

Debate Ammunition: Tony Blair

Published: May 29, 2026, 6:06 am

THE RICHARD J MURPHY YOUTUBE CHANNEL

DEBATE AMMUNITION

TONY BLAIR

Funding the Future | May 2026

TODAY'S TOPIC

Tony Blair. The video to which this Debate Ammunition relates [is available here.](#)

THE CORE ARGUMENT

Tony Blair has not merely made corrupt bargains; he has been corrupted, meaning that whatever principles he once held as a Labour politician have been entirely replaced by the agenda of the oligarchs and AI investors who now fund him. His essay on AI and the future of politics is not centrist pragmatism but a straightforwardly neoliberal programme: smaller government, lower taxes on the wealthy, cuts to support for disabled people, and the elevation of technological inevitability above democratic choice. This thinking is dangerous precisely because it presents surrender to concentrated power as the only rational response to a changing world, and in doing so it threatens the most vulnerable people in this country and the democracy that might otherwise protect them.

THE ARGUMENT STRUCTURE

Step 1 — Blair has been corrupted

There is a meaningful distinction between a person who commits corrupt acts and one whose principles have been hollowed out entirely. Blair once had to believe in equality and trade unions to lead the Labour Party; those beliefs are now gone, replaced by an agenda that serves oligarchs and AI investors.

Step 2 — The essay is pure neoliberalism dressed as centrism

What Blair calls "radical centre politics" is, on examination, a programme for smaller government, lower taxes on the wealthy, and unconditional surrender to market forces and technological disruption. It is not moderate; it is far-right in its assumptions and its beneficiaries.

Step 3 — His attack on disabled people is the essay's most revealing passage

Blair argues that spending on disabled people now exceeds defence spending and must be cut. He never asks why disability numbers are rising, what the human cost of forcing sick people into work would be, or whether the AI-driven economy he celebrates will actually create the jobs he claims they can take. His silence on those questions is the answer.

Step 4 — Blair's AI agenda threatens democracy itself

By insisting there is only one rational response to AI, Blair reproduces the Thatcherite claim that "there is no alternative". He uses the language of technological inevitability to remove political choice. Sitting on Donald Trump's misnamed Board of Peace, he now seems to serve an international agenda that subordinates democratic accountability to the interests of those who fund him.

THEIR ARGUMENT → YOUR REBUTTAL

They Say Your Response

Blair is a pragmatist, not an ideologue. He is simply acknowledging economic reality and the disruptive power of AI. Calling surrender pragmatism is exactly what neoliberalism has always done. Thatcher said the same. There is nothing pragmatic about cutting support for disabled people while refusing to ask why their numbers are growing. That is an ideological choice dressed up as arithmetic.

Disability spending is genuinely unsustainable and must be addressed if public finances are to be stabilised. Blair asserts this but never demonstrates it. He does not ask whether the neoliberal economy he helped build created the stress, insecurity and ill health that drove those numbers upward. The claim that the problem is the spending rather than the conditions that made the spending necessary is not analysis; it is prejudice.

The Blair Institute is independent, and its analysis should be judged on its merits, not

on who funds it. That argument might carry weight if the conclusions did not consistently serve the financial interests of the funders. When the institute is bankrolled by Larry Ellison, the boss of an AI company, and the essay calls for governments to embrace AI and cut public spending, the conflict of interest is not incidental. It is structural.

AI will generate new jobs and growth that will more than compensate for any displacement. Blair is simply asking governments to prepare for that transition. Blair himself champions an agenda in which AI eliminates jobs while simultaneously demanding that disabled people re-enter a workforce those same jobs are vanishing from. The contradiction is not accidental. It reveals that the concern is not employment; it is cutting the cost of social security.

THE ONE-LINER

“Tony Blair now argues that governments must cut support for disabled people and surrender to AI’s corporate owners, which tells you everything you need to know about whose interests he has served for the past twenty years.”

FURTHER READING

Post	Title	Date	Relevance
------	-------	------	-----------

<u>Blair is claiming TINA. I am sure there is TIARA</u>	May 2026	Richard's direct response to the Blair essay, arguing that a politics of care and economics of hope constitute a genuine alternative to Blair's TINA framing.
---	----------	---

<u>Tony Blair's assault on the anxious, depressed and those with ADHD</u>	Apr 2026	Examines how Blair's proposals target neurodivergent and mentally ill people, with commentary from medical professionals on the clinical failings of his reductionist model.
---	----------	--

<u>Why is Tony Blair attacking sick people?</u>	Apr 2026	Detailed critique of the Blair Institute report proposing cuts to social security, examining the political context and the authoritarianism underpinning its proposals.
---	----------	---

<u>AI does not care - and it is hard-coding neoliberalism</u>	Jan 2026	Argues that AI systems encode neoliberal assumptions about efficiency and cost-minimisation, automating rather than challenging the politics of
---	----------	---

destruction Blair promotes.

[Where are jobs going to come from when every current economic goal is to get rid of them?](#) Jan 2026 Directly addresses the contradiction at the heart of Blair's position: AI is projected to eliminate at least 1.5 million UK jobs, yet disabled people are to be forced back into a shrinking labour market.

[Neoliberalism is the politics of destruction](#) Feb 2026 Provides the theoretical framework for understanding Blair's essay: neoliberalism is not a mistake but a system designed to shift power from people to corporations, with fiscal rules as its enforcement mechanism.

[Don't be disabled in the UK](#) Feb 2026 Examines how social security has been deliberately reframed as charity rather than insurance, enabling the stigmatisation of disabled claimants that Blair's essay depends upon.

[The government says it must cut benefits for the disabled. They are completely wrong.](#) Mar 2025 Demolishes the claim that disability cuts are economically necessary, explaining why neoliberal market assumptions systematically exclude the most vulnerable from their models.