

The Sylvans

Detailed summary powered by AI

27 April 2026

Motion: the Greens and Reform are two sides of the same coin.

Contents:

1. Analysis of the outcome
2. Detailed transcript

Analysis of the outcome powered by AI:

The motion that the Greens and Reform are two sides of the same coin carried following a highly philosophical and deeply analytical debate. The discussion hinged on a clash of interpretations regarding political equivalence: whether two parties are defined by their contrasting policies and funding or by their shared political function, rhetoric and voter psychology.

The proposition opened the debate by establishing a structural symmetry between the two parties. Rather than arguing that their policies aligned, the first speaker posited that the Greens serve as the extreme fringe to Labour just as Reform does to the Conservatives. The core argument was rooted in their shared status as untested insurgent entities that make contradictory promises precisely because they do not expect to govern. The proposition utilised anecdotes regarding the lack of political pragmatism in both camps, portraying Nigel Farage as a frontman devoid of policy detail and the Greens as historically willing to sabotage functional budgets over personal ideological purity. By closing the debate with the assertion that both parties exist to offer "easy solutions to difficult problems", the proposition effectively anchored the motion in the mechanics of populism rather than ideological alignment.

The opposition attempted to dismantle the motion by focusing heavily on material and structural differences, urging the room to look past superficial anti-establishment labels. The second speaker drew stark contrasts between the parties' compositions and financial backing. Reform was characterised as a top-down vehicle for ex-Tory defectors funded by wealthy benefactors, whereas the Greens were painted as a grassroots movement reliant on small donations and lifelong members. The opposition further highlighted the stark demographic divide in their voter bases and argued that while Reform wants to take a "sledgehammer" to the current system to benefit the wealthy, the Greens merely wish to rewire it to tackle inequality and close corporate tax loopholes.

The floor debate was marked by a fascinating and shifting interpretation of the coin metaphor itself. The proposition found early support from speakers who noted that both parties thrive entirely on public dissatisfaction with the mainstream establishment. One speaker provided a particularly incisive boost to the proposition by pointing out that a coin intrinsically features two completely different faces; therefore, detailing vastly contrasting policies actually proved the motion rather than defeating it.

However, the opposition narrative briefly gained momentum as the floor debated the nature of the current electoral system. A notable contribution reframed the political landscape not as a binary coin but as a multi-sided dice, suggesting that Reform and the Greens merely represent different ends of a voter's life journey—from the hopeful naivety of youth to the nostalgic bitterness of older age. Other floor speakers vehemently rejected any moral equivalence, arguing that Reform relies on right-wing media and Trumpian chaos while the Greens maintain a legitimate, constructive philosophical base. Some went as far as to state they were not just different sides of a coin but entirely different currencies, contrasting the alleged racist undertones of Reform with the Greens' status as a beacon of hope for younger generations. What ultimately drove the result back toward the proposition was the audience's nuanced dissection of modern populism and anti-intellectualism. A pivotal floor speaker admitted to switching allegiances during the debate, noting that while one party shouts "tax the rich" and the other "stop the boats", both are simply weaponising complex societal anxieties regarding resources and changing demographics. This was heavily bolstered by a highly effective argument late in the debate regarding "truth decay". A speaker observed that both parties share a fundamental willingness to ignore established expert evidence—whether that be Reform undermining climate science and vaccines or the Greens historically rejecting nuclear energy and genetically modified crops.

Ultimately, the motion carried because the proposition successfully dictated the terms of the metaphor. The opposition fought a valiant but overly literal battle focused on tax policies, media representation and funding models. Conversely, the proposition and its floor allies resonated more deeply by arguing that political similarity in the modern era is not about having the same manifesto. It is about playing the identical role in a fractured electoral ecosystem. By defining the "coin" as a shared reliance on evidence-less populism, anti-establishment opportunism and the peddling of simplistic answers to an anxious electorate, the proposition provided a compelling narrative that successfully united the political extremes in the eyes of the audience.

Detailed transcript:

The motion is the Greens and Reform are two sides of the same coin.

What? The Greens are to Labour what Reform are to the Conservatives. So we are looking, in a sense, for similarity. Both of these parties are not elected. Consequently, whatever their leaders say, nobody expects them to deliver. So they can say whatever they like, and actually what the

Greens say, there are so many different things, they try to be nice to everybody. There are so many contradictions in what they say that they can't please everybody. And the same is true of Reform. There are so many different threads in Reform that try to please so many people that they can't please all of them.

Now, the Greens are headed by this chap called Zack Polanski. I don't know what his original name is, that's not his real name. He's famous for saying that if you want bigger tits, then hypnosis is the answer. Now, I can't comment on that because I haven't tried it out, but I suspect that the tits won't get any bigger. It'll just be that they'll appear bigger because of the hypnosis. That's just my possible take on it. But anyway, the Greens are utterly bonkers.

I was on the London Assembly some years ago, and the Green Party was represented on the London Assembly by Jenny Jones and Darren Johnson. Jenny Jones is now Baroness Jones. God knows why she's got a baronetcy, but I remember Jenny Jones being utterly, utterly mad, utterly bonkers. But one particular thing sticks in my mind. There are 25 assembly members, and if you get a two-thirds majority, you can vote down the Mayor's budget. The budget setting is done in February, the Mayor presents a budget, the assembly members vote on it, and if there's a two-thirds majority, they can defeat his budget and then suggest alternative things. Well, in 2005 we did actually get a majority against the budget. We did manage to get a sort of consensus among the various parties represented on the London Assembly, including the Greens and the Lib Dems and the Conservatives and all. We did get a two-thirds majority of one, but when it came to the actual day of the vote, Jenny Jones stood up. I mean, an awful lot of work went into this to get this sort of agreement going, this sort of coalition of parties which didn't usually agree at all. But on the day of the vote, Jenny Jones stands up and says, Oh, I can't, I've changed my mind. I can't possibly vote with the wicked Tories. And so the whole thing collapsed, and Ken Livingstone got his budget approved.

But the point about that is that Jenny Jones was prepared to put her personal prejudices against every other consideration. I mean, we were thinking about how x number of million pounds was going to be spent. And Jenny Jones had her own considerations, and she put those first, and that epitomises the Greens to me. Frankly, they are just utter rubbish, like Jenny Jones.

On the other hand, you've got Nigel Farage, who's the leader of the Reform Party. Now, the point about Nigel Farage is he's a very good front man, but he tends to make up policy on the hoof. He's not a details man. He is French, or Huguenot or whatever he is, and I don't really care, but he makes up policy on the hoof. When you have a political party, you need to have teams which sort out policies and test them out on the public, so that when you go to a manifesto, they're actually tested. But Farage does none of that. It's a sort of, I think, when you go to Piccadilly Circus and you see these great big neon signs emblazoned on the side of a building, they take up a lot of time and space, they're very bright, but there's no depth. And that epitomises Reform to me. There's no real depth to the party. It's all just a big advert on the outside.

Farage, frankly, I don't think he will ever lead Reform to victory, because he's not that sort of man. He's not a details man, he's a front man. Yes, and I think the same is true of the Greens. Frankly, they've got no experience of government. They've got nobody who's ever been in government. So I think if they were elected to government, they would make a complete balls of it. Sorry, Mr Chair, they'd make a mess of it. And I think that Farage and Reform would likewise

do the same sort of thing, because there's no depth to the party. So in that respect, they are quite similar, and they are two sides of the same coin. Thank you.

Thank you for that passionate speech. And now we move on to the next speaker.

Thank you. Those are very good, eloquent points that you've made. I'm going to start by actually challenging some of your points before you get your pen and pencil out. Go for it, I'll give you some of my time. So Labour are to what Reform are to Greens. When you said that, one of my thoughts was that I thought it'd be really interesting to have this debate, but try to not talk so much about what the parties are and what their policies are, because really what we're discussing here is that they aren't from the same coin.

For example, when you say that a lot of people have defected from Labour to Greens, I think there's only two or three who have done that, and that's only a very recent thing. Greens are mostly a grassroots party. So a lot of the MPs have actually just been Greens their entire career. They haven't been going through different places. Whereas 100% of every standard MP for the Reform Party has at one point in their career represented the Tory party, including Nigel Farage back up to 1992.

So when you're talking about the same coin, really think about it. You have the Reform Party, who represent what people are annoyed about in politics to some extent, where a lot of them have been MPs, and they've really moved because they felt disenfranchised with the Tory party. Whereas with the Green Party, you have people who have actually just been from that from the beginning.

The other point would be about the bigger tits argument that you made. It's a good example of how the media don't like the change of the status quo. If the thing that you got from Zack Polanski was that 10 years ago he agreed with some newspaper about hypnotism in his previous career, which he's addressed, and that's still being peddled rather than what Green policies are, it kind of shows that the media and the news are scared of one party. But they're not as scared of the Reform Party, because we know more of their policies, whereas the Green Party, we know more about bigger tits, as you rightly proved.

And I guess when we are talking about the two or three Labour people who have moved from the Labour Party to the Green Party, we are talking about Old Labour. We're talking about Tony Benn, who said, if we have money to kill people, we have enough money to help people, which are the old values of Labour. So it's the very left, or the very old values of Labour who have actually defected. Whereas for the Tory party, it's the people who felt that the disintegrating government the Tories have been running by privatising everything hasn't been enough, let's do more of it. It's another piece of evidence that it is a very different side of a different coin.

And it's fair to say, yeah, Nigel Farage does make up details on the hoof. When he was part of UKIP, one of his points was he wanted to abolish the NHS, but then later on he changed his stance, saying, no, we need to keep the NHS, let's just create tax breaks for the privatisation of the NHS. I'm realising I'm going into policies that I shouldn't. But my point is that Nigel Farage has changed his stance on it many, many times. He's also changed his stance on tax breaks, where he once said let's cut taxes for everyone, and now he's only saying let's cut taxes for corporations and the richest people.

So the idea is one side is saying the way to growth in Britain is essentially to make the wealthiest wealthier, because that will create loads of opportunities. And then you have the Green side who are saying, let's do the opposite of that and actually make the top one per cent

of the richest people poorer, and actually equalise things. Because, in essence, if you're a billionaire in Britain, you got there on everyone else's dime to some extent. If you think of companies like Amazon or Starbucks, who actually pay a much lower percentage of their profits into tax, the Greens are actually the only fiscal party that has a way to get rid of that loophole, whereas the Conservatives and by extension, Reform have actually kept that loophole. I mentioned the news because, again, we're talking about keeping the status quo, and if we're talking about the divide, it's also in the voters. If you are male and over 40, you are much more likely to vote for Reform, and if you're young and if you're a woman, you're actually more likely to vote for Green. So I'm just explaining that these are very, very different parties, and they represent and talk for very different communities.

Cool. Thank you.

Thank you to the previous speaker for that informed speech. We'll now open it to floor speeches of three minutes each. Yes, we'll have you, and then your name?

Okay, so I'm going to say that I'm for the motion, and I will address the coin, as it were, on a philosophical basis. I say that actually it's much worse than the first speaker describes, because a lot of people don't actually know what the policies of the Greens or Reform are. What they know is that they don't trust the mainstream parties any more. The years of the Tories basically undermined trust in the oldest political party in the world, and Labour is no longer the party of the miners, to put it politely. People are frustrated in different ways with what they see as a ruling establishment, and the votes that they are giving to Reform and the Greens are an expression of that.

There are differences in what individuals may give their vote to. Some may give it to Reform more likely than they'll give it to the Greens, but it does spring from the same coin. Otherwise, they would be giving their vote to the mainstream parties. The problem is, I don't think the issues affecting Britain right now are going to be really resolved by voting for these parties. It's political suicide to stand up and say, actually, British electorate, if you vote for Reform or the Greens, yeah, they can get into power, but that is not in itself going to necessarily improve things or help the challenges that we face.

Even a lot of the hardcore policies that both of these parties are proposing, I would argue they'll actually back down on. I don't believe for a minute that the Greens are actually going to be as hardcore with the rich as they'd like to be, because ultimately, they need the rich to help Britain's economy. I don't believe Reform are going to be as hardcore on immigration as they'd like to be, because immigrants are needed for the economy. So yeah, the Greens and Reform do spring from the same coin, that coin being dissatisfaction with the mainstream parties and a desire to elect people who will implement change for the better. However, I don't think the problems affecting Britain can be changed for the better in that way. Potentially, they could be made a lot worse. That remains to be seen.

Thank you. And your name, please?

The speaker.

So the first speaker here thinks that I always speak on the opposite side of the debate to him, but tonight he's wrong, because I'm actually on his side. And I think that all of the intricate details that the previous speaker was expounding on about the different personalities and the different policies, in a way, are irrelevant to this motion, which is about whether these are two

sides of the same coin. Because any coin has a heads side and a tails side, the two sides of any coin are different, and that's what we're arguing here.

This is a coin, and these two parties definitely are two sides of the same one. It is a coin that was minted in the white heat of political polarisation in this country since 2016, probably starting around the time of Brexit. And it's also affected by the dissatisfaction with the current government, and in fact, the two mainstream parties. In the 1951 election, 95% of the British electorate voted for either the Conservatives or Labour. Over the years, that has gradually come down and down. We've now reached a point where, who knows, you could get five parties getting between 18% and 27% at the next election. So that's actually what it's all about. Around the edge of this coin is probably written something like 'political parties who are prepared to say anything to get the votes of their constituency', and that's kind of what they're doing. Reform have put out lots of policies about extra money they're spending on defence and how they're going to stop the boats and all that kind of thing. The Institute for Fiscal Studies have looked at their proposals and said the figures just don't add up. And as far as the Greens are concerned, who want to bring in a wealth tax and are much less keen on stopping the boats than Reform, they haven't actually put out enough detail yet for the IFS to examine it. So this is what's happening. Two parties trying to benefit from the fact that the parties more in the centre are failing, and the electorate believes that, and they're trying to get people on their side to vote for them by saying whatever they want. Two sides of the same coin.

I'll go for at the back and then your name, please. What's your name? The speaker?

I've had my second pint, so it's going to be less high-level erudition and philosophy than the first contribution. But I really enjoyed this debate too. Really fun and actually quite interesting speeches from the proposition and opposition. Initially, I was very tempted by the proposition that they are two sides of the same coin, but I've been slightly swayed against them, thinking maybe the coin is the wrong metaphor. It's not a flip of a coin. Our politics and moments where we're either nailed on going to get Reform or nailed on going to get the Greens. I think the way our electoral system works, all bets are off, really. And it's actually more like a dice.

I was discussing this at work last week with someone who's doing politics. What are the arithmetics of Labour? One assumes high 20s percentage, then Reform, Greens, Lib Dems and Conservatives are actually all on about 15% here and there. So we are in untested waters politically, and because of that, there'll be a lot of tactical voting around that. It's just not a heads or tails situation. It's a one-two-three-four-five-six situation. So it's more like a dice than a coin. I think they're just two faces of a six-way dice, where you imagine some of the faces of possible coalitions between them and what that would turn out like.

But also on the tactical electoral cycle level, on the philosophical level, the arguments tempting the two sides of the same coin, they have simplistic populism in common, but I think it's more like they're just two extremes of the same journey. They're the start and the end point of a journey through your experience as a person and the solutions you come up with. I think the Greens embody a kind of hopeful naivety. They're like, yes, no one's tried taxing the rich before, let's tax the rich. We don't need fossil fuels, let's build renewables. It's very like teenage rebellion, basically. And the more you get into life, the more you experience, the more you moderate.

Then Reform is on the other side of the spectrum. They've got the bitter experience of a full life, and they look back in a nostalgic way and remember things in a way that possibly wasn't true,

but it's a memory that they cling to. They're at the other end of their journey. I think that's probably reflected in the ages who vote for them. That's not a criticism of either, it's just an observation correlation. So that's two ways in which the coin metaphor is just wrong, and that's why I am against the proposition.

The speaker.

Good evening, everyone. So I'm definitely on this side. This comes down to our politics. I'm not going to persuade you if you're on that side. I think before we even get into it, we have an issue about the economy and what anyone can do. It's very difficult to change anything we are dependent on. We're not energy independent, and that's gotten worse with Iran. We are not militarily independent, we're not financially independent, and that relates to the movement of capital globally. There's only so much that any party in power can do to invest. Britain hasn't been invested in for the last 30 years. To invest in our infrastructure and improve productivity, we need to borrow, and then we're relying on the bond markets, and that causes all sorts of problems. So what can any party do? Because of that, there is disillusionment, but there is a clear difference between the two sides.

We've got now, for example, our own version of Fox News, GB News, which is incendiary, and we know that Nigel Farage appears on there regularly, and we know that the Greens would not approach that with a barge pole. It's a bit like inviting Barack Obama onto Fox News. He's going to get interrogated and he's not going to be treated equally well. So there's a clear difference there. Before Trump was elected, people were saying, well, at least this unknown quantity may make a difference. That's a really poor reason to elect someone. And we know that Farage is taking the side of Trump. We know that the Greens aren't going to do that. Farage is going to align with the chaos that Trump has brought or help create that chaos.

Privatisation is the big thing. Where do you want to go? Reform and the proposition have suggested that part of the party is unlikely to win. I'm afraid that they may win, because every time I've switched on BBC TV news or breakfast TV, I find narratives that support that side. I'm really worried that they may win, but they are going to go towards privatisation. The Greens, who I would vote for, will go towards a reduction of inequality and more of a distributive economy. There are clear differences. Do you want a privatised NHS? Do you want Palantir to take over the NHS? The Greens will resist that. We also know from the energy crisis that there's a clear difference.

Hello, everyone. Initially, in the pre-vote, I was on the second speaker's side, but after a moment of contemplation, I found myself switching over. I actually really liked your argument in detail about just how different these two parties are. I don't think that's in question at all, but what we're talking about is whether they are two different sides of the same coin. So what thread are we talking about? It would be a waste of time for me to stand here and say they're different on this point or that policy. So why am I on this side of the aisle?

Let's just take one headline position from each party. Reform very much wants to slash immigration and stop the boats. The Greens want to tax the very wealthy and address inequality. Two very different policies, but I think they fall within the same category of populism, and that's because the issues of immigration and inequality are both real, genuine concerns that most people in this country have, but they are nuanced, difficult problems to solve. But what do both parties do? They say, 'Stop the boats.' 'Tax the rich.' What they do is they offer easy solutions to very complex, difficult problems. And so I think the common thread we find is that

the parties are not just two sides of the same coin, but two sides of the same populist mindset that drives them to want people to vote for whatever they're selling. Thank you.

Yes, sorry. Remind me of your name? The speaker again. Sure.

So, are Reform and Green two sides of the same coin? When I first read this motion, I got the impression they were saying that Reform is a right-wing populist party and Green is a left-wing populist party. I disagree on both points. I think with the Reform Party, they do have certain populist elements to it. One of their policies was that they want to renationalise utilities and control immigration. Those are populist sort of policies, but if you look deep down, the Reform Party is actually funded by billionaire backers. You have to think, well, why do billionaires want to go into politics? They have their own vested interests, and one of their interests is that they actually want to privatise the health service by stealth, doing it gradually. The other thing is, if you look at the last election, the Reform Party got a lot of publicity compared to previous so-called right-wing populist parties. The whole idea for the Reform Party is basically to split the right-wing vote so that you increase the chances of Labour getting back into power, because that is the real establishment party.

I don't believe that the Green Party is populist either. I mean, they do have certain populist policies, putting things like railways and utilities back into public ownership and preventing NHS privatisation. But one of the things that the Green Party does is that they actually support open borders. I think immigration is genuinely a good thing, but if you're basically having an open border policy that is putting more pressure on workers' wages, putting more pressure on public services and putting more pressure on housing, that actually serves the interests of big corporations.

And the other thing is that the Green Party wants to switch from fossil fuels to renewables. You can't get rid of fossil fuels entirely. Reducing the supply of fossil fuels is going to increase the demand and the price, and that's going to lead to more bills. Gas and electricity bills are going to go up, and that's going to affect the average working person. So that also is anti-populist. Somebody mentioned that the Green Party is a Bennite sort of Labour Party. I disagree with that as well, because Tony Benn was very anti-EU and quite anti-war. Both the Reform Party and the Green Party are quite vociferous supporters of the war in Ukraine. You can't support giving money to Ukraine and support the ordinary person at home as well, for example, by cutting winter fuel payments. So I would say that a more left-wing alternative populist would be someone in the form of Jeremy Corbyn. I don't think that the Reform Party is a right-wing populist vote. I think it's just there generally to get Labour in power by splitting the right-wing vote. Thank you.

Yes, please. Your name? Good evening.

I'll give you a bit of context about myself. I'm an immigrant from South Africa. I haven't been here very long. I've only been here for one election cycle, so I've only seen it once, and I've got a couple of quirks that I've noticed in the political system. I think the argument that they're either side of the same coin, I don't see it that way. I think it's a continuum. You've got the left, you've got the right, Greens here, Reform there. It's one side of the coin, the political side of the coin, which is actually offering solutions. Whether you see it as fringe or populist or figments of imagination, fairy dust or real. Can it offer solutions or not?

The other side of that coin is parties that are offering no solutions. When I came and voted for the first time, I saw this man standing there, Count Bucketface, and I was absolutely astounded.

What kind of politics allows a man who's got no actual policy behind him to sit on your ballot? That's the opposite side of the coin. He's offering nothing. He's detracting from a true political debate.

The real debate you should be having, from my perspective, is that you should have proportional representation. How can you allow a party that got 33% of the vote to get 66% of the seats and act like they've got a true mandate to put crazy change into the system? Labour has gone off the charts with what they've put in place with very little of the vote. 33% of people supported that, and yet they sit there with a majority of two-thirds and are running amok. I think it's sad to see as an immigrant that you've allowed your politics to run that way. You should have proportional representation.

The speaker.

Okay, so they are two sides of the same coin. They're not even the same currency. Reform is basically a racist organisation, whereas the Green Party is seen as probably a beacon of hope for the younger generation, and to put them onto the same side of the same coin is a bit strong, really. What can I say about it? I think that fundamentally, there's an argument here saying that political organisations, whatever philosophies they have, whatever policies they have, they are all the same, which they are. Because we can have this argument and say the Monster Raving Loony Party or Count Bucketface are the same. And the great thing about the British system is that if you are Count Bucketface, you can pay your money and you can get onto a ballot paper. That's why we live in a free liberal democracy, if that's what you want to do with your money. But we could argue about any party. We could say Liberals and Reform are the same sides of the same coin, and that may be true in one context, but generally with regards to policies, which is the most important thing, they are not the same side of the same coin.

Someone raised Palantir. God bless Palantir. Palantir is a commercial organisation, very successful. There's a lot of stuff around Palantir exploiting the NHS. Understandable, it looks pretty scary. And from one point of view, it is pretty scary because the UK chief executive of Palantir is a man called Mosley. For those of you who are old enough to remember, there was a man called Oswald Mosley who used to be pro-Adolf Hitler. You know, the sins of the father can't be visited on the son. But maybe there's something there. Personally, I think that's a red herring about politics. Fundamentally, though, I do not think that the two parties are two sides of the same coin. They are fundamentally different. And as I say, they are different currencies, not the same. Thank you.

We've got one at the back, the speaker, and then your name.

I'm going to argue that the second speaker here is correct and that they are not two sides of the same coin. I think a lot of the framing of this debate is a sort of centrist one driven by the mainstream media, which likes to have a quite simple 'two sides to everything'. You could say they're both populist, they're both blaming different people, the billionaires or the immigrants. You could look at it that way. You could also say they've both taken politicians from different parties.

But to be honest, for me, this is quite a shallow, perception-based way of looking of these two parties and not substantive. I think if you look at their funding models, it reveals that the Greens are a more substantial grassroots, real political party, in my opinion, with a real history that stretches back much further. While Reform are more billionaire-led in terms of funding, more of a way of pursuing the interests directly of extremely rich people, and less of a real party in that

sense. And for me, there's a substantial, real difference there between them. You could say in the past, Lib Dems had a charismatic leader, they're insurgent, but we would never say that UKIP and Lib Dems were another side of this populist coin.

No one really thinks that. Sorry.

Zack Polanski was a member. Lib Dems are opportunists. But UKIP wasn't real politics. It was just an opposition to the EU. There wasn't anything positive, there wasn't anything real. It was just 'get out'. The Green Party were originally an ecological party, a single issue, but they were actually pushing for things which were constructive and not just 'let's get out'.

Fellow political addicts, media people, whoever you are, I got a bit of a dilemma, should I be serious or should I take the humorous side? I was wondering in my imagination, are they twins? Are they the Prince and the Pauper? You remember that film, identical twins. One had a rich upbringing, the other one had a poor one, but they were twins, and so there, I think you have it. As our friend mentioned, Mr Zack Polanski was a Liberal Democrat. So it might be seen that they are trying to influence a fifth-columnist sort of approach to getting power. I don't think Lloyd George knew anything about Green policies. He might have done, he was very productive. Certainly was.

The first speaker would know.

What?

Okay, so, or are they the Muppets? This is entertainment, certainly. Since they have become more popular, I think you're right, they've deserted their philosophical base. Yes, I left the party. I was a member of the Ecology Party when they decided to change their name, and I was prepared to stand as an independent Ecology candidate, but they've got the copyright. You can't use the word Ecology in terms of standing for a Parliamentary seat, even though it's in the English dictionary. So perhaps they are the Muppets.

Of course, as I indicated, Mr Farage can trace his heritage back to the Huguenots. So perhaps he should be encouraged to stand as French president and solve the boat people from that side. But it won't be solved because immigration is a world situation. It's a world problem, and it needs a world government, and we won't get a world government by voting for these Muppets, whether they're Tory Whigs. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to swear, bad Whigs, okay? But at least the Green Party has its roots in some kind of philosophy, 'Small is Beautiful', Edward Goldsmith's 'Blueprint for Survival'. There is a philosophical base that we're all going to have to tackle. Even if our friend doesn't believe climate change is human-created, it is there, and a lot of evidence is there. The point is that there is a philosophical argument there.

But ultimately, it doesn't matter who you vote for. You know what I'm going to come to next.

When you get elected, I don't know whether that's the case for local government, where the councillors have to take the oath of allegiance. No, you do? Okay. But if you become elected as an MP in this country, as soon as you try to enter the House of Commons, you lose your popular mandate, and you have to swear an oath, an allegiance to the monarch. And so therefore they are Muppets. They're his puppets. And until we change that fundamental system, your vote won't count. So start the revolution as soon as possible. Thank you very much.

Yeah, I'm standing on this side because I do believe that these two parties are two sides of the same coin. There are a lot of obvious, superficial similarities. They both play the same role to the traditional parties. They're both now starting to steal the members of Parliament of the same parties, and they're very loosely labelled as populist parties. And I agree this might be a

superficial thing, but I think there is one very core idea to both of them which is important, why I think they're the same coin, and we're talking about populism.

There's a scarecrow in the room, Mr Trump, and despite his direct danger, one of his biggest influences in the world is how he affects how we talk about truth and facts. Trump is a master of jumping between the truth, lies and anything in between. He so quickly can tell you a fact, not a fact, and then just come up with something totally ridiculous. And everyone just takes it. And I think there is a core idea of how we've started to undermine facts, how we've started to undermine evidence and how we've started to undermine, to some extent, expert opinions in areas where people have worked for a lot of years and developed understanding.

From the Reform side, it was mentioned a lot. There's a lot about climate change, there is a lot about even stuff like immigration. There is definitely an evidence-based benefit to immigration. We can discuss how immigration should be done, but there's evidence of a benefit to it. COVID vaccines are another thing. We know there is evidence. There may be some caution, but not to the level of what Reform or people on the right are saying.

But on the Green side, nuclear energy. They're afraid of it, even though there is significant evidence that it is one of the safest and best energies available to us to build, and they are scared of it. For the longest time, they promoted homeopathy, though they have now started to walk back on this. They were against genetically modified crops. Those are also evidence-based things that improve our quality of life, and they were undermining them. Also, Modern Monetary Theory. As much as I know it's popular right now, there was a questionnaire of 50 economists in the world, many of them close to the post-Keynesian model, but even they reject what Modern Monetary Theory represents. And this is the same dangerous thing that Reform brings and the Greens bring. They bring evidence-less populism, and they want to bring it into our economy and into our lives. I think this is the core danger with them.

Yes, can you remind me of your name?

So I would agree with this side. I do believe that Reform and the Greens are two sides of the same coin. I think it's interesting what the first speaker said about the Greens are to Labour what Reform are to Conservatives. One thing I've been doing is learning about politics a lot more, looking into the history of British politics, and I've been looking at some of the leaders before, like Churchill and Margaret Thatcher.

One of the things I was thinking about as we move forward in terms of voting and politics is that the demographics of the country right now are different from the way they would have been before. And I think a lot of people are maybe kind of scared about that. The politicians are feeding that fear that people have. So we have one group of people that are happy for things to change, maybe people that have come into the country and haven't originally been a part of this country, and they're happy for the demographics to change. And then there are people that have historically been in this country, their ancestors have been here, and they don't want the country to change. And I think the politicians are both trying to feed these two groups of people, putting them against each other.

But I think in terms of their policies, they're kind of about the same thing. They're all about resources. When we look at Reform talking about immigration, obviously if a ton of people come into this country, then we need to think about the resources in this country. And then we think about the Greens and taxing the rich at the same time, it's all about resources. And one of the policies of the Greens being investing in renewables. Times are changing, and it is a very

uncomfortable period of time that we're all in, and these two parties are both feeding off of these fears. So I would agree with the first speaker's side.

The speaker.

Two sides of a coin. Well, we get that tonight. I was upstairs trying to do comedy. Please don't have you on the same night as me, I didn't get any audience anyway. I've come in and I've not really heard, except for the last four speakers, how they are not two sides of the same coin. Because I'll tell you why. You look at this, and it says Reform is to Conservative and Green is to Labour. How long has Labour been a Conservative Party? Quite a long time, from Blair when they started New Labour. So at the end of the day, there can't be the same thing. That coin has not been created in this country right now.

In regards to immigration, Reform and the media talked about immigration being widespread. But if you notice, any of the crimes that are highlighted are committed by people who've got colour in their skin. There may be people who are white from Poland who are committing crimes, but their pictures are not in the paper, so therefore that's why it becomes about race. Last year, I had a racist applicant who wants to be a councillor in my borough of Camden, same as Starmer. This person said to me, 'We don't want you here.' And when I said to him, 'You racist', he realised what he said. I wish I was a young person, because I would've been videoing it before that was said. He realised what he said and he goes, 'No, I mean, I don't like what you said.'

You see, this is the thing about saying that they're two sides of the same coin. At the end of the day, the Greens are not really saying that much. They're just saying whatever they need to say to sound votable. And Reform haven't actually worked out how they're going to deal with policies like education and housing and all the other stuff. You've got Suella, Kemi, all of them. And by the way, when you want to talk about people, and this is so important, I'm not black. Pink or purple? I'm just black, white, brown or whatever. But do not use the colours of aliens, because somewhere along the line, immigration sounds like we're talking about aliens. I'm not an alien, and I want to be here. I don't know who you're going to vote for. I'm voting for an independent, not voting for Green, but they're not the same sides.

Do we have any more speakers? No, okay, let's sum up. We're gonna start with applause for the second speaker.

I'm gonna borrow a really good strategy from an earlier speaker, where you stood over here and everyone thought you were on this side, but you moved this way, so I'm going to mirror that. Hey, I'm over on this side. Isn't it great? However, remember that this debate is not about the policies. It's about how they are different. So whether you are hearing policies which agree with your fundamental beliefs or not is irrelevant. What I'm here to try and convince you is that they are unrelated. The Green and the Reform parties are different.

One of the things I want to talk about that was mentioned a few times was where the funding comes from. One thing that makes Greens and Reform different is that Reform, for 2025, received 18 million pounds from very generous, rich donations. A lot of the people who are in the Reform Party are people who have benefited and actually got a lot of success from the current status quo. By comparison, whereas a single donation for the Reform Party last year was 1 million pounds, the highest single donation for the Green Party was actually in its thousands. It's nowhere near that number.

I'm gonna move this way. Whereas Reform are taking a sledgehammer approach to our democracy and how they want to tackle all the issues of the UK, the Green Party actually don't want to use a sledgehammer. They want to rewire things. They say, 'Hey, we have a democracy, we have things in place, it just needs to be working for the right interests and for different interests than it systematically has been in the past.'

And keep in mind that every Reform MP has been part of the Conservative Party in their career. But essentially, Green MPs have literally just been Green their entire career from the ground up, and that's a big differential between us.

Then when it comes to how people are taxed, one of the big differences is about the tax loopholes that the Diet Coke of the Conservative Party, Labour, have kept going. The Conservatives started with the Thatcher movement, this entire thing that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. The Greens really seem to be about doing the opposite of what we've been doing. And the Reform Party has been a lot about keeping things going, but being even harder in this direction. So that's kind of why I feel the two parties are very, very different.

Thank you to the second speaker. And now to the first speaker.

Fellow Sylvans, gentlemen, for a long time now we've had basically a two-party system. We've had the Conservatives and Labour in power alternately. In fact, we haven't had any government of the Liberals since about the 19th century. We did get a coalition of Conservatives and Lib Dems with David Cameron and Nick Clegg in 2010. But that was about it. And one of the conditions of that was that the referendum was held on proportional representation, and the people turned it down. They voted against it. So proportional representation is out of the window for a generation because it's been voted on and rejected. But I agree with the point that if the turnout is poor, if only about 50% of the population vote, then whoever wins is governing on less than a majority of the people. That is a good point, and I take that one, but that is how a first-past-the-post system works.

So what we are talking about, really, is the fact that the two-party system has fractured. It's no longer just Labour and Conservative with the Lib Dems on the periphery. We've got Reform and the Greens. And I said previously that the Greens are to Labour what Reform are to the Conservatives, meaning that the Greens are ultra-left and Reform are ultra-right. And in that sense, they are two sides of the same coin. The Greens do not have a philosophical basis any longer, because if you look at the Gorton and Denton by-election, which was not that long ago, they didn't talk anything about the environment at all. In fact, they did leaflets in about five different languages, four of which were South Asian. So it doesn't have a philosophical basis any longer. The Greens are not that interested in their environment. They're interested in populist policies.

In fact, where the parties are the same is that they will both say anything to get your vote. They will say what they want you to hear. They will both give you easy solutions to difficult problems. The Greens will come up with wonderful-sounding solutions which appear to appeal to young people, and Reform will come out with wonderful solutions which perhaps appear to appeal to older people, but they are still giving you easy solutions to difficult problems. And in that sense, they are both two sides of the same coin. Thank you.

Thank you to the first speaker. And now we will take our final vote on the motion, which I will just remind everyone: The Greens and Reform are two sides of the same coin. For those voting for the motion, please raise your hand.

Twelve. Those against the motion?

Ten. Did you vote?

I think I did.

Oh, you did. Abstentions? Okay, so by a vote of 12 for, 10 against and five abstentions, this motion carries.