

## Not A “Whistleblower”

Reuters, the masters of anti-Israeli and anti-American **bias**, report:

**Israeli nuclear whistleblower Mordechai Vanunu** emerged defiant after 18 years in prison Wednesday, saying he was proud of revealing secrets that exposed the Jewish state as an atomic power.

Whistleblowers are insiders who report wrongdoing in the organisations for which they work. But many highly reputable people (including **ourselves**, of course) believe that there was no wrongdoing in Israel possessing nuclear weapons, or in keeping the details secret. The correct term for people who reveal military secrets is *spies*. If they do this with the intention of **destroying the state of which they are citizens**, then they are also *traitors*.

By using the unambiguously positive term whistleblower rather than spy or traitor, or even renegade or defector, Reuters is endorsing Vanunu's call for the destruction of Israel.

**Update:** In regard to a tangentially related issue, **Steven Den Beste** corresponds with a reporter from *Paris Match* and criticises their biased conception of impartiality.

Wed, 04/21/2004 - 18:16 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

## A reader

Does the state have the right to develop nuclear weapons without seeking the consent of the citizenry? If so, why?

by a reader on Thu, 04/22/2004 - 10:00 | [reply](#)

## Secret weapons

a reader asked:

Does the state have the right to develop nuclear weapons without seeking the consent of the citizenry? If so, why?

Most states do not have the right to develop nuclear weapons at all. Those that do, derive that right from their duty to defend their citizens. In some situations, the effectiveness of a weapon depends

on secrecy. In such situations, if the the state in question has a right to develop that weapon at all, it has an obligation to develop it with the appropriate level of secrecy.

Thus, for instance, the Soviet Union and China had no right to develop nuclear weapons because they were rogue states. The United States had both a right and a duty to develop them because they were fighting a just war and such weapons would help to end it sooner, more certainly, and with less loss of life. Because of the circumstances, they also had a duty to do this in the utmost secrecy, which they did. Britain and France had a right to develop them under the conditions of the Cold War, but with a much lower level of secrecy: the existence and some of the capabilities of the weapons were rightly determined by public debate, while other details rightly remained secret. Israel had a right to develop them because of the existential threat it faced. Under the circumstances, the deterrence value of the weapons depended on only their bare existence being publicly known, but none of the other details. So the fact that they existed was deliberately leaked, and the other details kept secret – a policy of intentional ambiguity whose existence was itself deliberately leaked. These policies were publicly discussed and overwhelmingly approved. In particular, all the major political parties were in favour of them, and their leaders continued them through successive changes of government.

by [Editor](#) on Thu, 04/22/2004 - 12:52 | [reply](#)

## A reader

Nice answer. Thanks.

by a reader on Fri, 04/23/2004 - 09:29 | [reply](#)

## Isn't the problem (with news reporting)

the idea that impartiality is possible?

by a reader on Fri, 04/23/2004 - 23:16 | [reply](#)

## bias unavoidable?

no. the world is non-biased. thus proving it's possible.

(ok not \*perfectly\*, but far more than the media we complain about. so the media could be much less biased, if it was better.)

~curi

by a reader on Fri, 04/23/2004 - 23:22 | [reply](#)

## Don't understand

When you say "the world" is not biased, do you mean "[Setting The World to Rights](#)" is not biased?

by a reader on Fri, 04/23/2004 - 23:29 | [reply](#)

## you got it

yes. sry if my lack of caps confused u.

~ curi

by a reader on Sat, 04/24/2004 - 05:00 | [reply](#)

## rogue states ? just war ?

who decides which the rogue states and just wars are ?  
presumably Israel is not a rogue state despite constructing illegal settlements on someone else's land, despite electing as PM bus bombing terrorists like Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir (who also ordered the murder of UN peace negotiator Bernadotte)

by a reader on Wed, 04/28/2004 - 10:02 | [reply](#)

## Re: rogue states ? just war ?

who decides which the rogue states and just wars are ?

**We** do, of course. Since you evidently did not see our our [post yesterday](#), giving a working definition of 'rogue states' for the benefit of readers without a moral compass, you must be a newcomer to our blog. Welcome!

You will see that Israel does not meet the criteria. You should also read our [Short History of Israel](#).

by [Editor](#) on Wed, 04/28/2004 - 13:34 | [reply](#)