

# HOW LABOUR CAN | Ten priorities for a future government CHANGE BRITAIN

**Edited by Anya Pearson**

*With Rushanara Ali MP, Jessica Asato, Nick Butler, Mark Ferguson,  
James Hallwood, Andrew Harrop, Sarah Hayward, Grainia Long,  
Nicola Smith & Penny Young*

**FABIAN  
SOCIETY**

## ABOUT THE FABIAN SOCIETY

The Fabian Society is Britain's oldest political think tank. Since 1884 the society has played a central role in developing political ideas and public policy on the left. It aims to promote greater equality of power and opportunity; the value of collective public action; a vibrant, tolerant and accountable democracy; citizenship, liberty and human rights; sustainable development; and multilateral international cooperation.

Through a wide range of publications and events the society influences political and public thinking, but also provides a space for broad and open-minded debate, drawing on an unrivalled external network and its own expert research and analysis. Its programme offers a unique breadth, encompassing national conferences and expert seminars; periodicals, books, reports and digital communications; and commissioned and in-house research and comment.

The Society is alone among think tanks in being a democratically-constituted membership organisation, with almost 7,000 members. Over time our membership has included many of the key thinkers on the British left and every Labour prime minister. Today we count over 200 parliamentarians in our number. The voluntary society includes 70 local societies, the Fabian Women's Network and the Young Fabians, which is itself the leading organisation on the left for young people to debate and influence political ideas.

The society was one of the original founders of the Labour party and is constitutionally affiliated to the party. We are however editorially, organisationally and financially independent and work with a wide range of partners from all political persuasions and none.

Fabian Society  
61 Petty France  
London SW1H 9EU  
[www.fabians.org.uk](http://www.fabians.org.uk)

Head of editorial: Ed Wallis  
Editorial assistant: Anya Pearson

First published March 2014

This report, like all publications of the Fabian Society, represents not the collective views of the Society but only the views of the author. This publication may not be reproduced without express permission of the Fabian Society.

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Can the left change Britain when money is tight?</b>	1
	Andrew Harrop	
<b>2</b>	<b>The road to 2015</b>	4
	Mark Ferguson	
<b>3</b>	<b>Inequality and the state</b>	6
	Penny Young	
<b>4</b>	<b>A new partnership</b>	8
	Nicola Smith	
<b>5</b>	<b>Education for 21st century Britain</b>	10
	Rushanara Ali MP	
<b>6</b>	<b>Competition and climate change</b>	13
	Nick Butler	
<b>7</b>	<b>Building the homes we need</b>	15
	Grainia Long	
<b>8</b>	<b>Local delivery for the universal good</b>	17
	Sarah Hayward	
<b>9</b>	<b>Being human</b>	19
	Jessica Asato	
<b>10</b>	<b>Generation why Labour?</b>	21
	James Hallwood	

## About the authors

**Rushanara Ali MP** is the member of parliament for Bethnal Green and Bow and shadow education minister.

**Jessica Asato** is Labour's prospective parliamentary candidate for Norwich North and chair of the Fabian Society.

**Nick Butler** is visiting professor and chair of the King's Policy Institute at King's College London.

**Mark Ferguson** is editor of LabourList.

**James Hallwood** is associate director of the Constitution Society and chair of the Young Fabians.

**Andrew Harrop** is general secretary of the Fabian Society.

**Sarah Hayward** is leader of Camden council.

**Grainia Long** is chief executive of the Chartered Institute of Housing.

**Nicola Smith** is head of the Economic and Social Affairs Department at the TUC.

**Penny Young** is chief executive of NatCen Social Research.

## Summary

The Fabian Society's New Year Conference 2014 saw hundreds of delegates and a wide range of speakers come together to debate how the left can deliver lasting change in Britain.

Written by some of the conference's key speakers, the articles in this collection continue this important conversation. They explore ideas including challenging the coalition's narrative on education, building the homes we need for the future and creating a more authentic politics.

### **1. Can the left change Britain when money is tight? / Andrew Harrop**

Any opposition needs three Ps to be ready for power: principles, pledges and plans. Ed Miliband's Labour party has made real strides on the first two Ps, but the challenge for the next year is to prepare its blueprint for power.

### **2. The road to 2015 / Mark Ferguson**

Labour needs to take on widespread voter apathy by combining community organising techniques with a compelling national vision for housing, unemployment, and wages.

### **3. Inequality and the state / Penny Young**

High rates of in-work poverty combined with falling support for state safety nets has resulted in a complex equality challenge for Labour. However, it can win public backing for a new approach to collectivism.

### **4. A new partnership / Nicola Smith**

An ambitious Labour government should aim to hardwire a rebalanced and sustainable direction for the UK economy, by making better regulation, higher investment, refreshed corporate governance rules and environmental sustainability part of its core strategy.

### **5. Education for 21st century Britain / Rushanara Ali MP**

Education has a pivotal role in building a fairer society and a resilient, modern economy. Labour can change British education for the better by investing in teachers and breaking down the corrosive divide between vocational and academic pathways.

### **6. Competition and climate change / Nick Butler**

Reducing emissions, maintaining competitiveness and ensuring energy security are not mutually incompatible, as long as the next government is able to carefully identify its priorities.

### **7. Building the homes we need / Grainia Long**

Labour's housebuilding ambitions are both achievable and necessary, but

should be viewed as a stepping stone towards a longer-term ambition to house everyone affordably in balanced, environmentally sound communities.

**8. Local delivery for the universal good / Sarah Hayward**

To win power, Labour should pledge to give it away to local authorities. By decentralising public services, the party can put local people in control of design and delivery while still achieving nationally-defined universal outcomes.

**9. Being human / Jessica Asato**

The notion that politicians look and sound the same has become ingrained in the public's consciousness, but Labour can make a claim for greater authenticity by embracing the community organising drive.

**10. Generation why Labour? / James Hallwood**

Young voters have good reason to be cynical, so Labour must be frank about what can be achieved with limited resources while reflecting young people's aspirations for a better future.

# 1 CAN THE LEFT CHANGE BRITAIN WHEN MONEY IS TIGHT?

Andrew Harrop

*Any opposition needs three Ps to be ready for power: principles, pledges and plans. Ed Miliband's Labour party has made real strides on the first two Ps, but the challenge for the next year is to prepare its blueprint for power.*

For the next 14 months everyone within Labour will be focused on keeping the party's polling lead intact and winning in 2015. But a different disaster could unfold: Labour might come to power, govern badly and leave no impression at all. If Labour resumes office next year without clear and specific plans to change Britain, the chances are that the next government will be a damp squib - and then Labour will face catastrophic defeat after a single term.

## Principles, pledges, plans

Any opposition needs three Ps to be ready for power: principles, pledges and plans. Labour has made great strides on the first two Ps, but it has little to show on the third: plans.

We now have a pretty clear idea of the principles that will inform the thinking of the next Labour government: a radical agenda for reforming markets; fiscal responsibility, but with a little wiggle-room for investment and long-termism; and renewed public institutions based on localising relationships, power and accountability. The ideological contours of Milibandism are hardening, to the surprise of his early detractors.

We also have headline pledges that have a chance of lodging in the minds of some voters: the 50p tax rate, energy price freezes, extra childcare, guaranteed jobs, and a lot of housebuilding. More will come, no doubt.

But you can't govern just with big themes and a few trophy promises geared to winning an election. Labour needs to have operational plans, both for hitting the ground running in its first 100 days and in order to use power strategically over the long five years of a fixed term parliament.

Compare Labour's prospectus today to Conservative thinking before 2010. No one can accuse David Cameron's cabinet of coming to power without firm plans, even if they were well concealed from the electorate. Labour needs to replicate the single-minded determination that enabled a weak minority party to change the whole landscape of public services in such a short time. What's more, those plans must be robust, as the various pitfalls faced by the coalition's biggest reforms show.

## Changing Britain without spending

So what are the 2015 Labour equivalents to the coalition's year one

onslaught of reforms? We know there will not be lots of extra public money to pay for change, so the first question must be what can be achieved without new spending? The answer is a huge amount, if the party is prepared to be radical.

First, take economic reform, where the Labour leadership is being pretty plain about its principles. Ed Miliband knows that the inequality and short-termism that taints British capitalism has little to do with how much government spends; the party must take on deep structural flaws. For its next step, Labour needs to set clear goals for how the economy could be changed over a five year timeframe and then work backwards to flesh out the plethora of small-scale institutional and regulatory reforms that are needed. Little of this will be sufficiently eye-catching to be worth troubling electors with, but Labour's economic radicalism will founder without it.

The second route to changing Britain without spending is to reform our political and public institutions and create a better public sector ecosystem. There may be few votes in rewiring the machinery of the British state, but our crisis of political disaffection demands an institutional as well as a cultural response, to show that Labour has the confidence to put more trust and power in people's hands. Public institutions can only save money and meet people's rising aspirations by changing how they work with each other, with frontline workers and with citizens. And although 'no more top-down reorganisation' is a good line for attacking the coalition, it is also a potential trap. Labour must not rule out organisational change if this is necessary to drive through a plan for improving the strategic scope, capability and accountability of local public bodies, for that might include a redefinition of powers, responsibilities, funding and boundaries.

The third way Labour can change Britain without spending a penny is reforming taxation. Once again, there are already some pledges. The proposed taxes on top earners, mansions and bankers are fine in as far as they go. The return to a 10p starting rate of income tax is a mistake, which I expect to see quietly dropped before the election (far better to reform national insurance for low paid workers). But beneath this tweaking, Labour should embrace a systematic, five year process of tax reform of the sort the Institute for Fiscal Studies has been pushing for years. It should seek a fairer balance of taxation between earnings, other income and wealth. The academic evidence suggests that increasing taxes on top pay and property is not only fair, but will dampen down the excesses of the market. And if Labour is to realise Britain's 2020 targets for greenhouse gas emissions the chances are it will need to adopt more green taxes, and then recycle some of the proceeds into green investment and to mitigate the effects for low income households.

## How to spend it

Expenditure decisions will matter too. Labour will come to power in 2015 with years of spending restraint still ahead but the planned Osborne cuts are not set in stone. All political parties are staying very quiet about widely anticipated post-election tax rises; and if the economy and tax revenues perform a little better than current projections it will make a big difference to the options open to Labour.

At the 2014 Fabian New Year conference, Ed Balls set out the rough shape of Labour's fiscal policy with his pledge that Labour will balance the current budget during the next parliament. This means that Labour can reckon on

spending a little more than under the Chancellor's current cuts plan, but it is only a slightly looser straitjacket.

Crucially, the Balls fiscal rule excludes capital investment, and so opens the way to the possibility of a big increase in housing, infrastructure and public service capital spending. To some this may smack of fiscal irresponsibility, but it is time British politicians were prepared to speak up for investment. Even if Britain were to increase public investment to 2007 levels this would still be far below public investment seen before 1979 or in other advanced economies today. The party will need to plan investment to capitalise a proper network of state investment banks; build hundreds of thousands of cheap homes for rent; and build the schools our new baby boom demands.

When it comes to day-to-day spending, the party should also prioritise long-term investment-style spending, for example on science, skills and early years. But in the years directly after 2015 current spending decisions will be very tough. Following Ed Balls' Fabian speech, we know that spending on public services will be roughly flat until the deficit is closed. That is a big improvement on George Osborne's plans, but Labour politicians will inevitably have to make cuts in order to fund new priorities elsewhere. After all, childcare, jobs guarantees, whole person care and apprenticeships all cost money.

More widely, Labour should consider top-slicing every budget and reinvesting the money into upstream preventative measures. This may seem like draconian top-down control in defiance of the spirit of localism. But what is the alternative, after years when so much lip service has been paid to 'prevention' while public money has flowed in the opposite direction?

In the short term Labour may also need to shave the social security budget, although even modest cuts will not be easy. Again, it comes back to having a long-term plan. As things stand, we know that Labour would like to find a few hundred million pounds to reward contribution a little more, but there has been total silence on its direction for social security over the next two decades. If Labour wants to stop inequality from rising it will have to contemplate more generous social security for children and working-age adults.

After all, sometime in the next parliament austerity will be over. By 2020, and hopefully quite a bit sooner, Britain will have respectable growth and balanced public finances. Then it will be possible to raise spending in line with GDP, or even by a bit more if the party can make the case for modest tax rises.

The decisions the party takes once there are 'proceeds of growth' will set the course for the quality of public services and for the extent of inequality for decades. In the five years after 2015 Labour will need not one spending plan but two: a plan for austerity; and a plan for after, setting Britain's course for the long term.

# 2 THE ROAD TO 2015

Mark Ferguson

*Taking on widespread voter apathy will require the Labour party to combine community organising techniques with a compelling national vision for housing, unemployment, and wages.*

Labour faces the biggest political challenge in a generation. And yet I'm not talking about the fact that in May 2015 the Labour party under Ed Miliband's leadership will be seeking to achieve something incredibly rare in British politics – to return to government at the first time of asking. Nor am I talking about the fact that Labour's performance at the last election was our second worst post-war defeat, nor the ongoing impact of a ruinous debt-fuelled private sector crash that happened on our watch.

I'm talking about something far worse and far more potent than that – widespread, earth-shattering apathy. It's the biggest challenge to our politics since universal suffrage; probably the biggest challenge of any kind since the war. Except apathy probably isn't the word either, it's closer to antipathy, or even loathing. It's now accepted as fact by many in our society that politics can make little difference or even no difference at all. That is something born out evidentially from historically declining voter turnout, the success of smaller parties like UKIP and the Greens – and by the experience of everyone who has campaigned for the Labour party in recent years.

Taking on this antipathy will require the Labour party to have real ambition. Fortunately, in campaigning terms, it appears that the bar has been set suitably high. Labour has targeted 106 seats in May 2015, and winning them means running a strong campaign on the ground, with organisers placed in key seats and strong candidates selected early. Combined with the community organising techniques which Arnie Graf, Movement for Change and others are spreading throughout the party, Labour's campaign will be focussing its energy on face to face doorstep campaigning on issues that really matter to local people – and engaging with them on their terms.

But Labour's offer to the electorate needs to go hand in hand with a big, expansive vision for changing Britain. Most crucially of all, it needs to be a vision that a disillusioned public can get behind. The devolution of power agenda that Jon Cruddas and Ed Miliband have already fleshed out – combined with devolution of power and funds to local communities – is a step in the right direction.

But now isn't a time for 'small bore' politics. The problems that face Britain economically and socially are too vast to try and turn back the clock to 2005 and claim that will be enough. The public won't buy it, and they'd be right not to.

Ed Miliband said in a speech to Labour's National Policy Forum that "we have to be the people who under-promise and over-deliver, rather than the people who over-promise and under-deliver." Except under-promising is

an electorally problematic as failing to deliver. If people don't believe that Labour has the big ideas, scope and vision – and the practical application to go with it – then we won't inspire people to even turn up and vote.

The answer is to show ambition in the three areas where there are the greatest threats to the British people – and where Labour can deliver a compelling message about how a Miliband government might change things: housing, unemployment, and wages.

The British people aren't stupid; in fact, they are incredibly smart. If we speak to them honestly, explaining that we can't do everything but we can do some things better – do them well – Miliband and Labour will be rewarded for it. If we can convince the electorate that we share their priorities and understand the scale of their problems that gives us a governing ambition that matches the scale of our campaigning intentions.

In his speech to the Fabian conference this year, Ed Balls talked about how Labour would operate a surplus in government. He also talked about the 'tough choices' that Labour would need to make if government. Some people recoil from that kind of language. They think that tough choices means cuts, cuts and more cuts. But saying that a government will need to make tough choices is a truism. All governments need to make such choices on spending, but what Labour's zero-based spending review does is bring that out into the open.

We should not fear such discussions and debates; we should relish them. As Nye Bevan said in 1948, a far more difficult period in which to govern than the Britain of 2015: "The language of priorities is the religion of socialism." We must have in mind at all times our governing priorities, the priorities of the British people and what Labour seeks to achieve in government. Only by doing so, will a Labour government be elected in 2015, and will Miliband be able to govern with any clarity.

# 3 INEQUALITY AND THE STATE

Penny Young

*High rates of in-work poverty combined with falling support for state safety nets has resulted in a complex equality challenge, but Labour can win public backing for a new approach to collectivism.*

The British public is bothered about inequality. NatCen's British Social Attitudes survey finds that in 2012, pretty much everybody (eight in ten) thought the income gap too large. And it is not surprising that so many feel like this, given the levels of poverty and the extent of income inequality in the UK. For example, in 2011-12 4.7 million households in the UK were below the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's Minimum Income Standard; the income that people need in order to reach a minimum socially acceptable standard of living.

We also know that most people believe that the government has a responsibility to do something about inequality and poverty. Two thirds (69 per cent) think that it is the job of government to reduce income differences between the rich and the poor; 62 per cent believe government should find a job for those who want one and a majority (59 per cent) say that it is government's role to provide for the unemployed. Having said this, on the third point there has been major change over the last few decades. 81 per cent of people thought the government should provide for the unemployed in 1985, which tells us something about changing attitudes to the way Britain should support people in need. And we also know that the public attributes a lot of importance to hard work and aspiration as factors in getting on in life.

## Jobs that work

So what can government do? The government is keen to tell us about the number of new jobs being created; the prime minister hailed employment hitting 30 million for the first time as evidence that 'the plan is working'. But we should also ask if the types of jobs being created are the right ones. There are millions of people in work who do not earn enough to free them from poverty. Many of the working poor are in low paid, insecure, jobs and reliant on in work benefits. In fact, recent NatCen research showed that the most common family structure for households in poverty in the UK is couples with a single male breadwinner.

Less well known is the fact that low quality jobs can also have a negative impact on wellbeing. Creating very low skilled, very low paid jobs may give people a source of income, but evidence from the UK's largest survey of mental health, the Adult Psychiatric Morbidity survey, shows that the lowest paid jobs also have a correlation with 'common mental disorders', such as depression and anxiety. While this problem is not unique to Britain we do

seem to fare much worse than some of our near neighbours on job satisfaction and work life balance. Findings from the European Social Survey, shows that the UK does slightly better than Poland and Hungary when it comes to job satisfaction and work life balance, but worse than most of the rest of Europe, including Germany, France, Belgium and much lower than the Nordic countries. So while a higher minimum wage or living wage might help support the lowest paid, it's also the case that any policy should also consider the quality of jobs.

## Falling support for a safety net

Social security was created, to quote the Beveridge report, as 'an attack upon Want'. However, Beveridge also demanded that behind social security stood the principle of offering security in exchange for 'for service and contribution'. And it seems to be in this mutual arrangement that the British public have lost faith; they no longer believe that recipients of state benefits are doing their fair share. Attitudes are particularly harsh towards the unemployed. Eight in ten wrongly believe that large numbers of people falsely claim benefits (this stood at 67 per cent in 1987) and more than half (54 per cent) think that most unemployed people could find a job if they really wanted one – even in an age of austerity. Recently there have been signs of a slight softening of attitudes that could be a reaction to recent public spending cuts, but there is no appetite for the extra spending on social security that might pull some people out of poverty; only 22 per cent of the public agree that benefits are too low. The coalition has recognised that it can make cuts to welfare and be consonant with the public's view.

## The challenge: a new approach to collectivism

So any government faces a real problem in trying to reduce inequality. Low paid jobs are not necessarily better than being unemployed in terms of wellbeing, and they do not solve the problem of a high benefits bill, which the public wants to reduce. So what are the alternatives?

Last year's British Social Attitudes report had something of a clue. IPPR's Nick Pearce examined the hypothesis that we are becoming more individualistic and expecting people to stand on their own two feet. It is true that people have become harsher towards those on unemployment benefits, but he also found enduring support for some collectivist principles; the importance of the state pension and the value of the NHS, for example.

Our challenge to policy makers and political activists in the run up to the election is as follows: if the founder of the NHS, Aneurin Bevan, was alive now and asked to solve the problem of reducing income inequality rather than solving health problems, what would be his modern day answer? And for those on the left in particular, who believe passionately in the power of the state to improve lives, is it possible to look at new ways of directing state spending? Might you find public support for investment in skills and jobs if everyone contributed and everyone could see a tangible benefit for them personally, especially if public money was carefully targeted towards building the right skills and creating properly paid jobs?

# 4

## A NEW PARTNERSHIP

Nicola Smith

*An ambitious Labour government should aim to hardwire a rebalanced and sustainable direction for the UK economy, by making better regulation, higher investment, refreshed corporate governance rules and environmental sustainability part of its core strategy.*

**T**he UK economy finally seems to have stopped shrinking, but growth prospects remain uncertain. Business investment is still well below its pre-recession peak, our trade balance remains poor and debt, not rising real incomes, is driving increased spending.

The productivity gap seems stubborn. Of course output per worker fell during the recession. This was an inevitable consequence of employers hanging onto staff and helped keep unemployment down. But productivity is not yet recovering in the way we might expect as growth returns.

The worry is that the crash has reshaped our economy. Too many of the skilled jobs that we lost have been replaced by low paid and less skilled jobs in the recovery. And it was not as if we were world leaders before the recession hit; UK investment rates were the lowest among the most developed nations and our research and development expenditure was behind most industrialised countries. Middle income jobs and wages were already in decline.

We can neither go on as we are nor go back to 'business as usual' if we are to both restore living standards and deal with wider significant challenges such as decarbonising our economy. We need better balanced and greener growth if we are to create well paid, good quality jobs and secure the revenues that will pay for the public services and welfare state that make us a civilised society.

But what can government actually do? Economic history shows that such shifts are tough. But other countries demonstrate that different models are possible. All political parties need a retail offer, but raising short-term expectations that cannot be met or are not credible is not the route to a second term. An ambitious Labour government will need clear goals, a strategy to achieve them and a narrative that explains what it is doing and why. It will need to embed new institutions and regulatory floors that start to hardwire a strong and fair direction for the UK economy.

A future Labour government will also need a proper industrial policy, including support for the research and development, and science and education budgets that are vital to creating the climate for business growth and success. Rather than corporation tax cuts that will probably cost the country around £4bn annually by the end of this parliament, spending needs to go to areas that will boost short-term growth and medium term rebalancing. Part of the strategy must be identifying allies in business who recognise that active government and green investment are better than cash giveaways.

The case for a properly capitalised state investment bank that can raise funds on capital markets for strategic investment is compelling. The Brazilian Development Bank or the US Small Business Administration are obvious examples, but there are many others to choose from. The bank should support infrastructure and the high growth businesses that found raising cash hard even before the crash, let alone now. This government has made some baby steps, but there is business support for an ambitious bank that can raise its own funds.

Labour should also drive investment in urgent new green technologies. The UK could be a world beater in carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology – good for exports, skilled jobs and the environment. The terrible floods we are still experiencing should help make the case for green investment.

A green transition must also enable our core industries to adjust to the low carbon imperative. Without government action we face both a further decline in UK manufacturing and rising global carbon emissions.

As well as providing a different business environment, a radical government should change how business is done by shaking up corporate governance. Company boards obsessed with short-term share prices neglect vital investment that secures the long term. With over 50 per cent of UK shares held by overseas investors, and too many UK institutional investors reliant on short-term trading, shareholder governance is broken. Measures such as restricting AGM voting rights to those who have held shares for two years or longer can help. Support for both Sir George Cox and Professor John Kay's reviews of how to increase long-termism in different aspects of the UK economy shows that we are not alone, while public anger over cases like the Kraft takeover of Cadbury show these can resonate in public discourse.

Workers are represented on company boards in 19 European countries including the Netherlands, Sweden, France and Austria. These representatives don't exercise a veto, but they do have a voice. It makes corporate decision makers listen to frontline staff who have a real long-term commitment to the company. We should do the same.

But radical shifts will provoke opposition from vested interests. Of course there should be consultation about 'how?', but no debate about 'whether?' Take labour standards. Decent conditions and wages enforced by regulation will both push the economy up the value scale. They will break the race to the bottom that has brought us zero hours contracts and created workers too insecure to be useful customers for British business.

This government has let the opportunities of the crash go to waste. Not only has harsh austerity delayed the return of growth, but they have not used the recession years to set a new direction for the British economy, despite some welcome efforts by BIS. Growth based on rising house prices and borrowing is not enough, and most of the country and most people have yet to share in the upturn. 'Jam tomorrow' will not be believed, but an honest account of what needs to change will shift the terms of the economic debate away from value-free technocratic competence, to the kind of stronger and fairer economy we can start to build.

# 5 EDUCATION FOR 21ST CENTURY BRITAIN

Rushanara Ali MP

*Education has a pivotal role in building a fairer society and a resilient, modern economy. Labour can change British education for the better by investing in teachers and breaking down the corrosive divide between vocational and academic pathways.*

Can Labour change Britain? The answer is yes. No other political party, no other political movement has done more to shape the modern UK. Labour shaped the last century for the better through its bold and ambitious post-war effort and the 1945 Attlee government which paved the way for the NHS, state education system for all and a welfare state that provided protection from poverty and destitution.

In the late 1990s, I had the privilege of working for Michael Young, the author of the 1945 Labour manifesto and learnt from him first hand the power of government to rebuild and help people realise their hopes and aspiration. I also learnt from his work the vital importance of ensuring that people and communities had the power to shape their own lives and futures by using their skills and talents to transform society. Many of the best ideas emerged from the grassroots, but governments and other agencies are vital to supporting those ideas.

But Labour's long-term positive record is far more than just our headline achievements in the UK's infrastructure and economy. Over the last century, the party has also fundamentally shifted a deeply traditional society in the direction of fairness and aspiration for all. It is in the Labour party's DNA to push for change.

Now more than ever, with the coalition government still pursuing a divisive social agenda, Britain can do better and here is why I believe Ed Miliband's Labour party can confront the challenges we face. Just as Labour shaped the last century for the better, we must be bold and ambitious in transforming our country for the better for this century. Ed Miliband understands the challenges ahead. He has reinvigorated the party's commitment to making real and lasting changes to Britain and we know we can make the differences that count.

These are, of course, very difficult times for the UK. The country's economic and financial context is still shaky, with only an inadequate, unbalanced economy and the cost of living crisis being felt by people up and down the country. Equality and aspiration are at Labour's core; making them work in a time of budgetary constraints and deep public scepticism towards politics is the party's real challenge now. I believe Labour can change Britain for the better. Here, I believe education has a pivotal role in building a strong society and resilient and modern economy by maximising our collective human potential and talents.

First, this is because education is fundamentally about fairness and aspiration

for all. A lack of real, meaningful education spells disaster. But with a decent education, anyone and everyone can reach their true potential. Education is the vehicle to lift families and communities up and promote social mobility.

When Labour got into power in 1997, it inherited overflowing classrooms, leaking roofs in classrooms such as in my old school in the east end of London, university for a privileged few and like today, high levels of youth unemployment. Few would argue that we did not leave education in this country in better shape. We made the crucial link between education and economic competitiveness and focused on improving standards in schools, whilst expanding access to higher education. We have a world-class higher education sector, which we should preserve and support.

But not everyone goes to higher education. In fact a majority of our young people do not – last year the participation rate stood at 49 per cent. It is entirely fair to say that when in government we did not do enough for the group that Ed Miliband has called the ‘forgotten 50 per cent’. We did not do enough to improve standards in technical and vocational education. And they are being completely sidelined by the government, who have devalued apprenticeships, scrapped work experience, dismantled careers services for young people, and neglected teaching standards in further education. Labour will rebuild our careers service for young people. They are being failed and we can see the social and economic consequences all around us. And these failings particularly hurt vocational education, where the routes to qualifications and accreditation are often harder to decipher.

Second, education is what will allow Britain to really compete in the 21st century economy. By the most recent results, the UK is languishing 21st out of all OECD countries in terms of technical skills, which is completely unacceptable. At the same time, around a third of high-tech manufacturing firms in the UK are importing labour from overseas, due to a pronounced skills shortage. Put that into the context of almost one million young people unemployed and it becomes clear that, as a nation, we have to compete in a new way. We need a high wage, high innovation and hi-tech economy fit for the 21st century. To do this, we need the best skilled workforce in the world and education is the only tool fit for that ambition.

It will be a priority for Labour to build a coherent strategy to break down the corrosive divide that exists between vocational and academic pathways. And we will work to raise the status, the standing and the standards of teaching and vocational education. We need to sharpen our focus and channel all our energies upon two clear national priorities. First, to provide a supply of high skilled, highly motivated young people to meet the demands of the labour market; and second, to ensure college leavers are equipped and ready for a Level 3 apprenticeship. Labour would seek to dramatically increase the number of high quality apprenticeships currently offered by employers.

The third reason education has a pivotal role in building a strong society is the intrinsic link between education and national identity. Time and time again, we’ve seen the current education secretary demote and devalue teachers to cogs without a voice. Time and time again, we’ve seen this government ignore the importance of teacher morale in our classrooms, instead content to treat education as some kind of box-ticking exercise in which social values of limited remit are more important than hard skills, self-confidence and meaningful knowledge. We can’t go on with teachers feeling devalued and demoralised. We need to invest in them and help raise their status and standing, so they can educate our young people and prepare them for the world of work

in a globalised international economy.

Labour can change Britain for the better, and moreover do so at a time of deep public scepticism and fiscal constraints. I can think of no better avenue for implementing lasting change than ensuring we develop a world class education system enabling British success on the world stage, tapping into our country's creativity, diversity and promoting our technical and scientific potential in trade, commerce and global leadership. Labour can do this, in conjunction with talent from the private and public sector alike, and achieve Ed Miliband's vision of a one nation Britain.

# 6

## COMPETITION AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Nick Butler

*Reducing emissions, maintaining competitiveness and ensuring energy security are not mutually incompatible, as long as the next government identifies its priorities.*

By May 2015, after five years of the coalition, an incoming government will inherit a whole range of major challenges in areas which have been neglected or mismanaged. That applies across the range of policy areas – from health to defence to higher education – but there is no area where the failure of the current government has been so serious as energy and climate change.

Energy prices are rising for domestic and business consumers. As a result energy poverty is also increasing. Emissions of greenhouse gases are climbing and crucial investments are not being made. Britain needs new infrastructure and new power stations as older coal and nuclear generating capacity is closed down. But uncertainty and political dithering are putting off investors and therefore creating the quite unnecessary risk that in extreme circumstances such as a very cold winter supply will fall short of demand. That could lead to some form of rationing or supply cuts.

In the face of this legacy, we need to identify priorities. That was the starting point for discussion at the Fabian New Year conference. The public focus is on the proposal for a short term, twenty month freeze in electricity prices but it is clear that a freeze, however popular, will not solve the underlying challenges. If mishandled, the freeze could contribute to the uncertainty and delays in new investment and make the situation worse. 20 months is a very short period and producers and consumers will soon be asking what happens on January 1st 2017 when the freeze is supposed to end.

There are a number of immediate steps which could make a real and lasting difference. First, the new government has to ensure that existing supplies are adequate. Nothing would damage us more than supply shortages and rationing. Energy may be a hybrid business – a combination of public policy and private investment – but when things go wrong it is the government which will carry the blame. The present administration has failed to ensure we have adequate stocks, especially of gas, and has allowed the schedule of new capacity building to slow down. The immediate answer is to take plans for a number of gas-fired stations out of mothballs and to extend the life of the existing nuclear stations which have been working well, and subject to all the necessary tests, can keep working for a good while longer. In addition, there should be a requirement on suppliers to maintain adequate stocks.

The second step is to force down the cost of renewables, including new nuclear. The contracts for difference – essentially ‘take or pay’ deals which ensure supply is available – are too generous and impose no pressure on their operators to seek efficiencies or to cut costs. The 35 year index linked deal for

the new nuclear reactor at Hinkley Point which starts at a price level double the current wholesale electricity price is unsustainable. It should be renegotiated, as should some of the lavish offshore wind contracts. Energy policy should not be about corporate welfare.

The third strand of a new policy should be about protecting the poorest. Energy poverty is a shameful blight on a country as rich as Britain. A new policy should protect not just the very poorest but those on very small fixed incomes who may not qualify for emergency help but who still live in fear of ever-rising bills. This sort of poverty is a matter for welfare rather than energy policy as such, but the two are interlinked and should be managed with a joined-up approach.

The fourth priority is to take a rational approach to climate change and emissions reductions. Climate change may be off the media agenda but the problem has not been solved. We may not be able to forecast precisely how and when the climate will change but the melting ice in the Arctic is a visible and undeniable point of evidence demonstrating that change is happening. Calls for action are meeting resistance; people rightly resent high prices which achieve nothing for the climate but leave the UK uncompetitive.

The approach needs to be rethought. The priority should be a sharp improvement in energy efficiency – a policy which if pursued properly should cut both costs and emissions. A good idea lost in complexity, the Green Deal has failed. It should be recreated and backed up with real incentives for individuals, communities and businesses to reduce the amount of energy which is currently wasted. To this end, several speakers at the Fabian conference talked about the value of local as opposed to national schemes.

Research and technology matter as well but it is always worth remembering that there is much that can be achieved by simply applying the best technology which is already available. If we can get the balance right, the different objectives of reducing emissions, maintaining competitiveness and ensuring energy security are not incompatible.

# 7 BUILDING THE HOMES WE NEED

Grainia Long

*Labour's housebuilding ambitions are both achievable and necessary, but should be viewed as a stepping stone towards a longer-term ambition to house everyone affordably in balanced, environmentally sound communities.*

When Ed Miliband announced Labour's aim of building 200,000 homes a year by 2020 in England last September, the *Financial Times* reported that housebuilders had called it a 'wild' plan and that the party 'fails to understand how real markets work'. So the task for everyone who wants to see the supply of new homes radically increased is to prove it can be done and set out practical steps to achieve that target within the lifetime of the next government. The Lyons Commission, of which I am a member, has been asked to prepare a road map to reach that target.

I believe the target of 200,000 homes a year is not only achievable, but absolutely necessary if we are to address our national housing crisis. However, it's not going to happen just by talking about it; there will need to be a massive and concerted effort. Yes, targets can be criticised; it's not enough, it's too much, it's too much of a focus on numbers and not enough on quality and so on. However, I think in this instance an end goal brings focus and attracts attention, and that's important when we have so much to do.

But is it the right one? While some may say it's unrealistic, others say it isn't enough. After all, we're expecting 221,000 extra households each year in additional demand to 2021. The last time English housebuilding topped 200,000 was in 1988. We have to go back 30 years to find a period when that target was being achieved regularly. We've now had four years when output has been only a little more than half that figure. So the obstacles facing even a 200,000 target are formidable. Providing we get the mix right, reaching it will be a very significant achievement – but we must regard it as a staging post to a sustained and higher output in the future.

There are several key issues we need to tackle. On land, Labour's plan to penalise those holding onto land with planning permission is an interesting suggestion, and we could also look at the International Monetary Fund's call for Britain to reform its property taxes, including increasing tax on vacant land. Both would need careful design and testing if they were to be taken forward successfully.

It's also clear that we need new players in the housing market. Getting the numbers of homes we need in the right places will require all our current delivery models doing everything they can. But this alone will not be enough: we need to look at new and different delivery options too. Ideas we could explore include changing 'Help to Buy' to 'Help to Build', for example, guaranteeing finance to new entrants to the market to get them started, and looking to restructure the market to increase the number of small developers.

When it comes to the supply chain, a comprehensive range of government policies to boost supply for boosting supply in the longer term will help to

provide confidence that the demand for products and skills will be sustained.

It can't be right that private renting has grown so rapidly with virtually no investment in new homes. The coalition's £1bn rolling fund to support schemes for institutional investment is set to support the building of 8,000-10,000 homes in its first phase, which looks like a sensible policy intervention. The Montague Report made some interesting suggestions about using the planning system to build in a commitment to homes being available for rent into the longer term, and the Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH) has called on the government to look at incentivising higher standards through creative use of the tax reliefs available to private landlords.

Building the right mix of house size and tenure is vital. There's no point in more building if all we get are four-bed executive houses for sale. Much has been made of the obstacles supposedly created by section 106 requirements, where developers have to make a proportion of the new housing 'affordable'. But we should remember that a decade ago a very substantial proportion of new housing association homes were coming via planning gain. So those arguing that it stops housebuilding need to be asked – why didn't it 10 years ago? We should restore section 106 requirements and insist that planning authorities should be able to require a proper mix of houses, tenure and price range. Properly constructed 106 agreements can give builders certainty and help generate valuable cash flow.

Financing government grants to support the development of new homes is also crucial. Currently £23.5bn a year is spent on housing benefit and only £1.5bn on capital support. Without new homes, housing benefit is just subsidising rents, with no guarantee of increased supply, especially in the private rented sector. The current investment model for affordable housing is not sustainable in the medium to long term, if we are to increase the supply of housing across all tenures. And the early evidence of lettings at affordable rent is that tenants are even more dependent on housing benefit.

In the view of CIH, grant-led subsidy for social housing is essential. While affordable rent may have a role, it can't do the same job as a social rent building programme, not least because the homes produced can be hard to afford especially for working households on low incomes. More generally, local councils could also have a bigger part to play. They could build an extra 12,000 homes per year if the borrowing caps imposed on them were to be raised or removed.

In addition, we need to look at the potential role of new towns and garden cities. To get effective long-term supply that builds towards balanced, environmentally sound communities, new settlements or major extensions will be essential but there is much to be learnt from past experiences. Finally, it is down to everyone in the industry to make the economic case for investing in housing. Housing drives growth with a speed and effectiveness that few industries can match. Every affordable home built creates 2.3 jobs in England and generates an additional £108,000 in the wider economy. Every £1 invested in new affordable homes generates an additional £1.41 for the wider UK economy.

The scale of our task is clear. If we are to build the homes and places that Britain needs there is much to be done. There is no silver bullet, but the alternative, a continuation of the misery produced by the housing crisis, and the drag on our economy that it produces, is simply not an option. Instead, we must see the target of building 200,000 homes a year as a stepping stone towards a longer-term ambition; to get to a place where we are actually building enough homes to house everyone decently and affordably in places where they want to live. Surely this is not such an outlandish aspiration?



# LOCAL DELIVERY FOR THE UNIVERSAL GOOD

Sarah Hayward

*To win power, Labour should pledge to give it away. By decentralising public services the party can put local people in control of design and delivery, while still achieving nationally-defined universal outcomes.*

The biggest challenge the next Labour government will face is how to ensure public services realise our aspirations for greater equality and fairness as we face further spending cuts. As the pace of changing need and expectation accelerates, budgets shrink. Various problems such as our ageing population, escalating inequality between the rich and everyone else, and seemingly intractable problems like child poverty or reoffending rates all need different types of public services to solve them. The challenge can seem irreconcilable: less money, but higher demand for higher quality.

Well, maybe. But it could be that Labour's front bench is coming round to the solution that councillors and communities and others think have been staring them in the face for a long time: to win power, Labour should pledge to give it away.

We live in one of the most centralised states in the developed world. And if you narrow it just to tax and spending decisions, we are without a doubt more centralised than any of the other G20 nations and many more besides. And by a country mile. But this over-centralisation means waste, and it often results in services that are close to 'one size fits all' and are totally unresponsive to the evolving needs of individuals and communities.

What if Labour's big reform of public services was to ensure they are run closer to where they are delivered? Services could run in conjunction with the people who rely on them, giving councils and communities the powers to choose which services to run - and how - in order to meet their needs.

This might sound like a council leader's play for more powers. And often this suggestion is met with sceptical questioning from the left about how to preserve universalism if you go for broke with a massive devolution of powers. However, this decentralisation is not the end of universalism; in fact, it could just be its saviour.

The skills, employment and social security bill costs billions, but getting people back to work is charged to Job Centre Plus, who have to meet centralised diktats rather than respond to local economic need. One perverse outcome of this is you often find unemployed youngsters shoehorned on to courses where they simply have no prospect of a job, never mind a career at the end of it. So they end up back at the job centre having completely wasted the public investment in their training.

As an alternative, Whitehall could define outcomes and councils and communities could choose how to deliver them. Give councils a responsibility to increase employment in their area and they will. Camden will do it very differently to Carlisle or Cornwall, but you'll see unemployment fall, and I

know this because many of councils are already doing it in spite of Whitehall.

Up and down the country, councils like Camden are investing in developing apprenticeships with business to get employers the staff they need and help youngsters get skills that employers need. This is tough at a time of massive budget cuts, but it's the right thing to do for our young people and our economy. The council sees no financial benefit from its investment, as the saving in the benefits bill goes straight back to the Department for Work and Pension's coffers. But if we had the budget, and retained the saving, we could do so much more.

This is just one example. In Camden and other central London boroughs the cost of childcare is a major barrier to work, particularly for lone parents. So we choose to invest in childcare. But in other parts of the country the causes of child poverty and worklessness are more to do with the types of jobs available (or unavailable) in the local economy. So there would be no point in those councils helping people afford childcare.

Councils are very well placed to choose the right local solution to achieve nationally defined, universal, outcomes. You can look at any public service through this lens. Councils and communities have a far higher vested interest in lowering reoffending rates in their area than regional probation services do. Set us a reoffending target, give us the money and I'm pretty sure we'd do it. Camden already has an exceptional youth offending service and we apply this knowledge to reducing adult offending too.

The most controversial example, but one where the prize is biggest, concerns healthcare. In adult social care, squeezed council budgets are putting increased pressure on the ability to carry out preventative work. Councils are straining under the combination of cuts and increasing demand. People are being admitted to hospital unnecessarily, often staying there longer than needed because a care package cannot be put in place.

This costs the NHS billions and it costs councils too. But more importantly, it's simply inhumane for the individual and their family and friends. Giving much more localised control over the whole budget requires a more dramatic shift in thinking than the integration agenda, but it would help us put in place cheaper and better preventative care for vulnerable people and save the public purse.

Crucially, the outcome for the vulnerable adults concerned would still be nationally defined, thus preserving universalism. But we'd find the best way of doing this locally, creating services that truly responded to the needs of local service users.

Ed Miliband and Jon Cruddas have started to outline a Labour agenda that gives power away, which could be both radical and transformative. People want more control over the design and delivery of their services and councils are already leading the way, but we're doing this in spite of a centralised Whitehall - not because of it. Towards 2015 and beyond, Labour's new universalism can and should be driven by local delivery and local power.

# 9

## BEING HUMAN

Jessica Asato

*The notion that politicians look and sound the same has become ingrained in the public's consciousness, but Labour can make a claim for greater authenticity by embracing the community organising drive.*

The need for greater authenticity in politics has become a truism, but is it possible? With the rise of so-called 'independent minded' politicians such as Boris Johnson, Nigel Farage, Alex Salmond and George Galloway it often seems that the new challenge should be to de-professionalise politics.

For those of us who are active doorstep campaigners, the single biggest phrase we hear is that 'you're all the same'. Finding a way of differentiating politicians and their parties therefore seems an obvious potential route to electoral success. Simon Danczuk MP wrote an article for PR Week at the beginning of January in which he said: 'The premium currency that politicians should be looking to trade in these days is authenticity, and that means using stories and experiences to convey the message, not parroting slogans. It's about showing character, imagination and a deeper understanding of people's lives.'

Sarah Wollaston, one of the Conservative MPs selected by an open primary after the expenses scandal concurs. In an interview with the Observer, Wollaston said: 'I think the public dislike the cardboard cut-out, the lobby fodder, the sycophantic [planted] questions [in the Commons] ... they don't like it'. The growing debate about boorishness and playground taunting at Prime Minister's Questions underlines the worry that excessive party management is turning off the public. A recent Hansard publication 'Tuned in or Turned Off?' charts public disapproval with PMQS. 67 per cent of the public surveyed for the report agreed that 'there is too much party political point scoring instead of answering the question.'

It is widely accepted that Labour had an image problem in the 1980s and the sharpening of its media message and professionalisation of the party's operation has been credited with its success in 1997. But this appears to have been a double-edged sword. The notion that politicians look the same, sound the same and act the same has become ingrained in the public's consciousness even though the reality is rather different. Indeed, Philip Cowley's research has found that if anything, politicians have become more rebellious in parliament, not more, with Tony Blair's governments seeing bigger rebellions than any previous governments.

This view of politicians forms part of what has been called the public's cognitive dissonance – the holding of contradictory beliefs. On the one hand the public seem to favour independent MPs who speak their minds and challenge the party line, on the other, divided parties are rarely rewarded at the ballot box. Partly

this is reinforced by the media who seek to expose any difference between the leadership and other party representatives. Recently, Will Martindale, a Labour candidate in Battersea was very unfairly strung up by the *Evening Standard* for articulating what many Labour members have said in public for a while, including Ed Miliband himself – namely that Labour should have prioritised more house building in our years in power. The *Standard* breathlessly reported that Martindale’s comments were ‘a blow to party leader Ed Miliband’s housing pledges.’

Understandably, activists are wary of causing headaches for their political parties and will bite their tongue in the interests of the greater good, recognising that they are just one part of a much wider movement with differing views. In some cases it is this loyalty which is a more authentic expression of someone’s political beliefs, though the public and the media (when they want a row) are less likely to view it this way.

I would suggest there is a better route to authenticity than ending up as a ‘speak your mind’ machine, and that is by embracing the community organising drive which has been set in train by Arnie Graf and pioneers before him such as Gisela Stuart’s team in Birmingham Edgbaston.

It is demonstrably proving your authenticity that represents the greater electoral benefit for Labour in 2015. If you can point to concrete examples in which Labour through its local candidates and activists has managed to respond to local people’s concerns, it is much more likely that residents will see your actions as authentic, and in turn you will be able to talk about your experiences more authentically. There have been some signs that community organising is out of vogue, but those of us who have run the community clear ups, legal loan shark protests, and save your local pubs campaigns can see the difference in public attitudes. Whether this translates into a shift in votes for candidates at the general election remains to be seen, though we know that those MPs who had a much closer relationship with voters at a local level in the 2010 election bucked national swing.

This is not to say that a shift in language used political activists isn’t necessary. I agree with Simon Danczuk that there is no harm in candidates and activists sounding more emotional, relating to people’s everyday experiences and trying to use common sense explanations for sometimes complex problems. Voters don’t expect you to agree with them, or the interviewer, every time and showing a robust sense of your own convictions is often rewarded rather than trying to kowtow to the audience. The one thing we all know is that the public sniff out artifice pretty quickly which is why Ed Miliband’s pledge to under-promise and over-deliver is so important.

Pure authenticity is impossible to achieve, even as an independent politician, but clearly there is scope for Labour to encourage its activists to ‘speak human’ as well as acting human by focusing less on the dividing lines we hear in Westminster, and more on the day-to-day concerns of people in their local areas.

# 10 GENERATION WHY LABOUR?

James Hallwood

*Young voters have good reason to be cynical, so Labour must be frank about what can be achieved with limited resources while reflecting young people's aspirations for a better future.*

**F**abian leaflet 43 begins: "Vote! Vote!! Vote!!!" Its rallying cry against apathy reminds voters of the sacrifice of their forbears to win the franchise and asking them to "use what cost so much to win". More than 100 years on and its message is no less important. Indeed, it has a renewed resonance at a time when political apathy, particularly amongst young people, seems to have become the norm.

Young voters have good reason to be cynical. In 2010 the Liberal Democrats ran a campaign that relied on anti-politics and over promising. Assuring us that they were not like the 'Labservatives' – they kept their pledges – many first time voters bought their message that the other parties weren't to be trusted. Their betrayal on tuition fees may have prompted an apology, but the short-term political opportunism of the Liberal Democrats feeds into a long-term legacy of youth disenchantment.

From scrapping Educational Maintenance Allowance (EMA) to discriminatory cuts to benefits for under-25s, it's little wonder the youth of Britain feel politics does not work in their favour.

As with so much of the coalition's legacy, Labour has a big task ahead of it to clean up the mess they will leave behind. The party must make the first move to young people by reaching out to them, not expecting them to instinctively flock to the labour movement as in the past. We need policies that show an understanding for the concerns of young people and reflect their aspirations for a better future.

Optimism used to be the preserve of youth but many of our formative experiences have been shaped in particularly hard times. We were told that each generation would do better than the last, but people in their mid-20s are realising they are far behind where their parents were at that age while 16 year olds have spent a quarter of their lives under austerity.

Hope is an important message, but in a time of limited resources over promising in the short-term will only compound the long-term problem of youth disengagement. Labour must offer an alternative but pick its promises to young people carefully so as to avoid letting them down as the coalition has done; utopia is not just one policy away.

The younger generation is more sophisticated (and cynical) than ever before. We can grasp that the situation Labour will inherit is far from ideal, so what the party needs to do is set out concrete and achievable policies for young people, walking the awkward tightrope between realistic expectation and young people's aspirations. Being honest about the difference between

what we want to do and what we can do is essential to Labour regaining credibility as a party of government.

This is where ideals must trump idealism; where the values that underpin our party must speak to potential voters who share our vision for a better Britain. Labour can gain the trust of young people by trumpeting what we stand for and what we aim to achieve by presenting a realistic longer-term vision.

An immediate measure that would show young people that Labour is on their side would be the reintroduction of EMA. It would not just have a direct impact on many of their lives but is also emblematic – it was a policy designed specifically to help out young people that was much mourned when the coalition scrapped it. It symbolises a very clear divide between Labour and coalition thinking.

A commitment to an age-blind minimum wage would demonstrate to young people that their work is valued, whatever their age. A 17, 18 and 21 year old can currently all be doing the same job on three different minimum wages. It's a discriminatory practice that can't be defended and one that Labour must put right.

In the longer term, Labour must commit to a high standard of compulsory citizenship education so young people know how our political system works and how to make it work for them. All young people should know how to write to their MP to ask for help let alone developing an understanding on how politics and policies affect every one of us. As the Fabian leaflet says, "in public affairs the interests of those who do not vote are always sacrificed to the interests of those who do." Young people must be made painfully aware of this, and reminded that all politics is ultimately youth politics, because there are few policies that won't impact on them in some way.

In 2015 there is the potential for the common conceit that 'politicians are all the same' to be challenged in an election that sees a reawakening of ideological politics. As young people take to the polling booths, Labour must work to ensure there is a very clear choice between the parties of coalition, content to maintain the current economic and political model, and a Labour party that offers a radical rethink of how Britain can be run.

Those of us engaged in youth politics have a particular task to channel the enthusiasm and indignation of our peers. We must avoid becoming a 'closed shop'; overly male, middle-class and London-centric, we need to do more to open the doors to others and be enriched by the variety of their experiences.

In the same way, student activism will rightly focus on issues surrounding tuition fees and education policy, but youth groups must branch out beyond that – after all, not all young people are students. Labour is right to focus on 'the other 50 per cent'. University clubs are an easy way to attract students to Labour, but thought must be given as to how we attract more non-students to youth politics, and especially the leadership of our youth movements. We cannot hope to speak to the country if we don't reflect them.

The Fabian leaflet continues: "A political battle is about to begin. Choose your side according to your conscience; and strike the one blow that the law allows you." Let's instil this message to disenchanting and disenfranchised young people, empowering them to make a stand together for a better future. A vote can change everything and in 2015 every vote will count.



# HOW LABOUR CAN CHANGE BRITAIN |

## TEN PRIORITIES FOR A FUTURE GOVERNMENT

Edited by Anya Pearson

With the general election fast approaching, Labour's attempt to set out an expansive and inspiring vision of Britain after 2015 is being challenged by widespread voter apathy and difficult spending choices.

The Fabian Society's New Year Conference 2014 saw hundreds of delegates and a wide range of speakers come together to debate how the left can produce a compelling blueprint for power that will deliver lasting change where it is needed most.

Written by some of the conference's key speakers, the articles in this collection continue this important conversation. They explore ideas including challenging the coalition's narrative on education, building the homes we need for the future and creating a more authentic politics.

With contributions from:

**Rushanara Ali MP**

**Jessica Asato**

**Nick Butler**

**Mark Ferguson**

**James Hallwood**

**Andrew Harrop**

**Sarah Hayward**

**Grainia Long**

**Nicola Smith**

**Penny Young**