



Creatively factual Telegraph article claims Miliband is being mean to the military

## Description

**default watermark**

Telegraph

On 25 June, [low-grade looroll manufacturer](#) the *Telegraph* published a perfect right-wing, rage-baiting scoop: the hated net zero secretary has blocked oil drilling, depriving the poor military of more money. The shock! The horror! The outraged clicks!

The only problem? Both the Treasury and the Department for Energy Security [say itâ??s made-up](#). Whatâ??s more, they told the *Telegraph* as much, and it published anyway.

God, we donâ??t know who to believe â?? itâ??s like being trapped between the devil and a rapidly rising sea.

## â??Pure nonsenseâ??

The *Telegraph* touted its article/Milifandom-fiction on social media, [proclaiming that](#)

Ed Miliband derailed a plan to fund Britainâ??s rearmament by ramping up North Sea drilling, The Telegraph can reveal.

In turn, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero [replied](#)

This story is pure nonsense.

The Telegraph was repeatedly told these claims are categorically untrue, yet published it anyway.

[The article](#) centers on a -£18bn hole in the Ministry of Defence budget. That bit's definitely true a?? failing to plug it was [one of the reasons](#) ex-defence minister [John Healey](#) resigned dramatically earlier in June. His replacement, Dan Jarvis, has promised to smooth-over the the gap before a NATO summit in two weeks's time.

## â??A Cabinet source claimedâ??

Never fear though, the military can have its missing millions â?? all we have to do is [drill for oil](#). The *Telegraph* reported that:

The Treasury is understood to have concluded that more drilling in the North Sea would generate enough tax revenue to cover a significant chunk of the £18bn sought by the Ministry of Defence for military programmes. The plan was backed by Rachel Reeves and presented to the Prime Minister.

However, a Cabinet [source claimed](#) Mr Miliband â??vetoedâ?? the North Sea proposal.

In case anyone doesn't speak dodgy journalese, it is understood toâ?? can mean anything between â??this writer reckonsâ??, â??someone else saidâ??, â??everyone knowsâ??. Crucially, however, it always means â??I can't prove itâ??.

**default watermark**

Meanwhile, â??a Cabinet source claimedâ?? is a *really* useful phrase. See, it remains true, even if the following words are â??Cornwall is a conspiracy made up to sell spoiled milkâ??. Journalism is a truly wonderful profession for the creatively honest.

## â??Failing to back the ideaâ??

The article [goes on](#)

Sir Keir Starmer ultimately failed to back the idea, allowing opposition from the Energy Secretary to win the day.

A source close to Mr Miliband insisted he was not consulted specifically about using North Sea oil and gas revenues to fund the DIP [Defence Investment Plan]. They claimed the only talks between Mr Miliband and Downing Street were over cuts to his department's capital budget.

â??Failing to backâ?? is another excellent phrase. Roughly translated, it means â??he did something else, but I want to be a jerk about itâ??.

Hold up though, didn't Ed the Great and Terrible veto the idea? So why is it only Starmer *failing to back* the proposal that actually meant it fell through? Unless, that is, the *Telegraph* is getting even more creative with the truth!

Then, the rebuttal:

A source close to Mr Miliband insisted he was not consulted specifically about using North Sea oil and gas revenues to fund the DIP. They claimed the only talks between Mr Miliband and Downing Street were over cuts to his department's capital budget.

Oh dear, a denial. And to make matters worse, it sounds a bit more likely that "the Treasury said I should drill oil to fund the military, and mum " sorry, Chancellor Reeves " said it was OK". The *Telegraph's* in trouble!

## There was fury

Fortunately, our mysterious [Cabinet source](#) then makes a reappearance:

the Cabinet source told The Telegraph there was fury at Mr Miliband's blocking of greater drilling in the North Sea.

Yet another excellent example of spin-talk. "There was fury" " how many people were furious? It doesn't matter if it was just the "bar, or everyone in the Strangers" bar that night: there was definitely fury.

**default watermark**

The audience is then treated to a direct quote from the mystery source:

Ed has refused to make decisions on Rosebank and Jackdaw despite Scottish Labour and most of us wanting him to.

We got obliterated in the Aberdeen by-election because of his intransigence last week.

Another lesson: journalism-speak is closely related to politician-speak, and both are part of the lying-for-money language tree.

"Most of us" wanted Ed to "make decisions" is true, even if one person wants him to say "go ahead and drill" and a [hundred say](#) "please for the love of God say no, we don't want to die for a plan that won't even cover the UK's energy needs".

## Things that are true

A Miliband spokesperson said: "This story is completely untrue."

A Treasury spokesperson called the claims "categorically untrue".

A *Canary* writer [stated that](#)

the two greatest oil and gas reserves left in the UK-controlled North Sea are the [notorious Rosebank and Jackdaw fields](#). However, even these are already over 90% depleted. As such, theyâ??d require the use of extraction methods that are both energy-intensive and extremely costly.

[Even after that](#), research has predicted that the two fields combined would only produce around 3% of the gas that the UK currently imports.

The *Canary* understands that you could write a handbook on creative half-truths after reading just one *Telegraph* article. There was fury in response.

Well, weâ??re right angry at it, in any case.

*Featured image via*

By [Grace](#)

**default watermark**

[Source link](#)

#### CATEGORY

1. News

#### POST TAG

1. article
2. being
3. claims
4. creatively
5. factual
6. mean
7. miliband
8. military
9. news
10. telegraph
11. the

#### Category

1. News