

# CHAPTER 1

## WHISTLE BLOWING: DEFINITIONS AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This chapter focuses on defining whistleblowing, the presentation of the background information on whistleblowing. The nature, subtypes of whistleblowing and factors that determine its morality are to be discussed. During this exploration, some ethical challenges that are normally faced by whistle blowers in general are tabled and critically reflected on. It is this chapter's aim as well to briefly describe the ethics of Kant and Utilitarian and then task them to justify the practice world over. This will fail since the two moral theorems value individualism on the expense of African collectivism, from the failure and irrelevance, there sprouts the quest to appraise whistleblowing through *ubuntu*.

De Maria (1998:1) defines whistleblowing as an open disclosure about significant wrongdoing made by a concerned citizen totally or predominantly motivated by notions of public interest. This means that an individual member or employee of an organisation can inform the public about the bad acts by other individuals within the same institution, by the institution itself which are highly harmful to the welfare of the public. Callahan (1988:331) describes whistleblowing as an alarm by employees from within the very organisation in which they work aiming to spotlight neglect of a possible abuse that threatens public interest. At the same time, Buchholk and Rosenthal (1998: 398) define whistleblowing as an attempt by an employee or a former employee of an organisation to disclose what he or she believes to be wrongdoing in or by the organisation or an effort to make others aware of the practices one considers illegal, unjust or harmful. The whistle blower would have perceived the wrongdoing in a particular role and initiates the disclosure of her or his own free will to a person or agency capable of investigating the complaint and facilitating the correction of the wrongdoing.

However, whistleblowing becomes an issue when an employee is ordered to perform some act or has obtained knowledge that the institution is engaged in activities that are believed to cause harm to the third parties, are in violation of human rights and run counter to the defined purpose of the institution. According to Buchholz and Rosenthal (1998:399), specific situations that may require whistleblowing include the production of defective vehicles, abuse of government funds, illegal dumping of hazardous wastes, and discrimination because of race, sex or age, among others. Masaka (2007:33) confirms this as he asserts that the unethical business activities include overprizing, sale of

substandard commodities at exorbitant prices and sale of commodities that are injurious to health as well as their low quality and structural shortcomings. It is worth emphasising that situations requiring whistleblowing vary from place to place since the business of business is determined by each respective society.

Depending on the situation prevailing, whistleblowing can be subdivided into many categories or types. There is what is known as 'internal whistleblowing', a scenario characterised by an employee informing his or her immediate supervisor or higher management of wrongdoing within the organisation. Some immoral activities that may trigger internal whistleblowing range from stealing the organisation's properties, sexual harassment by supervisors, and negligence of duty, to mention a few. Such disclosure is meant to seek immediate solutions, such that the proper duties are done to provide quality services to the public. Worker confidence is then ensured against sexual abuse, hence each person is given that respect that makes that person an end in themselves.

Opposite to internal whistleblowing, is external whistleblowing which is the disclosure done to non-members of the organisation, and these might be the media, consumer councils or regulatory agencies. External whistleblowing comes in normally as a reactionary action following the undesired results of internal whistleblowing. In this case, external whistleblowing is an open invitation to any regulatory board or event to intervene in the crisis. The failure of internal whistleblowing might have resulted in the victimisation of the person who would have blown the whistle internally. As such, he or she is seeking both refuge and better corrective measures against the immoral acts in that organisation. However, external whistleblowing is much more effective on issues that negatively affect a wider sphere of influence.

There is the alumni whistleblowing which involves the resignation of an employee from the position and obtaining another job before blowing the whistle. This is to protect the self from being subjected to retaliation (Buchholz and Rosenthal, 1998:399). This move also ensures that the whistle-blower has continuity in financial supply for the livelihood of the self and the family at large. The resignation and securing of another job before one blows the whistle works towards avoiding the negative effects of being labelled a whistle blower because such persons are often regarded as a threat to bureaucracy. As such, a new job opportunity is hard to come by after blowing the whistle in another organisation.

On the sub-types of whistleblowing, there is impersonal whistleblowing which is done when the injury is potential or actual on the institution or others, other than

oneself. In this case, the whistle blower is trying to safeguard the interests of the organisation or the public at large. It becomes common in cases of discrimination which may affect, both the organisation staff discriminating other people and those who are discriminated. The manufacturing of defective vehicles or detergents or unhealthy consumables may trigger impersonal whistleblowing. To this end, the whistle blower is a person with *ubuntu* who does not want other people to be used as means in mere profit-making while their health is put at risk.

On the other hand, there is personal whistleblowing where and when the harm targeting oneself especially when talking to the wrongdoer. For instance, when a person is sexually abused. This means that the whistle blower is trying to protect own interests; say a disclosure of the act of victimisation on the self after turning down a love proposal from a superior. One may decide to blow the whistle after being assigned to perform an illegal act which might result in the whistle blower landing oneself in serious problems, say imprisonment or own death. For instance, a military officer might go into exile and then blow the whistle after rejecting to take part in acts of genocide.

There is governmental whistleblowing which is normally done within the government, be it within the same department or inter-department and it is directed at the regulatory agencies. Whistleblowing is also viewed differently basing on the motive behind. For instance, a teacher might blow the whistle against a headmaster who abuses school funds or school properties such as vehicles, houses, just to mention a few. Such disclosure is directed at the immediate bosses or the media to attract the attention of the anti-corruption agency to investigate the scandal in question. It is a form of governmental whistleblowing in that the Ministry of Education will probe into the problem.

Whistleblowing can be dissent, breach of loyalty and accusation. Dissent whistleblowing makes the public disagree with the authority or government policy (Donaldson *et al.*, 2002: 336). Breach of loyalty is when a whistle blower is said to have violated the oath of loyalty he or she took when signing the employment contract. All the promised confidentiality is at stake. However, this type of whistleblowing is more dangerous in the sense that, the whistle blower might be charged with treason, especially when it is against the state immoral activities. Such activities might include gross violation of human rights or illegal compulsory taking and redistribution of properties such as land. To this end, all sorts of retaliation measures or policies might be used against that person.

Accusation whistleblowing may infringe or invade personal rights and the privacy of the accused. For example, sexual harassment may result in accusation whistleblowing. This aspect normally invites strong reaction on the part of the hierarchy in an organisation leading to victimisation. In effect, whistleblowing affects the hierarchy in each institution.

While whistleblowing is a noble notion undertaken on the grounds of morality, the whistle blowers are usually entangled in many dangers. Whistle blowers are subjected to retaliation or retributive treatment by the supervisors, corporate and governments while those who risk or are guilty of causing death of some innocent people are promoted by their employers for increasing the profit or partaking in the bureaucratic responsibilities perfectly (De George, 1982:304). Normally, the whistle-blowers are viewed as threats to powerful interests rather than agents of rectifying the problems. So, they are threatened, ostracised, harassed, reprimanded, vilified, and referred to psychiatrists as they stand ready to jeopardise both their own career and the organisations' reputation (Symour, 1988:108).

Since whistleblowing involves a lot of risks to the whistle blowers which ranges from unjustified dismissal, demotion or forced transfers. In view of these problems, the potential whistle blowers are encouraged to consider many factors so that they would avoid them. Some of the considerations whistle blowers need to make are as follows;

One should examine the seriousness of the danger to the public before blowing the whistle. The degree of seriousness will determine the reaction of the public, organisation targeted and the regulatory agencies. If not dangerous enough, the whistle blower would have plunged themselves into deep and perpetual problems. For instance, the disclosure of genocide activities will draw much attention. On the other hand, false charges about fraud may result in no attention paid to the whistleblowing.

Evidence should be documented or recorded before one blows the whistle because the accused may destroy the evidence before the investigation is carried out. However, the evidence gathering process is tricky in that the potential blower might be caught recording the information such that they might be dismissed or imprisoned before they embark on the practice whistleblowing. These are some of the moral dilemmas faced by would-be blowers in their effort to safeguard the public good.

The time to blow the whistle is another factor to be considered because it is noble to blow before the injury is felt by the public. After the harm, is also an ideal time just to make sure that the perpetrators of the injury are punished to avoid such acts in future (Buchholz and Rosenthal, 1998:400). However, whistleblowing that comes before the harm is most appraised because it would have avoided the suffering of the public and goes on to influence some moral rectification.

The volume of the whistleblowing is also worth to consider, that is to do it internally or externally by informing the media or interested groups. The latter is normally the most effective one, especially where the unethical practices violate the law and regulations of the state (Buchholz and Rosenthal, 1998:400). External whistleblowing produces much volume in the sense that it is usually done through the media.

It is also important to decide whether the whistle blower discloses his or her identity, if it is disclosed the whistleblowing becomes open but if not disclosed, it becomes anonymous. The anonymous whistleblowing is meant to avoid any possible victimisation which might follow but it has been noted that identity is difficult to conceal. Frederick Elliston cited by Gene in Callahan (1998:318) argues that 'anonymous whistleblowing can both protect whistle blowers from unjust retaliation and prevent those on whom the whistle is blown from engaging in an *ad hominem* attack to draw away from their wrongdoing'. However, anonymous whistleblowing tends to draw less attention since the regulatory agencies would question motives of an anonymous whistle blower. On the other hand, open whistleblowing usually results in the whistle blowers victimised but, it is the most effective one because it gives room for further consultation of the whistle blower if a need to verify the charges arises.

It is also important to find out how much protection is available for whistle blowers in the industry, state or federal agency. In that regard, one needs to seek for protection before and after blowing the whistle. Thereafter, the whistle blower is certain of the nature and national guidelines that guarantees his or her protection, and to that effect proceeds to blow the whistle. If there is no such a facility for whistle blowers it therefore implies that the would-be whistle blower ought to gather much evidence and then leave the organisation before blowing the whistle to avoid demotions, forced transfers or even dismissal and being given damaging recommendation letters.

The responsiveness of the organisation in rectifying the wrongdoing also counts whether the whistle blower should continue or not. This should be considered before one effects much damage to one's own life. However, those who are much concerned with social obligation will continue to blow the whistle till the desired results are achieved. If these factors are not carefully considered, the whistle-blowers would end up entangled in disgusting moral dilemmas as is shown in the next chapter of this project.

Morality is only found in the human society because people are the only animals with rationality (De George, 1999:83). For Kant, all actions are judged based on the person's intentions which are only manufactured in the mind through the process of reasoning. Kant (De George, 1999) argued that reasoning produces the good will from which all people act accordingly, so it implies that ethics only apply to rational beings. Benn and Peters (1959:46) concur with this vein of thought as they argue that 'for whatever the individual does –whether it be scientific research, statesmanship, or commercial activity-may be marred by being done with undesirable intentions or aims in view, but integrity of character is the sole unconditioned good'. This means that rationality is not part of man's psychological make-up and the only law relevant to a rational being are the laws of logic.

Rationality entails good will from which Kant made ethical formulations. Initially, Kant distinguished between two kinds of duty (imperatives). There are conditional duties which are known as hypothetical imperative, say if you want to do x do y. But there are other duties required per se, with no ifs, ands or buts. These Kant describes as categorical and referred to the fundamental principles of ethics, the categorical imperative (Bowie, 2002:62). The categorical imperative is the ultimate basis of morality in that it is found in pure practical reason. It is in fact, a command of reason, one which ought to be upheld by everyone since it permeates the racial, geographical or cultural boundaries.

It should be known that the categorical imperative has three formulation which are normally used to judge whether or not an action or a lower –level moral principle is indeed moral (Buchholz and Rosenthal, 1998:27). The first formulation of the Kantian categorical imperative says one ought to act in such away one is willing to make the principle of one's action into a universal law (Rossouw, 1994:4).

Thus, Kant says an action is morally right for a person in any given situation if and only if the person's reason for carrying out the action is a reason that he or

she would be willing to have everyone act on. Such a rule should apply to everyone because it is a product of reasoning which is also a characteristic of every human being. As rational beings, we are commanded by reason to do what is morally right. Any action we are commanded to do, must be in such a way that, none of us interferes with or prevents others from doing it (De George, 1982:85). For instance, is it wrong to lie if one wants to borrow money? Kant would say, it is not morally right to lie to be given such services. In this view, lying cannot be taken as a universal-consistent moral law. Consider the rule "Tell the truth", everyone would agree to universalise it since it is constant hence it is a moral law. In this line of thought Kant says rational beings are lawgivers on their own and as such, they are always ready to conform to their own law of morality (Poole, 1991:19).

In his second formulation, Kant argues that one ought to act in such a manner that humanity is always treated as an end, and never as a mere means (Bowie, 2002:62). On this principle, the Kantian ethics call for respect for persons because all people are equal regarding the ability to reason. Every right action in the moral matrix assumes that no human should use another as a means or take advantage of others for the sake of achieving own ends. This principle goes along with the golden rule-do to others as you want them to do unto you. The insight behind this formulation is that it encourages commercial transactions in which two voluntary parties exchange goods and services with both benefiting. Thus, it promotes negative freedom which is freedom from coercion and deception (Bowie, 2002:62). The first two formulations are in fact, complements in the formation of a rights-network and duties defined by principles of formal reason which provide the framework of justice necessary for a commercial society.

In a way, the kind of treatment that rational beings deserve, as ends in themselves, is sometimes in terms of rights (De George, 1999:87). These rights include the right to just wages, right to healthy working conditions, and the right to due process. To this end, the second formulation argues that those people who serve as means in restaurants or those that are hired should be paid adequately and subjected to non-dehumanising conditions so that they remain as ends in themselves. In agreement with the Kantian call to respect persons in themselves, Arnold in Sullivan (2003:67) says human rights is a basic tool of moral evaluation by individuals of widely divergent political and religious beliefs. People have rights of freedom and wellbeing, and then at a minimum other persons have an obligation to refrain from interfering with the rights. It is in this sense that rights entail corresponding duties on the part of other persons. People have rights to non-defective products and non-harmful activities done unto them;

whistleblowing is morally justified since it denounces such things in favour of humanity's respect.

The third formulation of the categorical imperative stresses that one should act as if is a member of an ideal kingdom of ends in which one is both subject and sovereign at the same time. This principle says as rational beings we participate in making of our own laws. The law gives everyone the room to follow his or her own voice of autonomy. Thus, morality is not imposed on persons from the outside but by members of that moral society as lawgivers through the common ability of reasoning (De George, 1999:87). The autonomy entails freedom and the will to override instincts. The freedom and the will find expression in a person's law-making activities as a rational being, in acting on rational principles. The law of an ideal community or 'Kingdom of ends' are the product of agreement between rational beings as their own lawgivers (Benn and Peters, 1959:50). Thus, no one would take lying or stealing as a moral law because in one way or another, the one who makes such an impudent law is a victim of his own flaw.

In a bid to fully grasp the gist of this piece of writing, the notion of a moral dilemma ought to be precisely defined. An ethical challenge can be viewed as a situation or course of action which violates the inherently accorded respect or dignity to an individual person or a collective body of people. Thus, moral dilemma involves the assessment of being morally good or wrong.

The Deontological Theory of Ethics can be used to judge the morality of whistleblowing. De Maria (1998) defines whistleblowing as an open disclosure about significant wrongdoing made by a concerned citizen totally or predominantly motivated by notions of public interest (Martin, 1998:20). Callahan (1988:331) describes whistleblowing as an alarm by employees from within the very organisation in which they work aiming to spotlight neglect, abuses that threaten the public interest. The whistle-blower would have perceived the wrongdoing in a particular role and initiates the disclosure of his or her own free will to a person or agency capable of investigating the complaint and facilitating the correction of the wrongdoing.

In this regard, the whistle-blower values the humanity in the people to be affected and then decides to go open on the issue to save the lives, and interests of humanity. This position is only reached at through reasoning which is the central pillar of Kantianism. As such, the stakeholders, in particular the customers are being used as means for business people's ends, a practice which is grossly condemned by the Kantian ethics. The pursuit of Deontological Ethics has since



resulted in the rise of consumer movements seeking to champion the interests and respect of the consumers in all business transactions. Thus, whistleblowing plays an integral role in the upholding of humanity since it denounces all immoral activities seeking to demean the notion of personhood.

In the same way Kantian ethics have been used to judge the morality of whistleblowing, in this section Utilitarianism as the ethical theorem is also going to be used in an exercise that seeks to fully give a clear picture of whistleblowing in the occidental world before *ubuntu* come in to justify its morality in the Shona perspective. Briefly, the nature of Utilitarianism is to be unpacked and then proceed to find out how it handles the morality of whistleblowing.

By definition, 'Utilitarianism is an ethical theory that holds that an action is right if it produces, or tends to produce, the greatest amount of good for the greatest number of people affected by the action' (De George 1999:57). This definition entails that before one acts, there must be great consideration or calculation of the amount of people who are to benefit from that in comparison to those who would be negatively affected. If many people are to benefit, it therefore implies that that course of action is correct or morally right. When the opposite is true, then it is immoral to behave in that manner. Thus, Utilitarianism gives much value to the results of each particular action. However, the calculation is to be done after the action has been completed. Rather, it is done in mind or in open discussion by a board of directors who might be working in a process of business formulation. In view of this, actions are not good or bad in themselves but in close relation to their consequences.

Embedded in the above defined concept of Utilitarianism are the two version or subtypes of the theorem. These act and rule Utilitarianism. The act Utilitarianism says each particular course of action in its completeness and individualistic ought to be judged through the microscopic lens of Utilitarianism without basing on any lived experience or the general belief of the people in question. That is, the unique nature and circumstances in which the action or belief have been performed have the full capacity/influence to judge it morally.

On the other hand, rule Utilitarianism is a moral thesis which puts all the fundamental judgements in reference to a group of past examples of actions. In a way, it rests on societal or communitarian beliefs or traditions that suggest that any action of that nature is wrong without considering its circumstantial uniqueness. De George (1999:62) further argues that '...a similar analysis of a rule utilitarianism determines that people should not lie, steal, or murder'. Each of

these injunctions is the result of having observed the consequence of those acts as performed in the past, together with the assumption that the consequences in the future are similar. It is therefore a fact that rule Utilitarianism provides a technique to determine the moral value of human actions-including those on which the community has already made a moral determination.

The next task in this section is to evaluate how Utilitarianism as a moral theorem justifies the practice of whistleblowing. Buchholz and Rosenthal (1998:25) say that hedonistic Utilitarianists are those who argue that the ultimate 'good' or utility is pleasure and the ultimate 'bad' or disutility is pain, and all actions or practices ought to be evaluated in terms of how much pleasure or pain they produce for all the people affected to be considered a whole. Considering this in view of whistleblowing, it implies that Utilitarians would say as long as the practice will result on aggregate of 'goods' for the people, say through publicising the moral act for moral rectification to safe guard the public interests. So, utilitarianism would have appraised whistleblowing since a few people (ones involved in the immoral practice published) are negatively affected. It therefore implies that through the microscopic lens of hedonistic utilitarianism, whistleblowing is a morally permissible practice.

However, the pluralistic utilitarian on the other hand values an amalgamation of friendship, knowledge, courage, beauty and health as institutes that comprises 'good' as such, whistleblowing is morally good if and only if it promotes all these values. Assuming that one blows the whistle against acts of genocide, the publicising and the thereafter moral rectification create a conducive environment for friendship, attainment of health, and which may enable the courage and beauty, inherent qualities to unfold and manifest through peace of mind, guaranteed protection and provision of all the goods and social services.

Coming to the act and rule Utilitarian, one may need to consider the practice of whistleblowing in each particular situation bearing in mind its uniqueness and possible unique results. For instance, blowing the whistle against the public policy by the government will sound like an accusation and dissent, a practice which is a threat to the government/ institution image leading to loss of societal obedience and this can be considered to be a necessary evil because the whole argument behind is a need to help or promote the general good at the expense of a few in the managerial offices. In this case, act Utilitarianism is held to have appraised whistleblowing as a practice valuing the interests of the public. Act Utilitarianism is better to follow since rule Utilitarianism might be inflexible and inapplicable to new situations for which one might need new rationalization for unique and

deserving options aiming at bringing about ideal and favourable result to the trouble of the society.

Utilitarianism decision making totalises the amount the individual is to give a majority course of action at the expense of the minority. Thus, the Utilitarian appraised whistleblowing favours the majority and brings about harm or disutility to the minority. Utilitarianism does not account for how the utility of not whistleblowing is distributed. As such, this theory is individualistic and discriminative, a norm which is unethical in Africa, hence the need for a new quest to justify whistleblowing among the Africans. In view of this, *ubuntu* became the central philosophy to replace Utilitarianism among the Africans and the next chapter will explore this native philosophy and then try to forge a way forward of moralising whistleblowing in African business communities.

Turning to the Kantian Deontological ethics, this is somehow connected to the Utilitarian theory (Buchholk and Rosenthal 1998:29) and to this end it is also flawed by individualistic formulation which are contrary to the collectivism of the African legacy. It is also worth mentioning that Kantian ethics are characterised by legitimate disagreement as to exactly what action reason demands in a government situation. This suggests that the Deontological ethical theorem is somehow self-contradictory and self-conflicting; then how could it be accurately applied to test the controversial practice of whistleblowing. Acute consideration reflection on these flaws of the two applied ethical theorems, suggests that it is ideal to appeal to own native philosophy among the Africans to establish the non-alien and compatibility of whistleblowing to the African way of living through *ubuntu*. This suggestion therefore becomes the point of departure for this project offered in the next three chapters. Some moral conflicts that bewilder the potential whistle blowers are critically reflected on. However, it is important to first define the term whistle blower before any further discussion.

Davis in Larmer (2002:208) defines a whistle blower as, 'any member of a formal organisation who takes information out of channels to try to stop the organisation from doing something he believes morally wrong (or to force it to do something he believes morally required)'. Having established the task to be undertaken by the whistle blower in this definition, it follows that the whistle blowers are ever entangled in tricky situations that require accurate consideration in a bid to avoid the possible harsh results upon themselves. As such, Gene in Callahan (1988:316) raises the fact that whistleblowing is always justified because it is an exercise of free speech. However, it is important to note that the right to free speech, like most other rights is not absolute. Some rights tend to infringe on others' rights

thereby becoming a contentious viewpoint. Going straight to the point, one may have the right to blow the whistle in an accusation which might be correct or incorrect. This matter being incorrect will see the repute of the one against which the whistle is blown brought into mud. The right of the blower would have infringed onto the right to private and decency of the others. To this end, the free speech right will result in the whistle blower being prosecuted for deformation of character. In full awareness of this tragedy, the whistle blower finds it tricky and difficult to embark on the practice of whistleblowing. Thus, the whistle blower becomes undecided, whether to go by the moral obligation and blow the whistle to curtail the unjust or immoral practice by the organisation or holding back the information about such wrong doings as a well protracted move to avoid prosecution in the event of breaching the rights of the allegedly accused.

On another front, it is difficult to tell or decide when and to what extent, employees become part of the institution or not. The question is who is held responsible for bad activities or negligence by the corporate one works for? Does one's private moral dispositions have anything to with the policy of the company which employs them? Personal ethical inclinations seem to be independent of the professional ethics contained the company's policy document, no wonder a controversy arises when an employee is directed to participate in immoral practice by the business entity. As such, who is immoral in this case, is it the institution one works for or the individual worker or the top managerial team? If it is the entire organisation including the worker, one may claim that whistleblowing becomes unjustified because it is tantamount to back biting and breach of loyalty. But, if it is the institution itself without employees, then personal moral inclination coupled with the right to free speech come into play and justify whistleblowing. However, this controversy has been there since time immemorial and remains open ended, of which one may argue that since business is an activity by the people, for the people, among the people, the moral dictates that are at play in other social circles are therefore still operational even in the business spectrum. Based on this viewpoint everyone in that organisation is held morally responsible for all the activities by the business corporate, as a result it is everyone's moral obligation to blow the whistle against any immoral activity. Hence, the same zeal to avoid damage on the public in other social spheres is the same that ought to justify the obligation an employee has to blow the whistle. This position can be further substantiated by the fact one does not cease to be a member of a moral kingdom and neither does one cease to be a brother, in law nor a parent as soon as he gets employed or enters his workplace so the inherent personal ethical instincts give a free play whether to blow the whistle or not.

Another aspect of concern is the job security of the whistle blower, that is does it make moral sense to risk one's job on the expense of the public interest. One may argue that it is not mandatory to undertake a moral responsibility that puts one's own life, property, family in danger. This viewpoint entails the fact that, the would-be whistle blower needs and see if his anonymity is to be chosen for the sake of protecting their job. It is in this manner because the history of whistleblowing has it that the whistle blower is usually fired, transferred or demoted to a less interesting job. These possibilities also have a bearing on whether the whistle blower to be undertaken is current or alumni. The latter is much favourable because it tends to curtail the possible catastrophes. However, one's wrongdoing may always find the perpetrator's trace, suggesting that, even if one opts for alumni whistleblowing as soon as the current employer learns about the whistleblowing; the risk of losing the job arises again. After words, character demining recommendations and stigmatisation may haunt the whistle blower to the extent that new employment opportunities will not unveil themselves to the one. It therefore follows that, a serious consideration of these possible motives, retaliations the potential whistle blower may let go the moral practice without the disclosure, a thing which poses danger to the public interest.

It is worth mentioning and discussing the possibility that a whistle blower may have a two-pronged motive, that one facet is serving the interests of the public while the other is meant for personal profiteering from the disclosure. The motive for public wellbeing always makes the base for a moral justifiable act of whistleblowing because there is no informational exaggeration. On the other hand, the need for personal gain makes one's revelations of neglect or abuse slant questionable and less credence be put to his charges. However, one may indeed embark on whistleblowing as a quest that seeks to see moral justice and rectification be done but being conscious of the possible dismissal from work or demotion one may opt to make a profit out of the whistleblowing, say writing a book to avoid being financially crushed by the business cooperates sequels. The idea of making whistleblowing a gainful act to the whistle blower is meant to offset the losses or costs he is likely to acquire through the hiring of lawyers in the course of retaliation by the entity against which the whistle was blown. It should be noted however that, such subsidiary motives make the entire decision flawed to the extent that the investigating agencies might detect and lose interest in the charges. This type of moral conflict implies a drawback on the moral justification of whistleblowing.

To make a well-informed decision and documentary direct and accurate evidence pertaining to the charges, the potential whistle blower may contemplate

consulting legal practitioners and other stakeholders deemed equally concerned about the harmful immoral practice by the business corporate. The consultation implied herein would reduce bias and error in moral choice. However, one should note that, the practice of consultation prior to blowing of the whistle presents special problems resulting in pre-empting the act. This will result in the letting away of the cat before it is a mature point in time consideration. In case that one wanted to make it an anonymous whistleblowing, the consultation would make his assumptions, argument open to scrutiny and criticism beforehand. Such a scenario may degenerate into earlier victimisation or even dismissal from the employment if any of the consulted people backbite. In view of the conflicting importance of consultation and warring far reaching implication of consultation, the potential whistle blower finds it difficult to come up with a well protracted piece of information for the public consumption in his wellbeing endeavour. Apart from that, the would-be blower's psychological makeup is tone apart, that is, whether not to or blow the whistle. To this end, it can be claimed that, really, whistleblowing is a multi-moral dilemma driven practice hence, a need for an ethical theorem of *ubuntu* with precision when dealing with this practice of whistleblowing.

It is clear that the above definitions of whistleblowing imply that the practice involves a mammoth task for the potential whistle blower because it requires a lot of verifications before one undertakes the act. In short, it has been showcased by the aforementioned discussion that whistleblowing is an open disclosure about significant wrongdoing made by a concerned employee or citizen totally or predominantly motivated by moral reasons to safeguard the public interest. The discussion in question also unravelled that evidence documentation among the consideration of factors before blowing the whistle. Within the same exposition, the ethical implications were also highlighted among which, the zeal to rectify the wrong doing for the welfare or good of the general public. On another note, the moral conflicts and dangers whistle blowers normally face were also discussed. However, the Kantian ethics and Utilitarianism were tasked to justify the practice among the Shona to no avail, a result which functions as a rhizome from the quest to appraise whistleblowing sprouts.