“Some people believe it is often necessary, even desirable, for political leaders to withhold information from the public. Others believe that the public has a right to be fully informed.”

One of the most controversial issues in the modern world’s politics is the amount of information of which people are aware. While some people are of the idea that it is better for political leaders not to release information to public, there are others holding the view that the merits of fully informing public outweigh the demerits. Despite the fact that the positive effects of informing people cannot be neglected, it is my firm conviction that political leaders should keep secrets. In what follows, I will elaborate on my perspective.

The first vital point to bear in mind is that public is not educated enough and does not fully understand the meaning behind political expressions; however, political issues have their special language and only political leaders are able to analyze the concepts. Accordingly, the more public becomes aware of information, the more they misinterpret the pivotal political concepts by misunderstanding the events and news, which, in turn, brings about detrimental effects such as wrong revolutions. As a tangible example; before the Islamic revolution of Iran, the former king informed public about every political issue. He was honest to his people to whom he revealed every detail. At that time, the majority of people were illiterate, and they did not have political insight to see their brilliant and fruitful future and were deceived by Mullahs who abused the released political information, which, in turn, helped them to make a rebellion against the king. Had the king withhold the weaknesses from the public, he would have continued his monarchy and his country made a momentous progress.

Another worthwhile point to be mentioned is that by keeping the secrets from public, political leaders have enough time to analyze the challenges and make the best decision. The less the public is aware of information, the less the pressure will be on leaders, which, in turn, assist them to be meticulous and find the best solution. As an another example; when the Chernobyl disaster happened in a nuclear power plant in Soviet Union, and during first days, experts were able to put their effort and focus on finding the best solution; however, when people were aware of the accident, political leaders and experts had to hold many sessions and presentations in order to answer the questions of public and became off the right path. Had they kept the secret from public for more time, they would have had more chance to find the procedure in order to control the disaster.

However, there are some exceptions in which public should be aware of information. To begin with, people should be informed of political parties and their background in presidential elections. It has myriad of benefits, of which two of the most important are selection of the worthy parties and satisfying the sense of public contribution. Moreover, political leaders should release expired information to public in order to ameliorate the political insight of the public. For example, the CIA publishes the most secret information after about 30 years which not only demonstrates the strategies and precious information of that period of time to public, but also it has no negative effects since those political leaders do not exist in political events anymore.

To wrap up, it is a foregone conclusion that it is vital for political leaders to keep information from public. The fact that public does not have political insight, coupled with the fact that by keeping secrets, leaders have enough time to tackle the issues with no pressure, is the reason which strengthens my claim. However, it should be considered that in some special cases it is better to inform public.