

Name Withheld 9- 2nd Response

I thought it might be helpful to place your current proposal in the proper national context: the British public's relationship with political honesty.

To put it mildly, it's not a passionate affair.

According to Ipsos's Veracity Index (which I'm sure you've read in the breakroom between drafting broadcasting codes), a heroic **9% of the public trust politicians to tell the truth**. That puts them below estate agents, journalists, and—if memory serves—used car dealers. Only government ministers fare worse, which is rather poetic when you think about it.

There's a reason the old joke goes:

"How do you know when a politician is lying?"

"Their lips are moving."

That's not satire anymore—it's public consensus.

In this country **two-thirds of people believe politicians are "only in it for themselves"**, so the idea that a MP fronting a current affairs programme might mislead the unsuspecting public isn't just implausible—it's quaint.

No one thinks Nigel Farage is a neutral presenter, but that's rather the point.

This is Britain. We see a politician on screen and assume two things:

1. They're not telling us the full story.
2. They'll probably be on *Strictly* by next spring.

So let's not pretend viewers are wandering innocently into a trap when a politician reads a headline or interviews a guest. We're cynical, yes—but also not stupid.

If your concern is confusion between "news" and "current affairs," the answer is clarity, not censorship. Viewers deserve signposting, not silencing. The alternative I proposed—delimiting current affairs with rules on topic pre-announcement and format—still stands, and would help avoid this creeping tendency to treat public discourse like something to be disinfected before broadcast.

In short: if you're concerned about politicians bringing dishonesty into broadcasting, relax—we already expect it. The cure for that isn't banning them; it's watching them closely and letting the audience make its own mind up.

