

Wiki leaks Revelations in Global Context - The War Between 'Right to Publish' and 'Ethical Code of Conduct

Ratnesh Dwivedi*

Abstract

WikiLeaks is an international non-profit organisation that publishes submissions of private, secret, and classified media from anonymous news sources, news leaks, and whistleblowers. Its website, launched in 2006 under The Sunshine Press organisation claimed a database of more than 1.2 million documents within a year of its launch. WikiLeaks describes its founders as a mix of Chinese dissidents, journalists, mathematicians, and start-up company technologists from the United States, Taiwan, Europe, Australia, and South Africa. Julian Assange, an Australian Internet activist, is generally described as its director. The site was originally launched as a user-editable wiki, but has progressively moved towards a more traditional publication model and no longer accepts either user comments or edits.

The wikileaks.org domain name was registered on 4 October 2006. The website was unveiled, and published its first document in December 2006. The site claims to have been "founded by Chinese dissidents, journalists, mathematicians and start-up company technologists, from the US, Taiwan, Europe, Australia and South Africa".

WikiLeaks states that its "primary interest is in exposing oppressive regimes in Asia, the former Soviet bloc, Sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East, but we also expect to be of assistance to people of all regions who wish to reveal unethical behaviour in their governments and corporations."

WikiLeaks posted its first document in December 2006, a decision to assassinate government officials signed by Sheikh Hassan Dahir Aweys." In August 2007, The Guardian published a story about corruption by the family of the former Kenyan leader Daniel Arap Moi based on information provided via WikiLeaks. In November 2007, a March 2003 copy of Standard Operating Procedures for Camp Delta detailing the protocol of the U.S. Army at the Guantanamo Bay detention camp was released.

Thanks to the era of instant information retrieval, Americans and the Western alliance have a huge problem: silencing Julian Assange as he brings to light 250,000 sensitive documents regarding national security.

Shock, embarrassment, disappointment and no small amount of anxiety have overwhelmed us in recent days.

The Wikileaks phenomenon is intricate, but suppose we reduce its ethical evaluation to two questions: is whistleblowing ethical, even when motivated by resentment and the desire to harm its target? And is Wikileaks' facilitation of whistleblowing ethical, even if it might put at risk innocent people? A deontologist, convinced that telling the truth and never lying is an absolute must, is likely to appreciate whistleblowing as the right thing to do, independently of the reasons behind it. And a consequentialist may support Wikileaks as a means to maximise the welfare of the largest number of people, especially if risks are minimized by censoring sensitive information. So current answers in the mass media seem to converge: Wikileaks is a good thing. I am not entirely convinced.

Whatever may be the outcome of wiki leaks revelations, but the debate of right to publish and ethical code of conduct is something many of the political experts, journalists and academicians are debating. Wiki leaks, many believe has crossed the journalistic code of conduct and more firmly buy this opinion that its not a journalism, but wiki leaks has done something which traditional journalism has not been able to do so far. Peeping in the secured labyrinths of high profile political order of the world. It may or may not be ethically correct but the revelation has shaken many countries including U.S.A and India. As for as Indian part of revelation is concerned, former diplomat to India David Mulford has opined in a talk show with CNN-IBN that many of the cables are correct and Indian revelations are true to many extent.

The question now is whether to go ahead with these revelation trusting on the cables and then to realize the dirt in media and politics or just avoid the thought by saying that its unethical and what wiki leaks ahs done so far may be punished in the name of national security. The debate is on.

Keywords: Wikileaks, Global contexts, Right to publish, Ethical code of conduct, Whistleblowing, Julian Assange

1. Introduction

WikiLeaks is an international non-profit organisation that publishes submissions of private, secret, and classified media from anonymous news sources, news leaks, and whistleblowers. Its website, launched in 2006 under The Sunshine Press organisation claimed a database of more than 1.2 million documents within a year of its launch. WikiLeaks describes its founders as a mix of Chinese dissidents, journalists, mathematicians, and start-up company technologists from the United States, Taiwan, Europe, Australia, and South Africa. Julian Assange, an Australian Internet activist, is generally described as its director. The site was originally launched as a user-editable wiki, but has progressively moved towards a more traditional publication model and no longer accepts either user comments or edits.

In April 2010, WikiLeaks published gunshot footage from the 12 July 2007 Baghdad airstrike in which Iraqi civilians and journalists were killed by an Apache helicopter, as the Collateral Murder video. In July of the same year, WikiLeaks released Afghan War Diary, a compilation of more than 76,900 documents about the War in Afghanistan not previously available for public review. In October 2010, the group released a package of almost 400,000 documents called the Iraq War Logs in coordination with major commercial media organisations. This allowed every death in Iraq, and across the border in Iran, to be mapped. In November 2010, WikiLeaks began releasing U.S. State department diplomatic cables.

1.1 Founding

The wikileaks.org domain name was registered on 4 October 2006. The website was unveiled, and published its first document in December 2006. The site claims to have been "founded by Chinese dissidents, journalists, mathematicians and start-up company technologists, from the US, Taiwan, Europe, Australia and South Africa".

1.2 Purpose

WikiLeaks states that its "primary interest is in exposing oppressive regimes in Asia, the former Soviet bloc, Sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East, but we also expect to be of assistance to people of all regions who wish to reveal unethical behaviour in their governments and corporations."

In January 2007, the website stated that it had over 1.2 million leaked documents that it was preparing to publish. An article in The New Yorker said:

1.3 Operational challenges

On 17 July, Jacob Appelbaum spoke on behalf of WikiLeaks at the 2010 Hackers on Planet Earth conference in New York City, replacing Assange because of the presence of federal agents at the conference. He announced that the WikiLeaks submission system was again up and running, after it had been temporarily suspended. Assange was a surprise speaker at a TED conference on 19 July 2010 in Oxford, and confirmed that the site had begun accepting submissions again.

1.4 Administration

According to a January 2010 interview, the WikiLeaks team then

consisted of five people working full-time and about 800 people who worked occasionally, none of whom were compensated. WikiLeaks has no official headquarters. The expenses per year are about €200,000, mainly for servers and bureaucracy, but would reach €600,000 if work currently done by volunteers were paid for. WikiLeaks does not pay for lawyers, as hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal support have been donated by media organisations such as the Associated Press, Los Angeles Times, and the National Newspaper Publishers Association. Its only revenue stream is donations, but WikiLeaks has planned to add an auction model to sell early access to documents. The Wau Holland Foundation helps to process donations to WikiLeaks. In July 2010, the Foundation stated that WikiLeaks was receiving no money for personnel costs, only for hardware, travelling and bandwidth. An article in TechEye wrote:

1.5 Name and policies

Despite using the name "WikiLeaks", the website is no longer wiki-based as of May 2010. Also, despite some popular confusion due to both having the term "wiki" in their names, WikiLeaks and Wikipedia have no affiliation with each other ("wiki" is not a brand name); Wikia, a for-profit corporation loosely affiliated with the Wikimedia Foundation, did however purchase several WikiLeaks-related domain names (including wikileaks.com and wikileaks.net) as a "protective brand measure" in 2007.

1.5.1 Verification of submissions

WikiLeaks states that it has never released a misattributed document. Documents are assessed before release. In response to concerns about the possibility of misleading or fraudulent leaks, WikiLeaks has stated that misleading leaks "are already well-placed in the mainstream media. WikiLeaks is of no additional assistance." The FAQ states that: "The simplest and most effective countermeasure is a worldwide community of informed users and editors who can scrutinise and discuss leaked documents."

1.6 Leaks

1.6.1 2006-08

WikiLeaks posted its first document in December 2006, a decision to assassinate government officials signed by Sheikh Hassan Dahir Aweys." In August 2007, The Guardian published a story about corruption by the family of the former Kenyan leader Daniel Arap Moi based on information provided via WikiLeaks. In November 2007, a March 2003 copy of Standard Operating Procedures for Camp Delta detailing the protocol of the U.S. Army at the Guantanamo Bay detention camp was released. The document revealed that some prisoners were off-limits to the International Committee of the Red Cross, something that the U.S. military had in the past repeatedly denied. In February 2008, WikiLeaks released allegations of illegal activities at the Cayman Islands branch of the Swiss Bank Julius Baer which led to the bank suing WikiLeaks and obtaining an injunction which temporarily shut down wikileaks.org.

1.6.2 2009

In January 2009, WikiLeaks released 86 telephone intercept recordings of Peruvian politicians and businessmen involved in the 2008 Peru oil scandal. In February, WikiLeaks released 6,780 Congressional Research Service reports followed in March, by a list of contributors to the Norm Coleman senatorial campaign and a set of documents belonging to Barclays Bank that had been ordered removed from the website of The Guardian. In July, they

released a report relating to a serious nuclear accident that had occurred at the Iranian Natanz nuclear facility in 2009. Later media reports have suggested that the accident was related to the Stuxnet computer worm. In September, internal documents from Kaupthing Bank were leaked, from shortly before the collapse of Iceland's banking sector, which led to the 2008–2010 Icelandic financial crisis. The document shows that suspiciously large sums of money were loaned to various owners of the bank, and large debts written off. In October, Joint Services Protocol 440, a British document advising the security services on how to avoid documents being leaked was published by WikiLeaks

1.6.3. 2010

In March 2010, WikiLeaks released a secret 32-page U.S. Department of Defense Counterintelligence Analysis Report written in March 2008 discussing the leaking of material by WikiLeaks and how it could be deterred. In April, a classified video of the 12 July 2007 Baghdad airstrike was released, showing two Reuters employees being fired at, after the pilots mistakenly thought the men were carrying weapons, which were in fact cameras. In the week following the release, "wikileaks" was the search term with the most significant growth worldwide in the last seven days as measured by Google Insights. In January 2010, WikiLeaks received the first test cable A 22-year-old US Army intelligence analyst, PFC (formerly SPC) Bradley Manning, a US embassy cable relating about IceSave, thereafter referred as "Reykjavik 13". In June 2010, he was arrested after alleged chat logs were turned in to the authorities by former hacker Adrian Lamo, in whom he had confided. Manning reportedly told Lamo he had leaked the "Collateral Murder" video, in addition to a video of the Granai airstrike and around 260,000 diplomatic cables, to WikiLeaks.

1.6.4 Diplomatic cables release

On 28 November 2010, WikiLeaks and five major newspapers from Spain (El País), France (Le Monde), Germany (Der Spiegel), the United Kingdom (The Guardian), and the United States (The New York Times) started to simultaneously publish the first 220 of 251,287 leaked confidential-but not top secret-diplomatic cables from 274 US embassies around the world, dated from 28 December 1966 to 28 February 2010. WikiLeaks plans to release the entirety of the cables in phases over several months.

1.7 Backlash and pressure

1.7.1 Governments

1.7.1.1. Germany

The home of Theodor Reppe, registrant of the German WikiLeaks domain name, wikileaks.de, was raided on 24 March 2009 after WikiLeaks released the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) censorship blacklist. The site was not affected.

1.7.1.2. People's Republic of China

The WikiLeaks website claims that the government of the People's Republic of China has attempted to block all traffic to web sites with "wikileaks" in the URL since 2007, but that this can be bypassed through encrypted connections or by using one of WikiLeaks' many covert URLs.

1.7.1.3. Australia

On 16 March 2009, the Australian Communications and Media Authority added WikiLeaks to their proposed blacklist of sites

that will be blocked for all Australians if the mandatory internet filtering censorship scheme is implemented as planned. [181] [182] The blacklisting was removed 30 November 2010.

1.7.1.4. Thailand

The Centre for the Resolution of the Emergency Situation (CRES) is currently censoring the website WikiLeaks in Thailand and more than 40,000 other webpages because of the emergency decree in Thailand imposed as a result of political instabilities (Emergency decree declared beginning of April 2010).

1.7.1.4. United States

Access to WikiLeaks is currently blocked in the United States Library of Congress. On 3 December 2010 the White House Office of Management and Budget sent a memo forbidding all unauthorised federal government employees and contractors from accessing classified documents publicly available on WikiLeaks and other websites. The U.S. Army, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Justice Department are considering criminally prosecuting WikiLeaks and Assange "on grounds they encouraged the theft of government property", although former prosecutors say doing so would be difficult.[103] According to a report on the Daily Beast website, the Obama administration asked Britain, Germany and Australia among others to also consider bringing criminal charges against Assange for the Afghan war leaks and to help limit Assange's travels across international borders.

1.7.2. Organisations and companies

1.7.2.1. Facebook

WikiLeaks claimed in April 2010 that Facebook deleted their fan page, which had 30,000 fans. However, as of 7 December 2010 the group's Facebook fan page was available and had grown by 100,000 fans daily since 1 December, to more than 1.5 million fans. It is also the largest growth of the week. Regarding the presence of WikiLeaks on Facebook, Andrew Noyes, the company's D.C. based Manager of Public Policy Communications has stated "the Wikileaks Facebook Page does not violate our content standards nor have we encountered any material posted on the page that violates our policies."

1.7.2.2. Moneybookers

In October 2010, it was reported that Moneybookers, which collected donations for WikiLeaks, had ended its relationship with the site. Moneybookers stated that its decision had been made "to comply with money laundering or other investigations conducted by government authorities, agencies or commissions."

1.7.3. U.S. diplomatic cables leak responses

According to The Times, WikiLeaks and its members have complained about continuing harassment and surveillance by law enforcement and intelligence organisations, including extended detention, seizure of computers, veiled threats, "covert following and hidden photography." Two lawyers for Julian Assange in the United Kingdom told The Guardian that they believed they were being watched by the security services after the U.S. cables leak, which started on 28 November 2010.

Furthermore, several companies severed ties with WikiLeaks. After providing 24-hour notification, American-owned EveryDNS dropped WikiLeaks from its entries on 2 December

2010, citing DDoS attacks that "threatened the stability of its infrastructure".[61][207] The site's 'info' DNS lookup remained operational at alternative addresses for direct access respectively to the WikiLeaks and Cablegate websites. On the same day, Amazon.com severed its ties with WikiLeaks, to which it was providing infrastructure services, after an intervention by an aide of U.S. Senator Joe Lieberman. Amazon denied acting under political pressure, citing a violation of its terms of service. Citing indirect pressure from the U.S. Government, Tableau Software also dropped WikiLeaks' data from its site for people to use for data visualisation.

2. WikiLeaks Raises New Ethical Issues (Taken from concordmonitor.com)

By now, most people know that like the London alleys Sherlock Holmes prowled, the internet is populated not just by good guys but also by cutthroats, thieves, perverts and spies. Many also know that during every hour of every day, a great cyber-war rages as governments, including our own, attempt to penetrate the barriers surrounding critical information about allies and enemies alike.

Less is known about WikiLeaks.org, a largely clandestine nonprofit organization devoted to publishing information governments and corporations want to keep secret. Its efforts are global, its moral and ethical code its own, and its defenses against lawsuits and efforts to silence it excellent.

WikiLeaks and organizations like it aim to make the workings of the powerful transparent by providing information - some vetted, some not - to tip off researchers, journalists, and by extension, law enforcement agencies to wrongdoing.

3. The Cause of Embarrassment, Disappointment and Anxiety-- The Absence of Ethical Code of Conduct in Wikileaks-

Thanks to the era of instant information retrieval, Americans and the Western alliance have a huge problem: silencing Julian Assange as he brings to light 250,000 sensitive documents regarding national security.

Shock, embarrassment, disappointment and no small amount of anxiety have overwhelmed us in recent days.

WikiLeaks raises a number of ethical issues to contemplate.

So, the first ethical issue that emerges is what the public has the right to know in a democracy.

Abraham Lincoln, author of the famous words "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," actually laid the groundwork for modern government security measures during the Civil War as he authorized covert military action, information surveillance and secret negotiations with allies.

We are reminded that there are circumstances that demand and deserve not being made public until their result is achieved. Technical support, military resources, plans and strategies, treaty negotiations, human rights issues and security for leaders

are on my list. But the time comes when the government of a free people is accountable for the nature of its action. That's what the Freedom of Information Act is all about.

4. WikiLeaks, knowledge, and abuse of power-By Lyombeeko – Guest Opinion , September 20, 2010 7:20 AM

An old proverb states that "there is nothing hidden under the Sun." Sooner or later, even the most tightly guarded secrets become public knowledge. That "time will tell" logic was not good enough for WikiLeaks, a website founded by an idealistic group of self-styled "whistleblowers, activists, and journalists."

WikiLeaks was conceptualized as a whistleblower's Wikipedia, an open repository for purloined governmental, corporate, and private information. From its servers located somewhere between Australia and Sweden, WikiLeaks went drip, drip, drip - leaking "sensitive" information from corrupt, dictatorial regimes as well as from democracies that did not live up to their values.

In 2008, Index on Censorship awarded WikiLeaks its Freedom of Expression Award for leaking information about the alleged illegal offshore activities of a Swiss investment bank and successfully fighting off a permanent injunction issued by an American court against publication of that information.

In 2009, WikiLeaks and its enigmatic frontman, Julian Assange, won Amnesty International's UK Media Award in the New Media category. WikiLeaks had been accepted into the ever-expanding, "media" fraternity.

5. Discussing The Two Sides-The Ethics and Right to Publish

The Wikileaks phenomenon is intricate, but suppose we reduce its ethical evaluation to two questions: is whistleblowing ethical, even when motivated by resentment and the desire to harm its target? And is Wikileaks' facilitation of whistleblowing ethical, even if it might put at risk innocent people? A deontologist, convinced that telling the truth and never lying is an absolute must, is likely to appreciate whistleblowing as the right thing to do, independently of the reasons behind it. And a consequentialist may support Wikileaks as a means to maximise the welfare of the largest number of people, especially if risks are minimized by censoring sensitive information. So current answers in the mass media seem to converge: Wikileaks is a good thing. I am not entirely convinced.

Confidential communication is a three-player game – sender, receiver and referent – in which sender and receiver trust each other. The receiver, not the referent, trusts and holds responsible the sender for the truth of what is communicated about the referent. The referent may know about such communication and may even easily guess its contents (imagine a letter of reference), but there is confidentiality only if the receiver, not the referent, has access to the information exchanged. Accountability is present and connects sender and receiver. Whistleblowing disrupts such a three-player game. In the new, metagame the sender is the whistleblower through Wikileaks, the whole world

is the potential receiver, and the referents are the players in the previously confidential communication. This is problematic.

6. WikiLeaks: The Ethics of Revealing Secrets



WikiLeaks is at it again, releasing a trove of diplomatic cables that the organization claims will reveal "lying, corrupt and murderous leaderships from Bahrain to Brazil." Governments and news outlets around the world are scurrying to pore over the once-secret documents for important revelations.

WikiLeaks has been criticized before for revealing sensitive information. For example, the organization published thousands of reports about the Iraq War. Though much of the information was already known in broad terms, many of the specifics were not. WikiLeaks also released classified U.S. military footage from an attack in July 2007 in Baghdad by a U.S. helicopter that killed a dozen people including two journalists. For these leaks and others, many have praised the organization. But what are the ethics behind revealing secrets?

Despite what conspiracy theorists may think, secrecy is not an inherently bad thing; in fact, it usually keeps us safe. We keep our bank accounts, ATM and Social Security numbers a secret because revealing them could put our finances at risk. We may choose to keep personal information from other people, not to be deceptive but simply because it's none of their business. Similarly, revealing state secrets could put national security at risk or may just fall into the category of "too much information."

7. Journalism Ethicist Calls for WikiLeaks Code of Ethics --

by Sydney Smith, StinkyJournalism.org

Stephen J.A. Ward called for WikiLeaks and other "whistleblower" sites to establish some form of ethics code. He explained his concerns and call in the article, "How to Reveal Secrets," published on The Canadian Journalism Project Aug 24.

Ward is a journalism ethics professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the founding chair of the Canadian Association of Journalists' ethics advisory committee and the director of the Center for Journalism Ethics.

Noting that Wikileaks's publication of secret Afghan War documents "sparked an ethics firestorm," Ward wrote that WikiLeaks is a blend of old and new media. In fact, it's such a blend that when the Afghan documents were published, many in the media and public didn't know how to treat WikiLeaks -- is it a source or a news agency?

In order to determine what some of WikiLeaks' ethics may be, Ward listed numerous questions he has for WikiLeaks, including:

- What wouldn't the site publish and why?
- Are there legitimate reasons for secrecy, and what?
- "Would WikiLeaks publish NATO codes for protection against nuclear attack? Would it publish the security plans of energy installations or airports against terrorist attack? Would it publish information that would place in danger individuals, informants, or soldiers?"
- What is WikiLeaks' editorial process?
- How does WikiLeaks decide what to publish?
- Does WikiLeaks "attempt to be accurate, complete, and fair?"
- Does WikiLeaks consider any government "an oppressive regime?"
- "Will the advocates of the site publish secrets from all countries equally, or will they favor reports that support their favored causes or do damage to countries they dislike?"
- What does the public do when the site errs? How does WikiLeaks handle complaints?

Further, Ward clarified he's not necessarily against WikiLeaks, but that he sees the need for "open and responsible ethical policies." Likewise, in the media, he wrote "We need a serious debate on the ethics of secrecy." How does the media report secret information and what codes or rules guide those reporting decisions?

8. Wikileaks Revelation About U.S. Diplomacy - The Need of Journalistic Ethics--

WikiLeaks' systematic release of classified United States' diplomatic cables raises a myriad of questions. One of those questions is whether or not WikiLeaks endeavor towards "crack[ing] the world open" is ethical. There are no easy answers to the ethical questions posed by WikiLeaks.

What are ethics? According to Merriam-Webster, ethics are "the principles of conduct governing an individual or a group." As such, many organizations have a "Code of Ethics" or something similar to act as a compass when the organization is presented with an ethical quandary.

The touchstone of journalistic ethics comes from the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ). SPJ's Code of Ethics rests on four pillars: Seek the truth and report it, minimize harm, act independently, and be accountable. Few would question whether WikiLeaks is seeking the truth or acting independently; the real questions are whether WikiLeaks is minimizing potential harm and whether it is an accountable organization.

"Self-censorship... is based on context, careful calibration of circumstances with the public's right to know always

paramount," Clifford Christians, Professor Emeritus at the University of Illinois, said. "There is always accountability of whom and why the decisions were being made."

9. How India Was Shaken by Wikileaks?

India's ruling Congress party offered cash for votes to pass a crucial 2008 confidence vote in parliament, a secret U.S. state cable said, embroiling Manmohan Singh's beleaguered government in yet another corruption scandal that risks further opposition attacks on the graft-smear coalition.

The secret U.S. state department cable obtained by WikiLeaks and published by The Hindu newspaper details a conversation between a senior Congress party member and a U.S. Embassy official surrounding the payment of almost \$9 million by a government facing a crucial confidence vote to members of a regional political party to secure their support.

While the cable could not be independently verified by Reuters, its contents threaten to expose illegal practices that many fear are part and parcel of Indian politics.

Leader of the Opposition Sushma Swaraj, who has in recent months led a scathing attack on the Congress party-led coalition government for failing to tackle corruption in India, posted on Twitter: "The wikileaks details in today's Hindu about payoffs to MPs are shocking. I will raise this issue in Parliament today."

Both houses of parliament were adjourned after 30 minutes after uproar over the cable's contents.

The cable details a conversation between an aide of Satish Sharma, Congress party MP and close associate of party chief Sonia Gandhi, and U.S. Charge d'Affaires Steven White in which the aide states that four MPs belonging to the Rashtriya Lok Dal (RLD) party had been paid 100 million rupees (\$2.2 million) each in order to secure their support for the government in a tight confidence vote over the Congress party's support of a nuclear deal between India and the U.S.

10. The Bombardment of Wike Bombs Over India--

After leaking classified documents about the US, Iraq and Afghanistan, WikiLeaks has dropped eight bombs on India.

Wikibomb 1: Congress bought MPs for 2008 trust vote. US cable suggests MPs from Ajit Singh's RLD were paid Rs. 10 crore each by the Congress during the 2008 trust vote.

Wikibomb 2: P. Chidambaram's son and Azhagiri bribed voters US cable claims DMK's Azhagiri paid Rs 5000 per voter in Thirumangalam. Karti Chidambaram is quoted as saying that it is impossible to distribute the money when the villages are spread so far apart in 2009 LS polls.

Wikibomb 3: The Afzal Guru dilemma US cable sent on Oct 20, 2006 highlights Congress' fear of losing Muslim votes in UP if Parliament attack convict Afzal Guru is hanged.

Wikibomb 4: India, US face-off on sharing 26/11 info with Pak US embassy cables claim Delhi tried to fend off US pressure on information sharing, before relenting.

Wikibomb 5: PM isolated on Pakistan Cables claim that a US envoy after meeting NSA M.K. Narayanan was driven to the conclusion that PM was isolated within his own government over Pakistan.

Wikibomb 6: Pro-US tilt in cabinet shuffle US cables sent by David Mulford claimed that the 2006 cabinet reshuffle had a pro-US tilt.

Wikibomb 7: West Asia policy hostage to Muslim vote US cables stated that the UPA's policy towards West Asia is dictated by its anxiety to keep Muslims in good humour.

Wikibomb 8: Elitist Congress unwilling to engage with masses Another US cables released on March 15 claim Congress top brass is unwilling to go into the Hindi belt to engage the masses.

11. How Wikileaks Founder Links 'War on Corruption' in India with Wikileaks--

LONDON: WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange has said the "tremendous" anti-corruption movement "building up" in India is a result of the publication of "cablegate" revelations by The Hindu.

Citing the campaign, led by Anna Hazare, as an example of the impact of WikiLeaks cables, he said what was happening in India was "something that has not happened since the time of Gandhi."

Mr. Assange singled out The Hindu's coverage of the leaked U.S. diplomatic cables while speaking in a debate organised by the Frontline Club and New Statesman.

Stating that he could "speak for hours" about the reverberations sparked by the cables around the world, he noted: "Just yesterday [on Saturday], the Editor of The Hindu, the most respected paper in India, brought over 21 front pages from the past six weeks that were based on cablegate material. Indian Parliament walked out four times and there's now a tremendous anti-corruption movement that has been building up in that country - something that has not happened since the time of Gandhi."

12. Conclusion-The War Ahead-

Whatever may be the outcome of wiki leaks revelations, but the debate of right to publish and ethical code of conduct is something many of the political experts, journalists and academicians are debating. Wiki leaks ,many believe has crossed the journalistic code of conduct and more firmly buy this opinion that its not a journalism, but wiki leaks has done something which traditional journalism has not been able to do so far. Peeping in the secured labyrinths of high profile political order of the world. It may or may not be ethically correct but the revelation has shaken many countries including U.S.A and India. As for as Indian part of revelation is concerned, former diplomat

to India David Mulford has opined in a talk show with CNN-IBN that many of the cables are correct and Indian revelations are true to many extent.

The question now is whether to go ahead with these revelation trusting on the cables and then to realize the dirt in media and politics or just avoid the thought by saying that its unethical and what wiki leaks has done so far may be punished in the name of national security. The debate is on.

13. References

1. <http://www.concordmonitor.com>
2. <http://www.ethicsdaily.com>
3. <http://www.dailyiowan.com>
4. <http://thephilosophyofinformation.com>
5. <http://www.news.discovery.com>
6. <http://www.stinkyjournalism.org>
7. <http://indiatoday.intoday.in>
8. <blogs.reuters.com/india>
9. www.thehindu.com

