

reflecting on pep status (politically exposed persons) ?

## **description**

inspired by yesterday's post about the venerable alfred escher, it led me to ponder the following question:

in a world where trust is the currency of relationships, the status of politically exposed persons ( [peps](#)) often ignites [thought-provoking debates](#). but do these debates arise from a mistrust of our leaders?

## **the oath of office: more than just tradition?**

when politicians take their oath of office, they promise to serve with integrity and honour. yet, in finance, this weighty vow seems overshadowed by stringent regulations. is this centuries-old tradition now [merely a ceremonial act](#) in our complex modern world?

## **banking on trust: the asset minimum dilemma for peps**

banks often set a minimum asset under management (aum) for peps. but does this imply greater trust in those with larger accounts? why is a [pep](#) with 10 million viewed differently from one who has diligently saved 2 million? is labelling this as an 'increased compliance effort' an oversimplified view of a deeper issue?

## **share your thoughts on pep status**

what are your views on pep status and its implications in finance and beyond? please share your insights, and let's unravel this intricate web of trust, tradition, and transparency in the political and financial world.

source: [linkedin](#)

### **date**

26 jul 2025

### **date created**

08 dez 2023

