
LET US FACE THE FUTURE AGAIN

WES STREETING MP



FABIAN IDEAS NO.651

Fabian Society
61 Petty France
London SW1H 9EU
www.fabians.org.uk

Fabian Ideas 651

First published March 2020
ISBN 978-0-7163-0651-1

Editorial director: Kate Murray
Assistant editor: Vanesha Singh

This pamphlet, like all publications of the Fabian Society, represents not the collective views of the society but only the views of the authors. The responsibility of the society is limited to approving its publications as worthy of consideration within the Labour movement. This publication may not be reproduced without express permission of the Fabian Society.

© The Fabian Society 2020

The moral rights of the author have been asserted.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Designed by soapbox.co.uk
Printed and bound by DG3, London, UK

To find out more about the Fabian Society, the Young Fabians, the Fabian Women's Network and our local societies, please visit our website at www.fabians.org.uk



LET US FACE THE FUTURE AGAIN

WES STREETING MP

FOREWORD	2
There is No Hope in Nostalgia	
INTRODUCTION	4
Back to the Future: It's Not Just a Change of Leadership We Need, It's a Change of Direction	
CHAPTER 1	7
Economic Inequality: A Tale of Two Britains	
CHAPTER 2	18
Our Ageing Society: Living Good Lives, Not Just Longer Lives	
CHAPTER 3	26
Technological Revolution: Creating a Future That Works for Everyone	
CHAPTER 4	35
Climate Emergency: 'Cathedral Thinking' to Tackle the Climate Breakdown	
CHAPTER 5	41
Shifting Global Power: Defending and Extending Democracy, Freedom and Human Rights	
CONCLUSION	51
People, Places and Planet: A New Story for Our Party and a Brighter Future for Our Country	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	54
ENDNOTES	55

FOREWORD

THERE IS NO HOPE IN NOSTALGIA

...the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear.

– Antonio Gramsci

Our mission is simple: to renew the Labour party so that we can rebuild our country. Britain is deeply divided, economically, culturally and politically. The social contract that has underpinned the United Kingdom since the creation of the welfare state after 1945 is unravelling. We have lost our sense of common purpose and a shared understanding of our place in the world. It is no exaggeration to state that our current malaise is an existential crisis, for it is not a given that our ‘disunited kingdom’ will survive the next decade.

Britain’s crisis does not exist in a vacuum. Across liberal democracies the long tail effects of the global financial crisis, the economics of austerity, rapid deindustrialisation and the hollowing out of towns and communities have combined with concern about high levels of migration to form a perfect storm that has battered

centre-right parties, shipwrecked the centre left and given rise to populism and extremism.

The 2019 general election result means that the policies and the priorities of a resurgent Conservative party will define our country’s direction at a pivotal moment. Brexit is happening, but the greatest risk for our country is the politics of Brexit trapping us in an argument about a better yesterday, instead of building a plan for a better tomorrow.

The scale of Labour’s defeat is clear. We have suffered four election defeats in a row and 2019 saw our worst result since 1935. We are on life support in Scotland. We are on a final warning in Wales and large parts of the north and midlands of England. We are irrelevant in the south outside of London and major university towns and cities.

The problem was not just Corbyn, but Corbyrnism. It saddled us with a manifesto that people didn’t believe in, a world view that people reviled and a culture that people feared. These problems were not just foreseeable, but foreseen. Ideological

dogma, vanity and hubris meant that the warning signs were not heeded. It didn't have to be this way and we can never allow this to happen again. Losing isn't radical. Our aim isn't to 'hold the government to account', it is to *be* the government. When Labour loses, the country loses.

There is no future for the Labour party if the debate about our direction becomes locked in an ideological battle between two competing visions of the past instead of building a politics that unites the country around a vision for the future. There is no hope in nostalgia.

The Labour party wins when it turns its face firmly to the future, as it did in the 1945 manifesto with *Let Us Face The Future*, in 1966 with *Time for Decision* and in 1997 with *New Labour: Because Britain Deserves Better*. This pamphlet is a new attempt to do the same. It considers how we might build a new centre-left politics to address the crisis facing our country, as well as how we build the foundations to confront five key challenges ahead: economic inequality, an ageing society, technological revolution, the climate emergency and shifting global power.

These challenges have been thrown into sharp relief by the coronavirus pandemic, the extent of which was becoming clear just as this pamphlet was going to print. It has underlined the fragility of our economy and the insecurity of our society. Older and vulnerable people have been left dangerously exposed because of the social care crisis.

Many will discover first-hand the grim reality of our social insecurity system. There is a risk that climate change will fall even further down the agenda of world leaders. Collective global leadership in response to the pandemic has been noticeably lacking since the crisis began. If a 'wartime effort' is required to bring Britain through this crisis, we have a responsibility to build a better economy, society and world in its aftermath, just as we did in 1945.

I am grateful to the Fabian Society for publishing this work. It does not pretend to contain all the answers. No one individual or political tradition has a monopoly on wisdom or virtue. If this fact had been realised and appreciated – not just in recent years, but in recent decades – our collective politics would be stronger. The Fabian Society does recognise this fact, which is why it has been a place for open-minded and good-hearted debate and disagreement about the future of the left since 1884. In that spirit, my arguments are unapologetically rooted in the mainstream centre-left traditions that changed this country for the better under five Labour prime ministers and the revisionist tradition that understands that our lasting values have to be applied to the challenges of the future.

The country is looking for more than a protest against past wrongs. Let us face the future again.

Wes Streeting MP
March 2020

INTRODUCTION

BACK TO THE FUTURE: IT'S NOT
JUST A CHANGE OF LEADERSHIP WE
NEED, IT'S A CHANGE OF DIRECTION

We have now to rethink the philosophical foundations of our socialism under highly unfavourable conditions, because we must square our philosophy with the conditions of the world of today and tomorrow, unless we are content to be merely the dying advocates of a lost cause.
– GDH Cole

In its present condition, the Labour party is unable to deliver the change our country needs. The defeat on 12 December 2019 was on such a scale that it requires an equally urgent and seismic response. Honesty is the best policy.

After the previous run of four successive election defeats in 1992, Giles Radice published a seminal pamphlet for the Fabian Society entitled *Southern Discomfort*, analysing what he described as 'Labour's southern problem'. If only things were that simple now. Labour still has a southern problem, with only 14 seats outside of London in the whole of the south

of England, mostly concentrated in university towns and cities. But we also have a problem in the north east and north west of England, where Labour lost 20 seats; Yorkshire and the Humber, where Labour lost nine seats; the east Midlands, where Labour lost seven seats; the west Midlands, where Labour lost nine seats; and the east of England, where Labour is down to five seats from seven.

Seats that have returned Labour MPs for the best part of a century went Conservative. Even in London, which returned the single Labour gain of the election, we also lost a seat and Labour's vote share went down by 6.4 per cent.

In Wales, the Conservatives achieved their best result since 1983. With the sole exception of Alyn and Deeside, Labour's representation is confined to south Wales. In Scotland, Labour is on life support with just a single MP for the second time in three elections.

The Conservatives outperformed Labour in every social class. The crossover age at which people were

more likely to vote Tory fell from 47 to 39. Among working-class voters, they enjoyed a 15-point lead, winning more votes than Labour amongst manual workers and households with incomes below £20,000.¹ For a party founded to represent the interests of working-class people, this raises serious existential questions.

The uncomfortable truth is that Labour's problems can't be reduced to 'southern discomfort' or the collapse of the 'red wall'. We have a problem everywhere. The problem is the Labour party.

Since it was founded in 1900, the Labour party has contested 31 general elections and won a working majority in only five of them: in 1945, 1966, 1997, 2001 and 2005. By any standards, this is a lamentable record for a major political party. The pattern has become all too familiar: prolonged periods of opposition, interspersed with periods of Labour government that delivered meaningful and sometimes lasting change for our country, perennially plagued by dogma and division about what the Labour party is for and who it is supposed to represent. The consequence has been a Conservative century.

The roots of Labour's present crisis predate Jeremy Corbyn's leadership of the Labour party. New Labour profoundly misunderstood globalisation: it was seen as an inevitable fact of life and uncritical support for it became an unwise test of our modernising credentials. Globalisation should rather have been viewed as a construct of political decisions, which needed to be managed and shaped by progressive

political leadership. After 2010, Labour had to define a fresh and coherent vision to meet the challenges of a post-crash world. But Ed Miliband's team couldn't shake off the Tory attack that 'Labour crashed the economy', or comfortably frame a forward-looking argument without appearing to join in the attack on Labour's record.

In many ways, the election of Jeremy Corbyn as leader of the Labour party was a direct response to this malaise. In place of process-focused, technocratic thinking, he painted in primary colours, offering 'straight-talking honest politics'. In place of top-down machine politics, he promised party democracy. In place of coarse political debate, he promised kinder, gentler politics.

But rather than reversing Labour's decline, Jeremy Corbyn's leadership exacerbated it. Labour went into the general election with the most unpopular leader of the opposition since records began. Corbynism saddled us with a manifesto that people didn't believe in, with an endless wishlist of promises that led to real questions about whether they were achievable, let alone desirable. It offered a worldview that people reviled, from the response to the poisoning of the Skripals in Salisbury to a back catalogue of public statements about terrorists that led voters to question whether the Labour Party would side with our country's enemies over our friends. It presided over a culture that people feared, with the unchecked spread of a toxic, antisemitic, conspiracy theorist politics that saw Jewish MPs and members hounded out of the Labour Party.

It cannot be denied that Brexit was a serious problem for Labour at the 2019 election, but this provides little cover for an abject failure of leadership. Strong political parties shouldn't be merely victims of political events, they should define the narrative and the response to the challenges facing our country. Whichever way the Labour party turned, it risked alienating swathes of voters. This would have been true even if we'd had a genuinely pro-European leader. But instead of making a principled argument with clarity and conviction, Corbynism triangulated on the biggest question facing our country and, in aiming to please both sides, ended up pleasing neither. Worse still, our leaders willingly embraced an election on Boris Johnson's terms, labouring under the delusion we were 'election ready'.

There is no future for the Labour party in Corbynism without Corbyn.

The next leader of the Labour party needs to hit the reset button loudly enough that the voters notice. That doesn't mean that we need to jettison every policy, embrace the damaging economics of austerity or seek solace in past victories. But it does mean building a transformational economic policy that people can believe in, a worldview that provides security and opportunity in a turbulent world and a political culture that is open, welcoming and inclusive.

We are in the early stages of a new parliament. Our choices now will determine whether this moment will mark the start of a march back to power, the midpoint of another long period in the wilderness or a death spiral that brings to an end an interesting century-long experiment called the Labour party.

In short, it is not just a change of leadership we need, it is a change of direction.

CHAPTER 1

ECONOMIC INEQUALITY: A TALE OF TWO BRITAINS

The political problem of mankind is to combine three things: economic efficiency, social justice and individual liberty.
– John Maynard Keynes

Ours is a great country full of promise and opportunity. One of the richest countries in the world, we have world-class universities, entrepreneurs and captains of industry, groundbreaking scientists and inventors, globally renowned artists, and a vibrant civil society.

But this is also a country of staggering inequality, intolerable poverty and wasted potential. Our economic model isn't working for the majority of people and the social contract that underpins our country is broken.

INEQUALITY TODAY

Wealth and income inequalities in the UK are stark. The richest 10 per cent of households own 45 per cent of the nation's wealth, while the poorest 50 per cent own less than 10 per cent. The average FTSE 100 chief executive is paid 145 times more than the average worker and

Britain's one per cent have seen their share of household income triple in the last four years whilst ordinary people have struggled.² The last decade saw the slowest growth in living standards since the second world war.

Hard work does not necessarily guarantee even a basic standard of living. Wages have failed to keep up with living costs. Fourteen million people live on incomes below the poverty line, including 4 million children.³ Outright gender discrimination exists and is entrenched by this economic structure, with complex factors constraining the employment options open to women, trapping many in part-time jobs and in-work poverty with little opportunity for wage growth or promotion. Black, Asian and minority ethnic people face barriers throughout their lives including educational attainment gaps, precarious employment, and the continuing hostile environment.

Inequality and the poverty it creates have led to an increasing number of what the economist Sir Angus Deaton calls 'deaths of despair', caused by

drug and alcohol abuse due to financial hardship and hopelessness. The rate of these deaths amongst men has more than doubled since the early 1990s.⁴ The human consequences of economic inequality are clear in government statistics: people are needlessly dying.

These economic divisions are not merely drawn across our class system but across the regions and nations of our country. Britain is home to nine of the 10 poorest regions in western Europe, but also the richest: inner London West. A child on free school meals in Hackney is still three times more likely to attend university than an equally poor child in Hartlepool. The gap in productivity between English regions is worth around £40bn per year,⁵ with productivity in the south east and London standing at 50 per cent above the national average.⁶

In the last 40 years, we have witnessed a significant decline in the UK's manufacturing base with serious social consequences in former industrial towns and profound political consequences in the form of Brexit. People have seen their jobs disappear as a result of one of the largest deindustrialisations of any major nation, with production exported to countries with cheaper labour costs through outsourcing or being lost altogether to labour-saving technology.

THE CHALLENGES AHEAD

The World Economic Forum has warned that unsustainable asset prices, high levels of indebtedness and the 'limited firepower' available to governments and central banks in the event of another major crisis are forming

the economic storm clouds for the global economy over the coming decade, a concern echoed by the outgoing governor of the Bank of England, Mark Carney.

The IPPR warns that by 2030, stagnation will be the new normal, and that we are in for a low-growth, low-productivity and low-interest rate decade, with weak investment and labour power. Slow income growth and a less supportive welfare system will make the 2020s a period of stagnation that will be felt acutely by low-income households. As well as the inequality between the richest and poorest, the UK's sharp, growing and unprecedented intergenerational differences will become more pronounced. By 2030, almost 40 per cent of all under-40s are forecast to be living back home with their parents – up from 14 per cent today.⁷

The coming decade will see significant changes to the structure of our economy and the labour market, not least as a result of technological developments discussed in chapter three. 140,000 retail jobs were lost in 2019 and some estimates forecast retail job losses of up to 2 million over the coming decade,⁸ while sectors like education, health and care are expected to grow, as are jobs in business services, creative industries and the digital economy. The extent to which self-employment and job insecurity will become the norm is contested territory, but insecure hours, constraints on in-work benefits and the concentration of decent, well-paid jobs in the south east are already leaving too many people with a poor quality of life.

Public finances will be under pressure, particularly as a result of the rising costs of climate change, pensions, health and social care. The tax gap between receipts and expenditure is expected to grow.

Each of these challenges would be difficult to negotiate in normal circumstances, but the UK will need to do so whilst extracting itself from the most sophisticated political and economic alliance in the world. Much depends on the nature of the future relationship negotiated between the UK government and the European Union. Boris Johnson's planned divergence from the EU's institutions and regulations is certain to bring higher economic costs. Our exit will be built on an unsteady foundation, with existing growth in 2019 at its lowest rate outside of a recession since the second world war. Even with spending increases to soften the blow, the IFS forecasts that growth will only rise 0.5 per cent in the near future as we begin negotiations. In November 2018, Theresa May's government prepared economic forecasts of potential Brexit deals. The forecast closest to today's plan, the free trade agreement scenario, 'would see GDP between 4.9 per cent and 6.7 per cent lower compared with staying in the EU, depending on immigration policy. Trade with the EU under this scenario is estimated to be 25 per cent lower – and 5 per cent higher with non-EU countries – than if the UK had remained in the EU.'⁹ A United Kingdom weakened economically by Brexit will find it increasingly difficult to address the global challenges we face.

FACING THE FUTURE

The liberal market settlement born of Thatcherism is not up to the job of rebuilding Britain's economy to work in the interests of everyone, but nor are the often hierarchical and paternalistic institutions of our existing welfare state. Both require reimagination to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

A strong economy and a just society go hand in hand. This should be the central goal of Labour's economic policy. Disraeli's description of England in the 19th century as "two nations between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each other's habits, thoughts, and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different planets" has remarkable salience today. We need to be able to speak to the hope and ambitions of every region, nation and section of society. We need to enter the next election having already persuaded people on middle and high incomes of the shared benefits of lifting 4 million children out of poverty and having addressed concerns among all income groups about our ability to spend their money wisely.

EARNING TRUST

Labour first needs to win back trust that we can deliver on our promises and be trusted with people's money. At the 2019 general election, nearly two-thirds of the public weren't convinced our policies were achievable, let alone desirable. The credibility of the 'fully costed manifesto', which was already being tested as a result of plans to increase proposed spending from around £50bn in 2017

to £80bn in 2019, was put under further stress by a nationalisation programme that Labour refused to put a price on, repeating often the unconvincing line that ‘parliament will set the price’. It was then damaged further by a seemingly last-minute proposal to nationalise BT’s broadband business, with figures as high as £100bn being mooted. It was then finally shot to pieces by the subsequent announcement of an additional £58bn compensation package for WASPI women, which even the proposed beneficiaries saw as too good to be true.

We must re-learn the language of priorities. Why did our manifesto commit to spending over ten times more on higher education than on lifelong learning, and more than double than was proposed for early years or schools when the evidence suggests investment in these areas creates more socially just outcomes? Why was providing free broadband a greater priority than providing free childcare or social care? Where Labour’s goals were progressive and desirable, like the pledge to abolish in-work poverty during the lifetime of a parliament, they weren’t afforded the resources needed to achieve them. Even the Liberal Democrats’ commitment to increase benefits for the low-paid were more generous than Labour’s.

Alongside a fully costed manifesto, Labour should publish a distributional analysis of all tax and spending commitments to show how they would affect households with different levels of income. This type of analysis should appear alongside every policy put forward for adoption by Labour’s

policymaking bodies to ensure that every penny committed is directed towards just aims or otherwise justified. Labour must never again go into an election with a manifesto less progressive than the Liberal Democrats’.

Labour doesn’t need to embrace the politics of austerity to be credible. Demographic pressures on budgets for health, social care and pensions, the need to rebuild public services after a decade of swingeing cuts and changes to the nature of global threats to national security all point towards the need to spend more. The public understand that we can’t demand Scandinavian public services on American taxes, but they do need convincing that Labour will be careful with their money. So alongside a commitment to raise public spending as a share of national income, Labour should have clear fiscal rules committing us to balancing day-to-day spending with revenues over the course of a parliament and an explanation of how much we plan to borrow to invest and why this represents good value.

The strongest defence for Labour’s 2019 manifesto is that its proposed increases in the size of the state and public ownership were not dissimilar from other successful European economies, including the strongest: Germany. But the scale and pace of change on offer was not achievable – and it was not seen to be achievable by voters. Labour’s next leadership should set out a bold and ambitious vision for our country’s future, but offer a simple, practical and believable manifesto for a five-year parliament

that gives voters the confidence to elect a Labour government.

A FAIR AND HONEST TAX POLICY

Increases in public spending require increases in tax. This was well understood by a sceptical public, who did not believe that Labour's spending plans only involved increases in tax for the wealthiest five per cent and large corporations. Similarly, while a focus on improving productivity and wealth creation to boost tax revenues is correct, these revenues alone are not enough to meet even existing pressures on the public finances and our public services. It is time to put fairness and justice at the heart of our tax system.

Increased concentrations of wealth and growing levels of intergenerational inequality necessitate a greater focus on wealth taxation. It is unacceptable that those who have worked hard end up paying more in tax than those who have gained from investments or dividends. Labour's manifesto was right to argue that capital gains tax should be taxed on the same basis as tax on income – a policy previously proposed by the IFS and the IPPR – and that the poorly named and targeted 'entrepreneurs' relief', described by the Resolution Foundation as 'the UK's worst tax break', should be abolished.

The current system of inheritance tax is indefensible. The rich are notoriously good at avoiding it and the rest are too often unnecessarily worried about it. Serious reform is required, which could include capping or scrapping over-generous reliefs and allowances, like the exemptions for business

property. It could be replaced altogether with a lifetime gifts tax.

There is a strong case for increasing corporation tax and for taking further action on multinational tax avoidance. The rate of corporation tax is by far the lowest in the G7 with little discernible evidence to justify the current main rate of 19 per cent. Increasing corporation tax to 24 per cent would still leave the UK with one of the lowest rates in the G7.

Many of Labour's 2019 manifesto policies would have created other tax burdens for businesses higher than in almost all advanced economies. There were serious questions about whether they would generate the revenues suggested, and if they would lead to losses of jobs and investment to the UK. For example, the proposal to introduce a unilateral financial transactions tax in place of a multinational effort would have been an extraordinarily bad decision for a global centre for financial trading.

There are a number of steps by which the UK could clamp down on tax avoidance by corporations or tax havens. The abuse of charitable vehicles to buy property and avoid stamp duty land tax should be tackled by HMRC and the Charity Commission. High-value commercial property is usually not subject to stamp duty land tax, because the property is held in special purpose companies and it is the shares in those companies – rather than the real estate itself – which is sold. It would be fair and right to apply stamp duty land tax to the sale of those shares. A withholding tax could be introduced on payments to tax havens. Tech companies engaged in

tax avoidance could face a withholding tax or be subjected to licensing fees and conditions in order to operate in the UK.

Business will only deliver the tax receipts for future Labour governments to spend if our fiscal policy strikes the right balance between making sure they pay their fair share without incentivising them to take their jobs and activity elsewhere.

REFORMING CAPITALISM

There is a vacancy for a pro-enterprise party in British politics. The Conservatives have built Britain's anaemic economic recovery on weak foundations. Their Brexit approach is at best indifferent, and at worst actively hostile, to the concerns of British business. Who can be surprised, when our own prime minister is famously reported as saying: "Fuck business"?

Businesses offer Britain a lot more than tax receipts for Labour governments to spend on public services. Companies create jobs and opportunities. Private enterprises innovate and create. They supply products and services from everyday essentials to life-changing enhancements. They build physical and digital infrastructure. Britain's private sector is home to world-leading industry. The Labour party shouldn't just claim to be pro-business. We should mean it.

But capitalism is now in crisis. The promise of capitalism – that each generation fares better than the last – is broken and with it the social contract of our country. This crisis of capitalism is bad for the businesses which are hampered by short-termism, low

investment, poor access to finance, weak exports, poor productivity and market dominance by multinationals.

The Labour party is not an anti-capitalist party. To paraphrase Churchill, capitalism is the worst economic system except for all those other systems which have been tried from time to time. We oppose excessive concentrations of corporate power and are determined to break up monopolies and oligopolies. We want to see an end to crony capitalism, facilitated by poor political judgement, that allows public services to be outsourced, profits privatised, the risk kept with the state, big bucks paid to company directors and workers stripped of their decent terms and conditions. Carillion is a prime example of this. The next Labour government should work with the best of British business to reform the worst of British capitalism.

Action should be taken to improve the diversity of company boards, with a requirement for companies to publish clear action plans for achieving gender balance and the widening of diversity. As part of a broader set of proposals for industrial democracy, every public and private sector organisation with more than 250 employees should have elected employee representation on their board and remuneration committees. Reporting on pay gaps for women and ethnic minority groups should be mandatory.

Labour's plans for nationalisation were too easily portrayed as being based on an ideological attachment to the past rather than a plan for Britain's future. The East Coast mainline demonstrates the viability of a model

for public ownership where autonomous state-sponsored companies run public services in the public interest. The Labour party should review each proposed nationalisation in our manifesto, assessing the merits of each on the basis of three criteria: which model would give the public the best experience of the service, which model would provide best value for money and which model would best level up parts of the country that have been left behind? As well as rediscovering the language of priorities, the Labour party must re-learn the distinction between ends and means. The means of achieving a goal are important, but it is the end goal that matters most.

The most outrageous policy in Labour's manifesto was for a so-called 'inclusive ownership fund'. This would have required 10 per cent of the shares in all UK companies with more than 250 employees to be owned by a state fund, with dividends shared between employees and capped at £500, with the rest being paid to the exchequer. Promoting greater employee ownership is a noble ambition. Anchor shareholdings could promote longer-term thinking within the boardroom. But this was little more than a shameless tax grab and a brazen attempt to nationalise a significant chunk of British business, deceitfully sold as a plan to promote employee ownership.

The cooperative movement is an important part of Labour's history and, despite its recent difficulties, the historic model of the Co-op remains a model for how some businesses can be run for the benefit of all. The country would benefit

if more businesses were to become cooperatives or employee-owned like John Lewis. Heavy-handed mandatory transfers of shares would create nothing but ill-will, costly legal battles and damage to the UK's reputation for upholding the rule of law. Instead, we should be looking at ways to encourage and incentivise existing business owners to pass their business to employees and/or customers when they retire. We could combine the proposal above to abolish inheritance tax exemption for business property with a new inheritance tax and capital gains exemption for business owners who give their businesses over to a trust for the benefit of customers and/or employees.

Changing the world of work for good is not just a TUC or Labour slogan; it is central to reforming capitalism to work in the interests of everyone. Better pay, better conditions and better job security are the key indicators of social progress, but our economy is heading in the wrong direction with more people experiencing insecure work and millions not earning enough to make ends meet. The next Labour government should enhance employment rights and protections as part of a new Good Work Commission, modelled on the Low Pay Commission and outlined further in chapter three, with those rights negotiated between employers and trades unions.

REIMAGINING THE STATE

Just as elements of the left need to accept that business and industry have a pivotal role in bringing about a fair and just society, so the right must

understand the pivotal role of the state in creating conditions in which business and industry can thrive. This is not simply about rehearsing the tired argument that there is no such thing as an entirely free market, and that the state needs to regulate effectively to ensure fairness and competition; it is about recognising the active contribution of state investment in infrastructure, research and innovation, a case well-made by economist Mariana Mazzucato's work on 'the entrepreneurial state'.

Theresa May's government accepted the need for an industrial strategy for the UK, but the end product fell short of the ambition established by its own Industrial Strategy Commission. The Labour party should take the final report of the commission as the starting point for developing a new industrial strategy for the next Labour government. As Rachel Reeves argues powerfully in her pamphlet, *The Everyday Economy*, the government's industrial strategy pays little attention to the services, production, consumption and social infrastructure that lie at the heart of our lives, from the low-paid service sectors like hospitality and retail to areas like transportation, social care and the utilities, which employ 40 per cent of the workforce in England and Wales with similar levels across the country.

As Reeves argues, to meet the needs of the everyday economy, Labour should take up the challenge of the Industrial Strategy Commission and create a plan guaranteeing every citizen in every part of the UK access to a universal basic infrastructure, going further than the commission proposes to include

high-quality hard infrastructure like transport, housing, broadband and energy, as well as human infrastructure like education, childcare, health, leisure and social care.

It is no coincidence that the UK has one of the most centralised systems of government in the western world and staggering levels of regional inequality. The last Labour government delivered an asymmetrical settlement that gave power to Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and London, but left the question of English devolution unanswered. The next Labour government should preside over the biggest devolution of power in British history, shifting power and resources from Whitehall out across England as well as to the devolved governments of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. While every citizen in every part of the country should be entitled to good standards of service and the same universal basic infrastructure, there is no reason to believe that policies around economic development, health and social care, community safety and housing are better developed in Westminster than in the communities that they serve.

More equitable public transport investment across our regions is necessary but insufficient to make the system work. London benefits from regulated public transport answerable to its mayor through Transport for London and it is time elected representatives across Britain had similar powers, plus coordinating powers for organisations like Transport for the North.

In place of the lopsided approach of the current system of English metro

mayors, there should be a consistent and well-understood model of local power and decision-making developed on a cross-party basis with the Local Government Association. An either/or contest between cities and towns is self-defeating when the opportunities and lives of the citizens in both are so clearly interdependent. They must grow together and we should incorporate learning about the 'everyday economy' to ensure our approach relates to the complexity of people's lives as they experience them and not as some inconvenient data subset.

Without resources, devolved institutions will always be reliant on the centre. That is why sharing power must also be accompanied by a new local government finance settlement agreed on three-year cycles to allow for better financial planning and new revenue-raising powers in the hands of local decision-makers, including greater freedom to borrow to build new homes to meet local needs.

Reimagining the state is not just about devolving power from one set of politicians to another, but about giving people real control and agency over their own lives and destinies. On the night Britain left the European Union, one abiding image was of two women interviewed on national television about why they voted leave. They were subsequently ridiculed on social media for 'not knowing what it was that they had voted for'. In fact, they articulated clearly why they voted to leave the EU: they believed it would give our country more say over our own laws and they believed it would give them more say

over their own lives. The cynicism about whether Brexit really will give them that control is understandable, but these are positive aspirations. Surely the Labour party exists to make sure that we have a government that will make such hopes a reality.

Members of parliament, so often portrayed as out of touch, see the consequences of the failure of the modern welfare state every week through our constituency casework: a social insecurity system that punishes and penalises the unemployed into further hardship, destitution and ill-health; health services that all-too often leave patients feeling like they are being processed, rather than treated and supported; an education system ill-equipped to provide personalised support for children who need it; families pushed from pillar to post and away from relatives and support networks in overcrowded, temporary bed-and-breakfast accommodation; refugees fleeing violence and conflict in search of sanctuary enduring further suffering and the indignity of hand outs because they are prevented from earning their own keep. MPs see endless examples of human misery at our advice surgeries, many of which are made worse – not better – by their encounters with the state. The professionals who choose to dedicate their lives to public service experience this failure, too. It is why so many of them are leaving professions they spent time and money training to join.

Part of the solution for our broken social contract lies in restoring a social security system worthy of the name.

In her report, *Making Ends Meet*, Alison McGovern identifies a series of immediate priorities to end the need for food banks: ending the two-child limit in universal credit to restore support to 250,000 children, reducing the waiting time for universal credit payments, increasing child benefit to lift 300,000 children out of poverty and investing in disability support and childcare.

We must also ensure that people feel a sense of safety and security in their own homes and communities. It is no coincidence that ‘tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime’ was one of the few New Labour soundbites to make it into a Corbyn manifesto. It speaks to the desire of the public to feel safe and to see criminal activity met with justice, but also their recognition of the complex causes of crime and a belief that prevention is better than cure. Beyond criticising cuts to police numbers, Labour has had little to say on law and order for the last four years. Labour’s new leadership should make this a priority.

Longer term, we must completely reimagine the state. In her widely acclaimed book, *Radical Help*, Hilary Cottam applies her experience of working with UK families and communities across the world to find ways to return to the founding principles of the welfare state – reinventing it for modern times on the basis of building strong relationships with people to help them lead good lives and flourish. Cottam’s work forms part of a growing call for the state to be better at responding to the needs of people: showing flexibility and

doing things with people, rather than to them or for them.

Labour doesn’t have to wait to be in government to develop some of these ideas into practical proposals for improving people’s quality of life. Labour is already in power in communities across England and Scotland, as well as nationally in Wales. We should pioneer our new approach with groups affected by what some GPs famously describe as ‘shit life syndrome’, ending the indignity and ineffectiveness of publicly funded service providers marching into their lives to do things ‘to’ them. We should draw on the many examples of best practice identified by Cottam, including working with people to help them plan their own way out of challenges like poverty, unemployment or underemployment, ill-health or their struggles to care for loved ones. We should innovate, experiment and take calculated risks; scale up what works and learn from what doesn’t. As Cottam’s work demonstrates, this style of delivery would be cheaper to deliver but, more importantly, it would lead to better outcomes.

Complementing this approach is Mazzucato’s work on ‘mission-oriented innovation policy’, which focuses on big challenges that require system-wide transformation across different industries and sectors and partnerships between the state, private sector, third sector and wider civil society. It recognises the need for strong direction from above, but also the value of bottom-up experimentation.¹⁰

The coronavirus pandemic is not simply a public health crisis, but an

economic one. Any pronouncement here on the short-term response needed is likely to be overtaken by events, but it is clear at the time of publication that the demand and supply side shocks will be simultaneous and severe. This will necessitate a response more akin to wartime than the 2007–8 financial crisis in terms of state intervention to prevent businesses and entire industries collapsing under the strain. The focus must be on saving livelihoods, as well as lives.

If the coronavirus crisis demands a wartime response, we should give serious consideration to the peace that will follow. When future generations look back on our response to this pandemic, they should be able to do so with the same pride that our generation looks back on the legacy of the Attlee government. It could be a moment that further entrenches inequality, or it could be the turning point when we decided as a country to socialise risk and to give everyone a stake in success. Never again should we fail older and disabled people by leaving them so dangerously exposed as a result of our broken social care system. The level of social insecurity experienced by people

in precarious work should be seen as a wake-up call to start preparing for the challenges posed by the technological revolution that lies ahead, which chapter three considers. We can not afford to let this crisis distract us from the existential threat of climate change, so we must seize this opportunity to make our recovery a green recovery, with the measures described in chapter four. Should anyone still be attracted by the siren call of the populists and nativists, we must argue with renewed vigour and conviction that global problems require global solution. We need to rebuild global institutions to give people a sense of safety and security in a dangerous world, just as chapter five suggests.

As William Beveridge said when his landmark report laid the foundations of the welfare state: “A revolutionary moment in the world’s history is a time for revolutions, not for patching.” This is such a moment. It is time to commission a 21st century Beveridge report to meet the future with a genuinely forward-looking plan to rebuild our economy, reimagine our state and create a good quality of life for everyone in good times and bad.

CHAPTER 2

OUR AGEING SOCIETY: LIVING GOOD LIVES, NOT JUST LONGER LIVES

Policy-makers and broadcasters do not talk about a flourishing old age, much less enlightenment. Rather, they routinely speak of 'time-bombs' and 'burdens', of the 'flood-gates'. We need to reinvent.

– Hilary Cottam

Laying the foundations of our welfare state was a revolutionary response to an epochal moment for our country. But there was one area where the Beveridge blueprint was entirely unrevolutionary, even counter-revolutionary: the provision of care.

The founders of the welfare state didn't worry about care because there was already a simple answer: women would do it. While society as a whole no longer expects women to live lives of domestic servitude, the reality is that where caring roles need to be filled in the family, women are still more likely to take up those responsibilities than men.

Britain is in the midst of a social care crisis which the current welfare

state is spectacularly ill-equipped to address. We need to mobilise around a plan to address this crisis today whilst agreeing a longer-term strategy to meet the changing profile of our population over the coming decades. To do this, we need to be brave, taking on some difficult political arguments about how we build a society that cares, how we pay for it and how we attract people from around the world to join the UK's workforce.

THE CRISIS TODAY

The extent of the present crisis is well documented and the failure to tackle it is unforgivable. Over the course of the last decade, the social care safety net has been gradually cut to pieces. Government spending on adult social care in England fell from an average of £346 per person in 2010/11 to £324 in 2017/18.¹¹ Restrictive means-testing and pressure to 'deliver more for less' have impacted on the availability, quality and consistency of care available in different parts of the country.

The failure of successive governments to adjust the 2010 means test means people with property, savings and income in excess of £23,250 must meet the entirety of their care costs. As the Nuffield Trust reports, for some people these costs can be ‘catastrophic’.

Poor levels of funding are also driving a staffing crisis. According to the Health Foundation, there are an estimated 110,000 vacancies in adult social care. Staff turnover is high and the reasons for this are clear. Those who choose to dedicate their working lives to caring for others face low pay, poor working conditions and unstable contracts, with nearly one in four workers on zero-hours contracts. A noble profession helping people to live life to the fullest is currently seen as a low-status career path.

The economic value of unpaid care provided by friends and family is estimated by the Office for National Statistics to be £411bn per year, but there are broader impacts on our society. Linda Pickard at the London School of Economics has noted that carers are most likely to be of working age, with nearly two-thirds being women. BAME people, especially Asian people, are more likely to provide longer hours of care. Age UK highlights that more than 1 million carers are ‘sandwich carers’, looking after older relatives as well as bringing up their children, 68 per cent of whom are women.¹² For those who take time out of work to undertake caring responsibilities, the return to work can be hard and result in demotion. Taking all caring responsibilities together, the ONS estimates that there are 1.2 million

potential returners from care in the UK, 91 per cent of whom are women. Tackling the social care crisis isn’t just about providing people with the support they need; it is about unlocking the talents of people who could be in the labour market, a disproportionate number of whom are women. This is an issue of equality and social justice.

Even if the objective were simply a short-sighted commitment to maintain the status quo, the Health Foundation estimates that it would cost £1bn in 2020/21 to address demand pressures and staff pay, rising to £3.4bn in 2023/24 in comparison with the current baseline budget. Restoring access to 2010/11 levels would cost an additional £8.1bn.

But it is clear the status quo isn’t working for anyone. It fails those who need care, with 1 million older people failing to receive the support they need. It fails those who love them, as many of the UK’s 6.5 million family carers live in dire straits, with as many as one in four having failed to get a single day away from caring for five years. This brings harmful consequences for carers’ own wellbeing. The system also fails care service providers who know their service provision is not good enough, but who cannot make the changes needed because of the funding constraints on their paymasters in local government. This stops them recruiting, rewarding and retaining staff. The system fails our society and economy, as more and more older people end up in hospital as a result of preventable conditions and one-third of unpaid carers end up reducing hours or giving up paid work altogether.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

The UK will have become the fastest growing population in Europe by 2030. The bulk of Britain's population growth will come from our ageing population. One in three babies born today are expected to live beyond 100. By contrast, babies born 100 years ago had just a one per cent chance of living to 100 years. The over-65 population will increase from 11.6 million today to 15.4 million by 2030. By comparison, the 16-64 cohort will increase by just three per cent. This will place significant pressure on adult social care budgets, as the working age population to pay for it shrinks. IPPR estimates that the funding gap for adult social care will reach £13bn by 2030-31, which would be 62 per cent of the expected budget.

These factors necessitate recruiting skilled workers from overseas – not just to meet the skills needs of our economy, but to provide the tax revenues we need to fund people in retirement. But as we have seen in the UK and many other Western democracies, people aren't necessarily prioritising national economic interest when making political decisions and governments are beginning to follow suit.

FACING THE FUTURE

During his inaugural speech as prime minister, Boris Johnson pledged to “fix ... once and for all” the social care crisis which has plagued successive administrations. Proposals put forward by Gordon Brown to introduce a levy at death to fund social care were savaged as a ‘death tax’. After he left office, David Cameron expressed his regret

at not addressing the ‘catastrophic costs’ of social care. Theresa May’s manifesto commitment to address the social care crisis was successfully torpedoed by Labour attacks on her so-called ‘dementia tax’. Following the election, those proposals were quietly dropped and a Green Paper announced in March 2017 has still yet to materialise after missing five publication dates.

There is no shortage of ideas available. The Dilnot Commission, which reported in 2011, proposed a range of measures to tackle the funding crisis, including a more generous means-testing threshold set at £100,000, a cap on care costs of £35,000, disability benefits to support independence for disabled people and a national threshold for care eligibility to end the postcode lottery.

The Scottish government provides free personal and nursing care following a needs-based assessment to assist with a range of tasks from personal hygiene and continence management through to counselling and food preparation, with chargeable services including housework, laundry, shopping and the costs of supplying food. The cost of implementing such a model in England could add around £4.4bn to the social care budget today,¹³ but this will still fall short of meeting people’s full social care needs.

At the 2019 general election, the Nuffield Foundation called for clarity and consistency about the social care offer, supporting calls for free personal care for over-65s; fair and transparent funding being shared between individuals and the state; and a workforce strategy to address the scale of the

shortage; as well as stability for organisations providing care.

Labour's manifesto committed £10bn for social care and included proposals for free personal care for the over-65s, a lifetime cap on personal contributions of £100,000 and clear eligibility criteria. The funding commitments were widely welcomed, but the pledge to repeal the Health and Social Care Act was criticised for raising the spectre of another costly NHS reorganisation.

In the social care debates of the last decade, short-term political opportunism has trumped the national interest, resulting in a failure to treat the crisis with the urgency it deserves. The result has been human misery and indignity.

PUTTING PEOPLE FIRST

Living longer should be a cause for celebration, untainted by expectation of misery, fear or pain. Where people are unable to work because of chronic illness or disability, they should be actively enabled to live fulfilling lives. As a society, we are far from realising this vision.

The social care crisis can't wait for a Labour government. In opposition, Labour's new leadership needs to stress the urgent need to inject cash into the system and tackle the recruitment crisis immediately.

Longer term, any plan for funding must find the right balance between the contributions made by individuals and the state. But too often the debate starts and ends with a discussion about thresholds, entitlements and cash injections with the aim of propping up the existing system, rather than an ambition

to create something better in its place. We should first decide what a social care system which enables people to live good lives would look like and then decide how we should pay for it.

Politicians regularly contribute to political debates through the prism of people's lives: the people we meet, the services we visit, even the experiences of our loved ones. But the truth is we are not good at making policy through the same lens and we are even worse at handing over power and control to let people shape their own lives.

If we start by wanting to help people to live better lives, not simply endure longer ones, we begin a different conversation and open new worlds of possibility. Describing an initiative called 'The Circle', Hilary Cottam provides evidence that such an approach works. Working with a range of older people, some of whom were experiencing loneliness and ill-health, Cottam's team designed a programme of public action that built connections, relationships and friendships – helping them help each other to lead better lives – from activities like coffee mornings, book clubs, art and cinema trips, to an advice line and a team of people willing to use their skills to help with odd jobs. Each 'circle' of the project was funded with a start-up grant from a local authority or housing association. Cottam reveals that partners calculated they would save more than £2m in the start-up years, with approximately £800,000 in cash savings and the rest made up from reduced demand for items like unnecessary GP visits.

'The Circle' is an example of how a new kind of sharing, relational

state could work; one that is about genuine sharing rather than, as Cottam notes, the pursuit of ruthless profit and exploitation of people. The latter currently characterises much of the formal 'Uberised' sharing economy. 'The Circle' isn't a social care model, but one that hands over power and control so that people can live well.

People are clear about what they want from a social care system: dignity, choice and control. They expect it to include nutritional care, pain management, personal hygiene, practical assistance, respect for privacy and inclusiveness.

The case for integrating health and social care has been well made. In some parts of the country, strong local leadership and collaboration between local authorities, clinical commissioning groups and health trusts are demonstrating the value in terms of cost savings and, more importantly, outcomes for people. Progress has been hampered by the assault on public health budgets, which undermine attempts to promote wellbeing and reduce demand on NHS services in the longer term. This short-termist approach to public health spending must end.

We need to be much more imaginative about the relationship between social care and housing. As Andrew Harrop noted in *Take Good Care* for the Fabian Society, published projections estimate that we will need around 11,000 more care home beds and 9,000 more supported housing units to be developed each year to keep up with rising demand. We also need to focus on improving the quality of those available. Jewish Care has developed a successful

'campus model' that puts personal care homes and supported housing units alongside wider Jewish community centre provision, providing lots of scope for intergenerational interaction and community spirit.

FUNDING THE LIVING

Much of what Andrew Dilnot said in his review of care funding nearly a decade ago should direct policymakers today: we need a national threshold of care eligibility to end the postcode lottery, and we need to ensure the benefits system provides adequate financial support to give those unable to work genuine independence and quality of life. Public policy debate is so often about making sure support is targeted at those who genuinely need it, but an even bigger focus ought to be on making sure that the support available genuinely meets those needs.

Just as the last Labour government raised the status of professions like teaching, so the next Labour government must raise the status of the care profession. Caring is a hard job. Taking care of people, recognising their needs and providing personal support in a way that gives people dignity, requires a wide range of demanding skills. We would want the very best people caring for us, or those closest to us, so we should invest in the workforce to make this a reality. In her pamphlet with the GMB, *Everyday Work*, Rachel Reeves argues for a new set of Royal Colleges for professions like care work, giving carers a central role in the design and delivery of their own profession. This should be accompanied by an increase

in care workers' pay, to enable employers to recruit the best and invest in their ongoing professional development.

There is consensus on the need to change, but controversy arises over the questions of system design, who pays and how. We could design a system along the lines proposed by Andrew Dilnot, with a means-testing threshold and a cap on lifetime contributions, but whatever our choice, it is time to grasp the nettle of the social care debate. As we found in chapter one, it is clear that a shrinking tax base and greater concentration of wealth in capital assets makes the debate about how we tax wealth more pressing. This isn't just a question of how we fund our public services, it is a basic question of fairness and there is a clear argument for pooling our resources, spreading costs and sharing the risk. Being able to live well for longer should not be a game of chance.

The desire to leave something for future generations is an instinctive one. People who have worked hard, saved hard, and invested in homes and other assets have a natural desire to ensure their children and grandchildren share in that success through inheritance. This is not wrong or immoral, it is natural. But as a society we need to consider whether we are placing too much emphasis on protecting the passage of wealth from one generation to another rather than enabling our loved ones to live good lives whilst they are still with us.

In short, we should care less about how we tax the dead, and more about how we fund the living. By being upfront and honest about costs to the state and individual, we would enable

families to plan their legacies and also deliver certainty about how to prepare for the care that accompanies old age.

Involving the public in a national conversation along the lines of the citizens' assemblies used in Ireland to consider contentious issues like the introduction of same-sex marriage or changes to abortion laws might help to create the conditions in which we achieve sustainable, lasting change with public support. It is not just the old or disabled who stand to win from a properly funded and delivered social care system. More than 1 million people, many of them women and young carers, would be freed up to pursue their studies or careers, with enormous benefits for family life and our economy as a whole.

VALUING OUR INTERNATIONAL WORKFORCE

If the funding arrangements for social care weren't controversial enough, the workforce challenge in the social care sector crosses into another complex area of public policy: immigration. Of the 1.5 million people working in social care for local authorities, independent providers, and direct payment recipients, around 250,000 were non-British, comprising 115,000 EU nationals and 134,000 non-EU nationals.¹⁴

UK unemployment is currently holding steady around four per cent – near full employment. Combined with a shrinking working age population it is now a simple fact that we will need to recruit people from overseas to fill

vacancies and ensure world-leading UK industries are able to recruit the best talent.

The decision to leave the European Union was partly motivated by public concern, in some cases hostility, towards inward migration. Many associated inward migration from EU accession countries with the casualisation of labour, lower pay and poorer conditions. These concerns were successfully exploited by the right, including the far-right, to foment a populist backlash. The impact has reached the heart of government, culminating in the announcement in February by Home Secretary Priti Patel that freedom of movement would come to an end and be replaced with a stringent, points-based system that would exclude those without decent earnings and high skills. This shortsighted proposal plays well with hardliners in the Conservative party, but overlooks the reality that Britain is already facing a recruitment and retention crisis amongst UK-born workers – and that the only way of preventing the further decline of our public services is to welcome talent from overseas.

The UK now needs a realistic and progressive alternative to the immigration policy coming down the track. Honesty is the best policy. The UK needs to attract people to live, work and study here to ensure our economic success. International students make an enormous economic and cultural contribution to our colleges and universities, and the relationships they build provide a lifetime of diplomatic and economic ties. Many people who come

to work here do jobs that local people would not want to do. Others come here because they are the best in their field, wanting to work in a global centre with other world leaders. We must get better at educating, training and supporting our own homegrown talent, so that no one feels left behind, but we must also remember that without immigration we would not be able to fill the vacancies needed to grow our economy for our collective benefit.

The biggest problem with the immigration system is the bureaucratic incompetence of the Home Office and the arbitrary policies and targets its staff are forced to work towards. The Home Office is no longer up to the task of managing the UK's immigration system. In the wake of our exit from the European Union, the strategic importance of migration policy increases significantly and the scale of the task becomes harder. A new ministry of migration should be established, taking full responsibility for immigration policy and delivery, with clear rules that the public can understand and which they are reassured are being enforced.

As former Home Office minister David Hanson proposed in *Healing the Divide* for the Tribune Group, we should give special status to EU nationals under a 'close partnership' model, with freedom of movement maintained for those with proof of employment, as well as for students, scientists and for internal business transfers, as well as a 'right to family' to allow partners of UK nationals to live and work in the UK.

For non-EU workers, a points-based immigration system could enable people with the skills we need to enter the UK, without the requirement to earn a minimum of £30,000 which excludes people from working in the

sectors like social care which pay less but have higher numbers of vacancies that we desperately need to fill.

Together, let's fund a system that genuinely cares for people and values the people who care for us.

CHAPTER 3

TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION: CREATING A FUTURE THAT WORKS FOR EVERYONE

The internet is the great equaliser. The technology which emanated from the Silicon Valley of California has more potential to ameliorate social inequality than any development in the history of the world, including the industrial revolution.

– Benazir Bhutto

An industrial revolution is taking place at an unprecedented pace and scale. It was more than 50 years after the invention of the telephone that half a million Americans owned one. It took radio 38 years to attract 50 million listeners. By comparison, Facebook attracted 6 million users in year one and that number multiplied 100 times in the five years that followed. WeChat, the multi-purpose messaging, social media and mobile payment app launched in China in 2011, has more than a billion monthly active users. But aside from rapid growth, what makes this industrial revolution unlike any other is that advancements in machine

learning, artificial intelligence and quantum computing will allow technology to perform tasks previously thought to be quintessentially human.

This technological revolution opens up a world of possibility and opportunity but brings with it great risks. It will affect every aspect of our lives. This chapter focuses on the impact of technology on inequality. Before she was assassinated, Pakistan's prime minister Benazir Bhutto saw the potential of technology to tackle inequality, but as Klaus Schwab of the World Economic Forum warns us: "In addition to being a key economic concern, inequality represents the greatest societal concern associated with the Fourth Industrial Revolution." We need to learn the right lessons from our experience of globalisation: our political choices will help determine whether this technological revolution works in the interests of everyone.

DISRUPTING TODAY

We are already seeing the impact of technology on both the labour market

and on key sectors of our economy. The UK's retail sector is experiencing major disruption as a result of online retail, with significant high street job losses. Technological disruption is also driving industrial convergence, exemplified by companies like Amazon, Apple and Google. Manufacturers in the automotive industry are having to explore ways to reinvent their traditional business models whilst new entrants like Uber and Lyft motor ahead with serious investment in driverless car technology and shared transportation models.

Consumers have convenience at their fingertips, but this ease of access brings significant challenges. The so-called 'gig economy', operated through digital platforms like Uber and Deliveroo, whereby workers defined as 'freelancers' provide labour in temporary assignments or 'gigs', is already presenting policy makers and regulators with difficulties in imposing regulatory frameworks and standards. In cities like London, consumers have become accustomed to the convenience and cost of Uber's minicab service, but it is only made possible through a combination of venture capital, tax avoidance and the exploitation of low-paid drivers. Trade unions like GMB have been forced to take companies in the gig economy to court in order to defend basic, yet hard-won, employment rights like the minimum wage, holiday pay, sick pay and maternity pay. This is unacceptable.

Digital technology is also driving profound societal change, reflected in the explosion of interest in behavioural economics. Access to information is creating more demanding consumers,

with more of us seeking personalised services, but it also offers the positive potential to create more informed, empowered and engaged citizens. Public services have been slow to respond to this trend. Where they have, it has typically been through the conviction, held by politicians in successive governments, that digitisation will deliver more demanding consumers and better public services as a result – although the evidence to support this theory is mixed at best. Today's empowered customers open up an opportunity for the left to use technology and data to create responsive and efficient public services.

Some countries are already embracing the potential offered by new technology in transforming the civic sphere. New cities are being built from the ground up, like the Tianjin eco city – a joint venture between China and Singapore. Driverless transit systems and smart buildings are already beginning to emerge. For public services under strain, most notably the NHS, new technology offers the chance to make efficiency gains and improve health outcomes by seizing the benefits of sensor technology, real-time data, and analytics to re-orientate the service towards prevention and disease management. By 2030, artificial intelligence will be able to use sophisticated algorithms that diagnose and prescribe more accurately.

With new technology comes new forms of crime. From hacking and phishing to malicious software and distributed denial of service (DDOS) attacks with the aim of extortion, cyber criminality is on the rise, with criminals

devising an expanding range of tools to steal from citizens and businesses.

The impact of technological advancement and increased connectivity is multiplied by the data revolution taking place, which is placing unprecedented amounts of information in the hands of consumers and businesses alike. Who benefits will be a key political question.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

In February 2019, Microsoft founder Bill Gates was commissioned by the MIT Technology Review to compile a list of the biggest future advances that he believes will define our world, providing us with a clearer picture of how technological development will change our lives in the years ahead. Gates believes that in as little as three to five years we will develop robots with enhanced dexterity and ability to manipulate objects. This could take robots off the production line and deploy them within the randomness and complexity of our daily lives, able to carry out delicate procedures and operate in rapidly changing environments. He also predicts a step-change in our use of nuclear energy, with the development of nuclear fusion and fission reactors that will make nuclear production safer and far cheaper. As well as creating alternative energy sources, Gates also predicts we will develop carbon-dioxide capturing technology in the next five to 10 years. These initiatives, combined with the development of ‘meat-free meat’ to end the highly polluting dominance of the industrialised farming sector, offer real opportunities to prevent a climate catastrophe.

Most of Gates’ breakthroughs of the future, however, lie in the realm of medical advancement. He forecasts the creation of ECG-equipped smart watches which can provide alerts to patients with heart conditions; pills that can be swallowed with microscopic cameras and lights, allowing for quick diagnoses of gut conditions that affect millions in the developing world; DNA analysis via a simple blood test that can predict whether a woman will give birth prematurely and custom cancer vaccines bioengineered to kill the disease within the body. This last advancement is already a reality for hundreds of people, as the biotechnology firm Collectis has genetically engineered human cells to kill leukaemia, placing many gravely ill patients in remission.

FACING THE FUTURE

In his book, *Future Politics*, political theorist and lawyer Jamie Susskind argues that ‘the digital is political’, with technological advancements raising profound political questions concerning liberty, democracy and social justice. These include, for example, the limits of human freedom in a driverless car that refuses to go above a certain speed; the implications for democracy when machines are able to deliberate more effectively than human beings, or for social justice when algorithms are making decisions about how a human being is viewed or treated. Indeed, the deployment of AI in government systems ranging from judicial decision-making to passport production already demonstrates how technology can perpetuate unequal

treatment or even racial prejudice just like human beings.

For the Labour party, the consequences of machine learning and AI for the future of work make our founding mission – to defend the interests of labour – even more relevant and vital. As Professor Andrew McAfee of MIT has argued: “We’re going to see more and more things that look like science fiction and fewer things that look like jobs.”

Estimates on job creation versus job losses vary. IPPR estimates that 3 million new jobs will be created by 2030 as a result of new technology. The World Bank estimates that 57 per cent of jobs in OECD nations are susceptible to automation – rising to 69 per cent in India and 77 per cent in China. The Bank of England claims that two-thirds of jobs are currently at risk of automation, with the lowest paid jobs most affected. But advances made in artificial intelligence will also see white collar jobs, even creative jobs, being made redundant by machines.

As Daniel Susskind posits in *A World Without Work*, it is possible we might witness a time when the ‘Age of Labour’ comes to an end. In such a scenario, ideas like universal basic income, championed by voices across the political spectrum from the libertarian right to the Marxist left, might become a necessity to deal with mass unemployment. This isn’t just an economic challenge, but a philosophical one. As Voltaire said: “Work saves a man from three great evils: boredom, vice and need”.

But this is a long-term dilemma. Politicians should be more concerned with the foreseeable future, particularly the

displacement caused by the ‘frictional unemployment’ described by Daniel Susskind, where people don’t have the skills to undertake new jobs, don’t live near new jobs, or don’t see the opportunities available as jobs for people like them. This mismatch of skills, place and identity is already occurring. As the Fabian Society’s Commission on Workers and Technology has identified, those living in villages and towns are more at risk from automation than those living in cities; those living in London and the south east are less vulnerable than those living elsewhere in the UK (albeit AI think tank Future Advocacy argues the potential to automate logistics and transport means Hayes and Harlington’s reliance on Heathrow airport suggests some four in 10 of its jobs are at risk, second only to Heywood and Middleton in greater Manchester¹⁵); workers in their 30s are least at risk of their jobs being automated compared with those aged between 16 to 24 and 55 to 65; and 70 per cent of jobs at high risk of automation are currently held by women. We must have structures in place to mediate the impact of automation, or we will risk it widening the already gaping inequalities in our society.

LEARNING FOR LIFE

Education shouldn’t be regarded as a means to an end or a commodity to be bought, sold or traded in for financial success. It is an end in itself: a process of exploration and discovery to deepen our understanding of ourselves, the world and the universe that surrounds us. Teachers are in the business of

civilisation building. Learning is an inheritance that belongs to everyone.

Education is also a social leveller and a route out of poverty. In a world where we live longer, work longer and the nature of work changes constantly, lifelong learning will become even more important than it is today. Our current approach is woefully inadequate. Participation has fallen dramatically, budgets have been cut by 45 per cent since 2010 and 9 million adults of working age currently lack basic skills, with those aged between 16 and 29 having on average worse literacy and numeracy skills than those aged 30 to 45.¹⁶ We need a sea change in what we learn, how we learn and when we learn.

The Centenary Commission on Lifelong Learning argues that education is ‘a permanent national necessity’ and should be ‘both universal and lifelong’. Labour should embrace this vision, with a 20-year roadmap for ensuring that opportunities for lifelong learning are available to all and funded accordingly.

The next Labour government should do for adult education what the last Labour government did for early years and schools. People need peace of mind that they won’t be left by the wayside because it is all too hard for governments to cope with providing world-class education and training after our early 20s. It should have a relentless focus on developing better curriculum, teaching and assessment across a wide range of routes. It should make sure that everyone is able to access post-16 education throughout their lives and develop the funding model to make this vision a reality.

Inequality is entrenched within the education system. Children from poorer backgrounds arrive at school with significant gaps in phonics, reading, writing and mathematics compared with those from more affluent families, the attainment gap at the end of secondary school has barely moved since 2014 and these inequalities have a significant impact on opportunities for further study and career success.

We need to get the foundations right. Early years education should be the immediate priority, including investment in home learning targeted to those families who need it most, the rebirth of Sure Start children’s centres available to all children from birth to the age of two and free universal childcare available to all families from the age of two until they are of school age.

Every child should study a broad curriculum up to the age of 16. This should include at least English, maths, the sciences, a creative subject and one of the humanities. Computer science should become a core subject with the required investment in the teaching workforce. Curriculum development should be left to the professionals, not subject to the whims of every passing secretary of state.

We should aim to make this the best place in the world to be a teacher. Every successful education system in the world recognises the importance of good teaching and school leadership. It requires having a well-paid, well-supported and highly motivated workforce.

Angela Rayner’s vision for a National Education Service had lifelong learning at its heart, but the lion’s share of educa-

tion spending increases in the 2017 and 2019 manifestos were directed towards providing free undergraduate higher education. This was the wrong priority. Although participation in higher education has improved dramatically during the last 20 years, its direct beneficiaries are largely middle-class graduates who go on to earn significantly more over the course of their lifetimes than their working-class peers who do not attend university. Participation among those from poorer backgrounds has also risen and is higher than in Scotland, where tuition is free. All the evidence suggests that any government wishing to improve life chances and reduce inequality should prioritise spending on early years, school and adult education. There are serious shortcomings within the current higher education funding system: for most applicants, the fees advertised bear little resemblance to what they will pay back as graduates; the interest applied to student loans no longer commands public support; and the student finance package is not generous enough for students who struggle financially. Tuition fees should be abolished and replaced with a fairer and more honest graduate tax, providing more generous upfront financial support to poorer students funded by tax receipts from the wealthiest graduates.

Education is key to an equitable future. As Andreas Schleicher, the OECD director of education and skills warns: "Things that are easy to teach are easy to automate. The future is about pairing artificial intelligence with the cognitive, social and emotional skills and values of humans."

CHANGING THE WORLD OF WORK FOR GOOD

As TUC general secretary Frances O'Grady argues, every job should be a decent job, everyone should earn a fair wage for a hard day's work and all of us should have a real voice in how change happens.

The 2019 Labour manifesto contained a comprehensive set of proposals to improve employment rights, under the auspices of a new government ministry, many of which were practical common sense – and are therefore unlikely to be realised under a Conservative government. These include the repeal of the 2016 Trade Union Act and the strengthening of enforcement arrangements for existing employment rights. Some of the proposals were not ambitious enough, such as the modest improvements proposed for paternity rights in place of the full equalisation policy that should have been offered. Some of the more ambitious ideas, like a shorter working week or trials for universal basic income, raised more questions than answers and left Labour exposed under the scrutiny of a general election campaign.

The next Labour government should follow the successful model of the Low Pay Commission by establishing a Good Work Commission to negotiate the future of employment rights and protections. The Low Pay Commission not only ensured that the national minimum wage came into being, but also helped build support for the increase across business and politics, ensuring its longevity. A Good Work Commission, bringing together employers and trade unions with the government, could

similarly help to negotiate the future of work in the interests of everyone.

A shadow Good Work Commission should be established by Labour in opposition, to lay the foundations for an employment rights bill to be introduced within the first 100 days of the next Labour government. This would allow the state to lead by example. Many of the roles that are most valuable to people and least susceptible to automation are amongst the lowest paid, like those of care workers. As part of a shadow Good Work Commission, Labour should look at low pay and job insecurity across the public sector and prepare a workforce strategy to irreversibly raise the floor in relation to pay and conditions within the first term of the next Labour government.

A Labour administration should also encourage better practice in the private sector by introducing a modern form of fair wage resolutions in government contracts, so that goods and services are procured from contractors observing the highest conditions of pay and employment standards.

Trade unions like the GMB are demonstrating through the courts that corporate giants in the gig economy are abusing the notion of self-employment to deny their workers hard-won basic employment rights. This practice must end. It should not be left to the unions and the courts to ensure the fair treatment of these workers; government must act by strengthening existing legislation and taking tougher enforcement action against firms that seek to exploit their workers through bogus self-employment status.

The problem is not that trade unions have too much power, but that workers have too little influence. Trade unions should be seen as essential partners in developing responses to the challenges posed by the fourth industrial revolution. Collective bargaining rights have been steadily eroded in recent decades, leaving workers' voices weakened. It should be made easier for workers to join a union and to gain workplace recognition. IPPR proposes giving trades unions a physical and digital right to access employees to encourage them to join. Government should also consider seed funding a new generation of unions for the self-employed, to provide advice, training and insurance to cover challenges like sickness or late payments from clients. The Resolution Foundation points to the 'modern awards' system being used in Australia and the fair pay agreements proposed in New Zealand as potential models to expand collective bargaining in the UK.

THE INNOVATION NATION

The UK is a global centre of excellence in research and innovation, but we should be even more ambitious. The latest figures from the House of Commons Library put UK research and development (R&D) spending at 1.7 per cent of GDP – behind the USA, France and Germany. The next Labour government should aim to increase this to three per cent.

Such a significant uplift in innovation investment must also ensure value for money and be ruthless about returns for British taxpayers and our economy.

Whilst discussing R&D, let us remember that it is research which costs money and development that brings the financial and, crucially, industrial payback.

UK universities are world-class but we still need to do more to bridge the so-called ‘valley of death’ to take academic ideas on to commercial success. Industrial researchers know that the cost of scale-up and commercialisation is an order of magnitude more than the cost of the fundamental research. They allocate their resources accordingly. The public sector in the UK has this ratio entirely reversed, spending 10 times more on fundamental research than on scale-up and development. The consequence is that the UK taxpayer is a benevolent funder of research for the world, hamstrung by a funding regime that has insufficient capacity to absorb and commercialise UK-funded research.

The solution is to ensure that future growth in the science and innovation budget is targeted more towards development than research, ensuring that research carried out in the UK is commercialised in the UK and that the economic benefits are captured in the UK.

Britain’s research and technology organisations (RTOs) have a key role to play. Possibly the least known, and certainly the least well-funded element of the UK’s science and innovation infrastructure, RTOs are industry-focused centres, with strong industrial links and a commercial mindset. Analogous to the Fraunhofer system in Germany, RTOs include both public and private sector organisations. The UK RTO sector is larger than Germany’s

Fraunhofers but considerably less well funded by government and less well recognised. The German government is careful to ensure that each Fraunhofer occupies a distinctive space in the industrial innovation ecosystem, to ensure there is no displacement or crowding out by public sector funds. The UK has been more haphazard in this regard, with inefficient allocation of funding, examples of displacement and an inequitable access of funds for centres.

Bringing the RTOs back into the fold as part of the government’s delivery mechanism for innovation will create an immediate supercharge to commercialisation and economic growth for UK science and innovation. A consequence of funding development rather than research in this way is that funding will naturally flow in greater proportion towards industrial areas, particularly the north and Midlands where many RTOs are located rather than continuing to be concentrated in the so-called ‘golden triangle’ of universities in the south of England.

LEVERAGING TECHNOLOGY FOR THE COMMON GOOD

We should aim to have the smartest state in the world, with digital transformation driven from the centre of government, possibly as part of a new prime minister’s department, incorporating the Cabinet Office. Government should champion an open data approach and invite the best and brightest in our thriving community of tech entrepreneurs to propose answers to some of the biggest public policy challenges we

face. We should be brave enough to take on hostile elements of the right and the British media who believe that public sector workers should be paid less than everyone else, instead putting in place an attractive package to recruit and retain the best and brightest minds at different stages in their careers to build digital skills capability across the public sector, from Whitehall to town halls.

Data collection and analysis will not only challenge and transform political institutions, but create new models of ownership, economic power and wealth. IPPR argues that building a public, democratic data infrastructure in the 21st century will be a task on par with the creation of the welfare state in the 20th century. We have a responsibility to rise to that challenge so that data, power and value rests with people, not corporations. From political thinkers like Liam Byrne to diplomats like Tom Fletcher and creator of the world wide web Sir Tim Berners-Lee, consensus has emerged on the need for a 'digital bill of rights'. This featured in our 2019 manifesto but it is yet to be fully formed. Labour should lead the debate on this now, so that we can introduce such a bill early in the first term of the next Labour government.

The United Kingdom is respected around the world for our commitment to the rule of law and our experience in crafting international rules, regulations and treaties. Chapter five

explores the role that the UK must play in ensuring that democracy, freedom and human rights underpin the international system. As part of that effort, the UK should lead the international debate on the importance of ethics and responsible innovation to our digital future. The Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation has funding until 2021. It should be placed on a permanent, independent statutory footing with the dual aims of informing public policy in the UK and providing global leadership, just as the Department for International Development has done in global aid and development.

We should lead the world in developing new technology to help tackle the climate emergency. A net zero tech taskforce should be established to look at how government, businesses and universities can work together to develop and roll out the technology that can support rapid decarbonisation of our economy, from greener transportation through to housing standards.

The technological revolution presents us with challenges, but it also offers hope of a better tomorrow through scientific discoveries and technological innovations that are unimaginable even today. This should be a cause for hope and optimism. Just as the UK led the world in the first Industrial Revolution, we should aim to lead it again in the 2020s and beyond.

CHAPTER 4

CLIMATE EMERGENCY: 'CATHEDRAL THINKING' TO TACKLE THE CLIMATE BREAKDOWN

*Avoiding climate breakdown
will require 'cathedral thinking'.
We must lay the foundation while
we may not know exactly how
to build the ceiling.*
– Greta Thunberg

Greta Thunberg's message was clear when she addressed the UK parliament in April 2019: we must acknowledge the scale of the climate emergency we face; the time for us to act is now and it is our duty to be world leaders in the fight through the development of a UK Green New Deal (GND). We must meet this challenge urgently.

TELLING THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY

The UK and Europe today are already experiencing the impact of environmental decline. According to the World Meteorological Organisation, the last 22 years have produced 20 of the warmest years on record, with the hottest four occurring consecutively between 2015–18. Prolonged summer

heatwaves are crippling infrastructure and causing public health crises, with 1,500 people in France dying of heat-related illnesses in 2018.

On 25 July 2019, the UK Met Office declared a temperature of 38.7°C to be the hottest day on record. Temperatures such as these are set to become the norm, with London in the summer months predicted to become as hot as Barcelona by 2050.

Other climate-related processes will permanently change the face of Britain. If we maintain current levels of greenhouse gas emissions, sea levels around London are predicted to rise between 0.53 and 1.15 metres, threatening the safety of our capital and surrounding regions.¹⁷ Across the UK, the Met Office forecasts that flash flooding caused by the intense rainfall that has already caused such misery this year, from Yorkshire to Wales, could become five times as frequent by the end of the century if urgent steps are not taken.

Beyond our continent, the effects are more severe and the challenges more

profound. In America, PG&E Corporation became the first big business to fail due to climate change, declaring bankruptcy following hundreds of lawsuits by those who had lost their homes in the California wildfires.

The Arctic region, too, has faced an unprecedented environmental catastrophe. The melting rate of Greenland's ice has risen to three Olympic-sized swimming pools every second, and following the hottest June on record, wildfires visible from space raged through parts of Siberia, Antarctica, and Greenland. These caused the release of up to 50 megatons of CO₂, a quantity larger than that released by all other Arctic Circle fires in June from 2010–18 combined.¹⁸

But it is ultimately the people of the Global South who will be disproportionately affected by the developing climate emergency, with 95 per cent of the cities at extreme climate risk situated in Asia and Africa.¹⁹ In 2018, widespread drought-related food scarcity caused extreme food shortages for almost 840,000 people in South America,²⁰ a leading factor in mass migration to the United States which caused serious political instability. The World Bank believes the total number of globally displaced people is set to reach 140 million people by 2050 due to the rising sea levels, droughts, extreme weather, and subsequent conflicts that will come to characterise this global climate catastrophe. There is a small but growing body of evidence²¹ which supports the theory that climate change already drives current conflicts and population movement. It is clear this is not just a problem for the future.

FACING THE FUTURE

Faced with this global picture, the UK parliament has begun to act. Led by the Labour party, a UK climate emergency was declared in May 2019, and two months later the government finally legislated for zero-emissions by 2050.

Although these moves are welcome, the enormity of the challenge requires us to be more ambitious. The future of our climate hangs in the balance, and we must use a UK Green New Deal to reorient our economy in the planet's favour.

A NEW NATIONAL MISSION WITH STRONGER ENFORCEABLE TARGETS

Building a Green New Deal for the UK should be a national mission. It requires strong leadership from the government, but also a recognition that governments can't do this alone. We need to mobilise the resources, innovation and industry of the state, business and civil society. If ever there was a cause around which to unite our disunited kingdom, it is this one.

A climate and sustainability office should be established within a new prime minister's department, coordinating a cross-government approach to the climate emergency, working with devolved administrations, civil society and business to make the GND a truly national mission.

Further strengthening of statutory obligations will be required to enforce targets and achieve the goal of a zero-carbon economy long before 2050. A new Sustainable Economy Act, like that proposed by IPPR, should be introduced as a foundational step, with

statutory targets for all environmental impacts arising from the climate emergency, including on biodiversity, soil fertility and air-quality. This act must also acknowledge the reality that Britain has artificially lowered and effectively exported much of its carbon footprint by importing industrially produced products from poorer countries, allowing us to avoid environmental responsibility for its production. This act would place statutory targets for emissions on both domestic production and on the consumption of products imported to the UK domestic market. A Clean Air Act should also be introduced, designed to tackle toxic air through the extension of low-emission zones, speeding up the transition away from heavily polluting transport through grants and subsidies.

The consequences of failure are untenable, and successive governments must be held to account to make sure that each target is met. The Office of Environmental Protection should be given tough enforcement powers to take action against breaches of the legally binding targets laid down by parliament. The remit of the Committee on Climate Change should also be extended to analyse potential or planned policies and to help successive governments, opposition parties, devolved governments and local authorities take a longer-term view.

GREEN FINANCE

As one of the largest financial centres in the world-economy, the UK has a clear responsibility to provide international leadership through the greening of our financial system. Many central banks and their supervisors recognise the

risks that climate change poses to global financial stability and their personal potential to do business. They are waking up to the sober truth that you cannot make money on a dead planet. This can be seen in the formation of the 'coalition of the willing', a network of 34 central banks committed to greening our financial system.

The Bank of England is already undertaking its own climate risk assessment for release in 2020. It should consider extending stress testing beyond financial stability, encompassing assessments of climate risk and whether credit guidance could be used alongside investment from the Treasury to scale up low-carbon investment in green innovation, technologies and enterprise.

Reconfiguring the Bank's mandate with sustainability as a core aim could prompt a whole series of affirmative actions within the financial sector. It may also present an opportunity to bring an end to environmentally damaging practices. Quantitative easing in response to the financial crash saw central banks, including the Bank of England, invest heavily in corporate bonds issued by fossil fuel companies, benefiting not only the most wealthy but also the worst polluters. A step-change in the Bank's guiding ethos could signal a move away from this form of destructive investment, towards ethical investing and divestment from fossil-fuels.

A GREEN INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

While the notion of the Green New Deal draws its inspiration from FDR's New Deal in the aftermath of the Great

Depression, Labour's notion of a green industrial revolution draws on our own great history. Britain led the first industrial revolution as the workshop of the world and we are well placed to do so again in 2020.

Decarbonising the economy and reducing greenhouse gas emissions will only happen if the government uses every lever at its disposal: public investment, procurement, tax, well-designed and targeted regulation, and research and development. It should have at its heart ambitious plans to build a new generation of zero-carbon homes, with robust environmental standards for new builds and the insulation of existing homes. It should stimulate the creation of thousands of new, high-quality, well-paid jobs across a whole range of sectors. It should help consumers to ditch their gas-guzzling cars for greener alternatives like electric vehicles and green mass transit systems – particularly the bus networks in the large swathes of the country where public transport is either non-existent or fails to meet the needs of people's everyday lives. It should scale investment towards a 100 per cent renewable energy supply, invest in renewable energy projects like the Swansea tidal lagoon, incentivise onshore wind and solar power, and bring shale gas fracking to an end. We should be clear that nuclear energy will continue to be a key source of our energy supply if we want to decarbonise with the urgency required.

Left to its own devices, the market alone will not provide the route to new green industry and jobs. Just as state-led research, development and innovation

blazed a trail for the thriving tech industries we see today, state-led R&D and finance can create the conditions necessary to bring about the birth of a new green economy. As Mazzucato and McPherson argue, private finance has a tendency to be short-termist, risk-averse and, in the case of venture capital, structured to extract investments over a three to five-year period. Patient long-term finance is essential to bring about the green economy we need. The UK should create a real green investment bank with regional equivalents, armed with mandates for investing in green technological research, development and business growth.

The tax system should reward long-term investments, particularly in green jobs and research and development, and create and enforce incentives and disincentives to tackle polluting behaviour. The UK should commit to counting the environmental costs of goods consumed in the UK, not just those manufactured in the UK.

Every institution has a part to play in tackling the climate emergency. This should be reflected in changes to government procurement rules, statutory duties on publicly funded bodies and corporate governance rules, to make sure that every institution pays regard to financial sustainability in their activities.

A JUST TRANSITION

Once the GND has begun, a just transition must form a key component of any ongoing strategy. A just transition must be designed to ensure that the enormous economic and societal

changes a GND will require will not be at the expense of any one group. The burdens must be shared by all and the benefits distributed fairly.

This is of most importance on a regional basis, where a GND provides the chance to rebalance decades of systemic regional inequality and decline.

Our last industrial revolution was forged in the factories of the Midlands, the coal mines of Yorkshire and the shipyards of Glasgow and Newcastle. Now a green industrial revolution presents us with an opportunity to revitalise those same towns and communities which have experienced the sharp end of import shocks, globalisation, and rapid deindustrialisation. We must make sure that these trends are reversed, not exacerbated, by a transition to a zero-carbon economy. The majority of coal and gas-fired power stations exist in the north of England, with thousands of other jobs relying on high-carbon energy intensive industries.

A just transition, implemented with strong leadership from national and regional governments, must be the answer. As Labour seeks to build its political recovery in the north of England, we have to offer a vision for the future, based not on nostalgia for the coalmines of the past, but on an offer that the coalminer's grandchild can have dignified work in a sustainable industry that offers a prosperous green future.

A 'Just Transition Commission' should be created, alongside a fund, to bring together mayors, local authorities, businesses and civil society to mitigate against the risks of decarbonisation to these local workforces and communities.

GLOBAL LEADERSHIP

In 1944, the Allied Powers gathered at Bretton Woods in New Hampshire to build a new economic order led by a new set of international institutions to avoid a repeat of the disasters of the 1920s and 1930s that created the Great Depression. The meeting heralded the birth of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. Just as these global institutions have reinvented themselves in the decades since to tackle emerging challenges, so the Bretton Woods system must be reinvented to tackle the climate emergency today.

The gradual erosion of the rules-based international system has led to growing acceptance that global institutions are in need of serious reform. Let us seize the opportunity this creates by convening in Britain a new 'Bretton Woods' conference to renew the institutional basis of the World Bank and the IMF. They should be given new mandates to use the tools they possess to support global efforts to tackle the climate emergency, with reformed institutional governance to rebalance the power relationships between advanced and emerging economies.

As well as leading by example, the UK should encourage other national governments to adopt more ambitious carbon and emission reduction targets, and refocus the mission of the Department for International Development to give an even greater priority to supporting developing countries in climate adaptation, the development of low-carbon energy supplies and the reduction of carbon emissions.

This is not just a mission for governments. Multinational corporations and

global industries can also play a vital role in encouraging faster progress towards decarbonisation. The fashion industry charter for climate change is a good example of how industry and sector-based agreements can lead to meaningful change. The UK should press for the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change to do more to leverage business, finance, civil society and sub-regional government to apply pressure on national governments to be more ambitious.

MOBILISING SOCIETY

Public support is crucial. We each have an individual as well as a collective responsibility to play our role in helping to transition the UK economy into a zero-carbon future. This will involve widespread adoption of everyday measures to reduce our own carbon footprint, whilst each providing democratic consent for the scale of political ambition that will be required.

Political leaders must strike the right tone in explaining the scale of the challenge, the consequences of failure and our plan to succeed. A fine line exists between shocking people to act and scaring people to the extent they believe that we are doomed to failure and action is futile.

Too often, discussion about what needs to be done moves immediately to great personal sacrifices and a conversation about what we stand to lose, rather than what we stand to gain. Some of the most radical proposals from the green movement – from high aviation taxes to discourage flying to measures to reduce meat consumption are, at this point in time, unlikely to achieve democratic support. They therefore risk impeding progress on measures that would easily attract consensus.

Six select committees, led by the Business, Energy and Industrial Select Committee – have already announced plans for their own joint citizens’ assembly on combating climate change and the path to net-zero emissions. The findings of this assembly and the experiences of those who lead and participate in it should inform our approach to both the climate crisis and the use of citizens’ assemblies to inform future public policy debate.

If Britain can make the best of the opportunities a green industrial revolution has to offer, we can emerge into a post-carbon age as the world-leading, economically successful nation we should be. The opportunity is there. If we seize it, we can change the world.

CHAPTER 5

SHIFTING GLOBAL POWER: DEFENDING AND EXTENDING DEMOCRACY, FREEDOM AND HUMAN RIGHTS

*The price of liberty is
still eternal vigilance.*

– Clement Attlee

The world is changing around us. Global power is shifting from West to East. Rules, institutions and values that have underpinned international relations since 1945 are under strain and a backlash against globalisation has given rise to a wave of populism and extremism. It is not certain that democracy, rather than tyranny, will define the 21st century.

Whether tackling climate change or pandemics, hunger or terrorism, rogue states or the multi-national corporations, global problems require global leadership. The UK is well placed to contribute to such leadership – but are we up to the challenge?

Brexit is now a reality. The political turbulence of the last three years has not been without serious reputational consequences for our country, epitomised by the cover feature of Time magazine describing

‘How Britain Went Bonkers’. ‘Global Britain’ itself is little more than a slogan. To paraphrase former US Secretary of State Dean Acheson’s famous observation after the collapse of the British Empire: Great Britain has left the European Union and not yet found a role.

Since the decision to leave the EU, our government has failed to define who we are, what we stand for and how we intend to exercise our influence on the global stage. At a time when divisions over Brexit are being exploited by those seeking to break up our United Kingdom, the Labour party must be unequivocal about who we are. We are a patriotic, unionist party. We believe in the United Kingdom. While imperfect, our union of nations is a model of friendship and cooperation. We share more than an island and we are bound together by more than a treaty. This is not a question of votes, it is a question of values. This chapter addresses what the UK should stand for and how we should exercise our influence in the world.

THE GLOBAL CONTEXT

Global power is shifting. If the 20th century was dominated by the West, the 21st century may belong to the East. The flow of capital, information and talent has already shifted from the major trading hubs of Europe and North America towards a complex network across the world. Emerging markets have doubled their share of global trade over the last decade. The volume of trade between China and Africa rose from US\$9bn in 2000 to \$211bn in 2012. According to the UN, the total number of migrants worldwide rose in 2019 to 272 million, an increase across all of the world's regions.

Asia is becoming the world's largest trading region. By 2030, China will have more large companies than either the USA or Europe. By 2030, Africa's working age population is expected to have overtaken that of China. In less than a decade, more than 50 per cent of large companies will be headquartered in emerging markets.

Just as global economic power is shifting East and South, so too is the locus of economic power within nation states. In 1970, there were just two 'megacities' with populations larger than 10 million: New York and Tokyo. Today there are 27. By 2030, the UN estimates that there will be 41. As the world's cities grow in size and number, they are growing in political influence. C40 cities – a network of the world's largest cities committed to working together to tackle climate change – demonstrate the potential of city governments to provide global leadership on key issues facing humanity.

This forms part of a wider trend of urbanisation taking place across the globe. In 2008, the majority of the world's population lived in cities for the first time. By 2050, at current rates of urbanisation, the world will be two-thirds urban and one third rural. Asia and Africa will see the bulk of urban growth – an additional 1 million people per week for the next 40 years – placing huge pressure on natural resources and infrastructure. Lack of effective urban planning risks the growth of slum conditions. It is estimated that by 2050, around a third of city dwellers will live in slums – a doubling of today's numbers. Slum conditions – disease, destitution and despair – provide fertile ground for the recruitment of terrorists, traffickers and the trafficked.

Serious conflict and political breakdown continue to affect large parts of the Middle East and North Africa. Brutal civil wars have engulfed Syria, Yemen, and Libya, wreaking untold human misery as proxies perpetuate the conflict for political gain. Harsh autocracy continues to blight the governing practices of countries like Saudi Arabia, with severe ethical implications for nations like Britain from whom they purchase arms. Iranian citizens remain trapped under the rule of a paranoid theocracy, which following recent elections is set to become more resolute. Unfolding military tensions between Iran, the USA and Britain in the Strait of Hormuz, and the breakdown of the nuclear deal through the reckless actions of the Trump administration, represent the regional flashpoints which will define the 2020s if not carefully managed.

The trends discussed in previous chapters have global ramifications with implications for our defence and security. The melting Arctic is opening up a new front for commercial and military competition, with countries competing for access to the region's fish, oil, gas and other mineral resources. The Russian navy, previously constrained by a lack of warm water ports in the region, will be able to deploy their vessels year-round, threatening the coastlines of the Baltic states and the UK. Rising global temperatures will in turn create new security challenges for Russia. Their unlocked ports like Archangel will require constant naval protection. This will further feed the culture of paranoia which already defines the Kremlin's foreign policy.

According to the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, between 2008 and 2018, 87 per cent of internal displacements worldwide were caused by weather-related disasters rather than conflicts. The IPCC warns that going beyond 1.5°C warming will increase the 'intensity and frequency' of such events. More than 100 million people are at risk of displacement in sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and South America alone. The countries most vulnerable to the extreme effects of climate change are among the most fragile.

The technological revolution lies at the heart of a renewed arms race – as powers adapt to new capabilities and frontiers of conflict. The traditional role of conventional warfare has changed beyond all recognition, with hybrid warfare set to define the 21st century's conflict environment. Cyber attacks

erode faith in our democratic legitimacy and the line between fiction and reality. Every nuclear-armed nation is adding to or upgrading its arsenal, with Russia changing its nuclear protocols altogether. Hypersonic missiles could bypass current missile defences and Russia is leading the way in developing a functional system. Drones are able to deploy lethal force at the touch of a button, with China becoming a leading exporter of no-strings attached, strike-capable drones. Artificial intelligence opens up serious ethical issues around meaningful human decision-making.

The arms race is also a space race. Our daily lives are now reliant upon satellites in orbit around our planet. Concern about the security of those assets, particularly military assets, is growing, with NATO having declared space an 'operational domain' and a number of countries developing anti-satellite missiles. Expansion into space is already bringing environmental dangers, with huge amounts of space debris from previous satellite launches threatening our planet. The first nation to develop the capacity to clear this orbital junkyard could do so to its advantage.

Technology and globalisation have also opened up new routes for international organised crime, valued at anywhere between 1.5 to 2 trillion US dollars a year. The internet and the dark web are perfect vehicles for criminals because of the advantages in speed, connectivity and anonymity, but even conventional flows of illicit goods pose an enormous

challenge to law enforcement agencies. Both require cross-border, intergovernmental cooperation.

LIBERAL DEMOCRACY UNDER THREAT

Democracy is in retreat, according to the Democracy Index produced by the Economist Intelligence Unit. Its latest survey published in January 2020 found that democracy has eroded across the world during the past 12 months and that the global score is now lower than it was when the index first began in 2006. A third of the world's population live under authoritarian rule, a large proportion of whom live in China, where digital surveillance is widespread and the treatment of the Muslim Uyghurs in the Western Xinjiang province has attracted international condemnation, but very little action.

The West is now divided and uncertain. The 'America First' policy of the Trump administration has too often come at the expense of America's allies, our shared interests and the international institutions we have built together since 1945. European leaders aspire to be less reliant on US defence and to have greater independence from US foreign policy, but they remain divided over strategic questions like relations with Russia and the scope for European defence cooperation.

Much of the anxiety in the West, epitomised by the 'Westlessness' theme of the 2020 Munich Security Conference, is driven by uncertainty about how to respond to the growth of China. By contrast, China is expanding influence across the world, exercising

economic power through the Belt and Road initiative and its military strength in the South China Sea.

There is something deeper happening within the West, which threatens our collective security and shared values. While globalisation has lifted millions out of poverty to the extent that the global poverty rate is now at its lowest point than at any other time in human history, the benefits of globalisation have been unevenly shared. Since the global financial crisis, voters across Europe and North America have expressed their discontent with austerity, deindustrialisation and the hollowing out of communities at the ballot box. The failure of the liberal market settlement to deliver for the majority has fuelled the rise of populism, nativism and fascism across Europe and North America.

The pillars of Western liberal democracy are under attack from within. Although at times Western governments by their actions have laid themselves open to accusations of hypocrisy, liberal democracies have always been held together by a set of shared values and institutions, including democracy, freedom and human rights, underpinned by open economies, global institutions and international law.

For the populists, nativists and fascists, liberal democracy is a weakness, not a strength. It threatens their concept of nationhood, which is bound together along ethnic, cultural or religious lines. They do not share our commitment to equality, our belief that diversity is a strength and our open-hearted approach to migrants and refugees. Their ideology is fuelling the return of antisemitism,

with classic tropes about Jewish money, power and influence and conspiracy theories about George Soros threatening the European way of life. It paints Islam as the enemy and Muslims as the vanguard of an Islamic invasion. It is inspiring far-right terrorism in 'defence of the nation'. It is also being encouraged and exploited by our external enemies.

We should not be complacent about the defence of our liberal democracy in Britain, or about the populist tendencies of our mainstream political parties. During the Brexit crisis, Conservative politicians made inflammatory statements that gave licence to attacks on politicians, simply for acting in accordance with their conscience. The government had to be taken to court to prevent an illegal prorogation of parliament in one of the most tumultuous constitutional crises since the English Civil War. It now persistently threatens judicial independence. It has also resisted media scrutiny and barred critical publications and broadcasters from briefings, all whilst engaging in attacks on the BBC. Trade union freedoms were curtailed within months of the Conservatives winning a majority in 2015, and the freedom of civil society to criticise government policy, already curtailed by a so-called 'gagging law', has been further restricted in contracts with the government. Islamophobia has been a well-documented and poorly addressed crisis within the ranks of the Conservative party.

The Labour party has not been immune from populist tendencies or an anti-Western world view. There has

always been a left-wing tradition that sees the world through the prism of the cold war and has consistently backed the wrong side, even after the cold war had ended. This is not, and never has been, a Labour tradition, but as many of those who promoted this world view joined Labour after 2015, it gained traction within the party, sullied our reputation and clouded the judgement of some of our leaders. It has been seen most frequently through the jeering of journalists at Labour party events and the attacks on the mainstream media. It was evident most egregiously when Jeremy Corbyn cast doubt on whether Russian agents attempted to murder the Skripals using a chemical agent on the streets of Salisbury and echoed the request of the Russian government for a sample of the nerve agent to be sent to Moscow for testing. Labour's anti-semitism crisis stems from a worldview that puts Jews or Zionists at the centre of a global capitalist conspiracy working to create a rigged system that works for the wealthiest few at the expense of the many. It was this worldview that voters found repulsive and that we must comprehensively abandon.

FACING THE FUTURE

The Labour party has a long and proud history of internationalism. We were the last to give up on the League of Nations, and the Attlee government's legacy extends as much to building international institutions like NATO, the UN and the rules based international system as it does to the creation of the welfare state. It is our responsibility to help Britain forge a new future: standing up

for our values to defend and advance democracy, freedom and human rights. But we will need to convince a sceptical public that Labour has the right aims and values, the means to deliver and the will to act in the national interest.

KEEPING US SAFE AT HOME AND DEFENDING OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD

The first responsibility of any government is to ensure the safety and security of its citizens – therefore we should be crystal clear that this will always be the core purpose of any Labour government.

Defence cuts during the last decade have left the UK with the smallest army since the Napoleonic wars, the RAF has its smallest fighting force in its 100-year history and the delayed delivery of the Royal Navy's new type 31 frigates have left Britain with a smaller fleet than Italy. In opposition, the Labour party should begin work on a shadow strategic defence and security review (SDSR) to lay the foundations for commitments in our next manifesto to modernise and expand Britain's defence capability and to ensure that in government our first SDSR is focused on ensuring that our armed forces and security services have the right people, equipment and resources to provide the UK with a 'full spectrum' capability to guard against future threats. Ensuring British sovereign capability requires that these changes be implemented in conjunction with prioritising a domestic UK defence manufacturing sector and a defence industrial strategy. Sovereign manufacturing skills will

be as essential as domestic military capability in a post-Brexit world.

The Labour party has always been united in its desire to see a world free from nuclear weapons, but at odds as to how this should be achieved. We have endured tortured debates about whether to support unilateral disarmament since the Attlee government first gave the green light to Britain's nuclear deterrent. Under Jeremy Corbyn's leadership, the Labour party committed to maintaining the nuclear deterrent, but our policy was undermined by a clear statement that the Labour leader would never use them, thus making our deterrent nothing of the sort.

The next Labour leader should be clear that we do not believe the world would be safer if our enemies had a monopoly on nuclear weapons and that we are committed to multilateral disarmament. It should be the position of any aspiring prime minister that Britain has both the means and the will to act in response to a nuclear strike on our country.

Since the 1940s, the NATO alliance has been the cornerstone of our defence and security. The Labour party should be unequivocal about our support for NATO and our commitment to Article 5 of the Washington Treaty: that an attack on one member is an attack on all. But the uncertainty caused by the current occupant of the Oval Office should serve as a wake-up call to Europe about the risks of an over-reliance on the United States and the need for Europeans to take greater responsibility for our own collective defence, particularly in the face of Russian provocation. However

the Five Eyes partnership with the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand will always remain the bedrock of our defence.

Although we will be outside of the formal institutions of the European Union, the UK is a European country and our security at home rests on the security of our neighbourhood. Outside of the EU, we should strengthen the E3 relationship between Britain, France and Germany and be enthusiastic in our support for deeper cooperation on defence and foreign policy among EU member states. We should commit to developing mechanisms for strong UK-EU defence cooperation to defend our continent and to maximise our collective capabilities across the world.

A VALUES-DRIVEN AND MISSION-LED FOREIGN POLICY

The UK is no longer a global superpower, but we have an important role to play on the global stage. We are a permanent member of the UN Security Council, with the second-biggest military budget in NATO, and a leader in intelligence and security. We are one of the biggest financial contributors to international aid and development and DfID's independent expertise is widely respected. We are a European country with unbreakable bonds across the continent and over the Irish Sea. Through the G7, the G20 and the Commonwealth we have a broad network of allies and influence around the world.

The rules-based international system developed after the end of the Second World War is underpinned by liberal democratic values and upheld by the

norms of behaviour, international laws, protocols, treaties, trade agreements and institutions we have created together. Promoting, defending and extending the rules-based international order, rooted in democracy, freedom and human rights, should be the central plank of our values-led British foreign policy and at the heart of all our relationships. We should seek to strengthen key institutions like the UN, NATO and the Bretton Woods Institutions and use our influence and expertise to create new institutions and alliances to tackle global challenges, from climate change to ethics in artificial intelligence.

The European Union is our closest neighbour and, though the Brexit negotiations have put pressure on our friendship, we share the same values and the closest economic partnership of any third country. In opposition, the Labour party should make the case for the UK keeping the closest possible relationship with the EU's single market and customs union, to protect jobs and our economy and to pursue our shared global aims. A strong EU is in the UK's national interest as the EU's closest ally.

The special relationship with the United States of America is under pressure like never before. The Trump administration has taken a number of unilateral decisions on key issues like the Iran nuclear deal and its approach to international trade which we do not support and which sometimes undermine the UK's interests. The British government's decision to grant Huawei a role in the UK's 5G network has caused a further rift with our US allies. This disruption will hopefully end with

the election of a new president in 2021, or certainly by 2025. The US-UK relationship has always been deeper than the relationship between our presidents and prime ministers and we should resist anti-Americanism favoured by some on the left whilst equally protesting the Trump administration's attempts to undermine multilateralism and international norms let alone common decency. The current incumbent of the White House has demonstrated why our existing multi-tiered engagement policy with the US is so necessary, and we must do all we can to preserve it.

The Huawei decision underlined the wider debate about the nature of our relationship with China. There can be little doubt about the weight of China's growing economic and geopolitical influence, as well as its military and technological capabilities. The UK has built a strong dialogue with the Chinese government. Under David Cameron, a 'golden era' of Sino-British relations was declared and the UK is one of the few countries in the world to have a formal human rights dialogue with China. In the context of a power play between China and the USA, we can have a relationship with both, but our relationship cannot be equidistant between the two. In terms of our values and history we are in every sense the United States' natural ally. We should not treat China as an adversary, but instead we should seek to work together to promote trade and co-operation on global issues of common concern; to challenge and influence, where possible, China's human rights record; and not to compromise on our moral and treaty-based

obligations to the people of Hong Kong or on our responsibilities to our allies, like Japan, the USA and our wider Five Eyes partners.

If 'Global Britain' is to mean anything, it must surely mean recognising the importance of building stronger relationships with regional powers in Asia, Africa and South America, and renewing our commitment to the Commonwealth, which represents almost a third of the world's population.

As well as being values-led, our foreign policy should have clearly defined and understood missions. Chapter Four of this pamphlet argues for the UK to show clear leadership on tackling the climate emergency as a priority. Chapter Three argues for the UK helping to define common rules and international norms around the use of AI and other aspects of the technological revolution. As a global financial centre, the UK is well placed to lead the global debate around the rules of our financial system and a Labour government should put the focus on economic justice described in Chapter One at the heart of our global leadership.

A model of what could be a mission-led approach to British foreign policy can be found in our approach to international aid and development since 1997. The Department for International Development and, to a lesser but increasing extent, its UK AID brand, is recognised across the world for the leadership, expertise, direct delivery, partnerships and convening power it offers the world in pursuit of the sustainable development goals. It is one of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown's greatest

legacies and it is to their credit that David Cameron and George Osborne had the wisdom to keep DFID and maintain a commitment to spending 0.7 per cent of GNI on aid. But DFID and the UK's commitment to international aid and development remain under constant scrutiny and attack from right-wing ideologues within the Conservative party and they should be resolutely defended. DFID should remain as a separate government department and the 0.7 per cent commitment should be maintained, with every penny being spent on genuine aid and development projects, rather than backfilling cuts in other UK government departments or as sweeteners to export contracts which brought the Thatcher and Major governments into such disrepute.

RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT

In 2005, the UK signed up to the United Nations' 'responsibility to protect civilians' principle: when a government either wilfully fails to protect the security of its citizens, or is unable to do so, the international community has a clear obligation to intervene. Such interventions could include diplomatic means, sanctions and military action.

The Iraq war, which was a catastrophic foreign policy failure, has cast a long shadow over Labour's debate about how, or whether, it is right for the UK to engage in military intervention. Every situation should be judged on its merits, recognising that both action and inaction are a choice and that each choice has consequences. Just as we should never overlook or forget the

lessons of Iraq, we should also learn the lessons of Bosnia, Kosovo, and Sierra Leone where British action alongside the wider international community saved countless lives. We should also remember the mass graves and untold tragedies of Rwanda, where the world stood by, and remember Syria, where Western reluctance to act in 2013 created a vacuum which Russia filled to the detriment of the Syrian people.

The next Labour government should uphold the responsibility to protect as part of our values-led foreign policy and a progressive, multilateral, approach to humanitarian intervention.

PLAYING TO OUR DIPLOMATIC STRENGTHS

The UK has one of the finest diplomatic services in the world, but it has not been immune to a decade of austerity. A significant increase to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office's budget would be small beer for the Treasury and it is essential if we want to deploy our influence effectively. We must rebuild the skills pool available to the government at the FCO, GCHQ and MI6 by seeking out digital communications specialists and a greater number of foreign language speakers.

The UK has considerable soft power assets too. The British Council, the BBC World Service, our education system, our creative industries, science and technology and business strengths are linchpins for our global influence and should be cherished. We should continue to welcome global talent to work and study in the UK, invest in organisations like the British Council and the BBC and

expand the opportunities to showcase British strengths through our global network of embassies, consulates and trade missions.

Let us face the world as an open, confident and optimistic country with the conviction that our best days, and the best days of humanity, lie ahead.

CONCLUSION

PEOPLE, PLACES AND PLANET: A NEW STORY FOR OUR PARTY AND A BRIGHTER FUTURE FOR OUR COUNTRY

*What is now proved was
once only imagined.*

– William Blake

It is time for us to write a new story for our country and Labour's place within it. Children born in Britain today are among the luckiest on the planet. We are the sixth richest economy in the world. We are home to world-class universities, captains of industry, and groundbreaking inventors, artists and entrepreneurs. The birthplace of Shakespeare and the Beatles remains a global centre of music, literature, fashion, art, design and film. Our military, foreign aid, diplomatic and intelligence services provide a cornerstone of international development, peace and security. We are a beacon of democracy, freedom and human rights. 1.5 billion people around the world speak our language and more than 40 million people visit the United Kingdom each year.

But this is also a country with intolerable levels of inequality in power,

wealth and opportunity. We are failing to care for people later on in life. We are at the beginning of a technological revolution that is changing every aspect of our work, lives and democracy, for better and for worse. There is a climate emergency that is burning our planet. Old adversaries like poverty, disease and tyranny are manifesting themselves in new ways. It doesn't have to be like this.

Our story is about people. We believe that everyone deserves to live a good life: to have a place they can call home, to have a good job that provides an income that does more than pay the bills, to have quality time to spend with their friends and family, to enjoy arts and culture, leisure and recreation. We believe that everyone deserves the best start in life, with the best education in the world that provides learning for life. We believe that everyone deserves to enjoy their retirement, not just to look back on a life well-lived but to live life to the full until the very end. We believe

that the state, the private sector and civil society have a shared role to play in promoting human flourishing.

We believe that all human beings are born equal and that our rights are underpinned by our responsibilities to each other. When we are sick, we care for each other. When we are disabled, we enable each other. When we are down on our luck, we help to pull each other back up. When we have done something wrong, we accept there are consequences and we rehabilitate each other. When we see wrongdoing or injustice, we never turn a blind eye.

Our story is about places. Our pride in this great country, the achievements of our United Kingdom and our determination that it can and should be better. We believe that the places we call home, where we work, play, learn, laugh, eat, shop and socialise, the places we came from and live now, and which we will build together, should be places where we feel like we belong, feel safe and like spending time.

Our story is about our planet. We believe that we are temporary custodians of the world that we share together and that each of us has a responsibility to care for our environment and the life on Earth that it sustains. We care about the world beyond our own islands and wish to see a world without hunger and hardship, tyranny and oppression and needless suffering.

Our ambitions and our aspirations, for ourselves, our families, our communities, our country and our planet aren't radical. But achieving them really would be. It is no longer beyond our wit or capability to provide everyone with

the basic conditions to lead a good life, it is simply a question of will.

Throughout the party's 120-year history, every Labour government has changed our country for the better, but our time in government has been too short and the agony of opposition too long. Our values are timeless, but they are meaningless unless they're made real by Labour governments elected by the people. Power and principle go hand in hand.

LABOUR WINS WHEN WE TURN OUR FACES FIRMLY TO THE FUTURE

Let us face the future again as reformers of our broken capitalist system and as champions of a dynamic and enterprising economy where economic prosperity and social justice go hand in hand, where the contribution we make reflects the debt we owe society and where we're all better off when the country is better off. Let us win back trust that we will tax fairly and spend wisely to support enterprise and success alongside our historic mission to end poverty. Let us reimagine the state and our public services by presiding over the biggest devolution of power and resources in our country's history and commission a 21st century Beveridge Commission to build a more flexible, responsive and relational state, so that people in all parts of this country can take greater control over our lives and our destinies. Let's make sure that every part of the country has access to the services and infrastructure they need to live good lives. Let's return to the tried and tested approach of being tough

on crime and tough on the causes of crime as the party of law and order.

Let us face the future again for our ageing society, so that retirement is something to look forward to, rather than something to fear. Let's create a society where older people feel appreciated for their contribution to our country and where those who care for them are valued for the important personal and public service they provide. Let's care more about how we fund the living, than how we tax the dead.

Let us face the future again as the pioneers of this technological revolution. Let's push the frontiers of scientific discovery and make sure that the sum of human knowledge is used for the good of all humanity, to spread power, wealth and opportunity and extend freedom to those who do not yet have it. Let's prepare people to face the future with a lifelong learning system that provides opportunities for learning from the cradle to the grave. Let's make the future one that works for everyone, with a Good Work Commission to set a new global standard for employment rights and protections for the changing world of work. Let's advance our position as global leaders in research and development, by increasing the share of GDP we invest in R&D to three per cent by 2030 and let's build an innovation nation that can apply its research so that the financial returns and industrial gains benefit our whole country. Let's apply our technological breakthroughs to transform the state and our public services and face the biggest challenges of our time.

Let us face the future again with the ambition and the urgency that the climate emergency demands. Let's make this a national mission with the bold action needed to make sure that life on our planet has a future and future generations can look back with gratitude and pride that we got it right. Let our position as a global financial centre lead the way in greening finance across the world. Let's make this industrial revolution a green industrial revolution, using every lever available to incentivise the right behaviour and decarbonise our economy, recognising that government can't do this alone. Let's make this transition to a zero carbon economy a just transition, not simply preventing the further decline of the communities that experienced the sharp end of import shocks, globalisation, and rapid deindustrialisation, but actively seeking to reverse those trends so that those communities reap the benefit of green industry and green jobs.

Let us face the future again, so that democracy, rather than tyranny, defines the 21st century. Let's write a story for our country where people look again to the United Kingdom as a beacon of democracy, freedom and human rights. Let's rebuild the rules-based international order and institutions that give meaning to the notion that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

If we decide that we're serious about winning again, we can forge a path to a new future for the Labour party and write the story of our country's future. Therein lies the hope for our party and, with it, our country.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe a considerable debt of gratitude to a wide range of people who were generous with their time and expertise. Any shortcomings or errors are the responsibility of the author alone.

I'd like to thank the Fabian Society for publishing this work and for embracing the idea of the pamphlet so enthusiastically, particularly Kate Murray for her editorial direction, and Andy Harrop for his advice on the drafting and framing.

I am especially grateful to David Coats, Annajoy David, Matthew Hood, Darren Jones, Liz Kendall, Peter Kyle, Roger Liddle, Josh MacAlister, Adam McNicholas, Owain Mumford, Chris Phillips, Rachel Reeves, Amy Richards, Ruth Smeeth, David Taylor, Mira Vogel, Melanie Ward and Steve Wardlaw for commenting on earlier drafts, as well as providing policy input and inspiration. Diane Coyle, Jamie Susskind and Daniel Susskind were particularly generous with their time prior to the 2019 general election to help inform my thinking about the future. Richard Angell provided a constant sounding board throughout.

For the best part of the last three years Labour Together has provided a welcom-

ing, inclusive and ecumenical space to debate ideas away from the internecine conflict of the party. The selection of the five big challenges that form the core chapters of this pamphlet were derived from the Britain in the 2020s paper I produced for the group to inform our collective thinking about the future of the left. I am grateful to Morgan McSweeney, Hannah O'Rourke, Jonathan Rutherford and parliamentary colleagues involved in Labour Together for giving me the excuse to do the thinking in advance of the crossroads we've reached in the Labour party's history.

Finally, I have been fortunate to have had the best staff team that any member of parliament could ever wish for, led by Matt Goddin. Keir Mather, Alex Chitty and Eve Mason provided extensive research and first-class editorial input, Lloyd Duddridge provided inspiration and challenge to my thinking throughout, and Jay Asher's input indulged my refusal to accept that he doesn't actually work for me any more. As well as providing lots of input, I am especially grateful to my partner, Joe Dancey, for his patience while my head was buried in reading and writing during weekends and recesses.

ENDNOTES

- 1 How Britain voted in the 2019 general election, YouGov, 17 December 2019
- 2 Britain risks heading to US levels of inequality, warns top economist, The Guardian, 14 May 2019
- 3 Prosperity and justice: A plan for the new economy – The final report of the IPPR Commission on Economic Justice
- 4 Britain risks heading to US levels of inequality, warns top economist, The Guardian, 14 May 2019
- 5 1st Report Uk 2070 Executive Summary, Uk2070 Commission
- 6 UK regional inequality likely to widen further, warns study, Financial Times, 29 May 2019
- 7 Future Proof Britain in the 2020s, IPPR, December 2016
- 8 UK high streets shed 140k jobs this year with more to come – study, The Guardian, 30 December 2019
- 9 Brexit and the economy: Government analysis of the long-term impact, House of Commons Library, 05 December 2018
- 10 Mariana Mazzucato, Mission-oriented Policy Innovation, The RSA, 2017
- 11 What should be done to fix the crisis in social care? The Health Foundation, August 2019
- 12 Breaking Point: The social care burden on women – Age UK (March 2019)
- 13 What should be done to fix the crisis in social care? The Health Foundation, August 2019
- 14 Why international recruits are vital for better social care, The Independent, 22 February 2020
- 15 Tory ‘red wall’ seats to be hit hard by automation over the next decade, Future Advocacy, February 2020
- 16 ‘Three Rs’ on the decline as a quarter of adults have a reading age so low they struggle to read a bus timetable. The Telegraph, 28 August 2016
- 17 Headline Findings, UK Climate Panel 2018
- 18 ‘Unprecedented’: more than 100 Arctic wildfires burn in worst ever season, The Guardian, 26 July 2019
- 19 84% of world’s fastest growing cities face ‘extreme’ climate change risks, Verisk Maplecroft,, 21 November 2018
- 20 ‘People are dying’: how the climate crisis has sparked an exodus to the US, The Guardian, 29 July 2019
- 21 Climate, conflict and forced migration, Global Environmental Change Volume 54, January 2019

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Wes Streeting is the Labour MP for Ilford North and a member of the executive committee of the Fabian Society. Prior to his election to parliament, he was deputy leader of the London Borough of Redbridge and spent his career outside politics in senior roles focused on tackling educational disadvantage.

LET US FACE THE FUTURE AGAIN

WES STREETING MP

After a disastrous election result, Labour needs a fresh and hopeful vision to rebuild trust with the country. To win again, the party will have to leave nostalgia behind and develop a programme which addresses the big questions of our day. How can we end the inequality and poverty which blight our nations? What should we do to ensure everyone has a good life in older age? How do we harness the benefits of new technology to create good work for all? What should we prioritise to tackle the climate emergency? How do we forge new relationships with the EU and the rest of the world?

In this pamphlet, Wes Streeting MP sets out a Labour programme which can win again and, in so doing, improve the lives of millions. In the spirit of the 1945 Labour manifesto, he suggests it is time for Labour to face the future again.

FABIAN IDEAS NO.651

ISBN 978-0-7163-0651-1

£5.95