Mohammad Qorbani – Week 5

That people should be well informed about all subjects or not is one of the most controversial arguments in politics. Persuasively, both point of views have their attackers and defenders; however, I believe, all people should know what is happening around them, for if government attempts to confine information, not only will people suffer from information asymmetries, but also government will lose its support from ordinary persons. Nevertheless, in some extreme cases such as wars, this point of view has its negative consequences that should not be overshadowed.

To begin with, being restricted from information, people will be informed in varied levels. Thus, some people will be more informed than others, and an unbalanced society is its consequence. One of the most inevitable sequences of limiting information is selective information, since people who are close to rulers and information holders will be more informed than ordinary people which means they can conceivably decide better. Thus, they will have financial superiority due to their well informed decisions. Consequently, having access to more financial resources, they can be more informed which forms a positive cycle that lead our society to an asymmetric one. However, some people believe that if governments withhold this information from all people evenly, even their relatives, this information asymmetry will not shaped which seems a plausible arguments, but I believe, it is not pragmatic.

Secondly, not being well informed about decisions cornerstones, people will lose their trust in their leaders which have no result but society failure. As an instance, in smaller scale such as a company which I suppose is justifiable to country, managers ought to make challenging decisions for their ventures that are not favorable for all employees. Hence, people who are not informed about decisions` causes and triggers, and consequences, will be disappointed, and will lose their faith on their leaders. As far as I am concerned, in bigger communities like countries, this is unavoidable too. However, some people argue that in larger scales, this problem is solvable, since people want to experience a better life; consequently, they are not concerned with details of decisions, and they just care about consequences of these decisions on their lives.

In the last two paragraphs, I have referred to my reasons in order to champion that people should be well informed in almost all problems; however, I think, in some urgent problems such as wars and etc. governments can avoid to inform people, for in such cases, there could be some spies among ordinary people.

To wrap it up, in my opinion, I agree with people who hold the idea that information should not be confined by political leaders, since confining information can fail a society by its information asymmetry, and losing people`s trust; nevertheless, in a few radical situations governments can limit information to avoid some bigger problems.