

Labour and the Tories are both making the same false cl...

Published: January 13, 2026, 10:22 pm

As is apparent from yesterday's posts, I took a relatively quiet day with regard to the blog because I wanted to think and reflect on where we are politically. Given the total collapse of any identifiable Tory ideology, excepting something heading in the direction of racist neofascism, and Starmer's creation of a totally ethics-free Labour Party, embracing policy positions that can, apparently, overlap with those of the far-right of the Conservatives, this reflection seemed entirely appropriate.

As I noted on Saturday, it is entirely fair to suggest that this situation is the result of the adoption of neoliberal thinking by both these parties. As a result of this they presume that morality, ethics, and even political opinion have no role to play in the creation of their policy programmes. Instead, finance is the only decision criterion that they recognise, with self-imposed constraints on state finances being the only conditions that apply when considering those issues.

This led to the obvious question as to what this shared platform that both these parties now wish to present to the British people might be. I say shared, because it is apparent that there is almost no identifiable difference between them when it comes to this chosen ethical void excepting the degrees of apparent detachment from reality with which the resulting policies are pursued by them.

What became clear is that the argument that these neoliberal politicians are presenting is that we can no longer afford government. Their claim would seem to be that whilst we might have been able to do so once upon a time, now that we are supposedly richer than we have ever been, the collective desire that we live in a jurisdiction where we can put our faith in institutions over which we can exercise some degree of choice as to their composition in the hope that they might act in our collective best interests, sharing our resources in common for mutual benefit, is now, apparently, impossible. What they are saying as a result is that we must, therefore, now learn to live without the safety net of government that we once, when collectively worse off, enjoyed.

I do not, of course, accept this argument. That is because it is a very obviously carefully fabricated deceit. Those politicians making this claim do so on the basis of the support

of those who have been best rewarded by more than four decades of neoliberalism. Whether those providing that support be the wealthiest people in the country, or the largest corporations that operate within it, these politicians seemingly exist to support the claim made by the wealthy that those with the greatest capacity to contribute to the common good should not bear the burden of responsibility for doing so.

This is because, it is argued, we would not even have the option of having a government if the wealth of these people were constrained by a requirement that they contribute in a way that even vaguely approached the demand made upon the majority of the population. That is because requiring this would, apparently, so suppress the entrepreneurial spirit of those with wealth that there would be insufficient resources left in society for anything even approximating to affordable government. Where, however, this entrepreneurial spirit is to be seen within a society that has already provided the wealthy with so many opportunities for it to flow free, I do not know, because I am certainly not a witness to it.

This argument is, as a result, obviously false. The argument is that those possessed of wealth, who think themselves the creators of it as a consequence (irrespective of its actual sources), cannot be required to pay for government because if that demand were made, there would be no wealth to fund it. They have set up the ultimate political paradox as a consequence, which both the Tories and Labour buy into, hook, line and sinker, which is that we cannot have sufficient government without wealth, but if we have sufficient government, we would not have wealth, meaning that wealth must go untouched by government.

What, however, the wealthy require as a result is that people be elected who support this claim. As a result they have funded politicians willing to subscribe to this view. The consequence is that the possibility of beneficial government is now denied by the political assumptions made about the necessary structures of wealth and its preservation within the society in which such a government should operate that have been created by those who do not wish that such a government exist.

As a result, we live in an increasingly lawless state. Our judicial system is ceasing to function. So too, as I noticed yesterday, has company law. This is also true with regard to much of divorce law, where most people get by without legal assistance, laws to protect children, employment law, law to protect those with disabilities, and so much else. The denial of rights and the denial of the means to access the legal system that might afford those rights is now so normal that those who do not wish effective government to operate have guaranteed that it cannot. Whatever the law might dictate, the means to enforce it is now largely non-existent for most people.

Simultaneously, public services of almost all sorts are failing. Those who do not wish government to operate and who think (whether rightly or wrongly) that they can afford to buy themselves out of the system of services that the government provides are not just indifferent to this outcome; they welcome it because they think this provides them

with greater opportunity to exploit society at large, which exploitation is the true source of much of their wealth.

Meanwhile, the existential threats to society, from climate change, community breakdown, and so much more, are growing, but those who think that we do not really need government seemingly also think that stresses with regard to these issues can be constrained, no doubt with the use of a little judicial or even physical violence, which is why so many human rights have been abused in recent years both by their cancellation in law and increasingly unfettered police action.

Put all this together, and this idea that we cannot afford government is the common implicit but unstated theme that both Labour and the Tories will present to us during the course of the election that we will have this year. The real choice between the two, excepting the degree of mania on display, is insignificant. Instead, the conspiracy between the two is glaringly apparent. They are in obvious agreement that whatever it was that we could once afford to deliver government is no longer possible, whether that is true or not, and therefore they will make no attempt to deliver it.

What we are, therefore, faced with are politicians seeking office with one common objective, which is to destroy the very institutions that they seek to control, and all to serve the interests of wealth to which both parties have made themselves completely subservient.

For how long can this madness last? Or, to put it another way, for how long do we have to put up with a political duopoly that now asks for us to vote for them even though they are collectively saying that they do not believe that they can deliver whatever it is that we need, let alone want?

And, why is it that they can still presume that we might find this prospect appealing?

Is it that the conspiracy of first-past-the-post has simply been captured, like so much else, with the goal of denying us anything approaching the form of government that we really need? Or is the malaise deeper than that so that it infects even those parties supporting the replacement of that profoundly corrupt system of voting? That is open to debate.

The reality that we face a political conspiracy to deny us the chance of lives well lived supported by benign government intended to promote universal well-being is beyond debate. This is a fact. The question is, now that Labour under Starmer has gone so far out of its way to make this clear, what do we do about it?