

Pillinger, C

The High Court ruled that GB News had accurately and fairly followed your rules. I am disappointed to learn that you now seek to change the same rules to effectively ban elected politicians from presenting anything on current affairs.

Your proposed rules will make it almost impossible for broadcasters to distinguish between news and current affairs programmes, meaning they won't (and can't) put politicians on air.

Elected politicians should be able to speak to the people about the issues of the day, so we can assess their arguments. We can always switch off if we don't agree with what we hear. It is not right that you seek to make that decision for us.

There is no need to pursue this needless change to Rule 5.3. It restricts freedom of expression as well as viewers' and listeners' choice. I urge you to leave the rules as they are.

Please find attached my response form.

Question	Your response
Question 1: Do you agree with the proposed amendments to Rule 5.3 of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code? Please give reasons for your answer.	I do not agree with the proposed amendments, politicians should be allowed to broadcast as long as it is clear to the audience what their political affiliations are.
Question 2: Do you consider that Rule 5.3 of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code, if amended as proposed, will provide sufficient protection for audiences? Please give reasons for your answer.	This will offer no additional protection to audiences as it is completely unnecessary. I should say that the way the question is couched is biased in my view.
Question 3: Do you agree with the assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed amendments to Rule 5.3 of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code (as set out in Annex 2)? Please give reasons for your answer.	I do not agree with the impact assessment. It is patronising and assumes that the audience has no intelligence and are unable to take account of possible biases of the presenter. Therefore the proposals will impoverish political debate in the UK and have no benefit for audiences at all, quite the opposite in fact. It will allow a biased mainstream media to entrench its largely left wing position and have a free and uncontested hand to present its point of view to the public

Question	Your response
Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the Guidance on Rule 5.3?	No I do not – they are not necessary and assume, patronisingly, that the general public is unable to account for a politician’s position when assessing their outputs.
Question 5: Do you have any other comments to make on the proposals, including in relation the scope of the proposed changes?	I think this proposal shows why OfCom should be immediately disbanded and its senior management sacked from all public offices/quango positions they hold. My taxes could be much better deployed in place of funding a biased organisation that takes a position of preventing free speech in the guise of protecting the public.

Please tell us how you came across about this consultation:

- ☐ Email from Ofcom
- ☒ Saw it on social media
- ☐ Found it on Ofcom's website
- ☐ Found it on another website
- ☐ Heard about it on TV or radio
- ☐ Read about it in a newspaper or magazine
- ☐ Heard about it at an event
- ☐ Somebody told me or shared it with me
- ☐ Other (please specify)