

What government departments would Farage and the Tories.

Published: January 13, 2026, 3:59 am

GB News has, I note, [reported comments](#) made by Nigel Farage both on how Elon Musk might, in his opinion, take on the task of reforming government in the USA, and on how such ideas might be replicated in this country, which approach Reform approves of.

As they reported, he has said:

"This is the sexy bit: Elon comes in and takes a knife to the deep state. Just like when he bought Twitter he sacked 80 per cent of the staff.

There are going to be mass lay-offs, whole departments closing and I'm hoping and praying that's the blueprint for what we then do on our side of the pond.

Because that's what Reform UK believes in - that we're over-bureaucratised and none of it works. This assault on the bureaucratic state is the thing that's really exciting.

They'll all be gone. They'll all be fired. Why do we need Whitehall with all these useless, ghastly Marxists? Universities have all become madrassas of Marxism. The whole thing is appalling."

Note the many [similarities to what Badenoch](#) is saying.

I always find comments of this sort both bizarre and troubling. I also have to resist the temptation of laughing at the person who makes them because how they think whole departments of government might be closed down baffles me.

Which departments is he going to close? The NHS? The Department of Work and Pensions? Education? Defence? The Revenue, maybe?

Or is it going to be Environment, as a result of which flooding will become ever more commonplace, which is going to make him intensely popular (I jest).

Or is it agriculture?

I could keep going, but the point is that I can think of no government department that could be shut.

Farage might respond by suggesting the Arts, Media and Culture, but I have a very strong suspicion that there would be outrage from many Tories if he were to do so because the evidence is that the department in question does, in fact, quite heavily subsidise the wealthy.

Alternatively, he might, of course, suggest that he would close International Development, but that department has already gone, and the reason why we do international development is that nothing is more effective in keeping migrants away from this country than the aid that we supply to the countries where they currently live. It would be deeply ironic if he did not understand that.

So, what does he want to get rid of? I forgot to mention transport, or anything related to energy, climate change, or the devolved administration of the UK. Is he really suggesting they should go?

Alternatively, is he just, as usual, talking a lot of nonsense? And anyway, why use Musk as an example? He might have sacked up to 80% of Twitter staff when he took that company over, but as a consequence, he very badly damaged its business model and simultaneously destroyed the value of the investment that had been made in that company by others, following his lead. Is Farage really an exponent of the destruction of value as a method of government? That would be absurd.

So, why even ask these questions? I do so because I have little doubt at all that comments of this sort are going to come up time and again over the coming months and years. This is even more likely now that Trump looks likely to become President of the US because, with Badenoch as leader of the Tories, it is certain that her Party will be dedicated to the idea that government must be shrunk.

She did not deliver on that promise as a minister, and nor did her colleagues. Instead, they mis-spent with the intention of undermining the credibility of the government, but without ever reducing its overall level of spending. If she or Farage are to promote something different, then we need to get used to asking precisely what it is that they mean by the provocative comments that they make because unless we and the media do so they will perpetuate the idea the government is wasteful when generation after generation of Tory politicians have never found any serious ways of reducing the scope of the government activities or responsibilities, despite their perpetual claims that this is their objective.

These people are charlatans. We need to point it out. That is why we need to know what they are saying.