“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.”

**Write a response in which you discuss which view more closely aligns with your own position and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should address both of the views presented.**

**Concerning the necessity of releasing confidential information by politicians, people do not see eye to eye. There are myriads of individuals who believe leaking information publicly by authorities may lead to detrimental effects not only internationally but also on country’s domestic affairs while some others do not think so and contend transparency as well as honesty plays a crucial role in governing a country. I strictly agree that democratic leaders should provide a wide range of information to the press. In what follows two reasons supporting my position are explored.**

**The first reason why political administrators should transparent issues is that this approach is the premier right for people in democratic societies. If governors avoid providing adequate information regarding ruling strategies, citizens will question their honesty and validation of their performances. Therefore, not only would they lost their endorsement from the public, but also this ambiguity will broaden falsehood facts and rumours. In dictatorial countries, for example, the despotic leader offers a minimum amount of their ruling policies. They are also deliver untrue facts to the press in order that withhold significant information. Consequently, national chaos will arise, and people intend to overthrow the government.**

**Second, this vague method could undermine the countries’ global reputation when suspicions are extended. In this context, the domestic situation is so volatile that other countries could take advantage of internal controversy. For instance, in Iran, a lack of transparency of the nuclear program resulted in years of sanctions from the united state officials. The adverse impacts of this process lessened the standard of individuals’ lives and weakened world-wide trust. Even if authorities tend to make up this approach and share information with the public, it would be unlikely to acquire its desirable trust from the people. In other words, the alternation of the strategy can be unbelievable.**

**Though sharing crucial programs with citizens is required, the opponents of this technique argue that the merits of withholding some regulations should not be neglected. They speculate that some national programs are unlikely to apply in the country. Hence, scattering doubtful information about impractical programs can bring about irreparable consequences, including increasing expectations or bringing unrealistic hopes. It is true to a certain extent that cancelling some procedures before actualising them is inevitable, so it is on governors to distinguish whether the information can publish publicly or it should remain confidential. It can also prevent raising false expectation from unrealized progrems.**

**To sum up, although numerous governors prefer to evade publishing political evidence, some others argue the right of transparency for people cannot be ignored. As a result, my view is that the benefits of sharing information with honesty outweigh its drawbacks. Of course, to some extent, sharing programs before actualizing them are not necessary.**