

Presentation and Discussion Paper

Jehovah's Witnesses: Perverting the Course of Justice by 'theocratic warfare'

As presented by Steven Unthank¹

**to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse
and the Australian Federal Police**

Radisson Hotel, Melbourne, Victoria

27 February 2015

DISCUSSION: The 'Theocratic Warfare' policy and doctrinal teaching of Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of Australia Ltd and the Church of Jehovah's Witnesses and its relationship to Australian criminal and corporate laws.

Perverting the course of justice by 'theocratic warfare'

"It is proper to misdirect the enemy [the police and courts] by hiding the truth."

"For the purpose of protecting the interests of God's cause, it is proper to hide the truth."
—policies issued by Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of Australia

Perverting the course of justice is a common law criminal offence within Australia in which a person prevents justice from being served on themselves or on another party. Perverting the course of justice, or attempting to pervert the course of justice, can include fabricating or disposing of evidence, and intimidating or threatening a witness.

In the context of Australian criminal law 'theocratic warfare' has the intention and objective of promoting, encouraging and facilitating the criminal acts of perverting the course of justice and perjury if such acts will further the religious objectives of the administrative management corporation for the faith group known as Jehovah's Witnesses.

¹ Steven Unthank was invited by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse to discuss and present information on the following specific subjects as chosen by the commission:

- Understanding of the structure of Watchtower Bible and Tract Society in Australia;
- Understanding of the structure of Watchtower Bible and Tract Society in New York;
- Understanding of Jehovah's Witnesses theocratic doctrines (a. two witness rule, b. theocratic war doctrine, c. treatment of child sexual abuse as a sin rather than a criminal offence, d. discouragement from reporting child sexual abuse to police); and
- The role of Judicial and Appeals Committees in dealing with allegations of child sexual abuse; and Destruction of documents within Jehovah's Witnesses.

Within the faith group of Jehovah's Witnesses 'theocratic warfare' (a.k.a 'hiding the truth') is a doctrinal teaching emanating from the worldwide Governing Body of Jehovah's Witnesses, comprising the following individuals:

- Mr. Samuel Herd
- Mr. Geoffrey Jackson
- Mr. M. Stephen Lett
- Mr. Gerrit Losch
- Mr. Anthony Morris III
- Mr. Mark Sanderson
- Mr. David H. Splane

In relation to Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of Australia corporation ("Watchtower") theocratic warfare is part of the corporate culture that exists for the purpose of perverting the course of justice. Theocratic warfare is the attitude, policy, rule, course of conduct and practice existing within the Watchtower corporation generally when dealing with statutory authorities, the legal system, and investigatory bodies. This corporate culture—including the policies and procedures developed to support it—exists and operates in breach of the *Corporations Act 2001*.

In its present format the theocratic warfare policy is specifically used to protect the image of the Watchtower corporation and the trading name "Jehovah's Witnesses" in relation to child abuse allegations and other alleged criminal activities.

Some of the written policies or guidelines used are as follows:

"No harm is practiced, however, by withholding incriminating information from one who is not entitled to know." – *Watchtower policy w54 10/1*

"It is proper to misdirect the enemy [the authorities, police, or courts] by hiding the truth. It is done unselfishly; it does not harm anyone; on the contrary it does much good ... At all times [we] must be very careful not to divulge any information to the enemy." – *Watchtower policy w57 5/1*

"We must tell the truth to one who is entitled to know, but if one is not entitled we may be evasive ... for the purpose of protecting the interests of God's cause, it is proper to hide the truth from God's enemies." – *Watchtower policy w60 6/1*

"Lying generally involves saying something false to a person who is entitled to know the truth and doing so with the intent to deceive or to injure him or another person. ... While malicious lying is definitely condemned in the Bible, this does not mean that a person is under obligation to divulge truthful information to people who are not entitled to it. Jesus Christ counselled: "Do not give what is holy to dogs, neither throw your pearls before swine, that they may never trample them under their feet and turn around and rip you open." That is why Jesus on certain occasions refrained from giving full information or direct answers to certain questions when doing so could have brought unnecessary harm. Evidently the course of Abraham, Isaac, Rahab, and Elisha in misdirecting or in withholding full facts from nonworshippers of Jehovah must be viewed in the same light." – *Watchtower policy it2 244-245*

"Does being truthful with others mean that we must disclose every detail to whoever asks a question? Not necessarily ... Jehovah's people need to be on guard against apostates and other wicked men who use trickery or cunning for selfish purposes." – *Watchtower policy guideline w09 6/15*

The following policy and instructions are used by the Watchtower corporation to put pressure on members of the faith of Jehovah's Witnesses who work within hospitals, the courts, or as public servants to unlawfully access confidential records, when instructed to, for the express purpose of handing them over to Watchtower's representatives. The information obtained and used is not for the benefit of the owner of the records. The information unlawfully obtained is primarily used to intimidate, harass, blackmail, and threaten members of the faith of Jehovah's Witnesses. The following procedures are in direct violation of the Commonwealth *Privacy Act 1988* and the Australian Privacy Principles, in addition to state legislation such as the Victorian *Health Records Act 2001*:

"True, it is illegal in many countries to disclose to unauthorized ones what is found in private records. But if a Christian feels, after prayerful consideration, that he is facing a situation where the law of God required him to report what he knew despite the demands of lesser authorities, then that is a responsibility he accepts ... Employers have a right to expect that their Christian employees will 'exhibit good fidelity to the full,' including observing rules on confidentiality. If an oath is taken, it should not be taken lightly. An oath makes a promise more solemn and binding. And where the law reinforces a requirement on confidentiality, the matter becomes still more serious ... We cannot ignore Caesar's law or the seriousness of an oath, but Jehovah's law is supreme." – *Watchtower policy w87 9/1*

In relation to lay members of the faith of Jehovah's Witnesses who may object to engaging in any unlawful activity on behalf of Watchtower corporation the following is read out to them or provided to them in printed form in a book:

"BE OBEDIENT TO THOSE WHO ARE TAKING THE LEAD – This organizational arrangement calls for each of us to be obedient and submissive ... Some obey when they agree with the direction coming from those taking the lead but refuse to submit when they disagree with the direction or cannot see the reason for it. Keep in mind, though, that being submissive can include the idea that we obey even when we are not inclined to do so. Each of us, then, does well to ask himself, 'Am I obedient and submissive to those taking the lead over me?' ... The Governing Body [of Jehovah's Witnesses] obeys this direction by putting in place various helpful procedures and guidelines that ensure the smooth and orderly operation of the congregation. Responsible Christian men do their part by setting an example of obedience as they put such arrangements into effect. They also show themselves "reasonable, ready to obey" those placed in oversight. ... Why a disobedient spirit is harmful. It may cause those in positions of responsibility to do their work "with sighing." What should be considered a privilege of sacred service can feel like a burden when a brother must deal with an uncooperative, rebellious spirit in the flock. In turn, damage results "to you," the entire congregation. Of course, there is yet another form of damage that results when a person refuses to submit to theocratic order. It hurts his spirituality if he is too proud to submit ... Let us all, then, be determined to remain obedient and submissive." – *Watchtower reference Iv-E 48-9*

In relation to elders (ministers of religion in control of a congregation) of the faith of Jehovah's Witnesses, who may object to engaging in any unlawful activity on behalf of Watchtower corporation, the following instruction was provided directly to them in 2013:

"The direction that you receive from Jehovah's organization [i.e. Watchtower corporation] may seem strange or unusual. But all of us must be ready to obey any instructions we may receive, whether we agree with them or not." – *Watchtower reference ws13 11/15*

In September 2010 the Economics Legislation Committee of the Australian Senate produced a well considered report on the *Tax Laws Amendment (Public Benefit Test) Bill 2010*. The Committee members arrived at an interesting finding relevant to abuses perpetrated by cultic groups. They felt that ‘sufficient evidence’ had been put before them to suggest that the behaviour of cults should be reviewed with a view to developing and implementing a policy on this issue that goes beyond taxation law. As a consequence, the Committee recommended the Attorney-General’s Department:

“Provide a report to the Committee on the operation of Miviludes [Mission interministérielle de vigilance et de lutte contre les dérives sectaires - the official French cult-watch organisation] and other law enforcement agencies overseas tasked with monitoring and controlling the unacceptable and/or illegal activities of cult-like organisations who use psychological pressure and breaches of general and industrial law to maintain control over individuals. The report should advise on the effectiveness of Miviludes and other similar organisations, given issues that need to be addressed to develop an international best practice approach for dealing with cult-like behaviour. (Recommendation 2)”

The opening line of the government’s response to Recommendation 2 is worth highlighting:

“The Government recognises the financial, psychological and emotional impact that the activities of cult-like organisations can have on individuals and their families and considers that religious observance should not be regarded as a shield behind which breaches of the law can be hidden.”

The Government also noted in its response that:

“it is not the Government’s role to interfere with the religious beliefs or practices of individuals, unless they are in breach of Australian laws.”

The Watchtower corporation is currently hiding behind the shield of the faith group of Jehovah’s Witnesses while it engages in breaches of Australian laws. Take for example the persecution of whistleblowers, especially those members of the Jehovah’s Witnesses who go public or go to the authorities with allegations of criminal child abuse. These individuals are targeted and persecuted beyond belief. Ironically the primary definition of “persecution” as published by Watchtower in the Jehovah’s Witnesses encyclopedia states:

“PERSECUTION: Harassment or injury that is deliberately inflicted on persons because of social status, racial origin, or religious faith and beliefs, the purpose in the latter instance being to stamp out such beliefs and prevent their spread among new converts.

“...Persecution takes various forms. It may be limited to verbal abuse, ridicule, and insults, or it may include economic pressures, bodily injury, imprisonment, hatred, and even death. It may be promoted by religious authorities, or it may be carried out by uninformed persons and ignorant ones or by unreasoning, fanatical mobs. But often these parties are only the agents of more powerful and sinister instigators—unseen wicked spirit forces.

“...Other sources of persecution may be former associates or friends and neighbors of one’s hometown. Jesus said that close blood relatives, members of one’s own household, would sometimes become rabid persecutors of those believing in him.

“The principal human instigators of religious persecution, however, have been the promoters of false religion ... the objectives always seemed to be the same, namely ... suppression.”

When the objective of suppression and acts of aggressive intimidation fail, such as in trying to silencing child abuse victims or their family, it is then a very fine line to cross into actually engaging in acts of terrorism.

The Commonwealth *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Part 5.3) and the Victorian *Terrorism (Community Protection) Act 2003* defines a religiously motivated terrorist act in its most basic form as:

“... an action or threat of action where ... the action is done or the threat is made with the intention of advancing a ... religious ... cause; and ... the action is done or the threat is made with the intention of ... intimidating the public or a section of the public ... if it ... creates a serious risk to the health or safety of the public or a section of the public.”

* * *

Additional Reading:

Bergman, J. Ph.D. (2002). Lying in Court and Religion: An Analysis of the Theocratic Warfare Doctrine of the Jehovah's Witnesses, *Cultic Studies Review* 2002, Vol. 1, No. 2

Mutch, S. Dr (2011). *Cults and Public Policy: Protecting the Victims of Cultic Abuse in Australia*, Canberra, Parliament House, (CIFS Conference address), November 2, 2011

APPENDIX A

Lying in Court and Religion: An Analysis of the Theocratic Warfare Doctrine of the Jehovah's Witnesses

By Jerry Bergman, Ph.D.

Cultic Studies Review: An Internet Journal of Research, News, and Opinion
2002, Vol. 1, No. 2

[Extract: Section 2]

The Case of Jehovah's Witnesses

Until recently the Jehovah's Witnesses were one of the fastest growing religions in the world.

... Among the unique Watchtower doctrines is a prohibition against blood transfusions and a teaching called **theocratic war strategy** that justifies "lying" in court and elsewhere. Only three religions could be located that openly teach this doctrine. One is the Aryan Brotherhood, a white supremacist group that teaches it is appropriate to lie in order to further its interests (W. Caughey, personal interview, Feb. 3, 1991). Another is the Unification Church, which critics claim practices a similar doctrine they call Heavenly Deception (Levine, 1980; Elkins, 1980). Boettcher claims that

One of the central tenets of the [Unificationists] faith is the Doctrine of Heavenly Deception. Good must deceive evil. The non-Moon world is evil. It must be lied to so it can help Moon take over. Then it can become good under Moon's control. In the Bible, Jacob lied to Isaac. God rewarded Jacob by making him the father of the nation of Israel. (Boettcher, 1980, pp. 343-344)

The third is the Watchtower Theocratic War doctrine, which teaches that it is appropriate to withhold the truth from "people who are not entitled to it" if it will further the Watchtower's interests (Reed, 1992; Reed, 1997, p. 129; see also Franz, 1971, pp. 1060-1061, and Raines, 1996c). In the Watchtower's words, Witnesses are required to "use Theocratic War Strategy" against any and all persons who have a "wolf-like disposition," defined as anyone who does not accept the Watchtower as God's organization and the head of God's people. All other religions are defined as evil and of Satan (Franz 1991; *Watchtower* May 1, 1957, pp. 285-286 and p. 288 — this latter article was censored in new Watchtower reprints).

Reed defines Theocratic War Strategy as "hiding truth from persons not entitled to it—i.e., lying to outsiders when deemed necessary" (Reed, 1995, p. 40). He adds the Watchtower defines lying as "... deceiving outsiders to advance the organization's interests. Falsehoods presented to God's enemies are not considered lies, due to the state of war existing between God's forces (the JW's) and Satan's (the rest of the world)." In the words of Kotwall (1997, pp. 1-2) the Watchtower's teaching "to lie and deceive in the interest of their religion is Scripturally approved. They call such lying theocratic war strategy." Wilson says:

although a basic belief of Jehovah's Witnesses is that liars will receive eternal death with no hope of a resurrection, exception is made when it comes to lying or pretending to be someone one is not if the purpose is for the good of the organization. An example of this sort of deception that I had personally experienced was the time a Witness friend invited me and several other Witnesses to her house when a Witness missionary was visiting her, as he was to give a slide presentation about his work in Israel ... To protect the facility and the other Witnesses who were to

live there, the Society instructed this missionary to pose as an eccentric millionaire who has a fetish about being clean, and to inform any inquirers that this was his own house that was being built. This story was fabricated to cover up the real purpose of the building—that of being a Watchtower factory having bedrooms with sinks in them to house the factory workers. This incident was another example of theocratic war strategy (Wilson, 2002, p. 249).

Jehovah's Witnesses do not always lie outright, but they often lie according to the court's definition— not telling “the whole truth and nothing but the truth,” which means the court requires the *whole* story, not half-truths or deception. The Watchtower claims to condemn lying, but *only* lying as they define it, namely “saying something false to a person *who is entitled* to know the truth and doing so with the intent to deceive or to injure him or another person” (Franz, Vol. 2, 1988, p. 244, emphasis mine). The purpose of the oath is to discourage evading the truth by being truthful only in a narrow way. In a popular discussion designed to define lying to the lay public, Savant explains that when witnesses are asked to tell “the truth” in court, it means that they are not to lie and are also required:

... to tell “the whole truth.” ... For example, if a governor says that “in my state, we’ve moved 17,000 people from welfare to work” and omits adding the fact that in his state, 25,000 other people moved from *work* to *welfare* at the same time, he has told “the truth” but he hasn’t told “the whole truth.” That is, the net effect was that 8,000 *more* people were on welfare, not 17,000 *fewer* ... Third, witnesses are asked to tell “nothing but the truth.” This is yet another concept. For example, if a person tells the truth in response to a question and then adds a lie, he or she has told “the truth” but hasn’t told “nothing but the truth.” And although none of this will stop truly dishonest people, at least it gives us good ammunition to charge them with perjury. (Savant, 1996, p. 12)

In the words of Raines, theocratic warfare *in practice* means “deceiving” or misdirecting the “enemy” with untrue and misleading information to protect and advance the interests of “God’s people” and his “organization” (1996, p. 20). Magnani added that the Watchtower

has a special policy towards outsiders. Those who question its teachings are considered “opposers” and are treated in a special way. The Watchtower actually teaches Jehovah’s Witnesses to cover up or LIE about certain facts. This tactic is called THEOCRATIC WAR STRATEGY. (1979, p. 1, emphasis his).

The Watchtower tries to clarify its stand by adding that, although

malicious lying is definitely condemned in the Bible, this does not mean that a person is under obligation to divulge truthful information to people who are not entitled to it ... Jesus on certain occasions refrained from giving full information or direct answers to certain questions when doing so could have brought unnecessary harm (Matt 15:1-6; 21:23-27; John 7:3-10). Evidently, the course of Abraham, Isaac, Rahab, and Elisha in misdirecting or in withholding full facts from nonworshippers of Jehovah must be viewed in the same light—Gen 12:10-19; chapter 20; 26:1-10; Josh 2:1-6; Jas 2:25; 2 Ki 6:11-23 (Franz, 1971 p. 245).

An example of how this doctrine is in fact applied is explained by Reed as follows:

When a Witness knocks at a door, gives a brief sales pitch, and sells a small book for a dollar, local laws may require him or her to collect sales tax. (A credit report on the Watchtower of New York, Inc., revealed \$1.25 billion corporate sales figures for 1991, up from just over \$1 billion in 1990.). To evade this obligation the organization instructs JW's to say they did not sell the book; rather, they *placed* it. They did not

receive the dollar in payment; rather, the money was received coincidentally as an unrelated donation. Another illegal activity covered by cloaking expressions relates to violating child welfare laws and ignoring court orders regarding medical treatment. When taking such drastic steps to prevent blood transfusions for sick or injured children JW's commonly refer to their actions as keeping integrity or putting God first ... Cloaking expressions [with] obscure words ... to conceal information from outsiders unfamiliar with the sect. Witnesses resort to such devices when organizational instructions require them to violate tax laws, refuse military conscription, evade child welfare laws, and so on. Falsifications on these matters are not considered lies, but theocratic war strategy (1997, pp. 22, 28).

Yet another assessment of this doctrine by a long-time, once high-ranking Witness:

They [the Watchtower] adamantly teach that it is okay to "hide the truth from your enemies," since they are in "Theocratic warfare," which is taken as permission to lie. And who are their enemies? Everyone but themselves ... Lying has been described in their literature as permissible, especially to your "enemies" (which is everyone except the elitist governing body). It depends on whom you're lying to. They give the example of Abraham, in a life threatening situation, misrepresenting his wife's status, calling her his sister instead of his wife. So, do they reason it is a little thing for us to lie to the "other sheep," to tell them that they are "Christians," and can preach, that Holy Spirit will protect them, etc? What difference does it really make? (Ford, 1996, pp .7, 84)

The Watchtower teaches that lying to "God's enemies" is not really lying but theocratic "war strategy" and that:

God's Word commands: "Speak truth each of you with his neighbour" (Eph. 4:25). This command, however, does not mean that we should tell everyone who asks us all he wants to know. We must tell the truth to one who is entitled to know, but if one is not so entitled we may be evasive. (*Watchtower*, June 1, 1960, pp. 351-352)

The Watchtower then adds "we may not tell a falsehood," but this again refers to their definition of a falsehood. This *Watchtower* (1960, p. 352) also states that if a Watchtower adherent takes the witness stand in court and swears "to tell the truth, then, if he speaks at all, he must utter the truth." This "truth," though, is what the court defines as truth, but it is overshadowed by the focus on "hiding the truth" from God's enemies. Other articles and the actual practice of Witnesses both show that this latter advice is not strictly followed. For example, the May 1, 1957, *Watchtower* adds:

Lies are untruths told for selfish reasons and which work injury to others. Satan told a lie to Eve that worked great harm to her and all the human race. Ananias and Sapphira told lies for selfish reasons. But hiding the truth, which he is not entitled to know, from an enemy does not harm him, especially when he would use such information to harm others who are innocent ... So in time of spiritual warfare it is proper to misdirect the enemy by hiding the truth. It is done unselfishly; it does not harm anyone; on the contrary, it does much good. (pp. 284-285).

As William Blake once said "the truth that is told with bad intent beats all the lies you can invent." The doctrine is best summarized by, *The Measures Taken*, a play by Bertolt Brecht:

Whoever fights for communism must be prepared to fight or not to fight, to tell the truth or not to tell the truth, to give his services or to refuse them, to be recognized or to be disguised. Who fights for communism, has only one single virtue, that he fights for communism (Quoted in Perutz, 1989, p. 139).

Wilson gives an example of how the doctrine is used today:

the elders asked this young man to call our daughter and fabricate a reason to get her to come over to the house. Under the guise of “theocratic warfare,” lying was acceptable if it served the needs of the organization. Consequently, the truthfulness of the reason he gave her to get her to agree to meet him at the house was insignificant. He feigned helplessness about some aspect of taking care of things at the house, asking her to meet him there at a specified time so she could help him out. Trusting that he would never betray her, she agreed (2000, p. 118).

That the Watchtower specifically teaches their followers to lie as the word is normally used in English is illustrated by their discussion about when Abraham told Sarah to “hide the fact” that she was his wife (*Watchtower*, Feb. 1, 1956, p. 78). The Watchtower notes that years later when Abraham was in the Philistine country of Gerar, Abraham repeated the lie about Sarah, blatantly claiming that his wife “is my sister.” This, the Watchtower Society concludes, is not lying because Abraham represented Sarah as his sister for a laudable reason, namely:

to prevent violent controversy over his wife. Sarah recognized Abraham as her Lord and agreed to the arrangement, willing to take the consequences ... She was willing to do her part to preserve the life of Jehovah’s prophet ... But critics ... view Abraham wholly as a lying, prevaricating, weakling coward. (Feb. 1, 1956, p. 79)

Ironically, this example that the Watchtower Society uses to justify lying backfired *because* of lying. The Pharaoh, thinking Sarah was Abraham’s unmarried sister, took her for his wife, causing a plague on “Pharaoh and his house.” When Pharaoh found out about Abraham’s lie and returned Abraham’s wife, he protested to Abraham, stating that what happened would have been prevented if only Abraham had told the truth (Gen. 12:10-20). Thus, instead of being an example that justifies lying, this scriptural example actually condemns lying by showing that it can seriously backfire. Abraham also lied about his wife to Abimelech and as a result nearly caused him a disaster (Genesis 20). The latest discussion appeared in the Feb. 8, 2000 *Awake!*, which, under the title “Cautious as Serpents,” notes:

Of course, being truthful does not mean that we are obligated to divulge all information to anyone who asks it of us. “Do not give what is holy to dogs, neither throw your pearls before swine, that they may never ... turn around and rip you open,” warned Jesus, at Matthew 7:6. For example, individuals with wicked intent may have no right to know certain things. Christians understand that they are living in a hostile world. Thus, Jesus advised his disciples to be “cautious as serpents” while remaining “innocent as doves.” (Matthew 10:16; John 15:19) Jesus did not always disclose the full truth, especially when revealing all the facts could have brought unnecessary harm to himself or his disciples. Still, even at such times, he did not lie. Instead, he chose either to say nothing or to divert the conversation in another direction.—Matthew 15:1-6; 21:23-27; John 7:3-10 (Feb. 8, 2000, p. 21).

The Watchtower Society claims that they condemn direct lying and advocate only hiding the truth. But their using Abraham’s case as an example to emulate in situations where doing so can protect the Watchtower indicates that they in fact advocate direct lying. Reed comments on this doctrine:

By instructing Witness kids to testify in court to say the opposite of what they are really taught to believe, the Watchtower Society requires them to engage in a form of double-talk that most people would consider lying. And unless the youngsters are to consciously see themselves as liars, they must also engage in doublethink, the mental gymnastics described in George Orwell’s novel ... where people are forced by

a totalitarian society to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies. (1996, pp. 230-231)

Yet another example shows that the application of the doctrine involves open lying:

While doing this research ... I met a woman who showed me a scar on her upper arm that she said was caused by an acid burn. She explained that bribing a doctor to produce a scar on a child's arm that mimicked the scar left from a smallpox vaccination, and then signing a certificate of vaccination [certifying that they were vaccinated] to enable the child to go to school, was a common practice among the Witnesses during the years of the Society's ban on vaccinations. One can only imagine how many Witnesses or their children died of smallpox due to this practice of theocratic warfare to avoid vaccinations (Wilson, 2002, p. 180).

A detailed discussion of the doctrine and how it is applied was included in the court testimony in the case *Gouvitsa v. Gouvitsa* in which the sworn expert witness said, in answer to the question "What is within Jehovah's Witness' theocratic war strategy?":

Theocratic war strategy is very common among Jehovah's Witnesses. It's on different levels . . . first, one has to understand the definition of what a lie is. And because it's so important, I'd like to just read it ... "In the Aid to Bible Understanding," which is their encyclopedia, it says, "Lying generally involves saying something false to a person who is entitled to know the truth."

... Now, the reason I emphasize the word "entitled" is because Witnesses ... look at the world in two types of people ... the sheep and the goats ... the Jehovah's Witnesses, and the non-Christians being the rest of the world ... God's people and Satan's people ... The only people that are entitled to know the truth 100 percent of the time are Jehovah's Witnesses. The people that are opposing God's Word, according to the Jehovah's Witnesses, are people in Christendom ... They are in opposition, so consequently they are not entitled to know the truth all the time ... We have met people in our own work and heard of many cases, the one that comes to mind is a gentleman who had written a pamphlet exposing the Watchtower organization as a cult. And he met up with a Jehovah's Witness. And somehow they got into a dialogue on this particular pamphlet ... And the Jehovah's Witness was downing the pamphlet as being totally false, and not only that he was claiming that he knew the writer of the pamphlet and that the writer of the pamphlet was immoral and he had been kicked out of the Jehovah's Witnesses, was an apostate and so forth, and the information in the pamphlet could not be reliable.

Then this individual told the Jehovah's Witness that he was, in fact, the writer of the pamphlet ... That is an example called theocratic war strategy. In other words, the Jehovah's Witness [felt] ... what was important was to downgrade the information to make the organization look better. Theocratic war strategy is basically a method employed in many, many different ways. Not just outright lying, but sometimes evading the truth, sometimes telling half truths ... the organization employs it [theocratic warfare] not only to the general public, but also on Jehovah's Witnesses (*Joy Hutton Gouvitsa Arnold plaintiff, v. Gus Konstantine Gouvitsa*, Testimony of Duane Magnani, pp. 109-113).

* * *