Workplace bullying should have no place in politics

Hannah White

ritain's political classes are accustomed to financial impropriety being grounds for sacking. Even if it was Nadhim Zahawi's lack of openness rather than his actual tax error which led to his ejection from cabinet. The conservative party chair's etle inevitable. Most of his colleagues—If not he himself—appear to accept the most be consequences for ministers who builty. The tone was set by Boris Johnson's refusal to dismiss Priti Patel from cabinet after his own ethics adviser found she had builded her civil servants. After taking over, Rishi Sunak also resisted sacking Gavin Williamson until pressure forced the Cabinet Office minister to resign over aggressive text messages to the former chief whip.

Now, pre-empty into claims of builty-ing against deputy prime minister to minister to resign over aggressive text messages to the former chief whip.

Now, pre-empty into claims of builty-ing against deputy prime minister to minister of the conduction of Adam of the conduction of the conducti

Where we draw the line must not be

determined by an individual's reaction

ants or the nature of their complaints. Senior backbencher Sir Bernard Ienkis sought to draw a distinction between the "many people who are incapable of being bullied", and those who "are very easily bullied", arguing, "If you are at the top of the civil service and working closely with ministers, if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen." These remarks play down the physical, psychological and professional harm caused by bullying and seek to shift blame from perpetrator to target. They suggest a hierarchy of resilience among those who are bulled, implying it is the weak hierarchy of resilience among those who are bulled, implying it is the weak who complain and the strong who remain silent. The inverse is the interest of the strong who remain silent. The inverse is the interest of the civil servants who dare stand up to poverful policians. Surely where we draw the line between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour should not be determined by an individual's reaction?

Dismissively, Jenink described bullying as "quite a new workplace wellbeing in the size." He is right that it was only in the wake of the #McToo scandal that some settings—including Westminster—have accepted that people with powers bould not be allowed to use it to harm others. But he is wrong to imply that behated reached by bullies of all political affiliations before a new independent system ended by bullies of all political affiliations before a new independent system confidence in the signal complaints but that does not mean they were less "capable of does not meaning-ful way of flagging complaints but that does not mean they were less "capable of does not meaning-ful way of flagging complaints but that does not mean they were less "capable of the way they were less "capable of the work were less "capable of the work

generations of officials had no meaning-ful way of flagging complaints but that does not mean they were less "capable of being bullied".

While accepting that financial impro-priety is serious, some Conservatives apparently believe that ministers are due a deference that exempts them from normal standards of behaviour. Sunak's Ministerial Code should disa-buse them of this, going as it does beyond stating that "harassing, bullying or other inappropriate or discriminat-ing behaviour" will not be tolerated. Instead it emphasises that ministers should always treat others "with consid-eration and respect". Even if members of his government do not understand or accept the impact of their behaviour on others, the code makes clear that it is they, not those who work for them, who are accountable.