

The Right to Not Be Lied To: Making the Case for Truth in Politics

By [John W. Whitehead](#) and [Nisha Whitehead](#)
Global Research, August 01, 2024

Region: [USA](#)
Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Law and Justice](#),
[Media Disinformation](#)

Q: "How can you tell if a politician is lying?"

A: "[When his lips are moving.](#)"

["In an ever-changing, incomprehensible world the masses had reached the point where they would, at the same time, believe everything and nothing, think that everything was possible and that nothing was true..."](#) The totalitarian mass leaders based their propaganda on the correct psychological assumption that, under such conditions, one could make people believe the most fantastic statements one day, and trust that if the next day they were given irrefutable proof of their falsehood, they would take refuge in cynicism; instead of deserting the leaders who had lied to them, they would protest that they had known all along that the statement was a lie and would admire the leaders for their superior tactical cleverness." — Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*

The First Amendment assures us of a right to free speech.

It does not, unfortunately, explicitly assure us of a right to not be lied to by our government and its various officials. Any hope of holding government officials accountable for their lies rests with the political process, in the voting booths and through the impeachment process, which themselves have become so ineffective as to offer little real hope of transparency, accountability or reform.

We have been lied to so much, for so long, and on every subject, by government officials of every stripe that political lies have become our norm. It says something about the sorry state of our nation and the low bar we have set for those we elect to represent us.

However, although there are few consequences for government officials who lie to the public, the Deep State continues to wage war on those who challenge its lies, half-truths and obfuscations.

Case in point: Julian Assange.

Although the news of Assange's plea deal was quickly overshadowed by the drama that is the 2024 presidential election (the WikiLeaks founder pled guilty to a "[single felony count of illegally obtaining and disclosing national security material in exchange for his release from a British prison](#)"), his persecution at the hands of the Deep State was a warning shot over the bow for anyone who dares speak truth to power.

The Deep State has embarked on a ruthless, take-no-prisoners, all-out assault on truth-

tellers.

Activists, journalists and whistleblowers alike continue to be terrorized, traumatized, tortured and subjected to the fear-inducing, mind-altering, soul-destroying, smash-your-face-in tactics employed by the superpowers-that-be.

In an age of prosecutions for thought crimes, pre-crime deterrence programs, and government agencies that operate like organized crime syndicates, this is a new kind of tyranny being imposed on those who dare to expose the crimes of the Deep State, whose reach has gone global.

What happened to Assange was intended to send a message to anyone who dares to speak truth to power: don't even consider it.

Some background: Assange, the founder of a website that published secret information, news leaks, and classified media from anonymous sources, was arrested on April 11, 2019, on charges of helping U.S. Army intelligence analyst Chelsea Manning access and leak more than 700,000 classified [military documents that portray the U.S. government and its military as reckless, irresponsible and responsible for thousands of civilian deaths](#).



Collateral Murder video released by WikiLeaks.

Included among the [leaked Manning material](#) were the [Collateral Murder video](#) (April 2010), the Afghanistan war logs (July 2010), the Iraq war logs (October 2010), a quarter of a million diplomatic cables (November 2010), and the Guantánamo files (April 2011).

The [Collateral Murder leak included gunsight video footage from two U.S. AH-64 Apache helicopters](#) engaged in a series of air-to-ground attacks while air crew laughed at some of the casualties. Among the casualties were two Reuters correspondents who were gunned down after their cameras were mistaken for weapons and a driver who stopped to help one of the journalists. The driver's two children, who happened to be in the van at the time it was fired upon by U.S. forces, suffered serious injuries.

This is morally wrong.

It shouldn't matter which nation is responsible for these atrocities: there is no defense for such evil perpetrated in the name of profit margins and [war profiteering](#).



In true Orwellian fashion, however, the government would have us believe that it is Assange and Manning who are the real criminals for daring to expose the war machine's seedy underbelly.

Following his April 2019 arrest, Assange was locked up in a maximum-security British prison—[in solitary confinement for up to 23 hours a day](#)—pending extradition to the U.S.

Had he not taken the plea deal, he could have been sentenced to [175 years in prison](#).

"In 20 years of work with victims of war, violence and political persecution [I have never seen a group of democratic States ganging up to deliberately isolate, demonise and abuse a single individual for such a long time](#) and with so little regard for human dignity and the rule of law," declared Nils Melzer, the UN special rapporteur on torture.

It's not just Assange who was made to suffer, however.

Manning, who was jailed for seven years from 2010 to 2017 for leaking classified documents to Wikileaks, was arrested in March 2019 for refusing to testify before a grand jury about Assange, placed in solitary confinement for almost a month, and then [sentenced to remain in jail either until she agreed to testify or until the grand jury's 18-month term expired](#).

Federal judge Anthony J. Trenga of the Eastern District of Virginia also fined Manning \$500 for every day she remained in custody after 30 days, and [\\$1,000 for every day she remained in custody after 60 days](#), a chilling—and financially crippling—example of the government's heavy-handed efforts to weaponize fines and jail terms as a means of forcing dissidents to fall in line.

This is how the police state deals with those who challenge its chokehold on power.

Make no mistake: the government is waging war on journalists and whistleblowers for disclosing information relating to government misconduct that is within the public's right to know.

Yet while this targeted campaign—aided, abetted and advanced by the Deep State's international alliances—unfolded during President Trump's watch, it began with the Obama Administration's decision to revive the antiquated, hundred-year-old [Espionage Act](#), which was intended to punish government spies, and instead [use it to prosecute government](#)

[whistleblowers](#).

Unfortunately, the Trump Administration not only continued the Obama Administration's attack on whistleblowers. It injected this war on truth-tellers and truth-seekers with steroids and let it loose on the First Amendment.

In May 2019, Trump's Justice Department issued a sweeping new "superseding" secret indictment of Assange—hinged on the Espionage Act—that [empowered the government to determine what counts as legitimate journalism and criminalize the rest](#), not to mention giving "the government license to criminally punish journalists it does not like, based on antipathy, vague standards, and subjective judgments."

Noting that the [indictment signaled grave dangers for freedom of the press in general](#), media lawyer Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr., warned,

"The indictment would criminalize the encouragement of leaks of newsworthy classified information, criminalize the acceptance of such information, and criminalize publication of it."

Boutrous continues:

"[I]t doesn't matter whether you think Assange is a journalist, or whether WikiLeaks is a news organization. The theory that animates the indictment targets the very essence of journalistic activity: [the gathering and dissemination of information that the government wants to keep secret](#). You don't have to like Assange or endorse what he and WikiLeaks have done over the years to recognize that this indictment sets an ominous precedent and threatens basic First Amendment values.... With only modest tweaking, the very same theory could be invoked to prosecute journalists for the very same crimes being alleged against Assange, simply for doing their jobs of scrutinizing the government and reporting the news to the American people."

We desperately need greater scrutiny and transparency, not less.

Indeed, transparency is one of those things the shadow government fears the most.

Why? Because it might arouse the distracted American populace to actually exercise their rights and resist the tyranny that is inexorably asphyxiating their freedoms.

This need to shed light on government actions—to make the obscure, least transparent reaches of government accessible and accountable—was a common theme for Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, who famously coined the phrase, "Sunlight is the best disinfectant."

Writing in January 1884, Brandeis [explained](#):

"[Light is the only thing that can sweeten our political atmosphere](#)—light thrown upon every detail of administration in the departments; light diffused through every policy; light blazed full upon every feature of legislation; light that can penetrate every recess or corner in which any intrigue might hide; light that will open up to view the innermost chambers of government, drive away all darkness from the treasury vaults; illuminate foreign correspondence; explore national dockyards; search out the obscurities of Indian affairs; display the workings of justice; exhibit the management of the army; play

upon the sails of the navy; and follow the distribution of the mails.”

Of course, transparency is futile without a populace that is informed, engaged and prepared to hold the government accountable to abiding by the rule of law.

For this reason, it is vital that [citizens have the right to criticize the government without fear](#).

After all, we’re citizens, not subjects. For those who don’t fully understand the distinction between the two and why transparency is so vital to a healthy constitutional government, Manning explains it well:

“When freedom of information and transparency are stifled, then bad decisions are often made and heartbreaking tragedies occur – too often on a breathtaking scale that can leave societies wondering: how did this happen? ... I believe that when the public lacks even the most fundamental access to what its governments and militaries are doing in their names, then they cease to be involved in the act of citizenship. [There is a bright distinction between citizens, who have rights and privileges protected by the state, and subjects, who are under the complete control and authority of the state.](#)”

Manning goes on to suggest that the U.S. “needs legislation to protect the public’s right to free speech and a free press, to protect it from the actions of the executive branch and to promote the integrity and transparency of the US government.”

Technically, we’ve already got such legislation on the books: the First Amendment.

The First Amendment gives the citizenry the right to speak freely, protest peacefully, expose government wrongdoing, and criticize the government without fear of arrest, isolation or any of the other punishments that have been meted out to whistleblowers such as Edwards Snowden, Assange and Manning.

The challenge is holding the government accountable to obeying the law.

More than 50 years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 6-3 in *United States v. Washington Post Co.* to block the Nixon Administration’s attempts to use claims of national security to prevent The Washington Post and The New York Times from [publishing secret Pentagon papers on how America went to war in Vietnam](#).

As Justice William O. Douglas remarked on the ruling,

“The press was protected so that it could bare the secrets of government and inform the people. [Only a free and unrestrained press can effectively expose deception in government.](#) And paramount among the responsibilities of a free press is the duty to prevent any part of the government from deceiving the people and sending them off to distant lands to die of foreign fevers and foreign shot and shell.”

More than 50 years later, the people’s right to know about government misconduct continues to be pitted against the might of the Deep State.

Yet this isn’t merely about whether whistleblowers and journalists are part of a protected class under the Constitution. It’s a debate over how long “we the people” will remain a protected class under the Constitution.

Following the current downward trajectory, it won't be long before *anyone* who believes in holding the government accountable is [labeled an "extremist,"](#) is relegated to an underclass that doesn't fit in, must be [watched all the time](#), and is rounded up when the government deems it necessary.

Eventually, we will all be potential suspects, terrorists and lawbreakers in the eyes of the government.

All of us are in danger.

Partisan politics have no place in this debate: Americans of all stripes would do well to remember that those who question the motives of government provide a necessary counterpoint to those who would blindly follow where politicians choose to lead.

We don't have to agree with every criticism of the government, but we must defend the rights of *all* individuals to speak freely without fear of punishment or threat of banishment.

Never forget: what the architects of the police state want are submissive, compliant, cooperative, obedient, meek citizens who don't talk back, don't challenge government authority, don't speak out against government misconduct, and don't step out of line.

What the First Amendment protects—and a healthy constitutional republic requires—are individuals such as Julian Assange who routinely exercise their right to speak truth to power.

As I make clear in my book [Battlefield America: The War on the American People](#) and in its fictional counterpart [The Erik Blair Diaries](#), the right to speak out against government wrongdoing is the quintessential freedom.

*

Click the share button below to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Spread the Truth, Refer a Friend to Global Research](#)

This article was originally published on [The Rutherford Institute](#).

Constitutional attorney and author John W. Whitehead is founder and president of [The Rutherford Institute](#). His most recent books are the best-selling [Battlefield America: The War on the American People](#), the award-winning [A Government of Wolves: The Emerging American Police State](#), and a debut dystopian fiction novel, [The Erik Blair Diaries](#). Whitehead can be contacted at staff@rutherford.org.

Nisha Whitehead is the Executive Director of The Rutherford Institute. Information about The Rutherford Institute is available at www.rutherford.org.

They are regular contributors to Global Research.

Featured image [source](#)

[**Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page**](#)

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [John W. Whitehead](#) and [Nisha Whitehead](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.
For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca