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My first article is an abstract by Zachary Gregoricus. Gregoricus acts as an editor to the New England Law Review currently. In this piece the more technical side of whistleblowing is discussed. Various protections are available through the SEC to aid those who have blown the whistle. The moral side of whistleblowing and a number of reasons as to why people whistleblow is also thoroughly discussed.

It was interesting to learn that there are different types of whistleblowing. “While such policies can be effective and helpful when utilized to encourage employees to report to managers internal to their organization, philosophers often distinguish this internal reporting from whistleblowing proper, which occurs when an employee reveals information externally (or publicly) about wrongdoing within the organization” (Gregoricus 2016, p.1). Internal reporting differs from whistleblowing proper, or what common people think of as whistleblowing.

Internal reporting is a type of whistleblowing in which an individual takes information from an organization not necessarily to the public, but to government institutions that are responsible for such actions. For example, an employee might report fraudulent behavior done by their company to the IRS. This individual could then be compensated for a percentage of the money received by cracking down on the behavior. “In a 2001 case, whistleblower Douglas Durand received $77 million of an $885 million dollar settlement between his former employer (TAP Pharmaceutical Products) and the U.S. government” (Gregoricus 2016, p. 3). This is the preferred type of whistleblowing. This type does not allow big public spectacles and grants the company peace to handle their business within the company. This article paints a clear picture on the inner workings of whistleblowing.

My second article is an abstract by Manohar Kumar and Daniele Santoro. This piece delves deep into the various cons of whistleblowing and how public opinion is essential to keep a cohesive government unit. Proper whistleblowing is discussed and how potential threats could arise from a government leak. It was very interesting to see a counterargument to whistleblowing and how potentially detrimental it can be to a society.

These authors argue on how deteriorating whistleblowing can be to a society. Their arguments against whistleblowing include qualification and judgement. What power is granted to those who deem themselves whistleblowers and what gives an individual that authority? They believe whistleblowing to be a last resort: “The question is then whether whistleblowing can be a legitimate instrument for correcting wrongs in circumstances where no other internal channel is available. In virtue of this feature, some accounts classify whistleblowing as an act of last resort, which cannot be treated as a conventional institutional procedure” (Kumar, Santoro 2017).

Even within this last resort option, criteria have to be met for one to seem justified in whistleblowing. Intent and public interest also play a gigantic role in justifying whistleblowing. To see such people who are against whistleblowing still have justifications for when it is applicable should point to how evident it is in our society today. “First, that acts of whistleblowing are not only morally permissible, but also *demanded*, when nobody else other than the potential whistleblower possesses the information that is of public interest” (Kumar, Santoro 2017).
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