ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

A World Without Lies: A Critical Study on the Social, Psychological, Political, and Ethical Implications of Absolute Truthfulness

Dr. Sandeep Verma

Associate Professor and Head, Department of Humanities, Faculty of Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, U.P., India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150600100

Received: 26 June 2026; Accepted: 01 July 2026; Published: 11 July 2026

ABSTRACT

Lying is a pervasive element of human communication, deeply embedded in interpersonal relationships, social interaction, political processes, economic transactions, psychological adaptation, and cultural practices. Although deception is generally regarded as morally questionable, it also performs important functional roles by maintaining social harmony, protecting individual privacy, managing interpersonal relationships, mitigating conflict, and facilitating social adaptation. The ability to distinguish truth from falsehood constitutes one of the defining characteristics of human communication and social organization. Conversely, truthfulness has long been regarded as one of the fundamental virtues of ethical communication and civilized society. Against this backdrop, this study critically examines the hypothetical scenario in which all human beings suddenly lose the ability to lie. Rather than treating this question merely as a philosophical thought experiment, the paper presents a systematic interdisciplinary conceptual analysis of the potential social, psychological, political, economic, ethical, and communicative consequences of absolute truthfulness, exploring how the disappearance of deception might fundamentally transform individuals, institutions, and society as a whole. The study adopts a qualitative conceptual research design grounded in critical interdisciplinary analysis and philosophical thought experimentation. It does not rely on empirical data; instead, it synthesizes established theories and scholarly literature from communication studies, psychology, sociology, political science, economics, philosophy, ethics, and classical Indian thought. The analysis is organized through a thematic comparative analytical framework, which systematically examines the functions currently served by deception and evaluates how their absence might reshape human behaviour and social institutions. Existing theoretical perspectives on trust, impression management, self-deception, governance, organizational behaviour, media ethics, and moral philosophy provide the analytical foundation for assessing both the potential benefits and unintended consequences of a lie-free society.

The analysis suggests that universal truthfulness would substantially strengthen interpersonal trust, institutional transparency, democratic accountability, corporate integrity, and the credibility of information systems. Fraud, corruption, misinformation, and many forms of manipulation would decline significantly, thereby promoting greater social trust and institutional legitimacy. However, the study also demonstrates that absolute honesty could generate new psychological, interpersonal, and social challenges. The inability to employ impression management, protective discretion, or constructive self-deception may increase emotional vulnerability, reduce privacy, intensify interpersonal conflict, and weaken psychological resilience. Consequently, truthfulness alone cannot guarantee human flourishing because effective communication depends not only upon factual accuracy but also upon empathy, emotional intelligence, ethical judgment, and social responsibility. A distinctive contribution of this study is the integration of contemporary interdisciplinary scholarship with the Sanatan ethical principle expressed in the Manusmriti: "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □" ("Speak the truth; speak it pleasantly. Do not speak unpleasant truth. Do not speak pleasant falsehood. This is the eternal Dharma."). This principle provides a normative framework demonstrating that truth achieves its highest ethical value only when communicated with compassion and wisdom. The study concludes that a society without lies would represent neither a perfect utopia nor an inevitable dystopia. Instead, its success would depend upon humanity's capacity

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

to integrate truthfulness with empathy, ethical communication, and responsible social behaviour. By providing a structured interdisciplinary analytical framework for examining absolute truthfulness, this research contributes to contemporary debates in communication studies, moral philosophy, psychology, governance, and social ethics while offering a foundation for future empirical and theoretical investigations.

Keywords: Truth, Lying, Deception, Honesty, Communication, Ethics, Morality, Society, Social Trust, Transparency, Human Behaviour, Psychology, Sociology, Philosophy, Political Communication, Governance, Democracy, Privacy, Interpersonal Relationships, Social Harmony, Emotional Intelligence, Moral Philosophy, Ethical Communication, White Lies, Self-Deception, Trust Building, Social Interaction, Conflict Resolution, Cultural Norms, Social Stability, Public Discourse, Diplomacy, Negotiation, Leadership, Accountability, Integrity, Authenticity, Human Values, Moral Judgment, Information Ethics, Media Ethics, Social Psychology, Cognitive Psychology, Political Ethics, Corporate Ethics, Transparency Culture, Radical Honesty, Sanatan Dharma, Manusmriti, Truthfulness.

INTRODUCTION

Truth has occupied a central position in human civilization since the earliest stages of social development. Across cultures, religions, and philosophical traditions, truthfulness has been regarded as a fundamental moral virtue essential for justice, trust, and social cohesion. Religious scriptures, ethical systems, legal institutions, and educational practices consistently emphasize honesty as the foundation of responsible human conduct. Despite this universal ideal, lying remains an equally pervasive feature of human behaviour. Individuals routinely engage in deception ranging from harmless social pleasantries and protective white lies to deliberate fraud, manipulation, and political propaganda (Bok, 1978). Consequently, deception should be understood not merely as a moral failing but also as a complex psychological, social, and communicative phenomenon. Psychological research demonstrates that people lie for diverse reasons, including self-protection, impression management, conflict avoidance, preservation of relationships, and the pursuit of personal or professional goals (DePaulo et al., 1996). Likewise, sociological studies indicate that selective disclosure and strategic communication are deeply embedded within everyday social interaction. According to Goffman (1959), individuals continually manage the impressions they create before others in order to maintain dignity, social acceptance, and interpersonal harmony. These findings suggest that deception, although ethically controversial, performs important adaptive functions within both individual psychology and social institutions. Philosophical perspectives on lying have long reflected this complexity. Immanuel Kant argued that lying is morally impermissible under all circumstances because it violates the universal duty of truthfulness (Kant, 1797/1996). In contrast, utilitarian philosophers such as John Stuart Mill maintained that the morality of deception depends upon its consequences; lying may be ethically justified if it prevents greater harm or promotes collective well-being (Mill, 1863/2001). These contrasting positions illustrate the enduring tension between absolute moral principles and practical considerations in ethical decision-making. Ancient Indian philosophy offers a particularly balanced perspective through the well-known Sanskrit injunction: "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □"-"Speak the truth; speak it pleasantly. Do not speak unpleasant truth. Do not speak pleasant falsehood. This is the eternal Dharma." (Manusmriti, 4.138) Unlike ethical systems that emphasize either absolute honesty or consequential utility, this principle advocates a synthesis of truthfulness, compassion, and moral responsibility. It recognizes that ethical communication requires not only factual accuracy but also empathy, sensitivity, and concern for human welfare. This insight provides a valuable normative framework for evaluating the consequences of a world in which deception becomes impossible.

Against this philosophical and theoretical background, the present study investigates a fundamental hypothetical question: What would happen if all human beings suddenly lost the ability to lie? Rather than examining methods for reducing dishonesty through education or legal regulation, the study assumes a universal cognitive inability to communicate intentional falsehoods. This thought experiment provides a unique opportunity to understand the actual functions that deception performs in contemporary society by analysing the consequences of its complete disappearance. The implications of such a transformation extend across multiple domains of human life. Interpersonal relationships would become radically transparent, potentially strengthening trust while

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

simultaneously increasing emotional vulnerability. Political institutions might experience greater accountability and reduced corruption, although diplomacy, intelligence operations, and strategic governance could face significant challenges (Arendt, 1972). Economic systems could benefit from declining fraud, misleading advertising, and financial misconduct (Akerlof, 1970), yet business negotiations and competitive strategies might require fundamental restructuring. Similarly, psychological research suggests that self-deception and optimistic illusions contribute to resilience, motivation, and emotional well-being (Taylor & Brown, 1988); therefore, their disappearance could expose individuals to increased anxiety, diminished self-esteem, and psychological distress. Given these diverse implications, this study adopts a qualitative conceptual research design grounded in critical interdisciplinary analysis and philosophical thought experimentation. Drawing upon theories from communication studies, psychology, sociology, political science, economics, philosophy, ethics, and classical Indian thought, the paper employs a thematic comparative analytical framework to evaluate the possible consequences of absolute truthfulness. The analysis systematically examines the role of deception in interpersonal relationships, psychological functioning, political systems, governance, economic institutions, media ecosystems, ethical reasoning, and cultural transformation. The central argument advanced in this study is that although truthfulness remains indispensable for trust, justice, credibility, and social accountability, the complete elimination of lying would not necessarily create an ideal society. Human civilization depends not only upon honesty but also upon empathy, discretion, emotional intelligence, and ethical judgment. Accordingly, the paper argues that the sustainability of social life rests upon a careful balance between truth and compassion, a principle eloquently expressed in the Sanatan ideal of "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□". By integrating contemporary interdisciplinary scholarship with classical ethical wisdom, this research contributes a systematic conceptual framework for understanding the complex role of truth and deception in human communication and society.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative conceptual research design based on critical interdisciplinary analysis. Rather than employing empirical data collection through surveys, interviews, or experiments, the research investigates a hypothetical scenario—namely, a world in which all human beings suddenly lose the ability to lie. Since such a phenomenon cannot be empirically observed or experimentally tested, the study employs the method of philosophical thought experimentation supported by systematic literature analysis. The objective is not to predict future events with certainty but to critically examine the potential social, psychological, political, economic, ethical, and communicative consequences of universal truthfulness.

Methodological Approach

The research is grounded in a conceptual analytical framework that integrates insights from communication studies, psychology, sociology, political science, economics, philosophy, ethics, and classical Indian thought. The analysis follows a thematic approach in which the hypothetical consequences of a lie-free society are examined across major domains of human life. Each thematic section synthesizes established theories with the central thought experiment to evaluate both the positive and negative implications of absolute truthfulness. The study employs deductive reasoning throughout the analysis. Existing theories concerning trust, deception, impression management, identity formation, moral philosophy, governance, organizational behaviour, and media ethics are used as analytical lenses to examine how the inability to lie might reshape human society. Rather than treating lying solely as a moral issue, the research considers its functional role within complex social systems and evaluates the consequences of its complete disappearance.

Data Sources

The analysis is based entirely on secondary sources obtained from peer-reviewed books, journal articles, classical philosophical works, and internationally recognised academic publications. Foundational contributions from scholars such as Bok (1978), Goffman (1959), Habermas (1984), Taylor and Brown (1988), Fukuyama (1995), Brown and Levinson (1987), Erikson (1968), Westin (1967), and Vrij (2008) provide the theoretical basis for

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

examining communication, trust, identity, self-deception, governance, and interpersonal relationships. The study also incorporates ethical insights from the Manusmriti, particularly the Sanatan principle, "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □", to broaden the analysis beyond Western theoretical traditions.

Analytical Framework

To ensure systematic analysis, the study adopts an interdisciplinary thematic framework consisting of ten analytical dimensions: (i) the role of deception in human society, (ii) interpersonal relationships, (iii) psychological consequences, (iv) political systems and governance, (v) economic and corporate implications, (vi) media and information ecosystems, (vii) ethical and philosophical considerations, (viii) social order and cultural transformation, (ix) potential societal benefits, and (x) critical evaluation of whether a lie-free world represents a utopia or a dystopia. Each dimension is examined through comparative analysis by evaluating both the advantages and unintended consequences of absolute truthfulness.

Analytical Method

The study combines three complementary methods of analysis. First, critical analysis is used to examine existing theories concerning deception, trust, communication, and morality. Second, comparative analysis evaluates the differences between contemporary society, where lying remains possible, and a hypothetical society in which deception is impossible. Third, normative philosophical analysis is employed to assess whether universal truthfulness necessarily leads to moral and social improvement or whether human flourishing depends upon a balance between truth, empathy, discretion, and ethical responsibility.

Scope and Limitations

The present research is intentionally conceptual rather than empirical. Its conclusions should therefore be interpreted as theoretically reasoned possibilities rather than empirically verified predictions. Human behaviour is influenced by cultural, historical, institutional, and psychological factors that cannot be fully captured through hypothetical analysis alone. Nevertheless, conceptual thought experiments have long served as valuable methodological tools in philosophy, political theory, communication studies, and ethics because they enable scholars to examine fundamental assumptions underlying human behaviour and social institutions. The interdisciplinary nature of this study provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the possible implications of universal truthfulness while acknowledging that future empirical research would be necessary to validate particular theoretical propositions.

Theoretical Background: The Role of Lying in Human Society

Lying is not merely a moral deviation; it is also a communicative strategy shaped by social norms and cultural expectations (Goffman, 1959). Deception allows individuals to manage their public image, maintain politeness, and protect personal boundaries. Sociologists argue that minor dishonesty often stabilizes social relationships by preventing unnecessary conflict (Simmel, 1906). From a psychological perspective, deception is linked to cognitive development, emotional intelligence, and theory of mind, enabling individuals to anticipate others' reactions and manage social outcomes (Vrij, 2008). In political and economic contexts, deception has been used both destructively (e.g., corruption, propaganda) and strategically (e.g., diplomacy, negotiation) (Arendt, 1972). Thus, lying is deeply embedded in the functional architecture of social life. The phenomenon of lying has attracted the attention of philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, political theorists, and communication scholars for centuries. Although truthfulness is widely regarded as a moral virtue, deception remains an inseparable aspect of human communication and social interaction. Human beings live not merely as biological organisms but as social beings whose survival and success depend upon complex interpersonal relationships, cultural norms, institutional structures, and communicative practices. Within these social systems, lying has emerged as a multifaceted phenomenon serving various psychological, social, political, and economic functions. Therefore, before examining the implications of a world in which human beings lose the ability to lie, it is necessary to understand the theoretical foundations underlying the role of deception in human society.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Understanding the Concept of Lying

Lying is generally defined as the intentional communication of false information with the purpose of deceiving another person. According to Bok (1978), a lie is a deliberately deceptive message intended to create a false belief in the mind of the recipient. This definition distinguishes lying from mistakes, misunderstandings, and inaccurate statements made without deceptive intent. The essential characteristic of lying is not merely the falsity of a statement but the deliberate intention to mislead. Psychologists have further categorized lying into various forms, including self-serving lies, altruistic lies, defensive lies, strategic lies, pathological lies, and socially motivated "white lies" (Vrij, 2008). Some lies are intended to obtain personal benefits, while others are told to protect another person's feelings or preserve social harmony. Consequently, lying cannot be viewed solely as a negative behaviour; rather, it exists along a continuum ranging from harmless social conventions to serious ethical violations. The universality of lying suggests that deception is deeply rooted in human cognitive and social development. Research indicates that children begin to develop the capacity to lie at an early age, often around three to four years old, as they acquire theory-of-mind abilities that enable them to understand that others possess beliefs and perspectives different from their own (Talwar & Lee, 2008). Thus, the ability to deceive is closely linked with advanced cognitive functioning and social intelligence.

Philosophical Perspectives on Truth and Deception

The debate concerning truth and deception occupies a central place in moral philosophy. Throughout history, philosophers have offered contrasting perspectives on whether lying can ever be ethically justified. The absolutist position is most prominently represented by Immanuel Kant, who argued that lying is always morally wrong because it violates the categorical imperative, a universal moral law applicable to all rational beings (Kant, 1797/1996). According to Kant, if lying were universally accepted, trust and communication would become impossible, thereby undermining the foundations of society. Therefore, truthfulness is an unconditional moral duty regardless of circumstances or consequences. In contrast, consequentialist philosophers evaluate lying based on its outcomes rather than its intrinsic nature. John Stuart Mill argued that actions should be judged according to their ability to promote happiness and reduce suffering (Mill, 1863/2001). From this perspective, lying may be morally permissible if it prevents harm or protects innocent individuals. For example, deceiving a criminal to save a victim's life would be considered ethically justified. Ancient Indian philosophy offers a more balanced and context-sensitive approach. The ethical maxim: "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □"(Manusmriti 4.138) emphasizes that truth should be spoken in a pleasant and beneficial manner. The verse discourages both unpleasant truth that causes unnecessary harm and pleasant falsehood that promotes deception. This principle recognizes that communication is not merely about factual accuracy but also about moral responsibility and human welfare. It suggests that truthfulness must be guided by compassion, wisdom, and sensitivity. Similarly, the Mahabharata and other Indian scriptures acknowledge the complexity of ethical decision-making by emphasizing dharma (righteous conduct) rather than rigid adherence to rules. In such traditions, truth remains a supreme value, but its application is understood within broader considerations of justice, welfare, and social harmony.

Sociological Functions of Lying

From a sociological perspective, lying serves several important social functions. Human societies are maintained through norms, expectations, and interpersonal relationships that require a degree of flexibility in communication. According to Georg Simmel (1906), secrecy and deception are fundamental aspects of social life because they regulate the flow of information and help individuals manage social relationships. Social interactions often involve situations where complete honesty may be disruptive or harmful. For instance, people frequently conceal negative opinions, suppress unpleasant thoughts, or provide socially acceptable responses to maintain harmonious relationships. Such behaviours contribute to social stability by reducing interpersonal conflict and preserving mutual respect. Erving Goffman's theory of impression management further explains

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

how individuals present themselves strategically in social situations (Goffman, 1959). According to Goffman, social life resembles a theatrical performance in which individuals carefully control the information they reveal about themselves. People routinely engage in selective disclosure, exaggeration, and concealment to create favourable impressions and fulfil social expectations. While these practices may not always involve direct lies, they often depend upon managing perceptions rather than communicating complete truth. In professional settings, diplomacy, etiquette, and social conventions frequently rely upon indirect communication. Expressions such as "I am pleased to meet you" or "Everything is fine" may not always reflect a person's actual feelings, yet they serve important social functions by facilitating cooperation and civility. Thus, sociologists argue that certain forms of deception operate as social lubricants that help maintain interpersonal harmony.

Psychological Foundations of Deception

Psychologists view lying as a complex cognitive and emotional process. Deception requires individuals to construct alternative narratives, anticipate others' reactions, suppress truthful information, and maintain consistency in their false statements (Vrij, 2008). Consequently, lying involves sophisticated mental abilities associated with executive functioning and social cognition. Research conducted by DePaulo et al. (1996) revealed that people engage in deception frequently in everyday life. The motivations for lying include avoiding punishment, protecting self-esteem, maintaining relationships, achieving personal goals, and preserving privacy. These findings suggest that lying often serves adaptive functions rather than merely reflecting immoral intentions. An important dimension of deception is self-deception, which occurs when individuals unconsciously distort reality to protect their self-image or emotional well-being. Taylor and Brown (1988) argued that positive illusions contribute significantly to mental health by fostering optimism, confidence, and resilience. Individuals who possess moderately inflated perceptions of their abilities often demonstrate greater motivation and psychological stability than those who perceive reality with complete objectivity. The existence of self-deception raises important questions about the consequences of a world without lies. If individuals were unable to deceive themselves, they might experience heightened anxiety, reduced self-esteem, and increased vulnerability to psychological distress. Thus, certain forms of deception may contribute positively to human well-being.

Evolutionary Perspectives on Lying

Evolutionary psychologists argue that deception emerged as an adaptive survival mechanism during human evolution. Throughout history, individuals who successfully concealed vulnerabilities, intentions, or resources often gained advantages in competition, reproduction, and survival (Trivers, 2011). In ancestral environments, deception could be used to avoid predators, secure resources, strengthen alliances, and enhance reproductive opportunities. As human societies became more complex, the ability to manipulate information evolved alongside the ability to detect deception. This evolutionary "arms race" contributed to the development of sophisticated cognitive capacities related to communication, social intelligence, and moral reasoning. From this perspective, lying is not merely a cultural phenomenon but also a product of evolutionary adaptation. The persistence of deception across diverse cultures and historical periods suggests that it fulfils certain functional roles that have contributed to human survival and social organization.

Political and Institutional Functions of Deception

Political theorists have long recognized the role of deception in governance and statecraft. Governments frequently employ secrecy, strategic ambiguity, and controlled disclosure to protect national interests and maintain stability. According to Arendt (1972), political life often involves tensions between truth and power, with leaders sometimes manipulating information to influence public opinion or achieve policy objectives. Although political deception can contribute to corruption and authoritarianism, certain forms of confidentiality are considered necessary for diplomacy, military strategy, and intelligence operations. International negotiations frequently depend upon withholding sensitive information until agreements are finalized. Complete transparency may sometimes undermine security and compromise national interests. Similarly, legal systems recognize circumstances in which confidentiality is ethically justified. Attorney-client privilege, medical privacy, and classified governmental information illustrate situations where the concealment of truth serves legitimate social purposes.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Economic and Organizational Dimensions

Economic systems also depend upon complex information structures in which complete transparency is neither practical nor desirable. Organizations protect trade secrets, research data, and strategic plans to maintain competitiveness and innovation. Negotiations between buyers and sellers often involve selective disclosure of information, influencing market dynamics and economic outcomes. At the same time, excessive deception can lead to financial crises, corporate fraud, and market inefficiencies. Akerlof's (1970) theory of information asymmetry demonstrates how dishonest information can undermine trust and damage economic systems. Thus, economic institutions continuously attempt to balance transparency with legitimate confidentiality. The theoretical examination of lying reveals that deception is far more complex than a simple moral transgression. Philosophical, sociological, psychological, evolutionary, political, and economic perspectives collectively demonstrate that lying performs numerous functions within human society. While excessive deception can erode trust, promote injustice, and destabilize institutions, certain forms of concealment, discretion, and strategic communication contribute to social harmony, psychological well-being, and organizational effectiveness. The ancient Indian principle—"□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□"—captures this complexity by advocating a balance between truth and compassion. Understanding these multifaceted roles of deception provides an essential foundation for evaluating the profound consequences that would arise if humanity suddenly lost the ability to lie. Such an exploration enables a deeper appreciation of the intricate relationship between truth, morality, communication, and social order.

Interpersonal Relationships in a Lie-Free World

If humans lost the ability to lie, interpersonal communication would become radically transparent. On one hand, honesty could strengthen trust, reduce misunderstandings, and promote authenticity in personal relationships (Bok, 1978). Romantic partners, friends, and family members would no longer fear betrayal concealed through deceit. On the other hand, complete honesty could be emotionally devastating. Social etiquette often relies on mild deception to avoid hurting others' feelings, such as offering polite compliments or concealing harsh opinions (DePaulo et al., 1996). Without the ability to lie, individuals might express unfiltered judgments, potentially damaging relationships and increasing interpersonal conflict. The erosion of privacy—where one could no longer conceal sensitive thoughts or emotions—could also undermine personal autonomy and psychological safety. Interpersonal relationships constitute the foundation of human society. Families, friendships, romantic partnerships, professional associations, and community networks are built upon continuous communication, mutual understanding, emotional exchange, and trust. The quality of these relationships significantly influences individual well-being, social cohesion, and collective progress. Truthfulness is generally regarded as an essential element of healthy relationships because it fosters trust, credibility, and authenticity. However, human relationships also rely upon tact, discretion, emotional sensitivity, and selective disclosure. Consequently, the hypothetical elimination of lying from human communication raises profound questions regarding the future of interpersonal relationships. Would a lie-free world strengthen human connections through absolute honesty, or would it weaken them by exposing individuals to uncomfortable truths and emotional vulnerabilities?

Transparency and Trust in Human Relationships

The most immediate consequence of a lie-free world would be a dramatic increase in interpersonal transparency. Trust, which often develops gradually through repeated interactions and verification of reliability, would become significantly easier to establish. Individuals would no longer need to question the sincerity of promises, declarations of affection, professional commitments, or statements regarding intentions. The fear of betrayal, manipulation, infidelity, and deception would substantially diminish. Research consistently demonstrates that trust is one of the strongest predictors of relationship satisfaction and stability (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). In a society where lying is impossible, trust could become the default assumption rather than an achievement earned through experience. Nevertheless, trust encompasses more than factual honesty. It also includes loyalty, empathy, reliability, emotional support, and respect. While the inability to lie would remove many barriers to

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

trust, it would not automatically create healthy relationships. Individuals would still need to cultivate emotional intelligence and ethical responsibility in order to maintain meaningful connections with others.

Romantic Relationships and Marital Life

Romantic relationships would undergo particularly significant transformations in a lie-free society. One of the most common sources of conflict in intimate relationships is dishonesty regarding emotions, finances, personal habits, and fidelity. Partners often conceal information to avoid conflict, protect themselves from criticism, or preserve the relationship. In a world where lying is impossible, such concealment would disappear. Individuals would be compelled to express their genuine feelings, intentions, and expectations. This increased openness could reduce misunderstandings and eliminate many forms of emotional manipulation. Couples would possess greater certainty regarding each other's commitment, loyalty, and aspirations, potentially leading to stronger and more authentic partnerships.

However, complete honesty could also introduce serious challenges. Human emotions are often temporary, contradictory, and context-dependent. Individuals frequently experience irritation, disappointment, jealousy, attraction toward others, or uncertainty regarding important decisions. In contemporary society, people generally exercise discretion by filtering such thoughts before communicating them. If lying became impossible and absolute honesty became unavoidable, many relationships could experience heightened emotional tension. Unfiltered expressions of temporary feelings might create conflicts that would otherwise never arise. Consequently, romantic relationships could become more authentic yet simultaneously more fragile.

The Sanatan Principle of Ethical Communication

The ethical complexities of truthfulness in human relationships are addressed in the ancient Sanskrit injunction: “□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □” “Speak the truth; speak it pleasantly. Do not speak unpleasant truth. Do not speak pleasant falsehood. This is the eternal Dharma.” (Manusmriti, 4.138) This timeless principle recognizes that truthfulness alone is insufficient for maintaining healthy relationships. Communication must also be guided by compassion, sensitivity, and concern for the emotional well-being of others. The verse neither advocates deception nor endorses harsh honesty. Rather, it proposes a balanced approach in which truth is communicated responsibly and constructively. In a lie-free world, this principle would become increasingly relevant because individuals would need to learn how to express unavoidable truths in ways that preserve dignity and social harmony.

Friendships and Social Bonds

Friendships are built upon mutual trust, emotional support, and shared experiences. In a society where deception is impossible, friendships could become more authentic and dependable. Fear of betrayal through lies, manipulation, or false accusations would diminish significantly. Individuals might feel safer sharing personal concerns because they would know that their friends could not intentionally mislead them. Such conditions could foster deeper emotional intimacy and stronger social bonds. Nevertheless, friendships frequently depend upon encouragement, tact, and emotional sensitivity. Friends often provide reassurance despite personal doubts and avoid expressing criticisms that might cause unnecessary pain. Research by DePaulo et al. (1996) suggests that many everyday lies are motivated not by selfish intentions but by a desire to preserve social harmony and protect relationships. Without the ability to soften criticism or conceal negative judgments, friendships might become more emotionally demanding. Constant exposure to unfiltered opinions could generate resentment, embarrassment, and social distancing. Therefore, friendships in a lie-free society would require a greater capacity for empathy and emotional resilience.

Family Relationships and Domestic Life

Family relationships would perhaps experience the most profound transformation. Families are complex systems characterized by long-term emotional investment, shared histories, and interconnected responsibilities. Parents

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

often conceal worries from children to protect them from anxiety, while children sometimes hide mistakes or concerns to avoid disappointing their parents. Family members frequently engage in selective disclosure to preserve harmony and stability. In a lie-free world, these protective mechanisms would disappear. Family interactions would become radically transparent, revealing both affection and conflict with unprecedented clarity. On one hand, such transparency could strengthen family trust by eliminating suspicion and uncertainty. Parents would know when children are struggling emotionally or facing difficulties, enabling earlier intervention and support. Family members could address problems directly rather than allowing them to remain hidden. On the other hand, constant exposure to every thought, concern, and criticism might overwhelm family relationships. Emotional wounds that are currently avoided through discretion could become unavoidable, potentially increasing household tensions and psychological stress.

Workplace Relationships and Professional Communication

Professional environments depend upon cooperation, negotiation, diplomacy, and impression management. Employees often present themselves in ways that emphasize strengths while minimizing weaknesses. Supervisors frequently soften negative feedback to maintain morale, while colleagues use polite expressions to facilitate teamwork. According to Goffman's (1959) theory of impression management, individuals perform social roles by controlling the information they reveal about themselves. This process helps maintain social order and professional functioning. If lying became impossible, workplace interactions would become considerably more transparent. Hiring processes could become more efficient because applicants would be unable to exaggerate qualifications or conceal deficiencies. Performance evaluations would be more accurate, and organizational trust might improve significantly. However, professional relationships could also become more difficult. Employees might openly express dissatisfaction with management decisions, colleagues, or organizational policies. While such honesty could enhance accountability and transparency, it might simultaneously increase workplace conflict and reduce organizational cohesion.

Privacy, Personal Boundaries, and Emotional Security

An often-overlooked aspect of interpersonal relationships is the role of privacy. Trust does not require complete transparency; rather, healthy relationships typically balance openness with personal boundaries. Individuals possess thoughts, memories, fears, and aspirations that they may choose not to share with others. Privacy contributes to autonomy, dignity, and psychological well-being. Westin (1967) argues that personal privacy is essential for identity formation and emotional security. In a lie-free world, maintaining privacy could become increasingly difficult. Although individuals might still remain silent, they would be unable to provide false explanations or conceal sensitive information when questioned directly. This erosion of privacy could create significant psychological discomfort. People might feel constantly exposed, vulnerable, and unable to control how others perceive them. Consequently, the inability to lie could threaten not only interpersonal relationships but also individual autonomy and emotional stability.

Social Etiquette and Everyday Communication

Human societies have developed numerous conventions designed to facilitate smooth social interactions. Greetings, compliments, expressions of gratitude, and ceremonial exchanges often contain elements of politeness that may not fully reflect an individual's internal state. These conventions help preserve dignity and reduce social friction. Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness emphasizes that individuals routinely modify communication to protect both their own social image and that of others. The disappearance of lying could disrupt these mechanisms. Social interactions might become more direct and transparent, but they could also become less forgiving and more emotionally challenging. Many conventional expressions of courtesy might need to be redefined. Consequently, societies would have to develop new norms capable of balancing honesty with kindness, respect, and social harmony.

Emotional Intelligence and Human Adaptation

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Despite the challenges associated with universal truthfulness, human beings possess remarkable adaptive capacities. Over time, societies would likely develop new cultural norms emphasizing emotional intelligence, compassionate truth-telling, conflict resolution, and ethical communication. Educational institutions might place greater emphasis on empathy, emotional literacy, and responsible dialogue. Individuals would learn to express difficult truths in ways that minimize harm while preserving authenticity. In such a world, emotional intelligence would become one of the most important social skills. The ability to communicate honestly while remaining compassionate and respectful would determine the quality of interpersonal relationships. Human adaptation would likely transform radical honesty from a source of conflict into an opportunity for deeper understanding and stronger social bonds.

Interpersonal relationships in a lie-free world would be characterized by unprecedented levels of transparency, authenticity, and trust. Many forms of manipulation, betrayal, and misunderstanding would diminish, strengthening the foundations of human connection. Romantic relationships, friendships, family interactions, and professional associations could become more genuine and dependable. Nevertheless, absolute honesty would also expose individuals to emotional vulnerability, reduce privacy, and increase the potential for interpersonal conflict. Relationships thrive not only on truth but also on empathy, discretion, and emotional sensitivity. Therefore, the success of interpersonal relationships in a lie-free society would depend upon humanity's ability to communicate truth responsibly and compassionately. The challenge would not simply be telling the truth but learning how to speak the truth in ways that promote understanding, dignity, and human flourishing. The enduring wisdom of the Sanatan principle—"□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□"—offers a valuable framework for achieving this balance by integrating honesty with compassion, thereby ensuring that truth serves the welfare of both individuals and society.

Psychological Consequences: Emotional Burden and Identity

The human capacity for deception is not merely a social phenomenon but also a deeply rooted psychological mechanism that influences cognition, emotional regulation, self-perception, and identity formation. Throughout human history, truth and deception have coexisted as integral components of mental and social life. While moral philosophies and religious traditions have generally elevated truthfulness as an ethical ideal, psychological research suggests that certain forms of deception contribute significantly to emotional well-being and social adaptation (Taylor & Brown, 1988). Consequently, the hypothetical elimination of humanity's ability to lie would not only transform social interactions but would also profoundly affect the psychological foundations upon which individuals construct their sense of self and navigate emotional experiences. Human beings continuously engage in processes of interpretation and self-presentation. They selectively disclose information, suppress undesirable thoughts, reframe painful experiences, and project socially acceptable identities. These psychological processes allow individuals to function effectively within complex social environments. The inability to lie would therefore represent far more than a communicative change; it would constitute a fundamental alteration in human consciousness and emotional functioning. Every individual would be compelled to confront reality with unprecedented directness, creating both opportunities for authenticity and risks for psychological distress.

Emotional Burden in a World of Radical Honesty

One of the most immediate consequences of a lie-free world would be the emergence of a heightened emotional burden. In contemporary society, individuals often employ various forms of psychological filtering that enable them to manage difficult emotions and maintain social relationships. Not every thought is expressed, not every judgment is communicated, and not every emotional reaction is revealed. This selective process helps individuals preserve relationships while protecting themselves and others from unnecessary harm. If lying became impossible, people would be forced into a condition of radical transparency in which many of these protective mechanisms would cease to function. Individuals frequently experience fleeting feelings of envy, resentment, disappointment, insecurity, anger, or attraction that do not necessarily reflect their deeper values or long-term commitments. Under normal circumstances, such transient emotions are regulated through reflection and self-control before they enter public communication. In a lie-free society, however, the inability to conceal or modify

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

these experiences could increase emotional vulnerability and create significant psychological strain. The burden of continual honesty might generate anxiety concerning social acceptance and interpersonal consequences, thereby altering the emotional landscape of everyday life. Moreover, individuals would be required to confront difficult truths about themselves and others on a regular basis. Emotional discomfort that is currently softened through tact, omission, or reinterpretation could become unavoidable. Such constant exposure to unfiltered reality might intensify feelings of stress, shame, guilt, and self-consciousness. While honesty may eliminate the anxiety associated with maintaining deception, it could simultaneously create new forms of psychological pressure arising from perpetual transparency.

Identity Formation and Self-Perception

The relationship between truthfulness and identity is one of the most significant psychological dimensions of a lie-free world. Identity is not a fixed entity but an evolving narrative through which individuals understand themselves and present themselves to others. According to Erikson (1968), personal identity develops through a continuous interaction between internal self-perception and external social recognition. Individuals construct coherent life stories by interpreting experiences, emphasizing particular aspects of themselves, and assigning meaning to achievements, failures, relationships, and aspirations. This process often involves selective interpretation. People tend to focus on strengths rather than weaknesses, view personal setbacks as temporary, and highlight aspects of themselves that align with desired identities. Such tendencies contribute to psychological stability and self-esteem. In a world where deception becomes impossible, the individual's ability to shape and manage personal narratives would be significantly constrained. Individuals would be compelled to confront aspects of themselves that they might otherwise ignore, minimize, or reinterpret. The result could be a more authentic sense of self grounded in objective reality. However, it could also expose individuals to painful self-awareness and increased psychological vulnerability. The process of identity formation might become more difficult because individuals would have fewer opportunities to construct protective narratives that help them cope with adversity and uncertainty.

Self-Deception and Psychological Well-Being

Particularly important in this context is the phenomenon of self-deception. Psychological research demonstrates that individuals frequently maintain optimistic beliefs about themselves and their futures despite contradictory evidence. These positive illusions are not necessarily signs of irrationality; rather, they often contribute to resilience, motivation, creativity, and emotional well-being (Taylor & Brown, 1988). Many people believe they are more capable, more ethical, or more likely to succeed than objective evidence might suggest. Such beliefs encourage persistence during difficult circumstances and provide the confidence necessary to pursue ambitious goals. Athletes, entrepreneurs, artists, and leaders often achieve success because they maintain strong faith in their abilities despite numerous obstacles and setbacks. If human beings lost not only the ability to deceive others but also the capacity for self-deception, they might become more accurate in their self-assessments. However, this increased realism could come at a psychological cost. Individuals might become less hopeful, less motivated, and less resilient in the face of adversity. A world governed exclusively by objective truth could undermine the psychological mechanisms that sustain perseverance and optimism. Consequently, the elimination of self-deception might enhance accuracy while simultaneously diminishing emotional strength.

Self-Presentation and Social Identity

The sociological insights of Goffman (1959) provide further understanding of the psychological implications of radical honesty. Goffman argues that social life resembles a theatrical performance in which individuals manage impressions and perform various social roles. Through this process, people maintain professional identities, family roles, and social reputations that facilitate interaction and cooperation. Individuals behave differently in different contexts. A teacher, parent, friend, manager, or political leader presents distinct aspects of personality depending upon social expectations and situational demands. Such performances are not necessarily fraudulent. Rather, they represent adaptive responses that enable individuals to function effectively within diverse social environments. In a lie-free world, the ability to control these presentations would be significantly reduced. Individuals would find it more difficult to conceal insecurities, frustrations, weaknesses, or socially undesirable

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

thoughts. The resulting transparency could expose people to constant scrutiny and evaluation. Feelings of vulnerability, embarrassment, and social anxiety might become more common because individuals would possess fewer psychological tools for managing how others perceive them. At the same time, reduced impression management could encourage greater authenticity. Relationships might become more genuine because individuals would interact with one another as they truly are rather than as they wish to appear. Thus, the loss of social masking could simultaneously increase vulnerability and promote authenticity.

Anxiety, Vulnerability, and Emotional Exposure

A lie-free society would likely produce new forms of anxiety associated with emotional exposure. Human beings generally seek social acceptance and fear rejection. The ability to manage information about oneself serves as a protective mechanism that reduces the risk of social exclusion. If individuals became incapable of concealing socially undesirable characteristics, fears, or opinions, many could experience heightened anxiety regarding how they are perceived by others. Emotional vulnerability would become a defining feature of social life. Every individual would be exposed to the possibility that private thoughts, insecurities, and judgments could become visible to others. While this transparency might eventually normalize human imperfections, the transition could be psychologically difficult. Feelings of shame, embarrassment, and self-consciousness could intensify, particularly in societies that place strong emphasis on social reputation and public image. Furthermore, individuals who derive psychological security from maintaining carefully constructed identities might struggle to adapt. The collapse of protective social masks could generate identity crises and emotional instability as people confront aspects of themselves that had previously remained hidden.

Cognitive Benefits of Truthfulness

Despite these challenges, a lie-free world could offer important psychological advantages. The maintenance of deception requires considerable cognitive effort. Individuals who lie must remember false statements, maintain consistency across different interactions, anticipate reactions, and manage the risk of exposure. Research on deception demonstrates that lying places substantial demands on memory, attention, and executive functioning (Vrij, 2008). The elimination of deception could reduce these cognitive burdens. Individuals would no longer need to monitor multiple versions of reality or worry about being caught in contradictions. This simplification of communication might promote greater psychological coherence and reduce mental stress. People could devote more cognitive resources to problem-solving, creativity, learning, and meaningful social engagement. Additionally, relationships based upon complete honesty could reduce the anxiety associated with uncertainty and suspicion. Individuals would no longer need to question the sincerity of others or expend psychological energy attempting to detect deception. Such certainty could contribute positively to emotional security and interpersonal trust.

Authenticity, Self-Awareness, and Personal Growth

One of the most promising psychological outcomes of a lie-free world is the potential for enhanced authenticity. Modern psychological theories frequently emphasize the importance of self-awareness and congruence between internal experiences and external behaviour. When individuals consistently present themselves honestly, they may develop a stronger sense of personal integrity and coherence. Greater honesty could encourage deeper self-reflection and more accurate self-understanding. Individuals would be less able to avoid difficult truths about their strengths, weaknesses, motivations, and behaviours. Although such self-awareness might initially be uncomfortable, it could ultimately promote personal growth and psychological maturity. By confronting reality directly, individuals may develop stronger coping mechanisms and a more realistic understanding of themselves and the world around them. However, authenticity alone does not guarantee well-being. Psychological growth requires not only self-awareness but also self-compassion. Without the capacity to forgive personal imperfections and adapt constructively to difficult truths, radical honesty could become a source of distress rather than development.

The Sanatan Perspective on Truth and Emotional Well-Being

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

The psychological implications of a lie-free world find remarkable resonance in the ancient Indian ethical principle expressed in the verse: "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □" "Speak the truth; speak it pleasantly. Do not speak unpleasant truth. Do not speak pleasant falsehood. This is the eternal Dharma." (Manusmriti, 4.138) This maxim recognizes that truth alone is insufficient for human flourishing. Communication must be guided by both honesty and compassion. From a psychological perspective, the verse acknowledges the delicate balance between factual accuracy and emotional well-being. Truth communicated without empathy can become a source of suffering, while pleasant falsehoods can undermine trust and authenticity. The enduring relevance of this principle suggests that psychological health depends not merely upon the presence of truth but upon the manner in which truth is communicated and integrated into human relationships.

The psychological consequences of a lie-free world would be profound, complex, and multidimensional. While greater honesty might enhance authenticity, self-awareness, personal integrity, and interpersonal trust, it could simultaneously increase emotional burden, threaten self-esteem, reduce psychological flexibility, and expose individuals to unprecedented vulnerability. The inability to engage in self-deception could produce more accurate self-assessments but might also weaken optimism, resilience, and motivation. Similarly, the loss of impression management could foster authenticity while increasing anxiety and emotional exposure. Ultimately, the psychological impact of universal truthfulness would depend upon humanity's ability to develop emotional intelligence, self-compassion, and ethical communication practices. A lie-free society would not simply require people to tell the truth; it would require them to learn how to live with truth. The enduring wisdom of the Sanatan principle—"□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□"—suggests that psychological well-being emerges not from truth alone but from the harmonious integration of truth, empathy, and human sensitivity. Such a balance would be essential if a lie-free world were to promote genuine human flourishing rather than psychological distress.

Political Systems and Governance

A lie-free society would profoundly transform political institutions. Transparency could reduce corruption, propaganda, and misinformation, enhancing democratic accountability and public trust (Arendt, 1972). Politicians would be unable to manipulate voters through false promises or distort facts for political gain. Policy debates might become more rational and evidence-based. However, diplomacy and national security often rely on strategic deception. Governments sometimes withhold or manipulate information to protect citizens or maintain geopolitical stability (Bok, 1978). Without the ability to lie, states might become vulnerable to hostile actors, compromising security and negotiation leverage. Furthermore, radical transparency could expose sensitive intelligence, making governance more complex rather than more effective. Political systems are fundamentally dependent upon communication, information exchange, public trust, and the exercise of power. Governments formulate policies, manage institutions, conduct diplomacy, negotiate international agreements, and maintain social order through complex networks of communication between leaders, institutions, and citizens. Throughout history, truth and deception have coexisted within political systems in varying degrees. While democratic ideals emphasize transparency, accountability, and honesty, political practice often involves secrecy, strategic ambiguity, confidential negotiations, and, at times, deliberate misinformation. Consequently, the hypothetical disappearance of humanity's ability to lie would profoundly transform the nature of governance, public administration, political leadership, and international relations. A lie-free society would initially appear to offer significant advantages for political systems. Corruption, electoral manipulation, political propaganda, and many forms of abuse of power depend upon deception. If political leaders became incapable of making false statements, citizens would gain unprecedented access to truthful information regarding government decisions, policy objectives, and administrative performance. Such transparency could strengthen democratic institutions and significantly increase public confidence in government. Political legitimacy, which often suffers from distrust and skepticism, might become more stable because citizens would no longer question whether leaders were intentionally misleading them. The relationship between truth and democracy has long been emphasized by political theorists. Democratic governance depends upon informed citizens capable of making rational decisions based on accurate information. Habermas (1984) argues that democratic societies require open and honest communication in the public sphere, where citizens engage in reasoned discussion regarding collective

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

concerns. In a world without lies, public discourse could become more authentic and evidence-based. Election campaigns would focus more on genuine policy differences rather than carefully crafted narratives designed to manipulate public opinion. Political debates might become more substantive because candidates would be unable to make promises they had no intention of fulfilling.

Electoral Politics and Public Accountability

One of the most visible transformations would occur within electoral politics. Modern election campaigns often involve strategic communication, image management, selective disclosure, and occasionally misinformation. Politicians may exaggerate achievements, conceal failures, or present unrealistic promises to attract voters. In many democracies, public distrust emerges from the perception that elected officials frequently fail to honor campaign commitments. If lying became impossible, electoral campaigns would undergo a fundamental transformation. Candidates would be compelled to provide realistic assessments of their capabilities, limitations, and policy intentions. Voters would possess greater confidence in political statements because deception would no longer be possible. Consequently, electoral decisions might become more rational and less influenced by emotional manipulation or false narratives. Furthermore, political accountability would increase substantially. Government officials would be unable to conceal misconduct, misrepresent data, or deny responsibility for policy failures. Investigative journalism and public oversight would become more effective because factual information would be readily accessible. The resulting increase in transparency could strengthen democratic institutions and reduce the gap between political rhetoric and administrative reality. However, complete transparency might also create new challenges. Political leadership often requires flexibility, strategic planning, and the management of sensitive information. Public disclosure of every policy discussion, disagreement, or uncertainty could undermine confidence in government and make decision-making more difficult. Citizens might struggle to distinguish between preliminary deliberations and finalized policies, leading to confusion and instability.

Corruption, Bureaucracy, and Public Administration

One of the most significant benefits of a lie-free society would be the reduction of corruption. Corrupt practices typically depend upon secrecy, concealment, and deception. Bribery, embezzlement, fraud, favouritism, and misuse of public resources often remain undetected because individuals involved intentionally hide their actions. In a world where lying is impossible, many forms of corruption would become extremely difficult to sustain. Public officials would be unable to conceal illegal transactions or provide false explanations for their actions. Government audits, investigations, and oversight mechanisms would become more effective because information provided by public servants would be truthful. Consequently, public resources could be managed more efficiently, and citizens might develop greater trust in governmental institutions. Administrative efficiency could also improve. Bureaucratic processes frequently suffer from misinformation, inaccurate reporting, and strategic concealment of errors. Honest reporting would enable governments to identify problems more quickly and implement corrective measures more effectively. Policy evaluation would become more reliable because decision-makers would have access to accurate information regarding program outcomes and institutional performance. Nevertheless, governance requires more than honesty. Effective administration also depends upon discretion, confidentiality, and the careful management of information. Certain governmental functions, such as criminal investigations, intelligence gathering, and security operations, rely upon controlled access to sensitive information. The inability to lie would not eliminate the need for confidentiality, but it might complicate efforts to protect information that cannot be publicly disclosed.

Diplomacy and International Relations

The most complex political consequences of a lie-free world would likely emerge in the realm of international relations. Diplomacy has historically relied upon a combination of openness, negotiation, secrecy, and strategic ambiguity. States often withhold information, conceal intentions, or maintain flexible positions in order to protect national interests and facilitate diplomatic agreements. According to Arendt (1972), political power and truth frequently exist in tension because governments must navigate uncertain and competitive international environments. In a world without lies, diplomatic negotiations would become radically transparent. Nations

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

would be unable to misrepresent their intentions, capabilities, or strategic objectives. On one hand, this transparency could reduce international mistrust, lower the risk of misunderstandings, and decrease the likelihood of conflict arising from misinformation. On the other hand, diplomacy often succeeds because negotiators possess the ability to explore alternatives confidentially before making public commitments. Immediate disclosure of all intentions and strategies could reduce flexibility and make compromise more difficult. States might become vulnerable to exploitation if sensitive information regarding military capabilities, economic strategies, or security concerns could no longer be concealed effectively. The challenge would be particularly significant in matters of national security. Governments frequently classify information to protect citizens from external threats. Intelligence operations, counterterrorism initiatives, and military planning depend upon secrecy rather than deception alone. While a lie-free society could still maintain confidential information through silence or restricted access, the inability to provide misleading information to adversaries could alter the strategic balance of international relations.

Political Leadership and Public Expectations

Political leadership would also undergo profound transformation. Leaders are often expected to inspire confidence, maintain social stability, and provide reassurance during periods of crisis. In some circumstances, leaders deliberately present optimistic assessments to prevent panic and preserve public morale. During economic crises, natural disasters, or public health emergencies, governments may strategically manage information to avoid social disorder. A lie-free world would compel leaders to communicate with complete honesty regarding risks, uncertainties, and limitations. Such transparency could enhance credibility and foster long-term trust. Citizens would know that official statements accurately reflect reality rather than political calculations. Over time, this reliability could strengthen the relationship between governments and the populations they serve. However, absolute honesty might also produce unintended consequences. Public confidence is often influenced not only by facts but also by perceptions of stability and competence. Excessive disclosure of uncertainty or vulnerability could generate fear, panic, or political instability. Effective leadership therefore requires a balance between transparency and responsible communication. This challenge resonates with the ancient Indian ethical principle articulated in the verse: "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □" (Manusmriti 4.138). The verse suggests that truth should be communicated in a manner that promotes welfare and social harmony. Applied to governance, this principle implies that political leaders must not only provide truthful information but also communicate it responsibly, with consideration for its social consequences.

The elimination of lying would fundamentally reshape political systems and governance. Greater transparency could reduce corruption, strengthen democratic accountability, improve administrative efficiency, and enhance public trust in governmental institutions. Electoral politics would become more honest, and citizens would be better equipped to evaluate leaders and policies based on accurate information. At the same time, governance involves complex responsibilities that extend beyond simple truth-telling. Diplomacy, national security, crisis management, and public administration often require confidentiality, strategic communication, and careful management of information. Consequently, a lie-free political order would not automatically produce perfect governance. Rather, it would require the development of new institutional norms capable of balancing transparency with responsibility. As the Sanatan principle of ethical communication suggests, truth achieves its highest value when combined with wisdom, prudence, and concern for collective well-being. A society without lies might enjoy greater political integrity, but its long-term success would depend upon the capacity of leaders and institutions to communicate truth in ways that sustain both trust and social stability.

Economic and Corporate Implications

In the economic domain, the inability to lie could reduce fraud, false advertising, insider trading, and corporate manipulation. Consumers might benefit from honest marketing, while investors could make decisions based on reliable information (Akerlof, 1970). Market efficiency could improve due to greater informational symmetry. Conversely, negotiation, pricing strategies, and competitive advantage often involve strategic misrepresentation or partial disclosure. Without deception, firms might lose flexibility in bargaining, potentially reducing

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

innovation or competitive dynamics. Additionally, businesses rely on confidentiality, and an enforced inability to conceal information could threaten intellectual property and commercial viability. Economic systems function through intricate networks of trust, information exchange, contracts, competition, and cooperation. Markets operate effectively when individuals, corporations, financial institutions, and governments engage in transactions based on reliable information and mutually recognized rules. At the same time, economic activity has historically been vulnerable to various forms of deception, including fraud, false advertising, insider manipulation, accounting irregularities, tax evasion, and corporate misconduct. Consequently, the hypothetical disappearance of humanity's ability to lie would have profound implications for economic structures, corporate governance, financial markets, consumer behavior, entrepreneurship, and global commerce.

At first glance, a lie-free world appears economically desirable. Many of the most significant economic crises in history have been linked to misinformation, concealment of risk, deceptive financial practices, and failures of transparency. Corporate scandals such as Enron, WorldCom, and various financial fraud schemes demonstrate how dishonesty can undermine investor confidence, destabilize markets, and inflict widespread social and economic damage. If individuals became incapable of deception, many of these problems could be significantly reduced. However, economic activity depends not only upon transparency but also upon strategic decision-making, confidentiality, competitive advantage, and uncertainty. Therefore, the elimination of lying would produce both beneficial and challenging consequences for economic systems.

Trust as the Foundation of Economic Activity

Trust is one of the most important forms of social capital in modern economies. According to Fukuyama (1995), economic prosperity depends not only upon physical resources and financial capital but also upon the existence of trust within society. Individuals engage in business transactions because they believe that contracts will be honoured, products will perform as advertised, and institutions will enforce rules fairly. In a world where lying is impossible, economic trust would increase dramatically. Buyers would no longer fear deceptive marketing claims, investors would receive accurate financial information, and employers could rely upon truthful representations from employees and applicants. The costs associated with verifying information, monitoring compliance, and preventing fraud could decline substantially. Businesses currently spend enormous resources on audits, compliance mechanisms, legal protections, and regulatory oversight designed to detect dishonesty. The elimination of deception could reduce many of these transaction costs, thereby increasing overall economic efficiency. Furthermore, market participants would be able to make decisions based on more accurate information. Consumers would possess greater confidence in product descriptions and service guarantees. Investors would be better equipped to assess risks and opportunities. As a result, economic decisions might become more rational and efficient, contributing to improved market performance.

Consumer Markets and Advertising

One of the most visible economic transformations would occur in the relationship between businesses and consumers. Modern advertising frequently relies upon persuasive communication, emotional appeals, selective presentation of information, and, in some cases, exaggerated claims regarding product performance. Although consumer protection laws prohibit outright falsehoods in many jurisdictions, marketing often emphasizes benefits while minimizing limitations. In a lie-free society, businesses would be unable to make misleading claims about their products or services. Every advertisement would need to reflect factual reality. Consumers would receive more accurate information regarding product quality, durability, effectiveness, and value. Consequently, purchasing decisions would become more informed, and consumer confidence could increase significantly. This increased transparency would likely strengthen long-term customer relationships. Companies that consistently deliver genuine value would gain reputational advantages, while businesses that previously relied upon exaggerated marketing strategies would be compelled to improve the actual quality of their offerings. Market competition would shift from persuasive image-building toward substantive performance and innovation. However, advertising serves purposes beyond factual communication. Successful marketing often appeals to aspirations, emotions, lifestyles, and symbolic meanings associated with products. The inability to

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

employ certain forms of persuasive narrative might alter the nature of branding and consumer engagement. Companies would need to develop new approaches that attract customers while remaining entirely truthful.

Corporate Governance and Organizational Culture:

Corporate governance would experience significant changes in a lie-free world. Many organizational failures originate from information asymmetries, concealed risks, manipulated financial reports, and unethical managerial behaviour. Shareholders, employees, regulators, and customers often suffer when corporate leaders withhold critical information or misrepresent organizational performance. If deception became impossible, corporate transparency would increase substantially. Executives would be unable to falsify financial statements, conceal operational problems, or mislead investors regarding future prospects. Boards of directors would receive more accurate information, enabling better oversight and decision-making. Shareholder confidence could strengthen because investment decisions would be based on reliable disclosures rather than carefully managed narratives. Internal organizational culture would also be transformed. Employees could communicate concerns, report problems, and evaluate performance more honestly. Workplace politics, favouritism, and manipulation might decrease because individuals would be unable to conceal their intentions or distort information for personal advantage. Such changes could promote accountability and ethical behaviour throughout organizations. Nevertheless, organizations depend upon diplomacy, morale management, and strategic communication. Leaders often provide reassurance during uncertain periods and manage sensitive information regarding restructuring, mergers, or financial challenges. Absolute honesty could create difficulties when organizations need to balance transparency with stability. Employees might experience greater anxiety if every uncertainty, risk, or disagreement became immediately visible.

Financial Markets and Investment Behaviour

Financial markets rely heavily upon information. Stock prices, investment decisions, and economic forecasts are influenced by expectations regarding future performance, profitability, and risk. Information asymmetry occurs when some market participants possess knowledge that others do not, creating opportunities for unfair advantage and market inefficiency. Akerlof's (1970) influential theory of information asymmetry demonstrates how unreliable information can undermine market functioning. In his analysis of the market for used automobiles, he showed that buyers often struggle to distinguish between high-quality and low-quality products because sellers possess more information than consumers. Similar dynamics operate throughout financial markets. In a lie-free world, information asymmetry would be reduced considerably. Investors would receive truthful reports regarding corporate performance, financial health, and strategic objectives. Fraudulent investment schemes, accounting scandals, and market manipulation would become far more difficult to sustain. Financial institutions could evaluate risks more accurately, leading to more efficient allocation of capital. The likelihood of speculative bubbles driven by misinformation might also decline. Economic crises often emerge when inaccurate information distorts market expectations. Greater transparency could contribute to financial stability by ensuring that investment decisions are grounded in factual assessments rather than deceptive narratives. At the same time, financial markets depend upon uncertainty and future expectations. Economic forecasting involves predictions rather than certainties. Even in a lie-free world, market participants would continue to disagree about future outcomes. Therefore, transparency would not eliminate risk or volatility entirely, although it might reduce distortions caused by deliberate deception.

Entrepreneurship, Innovation, and Competitive Strategy

Entrepreneurship thrives on vision, ambition, and the ability to persuade others regarding future possibilities. Entrepreneurs frequently seek investment for projects that have not yet demonstrated commercial success. Their ability to attract resources often depends upon communicating confidence in future outcomes. A lie-free world could enhance entrepreneurial credibility because investors would know that founders cannot intentionally misrepresent their capabilities or intentions. Business proposals would be more trustworthy, and investment decisions could become more informed. Start-up ecosystems might benefit from increased confidence among

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

investors, employees, and customers. However, innovation frequently involves uncertainty. Entrepreneurs must communicate ambitious goals that may or may not be realized. The distinction between optimism and deception would become especially important. While individuals could continue to express genuine expectations, they would be unable to exaggerate probabilities or conceal weaknesses. This might encourage more realistic business planning and reduce excessive speculation. Competitive strategy would also be transformed. Businesses often protect trade secrets, research findings, and strategic initiatives to maintain competitive advantages. While confidentiality could still exist through restricted disclosure, companies would face challenges if they were unable to employ certain forms of strategic ambiguity when interacting with competitors. Consequently, organizations might need to develop new methods of protecting intellectual property and commercial interests.

Labor Markets and Employment Relations

Employment relationships are frequently affected by information imbalances. Job applicants may exaggerate qualifications, while employers may present idealized descriptions of organizational culture and career opportunities. Such discrepancies can create dissatisfaction, inefficiency, and mistrust. In a lie-free labor market, recruitment processes would become more transparent. Employers would provide accurate information regarding compensation, responsibilities, and advancement opportunities, while applicants would present truthful accounts of their skills and experiences. Hiring decisions could therefore become more effective and equitable. Workplace trust would likely improve as employees gain confidence in organizational communication. Labor disputes arising from misinformation or unmet expectations might decline. However, complete honesty could also generate challenges in performance evaluations, managerial feedback, and interpersonal workplace relationships. The ability to communicate difficult truths constructively would become increasingly important.

Economic Ethics and the Sanatan Perspective

The economic implications of a lie-free society resonate strongly with the ethical principle expressed in the Sanskrit injunction: "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □" (Manusmriti 4.138). Economic transactions are not merely financial exchanges; they are also moral interactions that depend upon trust, fairness, and responsibility. The verse suggests that truth should be communicated in a manner that promotes welfare while avoiding both harmful falsehoods and unnecessarily damaging communication. Applied to economic life, this principle encourages transparency without hostility, honesty without exploitation, and accountability without cruelty. It recognizes that sustainable economic relationships require ethical conduct grounded in both truthfulness and respect for others.

The elimination of lying would profoundly reshape economic systems and corporate institutions. Greater transparency could reduce fraud, strengthen consumer confidence, improve corporate governance, enhance market efficiency, and promote ethical business practices. Investors, consumers, employees, and regulators would benefit from access to more reliable information, thereby fostering trust and economic stability. Nevertheless, economic systems depend not only upon truthful information but also upon innovation, confidentiality, strategic planning, and human judgment. A lie-free world would require new approaches to competition, leadership, entrepreneurship, and organizational communication. Ultimately, economic prosperity would continue to depend upon the responsible integration of truth, trust, and ethical conduct. As the Sanatan tradition suggests, sustainable human relationships—whether personal, political, or economic—are best served not by truth alone, but by truth expressed with wisdom, integrity, and concern for the common good.

Media, Journalism, and Information Ecosystems

A world without lies could revolutionize media and journalism by eliminating fake news, propaganda, and disinformation. Public discourse might become more fact-based, reducing polarization and improving civic reasoning (Habermas, 1984). However, media narratives often involve framing, selective emphasis, and interpretive bias rather than outright lies. Even in a lie-free world, disagreements over interpretation, values, and meaning would persist. Furthermore, the inability to conceal sources or protect whistleblowers might create ethical challenges in journalistic practice. Media and journalism occupy a central position in contemporary

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

society. They function as the primary channels through which information is produced, disseminated, interpreted, and consumed. Democratic governance, public accountability, social cohesion, and informed citizenship all depend upon the availability of reliable information. The media serves as a bridge between institutions and citizens, shaping public understanding of political developments, economic trends, social issues, scientific discoveries, and cultural transformations. However, the modern information environment is also characterized by misinformation, disinformation, propaganda, sensationalism, and selective reporting. Consequently, the hypothetical disappearance of humanity's ability to lie would fundamentally transform the structure and functioning of media systems, journalistic practices, and information ecosystems. At first glance, a lie-free world appears highly beneficial for media and journalism. The proliferation of fake news, manipulated narratives, fabricated reports, and deceptive political communication has become one of the most significant challenges of the digital age. If individuals became incapable of intentional deception, much of the misinformation that currently circulates through traditional and digital media would disappear. Public trust in information sources could increase substantially, and journalism might regain its role as a highly trusted institution within society. However, information ecosystems involve more than the distinction between truth and falsehood. Interpretation, framing, editorial judgment, ideological perspectives, and narrative construction would continue to influence public discourse even in the absence of deliberate lies. Therefore, while a lie-free world would improve informational accuracy, it would not eliminate all forms of disagreement or controversy.

The Transformation of Journalism

Journalism is often described as the pursuit of truth in the public interest. Professional journalism relies upon principles such as accuracy, verification, objectivity, fairness, and accountability. Nevertheless, journalists frequently encounter challenges arising from unreliable sources, hidden agendas, and deliberate attempts to manipulate information. Considerable resources are devoted to fact-checking, source verification, and investigative reporting precisely because deception remains a persistent feature of public life. In a society where lying is impossible, journalism would undergo a profound transformation. Reporters would have greater confidence in the accuracy of statements provided by public officials, corporate representatives, and private citizens. Investigative journalism would become more efficient because witnesses and sources could no longer intentionally provide false information. News organizations would spend fewer resources verifying basic facts and more resources analyzing complex issues and their broader implications. Furthermore, public trust in journalism could increase significantly. Surveys conducted across many countries indicate declining confidence in news media due to concerns regarding bias, misinformation, and political influence (Newman et al., 2023). A lie-free information environment could help restore credibility by ensuring that factual reporting is not contaminated by deliberate falsehoods. Citizens would possess greater confidence that published information accurately reflects reality, thereby strengthening the informational foundations of democratic society. Despite these advantages, journalism would not become entirely objective. Journalists would still make decisions regarding which stories deserve attention, which sources should be consulted, and how events should be interpreted. Consequently, differences in perspective and editorial judgment would continue to shape media narratives even in the absence of deception.

The End of Fake News and Disinformation

One of the most significant consequences of a lie-free world would be the elimination of fake news and organized disinformation campaigns. The digital revolution has dramatically increased the speed and scale at which information circulates. Social media platforms allow individuals, organizations, and governments to disseminate information instantly to global audiences. While this has expanded access to information, it has also created opportunities for the spread of false narratives and coordinated misinformation campaigns. Disinformation differs from misinformation in that it involves the deliberate creation and dissemination of false information with the intention of deceiving audiences (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). Political actors, extremist groups, foreign governments, and commercial interests frequently employ disinformation to influence public opinion and achieve strategic objectives. If lying became impossible, such practices would largely disappear. False narratives could no longer be intentionally created or promoted. Political propaganda based on fabricated claims would become ineffective, and social media platforms would experience a substantial reduction in misleading content.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Public debates would be grounded more firmly in factual reality, reducing confusion and enhancing the quality of civic discourse. However, it is important to recognize that misinformation can also arise unintentionally through misunderstanding, incomplete knowledge, or incorrect interpretation. Even in a lie-free society, individuals would continue to make mistakes, misinterpret data, and draw erroneous conclusions. Therefore, the elimination of lying would improve informational integrity but would not eliminate all forms of informational error.

Framing, Interpretation, and Narrative Construction

Although facts are essential to journalism, news reporting involves more than simply presenting information. Journalists and media organizations engage in framing, a process through which certain aspects of reality are emphasized while others receive less attention. According to Entman (1993), framing influences how audiences understand issues by defining problems, identifying causes, making moral evaluations, and suggesting solutions. In a lie-free world, framing would remain highly influential. Two journalists could report the same event accurately while presenting different interpretations of its significance. Similarly, political commentators might disagree regarding the implications of economic policies, social reforms, or international developments without engaging in deception. Public discourse would therefore continue to reflect diversity of opinion and ideological perspectives. This observation highlights an important distinction between truth and objectivity. While lying involves intentional falsehood, objectivity concerns the fair and balanced presentation of information. A society without lies would still require critical thinking, media literacy, and analytical skills because citizens would need to evaluate competing interpretations of factual events.

Social Media and Digital Information Networks

Social media platforms have become central components of modern information ecosystems. They enable individuals to create, share, and consume content without relying upon traditional gatekeepers such as newspapers and broadcasters. While this democratization of communication has expanded participation, it has also facilitated the rapid spread of misinformation and polarized discourse. In a lie-free society, digital communication would become substantially more reliable. Users would be unable to fabricate stories, impersonate others, manipulate facts, or intentionally mislead audiences. Online interactions could become more trustworthy, reducing the prevalence of scams, fraudulent schemes, and deceptive content. The quality of public discourse might also improve. Social media debates often deteriorate because participants rely upon false claims, conspiracy theories, or misleading evidence. Greater informational accuracy could encourage more substantive discussions focused on genuine disagreements rather than fabricated controversies. Nevertheless, digital platforms would continue to amplify emotional content, ideological preferences, and algorithmic biases. Even truthful information can be selectively promoted or ignored. Consequently, challenges related to information overload, echo chambers, and selective exposure would likely persist.

Media Ethics and Public Responsibility

The ethical responsibilities of media institutions would also evolve in a lie-free world. Journalistic ethics traditionally emphasize truthfulness, independence, accountability, and minimizing harm (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2021). While the elimination of lying would simplify some ethical challenges, others would remain. Journalists would continue to face difficult decisions regarding privacy, confidentiality, and the publication of sensitive information. Not every truth is necessarily appropriate for public disclosure. Reporting certain facts may endanger individuals, compromise national security, or violate personal dignity. Consequently, ethical journalism would still require careful judgment regarding what information should be published and how it should be communicated. This challenge resonates strongly with the ancient Indian ethical principle: "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □" The verse suggests that truth should be communicated responsibly and constructively rather than merely disclosed without consideration for its consequences. Within journalism, this principle implies that accuracy must be accompanied by fairness, sensitivity, and concern for the public good. Ethical reporting requires not only factual correctness but also wisdom in the presentation of truth.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Information Ecosystems and Democratic Society

Healthy democracies depend upon robust information ecosystems that enable citizens to make informed decisions. Access to accurate information strengthens civic participation, promotes governmental accountability, and supports rational public deliberation. A lie-free society could significantly enhance these functions by reducing manipulation and increasing informational reliability. However, democratic discourse involves more than the transmission of facts. Citizens must interpret information, evaluate competing perspectives, and make judgments regarding complex social issues. The elimination of deception would improve the quality of available information, but it would not eliminate ideological disagreements or conflicts of values. Political debates would continue because individuals often differ in their priorities, beliefs, and visions of the common good. Therefore, a lie-free information ecosystem would not create universal consensus. Rather, it would create conditions under which disagreements are more likely to be grounded in genuine differences of perspective rather than misinformation and deception.

The disappearance of humanity's ability to lie would fundamentally transform media, journalism, and information ecosystems. Fake news, disinformation campaigns, propaganda based on falsehoods, and many forms of informational manipulation would largely disappear. Journalistic credibility could increase, public trust in information sources might improve, and democratic discourse could become more informed and constructive. Consumers of information would benefit from greater transparency and reliability across both traditional and digital media platforms. Nevertheless, truth alone would not eliminate all challenges within the information environment. Interpretation, framing, ideological diversity, and ethical dilemmas regarding privacy and public interest would remain significant concerns. Journalism would continue to require professional judgment, and citizens would still need critical thinking skills to evaluate competing perspectives. Ultimately, the success of a lie-free information ecosystem would depend not merely upon the absence of deception but upon the responsible communication of truth. As reflected in the Sanatan ideal of "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□,"
information serves society most effectively when truthfulness is combined with wisdom, responsibility, and concern for human welfare.

Ethical and Philosophical Considerations:

From a moral standpoint, absolute truthfulness aligns with Kantian ethics, which treat lying as inherently wrong regardless of consequences (Kant, 1797/1996). However, utilitarian thinkers argue that lying can be morally justified when it prevents harm or maximizes well-being (Mill, 1863/2001).

In a lie-free society, ethical dilemmas would intensify. For example, doctors might be forced to reveal distressing medical truths without discretion, potentially harming patients' emotional well-being. Individuals might be unable to protect others from harmful information. Thus, moral life could become more rigid, less compassionate, and less adaptable to complex human needs. The question of what would happen if all human beings suddenly lost the ability to lie is not merely a sociological, psychological, or political inquiry; it is fundamentally an ethical and philosophical one. Throughout human civilization, truth and deception have occupied a central place in moral reflection. Philosophers, theologians, and ethical thinkers have long debated whether lying is always wrong, whether certain lies may be morally justified, and whether absolute truthfulness necessarily leads to human flourishing. The hypothetical emergence of a lie-free world offers a unique opportunity to examine these enduring questions and to evaluate the relationship between truth, morality, freedom, justice, and human well-being. Truth has traditionally been regarded as one of the highest moral virtues. Most religious traditions, including Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Jainism, and Sikhism, emphasize honesty as a foundational ethical principle. At the same time, human experience reveals situations in which truth and morality appear to conflict. Individuals may tell lies to protect others from harm, preserve social harmony, safeguard privacy, or prevent injustice. Consequently, the ethical evaluation of lying has remained one of the most contested issues in moral philosophy. A world in which lying becomes impossible would force humanity to confront these dilemmas in unprecedented ways.

Truth as a Moral Ideal

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

The moral significance of truthfulness has been recognized across cultures and historical periods. In Indian philosophical traditions, Satya (truth) is regarded as a fundamental virtue and one of the essential principles of righteous living. The Mundaka Upanishad proclaims, "□□□□□□□ □□□□" ("Truth alone triumphs"), a statement that has become a guiding ethical ideal in Indian civilization. Similarly, Mahatma Gandhi regarded truth (Satya) as the highest principle of human existence and made it the foundation of his philosophy of Satyagraha. Western philosophy has likewise emphasized the intrinsic value of truthfulness. Aristotle argued that virtue consists in cultivating moral excellence through habitual ethical conduct, and honesty occupies a central place within this framework (Aristotle, trans. 2009). Truthfulness contributes to trust, integrity, and the development of virtuous character. From this perspective, a lie-free society would represent a significant moral achievement because individuals would consistently align their words with reality. The ethical attractiveness of such a society lies in its apparent elimination of deception, manipulation, and dishonesty. Social relationships would be based upon authenticity rather than pretence, and institutions could function with greater transparency and accountability. In this sense, the inability to lie might appear to bring humanity closer to an ideal moral order grounded in truth.

Kantian Ethics and the Absolute Duty to Tell the Truth

Among the most influential defenders of absolute truthfulness was Immanuel Kant. According to Kant (1797/1996), truthfulness is a categorical moral duty that admits no exceptions. He argued that lying is always wrong because it violates the principle of treating rational beings as ends in themselves rather than as means to an end. Deception undermines the autonomy of others by preventing them from making informed decisions based on accurate information. Kant's position is particularly relevant to the concept of a lie-free world. If lying became impossible, individuals would no longer violate the moral law through deception. Every act of communication would respect the autonomy and rationality of others. Trust would become a natural feature of social life, and moral responsibility would be strengthened. However, Kant's strict position has been widely criticized for failing to account for situations in which lying may prevent significant harm. Critics argue that moral life is often more complex than adherence to universal rules. A lie-free society might satisfy Kantian principles, but it could also create situations where truthfulness produces undesirable or even harmful outcomes.

Utilitarian Perspectives on Truth and Deception

In contrast to Kantian ethics, utilitarian thinkers evaluate actions according to their consequences. Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill argued that moral actions are those that maximize overall happiness and minimize suffering (Mill, 1863/2001). From a utilitarian perspective, lying is not inherently wrong; its moral value depends upon its effects. Certain lies may be ethically justified if they prevent harm, preserve life, or promote greater well-being. For example, deceiving a violent aggressor to protect an innocent person may be considered morally acceptable because the consequences are beneficial. Similarly, comforting a terminally ill patient or protecting vulnerable individuals from unnecessary distress may involve forms of deception that serve compassionate purposes. A lie-free world would eliminate the possibility of such morally motivated deception. While society would gain the benefits of transparency and trust, it might lose the flexibility required to address complex ethical situations. Consequently, utilitarian philosophers might question whether absolute truthfulness always maximizes human welfare. This tension highlights a central philosophical dilemma: whether moral principles should be evaluated according to their intrinsic value or their practical consequences. A lie-free society would provide a natural experiment for examining this question.

Virtue Ethics and Moral Character

Virtue ethics offers a different perspective by focusing not primarily on rules or consequences but on character. Aristotle maintained that ethical behaviour emerges from the cultivation of virtues such as honesty, courage, compassion, wisdom, and justice. Moral excellence involves finding an appropriate balance between extremes and acting in accordance with practical wisdom (phronesis). From the perspective of virtue ethics, the inability to lie does not automatically make individuals virtuous. Genuine virtue requires conscious moral choice rather than mere incapacity. A person who cannot lie because of biological or psychological constraints differs fundamentally from a person who chooses honesty despite possessing the capacity for deception. Therefore, a lie-free world raises important questions about moral agency. If individuals lose the ability to lie, can truthfulness

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

still be regarded as a virtue? Virtue presupposes freedom and choice. Ethical praise is meaningful only when individuals could have acted otherwise. Consequently, some philosophers might argue that a society without the possibility of lying would diminish the moral significance of honesty itself.

Freedom, Autonomy, and the Right to Privacy

Another important philosophical concern involves the relationship between truthfulness and personal freedom. Human autonomy includes the capacity to decide what information to disclose, what to withhold, and how to present oneself to others. While deception can be harmful, complete transparency may also threaten individual liberty. Political philosopher Isaiah Berlin (1969) emphasized that freedom involves the absence of coercion and the preservation of personal choice. If individuals were incapable of concealing information through deception, they might experience a significant reduction in personal autonomy. Certain aspects of privacy depend upon the ability to control how information is communicated and interpreted. This issue becomes particularly important in situations involving personal dignity, confidentiality, and emotional vulnerability. A lie-free society might promote honesty, but it could also create conditions in which individuals feel constantly exposed and unable to protect their personal boundaries. Thus, the ethical value of truth must be balanced against the ethical importance of privacy and individual freedom.

The Sanatan Perspective on Truth and Ethical Communication

The ethical complexities of truthfulness are remarkably anticipated in the Sanatan tradition through the well-known verse: "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □"-"Speak the truth; speak it pleasantly. Do not speak unpleasant truth. Do not speak pleasant falsehood. This is the eternal Dharma." (Manusmriti 4.138) This teaching offers a sophisticated ethical framework that transcends the simple opposition between truth and falsehood. It recognizes that truthfulness is a moral obligation but simultaneously acknowledges the importance of compassion, sensitivity, and social responsibility. The verse rejects both harmful truth and pleasant falsehood, advocating instead a harmonious integration of honesty and benevolence. From a philosophical standpoint, this principle represents a middle path between rigid absolutism and unrestricted consequentialism. It suggests that ethical communication requires not only factual accuracy but also wisdom regarding the effects of speech upon others. In a lie-free world, such guidance would become especially important because individuals would need to communicate truth in ways that preserve human dignity and social harmony.

Justice, Social Trust, and the Common Good

A lie-free society would likely strengthen justice and social trust. Courts could operate more effectively, corruption would decline, and public institutions would become more transparent. Citizens would possess greater confidence in one another and in the systems that govern collective life. Social cooperation, which depends heavily upon trust, could become more efficient and stable. Philosophers such as John Rawls (1999) emphasize that just societies require fair institutions and reliable norms of cooperation. The elimination of deception could contribute significantly to these objectives by reducing opportunities for exploitation and unfair advantage. Economic transactions, political processes, and interpersonal relationships would all benefit from greater honesty. Nevertheless, justice requires more than truthfulness alone. It also depends upon compassion, fairness, mercy, and respect for human dignity. A society governed exclusively by factual truth without ethical sensitivity could become harsh and unforgiving. Therefore, truth must function within a broader moral framework that promotes the common good.

The ethical and philosophical implications of a lie-free world reveal the profound complexity of truth in human life. While honesty is universally celebrated as a moral virtue, the complete elimination of lying would raise challenging questions regarding freedom, privacy, moral agency, compassion, and human flourishing. Kantian ethics would largely welcome such a society as a realization of moral duty, whereas utilitarian perspectives might question whether absolute truthfulness always serves the greatest good. Virtue ethics would emphasize that

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

genuine morality requires conscious choice rather than mere incapacity. The Sanatan principle embodied in the injunction "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□" offers a particularly valuable perspective by recognizing that truth must be harmonized with kindness and wisdom. Ultimately, the ethical value of a lie-free world would depend not merely upon the absence of deception but upon humanity's capacity to communicate truth responsibly, preserve human dignity, and promote collective well-being. The highest moral ideal may therefore be neither unrestricted truthfulness nor strategic deception, but the wise and compassionate expression of truth in service of justice, harmony, and human flourishing.

Social Order, Conflict, and Cultural Transformation

While honesty could enhance accountability and reduce manipulation, it could also destabilize social norms built on politeness, discretion, and ambiguity. Many cultural practices depend on indirect communication and face-saving strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The collapse of these norms might increase social friction and erode civility. At a macro level, a lie-free society might initially experience chaos as institutions, relationships, and communication norms undergo radical transformation. Over time, new cultural practices emphasizing empathy, emotional intelligence, and careful truth-telling might emerge. Nonetheless, the transition would likely be turbulent and psychologically demanding. Social order refers to the stable arrangement of institutions, norms, values, roles, and relationships that enable societies to function effectively. It is maintained through a combination of formal mechanisms such as laws, governance, and institutions, and informal mechanisms such as customs, traditions, moral values, and shared beliefs. Human societies depend heavily upon communication and mutual expectations, both of which are influenced by the ways individuals convey information to one another. Since truth and deception are integral components of human interaction, the hypothetical disappearance of humanity's ability to lie would inevitably reshape the foundations of social order. Such a transformation would extend beyond individual behavior and affect social cohesion, conflict resolution, cultural norms, collective identities, and the overall structure of civilization. At first glance, a lie-free society appears likely to become more harmonious and stable. Many social conflicts arise from misunderstandings, betrayals, misinformation, manipulation, and deliberate deception. The elimination of lying could significantly reduce these sources of tension, thereby strengthening trust among individuals and institutions. However, social stability depends not only upon honesty but also upon diplomacy, discretion, tolerance, and the management of differences. Consequently, a society characterized by absolute truthfulness might simultaneously experience greater trust and greater social friction. Understanding this duality is essential for evaluating the broader implications of a lie-free world.

Truth, Trust, and Social Cohesion

Trust is widely recognized as one of the most important foundations of social order. Sociologists have long argued that societies function effectively when individuals believe that others will act predictably and honour their commitments. According to Fukuyama (1995), trust constitutes a form of social capital that facilitates cooperation and reduces the costs associated with monitoring and enforcement. In a world where lying is impossible, interpersonal and institutional trust would likely increase dramatically. Citizens would have greater confidence in public institutions, businesses, educational systems, and community organizations. Individuals would no longer need to constantly evaluate whether others are being truthful, thereby reducing uncertainty in social interactions. Agreements could be formed more easily because participants would know that commitments are genuine. This enhanced trust could strengthen social cohesion by encouraging cooperation across diverse social groups. Communities often struggle with suspicion, prejudice, and misinformation that undermine collective action. Greater transparency could foster a stronger sense of mutual understanding and shared purpose. Social relationships might become more authentic, and collective decision-making processes could become more effective because participants would possess access to more reliable information. At the same time, trust alone does not guarantee social harmony. Human beings differ in their values, interests, beliefs, and aspirations. Even when all parties are truthful, disagreements may persist regarding how society should be organized or what goals should be prioritized. Therefore, the elimination of lying would strengthen one important component of social order but would not eliminate the complexity of social life.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Social Conflict in the Absence of Deception

Conflict is an inevitable feature of human societies. Differences in resources, identities, ideologies, and interests frequently generate disagreements between individuals and groups. Many conflicts are intensified by misinformation, propaganda, and deliberate misrepresentation. Consequently, a lie-free society might initially appear less conflict-prone. Indeed, certain forms of conflict would likely diminish. Political disputes fuelled by false information, interpersonal conflicts based on betrayal, and social tensions arising from rumours and misinformation could become less common. Public debates would be grounded more firmly in factual reality, enabling participants to focus on substantive issues rather than disputing basic facts. However, the absence of deception would not eliminate conflict altogether. In some cases, complete honesty might actually intensify social tensions. Human beings often maintain social harmony by exercising restraint in the expression of opinions and emotions. They avoid unnecessary criticism, soften disagreements, and employ diplomatic language to preserve relationships. If individuals became incapable of concealing negative judgments or unpopular opinions, social interactions could become more confrontational. For example, cultural, religious, and ideological disagreements that are currently moderated through social etiquette might become more visible and direct. Groups that harbour mutual distrust or resentment could express these sentiments openly, potentially increasing social polarization. Thus, while deception often contributes to conflict, certain forms of social stability also depend upon tact and discretion. This observation suggests that conflict arises not merely from falsehood but from the broader challenge of managing diversity within complex societies. A lie-free world would alter the nature of conflict, but it would not eliminate the need for negotiation, compromise, and conflict-resolution mechanisms.

Transformation of Social Norms and Cultural Values

Culture encompasses the shared beliefs, values, customs, practices, and symbols that shape human behaviour. Cultural systems evolve over time in response to historical experiences, technological developments, and changing social conditions. Because communication plays a central role in cultural transmission, the disappearance of lying would likely produce significant cultural transformation. Many cultural norms currently reflect the assumption that individuals possess the capacity for deception. Legal systems, educational practices, professional ethics, and social conventions have developed mechanisms to encourage honesty and discourage dishonesty. If lying became impossible, some of these institutions might require substantial reconfiguration. Educational systems, for example, might devote less attention to preventing cheating and more attention to cultivating emotional intelligence and responsible communication. Cultural expectations regarding authenticity would also change. Contemporary societies often encourage individuals to present idealized versions of themselves in professional, social, and digital contexts. Social media platforms, in particular, have created environments in which carefully curated identities are commonplace. In a lie-free society, such forms of self-presentation would become more constrained, potentially fostering a cultural shift toward greater authenticity and self-acceptance. At the same time, cultural traditions that rely upon symbolic narratives, social rituals, or forms of polite convention might be transformed. Many societies use indirect communication and ritualized expressions to maintain social harmony. The inability to employ certain forms of strategic ambiguity could alter the nature of cultural interaction and social etiquette.

Collective Identity and Community Formation

Collective identities play a crucial role in social organization. Individuals derive meaning and belonging from membership in families, communities, religious groups, nations, and cultural traditions. These identities are often sustained through shared narratives regarding history, values, and collective purpose.

A lie-free society could encourage more accurate and transparent understandings of collective identity. Historical narratives might become less susceptible to distortion for political or ideological purposes. Communities could engage more honestly with their histories, acknowledging both achievements and failures. Such transparency might promote reconciliation and mutual understanding among groups with histories of conflict. However, collective identities are not constructed solely from objective facts. They also involve symbols, myths, traditions, and shared interpretations that provide meaning and social cohesion. Some scholars argue that societies rely

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

upon unifying narratives that simplify complex realities and foster collective solidarity (Anderson, 1983). The elimination of deception would not necessarily eliminate these narratives, but it could encourage greater scrutiny of their foundations and implications. As a result, communities might develop new forms of identity rooted more explicitly in transparency, accountability, and shared ethical commitments.

Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Relations

The effects of a lie-free world would extend beyond individual societies to interactions among cultures. Misunderstandings between cultural groups are often intensified by stereotypes, misinformation, and deliberate misrepresentation. Greater transparency could facilitate intercultural dialogue and reduce prejudice by enabling more accurate understanding of different traditions and perspectives. International cooperation might benefit from increased honesty regarding cultural values, historical grievances, and political objectives. Cross-cultural communication could become more constructive because participants would have greater confidence in the sincerity of one another's statements. Nevertheless, cultural differences would remain. Honest communication may reveal disagreements that were previously obscured by diplomatic language or social convention. Consequently, intercultural relations would continue to require empathy, tolerance, and mutual respect. The absence of deception would improve understanding, but it would not eliminate the challenges associated with cultural diversity.

The Sanatan Perspective on Social Harmony

The ethical challenges associated with social order and cultural transformation find significant guidance in the Sanatan principle: "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □" This teaching recognizes that social harmony requires more than factual truth. Human communities flourish when truth is communicated with sensitivity, compassion, and respect. The verse does not advocate deception; rather, it emphasizes the responsible use of truth in ways that strengthen rather than damage social relationships. In the context of a lie-free society, this principle becomes especially important. Individuals would need to learn how to express truth constructively, balancing honesty with empathy. Social order would depend not merely upon the elimination of lies but upon the cultivation of ethical communication practices that promote understanding and cooperation.

Long-Term Cultural Evolution

Over time, a lie-free society would likely develop new cultural norms and institutions adapted to conditions of radical transparency. Educational systems might place greater emphasis on emotional intelligence, ethical reasoning, and constructive dialogue. Political institutions could become more transparent and accountable. Media systems might focus more on analysis and interpretation than on fact verification. Social norms surrounding privacy, reputation, and interpersonal communication would also evolve. New forms of etiquette would emerge to help individuals navigate the challenges of complete honesty while preserving dignity and social harmony. Cultural evolution would therefore involve not merely the elimination of deception but the creation of new mechanisms for managing truth responsibly. Such transformations would demonstrate the remarkable adaptability of human societies. While the immediate consequences of losing the ability to lie might be disruptive, long-term cultural development could generate innovative ways of balancing transparency with social stability.

The disappearance of humanity's ability to lie would produce profound changes in social order, conflict, and cultural life. Greater honesty could strengthen trust, enhance social cohesion, reduce misinformation, and improve cooperation among individuals and institutions. Communities might become more transparent, accountable, and authentic in their interactions. At the same time, complete honesty could expose underlying disagreements, intensify certain forms of conflict, and challenge existing cultural norms based on diplomacy and discretion. Ultimately, social order depends not solely upon truth but upon the manner in which truth is integrated into human relationships and institutions. The Sanatan ideal of "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□" provides

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

a valuable framework for understanding this balance. A lie-free society would achieve its greatest potential not through truth alone, but through the wise, compassionate, and responsible communication of truth in service of social harmony, justice, and human flourishing.

Potential Benefits of a Lie-Free Society

Despite its challenges, a world without lies offers several potential advantages. Trust could become the default social condition, strengthening cooperation and reducing the need for surveillance, contracts, and legal enforcement (Fukuyama, 1995). Crime involving deception—such as fraud, perjury, and financial scams—would diminish significantly. Education, science, and research could flourish in an environment free from falsified data or academic dishonesty. Social institutions might become more meritocratic, as individuals could no longer misrepresent credentials or achievements. In this sense, truthfulness could promote fairness, accountability, and intellectual integrity. The possibility of a world in which all human beings suddenly lose the ability to lie presents one of the most fascinating thought experiments in social philosophy. While previous sections have explored the psychological, political, economic, cultural, and ethical challenges associated with such a transformation, it is equally important to examine its potential benefits. Throughout history, truth has been celebrated as a foundational virtue in religious traditions, philosophical systems, and moral teachings. Human societies have consistently regarded honesty as essential for trust, justice, and social harmony. The widespread condemnation of deception suggests a collective recognition that truthfulness contributes significantly to individual and societal well-being. A lie-free society would represent a radical departure from the current human condition. Deception, in various forms, permeates nearly every aspect of social life, from personal relationships and commercial transactions to political communication and international diplomacy. If this capacity were suddenly removed, humanity would experience profound disruption. However, beyond the immediate challenges, such a society could also enjoy numerous advantages. Greater trust, stronger institutions, enhanced cooperation, reduced corruption, improved governance, and deeper interpersonal authenticity are among the benefits that might emerge from universal truthfulness. These advantages would not necessarily eliminate all social problems, but they could significantly improve the functioning of human civilization.

Strengthening of Social Trust

Perhaps the most significant benefit of a lie-free society would be the dramatic increase in trust. Trust is the invisible foundation upon which social relationships, institutions, and communities are built. Individuals cooperate with one another because they believe that others will act honestly and fulfill their commitments. According to Fukuyama (1995), trust functions as a form of social capital that enables societies to achieve higher levels of cooperation and economic prosperity. In contemporary society, individuals often invest substantial time and resources in verifying information and protecting themselves from deception. Contracts, audits, legal agreements, surveillance mechanisms, and regulatory systems exist largely because dishonesty is possible. In a world without lies, many of these safeguards could become less necessary. People would interact with greater confidence, reducing suspicion and uncertainty in everyday life. Enhanced trust would also strengthen social cohesion. Communities often suffer from divisions caused by misinformation, betrayal, and manipulation. Universal honesty could encourage greater solidarity and mutual understanding, enabling individuals to collaborate more effectively in pursuit of shared goals.

Improvement in Interpersonal Relationships

Human relationships frequently experience strain because of dishonesty. Romantic partnerships, friendships, family relationships, and professional interactions are often damaged by deception, concealment, and broken promises. Trust, once violated, can be extremely difficult to restore. A lie-free society could significantly improve the quality of interpersonal relationships. Individuals would possess greater confidence in the sincerity of others' words and actions. Romantic relationships would benefit from increased transparency and reduced uncertainty regarding intentions and commitments. Friendships could become more authentic because individuals would no longer need to question one another’s honesty. Families might experience fewer conflicts arising from secrecy and miscommunication. Furthermore, interpersonal communication could become more meaningful. Conversations would be grounded in genuine thoughts and emotions rather than strategic self-presentation.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Although such honesty might occasionally create discomfort, it could also foster deeper emotional intimacy and stronger human connections over the long term.

Reduction of Corruption and Abuse of Power

Corruption remains one of the most persistent obstacles to social and economic development worldwide. Bribery, fraud, embezzlement, favouritism, and misuse of authority often depend upon deception and concealment. Public resources are frequently diverted for private gain because individuals are able to hide unethical behaviour from scrutiny. In a lie-free world, many forms of corruption would become substantially more difficult to sustain. Public officials would be unable to conceal misconduct or provide false explanations for their actions. Transparency would increase across governmental institutions, making accountability more effective. Citizens could evaluate political leaders on the basis of truthful information rather than carefully constructed narratives. The reduction of corruption would yield significant social benefits. Public resources could be allocated more efficiently, institutional trust would increase, and governments could focus more effectively on addressing social challenges. The overall quality of governance would likely improve as honesty became an unavoidable feature of public administration.

Enhancement of Democratic Governance

Democratic systems depend upon informed citizens and transparent institutions. Elections, public deliberation, and policy debates require access to accurate information. When political actors engage in deception, democratic processes become vulnerable to manipulation and public trust declines. A lie-free society could strengthen democracy by ensuring that political communication remains truthful. Election campaigns would focus more on genuine policy differences rather than misleading rhetoric or misinformation. Citizens would be better equipped to evaluate candidates and make informed decisions regarding public affairs. Government accountability would also improve. Political leaders would be unable to misrepresent policy outcomes, conceal failures, or provide false justifications for controversial decisions. As a result, democratic institutions could become more responsive and trustworthy. Public discourse would be grounded in factual reality, creating conditions more conducive to rational deliberation and collective problem-solving.

Greater Economic Efficiency

Economic activity relies heavily upon information. Consumers make purchasing decisions based on product descriptions, investors evaluate opportunities using financial reports, and businesses negotiate contracts based on mutual expectations. Deception introduces inefficiencies into these processes by creating uncertainty and increasing transaction costs. A lie-free economy would benefit from improved informational accuracy. Consumers could trust advertising claims, investors would receive reliable financial data, and employers could make hiring decisions based on truthful representations of qualifications and experience. Markets would function more efficiently because participants would possess greater confidence in the information available to them. The reduction of fraud and financial misconduct could also enhance economic stability. Corporate scandals, investment frauds, and deceptive business practices often impose substantial costs on society. By eliminating many forms of dishonesty, a lie-free society could create a more transparent and resilient economic system.

Improvement of Journalism and Information Quality

The modern information environment is frequently disrupted by misinformation, disinformation, propaganda, and fabricated news. These phenomena distort public understanding and undermine trust in media institutions. Citizens often struggle to distinguish reliable information from deceptive content, creating confusion and polarization. In a lie-free society, the quality of information would improve significantly. Journalists would receive more accurate information from sources, and deliberate misinformation campaigns would become impossible. Media organizations could devote greater attention to analysis and interpretation rather than fact-checking and verification. The resulting information ecosystem would support more informed public discourse. Citizens would have greater confidence in the reliability of news and public communication, thereby strengthening democratic participation and civic engagement. Accurate information is essential for addressing

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

collective challenges, and a lie-free society would provide a stronger foundation for evidence-based decision-making.

Promotion of Ethical Conduct

Universal truthfulness could encourage a broader culture of ethical behaviour. Honesty is often regarded as a cornerstone of moral character because it reflects integrity, responsibility, and respect for others. When individuals know that deception is impossible, they may become more conscious of the ethical implications of their actions. Social norms would likely evolve to place greater emphasis on accountability and authenticity. Institutions could operate with increased transparency, and individuals might become more willing to accept responsibility for mistakes and shortcomings. Ethical decision-making could become more consistent because people would no longer be able to conceal unethical behaviour through deception. Such developments could contribute to the creation of a more morally responsible society in which trust and integrity serve as guiding principles for both personal and institutional conduct.

Advancement of Justice and Rule of Law

The administration of justice depends fundamentally upon truthful information. Courts, law enforcement agencies, and legal institutions must determine facts accurately in order to resolve disputes and protect rights. False testimony, fabricated evidence, and deceptive legal strategies frequently obstruct the pursuit of justice. A lie-free society would significantly enhance the effectiveness of legal systems. Witnesses would provide truthful testimony, investigations would become more reliable, and judicial decisions could be based on more accurate information. Wrongful convictions resulting from perjury or fabricated evidence would likely decrease, while accountability for criminal behaviour would improve. The rule of law would be strengthened because legal institutions could function with greater confidence in the reliability of information. Citizens might develop increased trust in judicial processes, thereby reinforcing the legitimacy of legal systems and social institutions.

The Sanatan Vision of Truth and Social Welfare

The potential benefits of a lie-free society resonate deeply with the Sanatan understanding of truth as a moral and social ideal. The ancient injunction, "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □" emphasizes that truth should be spoken, but it should be expressed with kindness, wisdom, and concern for others. This teaching recognizes that truth possesses transformative power when guided by ethical responsibility. A lie-free society would realize many of the benefits associated with truthfulness, including trust, justice, transparency, and accountability. However, the verse reminds us that truth alone is insufficient. Social welfare depends upon the compassionate and constructive communication of truth. The highest form of social harmony emerges when honesty is combined with empathy and respect for human dignity.

The potential benefits of a lie-free society are substantial and far-reaching. Enhanced trust, stronger relationships, reduced corruption, improved governance, greater economic efficiency, higher-quality information, more ethical conduct, and a stronger system of justice all represent significant advantages. Such a society would enjoy levels of transparency and accountability rarely achieved in human history.

Nevertheless, these benefits would not emerge automatically. The absence of deception would need to be accompanied by the development of new cultural norms, communication practices, and ethical frameworks capable of managing the challenges of radical honesty. The Sanatan ideal of "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□" provides valuable guidance in this regard, emphasizing that truth should serve the welfare of individuals and society alike. Ultimately, a lie-free world could bring humanity closer to ideals of justice, trust, and authenticity. Its success, however, would depend not merely upon the elimination of falsehood but upon the cultivation of wisdom, compassion, and moral responsibility in the communication of truth.

Critical Evaluation: Utopia or Dystopia

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

While radical honesty might appear morally appealing, this study argues that an absolute inability to lie would not necessarily create a utopian society. Human social life depends not only on truth but also on empathy, discretion, and contextual sensitivity (Bok, 1978). Truth without compassion could become cruelty; transparency without privacy could become oppression. Lying, though morally problematic, sometimes functions as a social lubricant that prevents unnecessary harm and maintains relational stability. The complete eradication of deception might expose individuals and institutions to emotional overload, political vulnerability, and social fragmentation. Thus, the moral challenge lies not in eliminating lies entirely, but in cultivating responsible truthfulness guided by ethical judgment. The thought experiment of a world in which all human beings suddenly lose the ability to lie raises one of the most profound questions in social philosophy, ethics, and human psychology: Would such a society become a utopia characterized by truth, trust, and justice, or would it evolve into a dystopia marked by emotional distress, social rigidity, and loss of personal freedom? Throughout this study, the potential consequences of a lie-free society have been examined from multiple perspectives, including interpersonal relationships, psychological well-being, political governance, economic systems, media ecosystems, ethical principles, and cultural transformation. The findings reveal that the implications of universal truthfulness are neither entirely positive nor entirely negative. Rather, they expose the complex and often paradoxical role that deception plays in human life. The concept of utopia traditionally refers to an ideal society characterized by harmony, justice, equality, and collective well-being. Conversely, a dystopia describes a society in which conditions become oppressive, dysfunctional, or detrimental to human flourishing. Determining whether a lie-free society would belong to either category requires a careful evaluation of both its benefits and its limitations. Such an assessment must move beyond simplistic assumptions that truth is always beneficial and deception is always harmful. Human societies are complex systems in which moral ideals often interact with practical realities in unexpected ways.

The Utopian Promise of Universal Truthfulness

The strongest argument in favour of a lie-free society lies in its potential to establish unprecedented levels of trust. Trust is indispensable for social cooperation, economic exchange, political legitimacy, and interpersonal relationships. Many of the most serious social problems confronting contemporary societies arise from deception in various forms, including corruption, fraud, propaganda, manipulation, and betrayal. If lying became impossible, these problems could be significantly reduced. From a political perspective, universal truthfulness could strengthen democratic governance. Citizens would have access to accurate information, enabling them to make informed decisions regarding public affairs. Political leaders would be unable to manipulate public opinion through false promises or misleading narratives. Transparency and accountability would become defining features of government, potentially reducing corruption and increasing institutional legitimacy. Economic systems would also benefit from increased honesty. Markets depend upon reliable information, and many economic inefficiencies arise from information asymmetry and deception. Consumers, investors, and businesses could make decisions with greater confidence if all participants communicated truthfully. Corporate scandals, financial fraud, and deceptive marketing practices would decline, contributing to greater economic stability and efficiency. Similarly, journalism and media institutions could regain public trust. The contemporary information environment is often distorted by misinformation, disinformation, and sensationalism. A lie-free society would eliminate many of these challenges, creating conditions for more informed public discourse and stronger democratic participation. On a personal level, interpersonal relationships could become more authentic and meaningful. Friendships, marriages, and family relationships would be built upon genuine honesty rather than suspicion and uncertainty. Individuals would possess greater confidence in the sincerity of others, fostering deeper emotional connections and stronger social bonds. From this perspective, a lie-free world appears to embody many characteristics associated with utopian ideals. It promises transparency, justice, trust, and authenticity—values that have been celebrated throughout human history as essential components of a good society.

The Dystopian Risks of Radical Honesty

Despite these advantages, the elimination of lying also raises serious concerns regarding human well-being. One of the most significant challenges involves the psychological burden of absolute honesty. Human beings do not

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

merely communicate facts; they continuously manage emotions, relationships, and social expectations. Many forms of communication involve discretion, tact, and selective disclosure rather than straightforward factual reporting. A world without lies could expose individuals to constant emotional vulnerability. People often refrain from expressing every negative thought or judgment because doing so may unnecessarily harm others. Social harmony frequently depends upon the ability to moderate communication and protect feelings. If individuals became incapable of concealing unpleasant truths, interpersonal relationships might become more fragile and conflict-prone. The psychological consequences could be equally profound. Research suggests that certain forms of self-deception contribute positively to mental health by supporting optimism, resilience, and self-confidence (Taylor & Brown, 1988). Human beings frequently rely upon positive illusions to cope with uncertainty and adversity. A society characterized by relentless truthfulness might weaken these psychological resources, increasing anxiety, self-criticism, and emotional distress. Privacy represents another important concern. Personal autonomy depends in part upon the ability to control the disclosure of information. Individuals possess thoughts, memories, and experiences that they may prefer to keep private. While privacy does not necessarily require deception, the inability to lie could make it more difficult to protect personal boundaries. Such conditions might create a sense of constant exposure and diminish individual freedom. These concerns suggest that a lie-free society could exhibit certain dystopian characteristics. Although it might eliminate deception, it could simultaneously create new forms of psychological and social discomfort.

The Paradox of Human Communication

A critical evaluation of this thought experiment reveals an important paradox: human communication serves multiple functions beyond the transmission of factual information. Language is not merely a vehicle for truth; it is also a tool for maintaining relationships, expressing emotions, negotiating conflicts, preserving dignity, and fostering cooperation. Sociologists and communication theorists have demonstrated that social interaction depends upon complex systems of etiquette, politeness, and impression management (Goffman, 1959). Individuals routinely adjust their communication according to context, audience, and social expectations. Such adjustments do not always constitute malicious deception; rather, they often reflect empathy and social intelligence. For example, expressions of encouragement, reassurance, or courtesy frequently involve selective emphasis rather than complete disclosure. A friend may offer supportive words during a difficult period despite privately harbouring doubts. A teacher may encourage a struggling student to maintain motivation. A physician may communicate difficult information gradually to protect a patient's emotional well-being. These practices illustrate that human communication often balances truth with compassion. The elimination of lying would not eliminate the need for such balancing. Instead, it would require societies to develop alternative mechanisms for preserving social harmony while maintaining honesty. This challenge highlights the limitations of viewing truthfulness as a simple solution to complex human problems.

The Sanatan Perspective: Beyond the Utopia–Dystopia Dichotomy:

The debate between utopia and dystopia finds a particularly insightful resolution in the Sanatan tradition. The well-known ethical injunction, "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □" provides a nuanced perspective that transcends simplistic binaries. The verse does not advocate deception, nor does it endorse harsh truthfulness devoid of compassion. Instead, it emphasizes the harmonious integration of truth, kindness, and moral responsibility. This principle recognizes that truth possesses ethical value only when communicated in ways that promote human welfare. Truth expressed without empathy can become destructive, while pleasant falsehoods can undermine trust and integrity. The ideal society is therefore neither one in which individuals lie freely nor one in which truth is communicated without consideration for its consequences. Rather, it is a society in which truth and compassion coexist. From this perspective, the question is not whether a lie-free society would be utopian or dystopian. The more important question concerns the ethical and cultural capacities that would accompany universal truthfulness. If individuals developed sufficient wisdom, empathy, and emotional intelligence, the benefits of truth could be realized without producing unnecessary suffering. Without such virtues, however, even a truthful society could become socially and psychologically challenging.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

A Balanced Assessment

A comprehensive evaluation suggests that a lie-free society would likely occupy a position between utopia and dystopia. It would eliminate many of the harms associated with deception, including corruption, fraud, misinformation, and betrayal. Trust would increase, institutions would become more transparent, and public discourse could become more rational and constructive. At the same time, the disappearance of lying would not eliminate conflict, suffering, or moral complexity. Human beings would continue to experience differences in values, interests, and perspectives. Psychological vulnerabilities, emotional sensitivities, and the need for privacy would remain significant aspects of human existence. The challenges of social life would therefore persist, albeit in altered forms. The success of such a society would depend largely upon its ability to cultivate complementary virtues such as compassion, tolerance, patience, and wisdom. Truth alone cannot guarantee justice, happiness, or social harmony. These outcomes require broader ethical frameworks capable of guiding human behavior in complex and often unpredictable circumstances.

The hypothetical disappearance of humanity's ability to lie presents both extraordinary opportunities and significant risks. On one hand, it promises greater trust, transparency, accountability, and authenticity across social, political, economic, and cultural domains. On the other hand, it raises concerns regarding emotional well-being, privacy, interpersonal conflict, and the preservation of human dignity. A critical examination reveals that a lie-free society would be neither a perfect utopia nor an inevitable dystopia. Instead, it would represent a fundamentally different social order in which longstanding human challenges would manifest in new ways. The ultimate character of such a society would depend not merely upon the absence of deception but upon the presence of ethical wisdom and compassionate communication. The enduring relevance of the Sanatan principle—"□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□"—lies in its recognition that truth and kindness are not opposing values but complementary necessities. A truly flourishing society is not one that simply eliminates lies; it is one that learns to communicate truth in ways that uphold justice, preserve dignity, strengthen relationships, and promote the collective good. In this sense, the future of a lie-free world would be determined not by truth alone, but by the moral maturity with which humanity chooses to live by it.

CONCLUSION

This critical study suggests that if humans suddenly lost the ability to lie, society would undergo profound and contradictory transformations. While transparency could reduce corruption, enhance trust, and improve institutional accountability, it could also destabilize relationships, strain psychological resilience, and complicate governance. Rather than envisioning a lie-free world as inherently ideal, this paper concludes that a balanced ethical framework—one that promotes honesty while recognizing the human need for compassion, privacy, and discretion—is more conducive to social well-being. Truth is essential for justice and trust, but its power must be guided by wisdom and empathy. The thought experiment of a world in which all human beings suddenly lose the ability to lie offers a powerful lens through which to examine the nature of truth, morality, social order, and human existence. Although hypothetical, this scenario invites critical reflection on some of the most fundamental questions concerning human behavior and civilization. Why do people lie? What functions does deception serve in individual and collective life? Would society become more just and harmonious if lying were impossible? Or does human flourishing require a more complex balance between truth, discretion, empathy, and moral judgment? The exploration of these questions throughout this study demonstrates that the consequences of a lie-free world would be profound, multidimensional, and often paradoxical.

The analysis began by examining the role of lying in human society. Deception has existed throughout recorded history and appears in every known culture. While lying is generally condemned as a moral failing, it also performs certain social, psychological, and strategic functions. Individuals lie to protect themselves, avoid punishment, preserve relationships, maintain privacy, gain advantages, and sometimes to shield others from harm. Political institutions, economic systems, media organizations, and cultural structures have all developed mechanisms to regulate and respond to deception because the possibility of lying is deeply embedded in social life. Consequently, the sudden disappearance of lying would not merely alter communication; it would transform the foundations upon which modern societies operate. The study further revealed that interpersonal relationships

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

would undergo significant changes in a lie-free society. Trust, which forms the basis of meaningful human relationships, would likely increase substantially. Friendships, marriages, family relationships, and professional interactions could become more transparent and authentic. Individuals would no longer need to question the sincerity of others or worry about hidden motives and deliberate misrepresentations. Such changes could strengthen emotional intimacy and promote deeper mutual understanding. However, the analysis also demonstrated that relationships depend not only on honesty but also on tact, empathy, and emotional sensitivity. Human beings often employ selective disclosure and diplomatic communication to preserve harmony and protect feelings. Therefore, the elimination of lying could simultaneously enhance authenticity and create new interpersonal challenges.

The psychological dimension of a lie-free world proved equally complex. On one hand, greater honesty could reduce cognitive dissonance, strengthen personal integrity, and encourage self-awareness. Individuals would no longer experience the mental burden associated with maintaining falsehoods or concealing contradictory identities. On the other hand, the inability to lie could increase emotional vulnerability and psychological stress. Human beings frequently use self-enhancing narratives and optimistic interpretations to cope with adversity and uncertainty. The loss of such mechanisms might expose individuals to harsh realities without the protective buffer provided by certain forms of self-deception. Consequently, psychological well-being in a lie-free society would depend heavily upon emotional resilience and adaptive coping strategies. The political implications of universal truthfulness were found to be particularly significant. Modern political systems rely upon communication, persuasion, negotiation, and public trust. The elimination of deception could strengthen democratic governance by reducing corruption, propaganda, and misinformation. Citizens would gain access to more accurate information, enabling them to make informed political decisions. Governments would become more transparent and accountable, and public trust in institutions might increase substantially. Nevertheless, political leadership involves more than the communication of facts. Effective governance often requires diplomacy, strategic planning, and the management of complex social realities. Thus, while truthfulness could improve political integrity, it would not eliminate the challenges associated with leadership and public administration. The economic consequences of a lie-free world would likewise be transformative. Markets depend upon trust, and many economic inefficiencies arise from information asymmetry, fraud, and deceptive business practices. Greater honesty could enhance market efficiency, improve consumer confidence, strengthen corporate governance, and reduce financial misconduct. Businesses and investors would benefit from more reliable information, and regulatory burdens associated with fraud prevention could decrease. Yet economic systems also depend upon innovation, strategic competition, and the management of uncertainty. Therefore, while transparency would offer significant advantages, economic actors would still need to navigate complex and evolving market environments. The study also examined the implications for media, journalism, and information ecosystems. In an era characterized by misinformation, disinformation, and digital manipulation, the inability to lie would appear highly beneficial. Fake news, propaganda campaigns, and many forms of informational deception could disappear, leading to greater public trust in information sources. Journalism might regain its role as a highly credible institution dedicated to informing citizens and promoting accountability. However, the analysis emphasized that information involves more than factual accuracy. Interpretation, framing, editorial judgment, and ideological perspectives would continue to shape public discourse. Thus, while truthfulness would improve the quality of information, critical thinking and media literacy would remain essential.

The ethical and philosophical dimensions of the thought experiment revealed some of its deepest complexities. Philosophers such as Immanuel Kant regarded truthfulness as an absolute moral duty, while utilitarian thinkers evaluated honesty according to its consequences. Virtue ethics emphasized the importance of character and moral choice. These perspectives illustrate that the ethical value of truth cannot be understood in isolation from broader questions concerning human welfare, autonomy, and moral responsibility. A lie-free society would undoubtedly reduce many forms of wrongdoing, yet it would also challenge conventional understandings of virtue and moral agency. If individuals become incapable of lying, honesty may cease to be a voluntary moral achievement and instead become an unavoidable condition of existence. The discussion of social order, conflict, and cultural transformation demonstrated that universal truthfulness would reshape collective life in fundamental ways. Increased honesty could strengthen social cohesion, reduce mistrust, and encourage more authentic forms of community. At the same time, the absence of deception would not eliminate disagreement, competition, or

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

cultural diversity. Human beings would continue to hold different values, beliefs, and aspirations. Social conflicts arising from genuine differences of perspective would remain a feature of human society. Consequently, social harmony would continue to require dialogue, tolerance, compromise, and mutual respect. One of the most important findings of this study concerns the distinction between truth and wisdom. Throughout the analysis, it became increasingly clear that truth alone cannot solve all human problems. While dishonesty often contributes to injustice and social dysfunction, honesty without compassion can also cause harm. This insight is captured profoundly in the ancient Sanatan principle: "□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □"-"Speak the truth; speak it pleasantly. Do not speak unpleasant truth. Do not speak pleasant falsehood. This is the eternal Dharma." This teaching provides a remarkably balanced framework for understanding the role of truth in human life. It neither endorses deception nor promotes harsh and insensitive honesty. Instead, it advocates a synthesis of truthfulness and compassion, recognizing that ethical communication requires both accuracy and benevolence. The verse anticipates many of the challenges identified throughout this study and offers guidance that remains relevant in contemporary discussions of ethics, communication, and social responsibility.

The critical evaluation presented in the previous chapter ultimately demonstrated that a lie-free society would be neither a perfect utopia nor an inevitable dystopia. It would eliminate many of the harms associated with deception, including corruption, fraud, misinformation, and betrayal. Trust, transparency, and accountability would increase across multiple domains of social life. Yet new challenges would emerge concerning privacy, emotional well-being, interpersonal sensitivity, and the management of social differences. The quality of such a society would therefore depend not merely upon the absence of lies but upon the presence of complementary virtues such as empathy, wisdom, patience, tolerance, and moral responsibility. In conclusion, the hypothetical disappearance of humanity's ability to lie reveals a fundamental truth about the human condition: social progress depends not solely upon truthfulness but upon the ethical use of truth. Honesty is indispensable for justice, trust, and authentic relationships, yet it must be guided by compassion and wisdom if it is to contribute meaningfully to human flourishing. The most desirable society is not one that simply eliminates deception through some external transformation; rather, it is one in which individuals consciously choose honesty while simultaneously respecting the dignity, emotions, and well-being of others. Such a society embodies the highest aspirations of both moral philosophy and spiritual wisdom. Therefore, the ultimate lesson of this thought experiment is not that humanity should seek a world where lying becomes impossible. Rather, it is that humanity should strive to cultivate a culture in which truth is valued, communicated responsibly, and integrated with ethical concern for the common good. Only then can truth fulfill its highest purpose as a force for justice, harmony, and the advancement of human civilization.

REFERENCES

1. Akerlof, G. A. (1970). The market for "lemons": Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 84(3), 488–500.
2. Anderson, B. (1983). Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. Verso.
3. Aquinas, T. (1947). Summa Theologica (Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Trans.). Benziger Brothers. (Original work published 1265–1274)
4. Arendt, H. (1972). Crises of the Republic. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
5. Aristotle. (2009). Nicomachean Ethics (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
6. Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong. Psychological Bulletin, 117(3), 497–529.
7. Berlin, I. (1969). Four Essays on Liberty. Oxford University Press.
8. Bok, S. (1978). Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life. Pantheon Books.
9. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press.
10. Dahl, R. A. (1989). Democracy and Its Critics. Yale University Press.
11. DePaulo, B. M., Kashy, D. A., Kirkendol, S. E., Wyer, M. M., & Epstein, J. A. (1996). Lying in everyday life. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70(5), 979–995.
12. Denton, R. E., & Woodward, G. C. (1998). Political Communication in America (3rd ed.). Praeger.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

13. Durkheim, E. (1984). The Division of Labor in Society (W. D. Halls, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1893)
14. Easton, D. (1965). A Systems Analysis of Political Life. Wiley.
15. Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51–58.
16. Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and Crisis. Norton.
17. Fukuyama, F. (1995). Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity. Free Press.
18. Gandhi, M. K. (1927). An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth. Navajivan Publishing House.
19. Giddens, A. (1990). The Consequences of Modernity. Stanford University Press.
20. Goffman, E. (1959). The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Anchor Books.
21. Habermas, J. (1984). The Theory of Communicative Action: Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Beacon Press.
22. Held, D. (2006). Models of Democracy (3rd ed.). Stanford University Press.
23. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), 305–360.
24. Kant, I. (1996). The Metaphysics of Morals (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1797)
25. Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2021). The Elements of Journalism (4th ed.). Crown Publishing Group.
26. Locke, J. (1988). Two Treatises of Government (P. Laslett, Ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1689)
27. Manusmriti. (2005). The Laws of Manu (G. Bühler, Trans.). Low Price Publications. (Original work composed circa 2nd century BCE–3rd century CE)
28. McNair, B. (2017). An Introduction to Political Communication (6th ed.). Routledge.
29. McQuail, D. (2010). McQuail's Mass Communication Theory (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
30. Mill, J. S. (2001). Utilitarianism. Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work published 1863)
31. Newman, N., Fletcher, R., Robertson, C. T., Eddy, K., & Nielsen, R. K. (2023). Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2023. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, University of Oxford.
32. Nye, J. S. (2008). The Powers to Lead. Oxford University Press.
33. O'Neill, O. (2002). A Question of Trust: The BBC Reith Lectures 2002. Cambridge University Press.
34. Porter, M. E. (1985). Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance. Free Press.
35. Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. Simon & Schuster.
36. Rawls, J. (1999). A Theory of Justice (Revised ed.). Harvard University Press.
37. Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M. P. (1985). Trust in close relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49(1), 95–112.
38. Rogers, C. R. (1961). On Becoming a Person. Houghton Mifflin.
39. Rosanvallon, P. (2008). Counter-Democracy: Politics in an Age of Distrust. Cambridge University Press.
40. Rousseau, J.-J. (1997). The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings (V. Gourevitch, Ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1762)
41. Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. Harper & Brothers.
42. Simmel, G. (1906). The sociology of secrecy and of secret societies. American Journal of Sociology, 11(4), 441–498.
43. Simmel, G. (1950). The Sociology of Georg Simmel (K. H. Wolff, Trans.). Free Press.
44. Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). Information and the change in the paradigm in economics. American Economic Review, 92(3), 460–501.
45. Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). Transparency in government. In R. Islam (Ed.), The Right to Tell: The Role of Mass Media in Economic Development (pp. 27–44). World Bank.
46. Talwar, V., & Lee, K. (2008). Social and cognitive correlates of children's lying behavior. Child Development, 79(4), 866–881.
47. Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. Psychological Bulletin, 103(2), 193–210.
48. Trivers, R. (2011). The Folly of Fools: The Logic of Deceit and Self-Deception in Human Life. Basic Books.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

49. Upanishads. (1996). The Principal Upanishads (S. Radhakrishnan, Trans.). HarperCollins.
50. Vrij, A. (2008). Detecting Lies and Deceit: Pitfalls and Opportunities. Wiley.
51. Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information Disorder: Toward an Interdisciplinary Framework for Research and Policymaking. Council of Europe.
52. Warren, M. E. (Ed.). (1999). Democracy and Trust. Cambridge University Press.
53. Weber, M. (1946). Politics as a vocation. In H. H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds.), From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (pp. 77–128). Oxford University Press.
54. Westin, A. F. (1967). Privacy and Freedom. Atheneum.
55. Williamson, O. E. (1985). The Economic Institutions of Capitalism. Free Press.