

What do we want? Care or fascism? That's the economic c..

Published: February 2, 2026, 7:05 am

This video argues that we are facing a stark economic and political choice: fascism or care.

Fascism is not history. It is happening now. It has a distinct economic logic built on extreme neoliberalism:

- * Market worship
- * Punishment instead of protection
- * Austerity
- * Fear, and
- * The use of the state to enforce cruelty while insulating wealth.

The economics of care offers a different framework entirely. It puts human needs first, makes security and freedom from fear a public duty, and insists that markets must serve people rather than control them. Care is not sentimental. It is economic realism, social resilience, and democracy's defence.

This is not an abstract debate. The structures we build now will decide whether we live in a society organised around fear or one organised around care.

That is the choice. And there is no neutral ground.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eBEahWrzEr0?si=QrxyFOu4pYzoaeyr>

This is the audio version:

https://www.podbean.com/player-v2/?i=ick8n-1a346cc-pb&from=pb6admin&share=1&download=1&rtl=0&font=Arial&skin=f6f6f6&font-color=auto&logo_link=episode_page&btn-skin=c73a3a

This is the transcript:

We have an economic choice to make. It is between fascism or care.

As far as I can see, those are the options that are going to be on the table soon, and there won't be any others.

And let's be clear, fascism is here now. Fascism is not about history. It is something that is happening at this moment.

We can see it in the USA. There are people there who are saying it. Robert Reich, a former minister in Clinton's government, is saying out loud that not only is there fascism in the USA, in the form of Donald Trump, but there's a Gestapo too, and he's right.

And so this video is deeply pertinent because it's about the choices we have to make if we are to avoid going down that road and having fascist economics in this country. And we need to discuss the alternative as well. What do we want? Care or authoritarianism? That is the question.

And let's be clear. This is an economic argument as well as a political argument, because fascists do have distinct economic policies.

They worship markets, and they punish people.

They cut care, health, benefits, pensions, and support for all of those in need, and they call it freedom.

They blame migrants for economic failure when that is wholly untrue, as we're seeing in the USA.

And they use the state to enforce cruelty.

And again, let's be clear, we're seeing this in the USA right now. Federal forces are shooting people dead on the street for standing up to them because this is fascism trying to impose its will against the rights of people.

But all of this has a distinctive economic logic of extreme neoliberalism that has already brought us to our knees.

So, does care have a distinct framework as well? But it is incredibly different to the framing of fascism. The economics of care are about everyone.

Everyone matters without exception, within this framework.

Social, economic and physical security are seen as a public duty that the state must provide within the politics of care.

And markets must serve people and not the other way round in this way of thinking.

And most especially in the politics of care, no one should be left to fail.

As a consequence, these approaches to economics are very far apart, and that's what we're talking about here.

Let's be clear about the economics of fascism. Fascism isn't about uniforms or rallies. It's not about symbols or marches. It's about power, markets, and control. It's about who gets to control security and who is made disposable as a result, and these are real questions to consider, which impact everyone.

Importantly, fascism doesn't oppose markets; in fact, it radicalises them. It runs the whole of society for the benefit of markets, and again, we can see that in the USA. Companies like Palantir are taking over the control of public services, and their CEO and founder has actually said he doesn't see a role for democracy anymore.

The goal of fascism is to protect capital and not people. As a result, it suppresses labour, and it suppresses dissent, and quite explicitly, it enforces inequality through the state.

And fascism is where neoliberalism ends up.

Markets are treated as morally superior.

The state is reduced to enforcement.

Social security is reframed as weakness to be condemned.

Inequality is justified as the price of efficiency.

And eliminating 'others' is treated as a cost where those 'others' are, of course, those who appear to have migrated to the UK, whether their families did so generations ago, or last week.

The discrimination is always real, and the role of the state under fascist economics has

to also be understood. The role of the state in this situation is to support the powerful. The state provides police, prisons, borders, and surveillance, the things that ring-fence the rich from everybody else. It provides law to reinforce a bias to wealth, but it does not protect from poverty. There is no security for work, health or housing. The state serves order, but not care.

Who benefits? Look, you know that already. It's always the same groups. Those who benefited from neoliberalism: large corporations, financial elites, asset owners, and those who are already insulated from risk. They're just made wealthier still.

And who pays the price? You do. Workers are made flexible and disposable. Rights disappear. The sick are blamed for their illness and do not necessarily get treatment, most especially if the illness in question is mental ill health, the existence of which is very often denied by right-wing and fascist politicians. Disability is also denied. The poor are accused of failure, and the social safety net that has kept them going is removed, whilst outsiders are turned into enemies.

This is a politics of discrimination. Let's be clear about that. And fear is essential to this. Markets cannot deliver security, we know that. So, therefore, fear fills the gap. Fear of migrants, fear of unemployment, and fear of the unemployed who are portrayed as skivers, and fear of social collapse, therefore requiring that people believe in the strong man at the top of the pile. All of these ideas are deliberately stoked to turn attention away from the fact that almost everyone else is being exploited.

Now, contrast this with the economics of care. There is a completely different starting point. Human needs come first. Markets are tools and not masters. The state enables well-being. Security is a public good, and security in this sense does not just mean defence. It means security against illness, against old age, against unemployment, against exclusion, because the aim is inclusion and not exclusion. This is the inverse of fascism.

The objects of a society that promotes an economics of care are very clearly stated. Universal healthcare would be provided. Education would be seen as an investment. There would be secure housing for everyone and decent incomes, plus job guarantees. You would always be able to work if you wanted to, and you would also have the time to live and care, not least for children, but also for the elderly, and each other. You wouldn't be exploited, in other words.

The role of the state in the care economy is to be an enabling state. It creates capacity. It invests ahead of need. It maintains social and environmental capital, and it acts as a steward and not as an enforcer.

In the care economy, money matters, and I cannot help but mention this because the care economy would understand that the state can always spend if there is a need to do so to meet a need, and there are resources available to fulfil it. That's because

spending comes before taxation: we know that. What we also know is that tax then shape behaviour and control inflation, whilst public investment creates resilience.

In fascism, all of this is denied. Scarcity is a policy choice. People suffer as a result. Because money is understood in the care economy, the opposite is true.

Care and fascism are things that must be compared.

Fascism economises on people by making them and their needs disposable and almost irrelevant.

Care economises for people by making them the epicentre of its concern.

Fascism relies on fear; care relies on trust.

So we have a choice. Fascism promotes austerity that creates insecurity, including, by the way, that created by AI, all of which will result in authoritarianism, whilst market absolutism will destroy democracy.

Care is, in fact, democracy's defence. What it means is that there would be a society run for people. Austerity would be consigned to history, and insecurity would be something that the state would do everything it could to abolish for the people who live within the society that a government is responsible for.

Look around. This is so different from what we've got now. We see attacks on welfare. We see hostility to migrants. We see criminalisation of protests. We see AI justified as an economic necessity. None of this is true.

Economics is never neutral. It always encodes values. We must either choose the economics of care, or we can drift into the economics of coercion. That is the choice.

These are the questions we need to ask then. Do we want an economy built on fear or one built on care? Because the structures we build now will decide that future. Literally, this is a real issue, now.

That is the choice we have to make: care versus fascism. There isn't a bigger decision to make, and there is only one answer which will benefit the vast majority of people in the world, and that is care.

What do you think? There's a poll down below.

Poll

[poll id="307"]

