

TALLINN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
School of Economics and Business Administration
Department of International Relations
Chair of International Relations and Political Science

Anita Antikainen

DIPLOMATIC TRANSPARENCY: A WIKILEAKS CASE STUDY

Bachelor thesis

Supervisor: lecturer Ivar Hendla

Tallinn 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- INTRODUCTION4**
- 1. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE6**
 - 1.1 Technological globalization..... 6**
 - 1.2 Diplomacy..... 6**
 - 1.2.1 Public diplomacy7
 - 1.2.2 Transparent diplomacy8
 - 1.2.3 Digital diplomacy.....9
 - 1.3 WikiLeaks.....10**
 - 1.3.1 Disclosure as liberal reform..... 11
- 2. TRANSPARENCY THROUGH DISCLOSURES: CASE STUDIES..... 14**
 - 2.1 Historical background.....14**
 - 2.2 Iran and Afghan war logs.....16**
 - 2.2.1 The video “Collateral Murder”16
 - 2.2.2 Threat to informants18
 - 2.2.3 Task Force 373.....20
 - 2.3 The United States Diplomatic cables21**
 - 2.3.1 Surveillance after The United Nations’ officials21
 - 2.3.2 Resignation of the US ambassador to Mexico.....24
 - 2.3.3 China supporting Korean reunification.....26
 - 2.3.4 Agreement between the US and Yemen.....27
 - 2.3.5 Closing Guantanamo Bay29
- 3. DIPLOMATIC TRANSPARENCY IN THE PRESENT DAY 32**
- 4. DISCUSSION..... 36**
- CONCLUSION 39**
- REFERENCES 41**

ABSTRACT

WikiLeaks is a non-profit organization that operates to promote transparency and justice in diplomatic relations by leaking classified government files to make them known to the public. The materials are published through chosen media channels online. The research question of the paper is: how has WikiLeaks' goal for complete transparency in diplomatic relations affected foreign relations and on what level has WikiLeaks achieved those goals for transparency and justice in diplomacy. The paper will first go through the theoretical framework and then analyze different cases arising from the leakage of the US diplomatic cables as well as the Afghan war logs. Based on the case studies it is proven that WikiLeaks has not succeeded to achieve transparency in diplomatic relations and has instead affected international relations negatively. However, the impacts of WikiLeaks have not been far-reaching and no significant consequences can be found in the present day. Therefore, WikiLeaks has failed to make the anticipated changes in diplomacy.

Keywords: WikiLeaks, journalism, diplomacy, transparency.

INTRODUCTION

WikiLeaks is a non-profit organization, often referred to as the site for whistleblowers that was established in 2006 by Julian Assange. The organization created a webpage where they published classified materials like top-secret government files that were leaked by anonymous sources. It operates with registered volunteers and reveals its stories wither through their webpage or later on through selected media publications. The webpage is often called as the site for whistleblowers, indicating that the people behind sharing the classified information should be protected since they are contributing to possibly exposing government crimes. However, the governments, on the other hand, see those people as “leakers” who are by definition not protected by laws and can be prosecuted for sharing classified data. For example, Julian Assange, the founder of WikiLeaks, is currently in Ecuador’s embassy in London, where he was granted asylum to protect him from the US who would most likely take him to trial for violating the 1917 Espionage Act.

The following paper aims to find out how has WikiLeaks’ goal for complete transparency in diplomatic relations affected foreign relations and whether the leaks have had more positive impacts or harm on the international society. Also, the aim is to find out on what level has WikiLeaks achieved its goals for transparency and justice in diplomacy. Moreover, the paper seeks an answer to whether or not the impacts of WikiLeaks can be seen in diplomacy in the present day. The thesis of the Bachelor thesis is that WikiLeaks’ aim for transparency and justice has had severe consequences for international relations and security and at the same time failed to achieve transparent diplomacy.

The following paper will first look through the theoretical perspective. First of all, how has technological globalization created the opportunity for the classified documents to be leaked in the first place and explain the essence of globalization in the field of technology. Furthermore, the paper will define many classifications of diplomacy relevant to WikiLeaks and explain how diplomacy has developed and gained new aspects within time and development of technology. Theories explaining the behavior of WikiLeaks will also be analyzed. More specifically, how has WikiLeaks expressed itself in the framework of two extremely different theoretical approaches: liberal reform and radial resistance.

To continue, the paper will give an empirical overview of the historic background of WikiLeaks. This is followed by eight case studies that will describe and analyze the contents of specific leaks and look through case-by-case what have been the impacts of certain leaks, how they have affected diplomatic relations and whether or not the aim for transparency has been justified. The paper will then give an overview of the situation in the present day and analyze whether or not the methods of diplomacy have changed due to WikiLeaks and if the aimed transparency has been achieved on some level. The Bachelor thesis will end with a discussion, where a thorough analysis of the consequences of the cases will be looked through the theoretical perspective.

The research paper is using a qualitative study method and is done by analyzing the classified materials that were published in selected newspapers online.

1. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

1.1 Technological globalization

The leakage of classified government materials through WikiLeaks is a phenomenon that could not have taken place in such a large scale a couple of decades ago. It can be said that a leakage this broad and significant could not have taken place twenty-thirty years ago when the technology was not anywhere near to what it is in the present day. This raises a new concept “technological globalization” which can be defined as the development of the world through technology. This indicates that due to the rapid development of technology, the world is in a constant change. The concept itself is therefore fairly new can therefore be used to understand how the leakages on this large scale have been made possible in the first place. Simply put, due technological globalization, people all over the world have access to the same technical equipment as well as the same data from the Internet. It is possible to download the same files regardless of the location and share documents between someone who is geographically thousands of miles away within a matter of seconds.

When connecting technological globalization and the actions of WikiLeaks, it becomes clear that the second could not exist without the first. It can be said that with the development of technology, globalization and the Internet, the arena of international relations has changed significantly. It has reached the point where just one single person has all the communication means necessary to reach the whole world. That explains how with the developed technology, WikiLeaks was able to gain access to the classified materials and with the Internet, it was able to disclose the information instantly and reach the entire world within a matter of seconds, minutes or hours.

1.2 Diplomacy

The word “diplomacy” comes from the Greek language and in straight translation means “to make a deal with other countries.” Generally diplomacy is defined as conducting communication

and negotiations with a foreign country using diplomatic representatives. Diplomacy addresses issues related to economy, politics, environment, culture and many others. Even though diplomacy can be categorized in many different ways and divided into numerous types, the following paper will focus on the types of diplomacy relevant to disclosures published by WikiLeaks.

1.2.1 Public diplomacy

Although traditional diplomacy can still be considered as the ground of diplomacy in general and many aspects like the use of embassies, wide use of protocols and secrecy are still in use, due to the changing world diplomacy has started to develop as well. Hence, the concept of public diplomacy slowly started replacing traditional diplomacy all around the world. Jan Melissen, the author of “The New Public Diplomacy” defined public diplomacy as an “increasingly standard component of overall diplomatic practice and is more than a form of propaganda conducted by diplomats.” In his book mentioned above, Melissen also compared definitions provided by other scholars and officials. For example, Melissen suggested that the most accurate definition of public diplomacy is stated by Paul Sharp where it is described as: “the process by which direct relations with people in a country are pursued to advance the interests and extend the values of those being represented”. Moreover, Hans N. Tuch, the author of a book called “Communicating With the World” defines public diplomacy as: "A government's process of communicating with foreign publics in an attempt to bring understanding for its nation's ideas and ideals, its institutions and culture, as well as its national goals and policies". Although Melissen acknowledges the definition, he also states that Tuch's concept does not perfectly explain the concept because many things have changed in the international arena since Tuch's book was published in 1990.

In general, it can be said that although many aspects of traditional diplomacy are still being practiced in the present day, public diplomacy has created an opportunity for diplomacy to adjust to the constantly changing world. Michael McClellan, the Counselor for Public Diplomacy in the US Embassy in Dublin published an article “Public Diplomacy in the Context of

Traditional Diplomacy” that tries to give the appropriate definition to such a new phenomenon. He defined public diplomacy as: “The strategic planning and execution of informational, cultural and educational programming by an advocate country to create a public opinion environment in a target country or countries that will enable target country political leaders to make decisions that are supportive of advocate country's foreign policy objectives.” This definition indicates, that compared to traditional diplomacy, public diplomacy is a step closer towards an open, democratic way of conducting international relations due to taking public opinion into consideration as well. Therefore, public diplomacy is the ground on which WikiLeaks and more specifically, Julian Assange, built his concept of “transparent diplomacy”.

1.2.2 Transparent diplomacy

The concept of transparent diplomacy slightly differs from the general definition of public diplomacy. Transparent diplomacy can be considered as a fairly new concept since it became more widely known since it was taken into use by Julian Assange. Therefore, it can be said that WikiLeaks took an existing concept of public diplomacy and created “transparent diplomacy” by defining the purpose for leaking classified government documents. Assange believes that transparent government is a just government; therefore he did not stop leaking classified materials to the public regardless of many threats received from the US officials (Assange 2010). He believes that his vision of reforming diplomacy and the work of governments can bring justice and democracy to diplomatic relations.

To put in the frames of academic definition, Mark Fenster, the author of “Disclosure’s Effects: WikiLeaks and Transparency“ gave his definition of transparency:

“Theories of transparency emphasize the normative democratic ideal of a deliberative, engaged public and the consequentialist ideal of a responsible, accountable government that will result from a visible state”

Therefore, the definition given by Fenster in 2012, which is several years later than WikiLeaks was established, shortly sums up the views WikiLeaks has been aiming for- public opinion, democracy, a just government.

Historically speaking, it can be said that the concept of transparent diplomacy is essentially not a new one. Similar attempts have been carried out in the past as well. For example, on the 8th of January 1918 Woodrow Wilson presented his famous speech about the “Fourteen Points” in which he, among other things, said: Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view,” (Page 2011). However, it seems that he soon realized the necessity for conducting negotiations in private and therefore it is arguable if and on what level Wilson really practiced openness in diplomatic negotiations. Moreover, Leon Trotsky similarly believed in openness, which is why he published many secret treaties after the Russian Revolution. It can be said that the actions of those two men are still seen in the present day. For example, ever since, majority of the international treaties are publically known (Archibugi, Chiarugi 2011). However, in regards of transparent diplomacy in general, they did not have much impact and this has resulted in Assange also attempting to turn open diplomacy into a more transparent one in order to achieve a just society.

1.2.3 Digital diplomacy

With the development of technology, a new concept of diplomacy has been created- technological diplomacy. In fact, the phenomenon has been taken into use in the US State Department, where efforts have been made to “to bring diplomacy into the digital age, by using widely available technologies to reach out to citizens, companies and other non-state actors,” (Lichtenstein 2010). The US State Department explained concept as a change in diplomatic strategy- to develop the means of traditional diplomacy and create new technology based policies, as well as promote cyber activism. Nicholas J Cull also used the concept “technological diplomacy” in his abovementioned article. He said that even though the rapid changes in technology create an opportunity for chaos, it also offers a chance for new kind of politics and

diplomacy. Therefore, it can be said that the development of technology itself is inevitable and it is an ongoing process that the world is still trying to adjust with. Technological diplomacy is a fairly new concept that can be used to explain WikiLeaks' aims and actions. In fact, it could even be used to define it because without the endless opportunities provided by computers and the Internet, WikiLeaks would perhaps never be known to the public.

Nicholas J Cull also drew a parallel between Julian Assange and Leon Trotsky. In fact, when publishing the secret treaties, Trotsky gave a statement: on the 22nd of November in 1917 where he said: "The abolition of secret diplomacy is the primary condition for an honest, popular, truly democratic foreign policy. The Soviet Government regards it as its duty to carry out such a policy in practice." However, when looking at the present world and Assange's efforts to carry out the same principles, it can be said that Trotsky failed to influence diplomatic relations as significantly as he planned to. However, Cull believes that the main difference between Assange and Trotsky is, in fact, a revolution in technology. He added:

"In 1917 the leak required an earth-shattering revolution. In 2010 all it took to challenge the diplomatic order of the day was a single individual with a well-placed accomplice and a little technical know-how."

Therefore, it can be said that without the process of technological globalization explained earlier, WikiLeaks would probably not be as relevant in the present day. With the development of technology, digital diplomacy was able to arise, taking diplomatic relations to a whole new dimension that the world needs to adjust with.

1.3 WikiLeaks

In an article called "Disclosure's Effects: WikiLeaks and Transparency" the author, Mark Fenster, has identified two theories that can be used to describe the reasoning behind leaks carried out by WikiLeaks. The method of Fenster was an analysis of the articles published by Assange to find out his explanation to WikiLeaks actions through theoretical perspectives. In the essay mentioned above, Fenster brought out two theories that can be used as a framework in order

to be able to explain the aims of WikiLeaks and Assange.

1.3.1 Disclosure as liberal reform

Fenster introduces the theory of liberal reform with WikiLeaks' goal "to reveal the state and other key institutions to the world—not only to the citizens who can hold public institutions directly accountable, but to everyone who is able to 'see evidence of the truth'." Moreover, the only limit that Assange sets on publishing the materials is the possibility of delaying the disclosure in order to do some damage control beforehand. Regardless of many controversial opinions of WikiLeaks, Fenster brought out Assange's statement:

"We work with other media outlets to bring people the news, but also to prove it is true. Scientific journalism allows you to read a news story, then to click online to see the original document it is based on. That way you can judge for yourself: Is the story true? Did the journalist report it accurately?"

Based on that it can be said that Assange seeks to improve the essence of journalism by giving people information they would otherwise have no access to. Moreover, Assange emphasizes the necessity of providing the original source. It can be understood that Assange is the supporter of free speech and journalism hence he is seeking to make it even more open and liberal by disclosing classified data and letting regular people know what is happening behind closed doors of the officials.

Moreover, Assange stated the following after publishing the diplomatic cables:

"Organisations such as WikiLeaks, which are philosophically opposed to state secrecy and which operate as much as is possible outside the global nation-state system, may be the best we can hope for in the way of promoting the climate of transparency and accountability necessary for authentically liberal democracy," (The Economist 2010).

That statement received a comment published in "The Economist" where the real essence of

reform through liberal democracy was questioned. The theory of liberal politics has always been limited: no early modern liberalists would consider it necessary or even possible to achieve total transparency when it comes to diplomacy and foreign relations in general. Therefore, the article takes a statement that although it can be seen that Assange sees himself creating reforms through liberalism, there are many aspects that have not taken into consideration when observing the reform through a liberalist perspective. The article states that the theory Assange is striving for should be called an "authentically liberal democratic" vision of reform since it does not really go in accordance with the traditional liberalist theories.

1.3.2 Disclosure as radical resistance

Another theory Fenster has created by observing the statements of WikiLeaks and Julian Assange is approaching the case from a different point of view. While the theory explained above expressed the viewpoint of WikiLeaks towards journalism and its readers, the theory of radical resistance is used to describe the attitude towards the secrecy practiced by governments and government officials and can therefore be considered in a controversy with the first theory. Fenster explains that when analyzing Assange's statements or essays, it can be seen how he, in addition to his liberal views, expresses radical viewpoints on transparency's potential to cause serious political consequences that would arise due to disclosures. Fenster believes that some political beliefs and theories of Assange go beyond the liberal democratic theories and can even be considered as radical. Based on Assange's statements, Fenster concluded that Assange considers conspiracy as the reason for bad governance. In fact, Assange explained bad governance with "conspiratorial interactions among the political elite". Therefore, it can be understood why Assange feels the need to go behind governments' back to gain justice. He believes in the conspiracy between government officials and it appears that when it comes to this particular issue, Assange feels the need to take a more radical approach in order to establish the desired transparency and justice. Moreover, Mark Fenster believes that the vulnerability of conspiracies has become the target of Assange and a place where he believes strong resistance will take him closer to his goals. He also came to the conclusion that although the methods of the

two theories are different, they predict different responses to the information leaked. Assange himself has concluded the two theories in the following words:

“Since 2006, we have been working along this philosophy that organizations which are abusive and need to be [in] the public eye. If their behavior is revealed to the public, they have one of two choices: one is to reform in such a way that they can be proud of their endeavors, and proud to display them to the public. Or the other is to lock down internally and to balkanize, and as a result, of course, cease to be as efficient as they were. To me, that is a very good outcome, because organizations can either be efficient, open and honest, or they can be closed, conspiratorial and inefficient.”

Therefore, it can be seen how that statement given to TIME magazine has briefly summed up the analysis of Mark Fenster. Although the goals Assange has tried to achieve through WikiLeaks have essentially remained the same within time, the methods chosen are often different depending the expected reaction to the leaks from certain target groups.

However, Farhad Manjoo, a columnist for The New York Times, believes that although WikiLeaks sometimes seems to be using radical methods to create transparency, it does not apply the same rules for the organization itself as it does for choosing the methods. More specifically, Manjoo states that the radical transparency WikiLeaks does not seem to be in accordance with WikiLeaks actions regarding the organization, especially by giving complete anonymity to the leakers. Therefore, it can be said that based on Manjoo’s words it seems that although WikiLeaks has shown to be radical in achieving transparency and justice, it often fails to be transparent itself. On one hand, it is understandable why WikiLeaks protects its sources, especially after the arrest of Bradley Manning, a former intelligence analyst sentenced to jail for leaking war logs. There would probably be no one leaking files if the sources were publically known. On the other hand, however, when having a goal such as complete transparency and not disclosing the sources creates a controversy showing that transparency through radical transparency is not quite compatible with complete anonymity.

2. TRANSPARENCY THROUGH DISCLOSURES: CASE STUDIES

2.1 Historical background

Julian Assange and his small team established the webpage of WikiLeaks on the 4th of October 2006. Already in December 2006 WikiLeaks published its first articles. During 2007-2009, the leaks were modest and not of high significance. Among other articles, the publications included Guantanamo Bay operating procedures, British National Party membership list, Climate Research Unit emails and 9/11 pager messages out of which some were official messages but most of them were civilians leaving messages for their families to tell that they are alright. However, in 2010 WikiLeaks had gathered materials with such high significance that their own website did not seem to be enough coverage, hence Assange hand picked three media publications to be the first ones getting access to the upcoming stories- The New York Times in the United States, Der Spiegel in Germany and The Guardian in The United Kingdom. Those three newspapers became the first ones to get access to the upcoming leaks, which Assange knew would shock the entire world.

On the 5th of April 2010 WikiLeaks published a video called “Collateral Murder” showing the US soldiers in Iraq killing civilians from a helicopter. Among killed people were two Reuters journalist and in addition, two children were severely wounded. The video expresses the soldier’s amusement as they shoot the people while laughing and making jokes. The US explained the situation by saying that the people were considered a part of anti-Iraqi forces as they were carrying guns. From the video, however, it can be seen that the journalist is carrying a camera, not a gun and the children were clearly unarmed as well. The video shortly hit 10 million views and raised numerous questions among the citizens of the US as well as around the world regarding the legality of the US actions in the war.

As it appeared soon, “The Collateral Murder” was only an introduction to what was coming. WikiLeaks had obtained an extremely high amount of Afghan and Iran war logs that

were going to be published by the three aforementioned newspapers. Although WikiLeaks got many threats saying not to publish the materials, Julian Assange hoped that by publishing the materials he could put an end to the war. Therefore, in April 2010 the classified documents of the war in Afghanistan were published day by day. WikiLeaks had a hold of over 90 000 classified documents and it is believed to be the first time information as sensitive as the war logs had leaked to the media or been published in general. The materials included details of the U.S assassin squad, civilian casualties, the CIA's expansion of paramilitary operations and how US drones were prone to failure. Although the war did not end after the publications, it did raise a great amount of national and international issues and the polls conducted after the leakages showed that the people of the US started resenting the war and the support for withdrawing the troops grew significantly.

The same year, WikiLeaks obtained another set of highly sensitive documents- the United States diplomatic cables. They were able to collect over 250 000 classified documents including confidential emails sent between The Foreign Ministry of the US and 274 embassies as well as almost 16 000 private IM messages. Similarly with the leakage of the Afghan war logs, Assange stated to have a noble reason for publishing the cables- the need for transparent diplomacy. Regardless of the warnings WikiLeaks received the night before the publications, stating that the leakage would have dangerous consequences to civilian lives, WikiLeaks went through with the leak and the first part of the materials was published on the 28th of November. Similarly to the previous leak with sensitive information, the leakage of the US diplomatic cables created an international debate on the extent of the damage. More specifically whether or not the materials were dangerous to civilian lives and up until which point have the leaks influenced relationships between the US and other countries affected by the publication of the data.

The following chapters will analyze the most significant disclosures carried out by WikiLeaks and the risks and benefits brought by WikiLeaks' aim for transparency. Also, whether or not the disclosures were justified, what were the consequences and an analysis whether the leaks had more negative or positive impacts on international relations and society.

2.2 Iran and Afghan war logs

2.2.1 The video “Collateral Murder”

In April 2010 WikiLeaks published the abovementioned video called „Collateral Murder” creating a special webpage just to display the video. Since two of the shooting victims were Reuters’ journalists, Reuters had tried to get the video from the U.S to start investigation but their requests had always been denied. The US has said that all the actions were legal and victims were armed and considered as anti-Iraqi forces. After publication the video shortly hit 10 million viewers and the issue became known all over the world. According to Daily Mail, all the attempts carried out by Reuters to get access to the details of the incident under the “Freedom of Information Act” have previously been denied by the US.

The publication of the “Collateral Murder” was followed by a shock all around the world. Mainly due to the attitude of the US soldiers seen in the video. The soldiers made inappropriate comments while shooting and were laughing “as they were playing a video game,” Assange later commented. It can be seen from the video that the camera one of the Reuters’ journalists was carrying, was mistakenly identified as a gun, which was the reason for initiating fire. The incident was followed by a military investigation that cleared the helicopter crew and considered their actions justified. The report composed about the attack said regarding the two killed Reuters journalists that they: “made no effort to visibly display their status as press or media representatives and their familiar behavior with, and close proximity to, the armed insurgents and their furtive attempts to photograph the coalition ground forces made them appear as hostile combatants to the Apaches that engaged them,” (Mitchell 2013). However, it raises a question of the reliability of the report. For instance, how could the two journalists identify themselves to the helicopter from such a long distance? Moreover, it can be heard from the video that after realizing that one of the wounded is a child, the pilot says while laughing “Well, it's their fault for bringing their kids to a battle,” (Adams 2010).

Based on the information published in the media, it can already be said without a further analysis, that the disclosure of the video creates controversy. On one hand, it can be understood

how the troops were following a mission that tells to eliminate any possible threat. However, when hearing the comments of the men on the helicopter while shooting, it reflects cruelty and disrespect and is in true controversy with the nature of a war. In terms of the video becoming public, it can be said that the US got another painful hit at its reputation while making the entire world doubt its legitimacy in the war. However, with the publication, WikiLeaks managed to make a difference among the American people as well. In fact, it appears that a poll conducted in the US in 2011, after the leakage of the video, showed that 75% of people supported withdrawing American troops from Iraq. However, a year earlier, before the leakage of the video, a similar poll showed that the majority of the American people thought the war in Iraq was, in fact, going well (LeMay 2012).

Moreover, the incident has also provoked human rights activists who have been doubting the legitimacy of the US missions for a while. For example, a human rights activist Kathy Kelly thinks that if incidents are beyond the frames of regular military procedure and never mentioned before WikiLeaks' disclosures, it raises a question of how many similar happenings have gone unreported. "Groups of US soldiers have been breaking into Afghan homes and killing people, without cause or provocation, for the last 11 years. Civilians have been afflicted by aerial bombing by helicopter gunships, drone surveillance and attacks, and night raids," Kelly adds (LeMay 2012). WikiLeaks has made the first step by publishing the materials with high hopes of putting an end to the war.

Therefore, it can be said that the disclosure created many different opinions around the world and especially among American people. When observing various blogs covering the leak and the comments under the publications, it can be seen how the general feeling is anger towards the lack of investigation conducted after the incident. Moreover, many supporters of WikiLeaks seem to think it is unjust for the US to arrest the leaker, Bradley Manning, while the troops seen on the video will not be brought to justice. Although the matter of a war is always sensitive, WikiLeaks managed to create significant impact with the release of "Collateral Murder". It changed the attitude of the US people towards the war in Iraq decreasing the support significantly. Also, it raised many questions towards the US war policy and the legitimacy of their actions. However, WikiLeaks did not manage to achieve the justice much wanted from peace and human rights activists due to the arrest of Bradley Manning and no further

investigation on the possible war crime committed on the video. However, it can be considered a success for WikiLeaks in the sense of transparency since the publications made a significant difference in the public opinion.

2.2.2 Threat to informants

Among all the 90 000 leaked reports and documents regarding the war in Afghanistan, there were many cases where it became fairly easy to identify the people mentioned in the documents. Although WikiLeaks withheld publishing over 15 000 documents until the names were removed from the documents, it was still possible to make the identifications due to the parts of information that were not removed (Chick 2010). Moreover, the documents are believed to contain sensitive information about Afghan informants who are collaborating with The US and NATO. The data can include contact addresses and precise GPS locations of Afghans cooperating with Western forces and also the methods and channels through which they are collecting intelligence (Winnett 2010). Pentagon stated, that the leaks do not pose a threat to the US forces. However, the real threat arising from the leaks is to local Afghans (NBC News 2010). Although in many cases the names have been removed, the addresses and specific locations and other personal details like father's names make the identification for Taliban forces effortless. In fact, A spokesman for the Taliban told Britain Channel 4 news that Taliban is carefully studying the reports published by WikiLeaks to find and punish the informants (Mackey 2010). Therefore, it can be said that Taliban can get access to the information regarding the informants and also get entail about the tactics and methods used by Western forces. Moreover, Robert Gates, The Secretary of Defense, made a statement commenting the leakage:

"The battlefield consequences of the release of these documents are potentially severe and dangerous for our troops, our allies and Afghan partners, and may well damage our relationships and reputation in that key part of the world. Intelligence sources and methods, as well as military tactics, techniques and procedures will become known to our adversaries."

However, a month after the statement, Gates told CNN that at this point, they have found no evidence of any Afghans being killed due to the WikiLeaks' publication but nevertheless, the risk itself remains because the reports are still accessible in the Internet (Levine 2010).

Therefore, when analyzing the potential harm versus potential benefits arising from this specific case, it becomes clear that due to the publication many lives were put at risk. Daniel Domscheit-Berg, a former partner of Julian Assange, has criticized Assange in his book "Inside WikiLeaks" saying that Assange rushed into publishing the files, giving it only four hours to edit the names in the reports leaving the result sloppy and possibly dangerous. Therefore, it can be said that although WikiLeaks wanted to publish details about what is really going on at the center of the war, it could have done it in a more careful way by taking enough time to edit the documents appropriately. In this case, WikiLeaks' need for transparency brought many critical consequences. Firstly, a real threat arose to the lives of the informants, who were giving information to the US in order to help them in the fight against terrorism. Secondly, Taliban forces gained access to US tactics and therefore, by studying the reports, Taliban received an advantage since they soon knew what they were up against.

The consequence to the US, in this case, is clearly damaging. It can be assumed, that after a leak this sensitive, informants will not be wanting to cooperate in the future due to the chance of being exposed. However, the information given by informants is presumed to be of high value. They are locals who know the life in the war zone and therefore may get easier access to information otherwise unreachable for the US. Therefore, Assange once said that his aim when publishing the war logs is to end the war. However, in this case, it can be that the need for transparency became an obstacle for fighting terrorism. With those publications, classified information was simply handed over to Taliban by which they gained a significant advantage. Moreover, it can be guessed that the US and in fact, and probably any other Western country, will have a difficult time when trying to gain information from local informants, since after the leakage it became clear that the US is incapable of keeping the information a secret and the informants safe.

2.2.3 Task Force 373

Among all the leaked war logs there was also a description of a special secret unit called Task Force 373, whose mission was to capture targets for death or detention without a chance of any trial, following the so-called “kill or capture list”. The Task Force 373 consists of men from the Navy Seals and Delta Forces and takes its orders straight from Pentagon (Gebauer 2010). Everything related to the task force, including identities, missions and outcomes, have been kept a secret. In fact, the information was kept in such secrecy that the documents related to the secret task force are believed to be one of the most sensitive ones among the 90 000 different war logs that were exposed. It appears from the files that the task force was born under the Obama administration and has proven to be very effective in capturing Taliban leaders or Al Qaeda specialists (Chivers 2010). However, another aspects that have been held a secret in regards of TF 373 are the missions gone wrong. The leaked documents show many numerous civilian deaths outdone by TF 373 that have gone unreported (Davies 2010)

One of the reports published by WikiLeaks states that TF 373 had a mission to kill a known Al Qaeda official called Abu Laith. The task force spent many weeks observing a Koran school where the official was believed to be staying. However, soon after launching several rockets it became clear that the target was not hit nor in the building. Instead, the forces accidentally killed six children and wounded one who soon died due to the severe injuries (Gebauer 2010). The incident was followed by a press release with false information, explaining that the attack was due to intensely dangerous activities in the schoolhouse when the mission was, in reality, about capturing the official (Davies 2010). Moreover, it became public that Task Force 373 was responsible for killing seven Afghan police officers when a mission to capture or kill a Taliban commander near Jalalabad went wrong (Davies 2010). The incident was covered up and not reported before WikiLeaks published the documents.

Therefore, it can be understood why the materials regarding the mysterious Task Force 373 were considered so sensitive. With the publication of the materials, many issues have arisen. Firstly, where is the line between the necessity of capturing dangerous officials and the need to protect civilian lives? Also, the legality of the “kill or capture” concept has been doubted. Mainly, whether or not the US forces can secretly kill or sentence to jail without a trial?

It is known that WikiLeaks seeks to find justice through transparency. Hence, it can be presumed, that by publishing the materials Assange wanted the US to take responsibility for all the unreported civilian casualties. The US responded in its usual way- by condemning the leaks. Moreover, due to sensitive information in the leaked files, Obama stated the necessity to change war tactics (MacAskill 2010). In fact, Obama emphasized the necessity to engage in the warzone more intensely and hence increase the troops by 30 000 more men. Furthermore, Pentagon insisted on finding whoever is behind the leaks and soon the main suspect- Bradley Manning, then 22 years old intelligence analyst, was arrested (MacAskill 2010).

Therefore, based on the actions taken of the US after the leaks, it can be seen that no one will be held accountable for the questionable methods of Task Force 373. In that sense, it can be said that WikiLeaks did not manage to get justice and it is likely that not much changed in the war arena ever since the leak. The US emphasized on the illegality of the leaks and instead of taking responsibility or conducting investigations of possible war crimes, all energy is directed into punishing the ones responsible for the leaks. In that sense, regardless of the sensitivity of the topic, transparency could be justified because of the possibility of war crimes. Understandably, it is necessary to take away any power from the officials linked to terrorist groupings. However, whether or not it can be done without a fair trial or including numerous civilian casualties cannot be up to one country's government's decisions, regardless of the amount of power the country has in the international arena.

2.3 The United States Diplomatic cables

2.3.1 Surveillance after The United Nations' officials

One significant part of the leakage of the US diplomatic cables was the allegation that Hillary Clinton, the Secretary of State of the US, asked diplomats to conduct surveillance after high-ranking United Nation's officials. The requested data included personal details like work schedules, email addresses, phone numbers, credit card and frequent flier numbers as well as DNA- iris scans and fingerprints and IT related data like passwords and user names. The

surveillance included all the permanent members as well as the Secretary General- Ban Ki-Moon (Booth, Borger, 2010). Moreover, Ban Ki-Moon's leadership style and work principles were also asked to monitor by Clinton. However, the impacts of the leak on the relationship between the US and the UN are not as serious as WikiLeaks expected after the leak. In fact, 1st of December the US officials denied any espionage conducted at the office of the United Nations giving a statement to CNN. The following day Ban Ki-Moon and Hillary Clinton met to discuss the leak. Ban Ki-Moon thanked Clinton for explaining the situation and emphasized on the need of the cooperation between the US and the UN. The statement said: "The secretary general reiterated his commitment to work in a transparent manner, and they reaffirmed the need for the US and UN to continue to work together on many issues of pressing concern based on mutual trust and confidence." (MacAskill, Booth, Borger 2010).

This situation, however, raises multiple questions. Firstly, how can the US deny Clinton ordering the surveillance when the document leaked was an order signed with Clinton's name? Also, why was the reaction of the UN so conciliatory? When denying the fact that the US diplomats were given intelligence officer's duties, it came with no clear explanation besides condemning the leaks and undermining the authority of WikiLeaks. Moreover, the anonymous official giving a statement to the CNN added: "It's one thing for someone to say, 'Hey, if you come across this kind of thing, we'd be interested.' It's another thing to say, 'Go out and do it' " (Benson, Dougherty 2010). Due to the vagueness of this statement it is hard to say whether or not Clinton ordered the diplomats to conduct surveillance. However, without giving any more specific explanations and drawing attention away from the issue by condemning the leaks, sets a tone for trying to cover up the leaked story.

When analyzing the reaction of the UN, it appears as if the UN would value cooperation with the US on such a high level that they are willing to let go of the leaked incident. According to The Guardian: "Ban does not like confrontation and his office has been careful in its responses not to alienate the US, but in private there is much unhappiness. That the US spies on other diplomats and staff at the UN did not come as a surprise to senior UN staff – but the scale of the operation did." (MacAskill, Booth, Borger 2010). It appears that the UN, in fact, disregarded the surveillance and more specifically, the scale of the actions done by the US. However, it seems that due to the need for maintaining good and stable relationships and cooperation, no further

attention will be given to the issue. One of the reasons could be that Ban wanted the US to support his reelection in 2012 and therefore had to prioritize the relationship instead of getting to the bottom of the problem. Thomas Weiss, politics professor at the City University of New York even said to The Guardian: "Would Ban say anything to anyone that indicated even modest disgruntlement? Now that would be a revolution in world affairs. And yes, we're stuck with him for the next six years." (MacAskill, Booth, Borger 2010).

It appears that the United Nations is, in fact, fairly used to espionage even though surveillance after the United Nations is banned with an international treaty. Mark Malloch Brown, a former deputy UN secretary general under Kofi Annan, also said to The Guardian that the UN officials had come to take spying for granted and had learned to work around it." (MacAskill, Booth, Borger 2010). However, what seems to be surprising for the officials in the UN is that the surveillance is asked to do by diplomats instead of intelligence agencies. Diplomats' duties usually include representing the home country, negotiating on specific issues and in general, conducting international relations. Although the line between a diplomat and a spy is often fairly blurry, the extent of espionage diplomats are involved in has to be in a legal framework. However, collecting data like credit card numbers and passwords is past the line of legality. In fact, it is stated in the 1946 UN convention on privileges and immunities in the Article II Section 3 that: "The premises of the United Nations shall be inviolable. The property and assets of the United Nations, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall be immune from search, requisition, confiscation, expropriation and any other form of interference, whether by executive, administrative, judicial or legislative action". In that sense it can be said that the surveillance asked from the US diplomats is way beyond their legal duties. However, in this specific case it appears that the UN needs the approval of the US more than it needs justice. Therefore, no further action on this matter was taken and the impact of the leak had much less significance on the relations between the United States and the United Nations than at first expected.

Therefore, when having to analyze whether the leak did more harm or good, it appears, that when looking from a present day perspective- the impact is nowhere to be seen. Today, Hillary Clinton is running for presidency and the US and the UN are still in cooperation. Also, since many officials in the UN have stated to be used to surveillance in the UN premises, it seems that no significant harm or good came out of the leaked information. Therefore, it can be said that

WikiLeaks' attempted transparency did not go beyond a simple shock and was more of an embarrassment for the United States. However, even that did not last long enough to have far-reaching consequences.

2.3.2 Resignation of the US ambassador to Mexico

One of the most severe consequences of the leakage of the US diplomatic cables is believed to have taken place in Mexico. WikiLeaks published documents that had sensitive information about Mexican drug wars stated out by Carlos Pascual, the US ambassador to Mexico. The leaked documents showed how Pascual reported of jealousies and insufficient cooperation between Mexican security forces. He was also doubtful, whether or not the former Mexican President, Felipe Calderon, can win the ongoing war against drug cartels in Mexico (BBC News 2011). Also, he described a situation of killing the drug lord Arturo Beltran Leyva, where the Mexican navy captured the major trafficker after U.S. officials gave them information that the Mexican army had not acted upon (The Guardian 2011). After the publication of the files, the former Mexican President Calderon expressed his disappointment over the criticism and stated to have lost trust in Pascual. In fact, Calderon said to The Washington Post that: "the release of State Department cables criticizing Mexico's anti-drug fight had caused 'severe damage' to its relationship with the United States and suggested that tensions had risen so dramatically that he could no longer work with the American ambassador in his country," (Sheridan 2011). Although Obama and Calderon met shortly after the documents were published, Pascual resigned at his own will, making him losing his job the first official casualty of the leakage of the diplomatic cables.

The resignation of Pascual raises a question whether or not in situations like these diplomats should suffer for doing their jobs? It is clear that the topic the leaks shed light on is especially sensitive for Calderon. His willingness to fight the drug war has been questioned by the Mexican people due to over 35 000 casualties that have taken place because of the drug war (Sheridan 2011). Moreover, with the leakage of the cables the lack of trust for Calderon's ability to fight drug cartels has increased significantly due to the close cooperation with the US. It

became clear that in many cases the strings are pulled by the leaders of the US making people doubt whether the actions are really in the best interests of Mexican people. Especially to the poor results and lack of progress so far. Therefore, it can be seen how Calderon took the criticism especially personally although it seems that Pascual did not cross any ethical lines by describing the situation and reporting back to the US the way he saw the situation.

When it comes to this case and the relations between the US and Mexico, Calderon himself expressed concern over the relationship and like aforementioned, stated that a significant amount of damage has been made. It can be seen how the sensitivity of the topic and the fragileness of the relationships between the two countries has made the situation worse. However, soon after the leaks Obama joined his administration to mend the damage and apologized for the materials published by WikiLeaks. According to New York Times, both leaders condemned the leaks and agreed that the incident should not distract further cooperation. Also, Obama and Calderon “reaffirmed their shared commitment to work together against transnational criminal organizations, to enhance border cooperation, and to improve the economic well-being of people in both countries,” (Calmes 2011). Therefore, regardless of the anticipation of the public, that changes would take place due to the leakages, not much changed in the relationship between the two countries. It seems that the leaks have possibly caused more embarrassment for both countries rather than actual damage in the long run. Also, it can be guessed that the leaks undermined Calderon’s authority in the eyes of Mexican people, which can be one of the reasons he did not wish to proceed working together with Pascual. However, even though it was just another minor setback among many previous ones for the US-Mexican relations, it did cause Pascual his position as an ambassador for reporting back his opinion on Calderon’s leadership and Mexican authorities.

Therefore, it can be seen, that the impacts of that specific leak were slightly more influential due to the resignation of the US ambassador to Mexico, Carlos Pascual. With the publication of his concerns over many issues related to drug wars in Mexico and the capabilities of the former President of Mexico, the already fairly instable relations became more fragile. Although WikiLeaks aimed to show the public the backstage of diplomacy, the transparency of those reports made Pascual resign from his position as an ambassador. Therefore, it raises a question whether or not the leakage and the transparency was in favor of international relations?

It can be presumed that the information reported back by Pascual could have helped in resolving the drug crisis in Mexico. Also, it is clear that it was Pascual's duty as a state representative to report back his opinion on the issue. Due to WikiLeaks, the report became a public knowledge and since it became an embarrassment for Calderon, Pascual was forced to resign although he was simply carrying out his duties as the ambassador. Therefore, it can be said that the negative sides of the attempt for transparency are quite obvious. It did not contribute positively to the relations of the US and Mexico nor to the ambassador reporting back as a part of the duties coming with this position. However, the leakage brought clarity for the Mexican people as they realized that the President at that time, Calderon, was incompetent in solving the country's biggest problem. Therefore, in 2012 a new president was elected- Enrique Pena Nieto, who also vowed to continue facing the issue and committing himself to continuing the drug wars.

2.3.3 China supporting Korean reunification

The published cables regarding China's attitude towards North Korea included 251 288 documents sent by American officials between from the late 1966 and until February 2010. The documents stated China's change of tactics and their growing support for reunification of two Koreas. In fact, in the published cables China told the US that it supports a peaceful reunification of the North and the South and does not tolerate North Korea's recent actions in nuclear testing. In fact, China said that North Korean nuclear capabilities are a threat for the entire world (Tisdall 2010). Furthermore, a Chinese official called its official ally "a spoiled child" and said that China is moving towards supporting a unified Korea under Seoul rule. Moreover, Chinese officials predicted the death of Kim Jong-il to be the end of North Korean regime, which would eventually lead to the anticipated reunification (Tisdall 2010). As it can be see now, Kim Jong-un has taken over the rule of North Korea after the passing of his father, Kim Jong-il in 2011 and continued with the North Korean regime.

However, when looking at the impacts on international relation, five years later, not many things have changed in the relations of that triangle. Even after the publication of the cables the US still continued to take China as a threat until they were in cooperation with North Korea and

their historical ties will still strong (Lin 2010). Moreover, North Korea then tried to reassure if China still opposed the US-South Korean military cooperation and regardless of the negotiations about creating a new treaty banning nuclear testing, North Korea launched its third nuclear weapon test in February 2013. So, it is likely that in this extremely difficult and also fairly sensitive case, all the parties involved are after their own personal benefits. It can be guessed that the reason China stated its support for reunification was also for its own benefits. When thinking of the possibility of the reunification of two Koreas China can come out as getting the most benefits of it. Although China is an ally of North Korea, it also simultaneously has an effective trade agreement with South Korea. Therefore, when the two Koreas would unite, it would be likely that the US would pull its troops from Korean territory since there would be no more need to protect the South from the North. Hence, China would get a beneficial relationship with the unified Korea without having to fear the US troops near its own border.

Therefore, it can be said that the significance of the leak was not as high as first thought. This can be due to the reason that many officials believed that the collapse of the North would certainly take place after the death of Kim Jong-il and this is possibly the reason China slightly rephrased its viewpoint. However, his younger son has continued to rule the country in the same regime and while the reunification is also a possibility in the present world, it is a process that can take years or decades before happening and once it does, all the countries involved will probably once again seek for their own personal benefit. As the leakage did not cause much harm in relation to those three countries, or as a matter of fact, to any other countries, the revelation can actually be justified. The leakage of the relations of the three countries give the people an insight of how countries act in regards of their own benefits and that the official statements do not always match the actions. However, the leak also came with a threat due to the involvement of North Korea. Due to the instability of the country, the actions can be unexpected when leaks like this get published in the media.

2.3.4 Agreement between the US and Yemen

With the release of the US diplomatic cables a secret deal between the United States and Yemen was also brought to public. The leaked documents show that Obama administration had a

deal with the President of Yemen Ali Abdullah Saleh to target terrorists working for Al Qaeda in Yemen. Moreover, Yemen took the responsibility of two air strikes, which were actually carried out by the US forces. The cable also published Saleh's words, saying "We'll continue saying the bombs are ours, not yours," which quickly spread in media all over the world (Booth, Black 2010). The reason the US targets Al Qaeda is due to the various terrorist attacks they have launched or tried to launch against the US. Since the US saw the Al Qaeda base in Yemen as a significant threat due to extremely poor conditions in Yemen's airport, the leaders of the two countries established the secret agreement for targeting the terrorist grouping. However, it can be guessed that due to the distrust for the US among the people of Yemen, Saleh decided to take public responsibility for the air strikes.

Although the goal of the air strikes was to eliminate people working for Al Qaeda in Yemen in order to prevent any future acts of terror, 41 civilians sleeping in tents nearby were killed in one of the attacks as well. After the leak of the cables it became a public knowledge that the US was responsible for the attacks. Therefore when the Yemeni government offered the families financial compensations, they did not accept it demanding the prosecution of those responsible (Human Rights Watch 2013). It can be said that with the leakage of the materials regarding the deal between Yemen and the US, the consequences are still seen in the present day. Four years later, Human Rights Watchers were still protesting for the need of taking responsibility. Especially, due to the fact, that another drone killed 12 civilians on the 12th of December, just four days before the fourth anniversary of the previous air strike. Letta Taylor, senior terrorism and counter-terrorism researcher said to Human Rights Watch:

"Four years later, relatives are still waiting for the US to acknowledge the killing of 41 civilians in al-Majalah, or even to account for what happened in that airstrike. Military operations that do little to address civilian casualties are short-sighted as well as unlawful."

In addition, it has been speculated that the US involvement in Yemen can on the contrary be useful for Al Qaeda. In fact, it is possible that due to many civilian casualties caused by air missiles launched by the US, Al Qaeda has a new tool for recruitment. More specifically, due to the numerous deaths of women and children, Al Qaeda can recruit boys and men from those

families to fight for revenge (Kelley 2012). It can be said that the topic related to Al Qaeda or other terrorist groupings are always extremely sensitive due to the relatives of those part of terrorist acts in the past. It is clear that the issue in Yemen is an ongoing one where in addition to two countries, a terrorist group and human rights activist are involved as well. There is certainly a need for taking responsibility in the attacks causing civilian casualties due to ethical reasons because currently, the trust for the US has declined even more, leaving space for Al Qaeda to use that for their benefit. Therefore, within every next move, possible consequences have to be strategically analyzed in order not to give Al Qaeda any advantages and at the same time avoiding involving any more innocent civilians, because it might be that those two aspects are interrelated.

When WikiLeaks exposed the secret agreement between the US and Yemen it exposed the countries to a significant risk due to the capabilities of Al Qaeda. However, it also gave the families of the killed civilians some insight to what really happened the night their family members were killed. Therefore, how can the costs and benefits be compared in this case? It is understandable why the US sees the publication of the files as a threat- after 9/11 all actions regarding Al Qaeda are taken with extreme caution. However, it is known that WikiLeaks aims to make powerful countries to take responsibilities for their actions by publishing the cover-ups kept in secrecy. Even years later, the US has not taken responsibility for the attacks nor given any explanations to the families although as it came out of the disclosures, they really were behind the attacks that killed numerous civilians. Therefore, in this case it can be said that the transparency can be considered justified or even noble. WikiLeaks exposed the US so that they would take responsibility in front of people who deserve to know the truth. However, regardless of the presumably sincere aim, the transparency had no effect, as the US has not claimed responsibility. Instead, they keep condemning the leaks due to the exposure to Al Qaeda, which is also true, but in this case, one does not out rule the other.

2.3.5 Closing Guantanamo Bay

Another exposure from the leak of the diplomatic cables shows that the US is using all possible methods to send prisoners of Guantanamo Bay to other countries. It is known for the

public since the beginning of Obama's first term that it is his intention to close Guantanamo Bay as soon as possible. For that, however, it is needed to reposition the remaining prisoners. With the leakage of the cables, several unusual ideas and proposals were brought to public. Firstly, in 2009 the King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia proposed placing chips under the skins of the prisoners in order to be able to monitor their activities at all times and brought an example of how it is sometimes similarly done with horses. Although the White House doubted the legality of this, they promised to "look into it" (MacAskill 2010).

Moreover, an American ambassador to Kuwait had a meeting with the interior minister of Kuwait, Sheikh Jaber al-Khaled al-Sabah, where he asked about transferring more detainees to Kuwait. To that, the minister reportedly told the ambassador: "You know better than I that we cannot deal with these people. I can't detain them ... If they are rotten, they are rotten and the best thing to do is to get rid of them. You picked them up in Afghanistan; you should drop them off in Afghanistan, in the middle of the war zone," (MacAskill 2010).

In addition to proposals from foreign officials, it was also revealed that the US offered several different deals to many countries. For instance, the US told Slovenia that in case they would accept prisoners from Guantanamo Bay, they are more likely to receive a visit from the President of the United States, Barack Obama (Savage, Leherh 2010). Also, in Belgium's case the US officials emphasized the country's wish to become a more important player in Europe and suggested that by taking more detainees, Belgium starts achieving that with the help of the US (MacAskill 2010).

When analyzing the leakage of the cables, it can be guessed that the publication of the files was also fairly damaging to the reputation of the United States. Firstly, due to the sensitivity of the topic, since Obama has failed to close Guantanamo Bay until the present day and those leaks are a reflection of the failed attempts. Also, the leakage of those conversations held can easily undermine the authority of the US, especially for the countries involved in those discussions. Moreover, it gave an insight of the tactics and ways of "sweet-talking" for the countries the US had not yet asked for obtaining the prisoners. On the 24th of April 2011 The US government gave a statement to The New York Times saying:

“It is unfortunate that The New York Times and other news organizations have made the decision to publish numerous documents obtained illegally by WikiLeaks concerning the Guantanamo detention facility. These documents contain classified information about current and former GTMO detainees, and we strongly condemn the leaking of this sensitive information.”

In general, it can be said that although the leaks also included classified information and details about the detainees, they are most likely to cause more damage to the reputation of the US rather than any severe problems with any other countries. When looking at the present day, it can be seen that no crucial consequences took place that would affect the facility nowadays. In fact, in January 2015 Obama renewed his vow to close Guantanamo Bay saying that the prison is “a source of international embarrassment and potential harm to the US.” (Weaver 2015) Therefore, it can be seen that once again the transparency did not cause significant damage and only affected the reputation of the US. However, it can be guessed that the leak could even have influenced the US to deal with the matter in an appropriate way to avoid any further embarrassments. The leak showed the public that the US is constantly dealing with the promise to close Guantanamo Bay, however, the means used were somewhat questionable. However, since Obama renewed his vow quite recently, it can be seen that that matter is still being dealt with, this time perhaps with more effective and appropriate solutions.

3. DIPLOMATIC TRANSPARENCY IN THE PRESENT DAY

When looking at the big picture of the impacts of WikiLeaks from a present day perspective, it can be said there are, in fact, several changes. However, the changes are not what WikiLeaks and Assange had been aiming for before disclosing significant amount of classified government documents. In fact, the direction in which the changes have taken place seems to be in contrary to the changed first anticipated. Victor Davis Hanson, a military historian and a scholar for ancient warfare, expressed his opinion on the aftermath of WikiLeaks saying that:

“Fewer players will wish to speak to our team; Americans will fight a reputation of being untrustworthy in keeping confidence; and we will thus miss out on some vital information that could have life and death consequences—in addition to these revelations hurting those we have enlisted to our cause,” (Hanson 2014).

Therefore, from that statement it can be understood that instead of no longer trying to keep diplomatic processes a secret, they will be held in even bigger secrecy than earlier. Especially when other countries have started to doubt the US capabilities in keeping diplomatic secrets and therefore not engaging in discussions as much as previously.

Therefore, it raises a question whether or not transparency is really necessary in diplomatic relations. Assange explains WikiLeaks’ aim as “The goal is justice, the method is transparency. It's important not to confuse the goal and the method.” He also added that: “Transparent government tends to produce just government.” Therefore, by publishing the documents he believes to achieve justice in government affairs and in order for there to be justice, diplomatic relations have to be transparent. However, many counterarguments for Assange’s beliefs have been provided by Mark Page and J.E Spence in their article “Open Secrets Questionably Arrived At: The Impact of WikiLeaks on Diplomacy”. They believe that „Foreign policy should be made open, but the processed by which they were achieved could not.” They emphasize on the obligatory balance between the public’s right to know and the government’s need for secrecy. In fact, they believe that many negotiations would not have successful outcomes if the stages of negotiations would constantly be made public during the process. Here,

the release of Nelson Mandela has been brought as an example. Page and Spence believe that the release would have been unlikely if the negotiations for Mandela's release carried out by diplomats from the UK and the US would have been done in front of the public eye.

Page and Spence also argue, that mutual trust between countries is of high importance. They share the same opinion with V.D Hanson when stating that leaks like those disclosed by WikiLeaks can easily break the trust between two countries and threaten the possibility of getting any more information. Moreover, they wrote:

“Diplomats are in countries to create amicable relations, facilitate open and candid communication, and gather information for their home state. If they become unpopular because of words said behind others' backs they will be severely hampered in these tasks. It could be argued that a diplomat must give his honest opinion to his government, and that he should feel able to do so freely, but clearly the diplomat's intelligent and informed opinions on the 'conditions or personalities' within the host country must be qualified by the use of tact.”

This statement can very well be linked to the cases mentioned above, where the US ambassador to Mexico was forced to resign after his report on Calderon's inability to fight drug wars was published. It was his duty to report back the information he had gathered while expressing his honest opinion. However, with the disclosure, the information found its way back to Calderon resulting in trust issues between Calderon and Pascual, as well as Mexico and the US in general. It can be assumed that Calderon would not be as open with the US as previously and it would be harder for the US to gain access to accurate information due to the disclosures.

Moreover, another important part of the disclosures is the intermediary- in this case, the press. Page and Spence believe that in addition to governments, the press also has a responsibility to the readers. They state that the problem with the press publishing top-secret government files is that they are not capable or even qualified to decide what is in the national interest. For example, in case of publishing articles, which make it easy to identify the people mentioned in the documents, it is firstly a threat for those people who are easily identified and secondly the chances of getting any information from those people decreases to a minimum. For instance, Page and Spence brought an example of an Iranian businessman became easily identified after

WikiLeaks published the files according to which he gave the names of the companies breaking the arms embargo in Iran. First of all, after the publication it was believed that his life was in danger. Also, it was very unlikely that he, or anyone in possession of similar information, would now come forward in the future.

However, regardless of the points made previously, there are still many supporters of WikiLeaks. However, it is understandable because a goal towards justice through transparency is something that seems worth supporting. Therefore, it can be that the supporters of WikiLeaks might actually simply be disappointed in the morality of the governments that have been exposed by WikiLeaks and therefore just in the need of a change in authority. However, the people do not realize the necessity for secrecy on some level in diplomacy. Hence, here another controversy is created: WikiLeaks disclosures revealed many actions that were damaging to the reputation of the US and created distrust in American people. However, there is very little mentioning of successful operations, which were followed due to secret diplomatic negotiations. This is again where press becomes the key. Those successful incidents that have happened are not as scandalous and therefore not as good for the publicity as the disclosures provided by WikiLeaks. Hence, there might be a fair point made by Page and Spence, which states that the press is not qualified for selecting articles in terms of national or even international interest.

However, on the other hand, there were many shocking revelations among the disclosures where it appeared as if the US was breaking the law. For example, conduction surveillance after high-ranked UN officials or the shootings shown in "Collateral Murder". In these cases, it can be considered necessary to publish the unreported incidents, in order to make the US take responsibility for the operation they have so far tried to cover up. Therefore, it can be said that the line between finding justice through transparency and damaging diplomatic relations is a thin one. Even though the documents were made public, no further investigation on the legitimacy of the US actions has been conducted and therefore no anticipated justice has been served regardless of many attempts from human rights activists or Assange. The reality is that when Wilson and Trotsky failed to make the significant changes they wished to make diplomacy transparent, it is fairly questionable if Assange has the power or capability to make those changes he aimed for. The amount of power and influence the US has is too important for other states to go against America and jeopardize any cooperation. Hence, it can only be guessed that after all WikiLeaks'

efforts the effect has turned controversial and the secrecy in diplomatic relations will increase even more in order to reestablish trusting diplomatic relationships with other countries.

4. DISCUSSION

It has now been established that the phenomenons such as transparent diplomacy and digital diplomacy could not have been created without the rapid development of technology. Globalization as such created all the presumptions needed for Assange to be able to leak classified documents and make them available within a matter of time to the entire world. It can easily be said that the impacts and reactions of WikiLeaks would not have been on a scale as large as it is now without having the Internet and the technological equipment to access information instantly. Therefore, it can be said that the opportunity to do so was the first step for WikiLeaks' actions. However, when now having established, that WikiLeaks has not managed to create transparency in diplomatic relations and has, in fact, done the opposite by leaking classified information, it can be said that the concept of "transparent diplomacy" created by Assange and WikiLeaks still does not exist beside being simply a theory. The goal for transparency came with shocking revelations, which were aimed to make diplomatic decision making open for everyone. Assange believed that with every publication he is a step closer to justice, transparency and a new era in diplomacy.

In this process, WikiLeaks has taken different measures and approaches to reach the right audience. Firstly, Assange has shown the desire for liberal reform in journalism. By giving journalists the materials otherwise not reachable, he believed in reforming the system. In fact, it appears that reforming journalism as such, would be the first step towards diplomatic transparency. Simply put, if news publications were constantly granted access to top secret files, the documents would be professionally edited and published and people would have daily overviews of what is really happening behind closed doors. Therefore, the liberal reform approach would start by completely changing journalism in order to reach the final goal: transparency.

However, when Assange took a softer approach in regards of journalism and reaching people through media, the approach towards governments is clearly less trusting and more straightforward. It has been observed that Assange's behavior towards governments' secrecy can be defined as radical as he is using radical resistance against the current measures governments are using in diplomatic relations. Regardless of many threats received by the US government

officials Assange still went through with publishing the leaked files proving the radical resistance approach. However, the theories Assange seems to manage WikiLeaks with seem to lack arguments when it comes to analyzing the situation from another angle. It seems to go without consideration whether the leaks can be, in fact, more damaging to diplomatic relations. The Economist has brought out a simple example regarding WikiLeaks trying to radically push for transparency:

“It's part of the nature of human communication that one doesn't always say the same thing to every audience. There are perfectly good reasons why you don't always tell the same story to your boss as you do to your spouse. There are things Washington needs to tell Riyadh to explain what it's just told Jerusalem and things Washington needs to tell Jerusalem to explain what it's just told Riyadh, and these cables shouldn't be crossed. There's nothing wrong with this. It's inevitable. And it wouldn't make the world a better place if Washington were unable to say anything to Jerusalem without its being heard by Riyadh, any more than it would if you were unable to tell your spouse anything without its being heard by your boss.”

The example simply illustrates how traditional diplomacy still needs to exist in the present world and some aspects of it cannot or perhaps should not be changed in the interest of foreign relations. As the earlier case studies proved, if the results of the leaks were not insignificant or an embarrassment for the countries involved, they were harmful for diplomatic relations. No significant benefits for diplomacy arose from any of the cases analyzed and the result is not a transparent diplomacy. On the contrary, it is believed that due to the leaks, diplomacy has reached a new level of secrecy. Therefore, it once again leads back to the necessity of secrecy in diplomacy, which is one of the key aspects of traditional and a more developed- public diplomacy. Therefore, it could be argued that although the globalization in the field of technology has created an opportunity for accessing and spreading classified diplomatic files, the world might just not be ready for transparent diplomacy. As it was proven, the leaks were not eye-openers for countries involved. Instead, the leaks created a lack of trust, which caused an ambassador his job, created an international terrorism threat, made governments question the morality of the selected media publications and caused a significant amount of embarrassment.

Even though leaks such as the one claiming that the US is conducting surveillance after high ranked UN officials give a hint of possible law breaking, it was proven to have no consequences. Moreover, the concept of transparent diplomacy is nowhere to be seen in the present day, five years after the significant leaks reached the media.

Therefore, it is a possibility that the world as well as diplomacy is simply not ready for an organization such as WikiLeaks. Although all the technological presumptions have been created, the world has not yet adjusted enough to put them into a beneficial use. It could be that the transparency will be established in the future, however, as the history has proven based on the examples of Trotsky and Churchill, there are some key aspects that diplomacy simply cannot function without. Even though diplomacy is changing within time and adjusting itself with the rapidly developing world, it is built on traditional diplomatic values that require secrecy of some sort and at least at the present day simply cannot be changed into a completely transparent one without causing a chaos in the diplomatic relations.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, it can be said that the leakage of the classified government documents had many impacts on international relations and diplomacy. The leaks even created a minor diplomatic crisis and endangered relations between the US and other parties involved. WikiLeaks itself is a relatively new phenomenon, which could not have been created in a way it is now without technological globalization. Both the Internet and the large variety of technological devices have been the tools for creating a new field called technological diplomacy that is also a concept that helps to define the nature of WikiLeaks. More specifically, since WikiLeaks published its leaked documents through online media publications. WikiLeaks' reason behind publishing classified government records has stated out to be the desire for transparency, democracy and justice. Hence WikiLeaks has used its desire for transparency to create a new concept called "transparent diplomacy", which works similarly to new public diplomacy with the addition of the public's right to have an opinion and know how decisions are made. The creator of WikiLeaks, Julian Assange, has chosen different ways in which he addresses the media and the governments, first being a liberal reform, the second, on the other hand, radical resistance. Those two well illustrate his two different viewpoints and attitudes towards those two parties involved in his plan to achieve transparent diplomacy.

When looking at the analysis of the eight case studies, it can be said that the scale of the impacts was very different. However, the general result of the cases was embarrassment to the United States and the lack of trust between the US and other countries involved in the documents. Simply put, it can be said that the leakages were more harmful for international relations and did not contribute to the development of diplomacy. The leaks created difficulties in foreign relations for the US, as well as threatened the international security because after the publication of the files, the classified information became easily accessible for terrorist organizations. Moreover, when looking at the present day, no significant evidence of diplomacy becoming more transparent has been found. In fact, it seems to have sparked a controversial effect and it can be said that diplomatic secrets are now being kept even harder due to the possibility of further leaks.

Therefore, to sum up, it can be said that the hypothesis was proved to be mostly true: the leakage of the classified government files had mostly negative consequences on diplomatic relations, however, on a smaller scale than first expected, and in the long run, the attempts failed to make any change towards diplomatic transparency. It can also be said that WikiLeaks did not succeed in its mission to bring transparency to diplomatic relations, because when looking at the present day it is expected that diplomatic secrets are being secured more than ever and all the people responsible for the leaks are being brought to trial. Therefore, it can be presumed that although diplomacy adjusts itself to the changing world and develops in time, it still operates on the grounds of traditional diplomatic values and based on the analysis of the cases and the results found, it can be said that the world is simply not ready for total transparency in the field of diplomacy and the concept of transparent diplomacy will, for now, remain just a theory.

REFERENCES

- Adams, R. (2010). Wikileaks: reaction to the Collateral Murder video. – *The Guardian*, 8 April 2010.
URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/richard-adams-blog/2010/apr/08/wikileaks-collateral-murder-video-iraq> (March 2010)
- Archibugi,, D. Chiarugi, M. (2011). Wilson, Trotsky, Assange: lessons from the history of diplomatic transparency. – *Open Democracy*, 20 February 2011
URL: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/daniele-archibugi-marina-chiarugi/wilson-trotsky-assange-lessons-from-history-of-diplomatic-transpar> (March 2015)
- A Statement by the United States Government. (2011). *The New York Times*, 24 April
URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/25/world/guantanamo-files-us-government-statement.html> (March 2015)
- Assange, J. (2010). WikiLeaks Founder Julian Assange: Transparent Government Tends to Produce Just Government. *Democracy now*, 28 July
URL: http://www.democracynow.org/2010/7/28/wikileaks_founder_julian_assange_transparent_government (April 2015)
- Benson, P., Dougherty, J. (2010). U.S. officials insist Clinton not ordering diplomats to spy. *CNN*, 1 December
URL: <http://edition.cnn.com/2010/US/11/30/wikileaks.clinton/> (March 2015)
- Booth, R., Black, I. (2010). WikiLeaks cables: Yemen offered US 'open door' to attack al-Qaida on its soil. *The Guardian*, 3 December
URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/dec/03/wikileaks-yemen-us-attack-al-qaida> (March 2015)
- Booth, R., Borger, J. (2010). US diplomats spied on UN leadership. *The Guardian*, 28 November
URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/nov/28/us-embassy-cables-spying-un> (April 2015)

- Calmes, J. (2010). Obama Calls Turkish and Mexican Leaders on Diplomatic Leak. *The New York Times*, 11 December
URL: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/12/world/12react.html?_r=0 (March 2015)
- Chick, K. (2010). WikiLeaks report harms national security in Afghanistan, says White House. – *The Christian Science Monitor*, 26 July 2010
URL: <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/terrorism-security/2010/0726/WikiLeaks-report-harms-national-security-in-Afghanistan-says-White-House> (March 2015)
- Chivers, C.J. (2010). View Is Bleaker Than Official Portrayal of War in Afghanistan. – *The New York Times*, 25 July 2010
URL: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/26/world/asia/26warlogs.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0 (March 2015)
- Cull, N.J. (2011). WikiLeaks, public diplomacy 2.0 and the state of digital public diplomacy. *EBSCOHOST*. (March 2015)
- Davis, N. (2010). Afghanistan war logs: Task Force 373 – special forces hunting top Taliban. – *The Guardian*, 25 July 2010
URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/jul/25/task-force-373-secret-afghanistan-taliban> (March 2015)
- Domscheit-Berg, D. (2010). Inside WikiLeaks. Berlin: Econ Verlag.
- Fenster, M. (2012). Disclosure's Effects: WikiLeaks and Transparency. *EBSCOHOST*. (March 2015)
- Gebauer, M. (2010). The Truth about Task Force 373: War Logs Cast Light on Dirty Side of Afghanistan Conflict. – *Der Spiegel*, 26 July 2010
URL: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/the-truth-about-task-force-373-war-logs-cast-light-on-dirty-side-of-afghanistan-conflict-a-708559.html> (March 2015)
- Kelley, M. (2012) Obama's Drone War In Yemen May Be Al Qaeda's Best Recruitment Tool Ever. *Business Insider*, 30 May
URL: <http://www.businessinsider.com/obamas-covert-drone-war-in-yemen-prompting-more-terror-2012-5> (March 2015)
- LeMay, J. (2012). 2 Years Since “Collateral Murder”: Mote Atrocities In The Middle East. – *Mint Press News*, 6 April 2012

- URL: <http://www.mintpressnews.com/2-years-since-collateral-murder-more-atrocities-in-the-middle-east/23401/> (March 2015)
- Levine, A. (2010). Gates: Leaked documents don't reveal key intel, but risks remain. – *CNN*, 17 October 2010
- URL: <http://edition.cnn.com/2010/US/10/16/wikileaks.assessment/> (March 2015)
- Lichtenstein, J. (2010). Digital Diplomacy. *The New York Times*, 16 July
- URL: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/18/magazine/18web2-0-t.html?_r=1
- Lin, C. (2010) WikiLeaks: China's break with North Korea is overblown. *The Guardian*, 30 November
- URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2010/nov/30/wikileaks-china-north-korea> (March 2015)
- MacAskill, E. (2010). Barack Obama enlists Afghan war leaks in support of policy switch. – *The Guardian*, 27 July 2010
- URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/jul/27/barack-obama-afghan-war-logs1>
- MacAskill, E. (2010). WikiLeaks cables show US U-turn over ex-Guantánamo inmate. *The Guardian*, 30 November
- URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/nov/30/wikileaks-cables-us-guantanamo-moazzam-begg> (March 2015)
- MacAskill, E., Booth, R., Borger, J. (2010). WikiLeaks cables: Hillary Clinton meets Ban Ki-moon after spying revelations. *The Guardian*, 2 December
- URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/dec/02/wikileaks-cables-hillary-clinton-ban> (March 2015)
- Mackey, R. (2010). Talibans Study WikiLeaks to Hunt Informants. – *The New York Times*, 30 July 2010
- URL: http://thelede.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/07/30/taliban-study-wikileaks-to-hunt-informants/?_r=3 (March 2015)
- McClellan, R. (2004). Public Diplomacy in the Context of Traditional Diplomacy. – *Public Diplomacy*, 14 October 2004 (March 2015)
- URL: <http://www.publicdiplomacy.org/45.htm>
- Melissen, J. (2005). *The New Public Diplomacy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Mitchell, G. (2013). Three Years Ago Today: What Happened After Release of 'Collateral Murder'. – *LeakSource*, 5 April 2013
URL: <http://leaksource.info/2013/04/05/three-years-ago-today-what-happened-after-release-of-collateral-murder/> (March 2015)
- Page, M., Spence, J.E. (2011). Open Secrets Questionably Arrived At: The Impact of Wikileaks on Diplomacy. – *EBSCOHOST*, June 2011 (February 2015)
- Report: Afghan leaks dangerously expose informants' identities. – *NBC News*, 28 July 2010
URL: http://www.nbcnews.com/id/38441360/ns/world_news-south_and_central_asia/t/report-afghan-leaks-dangerously-expose-informants-identities/#.VUzPKs44RUS (March 2015)
- Savage, C., Lehren, A. (201.), Cables Depict U.S. Haggling to Clear Guantánamo. *The New York Times*, 20 November
URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/30/world/americas/30gitmo.html?pagewanted=all&r=0> (March 2015)
- Sheridan, M.B. (2011). Calderon: WikiLeaks caused severe damage to U.S.-Mexico relations. *The Washington Post*, 3 March
URL: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/03/AR2011030302853.html> (March 2015)
- Stengel, R. (2010). TIME's Julian Assange Interview: Full Transcript/Audio. – *TIME*, 1 December 2010
URL: <http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2034040,00.html> (March 2015)
- Tisdall, S. (2010) Wikileaks cables reveal China 'ready to abandon North Korea'. *The Guardian*, 29 November
URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/nov/29/wikileaks-cables-china-reunified-korea> (March 2015)
- Tuch, H. N. (1990). *Communicating With the World*. Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

US ambassador to Mexico resigns over WikiLeaks embassy cables (2011). *The Guardian*, 20 March

URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/mar/20/us-ambassador-mexico-resigns-wikileaks> (March 2015)

US Mexico envoy Carlos Pascual quits amid Wikileaks row (2011). *BBC New*, 20 March

URL: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-12798622> (March 2015)

US/Yemen: Investigate Civilian Deaths from Airstrikes. (2013). *Human Rights Watch*. 17 December

URL: <http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/12/17/usyemen-investigate-civilian-deaths-airstrikes> (March 2015)

Weaver, M. (2015). State of the Union: Barack Obama renews vow to close Guantánamo Bay. *The Guardian*, 21 January

URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/jan/21/state-union-barack-obama-renews-pledge-close-guantanamo-bay> (March 2015)

Winnett, R. (2010). Wikileaks Afghanistan: Taliban 'hunting down informants' – *The Telegraph*, 30 July 2010

URL: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/7917955/Wikileaks-Afghanistan-Taliban-hunting-down-informants.html> (March 2015)