

Politics for People - and why we have chosen the phrase

Published: February 4, 2026, 7:46 am

To [continue the story of the narrative](#) we are developing to explain the politics of care in a way that is easier for people to comprehend, whilst making it work better on social media, this post explains the positive framing we now intend to use for this project.

It is our intention, unless somebody can point out serious problems with this, to describe what we are promoting as **Politics for People**.

The subtitle would then be: **The political economy of care**.

Our experiences suggest that these changes are needed before I pursue this project further, which we plan to do. What we have discovered is that when people become familiar with the term "**the politics of care**," there is no problem with understanding it, but there is when they first encounter it. The problem we have identified is that on YouTube and other social media platforms, people decide what to watch in seconds, often without listening to a word, so understanding what is going on immediately is crucial.

In this context, **politics for people**:

- * Is instantly comprehensible
- * Uses everyday language
- * Means no conceptual decoding is required

In contrast, the **politics of care** is:

- * Abstract
- * Sounds academic, or ethical, rather than practical
- * Requires explanation before it is comprehended

In that case, for a scrolling viewer, the phrase '**for people**' immediately tells them who the politics is about and whose side it is on.

Our research suggests that YouTube rewards relational language that implies inclusion, benefit, and agency. In this context, the phrase **for people** signals:

- * Advocacy
- * Alignment
- * Conflict with elites or systems

By way of contrast, the words **of care** imply:

- * Reflection
- * Values
- * Analysis

As a result, the risk we have found is that the phrase the **politics of care** can be misread as:

- * Relating to welfare alone
- * Sentimental
- * Apolitical or moralistic

In contrast, the term **politics for people**:

- * Can convey anger, urgency, and confrontation
- * Works equally well for economics, tax, fascism, housing, and power
- * Leaves room for hard arguments about money, markets, and the state

It sounds like a challenge, not the title of an academic seminar.

In addition, and critically, this is politics **for people**. It is not **about** people. Crucially, the description is active and implies that the purpose of politics is to create a state that delivers for the benefit of those living within it. There is, quite literally, nothing passive about that.

To add to that, the statement clearly states what is required and sets a standard against which achievement can be assessed. Politics is either for people, or it is not: that is the criterion by which all politics must be appraised. That is the obvious

implication of the phrase. In itself, that makes the terminology complete, and that is what we were looking for.

Critically, this phrase is also inclusive, and that is also intentional. The description does not refer to politics for some people, or rich people, or working people, or anybody else who can be differentiated within society. This is **politics for people**, implying that it embraces everyone, because that is what it is intended to do.

Turning, then, to the suggested subtitle, this is **the political economy of care**. Using the phrase **political economy** rather than just **economics** is, again, deliberate, making it clear that care is a choice in this case, not a supposedly rational, academic, or imposed option.

I will come back shortly, and in another post, to our discussion of how we plan to define what we oppose, which necessarily involves reframing neoliberalism and fascism. But even without reaching that point, we think the term **politics for people** achieves the goal of defining what we are against without necessarily or always needing an opposing label. Any politics that acts against the interests of all people, given that politics for people necessarily embraces everyone, stands in opposition to what politics for people stands for. Again, a performance criterion is established simply by using those three words, because actions that do not meet the expectations implied by this requirement necessarily run contrary to politics for people.

The obvious question to ask, then, is what do you think of this? There is a poll below, but please add your comments as well.

Poll

[poll id="312"]