## Your response

<i>Q. 1 Do you agree with our overall approach to setting the operating licence?</i>	No I don't, but I don't agree with a public broadcaster being anything like a necessity in the 21st century, least of all one that is supported by a licence fee with the threat of jail for non-payment. The BBC should be free to sink or swim in the commercial world. Privatise it!
Q. 2 Do you agree with the approach we have proposed for public purpose 1, including the high-level objectives and regulatory conditions we are proposing?	No again i don't. Impartiality is a Utopian objective that will never happen because those charged with being impartial are emotional human beings that unless they are sociopaths are incapable of objectiveness. How is the BBC supposed to secure high calibre presenters to analyse news when every other TV station offers much more money? The BBC will never tell the truth, politicians wouldn't allow it. How about the very truthful show "Taxes for revenue are obsolete". Do you think they will be allowed to show that? The website also lacks competent political and economic analysis. It is forever a site of misinformation for the incumbent administration.
Q. 3 Do you agree with the approach we have proposed for public purpose 2, including the high-level objectives and regulatory conditions we are proposing?	Again no. What you are proposing is akin to brainwashing, and the BBC has done plenty of that, just look at the climate change misinformation over the previous 20 years. I support the showing of old-style open university programmes, but nothing more than that as the BBC have already shown that education should never be a part of its remit. Most 'factual' programmes are nothing more than misinformation.
Q. 4 Do you agree with the approach we have proposed for public purpose 3, including the high-level objectives and regulatory conditions we are proposing?	The BBC can't produce the type of content you'd like it to. It simply can't pay enough. Production companies earn better money working for independent channels rather than a public broadcaster. None of the most talked about shows are ever on BBC let alone made by them. It couldn't even keep the Great British Bake-off. Public broadcasting has had its day and should have ended 35 years ago.

	<b></b>
Q. 5 Do you agree with the approach we have proposed for public purpose 4, including the high-level objectives and regulatory conditions we are proposing?	I don't even agree with the purpose and couldn't care less about how you regulate it.
<i>Q.</i> 6 Do you agree with Ofcom's approach to how we will set and amend the operating licence, as set out in Annex 5?	Surely by now you can tell I don't want to be taxed for something that people use by choice. It's not a necessity to life, like water, which is fine in the private sector, so why do we even have a public sector broadcaster? The BBC always ends up being a propaganda machine. It must be privatised and the TV licence sent to the dustbin of history.
<i>Q.</i> 7 <i>Do you agree with our proposed overall approach to performance measurement?</i>	Far too subjective.
Q. 8 Do you agree with the proposed framework of: availability; consumption; impact; contextual factors?	Not really. First-run shows and spend on first-run shows is unimportant if they are all flops which has largely been the case for years. Content analysis by experts? Similar to the economic experts that have sold the country down the river for forty years?
<i>Q. 9 Do you agree with Ofcom's approach to how we will set and amend the performance measures?</i>	What difference would it make? I don't support a public broadcaster when the essentials of life are all provided by the private sector. There ought to be no public sector broadcaster in the UK. Even mail delivery has been privatised. Why do the government insist on keeping this archaic relic from a bygone age as a public service? The state doesn't need another propaganda machine, it already has the Daily Fail, the Daily Torygraph and the Grauniad.