

## HANNAH ARENDT ON LYING IN POLITICS: A PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

**Basil S. Nnamdi, (PhD)**

Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities  
University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt,  
Rivers State, Nigeria  
[docgurubeennamdi@gmail.com](mailto:docgurubeennamdi@gmail.com)  
+2347038482828

### **ABSTRACT**

*Contemporary politics the world over suffers bad names in various states, nations or countries. Hence, in very many countries today citizens largely describe politics as a dirty game and the politicians as thieves of some sorts, such as pen robbers, fraudsters, and very dishonest and untrustworthy people or individuals out to hoodwink and shortchange the citizens. When a serious matter arises, some people are quick to say that they are not talking or playing politics and thereby implying that politics is a base and banal phenomenon. Whenever a matter becomes political, nobody takes anybody seriously, rather the common belief in such circumstance is that each person is being selfish and seeking to dominate others or impose his or her will on others at all cost in the most an unscrupulous manner. The maxim goes in Nigeria that 'there is no permanent friend or permanent enemy but permanent interest in politics' just to underscore unpredictability of politicians. Yet politicians are so capricious that they are ever ready to change as their fancy or imagination changes. This work seeks to x-ray the evil of lying in the political sphere here considered under Hannah Arendt's conception of it based on her American experience of democracy. While the paper joins Hannah Arendt in mourning this debasement of politics by politicians, it maintains in the final analysis that mass literacy and enlightenment of the citizenry are imperative in checkmating the politicians' penchant for lies and deceit. The reason is that when the citizens understand the intricacies in governance through proper education and enlightenment, they will be predisposed to demand for, and be able to benefit fully from true transparency in the public affairs.*

**Keywords:** *Arendt; Democracy; Lying; Politics; Philosophy*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Lying is a common feature of everyday life of humans as they interact with one another. Lying exists in very many ways, manners, and many circumstances, and humans tell lies for different selfish reasons. Lying is one way humans distort the view of reality to suit their whims and caprices and thereby deliberately distorting reality to suit their interests. Lying underscores insincerity and ulterior sinister motives for nobody who intends well in any given circumstance tells lies and as such telling lies smacks of bad faith. Lies are fundamentally told in order to deceive or hoodwink the audience who in this connection is at risk dealing on the basis of perverted reality. The worst evil of lying is that everything can be what they are not and as such nothing in lying remains what it is with the consequence that nothing is definite and nothing is reliable. Lying makes predictability impossible and places reality beyond the realm of intelligibility as nothing can be understood in itself but as one wishes to present it for personal reasons. The most unfortunate thing about lying is that lies, being man made, appear more credible, more authentic, than truth for the fact that in telling lies, one has to consider the psychology of the audience as to the audience's experiences, beliefs and expectations

so the audience would hear what he or she would, in the given cases, expect to hear. Lies are fabricated, manufacture and as such can be beautified and embellished to be attractive and convincing. But truth on the other hand, in its nature does not depend on human mind as such, therefore most times it happens to be personally unpalatable, unattractive, inexpedient and undesirable especially to an impostor.

The evil of lying in our sociopolitical life cannot be overemphasized, and philosophers, sociologists, social psychologists as well as political thinkers and scientists cannot but find lying in the political sphere unsettling for the colossal danger it constitutes to the polis or civil state in general. No wonder, then that socio-political philosophers are particularly perturbed about the constant occurrence of lying in politics because of its unhealthy implications for democracy in particular and politics in general. There are some scholars who maintain that frequent lying in politics not only undermine the democratic process, but also truncate and threatens its sustenance. According to Persson and Tabellini (2009), “the frequency of serious lies told by politicians can be taken as a measure of bad health of a democracy, as it is likely to critically affect the accumulation process of “democratic capital”. Alessandro and Luca (2013), while exposing the dangers of too many lies for the survival of democracy posits that “a democratic system characterized by an excess of lying by its political elite rests on shaky grounds and, therefore, is constantly exposed to the risk of a regime shift towards autocracy”. Therefore, gleaned from the above is the fact that there is no other realm where lying thrives stupendously than in the realm of politics and this truism, with reference to the United State of America (USA), is made explicit by Alessandro and Luca (2013) when they assert that lying is one of the vital traits exhibited by humans on a daily basis and the trend has assumed an alarming proportion both online and offline. Giving a succinct illustration of their position, they reiterate that “humans lie and lie a lot...the political arena is no exception as politicians frequently lie...” Alessandro and Luca further assert that their major concern is to employ relevant data in uncovering the major determinants of lying in politics, particularly, in American politics.

Brian (2012) also lamented the prevalence of lying in politics, especially with reference to the U.S when he reiterates that there are three basic truths which most Americans hold sacred and identified as the Article of Faith and they are; “The sky is blue. The Pope is Catholic and Politicians are Liars”. This assertion by Brian clearly attests to the fact that it is almost impossible to find honest politicians who are free from telling lies as nearly all of them are guilty of lying. They are fond of making promises to the electorates during campaigns which they are not willing to keep after being elected into office. This fact resonate the popular dictum of late former American President George Bush, the father of President W. Bush, who said “Read my lips, there will be no new taxes” yet no sooner had he won the presidential election than he introduced new taxes. This prevailing scenario where lying dominates politics raises the question such as whether politics is inherently inconsistent with honesty or whether is mere abuse of real politics

## **EXPLICATION OF TERMS**

### **Lying**

This simply refers to any statement that is untrue. Wikipedia conceives the term as the act of making false statements with the sole intention to deceive or “the practice of communicating falsehoods”. Collins Dictionary defines lying as “a statement or something intended or serving to convey a false impression; imposture or to speak untruthfully with the intent to mislead or deceive”. Arendt (1971) defines lying as “the capacity to change facts; a denial of factual truth”. The above definitions reveal

that lying connotes deception or deceit, untruthfulness, falsehood, incorrectness, deliberate inaccuracy and dishonesty; hence the end product of lying is to ensure deception and mislead people in believing and accepting what is untrue.

### **Politics**

This is one concept that parades a multiplicity of definitions. Etymologically, the term is derived from the Greek word '*Politika*', which implies "affairs of the cities". This shows that the original meaning of politics denotes the proper management or administering the affairs of a city, society or state. Aristotle conceives politics as the numerous activities employed by individuals in the society or state to make life better and good, hence his famous maxim that "man is by nature a political animal". Aristotle sees politics to be "talk-talk or jaw-jaw" by which he meant the activities undertaken by individuals to control the machinery of government and order society in such a way that the citizens co-exist peacefully and harmoniously. Wikipedia defines politics as the "organized control over a human community or state particularly as it concerns achieving and exercising positions of governance". Harold Lasswell (1930) sees politics as a struggle for power revolving around "who gets what, when and how". Alapiki (2004) defines politics as any human interaction in which the use of influence, power, authority and force prevail. Crick (1962) offers a fascinating definition in which politics is viewed as "the activity through which the various interests within a society or state are conciliated by giving them a share in power that is proportional to their importance to the welfare and the survival of the whole society". David Easton (1965) defines politics as "the authoritative allocation of values".

From the above definitions on politics, it is clear that politics entails the activities and actions of people with similar interests on how to acquire or capture political power with a view to controlling government in a state or society and influence the decision-making process. It is the process of understanding the activities, actions, inactions and policies used by individuals to influence and explain the interaction among people in a society, state or country. This also means that politics can be understood as an art of governance, a process for resolving divergent interests in society and a body of knowledge for administering and conducting public affairs

### **HANNAH ARENDT ON LYING IN POLITICS**

The increasing rate of deception and lying prevalent in politics constitutes an intractable problem confronting most developed and developing countries of the world. In fact, socio-political philosophers have paid little or no attention to this problem which removes credibility and honesty from politics and possesses destructive tendencies for the practice politics and democracy. Alessandro and Luca (2013). Hannah Arendt foresees much danger posed by lying in politics and therefore goes out of her way to try an understanding of this phenomenon in the contemporary states. In her view, "it is surprising that in the tradition of philosophical and political thought, enough attention has not been given to lying...". With this as a starting point, Arendt identifies the consequences that lying portends for politics and decided to employ a philosophical approach in addressing the problem. For her, lying and deception remain the essential features of the foreign and domestic policies of most governments and if this is left unchecked, lying can destroy governments and misled citizens. Arendt (1971) maintains that aside playing a dominant role in the foreign and domestic policies of most countries, lying constitutes a fundamental part of the decision-making processes of government in that it is used by dictatorial and authoritarian governments to eliminate anything that is against their interests. She considers politicians largely credible much as they see lying as a justifiable tool for achieving political ends and further maintains posits thus: "the deliberate

falsehood and the outright lie used as legitimate means to achieve political ends have been with us since recorded history. Truthfulness has never been counted among the political virtues, and lies have always been regarded as justifiable tools in political dealings". With the above exposition, Arendt reveals that lying has been construed as a political virtue in politics and men of proven integrity who venture into politics are largely prone to being corrupted by the seasoned politicians hardened in the business of lying and deceit. Regarding United States of America, the only individual, according to Arendt, who seems to be a victim of total deception is the President as he surrounds himself with a plethora of advisers who interpret the real world for him by sifting information before they get to the President. In her own dictum, 'Oddly enough, the only person likely to be an ideal victim of complete manipulation is the President...because of the immensity of his job, he surrounds himself with advisers who filters information that reaches him and interprets the outside world for him" In effect, the President is largely under illusion as he is told what who would please him. Arendt is quick to point out that the philosophical onslaught against lying stems largely from the fact that discretion and complete treachery not only hold sway but take centre stage in politics. Thus, she asserts that "in the realm of politics, where secrecy and deliberate deception have always played a significant role, Self-deception is the danger par excellence" One is forced to ask: why is lying so prevalent in politics and why are politicians so involved in the game of deception.

In agreement with Arendt, Ravins et al (1971) assert that politicians are more committed to falsehood and deception rather than truthfulness in politics and at the peak of government. Ravins et al further maintain that "because of the extravagant lengths to which the commitment to non-truthfulness in politics went on at the highest level of government, and because of the concomitant extent... lying was permitted to proliferate throughout the ranks of all government services, military and civilian..." Politician, no doubt find lying very expedient and pragmatic and as such also bank on it as if it is legitimate means of politicking. Alessandro and Lucca (2013) expand on this by exposing the different types of lies used by elected political leaders to deceive the audience with reference to America.

...Politicians – and prominent ones in particular – are reluctant to tell complete (or 'black') lies, they have a strong propensity to (strategically) tell 'grey' lies,...whereas politicians in general are significantly less likely to lie if they come from swing (or battleground) states, Democratic politicians lie more frequently if they come from traditionally Blue states and less likely to lie if they come from highly educated states where cherished traditional values still prevail.

They conclude that result available shows that lying in politics as elaborated by Arendt only confirms the general notion that politics entails deception to a reasonable extent.

In addition, Arendt tries to show how lying came to be associated with politics and explains that the act has been with humans since time immemorial. Perhaps, this is why Aristotle maintains that man is a political animal. For Arendt, lying is predominant among acting men, that is, men who are increasingly active in the game of politics. She reveals further that lying is inimical and should not be allowed to flourish in politics because it entails a deliberate denial of factual truth or put differently; the changing of facts. Showing the inter-connection between lying and acting as well as their source, she reiterates: "the deliberate denial of factual truth-the ability to lie-and the capacity to change facts-the ability to act-are interconnected: they owe their existence to the same source; imagination". With this assertion, she affirms that lying deals with contingent facts, that is, matters that possess no intrinsic truth within themselves. Thus, when one is lying, he/she ensures that the lie is presented in such a way that it is free from suspicion and remains appealing to reason, because the

appealing the lie is, the more likely the audience will accept it as the lie looks credible. Elucidating further, Arendt (1971) asserts:

lies are often much more plausible, more appealing to reason, than reality since the liar has the great advantage of knowing beforehand what the audience wishes or expects to hear. He has prepared his story for public consumption with a careful eye to making it credible...

Arendt goes on to maintain that no matter how appealing a liar presents or make his lies look, as well as making it credible enough for unsuspecting citizens to swallow, what is certain is that the liar will never be able to conceal the enormity of factuality with his numerous lies forever. She categorically maintains that “the liar who may get away with any number of single falsehoods, will find it impossible to get away with lying on principle....There always comes the point beyond which lying becomes counterproductive”. We can decipher from the above exposition that many lies of a liar will one day be discovered and the audience to which the lies were intended for will now be in a position to distinguish truth from lies. Arendt illustrates this fact vividly thus: “lies become counterproductive when the audience to which the lies or deception is addressed is forced to disregard altogether the distinguishing line between truth and falsehood in order to survive.”

With her, one is quick to understand that lying has been used by powerful countries to justify their actions in smaller nations. For instance, it is believed that the American government lied in saying that Iraq has developed weapon of mass destruction which made George Bush to compel American forces to invade Iraq in 1992. The same lie was again told by the American government to justify the invasion of Libya and subsequent killing of Gaddafi by American forces. During the Nazi regime, Hitler was reputed for telling huge lies to the Germans that the Jews were wholly responsible for the social and economic woes. This misleading information and deception from Hitler made the Germans to inflict harm and exterminate the Jews who were the objects of their hatred. On the lies told by past American Presidents, Alessandro and Luca (2013) elucidate thus:

As to single presidential lies, Dwight Eisenhower deceived the American people over the U-2 incident and had to publicly admit it. John Kennedy lied when he denied having Addison’s disease. The well-known Watergate scandal eventually led Richard Nixon to resignation. Ronald Reagan was untruthful in claiming that he personally witnessed the liberation of a German concentration camp. Bill Clinton underwent a long and heavy storm leading to the House of Representatives impeachment not for cheating his wife with the White House intern Monica Lewinsky, but for falsely denying the affair to the American public and under oath. Obama lies significantly less...

If the number one citizen of the most powerful country in the world indulge in lying, then it is very obvious that lying has eaten deep into the rubrics and fabrics of politics. In fact, it permeates and pervades the entirety of government. Indeed, Arendt is right in positing that lying not only characterizes the foreign and domestic policies of government the world over, but also constitutes a central component of the decision-making machinery. Little wonder Arendt posits that “lies thrive more in the hands of those who possess the means of violence”. Commenting on the pervasiveness of lying in politics, Arendt (1971) comes up with a typology of liars which is as follows in the next subsection of our discussion here.

## **HANNAH ARENDT ON THE CLASSIFICATION OF LIARS IN POLITICS**

Arendt classifies liars in three categories namely; public relations managers, problem solvers and down-to-earth liars. She further asserts that the public relations managers are those who laud the image of the government with a view to winning the minds of the citizens. The public relations managers are thoroughly schooled in advertising hence they are very good in the act of buying and selling of goods. Therefore, they are recruited in the realm of politics to bring their vast knowledge in persuading and manipulating people to buy their goods to bear in politics. However, one flaw with the public relations managers is their lack of the politicians' power to act and ability to create fact, hence they employ the use of force and terror to compel the citizens to buy and accept political views and opinions. Arendt explains this thus;

Public-relation is but a variety of advertising with origin in the consumer society, with its inordinate appetite for goods to be distributed through a market economy. The trouble with the mentality of the public relations man is that he deals only in opinions and goodwill...for he lacks the politicians power to act, to create facts....The only limitation to what the public-relations man does comes when he discovers that the same people who perhaps can be manipulated to buy a certain kind of soap cannot be manipulated...they can be forced by terror to buy opinions and political views

Arendt uses the above to show that sometimes politicians and government adopt the stick and carrot method to lure the citizens into believing or accepting their political views. However, she also maintains that there exist individuals who will do anything within their power to resist the carrot and stick method offered by politicians or government. Thus, it is very clear that the major role of the public relations managers in politics and government is simply that of image-making. However, Arendt also maintains that the public-relations managers succeed more only when the Senate fails to perform its pivotal function as it relates to providing advice on foreign and domestic policies as well as providing protection for the decision-making process as a result of friction between the legislative arm and the executive. Making this point clear, Arendt reiterates: "This, of course, can only happen if the executive branch has cut itself off from contact with the legislative powers of Congress;...when the Senate is being deprived of, or is reluctant to exercise its powers to participate and advise in the conduct of foreign affairs". With her assertion, Arendt reveals that one of the salient constitutional functions of the Senate is primarily to shield and guard "the decision-making process against the transient moods and trends of society at large-the antics of our consumer society and the public-relations managers who cater to it".

The second category of liars outlined by Arendt is the professional problem-solvers. The problem-solvers, as their name implies, denotes intellectuals drawn from different universities, think tanks and government services to help in solving problems. In Arendt view, "they are equipped with game theories and systems analyses to solve all the problems of foreign policy" Arendt further reiterates that the problem-solvers possess enviable moral qualities, but the qualities did not stop them from indulging in the game of falsehood and deception that characterize politics. Arendt reveals that the problem-solvers and public relations managers engaged in the act of lying not out of a mistaken patriotism for their country but to promote the image-lauding of the government.

The third class of liars is the ones identified by Arendt as the down-to-earth liars. This class of liars is of those whose stock in trade entails manipulating, deceit and changing of facts in such a way that no one can ever suspect or raise an eyebrow. Writing on the relationship between problem-solvers and down-to-earth liars, Arendt posits: "... what the problem solvers have in common with down-

to-earth liars is the attempt to get rid of facts and the confidence that this should be possible because of the inherent contingency of facts”.

Having shed light on the typologies of liars, Arendt went ahead to mention that American invasion of Vietnam, as contained in the Pentagon Papers, was replete with deception and falsehoods. In her view, the lies told by the American Government to justify their invasion of Vietnam were uncovered by the Pentagon Papers, but the most annoying thing was that the people who ought to be more concerned with what the paper had to tell never set eyes on the paper. Putting this view in a clear perspective, Arendt asserts: “... in the case of the Vietnam War, we are confronted with, in addition to falsehoods and confusion, a truly amazing and entirely honest ignorance of the historically pertinent background”. Arendt therefore, sums up that in the Pentagon Papers, humans were faced with people in government who did all that is within their power to win the minds of the generality of the citizens by trying to manipulate and deceive them so as to accept the justification provided by the government for their actions in Vietnam, but they never really succeeded in winning the minds of the people. She further reveals the fact that “the Pentagon Papers revealed hardly any spectacular news testifies to the liars’ failure to create a convinced audience.” She makes it clear that the reasons why American forces invaded Vietnam is for territorial and economic advantage and not the lie that Vietnam produced weapons of mass destruction. Commenting on Pentagon Papers in a vivid manner, Alessandro and Luca (2013) assert; “The Pentagon Papers scandal proves that significant lies can be very successful for many years (and even decades), before being detected, even within an established democracy”. Scheidhauer (2006) also maintains that a cursory “examination of the policies of the United States during the Vietnam War, reveals that Arendt came to the conclusion that politicians often live in a defactualised” world. Scheidhauer further reiterates that Arendt’s analysis of lying in politics with specific reference to the United States mission in Vietnam is not only incisive but also thought-provoking for its stimulating effect in “questioning the links between truth, discourse and representations of the political, as well as between power, truth, memory and history, and the relations of fact and fiction, interpretation and event”. It is very clear that Arendt exposes the deceit and falsehoods associated with politics on one hand and government on the other hand. Using the Pentagon Papers as a reference point, she reiterates that the aspect of the Pentagon papers that interests her is the section dwelling on “deception, image-making, self-deception, ideologizing and defactualization” that is common in contemporary politics. She however maintains that truth possesses a lasting supremacy over all lies both in public life and government. Thus, she concludes that no matter how convincing and successful a liar sounds, a day will come when the liar will end up believing his own falsehood and deception that he/she has prepared for people, and government should, as a matter of urgency, be informed that the citizens possess a political right to factual information, and not deception that is, the citizens have a freedom to be rightly informed and not to be fed with falsehood or untrue statements. Applauding Arendt for her precision, Adrienne (1975) articulates:

The possibilities that exist between two people, or among a group of people, are a kind of alchemy. They are the most interesting thing in life. The liar is someone who keeps losing sight of these possibilities. Nowhere is this liar’s loss of perspective more damaging to public life, human possibility, and our collective progress than in politics, where complex social, cultural, economic, and psychological forces conspire to make the assault on truth traumatic on a towering scale. Those forces are what Hannah Arendt, one of the most incisive thinkers of the past century, explores in a superb 1971 essay titled “Lying in Politics”.

In the above, Adrienne makes clear the predominance of lies in politics and their effects, according to him, can be very destructive not only to public life but also to the collective progress of human society in general. Thus, it behooves on everyone to demand truth from our elected public officers, that is, statements from government and politicians must be matched with facts before it can be accepted.

### **THE REASONS FOR LYING IN POLITICS**

It may not be proper to conclude this piece without trying to explain why the phenomenon of lying is predominant in our polity. The intention for this is not to rationalize over lying nor for outright justification of lying in politics, rather it is intended to seek an explanation of why the phenomenon. Understanding the possible reasons for lying in politics may ameliorate the situation and as such guarantee a more desirable politics and politicking.

The realm of politics, much as it is the public realm, remains a realm of acting; a sphere of appearance where what matters is what is apparent. It is a theatre of conjectures, imagination and fantasies where the actors, politicians, have to put up the best image of things or reality. There can be two broad reasons why politicians lie as a stock in trade. The first reason is patriotic and the second is outright desire for deceit, hoodwinking, for selfish interest by charlatans in politics.

#### **Patriotic Lying in Politics**

The nature of governance, especially in democracy, demands carrying the citizens along in a transparent manner. But patriotic lying takes the form of pretending to operate a transparent government of openness which in actuality hoodwinks the citizens by covering up certain government vital decisions, policies and actions, or on the other hand, by doing one thing and saying or claiming another only to tame or soothe the citizens. The relevant question here is why should any government run on this basis of deceit? Some difficulties political leaders encounter in management of state affairs are insulated from the citizens who could despair if they know the whole truth. A state or nation at war finds out the president and his handlers or those who manage information will highly censor what they dish out to the citizens so that they can retain the citizens' or public support in the prosecution of the war. Patriotic liars lie to protect and preserve the state or republic. Besides, democracy is peoples' government and hardly can majority of the citizens be right, and as such the will of the citizens may have been manipulated for the sake of having strong and progressive state. It is sometimes said that whatever argument made in support of democracy, few people still govern in reality. The of Britain and Brexit referendum may be relevant here where the majority of the British citizens may not understand as much their political leaders do what actual benefits they stand to continue to get from European Union. Democracy, if practiced in true sense and meaning can be dangerous and therefore the democratic politicians engage in what can be considered patriotic lying for the greatness and progress of the state.

#### **Fraudulent Lying in Politics**

Non patriotic liars in politics are those politicians who lie for selfish interest of maintaining grip on power at all costs. It is natural that not all have genuine interests in politics as statesmen, as many go into politics for personal gains. Such are charlatans who have no qualms in telling any sort of lies, whether white or blatant lies, with the hope of hoodwinking the electorate or citizens strictly for person interests and aggrandizement. These brand of politicians have the tendency for tyranny and can go to any length to remain political relevant by being always in one regime or government or another. They are quite unscrupulous and seek power not for the advancement of the state but for personal gains.



## CONCLUSION

Lying in politics has been a pandemic disease, especially in contemporary politics. Every nation or state of the world is implicated in this phenomenon as both advanced democracies as well as developing ones are guilty of lying, deceit and lack of complete transparency. It exists among democracies as well as among dictators and totalitarian regimes of tyranny. In x-raying this political ill of our time, we observe that politics can hardly strive without some sort of lying, given the nature of the problem of statecraft or management. Lying that is naturally associated with state management is quite understandable, but more pathetic case of lying is observed from political charlatans who lie strictly for selfish interest. The latter category of liars in politics, the charlatans, constitute a clog in the wheel of national or state progress as they lye for their stomachs, personal interests and aggrandizement without minding the progress of the state at large.

After all said, lying in politics speaks volume about politics as a human affair devoid of traditional morality which strives in expediency, pragmatism and psychological manipulation of the citizens. Political realm of human society is therefore a theatre of actions designed to achieve desired effects for the gains of either the state or for few individuals. This phenomenon, much as it diminishes transparency in governance, goes a long way to prove that majority rule as a democratic ideal is not without fault as most times few powerful individuals manipulate in the gab of majority. What is more, while lying in politics is a global phenomenon one should not be surprised that in the so-called Third and underdeveloped world or society it cannot but be exaggerated. However, mass education as well as mass enlightenment can go along way reducing the tendency of politicians to lies and deceptions. When the citizenry is well educated and widely enlightened in the intricacies of politics and governance, they will be quite predisposed to demand greater transparency which they can appreciate better with proper education. Therefore, a nation or state of less educated citizenry is more likely to harbour politics of deceit and political charlatans than one of greater education and enlightenment.

## REFERENCES

- Adrienne Rich (1975). "Speech on Lying and What Truth really Means" in *How Relationships Refine Our Truths*. New-York: Harcourt Brace.
- Alapiki, H. (2004). *Politics and Governance in Nigeria*. Port Harcourt: Amethyst and Colleagues Publishers.
- Alessandro,B. and Luca,Z. (2013). Lying in Politics: Evidence from the US. *Working Paper Series*, University of Verona.
- Arendt, H. (1971). *Crises of the Republic: Lying in Politics, Civil Disobedience, On Violence, Thoughts on Politics and Revolution*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Cambridge Dictionary.Org. "Politics" Retrieved from <https://www.cambridgedictionary.org/dictionary/english/politics> on 09-09-18
- Collins Dictionary.Com. "Lie" Retrieved from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/lie> on 09-09-18
- Curtis, M. (1968). *Comparative Government and Politics*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Easton,D. (1965). *The Political System: An Inquiry to the State of Political Science*. New York.
- Lasswell, H. (1930). *Politics: Who Gets What, When and How?* New York
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary. "Politics" Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster/dictionary/english/politics> on 09-09-18
- Persson, T, and Tabellini, G. "Democratic Capital: The Nexus of Political and Economic Change," *American Economic Journal of Macroeconomics*, Vol.1 (2).
- Ravins, S. et al (1971). *Washington Plans on Aggressive War*. New York: Macmillan Press.

Scheidhauer, C. (2006). "Beyond Truth and Lies: Self-deception as a Result of the Quest for Heroism". Being a Paper presented to the European Consortium for Political Science Joint Sessions of Workshops, Nicosia, 25-30 April 2006, Workshop 14: "Truth, Representation, and Politics" directed by Dr. Annabel Herzog and Dr. Tuija Parvikko  
Wikipedia. "Lie". Retrieved online on 09-09-18 from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lie>