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What he did was data-dump – a sort of digital tantrum. Data-of the sort. Manning had no specific issue to blow the whistle on. Wikileaks' most notable so-called whistleblowers – was nothing newsworthiness, not sensation for the sake of sensation. Advised to go to a reputable newspaper; one driven by a sense of danger. A whistleblower with specific information would be better. Case, the failure to competently redact put innocent people in tend not to know the difference, nor care to. Certainly in Wikileaks' interest" and what "the public is interested in". Internet mavericks newspapers are able to tell the difference between "the public watchdog against power and corruption. Editors of respectable undermines the role of the press in society as the most suitable information. Journalists should stop and think about how this unaccountable internet-based initiatives as mediators of important must prompt questions about the good sense of hailing secretive and figure of the European far-right known as Israel Shamir. blogs – had exposed Wikileaks' involvement with a shadowy private.setData. In full rant mode, Assange went on to claim that there was "an international conspiracy" against Wikileaks led by the (British) Guardian newspaper and – that old canard – "Jews". What had upset Assange was the fact that Private Eye – following the lead of political bloggers – had exposed Wikileaks' involvement with a shadowy figure of the European far-right known as Israel Shamir. This somewhat deranged haranguing of Private Eye's editor must prompt questions about the good sense of hailing secretive and unaccountable internet-based initiatives as mediators of important information. Journalists should stop and think about how this undermines the role of the press in society as the most suitable watchdog against power and corruption. Editors of respectable newspapers are able to tell the difference between “the public interest” and what “the public is interested in”. Internet mavericks tend not to know the difference, nor care to. Certainly in Wikileaks' case, the failure to competently redact put innocent people in danger. A whistleblower with specific information would be better advised to go to a reputable newspaper; one driven by a sense of newsworthiness, not sensation for the sake of sensation.

But this really is the trouble. Bradley Manning – one of Wikileaks' most notable so-called whistleblowers – was nothing of the sort. Manning had no specific issue to blow the whistle on. What he did was data-dump – a sort of digital tantrum. Data-