

# Labour is promoting the household analogy that suggests...

Published: January 14, 2026, 2:12 am

---

Rachel Reeves told [The Mirror today](#) that:

*"I know how hard people work for their money and they see more and more of it go in taxes and more and more of it go on mortgages, rent, food shops and energy bills. They've got less every month for the things that they enjoy in life. And I do want working people who work incredibly hard to have more of their own money in their pockets."*

The article continued with a reference to her mother checking her bank statements to balance the family's books: for all her supposed economics education Reeves chooses to promote the household analogy as her metaphor for macroeconomic management when history has, time and again, proved it to be totally wrong.

There is also so much else wrong with Reeves' stated concern. For example, why is she focussing on expenditure and not income? Could it be that she does not believe in fair pay increases for those who deserve them in an inflationary era?

And why too has she nothing to say on cutting mortgages, which she could demand? She could as Chancellor over-rule the Bank of England.

She could then have talked about the impact of cuts in interest rates on rents.

And even on business costs so that the cost of food might fall.

She could also have addressed that last issue by talking about Brexit.

And she could have talked about changing the rules on energy pricing.

Completely missing, also, is any awareness that what people might want are decent public services.

But she did not hint at any of that. She instead portrayed herself as a victim of circumstance like the householder - excepting the hint that must be implicit in what she

said that she would like to reduce tax. It is as if she wants power and thinks that there is nothing she can do with it.

Given the chance she had to say so much more than she did I have to presume that she thinks this is the case.

It is not a compelling case for voting Labour.