



Polanski calls out the back door between the AI industry and the Labour government

Description

default watermark

polanski

Green leader Zack Polanski [has published a letter](#) calling out ex-Labour leader Tony Blair's links to the artificial intelligence (AI) industry and government. The news comes after war criminal [Blair published an essay](#), via his Tony Blair Institute (TBI) think tank, calling for Labour to essentially shape all future policy around AI.

Of course, this policy recommendation has absolutely nothing to do with the fact that [Larry Ellison gave Â£250m to the TBI](#). Ellison just happens to be the CEO of AI-specialist company Oracle. He's also a good buddy of Donald Trump, at whose feet Blair all but worshipped in his essay.

The *Canary* already [covered Blair's piece](#) on 27 May. It's truly terrifying example of anti-immigrant, anti-worker fascist pandering dressed up as "radical centrism".

We could pull it apart all week. However, Blair [does a great job himself](#) "criticising the left and right for lacking vision, then pulling an about-face to praise Trump, Georgia Meloni, and Javier Milei. Here, however, we're going to take a look at Polanski's critique, focusing on Blair's obvious shilling for the AI industry.

Polanski spots Blair's cartoon evil

Polanski [addressed his letter](#) to Labour's Chris Ward MP, the parliamentary secretary in the cabinet office.

Tony Blair's essay published by the Tony Blair Institute yesterday contained some important points, notably, a call to switch to an AI focused economy with more government investment in AI, which he argued would be facilitated by cuts to welfare spending, reductions in the minimum wage and reduced workers' rights.

You might be forgiven for thinking this was hyperbole. "Fund AI by cutting welfare, wages and rights" seems that bit too cartoonishly evil, even for Blair.

However, because the ex-Labour leader is apparently a parody of himself, it's perfectly accurate. Blair listed the [commitments of the current government](#):

the new workers'-rights laws; the net-zero acceleration and phasing out of the British oil and gas industry; the uplift in the minimum wage beyond inflation; and the non-dom changes.

He then states that they should be abandoned in favour of growing the private sector:

The prime minister and the chancellor should lead right at the outset: these are commitments which economic circumstances have forced us to proceed with. The priority is growth. That comes with a vibrant private sector which has suffered years of economic instability, and we are going to go all out for making business feel respected and supported.

So long as the businesses feel respected, the voters can do one "fantastic plan" there. Blair is also very specific about the businesses he's talking about primarily: an AI-led "technology revolution". He then writes:

There is no point in debating whether this technological revolution is a good or bad thing. Just know it is a "thing". In fact, it is "the thing". It will displace jobs, though creating new ones, but no one yet knows the full consequence. Companies and countries will rise or fall on the back of it. It will revolutionise the private sector and should in time revolutionise public services and government.

Just ignore the ethics "spoken like a true war criminal."

The Ellison connection

In his letter, Polanski then moved on [to the heart of the matter](#) "the reason why Blair is shilling for the AI industry:

It has been widely reported that Larry Ellison the owner of Oracle, which specialises in AI, funded the Tony Blair Institute with over £250m, and also that the Tony Blair Institute has significant contacts and influence within the government.

All of that is, again, completely true. The Ellison Foundation has [funded the TBI with over Â£250m](#). In turn, just two months ago, the Treasury called on the help of the TBI and several private companies, specifically to guide AI policy. Treasury secretary James Murray said that:

These people are exactly who can help us create change across the public sector â?? giving us the hard truths on our approach to AI and advising where we need to prioritise our investment to support real efficiencies.

At the time, Donald Campbell, director of advocacy at tech equity campaign group Foxglove â?? described the move as:

yet more evidence of the governmentâ??s excessively cosy relationship with Big Tech.

Giving tech giants privileged access to decision-making around buying the very products they supply is clearly a risk.

Itâ??s hard to understand how members seem to be unable to spot a potential conflict of interest which is blindingly obvious to everyone else.

Hint: they see the conflict of interest â?? they just donâ??t see it.

default watermark

â??The challenge of democracyâ??

Speaking of obvious conflicts of interest, Polanski [rounded out his letter](#) by writing:

We are sure you will agree that itâ??s important for the public to know whether there is a link between Larry Ellisonâ??s donations and Tony Blairâ??s public advocacy for more government funding for AI. We therefore request that all formal and informal contacts between representatives of the Tony Blair Institute and government departments (officials and ministers) are disclosed.

It would be bad for public confidence if there was a suspicion that large corporate interests are buying access to the government via the Tony Blair Institute.

And heâ??s damn right there, too. Blairâ??s (further) corruption by the AI industry is as plain as day â?? and his arguments to fund it by slashing workerâ??s rights and pay (along with removing environmental protections) is a clear breach of public interest.

If this Labour government had any shame, theyâ??d make clear the exact links between Ellisonâ??s millions, Blair and their doggedly pro-AI policies. Then again, if they had any shame, they wouldnâ??t have called in Blair in the first place.

In his essay, the ex-Labour leader [stated that:](#)

The challenge of democracy is not transparency, honesty or conspiracy theories about the hidden power of elites.

This is, of course, precisely what a deeply dishonest champion of the (barely) hidden power of billionaires would say. If you listen closely, you can hear the £250m talking.

Featured image via [Getty/Ryan Jenkinson](#)

By [Alex/Rose Cocker](#)

[Source link](#)

CATEGORY

1. News

Category

1. News

default watermark