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ABSTRACT

Whistleblowers often report that they “had no choice.” Aside from a few psychoanalytic studies, most whistleblowing research takes a post-positivist correlative approach seeking to identify likely antecedents to whistleblowing. Studies ignore the meaning of what the whistleblower is resisting, consequently missing what conditions might be contributing to individuals blowing the whistle on perceived wrongdoing. Organizational scholarship has begun to use Jungian interpretation; the author hypothesizes that this irresistible impulse is due to whistleblowers being sensitive to archetypal activity in Jung’s collective unconscious, specifically a newly condensed form combining aspects of the Hero, the Seer and the Artist. In this frame, whistleblowers are seen as countering the cultural repression of the light aspects of the Heraclean and the Jacobean Hero by embodying the re-emergent heroic Horus archetype, the Son and Champion of the Dark Queen. Within a theoretical framework that marries the principles of Jamesian pragmatism and critical theory, the archetypological approach prioritizes an ethical teleology and allows for a flexible epistemology. The author has developed a distinctive method — the mytho-poetic analysis of social experience (MPASE) — to reveal new understandings from medical whistleblower narratives and dream reports. This method draws on abductive case study selection, Jungian amplification, Social Dreaming methodology and Listening Post technique. Panel members of a Dream/Image Reflection Group free associate to excerpts from the whistleblower data, and then both sets of responses are subjected to the author’s mytho-poetic amplification. Analysis highlights the importance of looking beyond organizational limits to the larger societal context in which organizations are embedded. This facilitates a recognition of the levels of misconduct that whistleblowers are resisting, and a way of comprehending the meaning of whistleblowing.
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There is no logical path to [understandings]; only intuition resting on sympathetic understanding of experience, can reach them.

Albert Einstein

The truth ain’t like puppies. A bunch of ‘em running around an’ you just pick your favourite.

Emerson Cod
*Pushing Daisies*
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Receiving, Refusing, Heeding the Call: Whistleblowing, from ethics to practice and back again.

Introduction

The thesis topic of whistleblowing came out of my own Canadian midwifery practice. This chapter contextualizes my interest in whistleblowing by documenting my history in the field. It recounts my path from becoming a mother, to becoming a birth activist, and eventually a practising midwife. It relates my resistance against what I saw as unethical conduct, the retaliation for this, leading to ill health and my eventual expulsion from the profession. It chronicles my subsequent engagement with academic work, leading to a thesis stressing the importance of the role of whistleblowing as an essential component of a society that promotes the health of its members. This work casts whistleblowing in a role crucial to contemporary capitalist society being able to refocus upon the general welfare of its polity and away from what some interpret (Connell & Wood, 2005; Sennett, 2006; Knights & Tullberg, 2012; Fleming, 2015) as the neoliberal preoccupation with sustaining and enriching global corporate interests in the free market.

Notions of professionalism, expertise, altruism, loyalty and rationality combine in this narrative, and are then elaborated upon in the ensuing mytho-poetic analysis. The organizational literature on whistleblowing tends to rely on generalizations across industries and cases but shy away from specific details. Framing my story as a tale of medical whistleblowing and making specific reference to particular practices contributes to the understanding of whistleblower behaviour. Attending to the details of praxis exposes individual cases as markers of the entrenchment of systemic wrongdoing. The interviews and Jungian-style analysis of several other medical whistleblowers’ tales
suggest motivations and possibilities for social change that are usually hidden from view, and grant whistleblowing new meaning when viewed within a global context.

In professional practice, levels of competence may determine differences of perception, not just of physical facts but of what may be seen as 'moral facts'. Moral norms may be granted the status of 'moral facts', because many people experience moral dilemmas as if they were "strong, clear perceptual images" (Wark & Krebs, 1997:175). Different perceptions of moral norms therefore "involve conflicts ... with implications for individuals, relationships, and society" (ibid.). Experts in any field may actually perceive what is wrong more immediately and more urgently requiring remedy than less experienced colleagues, members of other professions\(^1\) or the general public. In medicine, greater experience often produces changes in perception, not just clinically but morally. It has been suggested that experts have a different "availability and strength of the internal meaning-making structures they invoke to process moral information" (ibid.), echoing certain scholars (Maxwell, 1992; Coles & Knowles, 2001) who aver that only 'insiders', whose understanding has the most descriptive and interpretive validity (Maxwell, 1992), can really 'get it' (Wark & Krebs, 1997).

This view provides the rationale for presenting my own insider story in my research. Direct experience may contradict official rhetoric, which may not reflect how things actually operate on the ground. If moral clarity indeed results from extended experience, then it follows that the way an insider understands his\(^2\) own story and the stories of others in his field could be considered a trustworthy interpretation (Maxwell, 1992). One way for an insider to share his understanding is to present detailed narratives with an interpretation

---

\(^1\) v.i. 160-161 for a more detailed discussion of the concept of moral perception in Maxwell's (2008) theorizing about compassionate empathy.

\(^2\) Throughout the thesis, masculine pronouns will be used for the sake of brevity, but the reader is encouraged to interpret them as referring to males and females.
of what they have come to mean. Below is such a narrative and interpretation, aiming to reveal the ways in which a whistleblower may be sensitive to the moral dimension of work, and the persecution that follows on from expressing his concerns.

For twenty-five years, I worked with birthing women. Having given birth myself in hospital and at home, with physicians and unregulated midwives, I found myself plunging into midwifery activist work on task forces and picket lines and publishing an alternative childbirth newspaper (*Re:Birth*, 1984-1986).

I also learned much from experienced midwives, especially during many middle-of-the-night-while-waiting-for-her-to-push storytelling sessions. Before and after provincial midwifery regulation, I taught prenatal preparation and fitness classes, and helped all kinds of women birth in conventional venues (hospitals and birth centres) and odd spots (motels, elevators, stairwells) as their friend, doula or midwife. I was invited to teach cost-effective, low-tech models of care locally and internationally (in Nepal, Poland and Egypt) at conferences and seminars.

I always deeply identified with the hopes and anguish expressed by thousands of birthing women and their caregivers. They desired the same things — dignity, privacy, and to have their babies emerge into an atmosphere of skilled gentleness. Many midwives struggled to see these wishes fulfilled.

We thought we had created a social movement to protect our right to choose where and with whom we wanted to give birth. Like many others, I had become part of this movement in response to having had routine interventions transform my first birth from a low-risk to a high-risk delivery.³ Contrary to cultural assumptions that only higher

---

³ I went to hospital too early in labour, and my waters were broken routinely, unnecessarily. This led to a "cascade of intervention" (Wagner, 2008:39) producing a very rough operative delivery. My second labour

Pre-legislation, Canadian midwifery was built along the lines of a ‘trade’, where more experienced practitioners guided apprentices to provide unique responses to individual cases, usually strictly according to mothers’ wishes. In this grassroots free market model, knowledge and responsibility were shared equally between midwife and mother. Each midwife worked independently, her reputation and competition determining how much, for whom and for what fee she worked. Then, during the 1990’s, the focus on mothers’ freedoms was replaced by a midwifery professionalization project, starting with a ‘grannying-in’ program that incidentally outlawed access to many community midwives. By 1994, a group believing they represented all Ontario’s midwives had persuaded the government to legislate exclusive midwifery licensure, thereby criminalizing unlicensed practice, despite many studies (e.g., Gaskin, 1977; NAPSAC, 1981; Odent, 1984; Duran, 1992; Davis-Floyd & Davis, 1996) showing unregulated midwifery yielded superior outcomes. With this addition to the healthcare system, women were limited to government-approved practitioners. The creators of this new profession intended to establish an inclusive and client-sensitive service, but now some women’s choices went against regulatory strictures, and some women were pushed into precisely the kind of underground practice erroneously accused of putting the public at risk in the first place. Official rhetoric about autonomous practice notwithstanding, Ontario midwifery was

at home supported my suspicion that, without interference, this first labour would probably have progressed normally.

4 Ontario’s 1994 provincial ‘grannying-in’ program was designed to bring Ontario’s practising midwives to regulation readiness. It could accommodate only 75 applicants. An unanticipated number of midwives, 150, applied. Only 72 were accepted, and 58 completed the process (Committee for More Midwives, 1993a,b).
constrained by obstetrical community standards (i.e., physicians’ standards, not midwives’), and therefore over time midwifery praxis became in many respects indistinguishable from obstetrics.

My preference for the less technical, older model of midwifery practice presented unusual problems. As an auto-didact, who neither apprenticed nor graduated from an approved midwifery program, my experience did not make me eligible for ‘grannying-in’, despite having had the required clinical experience. In my first year of registered practice six years later, I barely met the minimum annual number of hospital births, because I was so comfortable with home birth that almost all of my clients opted to deliver at home. In comparison to my peers who had to attend other midwives’ home births to maintain registration, I had to attend other midwives’ hospital births to maintain my qualifications.

These changes in midwifery philosophy and clinical practice were predictable (Stewart, 1981; Monk, 1994), but their particular mechanisms remained unclear. During my 1992 residency in a freestanding Dallas midwifery birth centre, I learned that regulation could allow midwives the freedom to follow client choice. In Texas, the multi-system, *caveat emptor* approach to healthcare let midwives serve the wishes of all clients.

Ontario regulation demanded two things I found unworkable: no midwife could practise independently, since all remuneration came through an employing practice run by partner midwives; and the “principle” of “informed choice” (College of Midwives of Ontario [CMO], 1994, 2005) mandating a midwife support client choices after informing the client of standard practices, alternative practices, pertinent research and the risks and benefits of all these. Whenever the interests and choices of my clients conflicted directly with the interests of my backup hospitals and other medical professionals, I could seldom support my clients.
Chapter one: Receiving, refusing, heeding the call

Regulation tended to prioritize other professional concerns above client welfare (Monk, 2007). Ontario licensure required midwives to maintain hospital privileges, despite midwives' protocols often differing from nursing and obstetrical protocols. This caused conflicts, e.g., with obstetrical staff whose regulations did not require implementing informed choice. Midwives were frequently seen as underqualified intruders into hospital territory (Rothman, 1981; Daviss, 1999). It was only when lack of communication or cooperation between physicians and midwives produced 'adverse outcomes' (i.e., deaths\(^5\)) that these difficulties were publicly acknowledged. Often, licensed midwives felt stronger commitment to “professional oaths, codes of ethics and conduct, legal obligations and religious values” (Henik, 2008:60) than to maintaining good rapport with backup hospital staff. Many midwives felt like barely tolerated “visitors” (ibid.:63) on hospital turf, no matter how long their tenure.

My political and professional naïveté, like that of many others who speak out, never predicted that eventually I would lose my support at work, my credibility, my ability to earn a living, and then the support of my family during the protracted struggle to face the retaliation I encountered.

I never saw myself as a whistleblower.\(^6\) I just refused to implement certain protocols which were not well supported by research, and refused to gloss over the risks with my patients. Initially, I attributed these refusals to having come from a community-based model of care radically different from the professionalized one. Gradually I realized that my unease came from changes in praxis which increasingly were infringing upon patients' democratic rights, particularly the rights to self-determination and the security of the

---

\(^5\) E.g., in 2000, the death of baby Kelly-Stalker in Guelph General Hospital in Ontario, Canada was partly attributed to the on-call obstetrician having refused to deal with the midwife’s client (Bourgeault, 2006:282). Such hostile behaviour was quite common (Association of Ontario Midwives, 2000).

\(^6\) Other thesis subjects (Ajax and Nestor) shared this view. They simply saw “bad science” or unwise administrative policies in need of correction.
person. Midwifery rhetoric requires that midwives consider the physical, social and psychological wellbeing of clients, and that they defer to mothers as “primary decision maker[s]” (CMO, 2005). In practice however, the woman’s autonomy and wellbeing is legally subordinate to the protocols of the midwifery profession, of ‘partner’ health professions, and of hospitals aiming above all to maintain insurability.

Regulated practice prevented me from prioritizing patient welfare and choice above other measures, so that I could no longer work as a midwife in Ontario — ethically — and had to exit from the profession. In retrospect, most bewildering to me was that I had put my clients’ needs before my family’s, speaking out in the knowledge that to do so would endanger my job, and persisting until I could no longer act as the family bread winner. I had been led to birth activism in the first place from the desire to protect my own babies. Yet, as a midwife I appeared to value my clients’ welfare above a common kind of bourgeois common-sense that entailed compromising one’s principles for one’s family’s sake. The entire experience was profoundly disorienting and I could not comprehend my part in the story. Since then I have seen that “understanding organizations often means comprehending matters that lie beneath the surface” (Gabriel, 1999:1).

To help me understand what had happened, I entered a Master’s program in anthropology, nursing and history. Having seen firsthand the differences between Ontario and Texas midwifery in supporting client choice, I conducted a narrative inquiry asking the research question: what is it within a given midwifery system that preserves/creates a midwife’s freedom to serve any client as that client sees fit? My thesis (Monk, 2007) critically assessed the implications of midwifery regulation. It portrayed medical professionals as unknowing agents of corporate power (Scott, 2010), helping to disempower citizenry and erode democratic freedoms through bureaucratic casuistry (Illich, Zola, McKnight, Caplan
& Shaiken, 1977). Detailed documentation showed that organizational rhetoric around ‘best practice’ constrained midwives’ freedoms to act according to expertise and conscience, and that professional discourse substituted speech about serving ‘vulnerable’ groups for action protecting individual rights (Monk, 2013).

Studies recommending specific changes in midwifery structures (Sharpe, 2004) did not account for the power relations of the political context in which midwifery practitioners function (Monk, 2007). Drawing on work in systems theory (Bateson, 1972; Kauffman, 1981), I proposed that: midwifery systems stay most responsive to client needs in competitive multi-system environments that catalyze improvements and prevent monopoly stagnation; midwifery systems prioritize client well-being by having midwives solely liable and responsible to clients — not partners, hospitals, obstetrical ‘teams’, regulatory bodies, nor insurance companies.

Increasingly, I became aware that monopoly healthcare systems seemed to disproportionately benefit the corporate interests funding and/or controlling medical institutions, research, insurance and the medico-legal process (Bloom, 1987; Chomsky, 1989; Berman, 2006). I was invited to speak to university business students about the role of medical professionals during the so-called viral pandemic of H1N1. Investigating these dimensions of the medical profession, I responded strongly to the tales of medical whistleblowers resisting what they understood as unethical practice, and experiencing retaliation. I gradually realized that my struggles qualified as a kind of whistleblowing. Having personally gone through the whistleblowing process⁷, my interest in what prompted whistleblowers to speak out developed steadily.

Upon reading the whistleblower literature, my own history began to make more sense:

⁷ In this study, whistleblowing is constructed not as an event, but as a process with conceptually separable different stages, although these stages are only separable in retrospect.
whistleblowers have trouble figuring out what happened ... [taking] a while to figure it out, generally at least a decade, often longer. (Alford 2001:135-136)

I was curious to see how scholars explained this urge to speak out. As a whistleblower myself, I had experienced the documented irresistible imperative to expose wrongdoing (Alford, 2001, 2007). I felt that I had been blind to whatever was responsible for this powerful urge, and perhaps that was why it had felt beyond my control. This was not a unique realization: “It has virtually become common sense to contend that people act for reasons of which they are unconscious” (Gabriel, 1999:311). It was not difficult to accept that although my actions invariably felt “entirely transparent, consistent and rational”, my whistleblowing may have been susceptible to “mysterious motives” (ibid.). However, I disagreed, from a ‘gut’ level, with scholarly interpretations that attributed whistleblowing to narcissistic desires for prestige (v.i. 74).

Although there is a growing body of literature concerning whistleblowing, I have not come across insider research, where the author is also a subject of study. The thesis that follows is the work both of an insider — where understanding springs from personal experience — and an outsider — where more detached analysis attempts to examine the conditions of possibility underlying a whistleblower’s compulsion to report.

**From ethics to practice: Applied altruism**

The hand of compassion was faster than the calculus of reason. (Monroe, 2009a:424)

Perhaps I was born with a predisposition to self-sacrifice. Ignoring my own welfare in responding to others’ needs was something I manifested when very young. It was not a direct result of community moral training; close friends were content to stand aside and let
others act in emergencies. Nor had I ever been drawn to 'Polly-Annaism'; I'd always been faintly repelled by the patronizing attitude of people serving those 'less fortunate' than they. Nor was it logical; reason would demand I take care of myself first, and then consider others' welfare — like putting on your own oxygen mask on an airplane before offering assistance.

A particular memory illustrating this tendency stands out, the tiniest details of which are still clear in my mind after more than forty years:

My friend, her boyfriend and I were babysitting her three year-old cousin. After a little while, we all decided to go for a drive in the four-door sedan, a family car with bench seats front and back. My friend and her beau sat up front; the toddler and I shared the back seat.

At one point, we made a right turn. This was in the 70's, before mandatory seat belts. As I leaned toward the right to compensate for the list of the turning car, I saw out of the corner of my left eye two little legs tumbling out of the wide-open door. As I recall it, before I even understood what I had seen, I threw myself out after her screaming for the driver to stop, grabbing the opened door handle with my right hand as my body flew by. I recall my legs flung out behind the still-moving car, heels bumping rapidly against the tarmac, in the moment I gathered myself up to let go of the door. My next memory is of lurching a few steps back, sweeping the girl up in my arms and throwing her out of harm’s way onto the grassy verge to the right of the road. Several cars following us closely screeched to a stop within inches of me.
I don’t remember what followed, only that we were safe, and a strange feeling of being forced to act — there was absolutely no thought for my own safety — there hadn’t been time.

This was not the first time I found myself suddenly galvanized into action without forethought, without a plan. My mother has always said I am “good in a crisis”. I once caught my baby brother just before he would have cracked his head wide open on the slate landing of the stairwell. We have no idea how as a ten-year old I could have moved so fast from the other side of the adjoining room to catch him. Decades later, I found myself flying over a normally painfully rocky beach to rescue my son from being trapped upside-down in a flotation device 20 metres out from shore — before other people even had a chance to notice the situation. And there have been other instances, too.

On gathering these memories, what appears most remarkable is the complete lack of conscious decision-making involved. Rather, I recall a strange kind of hyper-focus catapulting me to where what needed to be done could be done, the awareness of obstacles — traffic, sharp stones under bare feet — obliterated by this urgent, automatic response. Midwifery work elicited this same response during obstetrical emergencies. Patience was the first requirement for attending birth, since not much happens for long stretches. But, occasionally without warning, everything lets go, necessitating just this kind of rapidfire, ‘thoughtless’ yet effective intervention. Time would ‘slow down’, and I would ‘find myself’ doing what needed doing, without awareness of anything extraneous. It was as if ego — employing this term as it is used in common parlance to refer to an everyday form of self-awareness — was replaced by a consciousness where all awareness was completely centred upon the recipient, the object, of this focus, and action simply arose. This response
did not come from training: what to do in each particular case was taught, but not how to optimize emergency action through achieving this particular focused state.

Eventually, this kind of ultra-focused, highly effective response was in part responsible for my being drummed out of the profession. Occasionally, the midwifery hierarchy supported incompetence and unnecessarily endangered potential victims, by insisting upon responses *per* protocol, which may be very slow. After regulation, I have seen practice standards fall to the level of the least competent practitioner, especially if she happens to be the proprietor (v.i. 13). Entry level practitioners more often adhere rigidly to protocol despite contraindications (Flyvbjerg, 1998; Crawford, 2009) and produce inferior results. Expert practitioners draw on past experience in ways which cannot be codified, including judging when and whether to bend or break the rules (Schön, 1987; Crawford, 2009). Rules are “mechanistic” substitutions for “individual mind” (Crawford, 2009:175) and cannot account for precisely those pertinent aspects of particular situations which may produce different expert responses and better outcomes (Flyvbjerg, 1998).

For instance, many practitioners are very leery of an emergency called shoulder dystocia, where a baby’s head emerges, but the anterior shoulder gets wedged behind the mother’s pubic bone. Textbook management calls either for percussive pressure on that bone in a vain hope of reducing the shoulder diameter, or cutting a large incision ‘allowing’ the performance of a prescribed series of manoeuvres, most of which are ineffective if the shoulder is genuinely impacted. These measures may temporarily cripple the mother and take longer than three minutes to complete birth, often requiring resuscitation or other ‘heroic’ measures to assist the hypoxic baby. A Texas midwife taught me an efficient technique that I have never seen in a textbook. The mother gets onto her hands and knees,
and the midwife expedites delivery, usually in under 90 seconds after the baby’s head births, by extracting the infant’s posterior arm, thereby reducing the shoulder diameter.

The last time I used this manoeuvre, the junior midwife — who was my employer at the time — exclaimed, “I don’t think I could have done that!” However, she then wanted to document ‘other’ manoeuvres from the standard series. In case of litigation, such documentation constituted proof of adherence to community standards, even though these standards in this instance would have been dangerously inefficient. When I could not fill in the form’s empty spaces, she became irritated, and then somewhat hostile.

Further conflict occurred after this birth. Anticipating keeping the baby warm post-birth, several times during labour I had asked the baby’s parents to turn up the heat. They had ignored these requests. Consequently, the baby became chilled. Regulations said a cold-stressed baby must be observed in a hospital nursery. I called ahead to pediatrics, asking for a neonatal warmer to be made ready, but on arrival, the warmer had not been touched. Instead, pediatric nurses berated me aloud to distract from this oversight. Months later, the mother registered a variety of complaints, including that the birth should have taken place in the hospital. No one seemed inclined to acknowledge my role in the baby’s survival, nor the pediatric staff’s negligence. My superiors’ overriding concern was maintaining good relations with hospital staff with whom regulation required them to work, not supporting their patients or their associate.

Another experience suggested strongly that client welfare was not the top priority. I had chosen not to call one of my bosses to attend as second midwife, since she had already been up working all night. I did not think it a terrible breach of protocol, which said that

---

8 At that time, SARS ‘epidemic’ protocols allowed only one lay person to accompany women in labour. This woman was afraid to tell her husband that she preferred her mother with her, so she chose home birth to allow both to attend. Afterwards, she objected to those aspects of home birth which had originally led her to choose a hospital birth.
two midwives attend each birth, since no one ever objected to a midwife working solo if other midwives were not available or arrived late. In the post-birth review, however, my employer said I should have called her in, regardless. I asked if I had been in her shoes what would she have expected me to do, considering that if I were that tired I would not be able to drive safely. She said she would expect me to call a cab and get there. If I were too tired to drive, how could I be awake enough to deliver a baby safely? The uneven manner in which my employers enforced the ‘two midwives at a birth’ requirement put clients at risk. To object, however, put my job at risk.

I kept finding that the longer I worked, the more irrationally toxic the work environment became. At one point the hostility in my back-up hospital was so intense, I found myself defending midwifery itself in front of the entire clinical staff at rounds, against the Chief of Pediatrics’ opinion that home birth should be outlawed.

Although legally hospital staff were to support midwives, day-to-day midwifery standards were replaced by far more restrictive hospital protocols. Midwifery regulations said that I was not allowed to dismiss a client from my care unless she had been accepted as a patient by some other practitioner (CMO, 1994/2004). In real terms, this meant that I was stuck with the most unconventional clients even when they consistently refused to accept my best advice, as they were the least likely to be taken on by another obstetric practitioner.

I tried to stay within the bounds of any gray areas and protect myself as my colleagues did, as one midwife had expressed when she said, “I will absolutely not step outside any of the guidelines or jeopardize my job for the sake of a few “uncooperative” women” (Monk, 2007:89). I swore silently to myself to avoid trouble with the hospitals and physicians upon whose goodwill all regulated practice relied. However, while working in unavoidably contentious situations I found myself acting against my own interests. This
was not because I had worked before regulation stipulated strictly mandatory protocols. A midwife with whom I had worked pre-legislation, once licensed, defended subjecting her clients to unjustifiable rates of intervention ten times those prior to licensure (Tyson, 1991). She explained her actions with the words, “Cover my ass. Cover my ass. It’s a good job and I don’t want to lose it.”

Once I tried to avoid taking responsibility for a client who planned a home birth after a former cesarean. Midwifery regulation made following client wishes mandatory — yet, in this instance I was expected to misrepresent information in order to persuade her to choose hospital birth rather than a less interventive home birth. Attending vaginal births at home after cesarean was not against midwifery regulation, but I felt pressured to manipulate this client’s wishes. One of my bosses had cared for her during her first birth. The woman had undergone surgery after transporting from home to hospital. She was forced to return to this practice, the only midwifery service in her area, despite being quite clear that she did not want to be attended by my employer again. Since we worked on a rotating basis on weekends, there was the distinct possibility that this unwanted midwife might attend her, perhaps as my second. It looked like a recipe for litigation, especially since this particular midwife was uncomfortable with home births after cesarean. Despite stating my objections, the practice assigned me to this client. Although this particular woman lived far away from the back-up hospital, she declined the practice protocol requiring her to birth in hospital. Part of my job was to inform her that, if she was well advanced in labour when I arrived to attend at her home, by regulation I was not allowed to leave her. However, we would have to engage in the documentary dance the College demanded. I

---

9 The regulatory document *When the client requests care outside midwifery standards of practice* (CMO, 1994/2004) describes how the midwife must repeatedly describe the rationale for recommending against a mother’s wishes; the mother must repeatedly refuse; all recommendations and refusals must be documented and signed by both parties ... meantime the mother is trying to birth her baby.
Chapter one: Receiving, refusing, heeding the call

was legally constrained to tell her that I was not permitted to recommend her choice, but also ethically obliged to tell her that she was not bound by my recommendations.

On the way to attend this woman I realized I was playing with fire again, and dreading, not the birth, but the looming political fallout. Sure enough, it became a political disaster. On arrival her labour was well advanced, I could not legally leave, we did the ‘docu-dance’, she failed to progress, and we transported to hospital. It took too long from decision for transport to delivery, because we waited for over two hours after arriving at the hospital.\textsuperscript{10}

At the mother’s request, during the birth I moved closer to see the baby’s position, and was chastised for compromising the “sterile field” although I had touched nothing. This objection was unwarranted and arbitrary: twenty minutes earlier, the obstetrician had breached sterile protocols by failing to change from contaminated scrubs to clean ones.

The woman and her partner were well content with the care I had provided. However, the Chief of Obstetrics berated me for having followed this woman’s decisions and attending at home. My bosses also reprimanded me, after having set me up by refusing to act on my initial objections.

Consequently, I brought what I perceived as troublesome practices to the attention of my immediate superiors, without response. Then I went to our hospital administrations, to midwifery colleagues and then the midwifery regulatory body. I arranged for the Registrar of the midwifery College to review with our backup hospitals the fundamental principles of Ontario midwifery, informed choice, and choice of birthplace. She stressed the legal and logistical importance of respectful communication between physicians and midwives. The obstetrical staff present appeared to agree.

\textsuperscript{10} Hospital regulations specify obstetric units should be surgery capable within 30 minutes of notification.
Yet, going forward I continued to have to cope with physicians insisting upon intervening and disregarding maternal choices. A month later, a woman labouring at home progressed very slowly, refusing my recommendations for obstetric consult. Eventually she agreed to a hospital transport. The attending obstetrician concurred with my assessment of her progress, and she accepted the suggested epidural anesthesia. However, during the next shift, the obstetrical Chief examined her and angrily pronounced that our assessments had been wrong. Ten hours later, he became even angrier when the woman refused cesarean section and insisted I return to assist her with a vaginal delivery. Almost as soon as I helped her to get more upright, she pushed her baby out quickly without needing operative assistance. Later, the Chief alleged I had mismanaged the case, without mentioning the obstetrician involved, and with the backing of my employers put me on 'probation', even though legally no authority other than my regulatory College could impose such restrictions.

At the time of my exit from the profession, I was working for a newer urban practice partly because we agreed about conservative management (i.e., not intervening unless indicated). Anticipating a reduced workload for their first year, they offered associates remuneration for a 75% workload, adjusting pay at the end of the year. Within months, we were working to capacity. Twice in the year I covered the entire practice due to other midwives being quarantined during the SARS scare, and having all cell phone networks but mine fail during the three-day blackout.¹¹

In November, I talked to an employer about adjusting compensation. There was no response. Then I brought it up in a practice meeting. It was tabled until the new year for tax reasons. In early January, I memoed the partners for information about amounts and

¹¹ For three days in August, 2003, there was an electrical grid failure in eastern Canada and north-eastern U.S.
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dates of reconciliation. No reply again. In these last months, I could feel myself being stretched thinner and thinner. From the time I first inquired about back pay, my workload had been increased to the point where it was insupportable. I then wrote asking for three months' paid leave in lieu of financial reconciliation. Instead of granting this request, I was ordered not to write memos, but communicate verbally. Instead of a leave, I was to cover for the other midwives over the Christmas holidays, and required to join a tri-hospital group designing national obstetrical upgrading seminars. At the end I was on call, 24 hours a day for 35 days straight, well over the acceptable limit.

Despite having accessed internal reporting channels appropriately, my concerns led to termination. Because the abuse was subtle and gradual, it was difficult to pin down. No one thing was of sufficient gravity to go to war over. In retrospect, boundaries were broken in direct contravention of written practice protocols and contract arrangements. As well as not being paid, the last reason for leaving this position — and, although I did not know it at the time, the profession — was a new practice requirement for midwives to monitor epidural anesthesia and pharmacologically augmented labours. It was not within Ontario’s original scope of midwifery practice (CMO, 2000, 2008) or of my working contract. At that time, midwifery clients almost never planned on anesthesia, meaning that whenever an epidural or augmentation was called for it was usually after many hours — sometimes days — of attending labour. If a client should require this assistance, her midwife would often already be exhausted, in no fit state to monitor procedures which were associated, albeit rarely, with a number of severe, possibly life-threatening risks. I expressed my misgivings first to one of my employers, then in a practice meeting, and then to a number of other practices attending one of our professional association’s

12 Miceli, Near and Dworkin (2008) deem non-response retaliation for internal whistleblowing. Documentation takes up the whistleblower’s free time. Persistent non-response adds to anxiety, depression and sleep deprivation, where “exhaustion ... put[s] whistleblowers in a position of conflict with people with whom they previously had ... enjoyable relationships” (ibid.:126).
quarterly assemblies. At the assembly I arranged a plenary session with another practice
where individual midwives were free to adopt or reject these monitoring skills. I was
asked to resign before the plenary took place.

Without explanation, my employers called me in. They planned to dismiss me after citing
a single complaint — having put up my hand, signalling a request for a mother to stay
quiet while I auscultated her newborn’s heart. I pre-empted their agenda with medical
confirmation that I was suffering from exhaustion and burnout from overwork. The
partners insisted I resign regardless, and forfeit 66% of my back salary. I refused the
forfeiture. It took nine months of correspondence while on medical leave to recover my
back pay. Though they did not have sufficient grounds for my dismissal, it seemed they
had already arranged for a new midwife to replace me.

As in many cases of whistleblowing, with the failure of all internal mechanisms I gave up
further attempts, having run out of the energy necessary to persist (Miceli, Roach & Near,
1988; Rothschild & Miethe; 1999; Miceli, Near, Rehg & Van Scotter, 2012). Because
their refusal to pay constituted professional misconduct, I was certain the midwifery
community would support me in my fight for compensation and in having resisted the
partners’ unreasonable demands. However, this was not the case. My professional
association refused to provide legal or moral support, despite confirming my mistreatment
‘off the record’. An appeal to our regulatory body produced only the suggestion to register
a formal complaint, perhaps meaning my former practice would be shut down. I would
then be responsible for denying many women in the area midwifery care. I just wanted my
reputation cleared, not to bring down the whole practice and incidentally harm local
women.
As things had deteriorated at work, my marriage had ended. Because midwifery demanded such unpredictable hours, I lost custody of my children. A decade later, I realized that I had already been suffering from "secondary traumatic stress" disorder (Beck & Gable, 2012) from witnessing several horrendous births. The symptoms of post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), according to the nursing literature (Figley, 1995), may result "from helping or wanting to help a traumatized or suffering person" (ibid.:10).

According to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV-TR)* ... [secondary] PTSD can result from a person's [indirect] exposure ... to a traumatic situation ... parallel[ing] th[at] experienced in persons directly exposed to the traumatic event. (Beck & Gable, 2012:747)

There had opened a huge chasm between what I knew was right — how I would want my daughter and grandchild, for example, to be cared for — and what I was supposed to do to mothers and babies 'for their own good'. My strongest objections, made publicly if necessary, arose when clients' safety and their rights to informed choice were threatened, more than those jeopardizing my personal welfare. Yet, I also felt forced to choose between caring for myself, so that when I came to a birth I would be rested and capable of rapid responses in an emergency, or carrying the growing burden of administrative and political tasks. The atmosphere of constraint in the profession was adding to the risks for mothers and babies. I could not work while trivializing these risks.

I was eventually blacklisted, locked out from further employment in the field (Qusqas & Kleiner, 2001)\(^\text{13}\). I did not know that whistleblowers are considered "social deviants" (Goffman, 1963), who because they are seen as stepping outside the organizational norms by their colleagues, then require those same colleagues to normalize, albeit unconsciously,

\(^{13}\) Three years after leaving practice I moved to a new area. On being well received by a group working toward establishing the first midwifery practice there, they arranged for a meeting. This meeting was cancelled without explanation. I could only surmise that they contacted my former employers and believed unfavourable comments, because I was not even offered an opportunity to state my case.
behaviours and attitudes they know to be unethical, harmful and perhaps even self-destructive (v.i. 61). I did not know that, subsequent to retaliation, whistleblowers “suffer stigmatization at the hands of their coworkers and other organization members” (Miceli, Near & Dworkin, 2008:128). Such professional ‘shunning’ is an expression of societal norms that tolerate and support professional wrongdoing (Hewlin & Rosette, 2005), while condemning those who oppose it.

From practice to ethics: Altruistic awareness

Altruism entails action; good intentions are not enough. Altruistic acts benefit others; advantages for the altruist must be secondary and incidental (Lozada, D'Adamo & Fuentes, 2011). Since altruistic behaviour extends beyond collective welfare, where “acts improv[e] the well being of both the actor and others” (Monroe, 2009b:502), altruism may be risky for the altruist, sometimes to the point of being life-threatening (Lozada et al., 2011). Courting these risks may make altruism morally controversial. Similarly, whistleblowing is rendered morally ambiguous because of harm it may bring upon whistleblowers or peripheral others (Perry, 1998; Hersh, 2002; Hart & Brady, 2005).

Theorizing around “ethical perspective” attempts to explain self-destructive action on behalf of others in terms of cognition, emotion, intuitions, predispositions, and sentiments (Monroe, 2009a), constructing altruism as “a psychological framework” (ibid.:427) in which individuals “see themselves as closely connected to others through bonds of a common humanity” (ibid.:421). Social science has traditionally (Machiavelli, 1532/2003; Hobbes, 1651; Locke, 1690/2000; Hume, 1751/1902) assumed that self-interest drives human behaviour. Much thinking about altruism in biology, decision theory, economics, political science, sociology, anthropology, and psychology derives from this core assumption (Monroe, 1991, 1996). Even sociobiology, with its talk of the “selfish genes”
of "altruistic hosts" (Lumsden & Wilson, 1981) "smuggle[s] in self-interest by explaining away altruism" (Monroe, 2009b:503). "Classical" (Monroe, 2009a:427) Freudian theory also holds that altruistic behaviour comes from an unconscious wish to protect oneself from being judged as antisocial. Freud understood altruism exclusively as a defense mechanism that modifies instinctive selfishness in order to be socially accepted (1966). These mechanisms may manifest as "altruistic surrender" (ibid.:125), empathy with another's feelings so intense it eradicates fear of death. Overall then, in psychoanalysis and much of natural and social science, altruistic behavior is paradoxically rooted in selfishness, ranging from a disguised form of self-interest to an unconscious pathological defense.

In contrast, moral psychology (e.g., Monroe, 1996, 2009a; Mikhail, 2008) contends that altruism comprises part of all individual personalities, triggered to different degrees in different individuals by situational variation. In this way, altruism is seen as "relational not merely dispositional, [where] both personality and situation work together" (Monroe, 2009a:422).14

Whatever its source, the altruistic tendencies of many Ontario midwives have been partly blocked by the realities of exclusively licensed practice in the wider healthcare context. Ample empirical evidence (Gross, 1978; Mason, 1989; Daviss, 1999; Monk, 2007) warns against exclusive licensure, not least because arguments supporting licensure have become increasingly irrational, or, as Flyvbjerg (1998) put it, the rationality15 of power has obscured the power of reason:

14 For discussion of altruism in relation to professional compassionate empathy (Maxwell, 2008), v.i. 160-161.
15 Flyvbjerg defines rationality as "the tendency to expound/conceal certain premises, certain logical leaps, the admission at one spot of a logical necessity and the deliberate avoidance of this necessity at others" (1998:2).
... find[ing] ignorance, deception, self-deception, rationalization and lies more useful ... than truth and rationality. (ibid.:38)

Regardless, irrational arguments limiting Ontario’s midwifery practice were encoded in detailed regulations for professional self-governance; praxis then contracted, substituting consistent adherence to regulation for professional judgment. Compliance with codified practice was enforced, up to and including incarceration for unregistered practice. Exactly this kind of situation is referred to by organizational scholars who contend that emphasis on compliance, not competence, “so ... over-controls employees that it undermines the development of ethical values, good decision making, and trust in management” (Miceli et al., 2008:117; also Hasnas, 2006). In questioning managerial decisions, I was seen to “challenge the authority structure along with the particular decision in question” (Miceli et al., 2008:118). Because bureaucracies cannot function without a universally recognized authority structure (Weber, 1947), the “primacy [of authority] cannot be questioned by subordinates” (Miceli et al., 2008:118). My being forced out, then, was perhaps a way of ensuring that my objections would disappear.

When midwifery was unregulated or only loosely regulated, it yielded superior outcomes (v.s. 4), perhaps because it could respond above all to the individual needs of birthing women. However, many midwives saw nothing untoward in honouring their colleagues’, hospitals’, regulatory body’s and insurance companies’ demands above those of the women in their care. Whenever I was caught between what a woman wanted and what the institution demanded, I could never bring myself to talk her into doing things ‘their’ way. Presenting a standard procedure as if it was for the mother’s benefit, when it was recommended specifically for reasons of defensive practice, seemed like lying about how much risk was actually involved, and thereby compromising the woman’s ability to make
a truly informed choice. I would not willingly confuse the existence of risk with the responsibility for taking action:

The mere acknowledgement of the possible existence of a risk does not by itself entail a particular course of action; further evaluation of the significance of the risk is necessary, and such an evaluation is a moral, not a medical, judgment. (Overall, 1987:103)

Whenever I witnessed wrongdoing in midwifery practice, I would experience with it an acute imaginative awareness of what could have been done, a vision of what action I would have taken. These awarenesses were not experienced as ‘thoughts’ as such, but, in line with the findings of moral psychology (Wark & Krebs, 1997)\(^\text{16}\), almost like sensory experiences. As with sensory percepts, these visions took up all the ‘space’ in my mental field, without an intervening or accompanying sense of self as separate from the sensations. In witnessing wrongdoing at work, there existed only a kind of completely object-absorbed consciousness. The frustration and feelings of powerlessness at these vividly imagined alternative scenarios pinpointed where wrong was being done, not some kind of concurrent cognitive, evaluative function taking place at some conceptual distance from the event unfolding before me.

Medicine is a stochastic art\(^\text{17}\) wherein “mastery ... is compatible with failure to achieve its end” (Crawford, 2009:81). Competence includes accepting not knowing and discarding the illusion of being in control all the time, “not turning a blind eye, but accepting the truth as it is and dealing with it” (Simpson & French, 2006:246). Perhaps because of unavoidable medico-legal pressures (Gross, 1978; Hogan, 1979), or perhaps because

\(^{16}\) V.S. 2, the discussion of the perception of moral norms as if they were sensory percepts.

\(^{17}\) Aristotle called stochastic those arts in which particularity meets theory, where practitioners know they have only a partial understanding of a given reality, and are therefore not in control of outcomes.
professional medical practice is sustained by a dominant masculinist discourse\textsuperscript{18}, the notion of not being in control may seem unbearable. Where "epistemic science and didactics" (Flyvbjerg, 1998:23) substitute for practical skill, empirical realities which are unconsciously perceived as threatening may be denied.

Individuals deceive themselves, without actually lying or being disingenuous. [Their] perceptions and ideas about the social reality ... are shaped by feelings, such as pride, anxiety and pain, as well as by earlier experiences. (Gabriel, 1999:5)

Schön (1983, 1987) contrasts some professionals' concern to project an image of competence, perhaps by rigid adherence to protocol even in the face of situation-specific contraindications, with those less unconsciously pre-occupied with self-image who may tend to prioritize moral aims. Whistleblowers may be among those who are not primarily preoccupied with self-image, but whose unconsciously shaped moral 'perceptions' allow for uncertainty (cf. Alford, 2001). It may be, then, that one of the keys to understanding whistleblowing behaviour unlocks the relationship between unconscious forces conditioning moral perception and the social meanings of the relations between organizations and the individuals acting in and on them.

Through recounting my experiences in the roles of activist, professional and researcher, various aspects of medical whistleblowing come to light: a sampling of several kinds of wrongdoing, channels and various outcomes of reporting in attempts to remedy wrongdoing, and the emotional and occupational consequences of speaking out. Investigating my 'irresistible urge' to report leads to several thematic puzzles around notions of freedom, rationality, loyalty, and expertise, and points to possible benefit in

\textsuperscript{18}The medical professions' authority rests on what some call masculinist discourse (Knights, 2014), which values mind not bodies, reason not emotion, and control not receptivity. "These forms of masculinity ... constitute[e professionals] as subjects with minimal resources for expressing feelings and emotions, and for whom there is little vocabulary to acknowledge or describe weakness and failure" (Knights, 2014:4).
investigating the unconscious dimensions of perception and action. Continuing our exploration by reviewing the literature, we may see what other researchers have thought about conditions contributing to the meaning of whistleblowing in contemporary society. The third chapter then discusses the methodology based on Jungian archetypology and pragmatism that was developed for the thesis. Data collected from whistleblower interviewees and an interpretive panel was subjected to analysis drawing on narrative and psychosocial inquiry methods, particularly Social Dreaming and Listening Post techniques. This mytho-poetic analysis of social experience, or MPASE, followed the images, feelings and metaphors contained in the narratives and comments of participants, treating the various allusions and associations arising therefrom as an avenue to understand the contemporary social meaning of whistleblowing. The fourth and fifth chapters explore the concepts of archetype and archetypal heroes respectively. The latter begins to investigate the significance of the archetypes of Hero, Seer and Artist to conditions underlying whistleblowing in preparation for the following chapter of interpretive analysis. This sixth chapter presents a Jungian ‘amplification’ of the major images emerging from whistleblower narratives and dream reports, and incorporates consideration of themes in the responses of the Dream/Image Reflection Group to excerpts from this whistleblower data. The concluding chapter is divided into three sections. The first discusses the nature and significance of findings in a study such as this, and contrasts the possibilities and limitations of narrative inquiry’s ‘insider’ insights with psychosocial research’s intersubjective agreement. The second section looks into those themes that seemed to permeate the thesis, keeping at the forefront the crucial role that different levels of analysis play in producing meaning and the particular suitability of Jungian method to multi-level interpretation. Uniquely, the Jungian interpretation of the thesis provides a frame that time and time again leads us to speculate that whistleblowing is a product of the
collective unconscious at organizational and societal levels, rather than primarily tied to the personality, social position or history of specific individuals. Themes explored here include: the interdependence and interpenetration of masculine and feminine archetypes in whistleblowing; a rigidly linear versus a flexibly recursive view of the 'purpose' of life and the role of emerging unconscious opposites in social development; and what may represent the condensation of a new archetype that combines the symbolic associations of the Hero, Seer and Artist on a moral dimension, constellating in response to a global power elite that downplays the need to support healthy human collectivity. The last section presents potential directions for further research suggested by this thesis' Jungian theorizing around whistleblowing. It suggests that MPASE, which aims to capture unconscious currents to be found within subject narratives and dream reports, may be applied in multiple sectors of industry, and at various administrative levels. Because of the focus on archetypal language and imagery, this approach can extend and complement more traditional organizational research approaches, assisting in sidestepping the defences of research participants, and thereby yielding a more complete picture of the forces at work in any given phenomenon.

In the next pages, the literature review throws light on the tensions whistleblowers experience in finding themselves loyal and disloyal, rational and irrational, expressing and repressing their grief on witnessing or being complicit in wrongdoing at work.
Leaving Home: Literature review

A review of the literature may develop and deepen our understanding of whistleblowing, and clearly indicate where it might be fruitful to conduct further work. As we follow my discovery of the extent, contours and limitations of whistleblower research, new directions with potential for fresh discoveries become evident.

Genesis

The previous chapter details how I came to be interested in whistleblowing through practising midwifery and pursuing critical research investigating some of the political, discursive and psychological dimensions of professional praxis. This chapter begins with various definitions of whistleblowing. We then look critically at several literature reviews, in the process tagging whistleblowing research's major arms and its major foci. Despite claiming to value understanding whistleblower motivation — understanding the motivations and perceptions of actual whistleblowers is crucial for developing a more comprehensive model of whistleblowing behavior (dos, Tompkins & Hays, 1989:552) — what will become clear is that whistleblower research has not addressed the "why" of whistleblowing as much as having concentrated on predisposing factors for blowing the whistle — the "when", "where", "what" and "who" of it. Research into factor correlations often fails to take into account the many complex relational forces at work. A major contribution of the thesis is in underlining why correlative studies looking at the activities of individuals within employing organizations fail to explain the conditions that produce whistleblowing. It points out that whistleblowing is not just the activity of an individual,

19 In organizational literature, the notion of 'motivation' may connote incentive, especially financial incentive, implying a degree of selfishness. For the purposes of this thesis, 'motivation' more widely refers to the set of possible conditions — ethical, socioeconomic, familial, ethnic to name just a few — that, whether through psychological, physiological or cognitive processes, and whether conscious or unconscious, come together to produce whistleblowing behaviour.
but a practice that grows directly out of the larger web of social relations across the society in which the employing organizations are constituted. A section follows exploring several conceptual muddles intrinsic to the terminology and the effect that this lack of clarity may have had in producing methodological shortcomings. Several notions related to motivation are explored in depth — wrongdoing, loyalty, models of whistleblowing, organizational retaliation and whistleblower persistence, emotion and rationality. In closing, the chapter indicates how some of the gaps in understanding whistleblower motivation might be filled by approaching the phenomena from a different perspective than the primarily positivist approaches of previous research. Jungian methodology is identified as one such alternative, as it concentrates on non-rational, unconscious moral motivators evident in whistleblower narratives and dreams.

See no evil: research naïveté

Baker and Comer (2010) claim that

[s]ociety has lost faith in business integrity as fallout from widespread corporate scandals since the 1990s has affected the lives of literally millions of people [and] that citizens no longer trust businesses and business people to behave ethically ...(ibid.:96)

In the face of this decline in public trust, some research indicates our best hope lies in the “burgeoning” (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999:126) incidence of whistleblowing. Whistleblowing studies help to document the rising incidence of harmful and defective products and fraudulent and negligent industry practices, because of a growing trend for organizations to dismiss, trivialize and lie about their activities to promote a healthy bottom line. Much of the whistleblower literature widens disillusion with corporate ethics (Peters & Branch, 1972; Nader, Petkas & Blackwell, 1972; Westin, 1981; Mitchell, 1981; Bok, 1984; Glazer & Glazer, 1989) in emphasizing the “bleak statistical record on the social fate of whistleblowers” (Perry, 1998:237). Whistleblowers tend to lose their jobs
and their subsequent employability, and sometimes their family lives, their health, and their freedoms (Smith, 2014). In the private sector, a pattern echoing the treatment of dissidents in the U.S.S.R. has been noted, with whistleblowers being routinely referred for psychiatric evaluation (Bok, 1984). Whistleblowing is acknowledged as “an organizational social control instrument” (Bjorkelo, Einarsen, Nielsen & Matthiesen, 2011:207) capable of stopping the wrongdoing which is harming organizations, their members or society as a whole (Jubb, 1999; Miceli, Van Scotter, Near & Rehg, 2001). Whistleblowing has “never been more important” (Miceli et al., 2008:31):

... large, complex organizations have unprecedented opportunity to commit wrongdoing, at a time in history when oversight is nearly impossible because of increasing organizational complexity and size ... members who decide to blow the whistle may be the best hope for identifying their organization’s wrongdoing ... (ibid.)

Much organizational wrongdoing would remain hidden without “conscientious employees who are in the best position to observe the wrongdoings firsthand” (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999:126).

However, the literature exhibits a peculiar disconnect between the growing evidence of deliberate organizational misconduct, and an increasing tendency to propose overly-optimistic rhetorical agendas as improvement strategies for business and government ethics. Either the researchers are politically naïve or they are engaging in ‘lip service’—proposing measures that sound good in theory but do not accomplish much. Similar to assumptions underlying initiatives to promote Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), measures recommended by whistleblowing researchers assume that corporate actors desire to behave ethically. However, precisely the same problems appear with respect to whistleblowing as they do in relation to CSR: rhetoric about solutions protecting whistleblowers may not mean that any such solutions are actually implemented, or that,
once implemented, they have the desired effects (Louw, 2011). Neither CSR reporting measures nor whistleblowing protection imply in any way that stakeholders other than shareholders can determine what constitutes responsible corporate behaviour (Cooper & Owen, 2007). In fact, research on whistleblowing protection, like CSR rhetoric, may actually serve to obscure irresponsible practices (Orlitzky, 2013). It is pointless to call for ‘more research’ (Dyck, Morse & Zingales, 2010) into, e.g., how to avoid hiring unethical managers. The studies will go for naught if firms ignore them because they have no genuine interest in ethical conduct beyond appearing to be ethical. Perhaps the research acts as “noise” (as in ‘signal to noise ratio’), supporting incentives for “opportunistic” managers to distort information about whistleblower protections. This makes it more difficult to interpret corporate behaviour around whistleblowing, and may lead to a market overvaluation (Orlitzky, 2013) of firms because of what appear to be ethical approaches to whistleblowing.

Dasgupta and Kesharwani (2010) claim that more prosperous organizations, with greater assets and stability, are more favourably disposed toward “acts of whistleblowing and will have more resources ... to investigate the claims of the whistleblowers,” (ibid.:63), whereas smaller, more fragile firms may be more hostile towards “whistleblowing as a threat to their existence” (ibid.). This claim neglects incontrovertible evidence of cover-ups in sectors with enormous assets, such as oil (e.g., the BP oil spill of 2010), chemicals (e.g., Union Carbide and the Bhopal disaster of 1984), finance (e.g., the 2008 financial ‘meltdown’) and pharmaceuticals (e.g., GlaxoSmithKline’s fine of $3 billion in 2012 for covering up off-label promotional practices and failing to disclose safety data about Paxil, Welbutrin and Avandia (List of largest pharmaceutical settlements, 2013)). Baker (2008) says that “well-structured whistle-blowing policy” (ibid.:38) can prevent organizations being “victimized” by massive fraud, since “most likely” “someone” (ibid.) knew about it
beforehand, and had tried, unsuccessfully, to speak out. Other researchers echo this bullish advice, calling for “organizations ... to develop more encompassing ethics programs to ensure that unethical practices are reported” (Vadera, Aguilera & Caza, 2009:566), and emphasizing the potential benefit to organizations and society:

Valid whistle-blowing, executed appropriately, can ... stem what appears to be a veritable tidal wave of recent corporate wrongdoing. (Miceli et al., 2008:66)

Miceli, Near and Dworkin (2008) have advocated that corporate ‘cultures’ be seen as valuing accountability and ethical behaviour in manager and employee, and protecting the public from harm.20 Suggestions have been made to change a “culture of silence” (Moore & McAuliffe, 2010; Bjorkelo et al., 2011) to one where leaders support whistleblowers (de Graaf, 2010), clearly communicate what constitutes wrongdoing, how to report it and how to protect those who do report (Firth-Cozens, Firth & Booth, 2003). “[A]n organization culture that accepts, welcomes, and encourages candid dialogue and ethic” (O’Leary, 2006:109) trains “managers who feel threatened by proactive subordinates ... [into] utilizing this resource effectively” (Miceli, 2012:947). Some (Lipman, 2012) suggest rewarding whistleblowers financially and protecting them by legislating anonymous reporting channels, thereby reducing “disincentives” (retaliation) for reporting.

On the other hand, some contemporary research (Brown, Vandekerckhove & Dreyfus, 2014) objects to such seeming disingenuousness, saying we don’t need more whistleblowers, but we do need to force managers to stop ignoring what whistleblowers are saying.

---

20 These authors suggest organizations “be seen” in this way, emphasizing appearance more than behaviour.
Chapter two: Leaving home

It may be that researchers have avoided wrestling with slippery concepts, especially those threatening their institutional funding. Whistleblowing research has tended to produce frame-dependent findings supporting an image of organizations being genuinely interested in reducing unethical practice; they "want to appear to be taking action but essentially not hinder companies from pursuing business as usual" (Earle & Madek, 2007:3)\(^{21}\). As recently as 2010 (Dasgupta & Kesharwani), authors persist in making statements exonerating organizations of deliberate wrongdoing, blaming it instead on individuals: "Contrary to popular belief, these acts [of wrongdoing] do not enjoy ... organization[al support,] but are perpetrated by some individuals or groups within the organization ... for their own personal and selfish gain" (ibid.:67). Solutions aim to create whistleblower support by convincing organizations that it is to their own financial benefit to do so (Bowen, Call & Rajgopal, 2010), rather than reducing the incidence of wrongdoing.\(^{22}\)

Some researchers (Rocha & Kleiner, 2005) even claim that organizations have already changed their attitude toward whistleblowing:

As the number of whistle-blowing cases increases, companies are growing weary with ... the cost involved in these litigations ... Corporations can save millions if they take preventive steps to avoid law suits. (Rocha & Kleiner, 2005:85)

If supporting whistleblowing were truly more lucrative than silencing dissent, with billions of dollars of resources devoted to increasing profit, how likely is it that organizations have simply overlooked whistleblowing as a way to reduce expenses, and only need reminding by intrepid researchers? Vadera, Aguilera and Caza (2009:566) declare succinctly what others avoid expressing — "How likely is this when so much money is at stake?"

\(^{21}\) An *ad hominem* focus away from wrongdoing, in studies examining institutional ‘disloyalty’ rather than exposing the extent and impact of organizational wrongdoing, may be a deliberate organizational counter-resistance strategy. (See Monk, Knights & Page, 2015 for an elaboration of this argument.)

\(^{22}\) Suggested solutions to wrongdoing are often [deliberately?] vague — “ensure that mechanisms exist to bring about necessary change following reporting” (Firth-Cozens, Firth & Booth, 2003:336) — without practical consideration of how best to make these recommendations feasible.
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The numbers have already been crunched:

Some ...have argued that Pfizer made more money from continuing the sale of off-label uses for Bextra and other drugs than from heeding the whistleblower complaints and stopping the sale. (Lipman, 2012:51)

The naïveté of researchers may mirror that of the whistleblowers they study. Whistleblowers have been called “organizationally naïve” — rarely do whistleblowers “accurately anticipate the retaliation and severe personal consequences that would follow their report” (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999:119) — for believing that their organizations actually aim to perform ethically.23 Jos, Tompkins and Hays (1989) characterized whistleblowers as “overly trusting” (ibid.:556) of an organization’s loyalties to its stated goals; neither did they find them to be disgruntled dissidents, but, on the contrary, very serious about fulfilling their organizational obligations. Rather than changing like social chameleons to meet different expectations in each situation, whistleblowers perform unusually consistently across social settings, adhering to “internal ideals and beliefs [and] values ... including a strong endorsement of universal moral standards as a guide” (ibid.:557).

Combining notions in Ho’s work (2010) about “Wall Street warriors ... lioniz[ing] themselves as the heroes of the new global community” with those detailing the consistent ethical behaviours of whistleblowers described above, I imagined whistleblowers as more classically heroic. Rather than responding to greed or pride, these heroes answer to the altruistic promptings of social conscience, even when their own wellbeing might be compromised.

23 Interestingly, this na"ivete is not what ‘makes’ a whistleblower. Non-reporters also appeared naïve, having high levels of “perceived organizational support” and “perceived channel justice” (Miceli, Near, Rehg & Van Scotter, 2012) — in either not seeing wrongdoing, or believing someone else would report it.
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Hear no evil: research approaches

In creating a literature overview, it surprised me to find work on whistleblowing across a wide range of fields, including organizational studies (Near & Miceli, 1985), accounting (Schultz, Johnson, Morris & Dyrnes, 1993), administration (Cruise, 2002), finance (Verschoor, 2010), law (Earle & Madek, 2007) medical humanities (Moore & McAuliffe, 2010, 2012), philosophy (McNamee, 2001; Bouville, 2007), sociology (Akerstrom, 1991; Evans, 2008), education (Jump, 2012), psychology (Keenan, 1990; Aherne & McDonald, 2002) and psychoanalysis (Alford, 2007).

Definitions

Since about 1972 — the year of Watergate (Harry Ransom Center, UTA), the ‘Pentagon Papers’ (The most dangerous man in America, 2010), and Nader, Petkas and Blackwell’s Whistleblowing — the press has discussed ‘whistleblowing’ as a particular kind of resistance, when those in the know expose unethical practice publicly. As the incidence of whistleblowing has increased, early questions whether whistleblowing constituted a phenomenon deserving of scrutiny or was “simply too infrequent to admit of any wider significance” (Perry, 1998:236) have been rendered moot.

Although logically not different from other kinds of resistance, the ‘bracketing’ of whistleblowing has sensationalized its implications, increased public attention and sold more newspapers. Insofar as ‘bracketing’ is the way by which people commonly divide the flow of experience into meaningful units (Weick, 2001:185, v.i. 88), researchers have not debated whether the whistleblowing phenomenon merits such division; rather they have engaged much effort attempting to describe its boundaries (Bok, 1980; Westin, 1981;
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Elliston, 1982). When Ockham’s razor\textsuperscript{24} is sidestepped by granting a social construct like whistleblowing independent ontological status, then the tendency is to “search for its properties rather than treat its “existence” as problematic” (Weick, 2001:184).

Initially, whistleblowing definitions debated concepts of harm (whether financial, psychological or physical, whether to members of organizations or to the public at large, whether deliberate or unintentional), communication (whether to internal or external agencies, whether recipients might/might not be able to remedy harm), and retaliation or reward. Most definitions involved an intentional disclosure of information to which the whistleblower has privileged access. Several definitions of whistleblowing were crafted:

- a man or woman who, believing that the public interest overrides the interest of the organization he serves, blows the whistle that the organization is in corrupt, illegal, fraudulent or harmful activity (Nader et al., 1972:vii);

- going public with information about the safety of a product (De George, 1980:8);

- sounding an alarm from within the very organization in which they work, aiming to spotlight neglect or abuse that threatens the public interest (Bok, 1980:2);

- an organisational member’s (former or current) disclosure of illegal, immoral, or illegitimate practices under the control of their employers to persons or organizations that may be able to effect action (Near & Miceli, 1985:4).

The latter definition, widely used in the literature (Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010; Mansbach, Melzer & Bachner, 2011), comprises four elements: the reporter, the wrongdoing reported, the organization or a group within it committing the wrongdoing, and the recipient of the report of wrongdoing (Near & Miceli, 1985; Rocha & Kleiner, 2011). Specifically the principle of parsimony, the ontological mode of ‘simplicity’ alluded to by the term Occam’s razor — “Entities are not to be multiplied beyond necessity “, or, with respect to theory (T), “Other things being equal, if $T_1$ is more ontologically parsimonious than $T_2$, then it is rational to prefer $T_1$ to $T_2$” (Baker, 2011:§2).
2005). Bjørkelo et al.'s (2011) variation of this definition — the whistleblower "reports to a person or a body that has the ability to change the [unethical] practice" (ibid.:214) — proves problematic in retrospect, i.e. when the whistleblower assesses the likelihood of the report's recipient being able and willing to remedy wrongdoing inaccurately, which occurs more frequently than not (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999).

Jubb proposed a more restrictive definition of whistleblowing (1999):

> a deliberate non-obligatory act of disclosure, which gets onto public record and is made by a person who has or had privileged access to data or information of an organisation, about non-trivial illegality or other wrongdoing whether actual, suspected or anticipated which implicates and is under the control of that organisation, to an external entity having potential to rectify the wrongdoing. (Jubb, 1999:78)

Jubb desired to differentiate whistleblowers from "sneaks, spies, squealers and other despised forms of informer" (Jubb, 1999:77). He believed this lack of differentiation was responsible for organizational retaliation against meritorious complaints. He also wanted to distinguish whistleblowing from internal organizational control, believing that internal whistleblowing, especially in the normal course of performance of one's job (e.g., as an internal auditor), should not qualify as whistleblowing. However, as pointed out by Malek (2010), in certain industries (such as pharmaceutical research) externality does not necessarily apply. Instead, a wider understanding of "the organizational and power structure differences" (ibid.:116) within and between certain sectors is called for. Estlund (2005) sees a "shift from 'self-governance' to 'self-regulation'" (ibid.:319) in reduced governmental monitoring of business. Employees whose role includes monitoring internal systems of rights and regulatory standards, despite exhibiting a greater propensity to blow the whistle (Arnold & Ponemon, 1991; Schultz et al., 1993), "have lost their institutional

---

25 In Chapter 6, Ajax and Odysseus discuss this problem in detail.
voices and are losing the protective oversight of courts and public agencies” (ibid.:319). Increasingly their reporting causes repercussions (Estlund, 2005). The debate whether internal reporting through established procedures, e.g. to a supervisor, qualifies as whistleblowing continues (Miceli, Near, Rehg & Van Scotter, 2012; c.f. Bjørkelo et al., 2011). Many, if not most, whistleblowers attempt to address wrongdoing through internal channels first, and then go external (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999; Miceli et al., 2012). To discount internal whistleblowing would be to dismiss studies (Miceli et al., 2012) linking organizational retaliation for in-house reporting to subsequent external whistleblowing:

acts of retaliation ... more deeply incriminate wrongdoers and make whistle-blowers angry with them. (Gundlach, Douglas & Martinko, 2003:109)

Factors

Because so many whistleblowers are subject to retaliation, defamation and shunning by colleagues and family (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005; Rehg, Miceli, Near & Van Scotter, 2008), studies have attempted to explain why whistleblowers persist, seemingly against reason, by considering whistleblower personalities and the contexts in which they work.

The ‘first wave’ of whistleblower studies, conducted predominantly by organizational behaviour scholars (Rozuel, 2010), applied empirical methods to measure a plethora of variables characteristic of ‘typical’ whistleblowers. They investigated demographics and personality ‘traits’: gender, age and pay scale, extroverted vs. introverted, rulebound vs. iconoclastic, religious vs. atheist, content vs. disgruntled, etc. (Nader et al., 1972; Mulkay, 1972; Harshbarger, 1973; Nagel, 1978; Peters & Branch, 1972; Mitchell, 1981; Westin, 1981; Brabeck, 1984). The critical management (Rozuel, 2010) ‘second wave’ (Graham, 1986; Glazer & Glazer, 1989; Rothschild & Miethe, 1994; Dworkin & Baucus, 1998;
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Perry, 1998; Goldman, 2001; Gundlach et al., 2003) framed whistleblowing activities contextually "within and between discursive and institutional structures" (Perry, 1998:240) by investigating organizations and management: large vs. small institutions, hierarchical vs. loose management styles, public vs. private sectors. Both waves assumed that focusing on the individual-organizational bond would explain whistleblower motivation (Vadera et al., 2009).

Personal and organizational variables have been examined in an attempt to predict whistleblowing by individuals. There have been several noteworthy reviews of the factors explored by the literature (Hooks, Kaplan & Schultz, 1994; Seifert, 2006; Vadera et al., 2009; Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010). These reviews group cogent factors into categories along differing lines.

Seifert (2006) proposes whistleblowing is a genus of "organizational citizenship behaviour" determined by "organizational fairness", citing Hooks et al. (1994) extensively. Hooks et al. describe many personal, situational, societally interactive and organizational factors which ostensibly increase the likelihood of whistleblowing: being married (Soeken & Soeken, 1987), those good at their job (Miceli & Near, 1988; Glazer & Glazer, 1989), those who enjoy and are dedicated to their work (Westin, 1981; Miceli & Near, 1988), those who have longer tenure or have achieved higher positions in a company (Miceli & Near, 1988), being male (Miceli, Near & Schwenk, 1991), older (Miceli & Near, 1988), more highly educated (Miceli & Near, 1984), or intolerant of ambiguity (Pincus, 1989). Situationally, the study claims that non-anonymous whistleblowing varies directly as the gravity of the wrongdoing (Miceli & Near, 1988), and that external whistleblowing rates increase if wrongdoing is harming work colleagues (Miceli, Near & Schwenk, 1991). Interactive factors examined suggest that whistleblowing occurs more
often when whistleblowers' job roles (Schultz et al., 1993), their professions (Arnold & Ponemon, 1991) or society in general (Becker & Fritzche, 1987) support their duty to report. Organizational factors include supportive organizational 'cultures' where retaliation is infrequent (Trevino, 1986; Arnold & Ponemon, 1991) and top managers are seen to behave ethically (Miceli & Near, 1992), establishing reporting policies and designating individuals/bodies to receive reports (Miceli & Near, 1992; Keenan, 1990).

Fifteen years on, Vadera, Aguilera and Caza's review (2009) divides research into subfields which examine: predispositions for perceiving wrongdoing (Miceli & Near, 1992); factors predicting the reporting of wrongdoing (Dworkin & Baucus, 1998); the process of whistleblowing (Near & Miceli, 1985); and reactions to whistleblowing, including predictors of retaliation against whistleblowers (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999). The review looks at situational and individual antecedents to whistleblowing, separating the latter category into consistent and inconsistent factors. Separating 'consistent' from 'inconsistent' individual antecedents, implies that some factors are found to be reliably and significantly associated with whistleblowing, whereas research into other factors may be inconclusive or contradictory.

In not distinguishing between 'consistent' and 'inconsistent' situational antecedents, the study's categories imply that all situational factors correlate consistently with a tendency to whistleblow. Situational antecedents to whistleblowing include perceiving an organization as supporting employee wellbeing by valuing justice and employee performance, caring about its resources, and functioning democratically (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999; Rothwell & Baldwin, 2007). The study also lists other organizational factors such as high organizational performance, minimal bureaucracy and being in the

---

26 Interestingly, this review does not identify work on protective legislation (Miethe & Rothschild, 1994; Miceli, Rehg, Near & Ryan, 1999; Callahan, Dworkin, Fort & Schipani, 2002; Earle & Madek, 2007; Lewis, 2011; Lipman, 2012) as a distinct subfield.
public sector (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005),
despite prior (cf. Miceli & Near, 1984:691, “no studies ... demonstrate the impact of
differences in public and private sector environments”) and subsequent (de Graaf, 2010)
contradictory findings.

Vadera, Aguilera and Caza (2009) maintain that factors such as gender, age, tenure, and
“personal morality”\textsuperscript{27} are not consistently associated with a propensity for blowing the
whistle (also Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). With respect to ‘morality’,
inconsistent findings may derive from researchers not having recognized the effect of
organizations tolerating wrongdoing to the point where misconduct is “normalized”, no
longer seen as wrong by most organizational members (Miceli et al., 2008). On the other
hand, Vadera et al. (2009) find that factors such as having reporting responsibilities as part
of one’s job (Ellis & Arieli, 1999; Park & Blenkinsopp, 2009), a good job performance
record, higher organizational status and pay, and higher levels of education are
consistently reliable predictors of whistleblowing in response to witnessing wrongdoing. It
must be noted that, in alleging this consistency, the study appears to contradict the
research it cites. The statement that such factors are consistent is immediately followed by
the contention that “other studies have found no association of individual performance,
education and organizational position to whistleblowing” (Vadera et al., 2009:556). One
study cited even goes so far as to say that “there are almost no sociodemographic
characteristics that distinguish the whistle-blower from the silent observer” (Rothschild &
Miethe, 1999:107), because of researchers failing to “include a sufficient number of
whistle-blowers and silent observers to make valid comparisons”(ibid.:113). Rothschild
and Miethe’s opinion is supported and extended by Henik’s literature review (2008:12)

\textsuperscript{27} Defined as “personal ideal values ... associated with viewing whistle-blowing as a moral obligation ...
etc.” (Vadera et al., 2009:559).
which states, “the list of inconclusive predictors of whistle-blowing includes such individual differences as assertiveness, authoritarianism, self-esteem, moral reasoning, internal locus of control, self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, religiosity and self-righteousness.”

Altogether then, the opinion that there are no reliable predictors for whether an individual perceives and then reports wrongdoing appears justified.

Organizational scholars often analyze phenomena in terms of power dynamics by including a discussion of gender (Siedler, 1989; Acker, 1990; Knights & Kerfoot, 2004) and class (Sennett & Cobb, 1977; Rey & Ritzer, 2012; Bauman, 2007). In this work, however, neither category are expounded upon in the more common ‘organizational studies’ manner. It could very well be that gender or social class do contribute to the conditions of possibility leading to whistleblowing, but a wealth of positivist research failing to demonstrate any kind of convincingly reliable connection between gender or tenure/position or socioeconomic status and the likelihood of blowing the whistle (v.s. 38-42) makes it unlikely that further analysis along these lines would be fruitful.

Studying ‘class’ effects upon whistleblowing becomes especially problematic when examined in the contemporary context of neoliberal capitalism. Class used to be a construct referring to the relations between industrial capital and wage-labour, based on a distinction between production and consumption (Rey & Ritzer, 2012), with multiple connotations of prestige, privileged access to material and cultural wealth, and control over the time and efforts of others — or the lack thereof. However, in the “liquid modernity” (Bauman, 2007) or “new capitalism” (Sennett, 2006) of the 21st century, the old understanding of class has been replaced “by a liquid modern division” (Blackshaw,
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2005:33), between privileged consumers and those struggling to consume. Where the “spheres of production and consumption were formerly separated along class lines” (Rey & Ritzer, 2012:453), increasingly consumers engage in production — in self-serve restaurants, navigating automated telephone menus, wearing blatantly branded clothing — reducing production costs, but not receiving any added value (i.e., they are now working for free).

Historically, corporations were set up to serve the public good (The Corporation, 2003), not just instruments for avarice:

The father of capitalism, Adam Smith, was concerned that workers receive a living wage; corporations not become too huge so they circumvent local control, and ...[he] posited an ethical transaction, such that if a child was the buyer, the seller would tend the same deal as if it was a knowledgeable adult. (Boje, 2006:28)

However, since the end of the second world war, this new capitalism has emerged from neoliberal economic theory and has increasingly become the basis for national policy making (Peters, 2001). Stemming from Enlightenment thinking valuing rationality, self-interest and legal equality, neoliberalism advocates liberty from government control of markets in the unsupported (Smith, 2012) belief that unhampered competition and the maximization of corporate profit benefit all of society. It has led to a widespread and growing global inequality, and the withdrawal of state responsibility in areas such as health and education as the result of a discursive emphasis upon the primacy of the individual who is motivated only by logical, individualistic, and selfish goals (Peters, 2001). With the unquestioning establishment of international free trade agreements that are touted as the route to strong economies, but are more likely to deepen the divide between rich and poor, it becomes apparent that national policies place profit above all else.
Despite the fact that such economic policies benefit only the very wealthy, a neoliberal focus on the rights of the individual not only obscures the importance of the public good, but also blames social ills such as poverty and inequality on those susceptible to them (Smith, 2012; Fleming, 2015). This ideology that dictates that markets should determine resource allocation through competition, and that individuals are only motivated by economic status has become a “true doxa” (Smith, 2012; Bourdieu, 1999), an almost universally and uncritically accepted worldview.

The hallmarks of the new capitalist order however are short term thinking, and movement, from job to job, place to place, family to family, commodity to newer commodity, with an ever changing set of buzzwords reflective of an endless trajectory of improvement (Ciuk & Kostera, 2010). They produce “some of the maladies of liquid modernity, such as the pervasive sense of discontinuity, shallowness and fragmentation of life” (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2015:56).

At the organizational level, where old ways to achieve goals are discarded more and more frequently, experience becomes obsolescence and loyalty is viewed at best as lack of ambition. In dispensing with its history, the new “regime of power” is “illegible” (Sennett, 1998:10) since rules for success constantly change, and the work itself becomes less and less clearly defined. At a societal level, in a frame where economic activity is solely devoted to the bottom line and all other moral or social functions have been discarded (Fleming, 2015), governments are subordinate to the economy, and economic institutions no longer have “obligations ... to the polity” (Sennett, 1998:53). More and more the confusion, insecurity and fear engendered by such a context is “shouldered by the masses” (ibid.:80; also Rey & Ritzer, 2012). Risk that used to be reserved for the venture capitalist is now offloaded onto citizens who pick up the tab for the errors and excesses of a
“capitalist system ... whose greed and rapaciousness very nearly led to its self-destruction” (Rey & Ritzer, 2012:460). The increasing lack of control over one’s life is accompanied by corporate mandates to perform the signs of enthusiasm and happy eagerness as a worker and as a consumer, or be declared redundant or deviant (Cedarström & Fleming, 2012). In this context, the archetypological analysis of this thesis searches for evidence that the repression of the negative psychological and social side-effects of a neoliberal society produces the unconscious conditions for a growing number of individuals to blow the whistle.

Moreover, because of its archetypal perspective, this study looks at gender differently. From a mythopoetic perspective gender does not mean “a simplistic equation of the feminine with women and masculine with men” (Höpfl & Matilal, 2007:205). The notions of masculine and feminine are not necessarily connected to “biological men and women, but as the socially produced pattern of meanings that distinguish the masculine from the feminine” (Pullen and Rhodes, 2008:7; also Bowles, 1993). Archetypal or “deep” masculinity (Bowles, 1990; Moxnes, 1999) or femininity comprise more than ‘maleness’ or ‘femaleness’ and do not “necessarily lead to the male/female binarism” (DiBernardo, 2003:60). The mytho-poetic analysis of this thesis reinforces the idea that every person has conscious and unconscious masculine and feminine aspects, including feminine-in-the-masculine and masculine-in-the-feminine dimensions.29 The analysis also suggests that it is in part the unconscious dynamic between these archetypal polarities that contributes to whistleblowing, as a counterbalance to the dysfunction of global society.

Dasgupta and Kesharwani’s review (2010) draws on Near, Rehg, Van Scotter and Miceli’s (2004) categorization of seven types of wrongdoing — stealing, waste, mismanagement,
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29 v.i. 255 for discussion of the archetypal Horus as being symbolic of the feminine-in-the-masculine.
safety problems, sexual harassment, unfair discrimination and legal violations — in a section entitled “types of whistleblowing” (Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010:58). They look at three components of the whistleblowing process: perceiving wrongdoing; deciding to act; and organizational reactions to whistleblowing. The third component relates firstly to the wrongdoing, that is, whether organizations continue or remedy the wrongdoing, and secondly with respect to actions taken against/in support of the whistleblower. The study then distinguishes whistleblowing from expressions of institutional loyalty, and whistleblowers as distinct from those whose job role requires reporting. Whistleblowing motivations are divided into three sections: altruism, “motivational and psychological” factors, and the prospect of financial reward. Next, the authors consider organizational reactions to whistleblowing, specifically retaliation against whistleblowers and whistleblowers’ reprisal against retaliation. Seven kinds of retaliation are identified: ad hominem attacks questioning the whistleblower’s credibility, creating poor performance appraisals, threatening termination, isolating or humiliating, setting whistleblowers up for failure (e.g., assigning impossible workloads), threatening prosecution (e.g., for breaking contractual gag clauses), and damaging employment prospects (not renewing contracts, not permitting promotion, or ‘blacklisting’ in the industry). The concluding section details the ways in which U.S. whistleblower protection legislation encourages organizational support of whistleblowing, and finds that whistleblowing is the best way for organizations to protect themselves against harmful wrongdoing. The study calls for sound and consistent laws to protect whistleblowers as well as fair systems for internal

30 The second section includes two motivational factors, financial incentive and revenge for having been fired or maltreated, and then financial reward is re-iterated in the third section. The authors arbitrarily separate monetary rewards into those from the whistleblower’s employing organization and those from elsewhere. A potential whistleblower would need to engage in identical reasoning and decision-making processes regardless of where rewards originate or whether reporting wrongdoing is intrinsic to the whistleblower’s job role.

31 “Nuts and sluts” is the phrase Alford employs (2007:244) to describe the disciplinary strategy of treating those who raise ethical issues as either psychologically or morally deviant.
whistleblowing. Importantly for this thesis, the authors clearly indicate an "absence of a comprehensive theory towards explaining whistleblowing" or whistleblower motivation (Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010:67).

**Speak no evil: research shortfalls**

Having experienced what it is like to blow the whistle, and what kinds of situations produce the urge to do so, I noted many difficulties in research approaches to understanding whistleblowing, including the lack of a comprehensive explanation for whistleblower motivation noted above. The research determining traits of whistleblowers and 'blown-upon' organizations assigns the whistleblowing label to a pre-defined set of an individual's activities. This should, according to Weick (2001), then allow the whistleblowing construct to be meaningfully integrated into a "network of causal sequences" (ibid.:185), part of the world's map of meaning. However, naming resistance whistleblowing, so far, has not created a clear sense of its origin. In their attempt to assess what predicts successful whistleblowing, researchers have administered self-reporting surveys, conducted interviews and assessed reactions to fictional vignettes to produce lengthy inventories of traits of whistleblowers and whistleblowing-prone organizations. However, the field is restricted and plagued with inconsistent findings especially regarding individual-level antecedents to whistle-blowing ... we still do not [understand] the motives of potential whistle-blowers (Vadera et al., 2009:571), not least because there is almost no discussion of subject/researcher relationship influence on self-report bias and false response. Too much data is not accounted for: many organizations have not produced whistleblowers that should have; many people who ought to have blown the whistle, did not.
Because whistleblower researchers generally do not lay out their ontologies and epistemologies for the reader to consider, it is important to trace how “variables become singled out and named in the first place” (Weick, 2001:190). Perhaps the literature’s inconsistent findings come from using fuzzy terms, such as “seriousness” of wrongdoing, or come from methodological problems, such as relying on findings from experimental designs using hypothetical vignettes of ethical ‘dilemmas’.

Research limitations

Looking at the field as a whole, the first two waves of research, conducted by organizational behaviour and critical management scholars respectively (Rozuel, 2010), become problematic when the assumptions underlying the variables these approaches examine are analyzed. First wave focus on whistleblower psychology (ibid.) dismisses social context as if psychology is context-independent; if whistleblowing actions, intentions and discourse are products of social constructions external to the whistleblower, then the second wave’s focus on social context (ibid.) obscures the individual’s knowledge of particular wrongdoing by discipline (Foucault, 1980). Somers and Casal (2010:152) mention that studies must account for the kind of wrongdoing perceived, because ample evidence shows that the nature and gravity of wrongdoing influences whether a person blows the whistle or not. Academic precedent for psychological analysis of leadership types, using instruments such as personality ‘inventories’ based on self-reporting surveys, and sociological analysis of hierarchical dynamics in organizations based on interviewing ‘key players’ (Kets de Vries, 1990; Wood, 1997a,b) has repeatedly led organizational researchers to study whistleblowers, rather than the moral status of the practices which concern them. Many organizational scholars seem reluctant to discuss the ethicity of whistleblowing with specific reference to particular practices, leaving this task to political scientists or philosophers. Not only is this focus myopic at the level of specific
individuals, but, unlike in this thesis, it also clouds the ability to clearly see the relationship between the actions of individual whistleblowers and the larger societal contexts in which they act, thereby missing a potential understanding of the role that whistleblowers play in the greater society and the importance of that role.

Excluding the particular wrongdoing or assigning it to a generic category, the rule rather than the exception for whistleblowing research, may be misleading in addition to misunderstandings from having ignored wrongdoing altogether. To illustrate, we may refer to Bjørkelo, Einarsen, and Matthiesen's (2010) empirical study of personality variables associated with whistleblower behaviour. This work is typical of the field in its aim and claim to have discovered objectively valid findings. In its discussion of the spiral of incivility, where one hostile act leads to another, these authors state, “In whistleblowing cases, this type of spiral may start if the focus is on the individual characteristics of the whistleblower instead of on the content of the whistleblowing ... [which] may lead to dismissal of the actual content” (ibid.:388). However, they then proceed only to look at whistleblowers, as do many others (Bok, 1980; Miceli & Near, 1984, 1988; Keenan, 1995; Goldie, Schwartz, McConnachie & Morrison, 2003; Gundlach et al., 2003; Seifert, Sweeney, Joireman & Thornton, 2010). Bjørkelo et al. (2010) talk about the personality traits revealed by self-report survey instruments that psychologists subscribing to Digman's (1990) Five Factor Model32 (FFM), and Sullivan (1953) and Leary’s (1957) Interpersonal Theory of Personality (ITP) consider valid. The investigators administer two sets of these instruments; all their data are subject-dependent.33 Moreover the subjects are filling out the surveys at work. The intent of many of the questions is completely
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32 FFM uses the Revised Neo-Personality Inventory; ITP, the Neo-Five Factor Inventory.
33 The researchers do not discuss psychologists' debates about the value of the “Big Five” model, where some claim that findings are simply that factor analysis produces descriptors of a variety of traits that cluster together (Block, 1995), nor that the 'standard' psychometric tools of both FFM and ITP have common theoretical axes ('friendliness' and 'dominance') (Personality Research Organization, 1998), weakening the study's claim that triangulating results support the validity of their findings.
transparent (See Appendix I for sample questions.). If these employees have no guarantee that this information is not going to be used against them, then it is possible that they may distort findings radically by lying to protect themselves, skewing their answers to be more socially acceptable (Brewer & Selden, 1998). A subject may, for example, tick off a box which will make him/her look more truthful than he/she actually is.

The omission of a discussion of the effect of the researcher/subject/context relationship and the effect of the self-report research process upon the data produced is surprising, given that it is personality and emotion being scrutinized. There is ample research (e.g., Kets de Vries, 1990; Hoorens, 1993; Kahneman, 2011) articulating how self-reports are affected by cognitive bias. Unconscious cognitive distortions prevent people having the complete control they think they do over their own perceptual processes. It is a standard axiom of psychoanalytic circles that people’s behaviour is all tied up with their fantasy images of who they want to be (L. Crociani-Windland, personal communication, 13 January 2012), which is not necessarily anything close to how they are perceived by those around them.

Terms

Some terms used in the literature are problematic. For example, the definition of what constitutes "serious" wrongdoing may assign the gravity of wrongdoing along multiple dimensions (Schultz et al., 1993; Miceli & Near, 1988; Hooks et al., 1994; Ayers & Kaplan, 2005), mixing concerns about how much money is at stake (Lipman, 2012), with how deleterious the effect upon public physical, mental (Mansbach et al., 2011) or financial (Macey, 2007) wellbeing may be, or by how seriously whistleblowing may affect the organization (Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010).
Rothschild and Miethe (1999) equate serious wrongdoing with fraudulent loss over $100,000 (ibid.: 122), or with any wrongdoing that frequently elicits retaliation against whistleblowers. Although the first dimension fits financial sector whistleblowing, it is not nearly so apt to gauge the seriousness of wrongdoing in, e.g., medicine, where wrongdoing may lead to irreparable harm or loss of life, which cannot easily be measured financially. The basis of the frequency of retaliation does not distinguish between, e.g. discriminatory behaviour toward individual employees with, e.g. the misrepresentation of pharmaceutical data. Although the former may elicit retaliation more frequently, the latter may affect entire groups of people, but instances of whistleblowing, and therefore of retaliation against it, may occur far less often.

Confounding individual misconduct with misconduct systemically entrenched in industry processes gives rise to conflicting findings about whistleblower altruism:

> the issue of the extent to which whistle-blowing is altruistic or egoistic in nature is still being debated. (Singer, Mitchell & Turner, 1998:528)

Such confusion makes difficulty in determining whether whistleblowers are influenced by beliefs “in protecting wider interests, [being] less concerned with self-interest, hav[ing] a strong sense of self-efficacy and locus of control” (Appelbaum, Grewal & Mousseau, 2006:9), because of religious values and moral standards (Chiu, 2003). Bjørkelo et al. (2011) try to compensate for this egoist/altruist confusion by excluding from whistleblowing reports of wrongdoing for personal gain. However, when whistleblowers pit themselves against large corporate interests to stop systemically entrenched misconduct, the chances of proving the wrongdoing in court are minimal, let alone the
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34 cf. "... researchers generally agree that requiring that whistle-blowing be purely altruistic in order to be morally acceptable imposes an unrealistically high standard" (Miceli et al., 2008:37). If ‘purely altruistic’ means ‘of no benefit to the actor’, *nothing* qualifies as altruistic.
prospect of financial gain. Bjørkelo et al.'s definition would exclude, retrospectively, many of the most significant instances of whistleblowing arbitrarily (e.g., Blumsohn v. Proctor and Gamble, Watkins v. Enron). Additionally, because most serious whistleblower cases drag on in court, any potential whistleblowers need to be financially secure to see the process through; disqualifying those who stand to reap financial recompense for their determination makes “whistleblowing ... an option only for the wealthy few” (Earle & Madek, 2007:25).

Confusion also arises when the research lumps together legal immoral misconduct with illegal immoral misconduct as if they are equivalent. Whistleblower protection “laws ... generally apply only when the alleged organizational wrongdoing violates the law” (Miceli & Near, 1988:270). This means that, for example, whistleblowing with respect to fraudulent reporting of expense accounts by government officials will be covered by the law because it is illegal to misrepresent expenditures in this fashion. However, the whistleblowing law will not apply when the corrupt procedures of an entire industry put whole sectors of the public at risk, as with the misrepresentation of medical research data (Malek, 2010).

Retaliation varies directly with the importance and systemic nature of the wrongdoing uncovered (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999). If the probability of retaliation is a consideration in deciding to blow the whistle (Appelbaum et al., 2006; de Graaf, 2010), the level at which wrongdoing occurs is central to understanding whistleblowing:

The organization reserves its most explicit discrimination and punishment for those who block the profit accumulation process by exposing the practices that undergird this process. (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999:125)
Further, collapsing levels of wrongdoing also confuses the impact of whistleblowers' job roles. Miceli et al. (2012) contend that when employees agree that their job roles demand doing wrong, "then more valid internal reports may come forward, and ultimately the damage of wrongdoing to all employees may be reduced" (ibid.:947). However, the authors contradict their own contention in referring to Latané and Darley's bystander intervention theory — "bystanders observing an emergency make a series of decisions ... whether to intervene" (ibid.:925) — by neglecting to cite Latané and Darley's main finding (1968, 1970), the "Bystander Effect", wherein the likelihood of an individual responding to a critical situation varies indirectly with the number of people present (Fischer et. al., 2011)35. Some (Treviño & Victor, 1992) argue that professional membership, requiring adherence to standards expressed in a regulated code of ethics (Rothschild & Miethe 1999), is significantly associated with a willingness to report unethical conduct, regardless of specific employment contracts. Others (Mathews, 1987; Moore & McAuliffe, 2010, 2012) find such codes ineffective. Neither position distinguishes between professional credos and personal belief systems.

Another point of confusion exists around value systems being partly culturally determined. Culture may influence the response to organizational misconduct. For example, the collectivist leanings of East Asian culture might affect whether whistleblowing is more likely to be seen as betraying the group or beneficial to the organization as a whole (Ab Ghani, Galbreath & Evans, 2011). "Little has been reported about the actions taken by employees in non-Western cultures ... observ[ing] wrongdoing in their organizations" (Nayir & Herzig, 2012:197). Most whistleblower research has been conducted in North America or the UK (e.g., Glazer & Glazer, 1989; Near et al., 1996, 2004; Estlund, 2005; 35 The bystander effect is likely more pronounced when job roles require internal monitoring and reporting. These situations satisfy several conditions linked to a stronger bystander effect: i.e., when situations are not perceived as dangerous, when perpetrators (managers or peers) are present, and when reporting repercussions are non-physical (e.g., jeopardizing one's employment).
Miceli et al., 2008, 2009, 2012; Lewis, 2011; Moore & McAuliffe, 2012). Cross-cultural or international scholars (O’Leary & Cotter, 2000; Patel, 2003; Verschoor, 2005; Zhang, Chiu & Wei, 2009; Park & Blenkinsopp, 2009; Nayir & Herzig, 2012) mostly use the same kinds of methodology, with the same design issues as American and British scholars. Tradeoffs in study design strengths and weaknesses have been called “particularly acute” in whistleblowing research (Miceli et al., 2012:948), and “similar design flaws across multiple studies” (Miceli et al., 2008:28) weaken findings in the field. In replicating this approach, other culturally relevant factors may be summarily dismissed, reducing the potential significance of international authors’ contributions.

Methods

Methodological factors in sample selection, the use of surveys or hypothetical scenarios, or defining parameters of assessment vaguely may contribute to the lack of definitive research.

Much research (e.g., Miceli & Near, 1992) relies on employee data, whereas many earlier studies (e.g., Westin, 1981; Glazer & Glazer, 1989; Jos et al., 1989) found overwhelmingly that whistleblowers tended to lose their jobs. It can be argued that this is the most single important deficit in employee survey studies (Miceli & Near, 1984, 1988; Jos et al., 1989; Ellis & Arieli, 1999; Keenan, 2000; Chiu, 2003; Rothwell & Baldwin, 2007). They ignore those “committed whistleblowers who have persisted in the face of substantial opposition and despite strong retaliation” (Jos et al., 1989:552) and been forced out. This objection applies more particularly to studies collecting data from employees claiming to have blown the whistle (Brewer & Selden, 1998) — their resistance perhaps
concerned subject matter too trivial to warrant termination\textsuperscript{36}, implying that subjects had exaggerated the significance of their complaints in imagining themselves as whistleblowers.

Regardless, some research (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999) argues that in order to accurately estimate the "true extent" of whistleblowing (ibid.:112), a nationwide random sampling of employees is required. Corollaries of this opinion (Miceli, 2008; de Graaf, 2010; Beck & Gable, 2012) are that being fired or quitting is an 'extreme' response, that retaliation is not that severe, and that most reporters, despite experiencing more retaliation than they expect, "function (reasonably) normally in the long run" (de Graaf, 2010:776). This position simply denies ample evidence that being let go is more common than not (e.g., Lenzer, 2005; Jump, 2012; Lipman, 2012), even to the extent of being permanently 'blacklisted' (Qusqaq & Kleiner, 2001). Researchers’ minimizing of retaliation directly contradicts findings that between 53\% and 84\% of whistleblowers develop depression, anxiety, feelings of isolation and powerlessness, distrust of others, and declining physical, financial and familial health (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999). Research excluding subjects in ongoing legal disputes (Henik, 2008; de Graaf, 2010; Miceli et al., 2012), excludes cases precisely where the most severe reprisal is to be found (Rothschild and Miethe, 1999), since the severe retaliation for reporting the most serious and most entrenched misconduct often requires whistleblowers’ engagement in lengthy legal battles waged at personal expense (Jos et al., 1989). All employee-based studies have therefore excluded active whistleblowing disputes, whether or not this is stated explicitly.

\textsuperscript{36} Sometimes organizations perceive material as so threatening, that just alluding to a whistleblowing incident brings retaliation; Sheffield University suspended Dr. Stuart Macdonald for “mentioning a controversial incident”, where Aubrey Blumsohn blew the whistle on Procter and Gamble and Sheffield University’s unethical research practices in 2003-2005 (Jump, 2012).
Researchers may believe termination is exceptional for whistleblowers due to organizational strategies that make whistleblowing appear disconnected from retaliation.\textsuperscript{37} Where a whistleblower is not fired "outright" (Lipman, 2012:60), retaliation overwhelmingly demoralizes and humiliates the whistleblower to the point where leaving is the only option (ibid.; Alford, 2001). Despite whistleblower protection legislation, some find that retaliation of all kinds is rampant and on the rise (Near et al., 2004), whereas others (e.g., Bjørkelo et al., 2011) contend that the rate of retaliation against whistleblowers was exaggerated in early research, having later found it to fall within a range of from 38\% of whistleblowers in one study (Miceli et al., 2008)\textsuperscript{38} to a mere 6\% in another (Near & Miceli, 1996). However, it is misleading to determine trends in the incidence of whistleblowing without considering subjects' employment status: reporting rates for self-selected samples of whistleblowers vary from more than 80\% (Dyck et al., 2010), to over 60\% (Jos et al., 1989; Rothschild & Miethe, 1999), contrasting sharply with randomly selected samples of employees who report only 17 to 40 percent (Bjørkelo et al., 2011). Differentiating between self-selected and employee whistleblowers is also crucial in findings of positive organizational reaction to blowing the whistle — virtually absent from self-selector data (Soeken & Soeken, 1987; Jos et al., 1989), but occurring in 13 to 50 percent of employee sample reports (Ethics Resource Center, 2005).

Further, most employees, despite being the first to become aware of unethical practice, are also the last to report or disclose their observations to anyone (Appelbaum et al., 2006).

\textsuperscript{37} Retaliation may include: coworkers refusing to socialize; daily surveillance by management; withholding information or access to areas needed to successfully perform a job; personnel/staff withdrawn; verbal harassment or intimidation; poor performance appraisal; professional reputation being harmed; charges of committing an unrelated offense; denial of award; denial of promotion, denial of training opportunity; relocation of desk or work area to an undesirable area; assignment to less desirable or less important duties or a different job with less desirable duties; reassignment to a different geographical location; withdrawing security clearance; requiring a fitness-for-duty exam; suspension from job; grade level demotion; termination (Rehg et al., 2008:230). I personally experienced many of these retaliatory strategies, including being blacklisted in the field.

\textsuperscript{38} Tellingly, 38\% retaliation is called "rather infrequent" (Bjørkelo et al., 2011).
Chapter two: Leaving home

The decision not to report has been thought to be the result of a rational cost-benefit analysis, where an employee concludes that no corrective action will be taken, the report might not be kept confidential, and they might lose their job, their friends or their potential for promotion (Chiu, 2002; Verschoor, 2005). However, investigators disagree whether or not fear of retaliation prevents observers of wrongdoing from reporting (Dworkin & Near, 1987, 1997; de Graaf, 2010: cf. Miceli, Roach & Near, 1988; Henik, 2008), and whether or not retaliation varies with a willingness to blow the whistle again (Dyck et al., 2010: cf. Near & Jensen, 1983).

Researchers cannot observe whistleblowing behaviour directly, and "due to the sensitivity of the topic, organizations and employees are reluctant to participate in studies" (Gundlach, Martinko & Douglas, 2008:48) asking directly about whistleblowing. Similarly to other empirical business ethics research, much whistleblowing research relies on hypothetical scenarios (Bay & Nikitkov, 2010). "Scenarios and vignettes are the most commonly used methodology among whistle-blowing studies," (Henik, 2008:112). Researchers who believe that since the hypothetical scenarios "approach has been widely used throughout whistle-blowing research ... it [is] an appropriate and effective design for acquiring data" (Gundlach et al., 2008:48), are basing their opinion either on a fallacious appeal to tradition (Pirie, 2006:14) or to popularity (philosophy.lander.edu, 2012), despite the fact that this type of rationale leads to a field riddled with design flaws, flaws that may underwrite the lack of decisive findings.

We must also consider the common approach to understanding whistleblowing reaching conclusions about employee reports of intentions to whistleblow (e.g., Arnold &
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39 Vignette studies predominate in the literature's reviews: Seifert's work refers to nine of twelve studies between 1991 and 2006 using 'ethical dilemma' vignettes experimentally; Henik (2008) presents seven more; Vadera, Aguilera and Caza (2009) refer to 15 vignette studies of 28; Dasgupta and Kesharwani (2010) refer to all these, and add a further three.
Ponemon, 1991; Patel, 2003; Seifert, 2006; Gundlach et al., 2008; Björkelo et al., 2010; Seifert et al., 2010), by analyzing hypothetical responses to imaginary vignettes (Seifert, 2006; Ab Ghani et al., 2011). Bay and Nikitkov (2010) emphasize that in choosing subjects responding to scenarios, care must be taken to include only those who can be expected to understand the behavior under investigation in its true context; separate groups require separate analyses. Their concern undermines the credibility of all whistleblower vignette research citing data from employees who have not blown the whistle or from students (Treviño & Victor, 1992; Wise, 1995; Sims & Keenan, 1998; O'Leary & Cotter, 2000; Goldie et al., 2003; Ayers & Kaplan, 2005; Peek et al., 2007; Zhuang, Chiu & Wei, 2009; Kaplan, Pany, Samuels & Zhang, 2009). Several authors (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005; Henik, 2008; Vandenabeele & Kjeldsen, 2011) have roundly criticized the assumptions of vignette-based whistleblowing studies. This is because they tend to assume that an intention to act is equivalent to acting, or that behaviour while role playing is the same as behaviour in a ‘real life’ situation.

Vignette studies also tend to presume rational responses free of affect; anonymous subjects consider, dispassionately and without accountability, what they or imaginary characters might or should do in a given circumstance. Then the same responses are assumed to hold in real situations. Without supporting evidence, vignettes ‘starring participants themselves are claimed to provide “a more realistic context for the respondents” (Ab Ghani et al., 2011:8) than scenarios involving imaginary actors. Self-reporting of imagined responses to imaginary vignettes do not consider the impact of a myriad of contextual details: the organizational ‘culture’ or the position in it from which a whistleblower resists, the gravity of the wrongdoing witnessed, how personally the

40 Vandenabeele and Kjeldsen (2011) excuse “threaten[ing] the validity of the conclusions” in measuring “whistle-blowing intention and not actual whistle-blowing” (ibid.:11) by claiming that asking about intent is less harmful to participants than insensitively asking questions about whistleblowing behaviour in a survey.
whistleblower is involved with the transgression being reported, the retaliation being invited, etc. More specifically, since most studies use data obtained from a single sector, such as the federal government (Miceli et al., 1988), or a specific occupational function, such as internal auditors (Ponemon, 1994), nurses (Moore & McAuliffe, 2012), or managers (Keenan, 2002), uncontextualized hypothetical scenarios cannot account for industry effects upon an individual’s relationship with his superiors, the choice of reporting channels (Kaptein, 2011; Miceli et al., 2012), and so forth. In short, considerable value must be granted to a whistleblower’s first-hand perspective vs. that of a laboratory participant (Henik, 2008; Bay & Nikitkov, 2010).

Queries about whether whistleblowing is ‘rational’ brings us to scrutinize research around whistleblower motivation (Deshpande & Joseph, 2009; Verschoor, 2010; Dyck et al., 2010). Much research utilizing employee surveys (Ellis & Arieli, 1999; Brewer & Selden, 1998; Goldman, 2001; Near et al., 2004; Moore & McAuliffe, 2010; Nayir & Herzig, 2012) assumes a reasoned cost-benefit analysis informing a decision to blow the whistle. Such studies “fail to take account of the committed whistleblower” (Jos et al., 1989:557) whose actions may spring from personal moral imperative.

The notion of logical cost/benefit analyses fueling whistleblowing has not gone uncontested. One study (Dyck et al., 2010) claims it is a wonder any employees at all come forward, despite privileged access to information, considering the adversities and the harsh reprisals whistleblowing engenders. Some work (Brewer & Selden, 1998; Vandenabeele & Kjeldsen, 2011) points to whistleblowing’s frequent self-defeating

---

41 It is unclear whether certain sectors tend to produce more whistleblowers. Whereas some (Bowen et al., 2010) have found that whistleblowing is more likely in regulated “sensitive” industries, such as pharmaceuticals, health care, medicine, the environment, oil, utilities, and banks, others (Dyck, Morse and Zingales, 2010) found no “statistical evidence that employees... [in these] industries are more likely to be whistleblowers” (ibid.:2246).

42 The rationality of the decision to blow the whistle will be examined in detail in Chapter 5.
consequences, and questions whether whistleblowing is ever a rational response. Their attempts to “trace[e] the process of what constitutes an issue severe enough to blow the whistle ... leads directly into theorizing on moral development” (Jos et al., 1989:555); others embrace thinking about the emotionality inherent in making such personally important decisions (Seifert, 2006; de Graaf, 2010), exploring how emotions such as fear, anger, or vengefulness mediate between seeing wrongdoing and deciding to report it (Henik, 2008; Gundlach et al., 2008; de Graaf, 2010; Vadera et al., 2010). Still others (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999) theorize how an individual’s identity may become based upon having blown the whistle, becoming “embattled and embittered” (ibid.:121) over time.

Some studies stress the importance of financial reward (Ponemon, 1994; Dyck et al., 2010; Lipman, 2012) or job security (Seifert, 2006); others aver that it is not monetary reward or job security, but a sense of injustice followed by the need for self-protection (Brewer & Selden, 1998; de Graaf, 2010), or “strong commitments to moral principle and resistance to social ... manipulation” (Jos et al., 1989:557; Chiu, 2003); some (Miceli et al., 2008) disagree, citing a dearth of statistical evidence for motivation from “moral reasoning or values” (ibid.:59).

Several authors (Callahan et al., 2002; Dworkin, 2007; Seifert et al., 2010; Miceli et al., 2012) contend that the whistleblower reports in the belief that these particular exposures will impede wrongdoing, whereas others (Brewer & Selden, 1998; Johnson, 2003; Gundlach et al., 2003; Henik, 2008; de Graaf, 2010) say it is more of a “public service motivation” (Vandenabeele & Kjeldson, 2011:2), “a general altruistic motivation to serve the interests of a community of people, a state, a nation, or humankind” (Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999:23) that may lay behind whistleblowing.
All in all, understanding of whistleblower motivation remains far from clear: there exists "still a mystery of what separates those who do whistleblow from those who don’t" (Miceli et al., 2008:23).

**Loyalty, integrity and the public good**

One research arm has focused on whistleblower 'loyalty'/'treachery' (Larmer, 1992; Corvino, 2002; Vandekerckhove & Commers, 2004; Drachsler, 2008; Mansbach et al., 2011). Do whistleblowers conform to values more important than company loyalty, or are they morally deviant? Evidence suggests that organizations value and reward employee loyalty, not honesty (Dyck et al., 2010). Reporting on one's work colleagues is labelled as traitorous or heroic, depending upon the context and point of view, the "result of a process of social construction that varies with time and place" (de Graaf, 2010:769). It may be the variation in these constructions that determine whether whistleblowing occurs or not.

Whether a whistleblower is seen as a traitor or as loyal depends upon the socially-determined role expectations pertaining to that person's position within the organization. Whistleblowers work in organizational roles that allow them to see and understand certain unethical aspects of the organizations, Then whistleblowers either choose, by reporting, to be perceived as deviant (Goffman, 1963) by work colleagues, or by staying silent, to experience their character as deviant (v.s. 20,v.i. 82). Role theory (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoak & Rosenthal, 1964) holds that when role expectations support activity that may be seen as normative within the organization, but in conflict with an individual's perception of their role as it interacts with internalized values and attitudes, an individual may blow the whistle in an attempt to resolve the role conflict. A Jungian interpretation, however,
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43 For example, it is a commonplace in organizational thinking that women are less loyal to their companies than their male colleagues because of their assumed primary allegiance to their families and children. However, this assumption is not supported in the empirical studies of whistleblowers to date (Kenny, 2014).
does not see the primary site of conflict as internal, but existing in the clash between an individual's organizational role requirements and the ethical imperatives of the societal context in which those organizations are embedded. When the ethos of an organization strays too far from a society's general sense of what constitutes desirable conduct, archetypes begin to constellate from the collective unconscious. A Jungian approach adds to our understanding with the notion that, by virtue of their position in an organization, individual whistleblowers have contingently become the subjects of archetypal constellation, a constellation arising from extended organizational repression of activity that, in the case of whistleblowing, supports the public good.

It has been argued that healthy societies must delineate between private and public spheres (Sennett, 1974). It is precisely this split that management depends upon when seeking reprisals against whistleblowers. Friendly relations between employees and between employees and management are constructed around the rationalist neoliberal Enlightenment notion of the autonomous individual (Fleming, 2015; French, Case & Gosling, 2009), therefore classified as part of the private sphere, as if individual experiences have no effect at a collective level. However, this thesis stresses that in contemporary capitalist society these spheres are not separate (cf. Cedarström & Fleming, 2012; Fleming, 2015), and it is partly as a consequence of the dissolution of the boundaries between public and private life that whistleblowing manifests.

Corporate demands flood into workers' private lives — saturating the private with the public — seeking to "colonize" employees' inner lives and desires (Mason, 2010; Cedarström & Fleming, 2012) so as to monopolize their time and energy. Psychological boundaries of roles at work
extend well into non-work life, sometimes to the extent that there is little left in terms of a vestigial self to protect against the intrusion of work into all areas of life. (Bauman, 1998:99)

Some authors hold that the "betrayal and cynicism" attendant upon such 'deviant' behaviours as whistleblowing, "in the context of organizational transformation, cannot primarily be regarded as the outcome of individual psychopathology" (French, Case & Gosling, 2009:148; also Sievers, 2007), but can become "part of the organization as a whole" (Sievers, 2007:2), manifesting as management’s retaliation and peer isolation.

A whistleblower acts to resolve conflicts between what on the surface appear to be two levels of the public sphere — the ethical demands of the organization, requiring unquestioning obedience to the aims of the organization, and ethical demands impinging upon the individual from the society at large. It is the limits of these public roles that come into question when a set of normative beliefs that determine an individual’s behaviour within an organization are held to be equally true for determining that individual’s behaviour with respect to the broader society within which his organization is embedded — “the arousal of a belief in one standard of truth to measure the complexities of social reality” (Sennett, 1974:338; also McAllister, Morrison & Turban, 2007).

The literature discusses two kinds of loyalty. Whistleblowers may be seen as loyal to the public good and traitors (Bok, 1980; Varelius, 2008) to their own organizations, or they may prove themselves, paradoxically, in exposing those activities which could harm the organization’s reputation or its bottom line, the most loyal members of organizations (Miceli & Near, 1988; Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010; Lewis, 2011), their loyalty being "towards the organization in a broader perspective" (Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010:61). Research (Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010) differentiating between loyalty to colleagues, employers and the organization as a whole versus loyalty to the legal and legitimate
“mission statement, goals, value statements and codes of conduct of the organization” (ibid.:61) identifies the latter as a “distal loyalty target” (Henik, 2008:60) — a category including professional oaths, codes of ethics and conduct, legal obligations and religious values. Such targets carry “stronger commitments to entities outside an organization than to the organization itself” (ibid.:60), and are crucial in determining whether silence is broken when wrongdoing is observed.

Corporate mission statements outlining high moral standards are often merely pro forma; these standards may actually be discouraged by “informal norms and reward systems” (Miceli & Near, 2002:466) or “undermined” by “unfair, informal interactions between the whistleblower and management” (Seifert 2006:27). Because the whistleblower must determine when individuals or the organization as a whole violates these codes, and whether his speaking out will help re-establish these codes, this loyalty is termed ‘rational loyalty’ (Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010; Read & Rama, 2003; Vandekerckhove & Commers, 2004):

if the organisation departs from its mission, goals and values, ‘rational loyalty’ would justify whistleblowing: the employee does not owe any loyalty towards the organization ... [condoning] organizational behaviour that runs counter to [that] ... described in its mission statement (Vandekerckhove, 2006:77).

Some theorists (Rocha & Kleiner, 2005) hold that notions of acceptable employee behaviour have undergone a radical change, keeping up with a growing tendency in societal opinion to choose public benefit over corporate profit:

In the past, there was an unspoken rule that no matter what you saw inside an organisation, you would never make that information public ... The employee had the duty to be loyal to the company no matter what. In the last 30 to 40 years this view of unconditional loyalty to the employer has been replaced by a loyalty to society and issues ... especially in cases involving public health, fraud, safety and abuse of office. (ibid.:80)
Beyond the traditional requirements for ethical conduct in government and the health professions, in the face of widely publicized corporate malfeasance, there is now a growing demand for integrity in all quarters (Monk, Knights & Page, 2015), where part of the definition of integrity is aiming to support the public’s collective trust (de Graaf, 2010).

**Models**

Looking at the literature’s limits, a theorizing problem emerges. Weber’s discussion (1978) of understanding, *verstehen*, states that in order to understand the relationship between a social action, its meaning and motivation, we need to progress beyond an understanding which is simply observational, that is, based on face value. This would mean embracing understandings which include affect, such as empathy, so as to take into account all manner of underlying conditions:

> we ... are susceptible to ... emotion[s] ... and appetites of all sorts, and to the ‘irrational’ conduct that grows out of them ...[the observer] can ... understand their meaning and can interpret intellectually their influence on the course of action. (Weber, 1978:6).

For Weber “explanation requires a grasp of the complex of meaning in which an actual course of understandable action thus interpreted belongs” (1978:9). The understanding of motivation is gleaned from the sequence of events in which an action is performed⁴⁴, where to grasp motivation is also to comprehend behaviour. Whistleblowing theory is observationally and descriptively adequate in analyzing whistleblowing behaviour in terms of the possible “underlying mental representations that organize it” (Buss, 2005:xii) in a constructionist manner. In relying on surveys and hypothetical vignettes, however, the

---

⁴⁴ This notion emphasizes the value of preserving research data contextually, to be further elaborated in the methodology chapter.
preponderance of whistleblowing research misses explanatory adequacy (Buss, 2005:xii), because without context, it must fail to discover why those mental representations, and not some others, operate to produce whistleblowing behaviour.

Rothschild and Miethe claimed that (1999:119) whistleblowers’ professional norms and values, and their personal values “grounded in ... religious or humane traditions” led whistleblowers to perceive that some action they saw at work was wrong, harmful or illegal. The authors took this to mean that whistleblowers blew the whistle based on these beliefs. However, such observations simply clarify subjects’ perception of wrongdoing. Alternatively, since some “silent observers” may deny knowing about violations to protect themselves (de Graaf, 2010:770), studies may only be describing subjects’ reported perception of wrongdoing.

In the search for reliable predictors, whistleblowing as a process has been attached to several theoretical models, which will be briefly outlined here. Each of the models tend to concentrate upon one or two of the steps in a 4-stage (Miceli & Near, 1992; Dozier & Miceli, 1985) “classic whistleblowing process” (Henik, 2008:9): the perception of wrongdoing as sufficiently significant to warrant resistance, the decision to blow the whistle, blowing the whistle, and ensuing repercussions, including the reaction of the organization[s] to such exposure, the whistleblower’s reaction to the organization’s response, and whether wrongdoing is stopped (Near & Jensen, 1982; Graham, 1986; Greenberger, Miceli & Cohen, 1987; Miceli & Near, 1992; McLain & Keenan, 1999; Henik, 2008).

45 Detailed exploration of these models is beyond the scope of this thesis; a comparative analysis would provide an intriguing direction for new study.

46 Henik calls this Stage 5 (2008:8), where the whistleblower decides how to proceed, e.g., escalate or abandon effort, after experiencing the organization’s response.
The social information processing (SIP) model (Gundlach et al., 2003) is linked to Near and Miceli’s (1996) prosocial behaviour or motivation model. SIP examines the first two steps, perception and decision, and sees whistleblowing as an altruistic act for the common good. SIP draws on justice (Seifert, 2006; Greenberg, 1987, 1990; Near et al., 1993) theories, and describes distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Seifert et al., 2010) components. Understanding of whistleblowing through the SIP model is summed up thusly: “... all else being equal, the perceived benefit of blowing the whistle (e.g., to resolve an injustice) increases as the perceived injustice of wrongdoing increases” (Gundlach et al., 2003:108).

The second step in the whistleblowing process (Singer et al., 1998; Zhang et al., 2009), decision-making, is highlighted by Seifert’s (2006) discussion of whistleblowing as a kind of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) (also Vinten, 1994; Treviño & Weaver, 2001), where perceived organizational support acts as a mediator between procedural justice and whistleblowing, and trust of one’s supervisor mediates between interactional justice and whistleblowing. In OCB theory, whistleblowing may be seen as ‘going beyond the call of duty’ (LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002) in an altruistic example of civic virtue, defined as “participating in the governance of an organization even at great personal cost (Graham, 1986; Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Hui, 2000)” (Seifert, 2006:21).

The Prosocial Organizational Behaviour model (POB) of whistle blowing (Jos et al., 1989; Vandenebeele & Kjeldsen, 2011, Miceli et al., 2012) posits that whistleblowing is not necessarily altruistic, but the result of social effects upon cognition, personality, institutional hierarchy and culture (Vandenebeele & Kjeldsen, 2011). POB highlights the

---

47 Although the thesis touches on certain aspects of OCB – e.g. altruism, responsibility, participation – it emphasizes understanding the experience of whistleblowers, rather than the OCB focus (e.g., Edward & Willmott, 2008; Scherer & Palazzo, 2008) on comprehending the political dynamics of organizational hierarchies or individuals’ positions within these.
arrays of [dis]incentives, assuming a constant ethical reasoning capacity and a
dispassionate cost-benefit analysis (Jos et al., 1989:556). POB, contiguously with certain
theories of power, predicts whistleblowing from higher status, more experienced
organizational members whose faith in the organization is insulated from threats to job
security (Brewer & Selden, 1998), but this prediction has been countered by studies (e.g.,
Dyck et al., 2010) showing that it is more common for reports to come from lower-
ranking employees. Concepts from power theories (Near, Dworkin & Miceli, 1993;
Vandekerchove & Commers, 2004), ethics (Bok, 1980; Treviño, 1986; Tsahuridu &
Vandekerckhove, 2008; Taylor & Curtis, 2010) or identity theories (Vadera et al., 2009)
also inform research investigating the decision-making step of the whistleblowing process.

Research exploring the action stage, using Latané and Darley’s (1968, 1970) Bystander
theory (Singer et al., 1998; Björkelo et al., 2011), Kohlberg’s moral development theory
(Kohlberg, 1975; Ponemon, 1994; Nayir & Herzig, 2011; Henik, 2008), and public service
motivation models (Paarlberg, Perry & Ilondeghem, 2008; Park & Blenkinsopp, 2009;
Vandenabeele & Kjeldsen, 2011), tries to distinguish whether whistleblowers perceive
themselves as the only ones in a position, and therefore obligated, to act for the public
good, or that they have actually developed a higher moral capacity than their fellows.48

Finally, studies centred around the fourth stage of the process, repercussions from
whistleblowing, focusing on how these function as [dis]incentives for whistleblowers.
Seifert et al. (2010) reference three legislative models, which explain whistleblowing in
terms of the amelioration of the 4th and 5th stages of the process. The Reward Model
(Dworkin, 2007; Dyck et al., 2010; Lipman, 2012) considers that financial reward for

48 Studies examining moral development have not been used to unpack whistleblower motivation; “studies
of moral judgment and values have focused instead on their relative efficiency in predicting whistle-blowing
intent or behavior” (Miceli et al., 2008:49). This makes one wonder for whose benefit these studies have
been conducted.
whistleblowing is an effective incentive. The Structural Model (Moberly, 2006; Kaplan et al., 2009) holds that providing a work culture perceived as being supportive, which provides for easily accessible and accepted internal reporting procedures, encourages whistleblowing (Berry, 2004; Lipman, 2012). The Protective or Anti-retaliation Model, posits that fear of retaliation discourages potential whistleblowing (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005; Henik, 2008; Moore & McAuliffe, 2012). Most whistleblowing protection legislation rests on this third model49, albeit several studies (Dworkin, 2007; Earle & Madek, 2007; Watnick, 2007; Miceli et al., 2008; Seifert et al., 2010) provide evidence that such legislation neither encourages nor protects whistleblowers.50

All theorizing promoting the idea that it is the cultivation of positive capacities that drives change and progress (OCB, SIP, POB) is subject to a curious paradox, the evidence that people tend to react far more strongly to negative stimuli rather than positive stimuli (Cameron, 2008). Some work which does focus on negative aspects of the whistleblowing process (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005; Henik, 2008; Gundlach et al., 2008; Rehg et al., 2008; Moore & McAuliffe, 2010, 2012) has connected cognitive anticipation of the fourth stage, that of retaliation and/or remedy, with emotional responses to that cognition such as fear or anger. For example, Moore and McAuliffe (2010) found that the fear of not being listened to and fear of retaliation by management and/or colleagues topped the list of whistleblowing disincentives for nurses and physicians, preventing their reporting. However, Henik (2008), counterintuitively, found that fear of job loss, career jeopardization, threat to organizational survival or defamation “did not consistently inhibit whistle-blowing, … rather, it drove some informants to devise self-protective strategies

49 In the U.S., the Whistleblower Protection Act (1989), The Corporate Accountability (Sarbanes-Oxley) Act (2002) and the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (2011); in Canada, the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act (2005); in the UK, the Public Interest Disclosure Act (1998).

50 Some work (Monk et al., 2015) speculates that the failure of legislation to protect whistleblowers may constitute part of a wider counter-resistance corporate strategy, but it is outside the scope of this thesis to pursue.
that lowered the perceived risks of retaliation and thus facilitated their decisions to blow the whistle" (ibid.:52). Henik explained this by attributing it to a cognitive mistake, inaccurate prediction: "they underestimated the severity of the retaliation ... or their financial, professional or emotional ability to weather it" (ibid.:48). Henik’s model incorporates an irrational dimension, emotion, into what is supposedly a rational cost/benefit analysis process. However, Henik’s explanation cannot account for Near and Jensen’s (1983) finding that having experienced retaliation does not reduce the whistleblower’s willingness to do it again (cf. Dyck et al., 2010).

The models extend understanding beyond a simple ‘rational/irrational’ dichotomy, and suggest a necessity for multiple judgments (Henik, 2008:9). Bok’s (1980) series of 13 questions whistleblowers (Appendix II) ask themselves makes these judgments explicit. The questions, posed in order to weigh the extent of wrongdoing, the availability and advisability of reporting channels, and the justifiability of accusation, are clearly biased against blowing the whistle as something undesirable except in the direst of circumstances. However insightful it may appear,

the fact is that the majority of whistleblowers do not use this list, and those that use it, decide not to do anything after they seriously weigh all the risks. The whistleblowers that do not use the list are normally guided by a sense of loyalty to principle, morality and commitment to prevent harm (Rocha & Kleiner, 2005: 84).

Retaliation and rationality

Research looking at the experience of actual whistleblowers (Westin, 1981; Glazer & Glazer, 1989; Rothschild & Miethe, 1999; Firth-Cozens et al., 2003; Moore & McAuliffe, 2010; Dyck et al., 2010) generally is restricted to examining the claims of those “who seek

51 Bok’s questions imply that dissent which would benefit the whistleblower personally should not be considered as whistleblowing, and that only resistance which provides a “promised benefit” justifies whistleblowing.
legal, political and emotional support” (Jos et al., 1989:553) in bolstering mechanisms of protection or appeal which they have found wanting. One study (Jos et al., 1989) identified an array of resources that whistleblowers reported going to for help. They listed in order of most to least helpful: immediate family, other whistleblowers, the Government Accountability Project, psychological counselling, legal advice, medical consultation, relatives, coworkers, committees of elected representatives, professional organizations, their own elected representative, and government-administered reporting bodies with a responsibility to rectify injustices (e.g., an ombudsman’s office). However, none of these appear to reduce the incidence or severity of organizational reprisal.

Notwithstanding legislation to protect whistleblowers and special offices set up to adjudicate cases, there is evidence that whistleblowers are being ignored and retaliation is still not being curbed: 75% of UK whistleblowers’ complaints are being let slide (Syal, 2013); the U.S. government’s Office of Special Counsel, a body ostensibly set up to remedy wrongdoing and help whistleblowers get fair treatment, has dismissed 99% of cases filed (Jos et al., 1989); Canada’s Public Service Integrity Commission found five cases of wrongdoing in the entire federal civil service in over 300 reports over its first five years (Hutton, 2012).

Despite changes in cultural values that seem to make it easier for employees to stand up for what is right (Rocha & Kleiner, 2005), the media are “inundated with retaliation cases” (ibid.:86). Despite laws supposedly protecting whistleblowers, each case is uniquely susceptible to dismissal for legal technicalities. Popular rhetoric interprets the enactment of whistleblower protection legislation as evidence of government working hand-in-hand

---

52 The Commission avoids the most serious cases threatening the Canadian public’s health and security, while pursuing insignificant details of important cases. The first Commissioner found no wrongdoing in the entire federal civil service over three and a half years, but her own “egregious misconduct” was exposed in a damning report by the auditor general, for which she was fired, “discredited and disgraced” but not without a “$500,000 payout of her own” (Hutton, 2012).
with the ‘socially responsible’ corporate world to protect the public interest. Despite the
detailed disclosure processes in these laws which are supposed to protect whistleblowers,
“no special method of disclosure ... insulate[s] the whistle-blower from ...retaliation
(Rothschild & Miethe, 1999:107).

Internationally, legislation has been enacted\(^53\), ostensibly to protect whistleblowers by
increasing corporate penalty for failing to implement “effective” in-house reporting
processes or for reprisal against whistleblowers, and providing incentives for
whistleblowing. Recent work (Lipman, 2012; FAIR, 2012) holds that legislative beefing
up of financial incentives for reporting and disincentives for committing wrongdoing is the
best way to encourage corporate accountability. Vandekerckhove (2006), in his exhaustive
review of international whistleblower legislation, maintains that the variety of constructs
underlying such legislation — rational loyalty, human rights, accountability,
responsibility, organizational social responsibility(OSR)—network and OSR—stakeholder,
and efficiency — are actually designed to “‘contain’ the conflict between society and
organization” (ibid.:293). The legislation creates multiple levels of legal and governmental
structures to respond to whistleblowing, which serve either to prevent organizational
wrongdoing from coming under public scrutiny or to ensure that society, i.e. members of
the public at large, cannot respond directly to incidences of whistleblowing, or both.

Reprisal in the form of termination, blacklisting, and shunning continues. Whistleblowing
efforts are overwhelmingly both unsuccessful and likely injurious to the financial, social
and medical well-being of their principals, making whistleblowers appear to be neither
rational nor heroic, but delusional.

\textit{Conscious rationality}

\(^{53}\) See footnote 49, above.
Chapter two: Leaving home

The models cited above hold that conscious rationality is responsible for whistleblower decisions:

the power, justice, and prosocial approaches suggest that whistle-blowers consider the economic and psychological costs and benefits of acting ... analogous[ly] to a subjectively rational decision process in which individuals exert cognitive energy to process information to determine the best course of action ... decidi[ng whether] the benefits ... outweigh the costs (Gundlach et al., 2003:112).

Even research that takes into account emotional components of the whistleblowing process (Gundlach et al., 2003; Henik, 2008) includes either a retrospective or predictive cost/benefit analysis. Retrospectively, studies construct loyalty (e.g., Larmer, 1992; Read & Rama, 2003; Vandekerckhove & Commers, 2004; de Graaf, 2010; Dyck et al., 2010; Mansbach et al., 2011) as the object of rational analysis. Henik (2008) reduces whistleblowers’ accounts of having had no choice but to report to rationalization, nothing more than examples of the well-established tendency for individuals to overestimate the strength of past negative emotion (Thomas & Diener, 1990). Predictively, a cost/benefit analysis assesses the guilt that would ensue from inaction in the face of wrongdoing, the “I wouldn’t be able to live with myself” phenomenon, as less tolerable than enduring retaliation, to be compensated for by future pride in having acted with integrity (Henik, 2008).

But insisting that the decision to whistleblow is rational does not make it understandable. Henik’s “classical model” of the whistleblowing process rests on the assumption that “all the judgments and decisions are presumed to be subjectively rational calculations” (Henik, 2008:10). Among other variations, the notion of what constitutes an [dis]incentive must also be subjectively rational, with different people responding differently to threatening prospects (Vandenebeele & Kjeldsen, 2011) and weighting self-interest vs. public interest differently. This brings into question the effective strength of any kind of cost/benefit
analysis upon determining a course of action, meaning that, rational analysis notwithstanding, “much still needs to be covered before a full (or even better) understanding of whistle-blowing [sic] can be gained” (Vandenebeele & Kjeldsen, 2011:19).

**Beyond the conscious**

As an insider researcher, I felt that the literature’s attempts to understand whistleblowing lacked credibility. It seemed to me that although investigation had begun to extend into areas beyond the simply rational, those dealing with values and emotion, it had not gone far enough. My decision to blow the whistle certainly had not been the result of a conscious cost-benefit analysis — in fact, I found myself acting *against* my own conscious analysis. Most research covered emotions experienced consciously; subjects had to report them for them to count. Perhaps — and here it was, the new direction in which to search — the explanation lay in the unconscious, and that was why all the efforts to explain whistleblower motivation at a conscious level appeared so confusing.

Perhaps what is needed is a direction that takes into account how rationality is informed by the unconscious, avoiding reducing knowledge and thought to the purely rational and intellectual. Because most of inner life is unconscious, it is ineffable unless brought to consciousness, and even then it may be unreliable. As the work of Kets de Vries (1990) and Brewer and Selden (1998) show, a person’s conscious appraisal of their motives may be completely off the mark: “Conscious motives may well, even to the actor himself, conceal the various ‘motives’ and ‘repressions’ which constitute the real driving force of his action” (Weber, 1978:9).

Psychoanalytical interpretation may provide one of the best routes to understand what underlies many social and political acts (Weber, 1978), including whistleblowing. Only
one researcher (Alford, 2001, 2007) has taken this tack, claiming that whistleblower motivation rests in the unconscious. He interprets the “choiceless choice” (2001:40) reported by whistleblowers as a symptom of “moralizing narcissism” (ibid.:63). By positing unconscious motives, he crosses the gap between description and explanation. My firsthand experience of “choiceless choice”, detailed in the preceding chapter, also leads to an ontology including a real unconscious realm. However, Alford’s explanation does not derive from his participants’ sharings, nor does it sit well with my own experience. He pushes interview data into a Freudian/Kleinian frame, a frame that can only derive meaning from the perspective of the individual, making key terms (e.g., ‘self-sacrifice’ or ‘altruism’) mean their opposite by confounding logical with empirical distinctions. Since logically self-sacrifice requires loss, and heroism requires danger of a real possibility of suffering or failure, by deeming all whistleblowers (and, by extension all heroes) compulsive neurotics, Alford turns these notions on their heads.

No matter how clear cut the meaning of an action may appear, its cause is necessarily only a matter for interpretation (Weber, 1978). What is needed is a hermeneutic approach linking individuals with social contexts, conscious experience with unconscious motivation and moral reasoning with moral motivation by attending closely to whistleblower experiences.

The research problem can now be articulated as how to identify whistleblowers’ unconscious drives usefully. Despite a considerable body of carefully conducted research attempting to explain, predict and encourage whistleblowing by describing personal, institutional or social antecedents, or the nature and severity of retaliation, or the effect of legislation to protect or encourage whistleblowing, the conditions for blowing the whistle have not yet been explained. The next chapter examines theoretical components of a novel
methodological approach purporting to shed new light on what may be driving whistleblowing behaviour. The proposed treatment unearths unconscious whistleblower motivation by drawing on several theoretical frameworks: phronetic research's abductive reasoning and sample selection; the principles of narrative inquiry; and Jungian archetypology's amplification and free association around personal narratives and dreams.
Planning the Journey: Methodology

Don’t insist on going where you think you want to go. Ask the way to the Spring.  
(Rumi, 1987)

Preparing

Having contextualized whistleblowing as a topic of interest to me, and having put forward what I perceive as the major limitations of much prior work investigating whistleblowing, this chapter describes how I came to decide, firstly what aspects of whistleblowing and whistleblowers my research would concentrate upon, and secondly what seemed the most promising methods for delving into those aspects. This chapter recounts the development of the methodological contribution this thesis makes to the organizational literature on whistleblowing — a new narrative approach to unconscious organizational processes.

Writing about medical discourse (Monk, 2010), I had wondered about medical whistleblowers, among whose ranks I had come to count myself. I was trying to understand why I had sabotaged my career prospects in midwifery by blowing the whistle, seemingly against my own will. According to the precepts of logotherapy (Frankl, 2006), it is the meaning of experience, rather than its character or its setting, that determines one’s mental health. Any extended conflict in conscience produces noogenic neurosis (ibid.), characterized by logotherapists as a collective neurosis of our time, a “private and personal form of nihilism ... defined as the contention that being has no meaning” (ibid.:129).

In hindsight, it seems that coming upon medical whistleblowing as the topic for this thesis was a ‘gift’. Steps toward my research question and method were unforced and developed seemingly naturally. I merely followed where I was invited: to Poland speaking about
midwifery\textsuperscript{54}, to Brock University lecturing Business students on discursive mechanisms in the Canadian healthcare industry; to a conference on organizational discourse in Amsterdam presenting “The Oxymoron of Professional Ethics” (Monk, 2010).

Knights’ closing presentation in Amsterdam (2010) strengthened Ho’s keynote address (2010) casting Wall Street leaders as global culture’s self-styled heroes by juxtaposing ‘machismo’, the male swaggering traditionally linked to military and political power, womanizing prowess and athletic ability, with contemporary control over markets and money. I wondered what had happened to masculinity such that a hero had changed from someone whose tender heart prompted him to protect the powerless to a rapacious, ruthless seeker after riches?

As a child I was utterly fascinated with the myths and legends of all traditions. Although the details of each story were unique, very early on I picked up on the recurrence of traits and powers in so many deities, heroes and royals across cultures and times. Given this context, my thinking about whistleblowers suddenly took on a mythic guise. Perhaps whistleblowers were the modern day heroes, not those promoted as heroes in the daily media — political or financial leaders, celebrities, or soldiers dying overseas. Perhaps the real heroes were being hidden from sight, and the anti-heroes were being lauded, because of some deep distortion in the ‘mind’ or ‘heart’ of modern society.

I knew of the work of Jung, his writings about archetypes (\textit{CW IX},\textsuperscript{ii}\textsuperscript{55}), and about the tension between unconscious opposites being partially responsible for conscious behaviour

\textsuperscript{54} 2004, June as keynote speaker and workshop leader in Warsaw’s Annual Obstetrical Conference. These seminars on ‘low-tech’ midwifery led to the establishment within a year of Warsaw’s first free-standing birth clinic.

\textsuperscript{55} Most citations of Jung’s work in this thesis refer to the twenty volume \textit{Collected Works of Carl G. Jung}, edited by Read, Fordham & Adler. Each reference cites the volume in Roman numerals, and where applicable, the paragraph. Page numbers vary from edition to edition, but paragraph numbers are consistent. Only those volumes cited in the text have been included in the References.
(CW VI, X). I speculated that the acts of whistleblowers might be better appreciated by applying Jungian theory, especially the archetypological aspects of it, to an exploration of blowing the whistle.

Investigating the whistleblower literature and its limitations, my research question had increasingly highlighted unconscious forces helping to determine conscious action. Could it be that whistleblower motivation originated primarily in the unconscious, particularly from Jung’s collective unconscious, and could it be that whistleblowers in some way are especially sensitive or susceptible to urges coming from that realm?

My attraction to Jung’s archetypal approach seemed timely. The importance of whistleblowing as a force for “constructive organizational and societal change” (Miceli et al., 2008:xiv) has been well recognized. Some writers (Maesschalck & Ornelis, 2003; Gundlach et al., 2008; Henik, 2008; Miceli et al., 2008; Tweedie, 2010), have called for more in-depth qualitative studies of whistleblowing to provide “insights into the deeper mechanisms of whistle-blowing” (Maesschalck & Ornelis, 2003:539), believing they will compensate for the dearth of empirically-based causal explanations, and for the lack of significant progress of understanding in the field since 1996 (Wolfe Morrison, 2009). In 1998 Perry called for theorizing around whistleblowing which could account for the “ambiguous status of whistle-blowing and contradictory responses” (ibid.:240). There has also been a call (Perry, 1998; Wolfe Morrison, 2009) for studies with new perspectives going beyond the general aim of positivist whistleblowing research “to predict behavior by discovering causal connections between variables” (Hurtado, 2003:217). Perhaps a Jungian approach with its unconscious archetypological oppositions could address Perry’s concern and provide a new perspective capable of producing novel insights into whistleblowing processes.
Generally, scholars accept the importance of non-conscious and non-rational influences to explain organizational behaviour (e.g., Carr, 1993; Gundlach et al., 2008). In the arena of organizational discourse, for example, some “methodological approaches are drawn from literary analysis ... [to discern] the social meanings of the text” (Marshak, Keenoy, Oswick & Grant, 2000:250; e.g., Contu, 2014). Organizational literature has also exhibited a growing interest in applying a psychoanalytic lens to organizations (Schwartz, 1987; de Swarte, 1998; Gabriel, 1999; Kets de Vries, 2001; Voronov & Vince, 2010). “[I]n the wider field of organizational theory and practice, psychoanalysis is often looked at with suspicion, as an esoteric doxa” (Fotaki, Long & Schwartz, 2009:326). Perhaps the complex Freudian/Kleinian/Lacanian interpretations upon which much of this work has been based (e.g., Arnaud, 2002; Mason, 2010) lends itself to such suspicion. Alternatively, within the last while Jungian theorizing has elicited more attention from organizational scholars (Zanetti 2002; Tallman, 2003; Ketola, 2006; Abramson, 2007; Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2010; Rozuel 2010; Kostera, 2012). The Jungian approach has not yet been explored with respect to whistleblowing. My thesis extends this arm of organizational thinking into the whistleblowing arena.

As detailed in the literature review, the preponderance of whistleblowing research to date relies on positivist assumptions about the reliability and validity of surveys and written or verbal responses to hypothetical whistleblowing scenarios. Alford’s work (2001, 2007) aside, one of the main limitations in the literature is the lack of explanation offered by empirical analysis. Even Alford’s work seems to fall short of a workable explanation, perhaps because of the lack of open discussion of the researcher’s position with respect to whistleblowing, or of the effects of the relationship between subject and researcher. As an ‘insider researcher’, my relationship to subjects is clearer — they certainly thought so — and by including my personal experience of whistleblowing in the introduction, my own
understanding of the whistleblowing process and its effect upon my discussion of it is made transparent to the reader.

Listening

As I began to imagine how I could investigate the urge to blow the whistle, I initially thought to interview a small number of subjects and record their stories and my own in a narrative inquiry. Such an inquiry had been the basis for my Master's thesis, looking at individual midwives' accounts to determine the *meaning* we had taken from recorded events. The analysis identified common threads, common concerns and common confusions in the various tales, showing the radical differences between the Texas and Ontario midwifery systems, between the law as written and the law as applied, and in the differing consequences for mothers and their babies. The work was interpretivist, designed to "generat[e] understandings, rather than deductive strategies that ... tested theories" (Sharpe, 2005:258). The thesis had demonstrated how the dominant 'narrative' "moves away from the embodied stories of particular [people]" (Mason, 1989:24), substituting a carefully crafted composite narrative and rewriting or discounting individual tales. The artifactual composite narrative ensures that what the public perceives as 'the truth' about the system will also be what is useful for maintaining that system's power. This certainly seemed to be the case in midwifery and in the larger context of medicine.

Whoever threatens the system is disciplined; ... people who don't understand or who disregard ... limits get into trouble ... [and] their voices simply become inaudible. Their mistake has been to speak personally instead of from the point of view of the ...system. The response of any well-functioning system ... is to silence such outsiders ... Conversely, any insider who presses too hard against the system's limits can lose her voice and be silenced. (Mason, 1989:22)
This silencing upon “transgressing the norm” is viewed (Kenny, 2014:5) as a particularly “catastrophic” (ibid.:5) form of disenfranchisement, resting upon others’ perception of the whistleblower as deviant:

... go[ing] against the dominant norms of behaviour within their specific workplace settings — a culture of silence, tolerance of rule-breaking and risk — [in ]attempt[ing] to raise their complaints to a higher level ... go[ing] against accepted norms of ... what it means to work ... such subjects are unrepresentable and can find themselves abjected\(^{56}\): denied a valid ontological status. (Kenny, 2014:17)

In falling outside of the norms, whistleblowers fall into roles others unconsciously fear to recognize. Witnessing this isolation and ostracism strengthens others’ “will to not transgress, to remain within the norm” (ibid.) and, in order to do so, they must embrace “aspects of their social (or organisational) milieu that they find disagreeable or know to be incorrect, or indeed that may hurt them” (ibid.:5).

To counter this totalizing effect, excerpts from the midwives’ stories were included verbatim, to preserve as closely as possible the ‘voice’ of each speaker, its affect, tone and ironies, as well as the words used.

Narrative inquiry preserves what we have to say independently as authors and as subjects, our “voices after silence” (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994:424), daring us to “sign” (ibid.) our work. If we rely overmuch on others’ voices, then “other texts and other theories, rather than the writer, sign the work” (ibid.). According to Harold Bloom, Sterling Professor of Humanities at Yale University:

After a lifetime spent in the company of scholars both great and small, I go on learning daily that their “objectivity” is shallow, and that their “subjectivity” can be deep, which makes for the authentic differences between them. (2005:112)

Coles and Knowles (2001) argue that the more closely embedded a researcher is to the participants interviewed, socially, historically and morally, the better able she will be to draw out meaning from her subject’s stories. It follows, then, that the stories of an insider, and above all the stories of the insider herself writing the analysis, could be considered the most trustworthy interpretive source (Maxwell, 1992).

Some organizational scholars use narrative analysis to comprehend organizational behaviour (e.g., DiBernardo, 2003; Landman, 2012), and at first I anticipated following their lead. As a medical practitioner who had reported wrongdoing and sustained the fallout, I could claim a certain degree of meaningful insight into other medical practitioners’ stories. We worked in the same kinds of system facing the same sort of problems, i.e., patient health concerns viewed physiologically, administratively, and so forth; we worked to benefit patients either directly — as physicians, midwives or nurses — or indirectly — as researchers or medical reform activists. In fact, before agreeing to be interviewed, each whistleblower in the study requested to be familiarized with my story to determine whether I could be trusted to interpret their experiences as an informed ‘colleague’. They expected me to understand the ‘hard science’ involved, the clinical and administrative problems, and the moral pressures in life-and-death work, that is, to have an insider’s view of their understandings.

**Positioning: abduction, phronesis and pragmatism**

Having decided on a Jungian analysis, I next had to determine how to select suitable subjects. Since my interest centred on heroic archetypes, I decided to give my subjects heroes’ names from Homer’s *Iliad* (1991) and *Odyssey* (2006). Using pseudonyms preserved subject anonymity and avoided hinting at specific ethnic, national, or gendered identities.
I found online two whistleblower support organizations — the American GAP (Government Accountability Project, 2012) and the Canadian FAIR (Federal Accountability Initiative for Reform, 2012) — and requested direct contact with some of their ‘clients’. No whistleblower responded until I wrote to a physician, Meleager, who had been arrested for speaking out during an American Senate hearing on health reform. He agreed to be interviewed. With this agreement, I reiterated my requests to the two support groups, and received an affirmative response from Ajax, from the UK. Ajax referred me to Odysseus, and so on. I followed this ‘snowball’ effect (Noy, 2008), one participant introducing me to another as someone ‘safe’ to speak with, until I had arranged six conversations.

I decided only to include individuals in medicine, as my own experience rested in this field. Other people reporting misconduct in the environmental or financial world might be responding to the same kinds of influences, but I would not be familiar with technical details of their issues, nor might they be at ease with my understanding of their tales. I took care “when recruiting respondents” to guarantee a “good fit between the context of the situation[s] described ... and the knowledge and experience of the respondents” (Bay & Nikitkov, 2010:1). This selection would avoid some of the problems associated with studies using hypothetical scenarios (e.g., Chiu, 2003; Henik, 2008; Ab Ghani et al., 2011).

There was a particular kind of compassion expressed by my interviewees, a specific response to the pain of others, whether imagined or directly encountered, which I had also noted in the very best medical professionals with whom I had worked. Frost et al. (2006) have specified that research needs to ask questions about what causes variations in people’s ability and willingness to offer compassion at work. I viewed this thesis as
answering this need, because it might link the compassion found in medical practice to that galvanizing a person into blowing the whistle. It seemed that compassionate empathy, described as a “moral imperative” (ibid.:845) in the medical and nursing literature, could be inextricably bound up with whistleblowing. My subjects’ narratives might bring to light some “microdynamics that comprise ‘the work of compassion’” (ibid.:850) and contribute to whistleblowing activities.

Having spent much time establishing diagnoses as a midwife, I am familiar with abductive reasoning (Douven, 2011): given several equally logically credible hypotheses, one selects the most pragmatic, that is, the one which will most likely lead to implementable effective treatment. The assessment of the utility of inductive research occurs, theoretically, after the fact by determining whether findings are generalizable. In contrast, abductive reasoning places instrumentalist considerations firmly at a study’s front end, during the phase of forming hypotheses and choosing method.

After deciding on a Jungian approach to subject narratives, the limitations I had identified in the literature helped to shape a new way to analyze whistleblower tales. During professional practice, I had seen medical literature which was based neither on good science nor coherent theory. I had wondered whose interests were served by publishing sub-standard research, and in answer had adopted a critical stance that recognized the effect of power. I perennially asked, ‘Cui bono?’ (‘Who benefits?’) (Monk, 2010; Monk, 2013) and had found that, if we followed the money, it became clear why the research and the praxis it produced looked as they did. I was keen to apply the same kind of questioning to the whistleblowing literature.

57 Keeping the politics of funding in mind, which research gets funded is also actually determined pragmatically. However, this thesis only looks at the theoretical requirement for inductive vs. abductive approaches in ‘pure’ types of research.
Albeit I did not know it at the time, this kind of research exemplifies contemporary phronetic method (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Flyvbjerg, Landman & Schram, 2012). Phronetic research “focus[es] on issues of context, values and power” (Flyvbjerg, 2006:370) by examining praxis in detail through the stories of particular individuals acting within organizational and social contexts. It asks four questions:

1. Where are we going?
2. Who gains and who loses, and by which mechanisms of power?
3. Is this development desirable?
4. What, if anything, should we do about it? (Flyvbjerg, 2006:274)

This type of research does not seek to answer natural science’s question, ‘How does the world work?’ with laws which are ontologically bound by logical necessity in an observable world. Neither can phronesis answer epistemic research’s other question, ‘Given certain universal laws, how can we make the world work in a certain way?’, with technical applications according to an instrumental rationality which is ontologically bound by empirical possibility. Scientific positivist research conflates episteme with phronesis, assuming that knowing how something actually is, is equivalent to knowing how something ought to be. However, phronetic research conflates techne with phronesis, assuming that knowing how something may be accomplished must be attached to knowing whether it should be accomplished. Phronetic method extends narrative inquiry into the dimension of ethics, by identifying “micropractices, searching for the Great [answers] within the Small [questions]” (Flyvbjerg, 2006:370). This thesis could be guided by the second and third phronetic questions.

58 My prior work has been phronetic, supporting Flyvbjerg’s opinion that “researchers doing phronesis-like work have a sound instinct for proceeding with their research and not involving themselves in methodology” (2006:375).

59 Aristotle divided knowledge into three kinds: episteme corresponds roughly to scientific knowledge; techne to craft or applied knowledge; and phronesis to practical common sense, which combines the first two and adds a component of value (Flyvbjerg, 2006).
I thought at first to use phronetic method because of its similarity to narrative inquiry, plus its added focus on how power determines action in a given context (Flyvbjerg et al., 2012). Phronetic method also accesses different individuals’ reports of the same event to compensate for “inaccurate” individual recollections (Landman, 2012:35). Implicit in this acceptance of multiple versions is an unstated objectivist ontology, perhaps a version of Heidegger’s ‘world always already there” (1996:77). For the whistleblowing thesis, phronetic research’s insistence upon an objectivist ontology was problematic. Instead I turned to William James’ philosophy of pragmatism (1906/1955). Pragmatism and phronesis are similar, in that by

look[ing] away from first things, principles, ‘categories’, supposed necessities; and ... towards last things, fruits, consequences, facts (ibid.:47)

they establish an ethical teleology prior to ontology or epistemology. However, pragmatism is better suited to exploring unconscious motivation, because the abductive reasoning at its hub does not require any objective notion of ‘truth’. As with constructive empiricism (Van Fraassen, 1980), pragmatism holds that the notion of truth is theoretically irrelevant, a theory being “empirically adequate if observable phenomena can ... be “embedded” in the theory” (Monton & Mohler, 2008). Uniquely, pragmatism considers truth as “one species of good” (James, 1906/1955:59), not a distinct category, but a union of the ‘absolutes’ of Goodness and Truth; something of whatever kind, abstract or empirically verifiable, is considered true if it can be shown to be “good for so much” (1906/1955:57). So long as an abstraction proves useful in “get[ting] about among particulars ... actually carrying you somewhere” (ibid.), it is good to accept it. Pragmatic truth is limited by instrumentality — “If what we do by its aid is good, then ...[an idea is] good in so far forth [italics mine], for we are the better for possessing it” — and by
coherence — the truth of things beyond this “depend[s] entirely on their relations to the other truths that ...[must] be acknowledged” (James, 1906/1955:57). Pragmatism entertains neither the materialistic bias of ordinary empiricism, nor the objectivist requirements of phronesis.

When grappling with the meaning of unconscious data, there is no possibility of directly accessing ‘accurate’ interpretation, but interpreting a heard narrative may lead to an intersubjectively agreed upon recognition of a ‘selective fact’ (L. Crociani-Winland, personal communication, 13 January 2012), one that suddenly brings coherence to what was a ‘random’ set of information. When several hearers ‘agree’ on the meaning of a particular narrative, either they find the same associations independently arising in their thoughts, or they experience similar emotional responses contiguously with the pairing of a particular interpretation with particular narrative components.

Organizational scholarship includes pragmatic notions of truth in discussions of interpretivist research. For example, Weick’s discussion of ‘bracketing’ in sense-making (2001) establishes a pragmatist precedent: it is in “chopping the stream of experience into sensible, namable, and named units, and ... connecti[ng them by] ... imposing ... typically causal relationships” (ibid.:189) through the positing of logically unnecessary but empirically boundaried objects, that meaning is made. Inescapably, we are engaging in diegesis, acting “as-if” — as-if the world is real, as-if an objective epistemology is possible, and as-if the relationships between arbitrarily bracketed parts of this world are observer-independent — because the results of our “alleged actions” on the “supposedly

---

60 Diegesis refers to the fictional world of narrative (Felluga, 2002), fictional because it rests on the subjective experience of the narrator ... as does any world about which one may communicate.
objective world”, some of which are the pleasurable emotions they engender (ibid.:184), are desirable and, therefore, part of that pragmatic truth, that good, which is to be sought.61

The Jamesian formulation of pragmatism plus the critical insights of Flyvbjerg’s phronetic methodology could account for power in organizations, and include the unconscious as part of this study’s ontology.

Choosing: abductive case selection

I began by selecting six cases plus my own62, chosen according to a phronetic subject selection strategy relying on abductive reasoning. One must be careful using case studies or anecdotal narratives, since they may be “just as essentializing and totalizing as … [positivist] generalization” (D’Andrade,1995:405), leading just as surely to “the world [being] ‘summarized by’ or ‘reduced to’ the story told about it” (ibid.). This reductionism may produce a rigidity in its version of the fluid reality it purports to represent. Authors using case study methodology (De Graaf, 2010) have been criticized for “undermin[ing] the rationale of an in-depth case study approach” (Knights, 1995:236) by claiming erroneously that “deploy[ing] multiple case studies … [is] in some way representative of a broader population” (ibid.).

Having selected “atypical examples” (Flyvbjerg, 2011) through a phronetic process avoided this shortcoming. Unlike positivist research that tends to reduce relevant dimensions only to those that contribute to generalizability in being found across the universe of discourse — representational factors — abductive selection seeks cases that: 1) are intuited as most likely to produce cogent understandings and 2) in being ‘extreme’,

61 To criticize this notion of reality construction because it is necessarily partial, is logically empty. Meaning must arise from some reality, part of which must be excluded by the limitations both of perception and language.

62 In an in-depth qualitative inquiry, “while there is no ideal number of cases, a number between 4 and 10 cases usually works well” (Eisenhardt, 1989:545).
help to delimit the range of conditions contributing to the phenomenon under scrutiny.

Phronetic case selection does not seek ‘representative’ or ‘typical’ cases:

... a representative case ... may not be the most appropriate strategy ... because the typical or average case is often not the richest in information. Atypical or extreme cases often reveal more information. (Flyvbjerg, 2011:307)

Selecting ‘atypical’ cases avoids both reductionist quicksands and “the conventional closure on meaning evident in narrative accounts of events” (Knights, 1995:232). When we want to understand behaviour in order to evaluate and perhaps implement action in response to such understanding, it is appropriate to work with only a few cases in depth (Flyvbjerg, 2011).63

Given an empirically limited set of possible conditions leading to whistleblowing, each conscious motivation that may be ruled out through careful case selection increases the probability of those remaining being unconscious. Two conscious motivators were eliminated by interviewing only medical whistleblowers. Firstly, although there have been several massive payouts to whistleblowers exposing pharmaceutical firms’ misconduct in American *qui tam* cases (Kesselheim, Studdert & Mello, 2010), generally medical whistleblowers do not obtain financial ‘rewards’ (e.g., Firth-Cozens et al., 2003; Moore & McAuliffe, 2010, 2012). Therefore, the bounty hunter’s incentive to take advantage of whistleblower legislation is ruled out64. Of my subjects, those who did receive some

---

63 To understand the significance of a set of behaviours, phronetic analysis looks beyond assigning numerical values to certain abstracted aspects common to all examples of the behaviours, and instead looks at a number of promising dimensions — here, whistleblower ‘success’ is one— in order to identify the positive and negative ends of a spectrum of such measures — positive ‘success’ being good health, good employment, good social standing and reducing or eliminating wrongdoing; negative ‘success’ being the exact opposite — along which any given case may be located. Cases are then selected for being located in different spots along these spectra, as this selection maximizes available information about the phenomenon along these dimensions.

64 Incentive-based legislation, such as the U.S. False Claims Act (Carson, Verdu, & Wokutch, 2007) covers financial fraud such as in the Enron scandal. In medicine, this act only covers defrauding the government (as
financial recompense — e.g., Ajax and Daskylus — were adamant that it fell far short of compensating for their other losses. Secondly, choosing to blow the whistle may be considered a consciously rational choice if it is done for self-protection. If outsiders are very likely to discover wrongdoing, then blowing the whistle may prevent the whistleblower from being discovered as a wrongdoer himself (de Graaf, 2010). This usually doesn’t apply in medicine, as typically exposure comes from insiders, most often uncovering systemically entrenched misconduct

The third dimension of conscious whistleblower motivation to be ruled out was the likelihood of success. The “classic” model of whistleblowing (Henik, 2008:9) assumes that whistleblowers make cost/benefit analyses prior to reporting, including whether their efforts will be successful (Bok, 1980). In this study, positive answers to the following three questions may be understood as markers of ‘success’: 1) Did the changes the whistleblowers attempted to make actually occur? 2) Did they manage to keep working in their field, despite having blown the whistle? 3) Did their social and mental health survive the whistleblowing process without permanent damage?

The fourth type of conscious motivator to be eliminated is emotional. Some authors (Brewer & Selden, 1998; Gundlach et al., 2008; Peters et al., 2011) claim that emotions and cognition influence the decision to blow the whistle. The closeness of the whistleblower’s relationship to potential or actual victims may affect the intensity of a whistleblower’s emotional response and, therefore, also affect the decision to blow the whistle. If, as Maxwell (2008) claims, ‘moral imagination’ consists of “cognitive and

in Medicaid overbilling, etc.), and cannot address systemic fraud, such as the misrepresentation of research data (Blumsohn, 2010).

E.g., birth attendants occasionally chart ambiguously or falsely, circumventing rules which forbid the way many attendants actually work. I once attended a normal birth where the supervising registered midwife arrived late. Because the attending midwives were supposed to be supervised, the registered midwife charted the birth as if she had been present. Accurate reporting would have caused political overreaction to those hypothetical problems which supervision rules were supposed to prevent.
affective simulation” (ibid.:57), allowing one to put oneself in another’s place and imagine their internal state, then closeness must figure in to whistleblowing decisions. The more similar to myself I perceive another person to be, the easier it becomes for me to imagine their experiences (ibid.). Closeness of the whistleblower-victim relationship varied amongst the subjects I chose: 1) Did they work at a remove from those their whistleblowing would benefit, as in doing research, administration, or organizing political resistance? 2) Did they work face-to-face with patients, who were otherwise unknown to them? 3) Did they have a more personal connection to those they were protecting, as in family members or friends?

Lastly, all the subjects persisted beyond initial internal reporting, and beyond the point where, realistically, they could hope to avoid retaliation. The severity (scope and scale) and duration of retaliation, which is believed in part to motivate continued resistance after initial reporting (Glazer & Glazer, 1989; Jos et al., 1989; Rothschild & Miethe, 1999; de Graaf, 2010) also varied from subject to subject: 1) Did retaliation come from one source or many? 2) Did retaliation originate from and have impact beyond the immediate work environment? 3) Did retaliation attack just the matter being reported, or did it extend beyond that?

The cases I selected are located at different points along the axes of the three dimensions of ‘success’, closeness of the subject’s relationship to actual and potential victims of wrongdoing, and the severity and duration of retaliation. A summary of each subject’s position along these spectra, in the order in which they were interviewed, follows:

66 For the reader's convenience, condensed biographies of the seven whistleblower participants are to be found in Appendix X.
Ajax has been a minimally successful whistleblower. He won in court against his employers and the funding organization behind his research. Although the change his whistleblowing aimed for has not occurred, he still hopes for effective change in research protocols and procedures in the community at large and works toward that end. He was neither permanently disabled by retaliation, nor abandoned by his family, but he has abandoned hope of further work in his field. As a member of a pharmaceutical research team, he worked at a distance from the potential victims of wrongdoing, interacting only with abstracted data about them. Retaliation occurred over several years coming from many different corners of his employer’s administration, but did not extend beyond either the work environment or the specific matter which was reported.

Odysseus is another researcher. He has always worked closely with each of his research subjects. Odysseus’ whistleblowing has been quite successful: although the particular matter he originally blew the whistle on is still in contention legally, he has won several suits against his retaliators (his employers and the organizations funding the research) at individual and organizational levels, has a healthy notoriety in the press and a solid international professional reputation; he still works in the field at a job with considerable responsibility and professional cachet; his mental, physical and social health is intact; he continues to fight, although he is not optimistic that “the little man” will be able to counter corporate and bureaucratic greed. Certain of eventual failure on a societal scale, he sees no alternative but to suspend the disbelief that his concerns will ever be addressed justly. Retaliation has being ongoing for decades coming from several quarters, sometimes in the form of what appears as character assassination, ranging well beyond the original work situation and the original wrongdoing.
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Meleager may be seen as one of the two most successful of my subjects. Initially spurred on by one-on-one interaction with patients, his efforts currently aim at wider societal justice, “good for everybody” at the intersection of government and medicine. He does not see retaliation, although severe (he has been incarcerated several times for civil disobedience), as a deterrent, but as an inevitable result of “speaking truth to power” and simply a part of the resistance process. His social, emotional, financial and physical health are excellent, and his attitude is optimistic, although he believes that the changes he fights for may not come any time soon.

Nestor, another seemingly successful whistleblower, was ‘initiated’ into whistleblowing by Meleager. Having retired from medical practice, he works for the improved wellbeing of all patients in his country’s health system. He believes intensely in the efficacy of civil disobedience and public education, and puts his faith in “the people”. He is not concerned about retaliation, on condition that it does not negatively affect his family. Because he began whistleblowing late in life, he has not suffered harm personally or to his family. He shares Meleager’s optimism for the future.

Hector has been the least successful subject. He was forced to leave medical practice in retaliation for having attempted to ameliorate individual and general patient treatment locally, by reporting to immediate supervisors and staff managers in his employers’ organizations, then regionally by attempting to engage supervisory bodies with his employers. He managed to recoup wages withheld as part of retaliatory tactics, but was fired, then blacklisted and defamed. Employer reprisals were sufficiently severe in his last months of work as to precipitate clinical exhaustion leading to permanent disability, loss of reputation and livelihood, and withdrawal of familial support.
Daskylus' minimally successful resistance occupied the middle ground — he knew some patients personally, but most of his work occurred at a middle managerial level. He advocated for colleagues against employer maltreatment, and tried to stop unsafe practice in institutions under his direction as a regional administrator. Subsequently, his employer became hostile and his colleagues avoided him. Upon going public, despite considerable support from his family, the stress occasioned by vicious retaliation has meant permanent loss of health, precluding further full-time employment in his field and truncating his career. Albeit he was initially successful in his suit to return to work and was awarded financial compensation, he is still embroiled in legal problems with this employer. The individuals “who created the poison work environment” were awarded generous severance packages, and other employees directly responsible for abusive practice are still employed. He is sad and shocked at “how far powerful people will go” to cover up their wrongdoing.

Diomedes, while working in an ancillary medical position, blew the whistle on the abuse and consequent death of his severely disabled mother in a nursing home, and the subsequent cover-up. At the time of our interview, none of the individuals or the organizations responsible for the wrongdoing have been fined or reprimanded. Although his whistleblowing did not directly derive from his employment, he and his family suffer financially. Despite his mother’s death he persists in his campaign for the sake of "changing things so nothing like this happens to someone else, ... my [spouse] and I and all of us.” Diomedes’ history provides an example of a whistleblower’s anger being directed against the systems within institutions which do not work, including those allowing some individuals to cover up wrongdoing while ‘killing the messenger’ (Henik, 2008). His fight against the concealment of staff misconduct has grown to include negligence cases against the supervisory medical staff, the investigating police, the
prosecuting attorney and the local health ministry. He feels certain that, at the end of the day, his mother will “have justice”.

Some object that since Diomedes was not an employee of the offending organization, he does not qualify as a whistleblower. Viewing Diomedes as a whistleblower despite being employed outside the organization is in keeping with the emphasis of this thesis, that whistleblowers act individually in response to wrongdoings proximal to them, but that their actions produce a kind of ethical fallout, with much larger-scale implications for wider swathes of society, perhaps industry-wide or even for all of human society (v.i. 130). Other authors agree that “[t]raditional notions of whistle-blowing are too narrow” (Johnson, Sellnow, Seeger, Barrett & Hasbargen, 2004:351) and must include “external or outsider” whistleblowers. Diomedes values “consumer protection” (ibid.) highly, and “enact[s] many of the processes found in employee whistle-blowing” (ibid.). Moreover, having worked in the medical sector, Diomedes’ whistleblowing is due in part to having expertise beyond that of the average citizen. An ‘outsider’ might not have recognized the many particular ways in which the victim’s treatment constituted abuse, nor known how to pursue the matter legally as a result.

Understanding: narrative inquiry and psychosocial method

Although I had not planned to stray from conventional narrative inquiry or phronetic method, I realized that I was thinking of a definite departure from the way this phenomenon had already been researched. During the preliminary interview with Meleager, I realized that a straightforward narrative of his experiences would not provide the window I sought into what it was that spurred him into acting as he did.

I had thought a narrative inquiry incorporating Jung’s multiple levels of significance would be sufficient to uncover the forces leading to whistleblowing by couching it in a
significant context, a chronological continuity of meaning. Readers could select what was significant from the stories, forming “their own judgments about the case[s] and [their] implications” (Flyvbjerg, 1998:1).

It appeared at this point that I might be moving toward autoethnography, in which anthropology seeks to “construct better worlds and enrich our collective lives” (Anderson, 2006a:459) by combining autobiography with narrative inquiry. There were certain similarities between autoethnographic aims and the aims of my work: seeking to develop “understandings of broader social phenomena” (Anderson, 2006b:373) than those directly discussed in the data, and investigating “grievances and anger” because of a sense that “things aren’t as they should be and no one is doing anything about it” (Van Maanen, 2010a:338). I was hoping to employ the open-endedness of narrative and ethnographic inquiry, where the threads of meaning come up on their own. I also saw myself autoethnographically as “a full member in the research group” (Anderson, 2006b:373), whose own experiences and thoughts could produce “analytic insights ... as well as those of others” (ibid.:384). However, this study does not aim at ethnography’s primary goals of representing either culture or “what it is like to be someone else” (Van Maanen, 2010a:339) by writing a “rich and detailed interpretive description of life within the context of the research setting” (Coles & Knowles, 2001:17), nor does it seek to describe the “symbolic meanings attached to the patterns of social interactions of individuals within a particular cultural group” (ibid.). The thesis was designed to go beyond description and make “unusual sense of something”(Van Maanen, 2010b:240), as description in itself is rarely explanatory.

Jungians (Woodman & Dickson, 1996) and narrative inquiry scholars (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994) claim narrative should ‘lead’ investigation, encouraging thinking to
develop in unexpected directions. When interpreting, it is vital to avoid "preconceived, doctrinaire opinions about the statements made" (Jung, 1965:312). Some of the language in my original list of questions for interviewees (Appendix V) was revised to avoid using evaluatively 'leading' language. In one instance, I substituted a question using the loaded word "bullying", by asking subjects to tell me about having witnessed or being subjected to "injustice". Ajax responded to the revised question by comparing "bullies" at school to "bullies" at work, the latter misrepresenting data and retaliating viciously against anyone "foolish enough" to point out misrepresentations; Meleager related standing up for victims against "schoolyard bullies", and resisting "bullies" in the government and the healthcare industry blocking care for the poor.

I found myself being led not only by the narratives, but by the research process itself. It was not only meaning that was unfolding, but method. I could see that understanding would not likely come simply from a subject telling 'what had happened.' Since most of inner life is unconscious, it is ineffable unless brought to consciousness (Horizon, 2012). Kets de Vries (2001) has argued that people do not control their overt behaviour to the extent they think they do, because it is significantly dependent upon unconscious perceptual processes. Whistleblowers might not be able to say what they know, and what they say might unconsciously conceal uncomfortable truths from conscious apprehension. It seemed wise to find a way to delve beneath the surface of the whistleblowers' stories to discover hidden meanings.

It was important not to replicate the methodological errors" and possible cumulative misunderstandings about whistleblowing already becoming orthodoxy in the field. The methodology of most of the research to date was not suitable for exploring unconscious factors contributing to whistleblowing behaviour. As there was already a growing interest
in psychoanalytic analysis of organizational phenomena, it seemed entirely appropriate to draw upon psychosocial research techniques.

Psychosocial researchers propose focusing on what is not said — hesitations, contradictions, silences, absences, inconsistencies and paradoxes — as a way to ‘mine’ raw narrative for unconscious mechanisms at work (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000). Interview techniques elicit life histories, and offer open-ended, semi-structured questions cognizant of a given research question, while staying aware of the dynamics between researcher and subject (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000; Wengraf, 2004). The researcher stays alert for signs of transference, where repressed discomforts from a subject’s past relationships are ‘projected’ into the research encounter, and countertransference, where the researcher’s repressed emotional responses from past relationships emerge into the present situation (Freud, 1923/1960; Etchegoyen, 2005). The underlying assumption is that material is always and only repressed into the unconscious when it is too anxiety-producing for the individual to accept consciously.

Another assumption is that the ‘self’ is not a unified entity, but unstable and constantly in flux, and that the repressed suspicion that one’s self is fragile and threatened creates much of this anxiety (Clarke & Hoggett, 2009). Because the interviewee’s ‘self’ is conceptualized as divided, psychosocial interviewing technique allows the researcher to strengthen the connection between researcher and subject by talking about uncomfortable material, that may clarify what the researcher thinks the interviewee may be hiding from himself.

Evidence supports the notion that unconscious forces are responsible for “choiceless choice” (Alford, 2007), but in basing my thesis on Jungian theory, I rejected the psychosocial assumption that all repression is symptomatic of pathology. Whistleblowers
have been deemed delusional, and called "narcissistic moraliz[ers]" (Alford, 2001). Despite the absence of the two defining factors of pathological narcissism, exploitation of others and lack of empathy (American Psychiatric Association, 2000), other research has adopted this stance:

The only force strong enough to make whistleblowers blow and keep blowing, despite mounting psychological and financial costs ... is narcissistic rage. (Abraham, 2004)

Severe psychopathology aside, one may just as easily posit a store of unconscious material which is, in a Jungian sense, too-deep-to-be-easily-accessed, as to assume it is repressed due to trauma. Jung’s unconscious realm is layered into the personal unconscious, which may very well contain traumatic repressed historical material, and the collective unconscious, a repository for the acquired total knowledge of humanity gathered over deep time. Jung further subdivides the collective unconscious — the deeper the layer, the greater the fraction of all of humanity, past and present, included (v.i. 171; figure 1, Jung’s Layers of the Unconscious) — into family, clan, nation, nation-groups (e.g., Europe), and primeval ancestors (Hannah, 1999:17). “Jung’s archetypal psychology ... is for collective behavior what personality psychology is for individual behavior” (Abramson, 2007:116).

Organizational research accesses Jungian theory mostly for thinking about leadership (eg., Abramson 2007; Rozuel, 2010). When applied as a lens through which to comprehend whistleblowing, a Jungian approach supports findings from both ‘waves’ of whistleblowing research (v.s. 38). In this frame, whistleblowers are moved to act by emergent archetypes, understood to be potent forces operating below rational consciousness. In being tossed between selfish and altruistic impulses, a whistleblower’s “agony” (Alford, 2007:43) arises from tension between an archetype’s ‘light’ and ‘shadow’ aspects. By positing archetypal forces working simultaneously in the individual
unconscious and in multiple levels of the collective unconscious, data may be interpreted at various levels to maximize comprehension. A Jungian analysis of simultaneously multi-level meanings will be examined in the chapters below.

Voyaging and returning: validity and authenticity

In qualitative research, validity or “credibility” (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006) depends in part upon multiple perspectives. Psychosocial research premises validity on intersubjective agreement in post-collection analysis, consensus as to what data means. Multiple voices are said to guard against forcing “data [to] fit preconceived ideas and research questions” (Clarke & Hogget, 2009:21). Group data analysis generates multiple ‘threads’ of meaning which “provide the building blocks of cross-case analysis” (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000:20). In direct contrast, narrative inquiry theory requires an author to position him/herself by stating personal autobiography and opinion clearly, but the reader is solely responsible for interpreting how this positioning shapes the author’s views (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994). Both narrative and psychosocial inquiry connect validity to ‘authenticity’ (rather than imposing meaning, letting it emerge from data) and ‘authority’ (the degree of the writer’s ‘closeness’ to participants). By narrative inquiry reasoning, the most authoritative voice is that of the ‘insider’ autobiographer; theoretically it provides the most accurate representation of the speaker’s locution and illocution. In contrast, psychosocial theory collapses ‘authority’ into ‘authenticity’ by insisting upon multiple perspectives and intersubjective agreement as to the meaning of data (P. Hoggett, personal communication, 14 January 2012). The writer’s understanding is best accepted if it can be agreed upon. Early on, I felt unease at psychosocial analysis being exclusively dependent on intersubjectivity, but had yet to conceive of an alternative approach.
I was more and more drawn toward concentrating tightly on the language used by whistleblowers, as markers or signposts of unconscious elements in their stories. This was entirely in keeping with Jungian theory, specifically with the Jungian method known as ‘amplification.’

At this very point I was introduced to Lawrence’s “Social Dreaming Matrix” (1998, 2003) and to Bollas’ notion of the “unthought known” (1987). Lawrence theorized that dreams can be seen as expressions of unconscious aspects of social reality (Lawrence, 2003), revealing the “implicate order present in the explicate order” (Maltz & Walker, 1998:179). Dreams may be thought of as “complex products of unconscious trains of thought ... shaped by ... cultural beliefs ... mental processes enabl[ing] human beings to give meaning to their waking life” (Lawrence, 1998:35). This led into the idea that myths may be considered as records of collective dreaming (Armstrong, 1998:105). As such, dreams provide gateways to what Bollas (1987) termed the “unthought known”. In psychoanalysis, the “unthought known” refers to the boundary between the unconscious and the conscious mind. Bollas referred to material a person ‘knew’ — had an ‘intuitive sense’ of — but could not think about because it was repressed, forgotten or inexpressible (Robbins, 2008). In a way, such thoughts exist independently of the thinker as “thoughts that are available but as yet do not have a thinker” (Simpson & French, 2006:246). In a Jungian formulation, these thoughts arise from the collective unconscious galvanized by the activated archetype(s), and the unthought known is embodied in the whistleblower. I hypothesized that by pulling the idea of the unthought known away from personal

---

67 Amplification derives the meaning of narrative or dream images from associating to the meanings of similar images from other sources (Stevens, 1994). Prerequisites for this technique include a broad knowledge of myths, fairy tales, folktales, art, literature, and culture to recognize pertinent meanings.

68 While researching, I would often encounter an idea or form exactly when I needed it, or would see an image which had just emerged repeated in a book, in something someone said, or on the television. These surprising coincidences might be instances of Jungian synchronicity (CW VIII 816-968), but a discussion of this concept is beyond the scope of the thesis.
pathology by regarding it in terms of Jung’s collective unconscious, where the unthought known is “what we already know but don’t yet know that we know” (ibid.), then it might provide a workable way of comprehending “choiceless choice”. Contrary to the assumption of past whistleblower research that moral reason is responsible for whistleblowing, this study entertains the notion that part of the unthought known, perhaps unconscious moral empathy (Maxwell, 2008), motivates the whistleblower by producing ‘knowledge’ of right action concurrently with the action itself, appearing to bypass thought entirely. In contrast with some researchers’ construction of altruism as conscious acting upon sophisticated cognitive representations of another’s viewpoint (Krebs, 2005), proposing that whistleblowing is unconsciously motivated may construct whistleblowing empathy as neither instrumentally rational (Habermas, 1972) nor conscious.69

The depth and breadth of the images and associations which can come up in a dream matrix in response to dream ‘narrative’ fit precisely into the kind of approach for which I had been searching. For a while, I found myself consciously resisting a dream analysis, thinking that it was too ethereal and inadequately ‘serious’ for organizational studies. I doubted that the “politics of epistemology”, the “shifting frames of reference that define acceptable knowledge and inquiry” (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994:414), would allow that mytho-poetic analysis of dream data might shed light on whistleblower motivation. Attempting to develop an epistemology of the unconscious based on Jungian theory could be a risky move, particularly since recent organizational theorizing tends toward a

69 It may be that whistleblowing behaviour arises in a similar manner to expert behaviour. Expert responses appear to have no need of conscious reasoning, ‘reasoning’ having already occurred during the process of likening a current situation to a past one (Crawford, 2009). Arendt contends (1956) that inner dialogue, serious enough to affect one’s behaviour, is thought, and that individuality means this thinking process. If Arendt is correct, then neither expert behaviour nor whistleblowing behaviour are due to a conscious individual process. Instead, they may emerge from of an unconscious transpersonal realm, like Jung’s archetypal realm.
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linguistically-based Lacanian approach to the unconscious (Roberts, 2005; Hoedemaekers, 2007; Vidailllet, 2007; Cederström, 2009; Driver, 2009; Fotaki, 2010).

However, I would argue that failing to consider unconscious factors constitutes “a form of epistemological violence” (Romanyshyn, 2010:276). Romanyshyn contends that “after Freud” (ibid.:283), the reality of the unconscious cannot ethically be left out of the equation between a knower and what is being known, and an honest epistemology must include unconscious factors. Since the Enlightenment, research is most often conceived of as a rational process which ignores non-conscious phenomena such as dream material (James, 1906/1955). Nevertheless, when investigating the human psyche, it would seem a natural next step toward escalating levels of reflexivity, moving from psychology as a natural science, to its being seen as a humanist and hermeneutic science, to making a place “for the unconscious subjectivity of a researcher” (Romanyshyn, 2010:275). Unconscious factors constitute an implicit part of the research process:

... the process begins, like our dream life does, below the radar of the conscious mind ... to leave this dynamic aspect out of the research process is as detrimental to it as it is to leave our dreams out of life. In each case we are working and living with half a mind. (ibid.)

In discussing the possibilities in case study research, Knights attributes the “absent subjectivity” (ibid.:280) of the positivist researcher, who supposedly secures objectivity by excluding his own presence in the work, to an attempt to cover up his own anxiety:

... the author’s own desire for a unified identity remains a hidden agenda ... in a heroic (masculine) struggle to capture the reality of the empirical world in a totalizing set of scientific depictions. (Knights, 1995:232)

In this work, then, it was necessary to include my unconscious subjectivity, while treading carefully so as not to fall into wild analysis, a risk attendant upon generating all of the
analysis myself. I was encouraged by organizational literature already referring to Jungian theory (Bowles, 1991; Tallman, 2003; Hart & Brady, 2005; Rozuel, 2010), and proposed to extend this precedent into Jungian method through incorporating dream data and mytho-poetic analysis. Dream data was traditionally the stuff of analytic psychology, and dream narratives, subjected to Jungian amplification, could be rich sources of mythic elements pointing to archetypal influences. Free associating to mythological images might lead directly to where I hoped to go, triggering awareness of “fears, hopes and motivations” from “beneath the surface of consciousness” (Abramson, 2007), “point[ing] to collective meanings beyond the individual ... to social meanings hidden in texts” (Marshak et al., 2000). I would ask my interviewees to relate dreams to me that they thought might be connected with their whistleblowing, identify powerful images therein, and see what other images, metaphors and meanings spontaneously arose from the whistleblowers’ words that might provide clues to the unconscious factors at work in the organizations — the industries, the companies and the society in which the whistleblowing was embedded. I anticipated that this approach would clearly emphasize the importance of the whistleblower’s role to organizations and society, rather than tending to a close focus on the individual whistleblower.

I emailed a “Letter of Information” (III) and a “Consent to Participate” (Appendix IV) to my six interviewees, plus a preview of the kinds of questions I might ask (Appendix V). Over the course of a year, I arranged to travel to their home cities for a two to three hour interview. I met with four subjects in their homes, and one in a private room in his local public library. Daskylus opted to answer my questions by email, declining to meet face-to-face. I recorded all other interviews for transcription later. Several subjects wanted to continue past the allotted time; several kept communicating after the recorder was turned off; several acted as gracious host during my time with them, sharing family meals and
acting as tour guide to their city. I came away feeling indebted to all of them for having shared their energy, time and their stories so openly with me.

Narrative inquiry requires that a narrator’s words be presented in as close to the original form as possible; psychosocial technique allows for more latitude in how these words might be presented. As I reviewed our interviews, I drew meaning from subjects’ tales as wholes. Then I sent the transcripts to the narrators to confirm the writing was faithful to what they had meant to say, and to invite their further involvement. One subject, Odysseus, was agitated that too much of what had been said was litigious, and there were too many errors. Accordingly, I reviewed the recording, making extensive corrections, and sent the corrected version. I also offered reassurances that the material to be included consisted primarily of images and responses to them, rather than citing potentially libellous interpretations of events. I promised to send him all particular excerpts to be quoted in the thesis ahead of its finalization. These suggestions were accepted without objection. Our correspondence thereafter conveyed the sense that he was looking forward to seeing what was to be made of his words. In this way, the research material had already begun to be produced cooperatively, incorporating dimensions of narrative and affect, with previously unrecognized material emerging. The connection between researcher and researched was being dialectically recognized (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000:68) and dialogically strengthened (Clarke & Hoggett, 2009:18), trust was growing and material being offered was deepening (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000). Contact with several participants continued by email, testing out ideas, receiving their comments, and exchanging good wishes.

Alford (2007) used narratology to derive meaning from the structure of whistleblowers’ narratives, but discarded their content. This aspect of his research seemed to mirror the
corporate counter-resistance strategy of ignoring what whistleblowers reported, and instead hammering away at the whistleblower. Mytho-poetic analysis was an alternative that did not discard content. To the contrary, it required attention to narrative detail, finding meaning from a close reading of the content of subject narratives, not just their structure. In looking for analogues to archetypes in other fields, I had come across an idea of the interpenetration of structure and content in the field of evolutionary psychology, which, in order to get beyond behaviourism’s insistence on neural mechanisms as *tabula rasa* existing independently of data, looks at specific contents of neuropsychological systems, without positing “content-free neural networks or information processing systems” (Buss, 2005:xv)\(^70\).

Allowing myself to be drawn from one surprisingly apt method to another enabled a degree of unconscious subjectivity to manifest in the work. During research and writing, I was aware of loosening my conscious control of analysis, allowing the work to ‘organize’ itself. It was as if I were being “called into [my] work ... through ... complex, unconscious ties” (Romanyshyn, 2010: 283) to it, as if I were being quietly pushed along. This was a familiar feeling. When entering midwifery practice it had also felt as if I were being called by those for whom it was being done — as if somebody had to do it, and that somebody just incidentally happened to be me. It had felt like being appointed or apprenticed by unseen forces, greater than individuals, being given a ‘gift’ which carried with it a burden of responsibility — some kind of *geas*\(^71\). Romanyshyn terms this a process of transformation, turning the researcher “from being only the author of the work to being also its agent” (ibid.:285). The researcher discovers “those for whom the work is

---

\(^{70}\) Insights about archetypes from evolutionary psychology will be investigated further in the next chapter.

\(^{71}\) For elaboration of *geas*, v.i. 176.
being done, the ancestors ... who carry the unfinished business of the work ... the scope of
the work go[ing] beyond the individual researcher” (ibid.).

In other words, the research proceeded as I had hoped it would, its direction developing
hermeneutically. It required a kind of pragmatic perspective. With each new stage in the
research process, epistemological “humility” (ibid:278) demanded discarding dogmatic
belief and disbelief, and instead adopting a pragmatic suspended judgment, pending the
emergence of meanings intersubjectively agreed upon. If there were indeed archetypes
informing whistleblowing behaviour, then it was not enough simply to conceptualize
archetypes in the collective unconscious guiding the actions of whistleblowers. It was
important for me to think and act ‘as-if’ they were also guiding this work by determining
the methodology of the research.

**Scanning: multiple subjectivity**

I next thought to conduct a panel similar to Lawrence’s Dream Reflection Group (DRG),
(v.i. 111) responding holistically (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000:68) to individual excerpts
from the whistleblower transcripts. By including myself as a participant, by collecting
narratives of other participants, and by using a DRG to enrich meaning detected in
participant data, the study would enhance validity both psychosociologically (ibid.:43) and
in a narrative inquiry sense.

My research aimed at contributing to the ongoing dialogue about whistleblowing, in the
hopes of one day changing organizational practice to support it. Accordingly, the methods
used were dialogical, “incorporat[ing] and ... [being] incorporated into a polyphony of
voices” (Flyvbjerg, 2006:381). Working with multiple voices reduced the likelihood of
simply conjuring up meaning and imposing it on phenomena (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000;
Clarke & Hoggett, 2009). Rather, ‘threads’ of meaning were created in the interactions.
between interviewees, their narratives, panel members and their responses, and my own responses.

This kind of open-ended process invited and preserved the complex conditions leading to blowing the whistle. I saw including a panel as part of analysis as a deliberate attempt to address an early concern with the essentialist assumptions being made in whistleblowing literature scholars. Much of the literature put forward essentializing notions, e.g., that behaviour is agency driven rather than a complex product of embodied values and relations:

*We blame* a knowing and intentional agent, but almost always what happens is the result not *just* of a knowing intentional act but of a complex web of causes. (D'Andrade, 1995:405)

Simply using whistleblower narratives in my work might have exacerbated this tendency and led to oversimplifying the influences operating in the whistleblowers’ tales. The “complexities of causality do not respect our human wish for the good to produce good and the bad to produce bad” (ibid.); a mature person can move beyond the point where the world is susceptible to a Manichean splitting, and accept that good and evil often travel together, whether within an individual or an organization (Hoggett, 2006:13)72.

Multivocality, or the multiplicity of frames, is of concern not only to psychosocial inquiry and narrative inquiry, but is central to phronetic inquiry (Flyvbjerg, 2011, 2012). Manipulation of meaning through the manipulation of frame may be seen to control and eliminate dissent. A polyphonic approach that rests on a number of narratives and several interpretations from several sources, changes emergent meanings. It widens the frame

---

72 One psychoanalytic framework (Klein, 1946) posits that identities are fraught with anxiety in either a paranoid/schizoid or a depressive mode. The paranoid/schizoid type reduces anxiety by polarizing everything in their world as *either* good or evil, repressing anomalous data; the more mature depressive type realistically sees everywhere good mixed with bad.
beyond the particular concerns of individual subjects to encompass issues of importance to their various organizations and to the effects their actions have upon the larger social context. Changes in meaning may uncover power vectors, revealing where oppression exists and how it may be remedied.

Using many voices may also contribute to an easing of conscious control of the direction of one’s research. A researcher may share with others the responsibility for seeing the work done. In a dialogic set-up, it is understood that all participants continually respond to what others say. Wherever there is community discussion, it means that “everything adapt[s] to everything ... [and] inevitably and inexorably, the environment is actually going to be in a perpetual state of deep flux” (McSwite, 2009:83). Environmental flux may require changes in method and technique, which, if followed, provide a capacity “to see and express the fundamentally new” (ibid.:84). By eliciting and incorporating a number of voices into both generation and analysis of data, I was ostensibly “making a place for the unconscious” (Romanyshyn, 2010) in my research, allowing space for the opinions, reflections and images of a group of participants to help weave the concepts in the study.

**Sharing: the Dream/Image Reflection Group**

When I first described the misty beginnings of my method, one of my supervisors dubbed it “mytho-poetic analysis of social opinion” or MPASO; later I modified it slightly to “mytho-poetic analysis of social experience” (MPASE), as it was whistleblowers’ experience and, with the addition of the Dream group, the uncensored experience of group members on hearing the whistleblowers’ tales, that would be the source of emergent understandings.

In preparation for the last phase of data collection and the beginning of analysis, I contacted Dr. Howard Book, a professor of psychiatry at the University of Toronto well
versed in Lawrence’s work on Social Dreaming Matrices (SDMs). Dr. Book generously agreed to act as consultant on the dream/image data collection.

I proposed at first a new form of data collection/analysis, loosely based on a Dream Reflection Group (DRG). Lawrence’s Social Dreaming method includes two processes: the SDM, wherein

a large number of people share their dreams, freely associate to them and amplify them, to make links and find connections among the dreams so that thinking is transformed from the social unconscious to consciousness (Sirota, 2012);

and the Dream Reflection Group (DRG), the data analysis panel, where a (smaller) group of participants

identifies the paradoxes, puzzles, challenges, issues and themes made available in the SDM to discern the patterns that connect them ... [which in] illuminating the social cultural political [sic] situation provide working hypotheses (ibid.)

that may help to expose and explain the forces operating in a given situation.

I proposed a variation on Lawrence’s method: not to conduct an SDM as such, but to collect material from my interviewees and present them to a panel using the same response/amplification process as that described for a DRG. As my thesis would be taking a Jungian approach to the question of whistleblower motivation, I anticipated using some dream data. A few of my interviewees related some dreams. Others claimed not to have had any dreams, or not to remember any.

Preliminary reviewing of the interview material identified some quite arresting poetic/metaphorical language. I had, then, a collection of dreaming material and of waking material, both bursting with poetic potential. Struggling with the problem of accessing and fruitfully working with unconscious aspects of whistleblowers’ experiences, I included a
mytho-poetic analysis, not just of my subjects’ dreams, but of their narratives too. The close reading of the narratives I had planned under the narrative inquiry rubric had changed into a different kind of close reading more receptive to the images, feelings and mytho-poetic references triggered by the whistleblowers’ words, whether from waking or dreaming. I wanted the DRG panel to do the same, and so changed the name of the group at that point to a DIRG, a Dream/Image Reflection Group. Participant narratives could then act and be responded to as “an expression of personal autonomy and social solidarity” (Mansbach, 2007:128), reflecting the multi-level quality of Jung’s theorized unconscious realm.

I told Dr. Book of this plan. He said that it sounded like a new way of working. In Lawrence’s original formulation of the Social Dreaming Matrix, people already connected in some way (as members of an organization, a geographic area, etc.) gather together and share their dreams, free associating and amplifying around the dream datas. Through carefully considered arrangements of furniture, lighting and so forth, the ‘dream host’ attempts to reduce conventional cues and provide what can be construed as a loose, almost dream-like environment, designed to “break the [normal] pattern” of communication and “to enable a container for freer thinking” (P. Hoggett, personal communication, 15 March 2012). In Romanyshyn’s process, this creating an atmosphere of “reverie” (2010:292) is the first step in setting the stage.

I envisioned my panel of responders, free associating with the poetic language and imagery content from the whistleblower interviews. Psychosocial research calls the attempt within an interview to bring out and work with unintended metaphor eliciting, where the researcher notices “the interviewee’s use of metaphor and imagery and invite[s] them to explore further” (P. Hoggett, personal communication, 12 January 2012). Rather
than eliciting during the original interviews, I would bring material to the DIRG, inviting them to explore further. The DIRG’s free associative and amplificatory responses to interview material could be seen as providing yet another layer of data for mytho-poetic analysis. Dr. Book pointed out that my plan diverged from Lawrence’s technique not only in using waking material, and in having the DIRG members work with material not of their own ‘creation’, but in that members of my DIRG were not necessarily members of a particular organization. He likened some aspects of what I was planning to the method of a Listening Post (LP), a communication technique where people “reflect upon their experiences in ... various citizen roles in order to identify affective undercurrents thought to be present in the wider society” (Hoggett, 2006:4). In an LP, members “access shared [lived and felt] experiences” (ibid.); DIRG members’ commonality stemmed from the fact that all of us have at one time or another, as had the whistleblowers, experienced instances of injustice and felt some sadness, anger or fear in response. Yet, the DIRG also differed from a Listening Post session in that, again, they were starting from other people’s material which was brought to them, and that this material could include not just waking thought, but dream data. Both SDMs and LP assume that there are “underlying affective and emotional dynamics at work in any given society” (ibid.:5), an assumption which fits well with a Jungian cosmology, and both try to “allow things to emerge so that, having emerged, sense might then be made of them” (ibid.:4). Both techniques also have a number of elements in common: free association; spontaneous response in the here and now rather than interpreting; a clear structure; a facilitator; members and facilitator both participate; and everyone adds whatever they like to the ‘pot’, working together, not hierarchically.

This new MPASE appeared to be tangential to narrative inquiry. As with narrative inquiry, my approach looked as if it aimed at emergent intuition toward a topic, rather than
certainty and theoretical precision, grasping what may be inarticulable yet commonly known (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994). "The results of narrative inquiry are necessarily tentative and in the process of being formed" (Monk, 2007:46).

Stories in my Master's thesis had unfolded without interpretations being imposed on them, and in the telling allowed the "audience to experience ... conflicts, dilemmas, ambiguities ... resistance and change" (He, 1998:217). In this thesis, such tensions form part of the data collection and analysis rather than simply resting in readers' reactions to the finished work.

Dr. Book had said that "neophytes" were preferable to academics or analysts as DIRG members, as they would provide more spontaneous, fresher responses and not answer in ways reflective of Jungian or SDM training or past free associating they might have conducted with patients. Fresh responses might also be more reflective of a wider societal experience of being subject to or witnessing injustice than could be brought out by a dedicated group of analysts. At first, I invited members and students of Toronto's Jungian Analysts' Association to form a group, but as there was no response, I contacted six acquaintances who I thought might be intrigued by this kind of work. Some contacted others who might want to sign on. I sent them all my letter of invitation (Appendix VI), accompanied by an offer to chat over the phone or in person if they had any questions. Two asked for clarification of some of the more academic language. Within a week, one of nine respondees offered to host the group in a neutral space, a house where workshops, seminars, seances, moon lodges and all manner of meetings were held regularly. We selected a day to meet for approximately three hours after lunch. I had made it clear that this was the first time this kind of session had been tried, and that their participation would be extremely valuable in working out how best to conduct it as we went along. Most
attendees offered to bring along food to share — this is normal for the other groups to which some individuals belonged. The six whistleblower interview transcripts were completed, with the generous help of two assistants, two weeks prior to the date of the DIRG.

On the appointed day, I pooled cars with three others and we set out for the venue forty-five minutes distant. The car buzzed with animated chat the whole way. Within five minutes of arriving all but one participant was ready (she had had some car trouble and would arrive a little later), their snacks were assembled on the coffee table in the middle of a good-sized room, and couches and chairs were brought into a circle around it. Altogether seven members participated — six respondees and myself. The room was quiet and cozy, the sunlight pouring in from a large picture window opening onto a view of the lake in the afternoon light. The various kinds of ethnic and ‘new age’ art and artifacts all around gave the setting a very relaxing feel, and because it was right after lunch people were somewhat sleepy. I had planned this timing to allow people to be more open to daydream, to attend to their mind’s eye and to any physical sensations that might arise during the session. It seemed appropriate that this kind of unforced ‘unfolding’ was “at the centre of Jung’s process of active imagination” (Romanyshyn, 2010:296).

Two weeks after the session I first came across Romanyshyn’s work (2010) outlining a research process which encourages the emergence of unconscious material into the consciousness of the researcher. In it he recommends five steps that he contends allow space for the unconscious subjectivity of the researcher, while “reduc[ing] the danger of the work becoming a confession of [the author’s] complexes” (ibid.:285). In almost every detail, it mirrored the DIRG session I had ‘invented’! The first step was to create “a ritual
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space” (ibid.:293) by cultivating a sense of “reverie” (ibid.:292)\(^\text{73}\), by making “gestures of hospitality” in meeting people’s needs, and by acting as witness and scribe, not critic.

I began by reading aloud the DIRG Opening Statement (Appendix VII) that reiterated the topic of my thesis, the process we would be embarking upon, the fact that we were all pioneers in this with an appeal to be patient, and a reassurance that they would be able to access what they had shared after it had been recorded. Romanyshyn terms these second and third steps the “invitation” (ibid.:294) and “waiting with hospitality” (ibid.:295), i.e., resisting impatience with the process. The fourth step, “engaging figures in the work”, consisted in encouraging members to just let themselves see what came into their awareness — images, emotions or thoughts — without judging or controlling. I also elaborated on my path to this work from midwifery, and added a little about each of the whistleblowers, referring to them only by their pseudonyms.

As mentioned above, early on in the planning process I thought using pseudonyms could protect subjects with anonymity, while balancing the twin directions of insider knowledge and multiple voice. I used mythic pseudonyms throughout, and included a pseudonym for my own data, to reduce the DIRG members’ potential tendency to personalize and move back into a more conscious, more alert state upon realizing these were the words of someone they knew, someone in the room. Over time another rationale arose from the methodology itself. Referring to the interviewees by their heroic names appeared to assist whomever was responding to the texts, whether myself or members of the DIRG panel, to be more open to experiencing unexpected emotional undercurrents and to express their more outré ideas and associations freely.

\[^{73}\text{The poet Keats describes ‘reverie’ as “being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason” (Keats, 1891:48).}\]
A series of DIRG members’ statements about the struggle one of my interviewees seemed to be having with ‘his’ masculinity demonstrated the soundness of this consideration. I had interrupted gently to remind participants that all my whistleblower subjects had been given the names of male heroes, although simply because a whistleblower was given a masculine name it did not signify the subject was male. The speaker immediately backed up, and responded in a completely different vein, one that did not rest on assumptions about gender. Just this one incident demonstrated clearly how using a person’s real name would have attached far too much chronological, social and technical specificity to the interviewees’ words, perhaps blocking associations arising from the unconscious that fit into a collective notion of whistleblowing, but not into a set of preconceived ideas about a specific individual.

In preparation I had excerpts from each interview, selecting those dreams and waking material sections which felt significant (Appendix VIII). In selecting certain texts for the group to work with, I was already engaging in an interpretive process, some aspects of which were conscious and some, I could safely assume, were not. Evidence of the latter rested in that when some of these excerpts were read aloud later in front of the group, I was surprised they were included, because I did not recall having chosen them nor of deciding why they ought to be included. During choosing, I had already begun to find strong or repeated image and metaphor material (e.g., the metaphor of the game of baseball came up twice in Odysseus’ dream material) and noted these beginnings of ‘threads’ of meaning. All excerpts were cut into more or less rectangular shapes, and deposited into one of two large bowls, a ‘dreams’ bowl and an ‘images’ bowl.

I began by reading aloud an excerpt from the ‘dream’ bowl. Immediately, each participant shared her response to the piece read, other participants’ responses, or both. Next, I
offered the ‘image’ bowl to a member to choose one at random, and we all shared on this piece. I alternated with excerpts from first one bowl, then the other, making sure everyone chose an excerpt. At one point, I felt perhaps I was controlling the process too much, and in an effort to be more egalitarian, I asked a member to read the chosen excerpt. However, during her time to share, she said “there was nothing to share about it, because reading it stopped the process of being able to hear it and then be aware of arisings as a result, as if a different part of the brain were being utilized”. So I offered to read all of them, explaining that I was truly interested in what they had to say and didn’t want anyone to miss out on being able to share their response. The group laughed and accepted this. It felt like a good solution. Initially, I asked members to share randomly, but I found it too difficult to remember who had and hadn’t shared. So at one point, I got members to take turns going around the circle. Right away a member commented on this, saying when she knew her turn was coming it “put her on the spot”\textsuperscript{74} and made her “mind blank”. A couple of others agreed. I told them I had been trying to make it more systematic so that no one would miss their turn to participate, and appealed to them to help me make sure everybody spoke, because as the afternoon wore on, I was sure I would make mistakes. At this they all promised to help, which they did. From time to time, I would share something if it came up very strongly, but only did this a few times. As each member spoke, I typed notes. After a while, the members slowed their speech down, pausing to allow my typing to keep up with their words. It appeared as though over time, what they were saying became increasingly significant to them, such that they wanted to ensure sufficient time for accurate documenting. After an hour and a half, we broke for fifteen minutes, to snack without being concerned about disturbing the speaker. Then we reformed the circle and completed the session.

\textsuperscript{74} It is intriguing that this member should experience actually being ‘put on the spot’ as \textit{not} being put on the spot. This will be returned to in the amplification analysis chapter.
The range of responses, the tempo, pitch and intensity of accompanying affect varied tremendously between members and with each member over time. I began to hear each one’s personality come out further in the sharings, and as time passed, the mood got looser and looser, more emotional, communicating more outright glee, more mourning. As we got further into the process, the sharings became increasingly characteristic of free association, with less and less interpreting into these arisings. In retrospect, it is possible that I was the one who was doing less interpreting into what they offered. Several of their responses took me completely by surprise, exactly the kind of delighted astonishment which showed either an encounter with ideas new to me, or seeing familiar ideas in surprisingly unfamiliar contexts. This kind of startle occurs when one’s preconceptions are shown to be completely off the mark, or when it is made clear that no one shares one’s own ideas. When engaging in research which is already expected to be highly subjective, this awareness in itself is surprising. Positivist researchers are fond of claiming that qualitative research, especially one employing case study methods, has a bias toward verification of a researcher’s subjective preconceptions, but careful consideration proves this a misunderstanding (Flyvbjerg, 2006, 2011). George and Bennett (2005) offer a template for a preconception falsification experience thus:

When a case study researcher asks a participant “were you thinking X when you did Y,” and gets the answer, “No, I was thinking Z,” then if the researcher had not thought of Z as a causally relevant variable, she may have a new variable demanding to be heard. (2005:20)

This template expresses precisely how many of my whistleblower and DIRG members’ utterances were surprising.

I experienced the deepest sense of wonderment when members brought up images or symbols which were eerily similar to material from excerpts which had not been chosen
Chapter three: Planning the journey

during the DIRG process, or when something someone articulated reappeared in an excerpt which was randomly selected and read later. I found myself getting quite excited at the idea that they were drawing material across time and across individuals, seemingly ‘out of the blue’. Occasionally members disagreed completely with another’s response to an image or dream; these alternatives were accepted easily without any noticeable disruption at all. Perhaps because of the emphasis on letting things just “come up”, no one appeared defensive about their ideas. The spontaneity and the feeling that there was ‘more to this than met the eye’ meant that sharings were not automatically personal nor to be taken personally. Therefore the feeling of being personally threatened and having to defend oneself — the psychosocial notion of the ‘defended’ and anxious subject — was diminished.

Near the three hour mark, there was a consensus to stop, and we put back furniture, packed up and departed quite quickly. I thanked everyone sincerely — they had been so generous in their time and their spontaneity — and assured them that they would have session notes in their emails within a couple of days. Arriving home, I expanded and corrected the notes from the DIRG session, adding additional triggered thoughts about what some of the interview transcripts had said.

Writing: Jacob wrestles with the angel

From then on, I was left to engage in what I discovered Romanyszyn considered his final research step, that of “scholarly amplification” (Romanyszyn, 2010:297), wherein the writer takes the symbols, images and ideas produced, and ‘amplifies’ them, drawing on the literature to support, repeat, resonate and harmonize with the new data. I had already decided not to follow the strict narrative inquiry representation of subjects’ stories, but to
use identified emergent themes to present evidence of arisings from multiple sources. As far as possible, I represented selections from field texts as they had been originally recorded with 'sufficient' context, in order to give the reader a sense of the larger tales in which they were embedded so as contextualize the meanings of these words and detract from what felt like less relevant interpretations.

I reviewed each of the transcripts several times, and the DIRG session notes, marking down where certain themes arose as they occurred to me, taking special care to identify those displaying some sort of 'coincidental', synchronistic external confirmation or repetition. Each symbol or image or rich idea was dealt with, written about extensively and spontaneously, following 'arisings' as they manifested. In this process, I noted the tendency to "[blur] boundaries between inner and outer experiences" (Downs et al., 2002:444), something to be expected when working with archetypology (ibid.) Collected data informed and enhanced all chapters, not just those dealing with post-collection analysis, by clarifying general concepts such as the collective unconscious with specific illustrations.

An intricate web began to form, linking symbols and the written thinking about them as if they were forming 'currents' of meaning at multiple levels simultaneously. Those coming from whistleblowers' tales of their experiences, DIRG members' reveries, and my ruminations on my own dreams and experiences rapidly connected to each other and to what appeared to be emergent issues of concern, opinion and action in organizations and

---

75 In Tantric meditation practice, skilled practitioners experience the "spontaneous [mental] arising" of particular symbols in particular settings. In Tibetan iconography, many of these symbols act as markers of progressive changes in psychic development towards Buddhahood (Namgyal Rinpoche, 1998). For Western practitioners these symbols are not culturally familiar, so encountering them in meditation is a surprise — just as subjects' and DIRG members' completely unexpected responses to questions or texts surprised me, as did identical symbols coming up without a way for one symbolizer to have known of another's similar production. Both experiences demonstrate, not a bias toward verification, but a falsification of preconceived notions (Flyvbjerg, 2011).
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the larger society. Images began to emerge, merge and deepen, less dynamic symbols being replaced with more fully developed images, urging thinking toward a more powerful and pervasive comprehension. Using multiple data sources and multiple methods “help[ed] facilitate deeper understanding” (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006) of the growing array of images. Analogs in other fields of study (e.g., evolutionary psychology, neuroscience, etc.) became evident, providing the work with greater qualitative “confirmability” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985)76 through theoretical triangulation.

As promised, I sent sections of the analysis including their words to my original whistleblower subjects, showing them what had been done with the material they had provided. If they had responded with further ideas and images, these responses would have been worked back into the analysis chapters. Only half of the interviewees acknowledged receipt of the material, and no one elaborated beyond a single request to read the whole thesis when completed. As it was, this final process helped postpone the tendency to jump on meanings, arbitrarily closing off further discussion, what Knights refers to as “inescapably an exercise of power” (1995:235). Inviting participants to participate in enhancing or eliminating data served to suspend, for as long as possible, those aspects of closure in which interpretive authority would be reserved solely for me as author.

This intuitive writing process included “a communal construction of reality” (Kvale, 2002:306). In extending the ‘conversation’ with subjects in sending transcripts and preliminary analyses for review, there was further opportunity to co-create the work. In this back and forth of understanding and questioning of understanding of both conscious and unconscious influences in the work, lay the space for the unconscious material to

76 Following Lincoln and Guba (1985), theory/perspective triangulation, “using multiple theoretical perspectives to examine and interpret the data”, can improve the validity of qualitative research (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006).
emerge and be grappled with by DIRG members, whistleblower subjects and myself as author.

The notion arose to title each section with a stage from the heroic journey, sowing the reader's mind with 'mythic seeds', potential connections between the interviewees', the DIRG members', the author's and the readers' experiences. Each chapter would be framed by a mytho-poetic context, setting the stage so to speak, to coax the reader's imagination to bring images, memories, sensations to the fore — just as the whistleblowers and the DIRG group brought such awarenesses forward during our sessions. In this manner, the reader's process could echo the research process.

As writing progressed, the multiple ways of viewing the data began to converge upon a set of central meanings, which seemed to stretch across and underpin all of the stories and imaginings under consideration. By being open to the creative, intuitive and constructive aspects of the research process itself, and in allowing space for my writing and imaginings to be led by a mytho-poetic muse, I made as conscious as possible those unconscious forces by which all of us were bound to this work. Therein, according to Romanyshyn (2010:297) lies a deeper sense of objectivity, and the larger emancipatory purpose that the work might serve. Just as I had conceived fuzzily at the beginning of the project, and as other scholars are becoming increasingly convinced (Diamond, 1993; Gabriel, 1999; Wertime, 2002; Driver, 2005; Ketola, 2006), comprehending the meaning of social action by bringing "the unconscious ... into [the organizational field] of study" is "a collective necessity of our times" (Elsner, 2009:26).

If researchers hope to unearth unconscious group processes involved in phenomena under study and want to draw from the narratives of research participants for emergent insights, then the following steps of this MPASE method may be replicated in future research:
Chapter three: Planning the journey

1) Definition of the phenomenon of interest;
2) Abductive identification of significant dimensions of variation and their ranges, and selection of participants along these dimensions;
3) Semi-structured interviews of participants eliciting narratives and dreams, audio recordings transcribed, and invitation to participants to suggest additions, deletions, changes after they read their own interview transcript;
4) Selection of DIRG participants, arranging of DIRG session[s] in a welcoming environment conducive to "reverie" (v.s. 112, 116);
5) Selection of interview excerpts per wordings, images that (potentially) trigger meaningful associations in the (DIRG participants and) researcher;
6) DIRG session where each excerpt is read aloud, each DIRG member has the opportunity to free associate with each excerpt, and these associations are recorded by the researcher on site as field notes, adding the researcher’s ex tempore responses to the DIRG members’ words, including “coincidental”, synchronistic external confirmation or repetition (v.s. 119) of themes or images;
7) invitation to DIRG members to suggest additions, deletions or changes to the transcribed DIRG session;
8) researcher's mytho-poetic amplification of significant emergent themes, images, omissions, contradictions, etc. from the interview and DIRG transcripts, noting “convergences” (v.s. 116) of meaning, and possible significance of these for understanding unconscious processes involved in the phenomenon under investigation.

At this point, it is important to explore notions of Jungian archetypes, enhancing comprehension through analogs found in interdisciplinary fields such as evolutionary psychology, sociobiology and psychoneurology. Such an exploration will begin to illustrate the archetypal relationships linking individuals with contexts, conscious experience with unconscious motivation, and moral reasoning with moral perception. Accordingly, the following chapter will discuss aspects of Jung’s archetypology relevant to deepening and clarifying our current understanding of whistleblowing.
Arranging for Guides: Archetypes

In the previous chapter, we considered a new qualitative approach to whistleblowing that might prove fruitful, one relying upon Jungian concepts of the unconscious to appreciate the role that unconscious processes may play in prompting whistleblowing. This chapter begins with an overview of the unconscious aspects of human behaviour, moving then to a focus on defining and exploring certain aspects of Jung's theory of archetypes. By linking Jung's ideas of the collective unconscious as it manifests through archetype with analogous concepts from ethology, sociobiology and neuroscience, we may begin to understand the unconscious mechanisms by which archetypes affect whistleblower resistance.

Then follows an exploration of the function of archetypal symbols in myth, literature and dream, and a newly clarifying archetypal crystallographic typology. A question about the relation between the different archetypes possibly involved in whistleblowing behaviour and their relation to ethical decision-making arises. A pragmatic approach to grasping the concept of Jungian individuation drawing on mathematical modelling of patterns in economic theory, neuropsychological concepts of certainty and philosophical analysis of compassionate empathy is probed. Keeping in mind the moral purpose of Jungian constructs, a discussion of the integral role of moral perception and imagination in whistleblowing behaviour ensues. Lastly, the chapter turns to placing these analyses of whistleblowing empathy, sacrifice and moral motivation in an archetypal context, preparing to explore in more depth several archetypes which might be contributing to whistleblowing behaviour: the Hero, the Seer, the Artist.
Why the unconscious?

Organizational research has acknowledged that the decision to blow the whistle may incorporate both cognitive and affective dimensions (Keenan, 1995; Henik, 2008), which psychoanalytic methods may uncover (e.g., Schwartz, 1987; Kets de Vries, 2001; Gabriel & Carr, 2002; Hart & Brady, 2005). Psychoanalysis, as "a system of interpreting mental phenomena ... as observable outcomes of unconscious processes" (Gabriel, 1999:297), can get 'under' the reasons people may profess for their actions, and reveal deeper, often unconscious meanings.

Some organizational authors (e.g., Wood, 1997a,b) have utilized specific aspects of Jungian analysis, such as referring to mythological archetypes (Schedlitzki, Jarvis & MacInnes, 2014) or amplification of personal narratives (Zanetti, 2002). These techniques require open-ended, less formulaic language and thinking, and may therefore be sufficiently opaque as to allow subjects (and analyst) to speak more freely without worrying about how their responses will be interpreted (Romanyshyn, 2010).

The literature chapter presented studies finding that whistleblowing behaviour was not based on consciously perceiving wrongdoing, nor on a rational cost/benefit analysis, nor necessarily on an intention to whistleblow (Mesmer-Magnus & Viveswaran, 2005). Alford's work (2001, 2007) concluded that the unconscious pathological force of an individual's 'moral narcissism' impelled whistleblowers to act. Alternatively, viewing whistleblowers archetypologically suggests that their actions may result from unconscious struggles toward a state of health at collective levels.

In the opening chapter I recounted feeling as if some kind of unconscious compulsion to speak out was at work, trumping reasoned concern for my own professional and personal well-being. Other whistleblowers reported having had the same feeling (Alford, 2007).
Jung addressed such feelings in considering that arisings from the unconscious felt overpowering because one “cannot grasp, comprehend, dominate them; nor can [one] ... escape from them” (Jung, 1965:36). These experiences and the forces behind them are almost impossible to express in words because they are archetypal, i.e., they do “not in any sense represent things as they are in themselves” (ibid.:347), but they may be suggested by symbols and images that we can perceive, which we may use to communicate these experiences.

There have been numerous attempts to define what Jung meant by archetypes. Jung thought of archetypes as unconscious organizational patterns partially responsible for determining highly probable human responses to life occurrences commonly encountered by individuals from all human groupings (CW VIII 283-342). Organizational theorists have drawn on the notion of archetypes (Bowles, 1989, 1991, 1993; Mitroff, 1983; Gabriel, 1995, 2000; Moxnes, 1999, 2013; Kostera, 2007, 2012; Case, Höpfl & Letiche, 2012; Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2012), understanding archetypes variously as “universal ... hidden images of human motivations” (Ciuk & Kostera, 2010:190), “psychobiological imperatives” (Moxnes, 1999:104), or “universal drives, whose actions are beyond the governance of mere laws or cultural norms” (Matthews, 2002:462). They are the unconscious “creations of the collective mind” (Moxnes, 1999:1440). As such, the “complete set of archetypes” (Mitroff, 1983:392) may be understood as forming the substrate of culture and society (Starr-Glass, 2002; Kostera, 2007), each archetype commanding a “deep cultural significance, profoundly rooted in a wide cultural context” (Ciuk & Kostera, 2010:190).

Archetypes when activated move unseen in the depths of many individuals, disposing them to form groups whose members share common perceptions, and thus common beliefs
and values (ibid.). In describing the dynamics between group and individual roles in organizations, Moxnes (1999) muses that "the group structure reflects the patterning of the human psyche, and ... the human psyche reflects the group structure" (ibid.:1428; also Hart & Brady, 2005), a notion that could also describe the mutually constitutive relationship between archetypes in the individual and in the collective unconscious.

If, as some organizational thinkers propose (Case, Höpfl & Letiche, 2012), work is "the primary mediator of consciousness, [then] it is the belief systems of work and organization which become the primary influences on belief and meaning" (ibid.:6). As archetypes determine how humans perceive the world, comprising the "built-in-machinery for interpreting experience" (Carr, 2002:480), it implies that contemporary organizational beliefs and meanings function as archetypes in determining "ways of apprehending the world" (ibid.). Jung (cf. Mitroff, 1983; Kets de Vries, 1990; Bowles, 1993; Gabriel, 2000; Kostera, 2008; Moxnes, 2013;) conceived of archetypes as empty of detail, "forms without content" (Moxnes, 2013:640), as metaphorical "river-beds along which the currents of psychic life have always flowed" (CW VII 337; also Bowles, 1993). Archetypes may be expressed via a huge diversity of representations according to cultural forms, and may or may not be evident in the lives of individuals or organizations that seem similar on the surface, but "the surface diversity of individual worlds" does not necessarily "detract from the existence of [similar] underlying processes" (Lee, 2005:52). Archetypes do not, therefore, constitute a deterministic world, and do not imply "inherited ideas but of possibilities of ideas"(CW Xi 136; Moxnes, 2013).

Archetypes cannot be directly observed, but are "most easily identified through their mythological representation across diverse cultures" (Bowles, 1990:406; also Mitroff, 1983; Hart & Brady, 2005; Kostera, 2008), the symbols to be found in "stories, myths, and
fairy tales" (Moxnes, 2013:640). Archetypes are dormant until psychic imbalance between expressed/repressed material “reaches a critical threshold” (Moxnes, 2013:640). Operating below rational awareness, they may be involved whenever a person or a group cannot pinpoint why they are experiencing certain desires, or feeling drawn towards certain behaviours. At such a juncture, archetypal activity may be revealed by the emergence into consciousness of “symbolic actions, dreams and images” (ibid.) often highly charged with intense emotions (Starr-Glass, 2002).

Organizational authors have written about the archetypal ‘roles’ of individuals in organizations (Gabriel, 1995; Kets de Vries, 2001; Barton, 2003; Tallman, 2003; Hart & Brady, 2005; Abramson 2007; Kostera, 2008; Rozuel, 2010; Moxnes, 2013) — as Kings, Warriors, Lovers, Magicians, Heroes, Fools and Tricksters — most often as a way to understand effective leadership. The literature also has interpreted the meaning of various archetypal roles as they pertain to positions of varying power within an organization (e.g., a leader, an internal auditor, etc.), within a kind of occupational approach (e.g., entrepreneurial, bureaucratic, etc.), or within an industry (e.g., the military, the medical profession, etc.). Similarly, this work touches upon a selection of various archetypal figures — Tricksters, Heroes, Artists, Seers and Kings, Queens and Princes — and how the influences of these forces may be inferred from the activities of individuals.

It has been standard practice to include argument about the role of class in much organizational literature, e.g., in discussions about bureaucratic and symbolic maintenance of the capitalist class order (Fleming, 2015). For an archetypal analysis, however, this presents an unusual problem. This thesis is not primarily concerned with discerning the particular kinds of archetypal influences at work in various positions, types of

Because my research process unfolded as the study proceeded, according to a Jungian perspective, the study itself could be seen as likely determined in part by the archetypes active in Jung’s analytic process (Papadopoulos, 2006).
organizations or industries. Although this study refers to specific individuals’ activities in organizational contexts — the Heroic archetypes informing individual resistance against questionable organizational practices — it comes to the same conclusion as Bauman (1992), that the effects of individual practice “spill far beyond their ostensible (falsely assumed to be autonomous) sector of application and come into contact with ... [other] equally narrowly-focused [practices]” (ibid.:94). Multiple details of individuals’ practices together have meaningful effects across the organizations in which they are embedded, not only at the level of professions or corporations or governments, but in the frame of whole societies, whole cultures in which these organizations in turn are embedded, up to and including significance across the ‘culture’ of the globalized economy. The thesis also looks not just at small scale families or work organizations as being responsible for generating archetypal constellations, but at societies and the human species as matrices from which archetypes manifest in individuals.

Additionally, this thesis identifies archetypal themes in an effort to understand the unconscious organizational processes underlying whistleblowing by applying a Jungian amplification process to the narratives of whistleblowers, followed by a close reading of the narrative responses of the Dream/Image Response Group (v.s. 121). This emergent, interpretivist approach differs from much of the work of other writers (e.g., Bowles, Kostera, Rozuel, Moxnes.) who interpret the reports of organizational members within the work environment, and then overlay their understanding of how this behaviour might be influenced by archetypal forces.

Archetypes, by their nature are not definable in a positivist, scientific sense (Lee, 2005). However, reasoning “backwards from phenomena” (James, 1906/1955:81), Jung inferred an archetypal realm as physicists infer the sub-atomic realm of quantum physics (Capra,
Both hypothesize the unobserved (archetypes/ sub-atomic particles) by what is observed (patterns of individual and societal conduct/ patterns in particle acceleration chambers), mediated by an overarching construct (a layered unconscious realm/ mathematics). Neither ‘world’ is susceptible to direct ontological verification, but both may contribute pragmatically to a coherent explanation of behaviour in what constitutes the observable world.

Jung described the human psyche as central to our life and to our perception of the external world (CW VIII 270). He said the psyche is composed of two parts, the conscious and the unconscious, the conscious part being the familiar domain of the Ego or Ego-consciousness (CW VIII 321). Freud also posited an unconscious sector in the human psyche, but the Freudian unconscious consisted solely of images, experiences, ideas and memories that had been repressed because they were too anxiety-provoking for an individual’s fragile self-regard (Stevens, 2006). Jung extended Freud’s version of the unconscious in order to explain why so many dream symbols seemed to be universal. Jung added to the unconscious a collective layer. This “phylogenetic layer” (Stevens, 2006:75) encompassed the “entire psychic potential” (ibid.) of the human species, and was expressed through archetypal images. Jung compared the concept of instinct to that of archetype, claiming that the deeper collective unconscious layer is “the source of the instinctual forces of the psyche and of the forms or categories that regulate them, namely the archetypes” (CW VIII 342).

According to Jung, each individual’s personality is a unique variation of unconscious archetypal themes. Jung likened human instincts, as they produce specifically human responses to environmental cues, to archetypes that force individuals into “ways of perception and apprehension [that are] specifically human patterns” (CW VIII 270).
Instincts are designed to eliminate the tension caused by building physico-hormonal imbalances resulting from physical stimuli (Gabriel, 1999) — they are experienced as an “abrupt psychic occurrence, a sort of interruption of the continuity of consciousness” (CW VIII 265). Jung conceptualized archetypes similarly, as operating unconsciously to eliminate the tension caused by building mental and emotional imbalances resulting from psychic stimuli. Things we understand consciously form and direct our voluntary actions; things we apprehend unconsciously form and direct our involuntary perceptions (CW VIII 277).

Historically and collectively, Jung held that archetypal energy had been expressed through religion, but thought that “[the modern] ... Weltanschauung is completely deficient in receptacles for it” (Hannah, 1999:149). As a result, he believed that this energy has fallen into the unconscious “whence [it returns] in archaic and very unacceptable forms” (ibid.). In an individual, when the unconscious begins to ‘thicken’ because more and more material is repressed away from conscious awareness, the contrast between the conscious outer life and the inner unconscious creates a “terrible tension” (ibid.:182) that may result in mental illness. In the collective, the same tension, if not allowed to manifest, can have disastrous consequences on a society-wide scale. Jung felt that this larger scale was a given:

... just as the individual is not merely a unique and separate being, but is also a social being, so the human psyche is not a self-contained and wholly individual phenomenon, but also a collective one. And just as certain social functions or instincts are opposed to the interests of single individuals, so the human psyche exhibits certain functions or tendencies which ... are opposed to individual needs. (CW VII 235)
For example, Jung thought that Europeans had precipitated the first world war by creating an intolerable tension in the unconscious — denying the dark face of the Ares\textsuperscript{78} archetype — with the modern belief that civilized, rational people would never wage war. This psychic imbalance caused the repressed Ares archetype to erupt across Europe. Jung also conjectured that the Third Reich was the result of having repressed the similarly savage aspects of the Teutonic Wotan\textsuperscript{79} archetype, which in its uncontrollable eruption from the unconscious manifested as Nazism (Hannah, 1999:183). In grappling with whistleblowing from an archetypal perspective, this thesis does indeed cast whistleblowing as the uncontrolled eruption into widespread social consciousness of urges and awarenesses repressed by a new capitalist society (Sennett, 2006) that is “deficient in receptacles” (Hannah, 1999:149) for them.

**Analogs to archetypes: ontologic and epistemologic considerations**

Jung’s collective unconscious can be likened to the ethological idea of the set of instinctive “biological imperatives” available to a particular species (Tinbergen, 1951). These imperatives activate in response to certain environmental conditions (Stevens, 1994), producing behaviour within a certain limited range characteristic of that species (Hart & Brady, 2005). In biology (Waddington, 1957) and sociobiology (Lumsden & Wilson, 1981) these response patterns are biologically-based. Archetypes may be similarly conceived of as “universal human hardwired behavioral DNA” (Abramson, 2007:118) — an instinctive human operating system — that affects how people interpret their surround. For each species, the hard-wired limited repertoire of such percepts is built into the central nervous system by evolution, and functions in an individual without conscious awareness

\textsuperscript{78} The dark side of the Greek god Ares, known to Romans as Mars, was as deity of war and conflict; the light side as patron of husbandmen (Bulfinch, 1979).

\textsuperscript{79} The Old High German form of Odin, king of the Norse gods. He represented wisdom bought at a terrific price, and swift (and perhaps terrible) judgment (Bulfinch, 1979).
or volition. According to this way of thinking, “epigenetic rules similar to archetypes ... [control] the psychosocial development of individuals” (Abramson, 2008:119).

Neuroscience suggests how these species-specific responses might work (e.g., Kurzweil, 2012). The human brain is adept at recognizing and organizing patterns hierarchically. As a human goes through life, 300 million neocortical pattern recognizers assign every experience a place in the hierarchy, that, “through repeated exposure ... eventually self-organizes and becomes functional” (ibid.:63). Consequently, some neuro-physiologists contend that consciousness is simply an “emergent property” of a complex physical system (Kurzweil, 2012). The bulk of most brain activity is the unconscious processing of words, faces, meanings, numbers, sounds, emotions, errors and so on. All can cause neural response without emerging into brain areas associated with conscious awareness (The Brain Series, 2012). For example, psychophysical skills are maintained by practice. Practice creates new, more efficient neural connections and activates the striatum, a neural structure not involved with consciousness, but with motor coordination and emotional processing (Mangels, 2003). “[I]t is increasingly clear that [most] of human mental life operates without awareness or intent” (Glaser & Kihlstrom, 2012).

Unconscious control extends beyond physical skill and perception. “Newer research reveals that ...[unconsciously controlled] responses” (Glaser & Kihlstrom, 2012) may be mediated by corrective or compensatory processes which rely on stimuli that may appear and disappear too rapidly for conscious apprehension. Cognitive psychology has gathered a wealth of empirical evidence for the operation of unconscious affect and judgment (Zajonc, 1980; Kihlstrom, Mulvaney, Tobias & Tobis, 2000) and the latest research points

---

80 Cortical processing has been described using the metaphor of an iceberg, where only the tip above water is conscious, and the vast proportion of activity is unconscious (Horizon, 2012; The Brain Series, 2012).
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toward unconscious processes responsible for monitoring and correcting unconsciously controlled activity in the light of unconsciously-held goals and objectives (Glaser & Banaji, 1999). The unconscious mind appears capable of “maintaining unconscious vigilance over its own automatic processes, even going so far as to posit unconscious “self-awareness and metacognition” (Glaser & Kihlstrom, 2012). For those who equate awareness with consciousness, this suggestion is self-contradictory, implying a “volitional nature of the unconscious” (Andersen, Reznik & Glassman, 2012).

This neuropsychological research mirrors the Jungian notion of an underlying archetypal psychic structure, operating constantly in complex ways to guide the individual unconsciously toward goals and objectives, even when these goals are not consciously recognized. However, biology and neuropsychology, in ‘explaining’ psychological facts have dismissed psychological noema (i.e., what is thought about or felt) and proposed more or less content-free neural networks or information processing systems. Apperception has been reduced to perception:

Sense perceptions tell us that something is. But they do not tell us what it is. This is told us not by the process of perception but by the process of apperception, and this has a highly complex structure. (CW VIII 288)

Social science, likewise, in referring to general-purpose neural networks or information processing systems as if their content is not important may not help us to understand behaviour (Pinker, 2002). As with Weber’s notion of verstehen residing in a contextually-conditioned ‘narrative’ (1978), content, that which is being responded to including mental content, is essential for understanding response.

The more recent field of evolutionary psychology does, however, in linking structure with purpose, the functioning of neurobiological structures with Darwinian selection,
recognize the importance of specifying which emotions and which thoughts act as triggers in order to explain why these particular mental phenomena inform characteristic human behaviour patterns. Even when physiologically these thinking or feeling states are indistinguishable, this discipline differentiates between thinking about rocks or about family members, between feeling excitement or fear.

Just as evolutionary psychology insists that understanding comes from contextualizing species-specific behaviour patterns, Jung’s archetypal patterns can only be understood as they emerge in the particular context of the life of an individual or of a group (Hart & Brady, 2005).

The contiguities between Jungian archetypology, neuropsychology and social science may be problematic. In discussions of the unconscious, there may be two distinct reductionist tendencies. One reduction, reflecting the orientation of neuropsychologists, casts the unconscious realm in a naïve realist manner as “computational programmes that are (perhaps only contingently) in the brain or to neuro-physiological networks that are the stuff of the brain” (Moll, 2004:50). The other position, espoused especially by some social scientists (e.g., Lévi-Strauss, 1978; Andersen, Reznick & Glassman, 2012), reduces the unconscious and its contents into hidden aspects of social relations existing in some unknown private manner ‘within’ individuals, thereby “dissolv[ing] them in social relations, or even more specifically, in sociolinguistic relations” (Sève, 1980).

Some see it unnecessary to claim the existence of a collective unconscious, viewing recurrent behavioural patterns as evidence only of “common but socially derived reactions to our human experiences that are really only the product of cumulative, but individual, experience” (Hart & Brady, 2005:425). A similar objection to Jung’s notion of the Self as ‘found’ and not ‘made’ (Zinkin, 2008), is that it does not sufficiently acknowledge the primacy of interactions within social context. The pragmatic approach of this thesis, however, does not seek explanations, nor to determine ‘once and for all’ whether the self is a limited solitary subject, a product of complex relations within social contexts or an emergent product of a complex physiological system. It seeks theoretical constructs which appear to grant significance to observable data, and to enhance other understandings these constructs generate.
It is ontologically reductionist to claim that, since biological processes may produce psychological states — such as the firing tendencies of neurophysiological structures given certain environmental cues (Skinner, 1957) — then those psychological states are biological states. Simply because a psychological state may be brought into being by a physiological mechanism does not imply that the state is therefore also a physiological mechanism. The same goes for social mechanisms. Simply because social relations may be hypothesized as producing a psychological entity does not mean that this psychological entity is, therefore, in some way sociocultural. Both perspectives claim, in what seems to be a nominalist move, that the unconscious is merely a construct in a theoretical system “remov[ing] any substantive requirement for an ontology” (Moll, 2004:75). These two reductions conflate the epistemological and ontological, “which is all very well if one adopts the position that there is no [unconscious realm] as such ... that exists independently of the theories or socially constructed discourses that we use to describe them” (ibid.).

If we understand archetypes and the unconscious ‘existing’ as “emergent propert[ies] of a complex ... system” in the same way as Kurzweil understands that consciousness ‘exists’ (v.s. 134), then “it is no longer necessary or viable to [make an ontological] claim that the archetypes ‘exist’ somewhere, as some kind of structural entity” (Colman, 2006:169). Thinking in this vein positions archetypes as ‘existing’ in a virtual realm of the unconscious, in the same way as data ‘exist’ in cyber space. In this way, archetypes are constructed as features of the psyche, not primary features in the psyche (Saunders & Skar, 2001). Avoiding the necessity to be ontologically or epistemologically certain about the status of archetypes by claiming a ‘virtual’ existence for them does not, however, support a workable conception of how unconscious material might condition or be consequential to an individual’s activity.
Pragmatic ontology and mytho-poetic meaning

If one does want to understand action in terms of the possible unconscious conditions for it, then Jung’s realist stance with respect to the collective unconscious and archetypes (CW VIII and IX), asserting that they exist in the real world independently of what is thought about them, may be more useful. If archetypes only exist insofar as they manifest in individual circumstances, as ‘emergent properties’, then, as every situation is unique, so too every force unconsciously influencing an individual in every particular situation could also be unique. Such infinite complexity would prevent determining generally which traits and aims pertain to which archetype, except so broadly as not to throw much light on particular situations. We cannot rule out that the unconscious is merely a theoretical aspect of physiology, social discourse, or complex systems; nor can we rule out an unconscious psychological reality, one susceptible to mytho-poetic analysis (CW VIII).

In archetypal psychology, the symbols of myth and poetry are thought to be expressions of those organizing principles called archetypes. Traditionally, the characteristics of an archetype are identified by mythological analysis (Campbell, 1949; Neumann, 1974). An archetype’s content is only a potential until “it has become conscious and is therefore filled with the material of conscious experience” (CW IXi 155), and this content manifests in symbols or images. It is common for there to be confusion between the archetype itself and its content, as archetypes are often equated with their symbols or images (Carr, 2002). Dobson (2009) contends that it is this “neglect [of] Jung’s distinction between the archetype and the archetypal image” (ibid.:151) that is responsible for the “misreading” or “unread ing” (ibid.) of Jung as essentialist. Dobson points to the case of the concert pianist, the difference between capacity and realization, in Jung’s defense. All people have some

---

82 E.g., Rozuel calls archetypes “influential symbolic image[s]” (2010:37), confusing archetypes with their representations to the conscious mind.
degree of sensitivity to music and its components — rhythm, pitch, phrasing, dissonance, etc. The fact that only a few become professional musicians who realize these capacities to their highest form does not imply that we don't all have the capacity, merely that it is variously realized in individuals.

Jung’s example of the “Jonah-and-the-whale” archetype helps to explain this difference. Many archetypes are anthropomorphic (e.g., the Mother, the Maiden, the King), but this particular archetype is an abstraction of psychological engulfment, the experience of being devoured, and, as a transformative archetype, it alludes to changes in a state of being. As such it is not representable by a single figure, but by any one of numerous images: the witch fattening Hansel in preparation to eating him (Grimm & Grimm, 1825); the monsters Scylla and Charybdis eating unsuspecting Greek mariners (Bulfinch, 1979); the alien in the 1950’s science fiction film, The Blob (1958).

In the Jungian frame, mythological analysis may shed light on both individual and collective human behaviour (Abramson, 2008). In order to understand human behaviour, it must have meaning (Frankl, 2006; v.s. 77). We can only derive meaning from viewing individual behaviours in the contexts of their occurrence (Weber, 1978). Part of the meaning of behaviour lies in its purpose, and purpose is necessarily linked to context. Meaningfulness in the relationship of an action to its purpose can be contextualized across greater and greater fields, as across the ‘lifetime’ of a nation, a society or the human species. Looking at behaviour through a Jungian archetypological ‘lens’ can import multiple meanings to successively greater layers of significance: from the actions of an individual qua individual, and further as significant to that individual’s family, his
employing organization, local culture, nation, or the entire human species. In this way, Jungian archetypology can prioritize an ethical teleology no matter the level at which analysis is being carried out.

Considering all of the above, a pragmatist in an experimental frame of mind might ask the following kind of question: “Let us, for the moment, suspend disbelief that there is such a thing as an unconscious realm, and suspend our materialist tendency to scoff at the idea of an archetype existing independently of the minds of individuals. Instead let us posit a ‘real’ archetypal realm that can influence individual and societal behaviour. Does such a position reveal new interpretations of what might be happening in the world with respect to whistleblowers and whistleblowing, interpretations that might help us to benefit from the efforts of whistleblowers?”

Such a question leads toward a tentative, open-ended investigation. To dismiss Jung’s archetypological approach with “contempt prior to examination” (Paley, 1794:392), is to insist something be ‘proven’ before it can be considered true. Positivism insists on distinctions between “objectivity and subjectivity, fact and language, knowledge and opinion” (D’Andrade, 1995:402), distinctions not necessarily recognized in other paradigms. Because we are restricted to expressing all our theories and paradigms in language, we are therefore also restricted to representation through duality, in that the word we choose to use necessarily logically excludes an entire range of reality to which it is understood not to refer. Engaging in this “simple and necessary heuristic practice of setting up distinctions in the reasoning process” (Blake, 2006:85) is not necessarily to indulge in the “inherent dangers of dualism” nor to endorse the positivist position, but to attempt to discover meaningful connections in the distinctive ontological status tentatively

83 To look at this nested complex of meaning, is to see meaning replicated at micro- and macrocosmic levels. In the archetypal universe, meaning is ‘fractal’ (v.i. 136), being repeated in detail at various levels of collectivity if one looks closely (or widely) enough.
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granted to the “categories so-defined” (ibid.). All our theories are thereby limited to pragmatist ‘as-if’ descriptions, intended as meaningful versions of the reality we seek to understand. Positivist epistemology argues that a statement not likely to be proven must be treated as false; Popperian positivist epistemology argues that a statement incapable of disproof is false. Pragmatism neither discards nor credits positivism, but suggests that truth rests on utility, rather than proof (v.s. 87). Critical theorists (e.g., Rabinow (1983), Scheper-Hughes (1992), per D’Andrade (1995)) who discard the totality of objectivist science because its truth claims are in part politically determined, “problematize the objective, the universal and the categorical and ... think away everything intransitive [sic] ... [such as] the intransitive or universal dimension of the unconscious” (Blake, 2006:92). This extreme critical rubric may ignore all available evidence, even that which “is very likely to be connected in a causal way from a commonsense point of view” (D’Andrade, 1995:403). Pragmatism also considers this view erroneous, as it may discourage potentially useful concepts for having failed to satisfy theoretical, and therefore acontextual, conditions.

Jung himself endorsed using a pragmatic approach, the ‘as-if’ perspective, in order to avoid thinking reductionistically about the unconscious:

because a systematic study of the world [and the psyche] is beyond our powers, we have to content ourselves with mere rules of thumb and with aspects that particularly interest us. (CW VIII 283)

and

If we assume that there is anything at all beyond our sense-perception, then we are entitled to speak of psychic elements whose existence is only indirectly accessible to us ... It is not directly accessible to observation — otherwise it would not be unconscious — but can only be inferred. Our inferences can never go beyond: “it is as if”. (CW VIII 295)\(^4\)

\(^4\) Jung was careful to go to great lengths to justify his ontological position with respect to the unconscious, as if positivist science were based on something more than “antecedent rationalism, [that] ... actually presupposes metaphysics” (Siu, 1957:38). Jung’s position is as justifiable as that of relying on positivist
The pragmatic perspective allows for 'incommensurable' paradigms considered together to yield new insights, ideas which 'triangulate' in their intuited meaningfulness across paradigms. Rather than discarding the totality of one paradigm because of personal preferences for the functional metaphors guiding another, one may put valuable but necessarily different kinds of conclusions 'side by side' with those from another paradigm as "an interlocking series of explanatory metaphors" (D'Andrade, 1995:404).

Pragmatism, in prioritizing ethical teleology over both ontology and epistemology, aids in moving understanding beyond the mires of paradox. Neurophysiological research indicates paradoxically that there is some kind of awareness of which the individual is not aware (Hassin, Uleman & Bargh, 2005; Moxnes, 2013). It is an 'unconscious' awareness that actively monitors and corrects for unconscious activity which might, if it rose to consciousness, endanger achieving certain conscious goals and objectives. Jung’s realist convictions about the collective unconscious and the archetypes are similarly paradoxical. There is a logical contradiction in the notion that the collective unconscious must enjoy consciousness-independent existence — that is, the collective unconscious and its archetypal components exist free of content, until such time as they become activated into consciousness by an individual’s encounter with empirical fact (CW VII 300). In assuming that the unconscious and the archetypes exist independently of consciousness, Jung makes a fundamental distinction between ontology and epistemology, a distinction which does not necessarily present a problem if one is willing to entertain a pragmatist construct of truth, which is that something is construed as true if it leads to the good (James, 1906/1955; v.s. 87).

probability which "depends more on the evidence in the possession of the observer than on a property of the object under consideration" (Siu, ibid).
Arche-types

Archetypology traditionally divides archetypes into those dwelling in the personal unconscious and those originating from the collective unconscious (Shelburne, 1988). However, archetypes associated with individuals can also be understood to function in groups of people. Jung himself did not distinguish personal from collective archetypes, but discerned between ‘eternal’ natural and ‘living’ cultural symbols (Jung, 1964). He understood natural symbols to have sprung directly from nature, to be “rooted” (Nouriana, 2011:20) in archetypal images and to be deeply seated in the unconscious; cultural symbols developed over time as various civilizations changed the nature of human consciousness, expressing ‘eternal truths’ despite changing in form (ibid.). Jung’s two categories have become increasingly muddied, as man’s presence has permeated into every natural dimension.85

I propose three dimensions of archetypal categorization: processual archetypes (PAs); culturally iconic versions of panhuman types (IAs); and ‘family groups’ of IAs across certain characteristic aspects (IAGs).

Processual archetypes are polar, and are to be found within and across all culturally iconic manifestations. PAs would include, e.g., the Shadow/Ego, the Ego/Self, or the Animus/Anima (CW IXii 13-67). Jung ascribes to these polarized archetypes the mechanisms of the relationship between an individual and the working of emotions and imagination in that individual, or, alternatively, similar unconscious motivating drives working in all kinds of human groupings, whether a ‘group’ of one individual or the group of all members of the human species.

85 E.g., Jung would have termed the ocean a natural symbol. Because of current global concerns about greenhouse gases and pollution from offshore drilling accidents, this natural symbol carries cultural dimensions and understandings which are neither universal or eternal.
For example, the Shadow describes that oppositional aspect of any archetype which is hidden, or destructive, or repressed — its dark aspect \((CW\text{ IXii }13-19)\). A King archetype may appear in his positive aspect as inspiring and virtuous — the Good King (think here of Solomon the Wise, \(1\text{ Kings }3:9-12\) or King Arthur)) — or he may manifest as the Good King’s Shadow, the corrupted King (think here of Herod the child-slayer, \(Matthew\text{ 2:16,}\) or Arthur as cuckold). In a corrupt society, the PA’s positive aspect may be repressed; under the Third Reich the Shadow of the King was the Good King, and the Shadowed Healer under the Inquisition practised compassionate folk medicine in the community clandestinely. The characterization of a PA is context-dependent, being determined by the poles, or dualisms, in a given context. There may be further polarization of each aspect into active or passive: the Dark King may be a tyrant (active) or a weakling (passive) \((\text{Dobson, 2009)}\); the Light Healer may intervene with medication (active) or not interfere with a painful healing process (passive). If an Ego can bring both aspects of an archetype to consciousness by admitting and integrating awareness of their influence — what Jung calls the “individuation” process \((\text{Jung, 1928)}\) — mental and spiritual health ensue. On the other hand, “[a]n Ego that does not properly access an archetype will be possessed by that archetype’s shadow and left oscillating between the shadow’s two poles” \((\text{Moore & Gillette, 1992:28)}\).

The IAs are context-independent, and therefore found cross-culturally. A king is a King, and a seer is a Seer, whether benevolent or malevolent, and whether their activities are supported or repressed. IAs are permeated by the processual archetypes; the direction of an IA’s energy is modified through the processual archetypes.

In using the axial system of crystals to explain archetypal activity, Jung’s work \((CW\text{ IXi)}\) supports the PA/IA distinction. All crystals of a particular mineral are structured in a
certain characteristic pattern, like the cubes of salt crystals, while each individual crystal is unique. The IA is analogous to the organizing principle which causes a dissolved mineral to crystallize in a characteristic manner. The trait of optical rotation (the turning of linearly polarized light in a characteristic direction as it passes through a substance in response to different environmental factors) found in many crystals, may be thought of as analogous to a PA. For example, the simple sugars, dextrose and fructose, are structurally identical yet asymmetrical such that they turn light to the right and to the left respectively. This simple variation causes organisms to process these substances differently. Just so, IAs exhibit the polarities of PAs; the Greek god-king, Zeus, can behave lovingly toward his son Hercules, or despotically, abandoning his light side to lust in the rape of Leda (Guirand, 1968); Jehovah can be merciful, feeding the Israelites manna in the desert (Exodus 16:14), or the wrathful Shadow that murders the innocent firstborn of all Egyptians (Exodus 12:29).

IAs can also be grouped expediently into similar ‘families’ (IAGs). Just as some crystals are grouped into ‘families’ by geometry and optical properties (e.g., rubies and snowflakes are ‘related’, as they both form hexagonal crystal structures), so too may IAs share trait ‘kinship’. Such similarity amongst members of IAGs might more easily allow one operating archetype to activate another, related, archetype.

To illustrate, let us engage in a brief archetypological analysis of the whistleblowing process. On the surface, a whistleblower may be a Messenger, one of the aspects of the Greek god Hermes. However, Hermes was also a Trickster god. By going beyond merely reporting in attempting to change practice, a whistleblower takes on the mantle of the Warrior, and perhaps in so doing engages this Trickster side of Hermes. The Trickster archetype is “synonymous with collective shadow ... being sly, mischievous and able to change shape ... an “emblem of pagan wantonness” (Casement, 2006:107). Western
Christian culture has repressed the Trickster, so popular in ancient cultures, into the unconscious as the collective Shadow of ‘civilized’ human beings (ibid.). It may be whistleblowers are often seen as disloyal (Bok, 1980; Hersh, 2002) because people in authority are unconsciously sensitive to the disruptive Trickster side of these Messengers. His repressed Trickster aspect even causes trouble for the whistleblower, misleading him into expecting immediate and reasonable responses to his reports, not retaliation (Henik, 2008). Hermes ‘sets the whistleblower up’ to reveal and resist the full spectrum of the wrongdoing occurring in his organization. This archetypal manipulation of the whistleblower may explain why whistleblowers start off as system sympathetic Messengers “devoted to their work and organisations ... until ... asked to violate their own ethical standards” (Hersh, 2002:249), becoming Warriors only after experiencing reprisals (De Maria & Jan, 1997). The impetus to bring that organization back into some kind of moral balance seems to originate from the archetypal realm where deception unravels, and the Trickster constellates. Otherwise, even though he does not know this at the outset, the whistleblower’s reports are pointless — as Messenger he is the Seer whose visions people deny, and who then may silence him to bolster this denial (Campbell, 1988). In this situation, the King (contained in the organization’s ethical codes of conduct), the Messenger/Seer, and the Warrior may be seen as members of the same IAG: each is concerned with the welfare of common folk; each deals with truth and social reality and how they are to be interpreted and acted upon. One small but potent detail, the organization’s choice to retaliate rather than address the wrongdoing, causes the Messenger to change into his kin, the Warrior.

86 This can be seen as the Seer’s dark aspect. The light aspect is represented in the tale of The Emperor’s New Clothes (Andersen, 1837), where a young boy acts as Seer. He still reports what society does not want to admit, but by virtue of his innocence and lack of a hidden agenda, society can accept his truthfulness and stop engaging in collective delusion.
This movement from one archetype to another within an archetypal family, the IAG, image to image, may be achieved through condensation, defined as “an unconscious process whereby several images may overlap or combine to form a new image which combines the symbolic associations present in all the other images” (Gabriel, 1999:291). In this study, amplification of the whistleblower interviews and the DIRG responses may clarify whether whistleblowers are beginning to condense into a new archetype in response to a novel human situation, or whether what is driving whistleblowing is the movement between archetypes within an IAG.

It was on the basis of dream analysis, where dreams function “invariably ... to express something that the ego does not know and does not understand” (CW XVII 189), that Jung hypothesized that the individual human psyche includes a collective unconscious. He considered dreams the ‘purest’ form of the unconscious accessible to conscious awareness, reasoning that because volitional consciousness does not design dream content, it must come, therefore, directly from the unconscious (CW VII 210).

Lawrence’s social dreaming model (1998, 2003) also contends that dreams represent unconscious aspects of a common reality. If dream content is unconsciously determined by cultural belief systems (Lawrence, 2003), then examining dream content may assist in making shared waking experiences meaningful. Jung considered patterns of behaviour represented by myths and iconographies to be archetypically determined (Stevens, 2006). As records of collective dreaming (Armstrong, 1998), myths and the like are primary sources for archetypal images corresponding to the symbolic images found in dreams (Carr, 2002; Rozuel, 2010).

When we look at fairy tales, myths, legends, folk tales, literature and poetry, often their archetypal images communicate a moral lesson. Archetypes’ primary function is to present
human ethical problems and solutions for consideration (Papadopoulos, 2006; Rozuel, 2010; Bortz, 2011). Personified as characters or embodied as human traits, archetypal images always suggest types in general (the good father, the evil stepmother, the innocent youth, the conniving courtier, etc.), who do not need the specifics of "true to life" individuals to be meaningful. The metaphor and images of mytho-poetic language suggest meaning obliquely (Siu, 1957), as do the sensual associations linked to the verse, the melody, the rhythm of the words.

In Jung’s analytic psychology, as opposed to Freud's, unconscious material need not be toxic. Jung was always concerned to make his method contribute to individual and social development (Dobson, 2009) by bringing about a healing reconciliation between conscious material and material repressed into the unconscious. It is how much material is repressed and how this material comes to be expressed, to travel from the unconscious to the conscious as it were, which determines whether it is beneficial or dangerous. The notion of archetypes being potentially beneficial and/or harmful derives from Jung’s dualist vision of all archetypes containing both light and dark aspects (Neumann, 1974; Matthews, 2002). This means that archetypes are capable of uniting opposites within themselves\(^7\) (Colman, 2006), permitting their imprint upon persons or groups to be flexible, open-ended, and to evolve over time. Jung believed that, in part, the individual and societal purpose of the collective unconscious was realized through dreams, which served as vehicles to bring those unconscious forces which conflict with conscious forces into balance. Working with dreams could create an awareness of the archetypes, allowing conscious integration of helpful features of both light and dark aspects.

\(^7\) Both sides of an archetype may be activated, depending upon circumstances and the individual. E.g., the hero’s concern to protect a victim may unite with an anti-hero’s disdain for authority to produce the persistent whistleblower.
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**Chaos, certainty and whistleblower ‘choice’**

Jung conceptualized mytho-poetic analysis as potentially capable of benefitting individuals and collectives simultaneously, because it could show how archetypes work at multiple levels simultaneously (Lee, 2005). Any changes in the world involve a staggering number of interacting factors, as there are “a great many independent variables ... interacting with each other in a great many ways” (Sardar & Abrams, 1999:82). On close inspection, there may appear to be nothing but specific indeterminacies and chaotic details. However, somehow when viewed from afar as parts of a greater whole, groups of such details seem to display an observable, determined order in the patterns of their interactions. Within the chaos of seemingly random changes at a micro-level, order may be found at meso- and macro-levels. Working on equations in economics, Mandelbrot (1982) produced special patterns he called fractals. He found that, if the economy were viewed as one whole system, patterns of tiny random changes in a subsystem produced identical large-scale changes: “curves for daily and monthly price changes were perfectly matched ... over sixty years” (Sardar & Abrams:29). Fractals are replicable at an infinity of scales, patterns which are self-similar viewed from far or near. “Self-similarity implies that any subsystem of a fractal system is equivalent to the whole system” (Sardar & Abrams, 1999:35). Theoretically there is never ‘fuzziness’ regardless of scale, because the level at which the pattern may be viewed is arbitrary, extending to infinity in both directions (Mandelbrot, 1967). Fractals are analogous in this way to archetypes, as they also constellate in the same form at any level, in individuals or human collectivities, despite a chaotic diversity of detail within each level (a person, a company, a nation, the species). Even though the archetype is generally ordered and universally self-similar
across levels, within each level it is activated by highly specific and, therefore, chaotic components.

The Jungian archetype of the Self provides an illustration. In order to speak about what is ‘human’ meaningfully, there must be a common stratum of species-specific capacities found to varying degrees in all human individuals. One example is a ‘sense of self’ (Colman, 2006). We all develop some kind of implicit understanding of what this ‘self’ is as apart from our sensations, impressions, thoughts and memories (notwithstanding the fact that this understanding may be erroneous), which means that the ‘self’ is understood as a kind of permeating organizational principle that organizes chaotic content into meaningful patternings. To reduce ‘self’ to a random assortment of sensations, impressions, thoughts or memories is to render the concept of ‘self’ meaningless. The ‘self’ does not consist in the content, but neither can it be said to exist without it.

Jung’s archetypal Self is the archetype of the wholeness of this organizing principle. Jung’s concept is close to the concept of self in Eastern mystic traditions, that refer to “the ‘suprapersonal’ or ‘supraordinate’ centre of the personality” (Colman, 2006:155).

Since the Self is symbolic of both “the unity of the personality as a whole” (CW VI 789) and the total of all man’s conscious and unconscious contents (Colman, 2006), it may be fractal, incorporating chaotic elements in an overall organized pattern.

The concept of a psyche that is simultaneously random and ordered may also help to explain archetypal activity in moral choice, such as those facing would-be whistleblowers. If the teleology of archetypes is ethical, then archetypal activity could explain “existential moments” (Burton, 2008:7), when suddenly “an abrupt psychic … interruption” (CW VIII

---

88 E.g., as found in the Vedic writings (Swami Nikhilananda, 1975) of Hinduism, or in Zen Buddhist philosophy (Kitaro, 1958).
265, v.s. 132) makes "formerly satisfactory feelings of purpose and meaning no longer 'feel right'" (Burton, 2008:7). Such feelings are not modifiable by reason. The uncomfortable feeling that something is wrong occurs generally before one recognizes the source of these feelings. When we know something is wrong, the tendency is to "search through reasons until there [is] something measurable" that explains the feeling (ibid.:19). Conversely, when we know with a fierce certainty that something is right, we must also seek why we feel this way. For instance, some mathematicians "simply know" that a complex theorem is false/true and go on to prove it later (ibid:67).

Feelings of conviction, of knowing that one is right, arise seemingly independently of thought, but then must be attached to particular thoughts. As such, feelings of conviction are neither conscious nor deliberate choices, but "mental sensations (emergent phenomena) that happen to us" (Burton, 2008:218). The process of reasoning in preparation for making a decision can only be terminated by a feeling of knowing, an emotional 'arrival' at a sense of completeness. Whether arriving at a decision individually or in a group, people will talk "in circles" until arbitrarily deciding that an idea is finished, a decision is to be made, the "point at which we are societally conditioned to feel comfortable quitting thinking" (Hoggett, 2006:6). This closure precludes a potential infinity of new ideas.

A closure can occur at an individual level, or societal. For example, most contemporary Westerners are "societally conditioned" (ibid.) to attach the idea of 'happiness' to consumerism (Berman, 2006), accepting a closure of the 'search for meaning' in life in relation to material goods and security. People may choose to embrace this arbitrary closure by 'disowning' its limitations, that is, forgetting or refusing to think about their

---

89 The feeling of knowing may have evolved to end indecision, the end point of an unconscious process that brings endless ruminating to a halt (Burton, 2008).
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own feelings of discontent beyond “materialistic and narcissistic” (Wong, 2009) measures. This requires denying aspects of themselves which do not fit within the generally accepted aspirations of their society, including conflicts of conscience.

Whistleblowers challenge the unconscious repression of others who “overlook contradictions or problematic aspects of ... norms” (Kenny, 2014:5) that “they find disagreeable or know to be incorrect” (ibid.). The more “‘passionate’ the unconscious attachment to organizational norms “that can potentially cause ... injury” (ibid.) (i.e., injurious because, in the light of day, they are clearly unethical), the stronger the tendency to repress awareness of these conflicts. This is especially true when the repression of ‘the knowledge of good and evil’ is normative not only within the organization, but also within the larger societal context within which the organization functions. What results, then, is the strengthening of the Shadow at the organizational and the societal level.

Whistleblowing and the retaliation it engenders appear at least predictable, if not strictly necessary, within the contemporary neo-liberal, capitalist context. As evidenced by the widening gap between rich and poor not seen since the early 1900’s (vanden Heuvel & Raskin, 2012), and the historically unprecedented global concentration of wealth90 (Vitali, Glattfelder & Battiston, 2011), the

... spread of zealotry for the democratic franchise has been matched by the decline of independent labour. The free democratic “people” are in fact a great huddling mass of wage labourers, utterly beholden to paymasters. This inverse relationship between the growth of dream democracy as a euphoric public philosophy and the reality of an ever-increasing loss of true economic independence is surely bizarre. (Gairdner, 2001:59)

---

90 Mathematical modeling of the web of ownership relations in 43,060 publicly traded transnational corporations (Vitali, Glattfelder and Battiston, 2011) finds a concentration of economic power amongst “a tightly-knit” core of 147 corporations”. Three-quarters are financial intermediaries who played major roles in the 2008 financial crisis (e.g., Bank of America, Bear Sterns, Citigroup, Credit Suisse, Deutschebank, Goldman Sachs, Lehman Brothers, et al.)
Originally, the civic ideal of individual autonomy required that, to be fully human, a man could never be politically, economically or religiously dependent upon another individual, and had only to answer to “God, the law, and his conscience, but not much else” (ibid.:56). This notion was based on a Lockean conception of man’s “yearnings ... [being] good in themselves ... to be repressed by the person or restrained or filtered by society or government” (Gairdner, 2001:53) as minimally as possible. In the neoliberal version of this Enlightenment credo, the corporate elite of modern representational democracies claim that market forces — understood as a higher order manifestation of individual desires — may be trusted to secure ‘the good’ for citizenry. Masked by a rhetoric of ‘democracy’, ‘liberty’, ‘freedom’ and equality’ for the Enlightenment’s autonomous individual, contemporary reliance upon abstracted individual rights, as articulated by Constitutions or Charters of Rights and interpreted by an appointed judiciary, fails to take into consideration the real constraints placed upon those freedoms by the sociopolitical contexts in which these individuals exist. Such claims promote oligarchic power in a society “increasingly controlled from the top down, through a judicial activism ... that resembles more than ever ... [Plato’s] republic ruled by unelected judges” (Gairdner, 2001:34).

Many analysts (e.g., Layton, 2004; Frankl, 2006) believe that responding with denial to a morally corrupt and disturbing environment (Frankl, 2006) may appear ‘rational’, but is often so anxiety-producing that it becomes pathogenic. Jung warned that when archetypal patterns are “violated, profoundly negative psychological consequences ... result” (Abramson, 2007:115) that may produce destructive compulsions. Frankl (2006) contends that a person can cope with his unease by deliberately divorcing his self-image from the world’s moral inconsistencies, and consciously choosing to behave in a way which is morally congruent with his convictions. This study contends that a whistleblower splits his
self-image in just this fashion, but that further, he is responding not only to personally thwarted ethical convictions, but to the “negative psychological consequences” (ibid.) of ethical repression occurring across the organizations and the society in which he must function.

Many whistleblowers (Alford, 2007; Odysseus and Meleager, 2012) readily acknowledge that they acted in response to strong feelings of conviction, but they might argue against a rationalist process having allowed them to speak out despite social cues not to do so. They report feelings of knowing coming up strongly as an intense dis-ease, which then became attached to a clear awareness of specific wrongdoing harming people who needed protecting. Despite some research claiming the contrary (de Graaf, 2010), my interviewees and I did not recall any “long and hard ... process of deciding to report” (ibid.:770). Our experience was such that there was “no deciding” (Johnson, 2003:48) — a “choiceless choice” (Alford, 2007) indeed.

If, as some authors (Burton, 2008; Maxwell, 2008) contend, the distress experienced by those who “find themselves doing things that don’t fit with what they know” (Burton, 2008:12) or believe is not subject to rational choice, and if this feeling of knowing can arise in the absence of any specific explanatory knowledge (ibid.:21), then it makes more sense to see such distress as the result of an unconscious process than of a simple rational disjuncture. In this frame, the whistleblower’s experience of the feeling of knowing may be so strong that it is experienced as a type of seizure (ibid.:24) — irresistible and impervious to reason. Such an experience harkens again to Jung’s idea of an “abrupt” psychic “interruption” (CW VIII 265; v.s. 132, 150), that he ascribes to the “eruption” of an archetype from the unconscious.
As an individual matures, their feeling of knowing what is right in a given situation may change. Their moral certainty may fluctuate in response to random alterations of specifics in the environment. Where morality is endlessly variable, as it is in the complexities of human life, a Jungian would aver that it is the unconscious activity of archetypes that keeps individual and groups modifying their conceptions of what constitutes ethical and unethical behaviour in each new circumstance. Jung called this unconscious archetypal activity *enantiodromia*, "the emergence of the unconscious opposite in the course of time" ([CW VI 709](#)), occurring whenever there is an extreme one-sided tendency dominating conscious life. Such lack of balance is due to powerful repression, which over time, is countered by an equally powerful countertendency for expression, eventually reaching the point where sufficient tension builds up so repressed material breaks through conscious control (Mehrtens, 2012).

For both Jung and Frankl, good mental health requires the creation of satisfactory meaning systems (Wong, 2009). Jung’s position goes beyond Frankl’s logotherapeutic rationality in holding that it is more than an external social reality that needs addressing. In positing an autonomous unconscious archetypal reality, distress may only be alleviated by going through the painful process of individuation, integrating the “dark side of the self” in order to achieve that sense of wholeness (Wong, 2009), a process which, as it creates new systems of meaning, may incidentally create new individual patterns of behaviour.

**Individuation, uncertainty and wholeness**

Individuation requires two changes: the first, to divest oneself of the “false wrappings of the persona” ([CW VII 269](#)), consciously coming to terms with who one truly is, rather than who one thinks one is seen as; the second, to explore the unconscious fully, in order to
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make “explicit what implicitly one already is ... overcoming the divisions imposed by the parental and cultural milieu” (Stevens, 1994:83), and, instead of only seeing one’s Shadow projected onto others, accepting and integrating the shadow side of the Self (Rozuel, 2010).

Jung thought, therefore, that individuation could free an individual from knee-jerk reactions in lockstep with local morés (CW X 843-844), releasing him to act on his personal conscience (CW X 856-857). Jung believed that these changes would produce a state of wholeness balanced across all oppositions — the individual and the collective, the masculine and feminine, inner and outer, the similar and the different (Downs et al., 2002).

Many myths and fairy tales, such as the tale of Snow White, present versions of this balancing process (Ketola, 2006). Snow White is one-sided, a weak Persona, her evil Stepmother is the Shadow, and the seven dwarfs represent the conscious Ego, digging industriously to produce ‘gems’ from the ‘mine’ of the unconscious. The dwarves prepare the Persona, preserving her in the glass coffin in the forest, to be assisted in her struggle to integrate her Shadow by a stronger Ego, the courageous prince. He awakens Snow White’s Persona with a kiss (a strengthening and bringing-into-consciousness through love), allowing her to emerge into her queenhood. As bride-queen she is her whole Self, her Shadows’s energy complementing her Persona’s sweetness.

The process of individuation, the bringing-to-consciousness of the Shadow, begins with an awareness of one’s negative aspects (Hannah, 1999:146) that may create “genuine fear of what lies in the depths” (Colman, 2006:102). Confronting one’s Shadow may demand acknowledgment of forbidden feelings of lust, rage or greed. Facing and embracing one’s Shadow — ‘romancing’ the Shadow (Zweig and Wolf, 1997) — is an arduous process demanding more than reason (Colman, 2006). Reasoning one’s way through this process
would probably mean involuntarily repressing unwanted aspects back into the unconscious, and integration would be infinitely elusive. In contrast, individuated action emerges from the centre of the whole Self, “a point midway between the conscious and unconscious, ... a new centering of the total personality” (Colman, 2006:156). A person who has confronted and come to grips with his Shadow, consciously recognizes the force of an archetypal arising, and has the capacity to implement coping strategies that avoid self-destruction.

In the unindividuated person who still sees himself through the lens of his particular cultural context, the demands of moral autonomy remain in the unconscious. However, it may be that archetypes are constellating not in response to an individual’s own psychic tension, but to that of a group to which he belongs. This group may be functioning in “basic assumption mode” (Gabriel, 1999:291), reacting to “overpowering emotions and shared delusions” (ibid.) that obscure alternative, healthier sets of responses. In blowing the whistle, an individual may be acting upon an unconscious, uncontrollable archetypal response to the group’s repressed knowledge. It may even be that the society itself is so distorted by having repressed too much, having created a kind of society-wide psychic dissonance, that in response archetypal eruption also begins to occur society-wide. This may explain why we are currently witnessing an increasing incidence of whistleblowing globally (Monk et al., 2015).

**Decision-making, moral empathy, imagination and artistry**

In this way, it may be that whistleblowers are thrust into action by ‘transpersonal’ forces erupting from the collective unconscious, and not by personal value systems at all. “Company m[e]n” (Crane & Matten, 2013), who abide by the rules of their organization, raise no one’s hackles. Whistleblowers do not appear to be company men, but perhaps are
fueled by principle-driven conviction, the kind of conviction that comes to prominence when “fundamental values of society are ... challenged” (ibid.) by organizational practice that deviates significantly from the “wider moral values which society deems appropriate” (ibid.). Studies have failed to find that whistleblowers acting on principle have been specially inculcated with religious or ethical value sets by reason of childhood training (Barnett et al., 1996; Rothschild & Miethe, 1999; Henik, 2008). However, from a Jungian perspective whistleblowing, rather than arising from overt ethical training, may result from more of a peculiar sensitivity to the promptings of the archetypal Self in the collective unconscious, a push to discard social moral conditioning and act toward improving health for humanity.91

Whistleblowing may be construed as one subset of the larger set of behaviours resulting from ethical decision-making. Moral reasoning, the making of benefit/cost analyses or logical analysis of ethical problems, does not appear to be a condition of whistleblowing — in fact, very often the opposite, as most non-reporters do not speak out because of potential threats to their own well-being (v.s 62).

Moral behaviour does not rest just on reason (Henik, 2008). There is a big difference between knowing what is right and doing what is right; this is a fundamental assumption of our legal system. Some theorists break moral decision-making into components of which reason is only one. Rest’s (1986) model has four components: awareness, judgment, intent and behaviour. The first two are informed by reason, in that the ‘decider’

91 At this point one may ask where moral behaviour originates in order to begin to understand why some individuals act on behalf of others to their own detriment. Work examining the ‘poverty of the moral stimulus’ (e.g., Mikhail, 2008) holds that absorbing moral rules and imitating the moral behaviour of others cannot possibly account for moral decision-making in all the situational variations encountered in a human life. Some of this work suggests explanations similar in several directions to Jung’s notion of archetypal activity. E.g., Flanagan and Williams’ (2010) “modularity of morals hypothesis” (2010:430), proposes that neurologic ‘modules’, brain structures ‘programmed’ by evolution — producing “evolutionarily ancient, fast-acting, automatic reactions to particular sociomoral experiences” (ibid.:430) — are responsible for moral competence. It is, however, beyond the scope of this thesis to explore these models further.
Chapter four: Arranging for guides

refers to some kind of independent philosophical moral framework in order to judge whether and how seriously a specific situation is unethical, but moral behaviour only occurs when during the third step, there arises the prioritizing of moral considerations above other considerations. This marks the point where an altruistic attitude must take effect, or else other considerations — conformity, ‘looking after number one’, etc. — will take priority. Most empirical research has been carried out on the component of judgment (Craft, 2013), in whistleblowing studies that centre around professed intent, not action (v.s. 57-58), and studies relating whistleblowing to codes of ethics (Mathews, 1987; Moore & McAuliffe, 2010) in organizations.

In an effort to discover what prompts action to benefit others, altruistic intent has been correlated with measures of “moral intensity” (Jones, 1991): the magnitude of the consequences of (not) acting ethically; social consensus as to the moral status of behaviour; the likelihood of the act occurring and of benefitting/harming those involved; temporal immediacy; proximity92; and concentration of effect, which is defined as the impact on those directly involved (Craft, 2013:223). Work based on these dimensions (Loe, Ferrell & Mansfield, 2000; Watley & May, 2004; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005) found perceived magnitude and social consensus to take priority, i.e., how seriously others would be affected by (not) acting ethically, and what others in the ‘social group’ would think about this action.

What is not often discussed in research on measures of “moral intensity”, although it is relevant, is at which level a particular condition is affecting the decision to act (un)ethically. For example, is the measure of social consensus based upon agreement among one’s colleagues, or agreement among the members of one’s extended family, or

92 This is defined as “the feeling of immediacy to those involved” (Craft, 2013: 221). This is almost identical to one of the measures used to select my whistleblower subjects, the degree of closeness to the victim(s) of wrongdoing (v.s. 83).
among local citizens in general? The same may be asked about “magnitude of consequences” (Jones, 1991). These questions lead us to consider the notion of empathy, where compassionate responses widen beyond an individual’s immediate family or friends.

Maxwell, in his work on compassionate empathy (2008) in professional practice, critiques Kohlberg’s notion of “cognitive affective parallelism” (ibid.:96), which assumes that reasoning varies directly with motivation. Maxwell claims that moral cognition is not correlated with moral behaviour (citing, e.g., Colby & Damon, 1992). It is a moralistic fallacy, he asserts, to assume that cognition is enough, as if moral ‘action’ takes care of itself, somehow springing directly from a reasoned description of the nature of the world. He claims that although moral cognition is essential to professional practice, moral reasoning ability is neither sufficient nor necessary to produce moral behaviour (Maxwell, 2008:3). Maxwell talks about moral affect, moral perception, and, most cogently as we shall see later for this thesis, moral imagination. He suggests that the greater the number of individuals with whom an individual can identify sufficiently to spur him into action, the “more moral” he is. Maxwell’s idea, then, is that morality varies directly with perception, not just in detecting when something is ethically awry in a given situation, but also with insight into others’ internal states. An individual with a highly developed moral imagination may not only see what the other person must be feeling, but is capable of imagining exquisitely what it would feel like to be in that person’s place. This insight into the other’s experience is what determines compassionate empathy; feeling with the other. Perhaps this imaginative capacity for compassionate empathy informs research (Bierly, & Charette, 2009) which finds that creativity may actually generate ethical behaviour. Such clear imaginings give rise to intense moral affect, where love for another may be as that...
for oneself, and it is this empathy that produces the altruistic attitude. The more intense this capacity for insight, the greater the motivation it may produce (Maxwell, 2008:67).

Maxwell contends that the moral force of empathy comes from a ‘there but for the grace of God go I’ consciousness. Whistleblowers’ characterization as not having “a universal morality in the modern sense of a Kantian or utilitarian ideal, but a moral sensitivity that is peculiarly individual” (Grant, 2002:396), may be due to a deep identification with the experience of another person that diminishes the impact of impersonal, reasoned appraisals of their position. The empathy coming from such a sensitivity is truly not self-regarding (I only do this because it might happen to me, reasonably), but other-regarding because the sense of commonality with others refers to a general condition of existence, not a specific congruity of situation and consequences. Maxwell enlarges on this idea: “if a person ... feel[s] compassionate empathy [it] demonstrates .. that he or she has grasped the fundamental moral notion that others’ needs are normative — that they make categorical demands on one’s attentions” (2008:95). Others’ normative needs may require personal sacrifice.

Sacrifice is not a suffering that one chooses oneself, nor is it a ‘convenient suffering’ in which the terminus is controlled by the ‘sacrificee’. Sacrifice is not a great striving or even a substantial discomfort. It is in some way ‘entering a hell not of one’s own making’, and returning from it, fully chastened, fully focused, fully devoted. No more, no less. (Estes, 1992: 510)

James (1891/2011) would argue with Estes, saying that to act morally, to have that wisdom which “use[s] expertise in service of a transpersonal good, a value or idea that transcends mere ego gratification” (Dobson, 2009:155), one needs to cultivate a “strenuous mood” (James, 1891/2011:105). This mood is the antithesis of an “easy-going mood” (ibid.:104), the ‘non-responder’s’ mood of indifference and passivity. The
strenuous mood makes one care, about one’s self, one’s family, the wider community and may even extend beyond the temporal limits of one’s life to caring about members of potential communities of the future. Such a mood rests on identification with a wide range of others, both present and future.

In contrast with Grant’s contention that whistleblowers do not ascribe to a moral universality, but are instead peculiarly sensitive to the moral requirements of individuals in specific circumstances, some (e.g., Jos et al., 1989) have thought that whistleblowers tend to be universal moralists, not relativists and, therefore, not consequentialists except in the broadest possible sense of consequences for all people. James’ notion of heightened sympathies allowing for an appreciation and respect of the experience of others (Browning, 1980) corresponds precisely to Maxwell’s ideas about the effect of a highly developed moral imagination producing an attitude of altruism. James’ ‘strenuous mood’ conjoins moral perception, the noticing of violation of moral rules in given situations, with moral imagination, the capacity for a wider range of identification with persons brought on by highly developed insight. Caring about many ‘others’ is not necessarily due to universalist deontological ethics, but combines universality with a particularity which recognizes the needs of individuals, even many potential individuals.

Insight into another’s experiences, imagined so intensely that it produces actions to benefit the other even at one’s own expense, is not something that is the product of a conscious choice. It is rather the result of involuntary, and therefore, unconsciously determined, processes. Campbell describes the altruist as metaphorically inhabiting a different region of the “geography of the psyche”:

Some people are living on the level of the sex organs, and that’s all they’re living for ...This is Freud’s philosophy, is it not? Then ... the Adlerian philosophy of the will to power, that all of life is centered on obstructions and overcoming the obstructions. ...a perfectly good life ... [but] they are
on the animal level. Then there comes another kind of life, which involves
giving oneself to others one way or another. This is the one that’s
symbolized in the opening of the heart. (1988:214)

This ‘opening of the heart’ may be catalyzed by archetypes such as those of saintliness
(Grant, 2002) or heroism (Glazer & Glazer, 1989). In order to develop, the Self needs
opportunities where “conflicts of duty” occur, where obedience and conformity to social
norms come into stark contrast with the ethical demands of the “inner voice, a Vox Dei
whose authority lies in its unconscious character” (Rozuel, 2010:37-38). In order for
altruistic empathy to “violate” (Campbell, 1988) conventional morality, it cannot be
restrained by cultural habit. During moral crises, the Self can “[tap] into the vast,
unconscious archetypal reservoir to provide a creative solution to the moral dilemma”
(Rozuel, 2010:38). Beyond the limits of average moral imagination, such a solution can
strengthen linkages between the collective morality of humankind and the “deepest
foundations of the [individual] personality ... [and] its wholeness” (CW X 856).

However, as with everything in a Jungian formulation, conscience is also dual. It may be
false or misleading at times (CW X) and a person must rely on an internal sense, a ‘feeling
of knowing’ (v.s. 151) that one is doing the right thing. Since Jung believed that the
teleology of individuation is above all ethical, serving to reconnect the individual with our
collective moral heritage, for a person’s confidence in his sense of knowing to be justified,
he must have engaged in the process of individuation (CW X 843-844) and become fully
cognizant of lower and higher motives, of both sides of his character. Despite being aware
of his selfish motives and the shadow side of his character, such an individual is able to act
on the understanding that being vigilant about the dark side allows him to steer away from
it. Being aware of one’s failings while acting on one’s strengths, seeing the light and the
dark aspects simultaneously, means accepting the paradox of ‘both/and’ as opposed to
‘either/or’. Attending to the Shadow and the Ego, sin as well as goodness, promotes
wholeness by abandoning denial and acknowledging that there is both good and evil, strength and weakness, within each person and within the community. James calls those who have the capacity to see in this multiple way “sick souls”, sickened by Zerrissenheit (“torn-to-pieces-hood”) (Browning, 1980:134), plagued by the constant awareness of the evil entwined with goodness. Their vision switches back and forth, from the sense of tragic failure to that of the possibility of transcending it. Individuation requires embracing this soul sickness, and becoming willing to entertain the ongoing vision of how everything and everyone participates in multiple levels of meaning at one time.

In heeding the imperative of the unconscious to allow the Shadow to surface, the whistleblower may experience “a transformation or enlargement of consciousness, which no longer resembles that of his fellow men” (CW VII 243), and become alienated from them in the doing. In this way the whistleblower is the Seer who points out what no one wants to know, the Messenger, ostracized for the content of his message.

What kind of force might determine a quality of moral imagination sufficiently intense to knock down cultural boundaries? At this juncture I would introduce another archetypal candidate to the list of those possibly responsible for initiating whistleblowing. Love gained from an extraordinarily intimate view of the heart of the stranger ‘other’ may violate culturally approved boundaries of loyalty to one’s company, one’s family, one’s nation. Such an extraordinary imagination may derive from the vision of the archetypal Artist. It is the Artist’s perception conjoined with imagination that produces an enlarged consciousness, one that demands expressive action and creates great art.

In unravelling what Jung meant by people being brought to destructive or constructive actions by archetypal activity, and in looking at concepts analogous to archetypes in other disciplines, we have explored the capacity of archetypology to explain in a large sense
why individuals might blow the whistle and yet jeopardize their own position. In the next chapter we will turn to a closer examination of those archetypes, which may push the witness of wrongdoing to blow the whistle. We have touched on notions of whistleblowers as heroes, as tricksters, as warriors, as seers, as saints, as artists. In order to determine which archetype(s) might be responsible for whistleblowing behaviour, we need to examine in closer detail some of the mythical and metaphorical characteristics of the various archetypes we have encountered. In discerning the contradictions they represent, we may better accommodate rather than resolve the paradoxes they present that “challenge the often taken-for-granted Black and White” (Schedlitzki et al., 2014) solutions of ethical problems.
Being Introduced to Nemesis: Heroes

Love responsibility. Say: It is my duty, and mine alone, to save the earth. If it is not saved, then I alone am to blame. Love each man according to his contribution in the struggle. Do not seek friends; seek comrades-in-arms. (Kazantzakis, 1923/2012)

We have established that the Jungian notion of archetype may be useful in illuminating some aspects of whistleblowing behaviour. In the discussions above, several potentially relevant archetypes — heroes, tricksters, warriors, seers, saints, artists — have been considered that could be involved with unconscious conditions prompting whistleblowing. In this chapter, we will concentrate upon the Hero, as it has been the archetype most often associated with whistleblowers in organizational research (Hersh, 2002; Hillon, Smith & Isaacs, 2005; Crane & Matten 2013). Following the Hero on his Quest will show that intended beneficiaries of actions are central to the meaning of heroism, morality, and of whistleblowing.

Neuroscientific evidence for physiological bases for courage, altruism and moral development will be linked to understandings of altruism and empathy in evolutionary and positive psychology, showing parallels to Jung’s ‘schematic’ of the layered unconscious. An analysis of the Western preference for rationalist models of morality, found in consequentialist, deontological/Kantian and virtue ethics, across historical epochs will clarify certain paradoxes and confusions in contemporary theorizing about whistleblowing.

The introduction of two faces of the archetypal Hero, the Jacobean and the Heraclean, will mark the start point of a preliminary mytho-poetic analysis of social constructions of heroism in ancient, medieval, industrialized and post-industrialized society, and in
domestic, public and military arenas. Aspects of these archetypes will be linked to the intellectual and moral traditions of their cultural contexts, suggesting that contemporary Western organizations (and current research) are unconsciously conditioned by the repressed dimensions of both heroic types. The Hero will be shown as a paradoxical expression/negation of the Enlightenment ideals of rationality and action. Component aspects of the Hero archetype — light and dark aspects, masculine and feminine dimensions, and the Hero’s task as a boon and a curse — when subjected to Jungian amplification will help to unravel areas of contention, such as the relationship between whistleblowing ‘success’ and rationality. The impact of changing cultural constructions of notions of love, empathy, leadership and ‘knighthood’ as it pertains to whistleblowing will begin to solidify. Finally, the Hero archetype in relation to other archetypes — the Trickster, the Great Mother and the Father — will be explored, uncovering the root of a Hero’s masculinity as embraced in the Holy Dyad of Mother/Son.

Classical courage

Heroic characters who act morally in the face of difficulty and dire consequence form a part of the myths and stories of all nations and times. The Greeks spoke of Heracles and his twelve labours, Homer wrote of kings and heroes in his epics the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and the ancient Hebrews recorded the exploits of Joshua (*Joshua* 6) and King David (*I Samuel* 17). There also have been many who were persecuted for speaking truth — Cassandra of the *Iliad* (Graves, 1958), Daniel in the lion’s den (*Daniel* 6:12-24) — or for helping others — Prometheus, who brought fire to humans and was eternally punished by the Greek gods (Graves, 1958), and, of course, Christ. We have seen that whistleblowers, acting against evil with heroic speech, generally are not leaders or Kings, but usually Knights in the service of the governing elite, or perhaps Seers attempting to
guide royal decisions. As Seers, whistleblowers announce the truth, and are retaliated against since “organizations in general can't bear truth tellers, those who dare ‘to bring the outside in’” (Abraham, 2004). Because the whistleblowing process comprises actions and reactions that go beyond telling the truth, the Seer aspect of whistleblowing behaviour is subsumed by the archetypal Hero.

Classically after initial reluctance, the Hero is drawn onto a quest to improve the lot of others (Maricopa, 1999). Potential beneficiaries are relative strangers — e.g., Perseus rescues Andromeda from the sea monster that threatens the citizens of Ethiopia (Guirand, 1968). The Quest usually consists of several phases: the call and its refusal, then the departure and training, initiation, ordeal and return (Campbell, 1949; Kesson, 2003; Hart, 2005).

Often when the call is given, the future hero refuses to heed it ... from a sense of duty or obligation, fear, insecurity, a sense of inadequacy, or any of a range of reasons that work to hold the person in his or her current circumstances. (Hillon et al., 2005:18)

Once the Hero has endured tests to sharpen his courage, he is on his own undergoing a transformation, one that requires him to act morally by drawing on other qualities such as compassion, and overcome certain flaws, such as lust:

the challenges increase in difficulty and the hero must rely on his own sense of judgment and the advice of mentors to pass these tests. Eventually, the hero must face the greatest challenge of the journey, alone. The challenge is so great that ... it is possible for him to be beaten. (ibid.)

The archetypal Hero’s empathy and courage spur him into ‘right action’ on behalf of others, especially in the face of overwhelming odds or at a personal cost. Once he has survived the “Dark Night” of the Soul (Underhill, 1960:382,384), fighting its terrors and being transformed by them, the Hero returns to the world of Light. He comes to
understand both worlds, and is able to guide others. There is always, however, the possibility of the Hero’s failure, or that his new knowledge will be rejected (Hillon et al., 2005).

Moral behaviour has long been of interest to developmental psychologists (eg., Piaget, 1932; Kohlberg, 1975), whose theories divide morality into categories based on increasing conceptual complexity. These theorists claim that moral maturity varies directly with rationality. Those engaging in moral reasoning employ “deontic choices” (Krebs & Denton, 2005:631) to decide what constitutes moral behaviour in a given situation, who is responsible to enact this behaviour, and if necessary “muster the wherewithal to carry it out” (ibid.). Of these three steps, the last, “muster[ing] the wherewithal”, finding the courage, is not a rational process. Courage is comprised of attributes such as valor, perseverance, optimism and compassion. Psychologists have divided courage into: physical courage, a development of andreia, the military courage of the ancient Greek soldier; vital courage, persevering with dignity through disease or disability (Snyder and Lopez, 2009:224); moral courage, resisting injustice by maintaining integrity in “service for the common good” (ibid.); and civil courage, a sub-category of moral courage, defined as “brave behavior accompanied by anger and indignation that intends to enforce societal and ethical norms without considering one’s own social cost” (Greitemeyer, Osswald, Fischer & Frey, 2007:115). Given the phenomenon of ‘choiceless choice’ (v.s. 74, 154), many whistleblowers have civil courage, as they appear to act without considering the cost. It may be that it is the inner Hero of moral or civic courage, whose sense of moral obligation is accompanied by selflessness, that determines whether an individual blows the whistle or not.
We have already considered theorizing in other disciplines that posits innate mechanisms responsible for human behaviour (v.s 133-136), and we shall seek similar understandings of the moral courage of whistleblowing.

**Altruism and morality**

Altruism, behaviour for the benefit of others, if conceptualized as a universal and innate human mechanism, is supported by thinking about possible neurological bases of morality in evolutionary psychology (e.g., Buss, 2005; Flanagan & Williams, 2010), and notions of courage in positive psychology (e.g., Piliavin & Charng, 1990; Batson, Ahmad & Lishner, 2009).

‘Pure’ altruism by definition cannot be driven by self-interest or egotism (Batson et al., 2009), but derives from that which positive psychology calls empathy, defined as “the capacity to form internal simulations of another’s bodily or mental states” (Snyder and Lopez, 2009:272). ‘Pure’ altruism exists only theoretically, since any ‘internal simulations’ of another’s mental states cannot help but draw upon one’s own, if in differing proportions. Positive psychology has also called altruism a capacity for “tenderheartedness” (Batson, 1991); Chögyam Trungpa, a Tibetan lama, in examining the vajrayana Buddhist archetypal version of the Hero (1988), repeatedly refers to the “tender heart” of the spiritual warrior (ibid.:45), a heart open enough to its own vulnerability that it can identify deeply with the vulnerability of others. The warrior

... would like to spill [his] heart’s blood, give [his] blood to others. For the warrior, this experience of sad and tender heart is what gives birth to fearlessness. (ibid.:49)

Altruism is not simply a matter of pleasurable preference. Neurological evidence suggests that humans are ‘hard-wired’ to tune in to each other. The posterior superior temporal
cortex functions to create “awareness of other people’s emotional states” (Maté, 2008:391), lighting up

as a person performs an altruistic act ... not the [same] circuitry activated by pleasure or by the anticipation of reward. (ibid., italics mine)

Empathy has also been associated with the so-called ‘mirror neurons’ in the prefrontal and parietal cortices (Damasio, 2002), that fire identically whether an animal is performing an act or witnessing another animal doing the same (Winerman, 2005). Krebs (2005) maintains, as does Maxwell (v.s. 160-161), that the more sophisticated the cognitive capacity to empathize, the more highly developed the moral sense. Krebs suggests four levels of moral judgment: the lowest supports the continued existence and reproductive capacity of the single individual; the next sustains the individual’s nuclear and extended family (or tribe); the third protects the individual’s community/nation/society; the highest level promotes the good of all humanity. Krebs’ ‘hierarchy’ of moral concern is analogous to Jung’s layered cosmology of the unconscious (fig. 1).

**fig. 1** Jung’s Layers of the Unconscious
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Key to Diagram

A. Individual (highest point)  E. Large Group (eg., Europe)
B. Family                    F. Primeval Ancestors
C. Clan                       G. Animal ancestors
D. Nation                     H. Central Fire

(Adapted from Hannah, 1999:17)

The personal unconscious is embedded in deeper and wider levels of the collective unconscious: the family, the clan, the national, the societal, and the realm of the primeval ancestors.\(^9\) In this formulation, the deeper the unconscious level, the fewer the individuals who are conceived of as separable, as 'other'.

As well as particular brain structures involved in altruistic behaviour, neurological evidence indicates cortical processing specifically dedicated to altruistic mental content:

... functional magnetic resonance imaging ... indicates that people process information about personal moral dilemmas ... differently ... from ... impersonal moral dilemmas ... People are more emotionally engaged by personal moral dilemmas ... activat[ing] different areas of the brain and evok[ing] different kinds of moral judgments. (Krebs & Denton, 2005:638-639)

Rational explanations of moral actions are tied to, e.g., determining whether it is safe to proceed, or whether it will pay off. To comprehend whistleblowing in a Jungian fashion that takes into account something like Kreb's moral 'hierarchy', we must look beyond much whistleblower research which has examined whistleblowing in relation to dimensions such as legal protection (Watnick, 2007; Lewis, 2011) and financial incentives (Dworkin, 2007; Lipman, 2012).

\(^9\) Hannah's diagram includes one more unconscious collectivity and the 'central fire', but discussion in the thesis only deals with the six human levels.
Meaning, intent and success

A common research approach to understanding whistleblowing reaches conclusions about employee reports of intentions to whistleblow (e.g., Björkelo et al., 2010; Seifert et al., 2010), by analyzing hypothetical responses to imaginary vignettes (e.g., Henik, 2008; Ab Ghani et al., 2011). Limitations of such studies (v.s. 57-60) include the distortions inherent in subjects responding rationally to these scenarios divorced from any personal investment or responsibility, and in being predicated upon self-reports (ibid.). These studies cannot account for the different neurophysiological mechanisms responding to differing contexts of altruistic action: the organizational ‘culture’ and the position in it from which a whistleblower resists, the gravity of the wrongdoing witnessed, how personally the whistleblower is involved with the transgression being reported — all of which engage the brain differently (Mate, 2008).

Apparently for whistleblowers the need to ‘do right’ trumps the desire for material gain and, even more fundamentally, deprioritizes rationality as a behavioural determinant. Successfully or unsuccessfully, by definition, heroes act courageously when there is a recognition of possible failure:

Dispositional psychological courage is ... choosing to act in spite of potential negative consequences in an effort to obtain the ‘good’ for self or others, recognizing that this perceived good may not be realized. (O’Byrne, Lopez & Petersen, 2000:6)

Whistleblower literature that leans toward consequentialism (Mitchell, 1981; Glazer and Glazer, 1989) in denying whistleblowers heroic status if their resistance fails, and in labelling irrational those who know they will probably fail but persist regardless, stresses the negative outcomes of whistleblowing. Some work (Alford, 2001) even impugns the credibility of whistleblower claims by judging unsuccessful efforts to be delusional. The
psychoanalytic imputation of 'narcissism' to the whistleblower (ibid.) is connected to a putative cost-benefit analysis; if the cost of blowing the whistle is less than the "shared penalty of keeping silent" then the whistleblower is indulging in a type of "self-aggrandizement" (Barash 2008); if the cost to the hero is greater than the benefit to individuals in society, or if his efforts do not produce the change for which he fights, then he is considered irrational.94

In contemporary society the potential self-sacrifice, which in part defines heroism, is considered beside the point, unless there is a guarantee of success. Without success, his actions are meaningless, since it is in success that the meaning of contemporary heroism rests:

...the true moral to [the whistleblower's] story ... is that her act has no meaning ... because true vindication — the little gal took on the big organization and won — is unlikely ever to come. (Abraham, 2004)

According to this line of thinking, somehow magically, the whistleblower is supposed to be able to calculate the success of his efforts in advance. Others (e.g., Frankl, 2006; Grayling, 2007; Wong, 2009), however, aver that the meaning of moral action does not depend upon success. Just as experiencing empathy for others has moral worth independent of its practical consequences (Maxwell, 2008; v.s. 160-161), so are a hero's actions meaningful by virtue of the suffering of others on whose behalf he acts: "they must not lose hope but keep courage in the certainty that the hopelessness of [the] struggle does not detract from its dignity and its meaning" (Frankl, 2006:83). Grayling (2007) avoids resorting to a consequentialist construction of rationality by linking meaning with effort, combining the classical notion of virtue with the Enlightenment ideal of active

---

94 This last point is congruent with the categorical imperative of Kant (1797/1996). Not blowing the whistle "hurts the rest of us while making a mockery of society itself" (Barash, 2008), but Kant's position contends that where sympathy is not instrumental in producing an effective solution, it has no rational ground and is, therefore, superfluous (1797/1996:82).
participation. He interprets heroic motivation in an Aristotelian manner, where an individual manifests excellence by living "the life best worth living ... the informed life, the considered life, the responsible life, the chosen life" (ibid.:172). Striving toward this life is the basis of morality, "for it is the endeavour itself which is the greatest part of the good" (ibid.).

This point, that the value of whistleblowing depends not upon eventual success, but upon the meaning of striving which it enacts, is supported by studies (Miceli, Dozier, & Near, 1991; Ab Ghani et al., 2011) that find no relationship between intent to blow the whistle and what the literature terms "internal locus of control" (Ab Ghani et al., 2011). ‘Internal locus of control’ is defined as the degree to which an individual perceives that he has the power to change a situation. The lack of correlation of this construct to whistleblowing intent is interesting; by extension, if whether an individual blows the whistle is unconnected to his understanding of his capability to affect a situation, then his decision to whistleblow cannot stem from any calculation of success. This belies the claim that whistleblowing intent is based on reason, because, if one sees that one has no power to change things and one’s wellbeing is threatened by taking action to effect such change, then it is not reasonable to resist. Further, this seems to indicate that meaning itself is not necessarily rational, in whole or in part, but may rest in non-rational dimensions — and Jung would agree. Looking through a Jungian frame where Shadows are the result of repression and there are light and shadow aspects to all facets of unconscious motivation, it only makes sense to try to see beyond the rationalist preoccupation with guaranteed success.
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‘Geasa’

In Celtic and Gaelic mythologies, as well as in Teutonic, Greek and Judeo-Christian traditions, the Hero’s experience of an irresistible compulsion is central to the stories. In the Gaelic tradition, these compulsions were called geasa. They were inviolable obligations or prohibitions imposed upon individuals by a magical spell or oath (MacKillop, 1998). When burdened by a geas, the Hero is simultaneously at the mercy of and aided by divine will; it is paradoxical as he is both cursed and gifted. He is assisted by the deity under whose protection and within whose jurisdiction the task or quest is undertaken. For example, the Greek goddess Athena guides Perseus in beheading Medusa (Guirand, 1968) by lending him Hermes’ magical sandals that allow the wearer to fly, and suggests he use a mirror to slay Medusa so as not to be turned to stone by the Gorgon’s direct gaze. A divine geas not only forces the Hero to fulfill the task, but constrains him as to how he is permitted to do so. If the constraints are broken, the Hero fails and suffers horribly. In the Thracian myth, the poet-hero Orpheus is granted permission by Persephone and Hades himself to retrieve his beloved wife Euridyce from the underworld and return alive, on condition that he not look back when leaving; in the Bible, Lot and his family are allowed to leave the destruction of Sodom under the same restrictions. Orpheus and Lot’s wife break the taboos; Orpheus is torn apart by Maenads (ibid.); Lot’s wife is turned into a pillar of salt (Genesis 19:17,26).

On the other hand, completing a geas may bring power, or luck. For example, someone might receive a vision of the Hero’s death — again we have the Seer intimately connected with the Hero — allowing him to avoid it. Often it is women, goddesses or royalty in disguise, who place geasa upon men (MacKillop, 1998), and often it is women who are responsible for determining whether these geasa manifest as curses or boons. The Iliad's
Agamemnon, heroic king of the victorious Mycenaean Greeks, was promised a death “neither on land nor in water, neither naked nor clothed, neither inside nor outside the house” (Parker, Mills & Stanton, 2007:183). His Trojan captive, the oracle Cassandra, saw the prophetic geas as a curse and foretold the doom of Agamenon’s entire family. However, Agamemnon thought the prophecy declared him immune to accidental death, and ignored Cassandra’s warnings. Agamemnon was murdered by his wife, Clytemnestra, in revenge for having sacrificed their daughter, Iphigenia, to secure a victory against the Trojans. The prophecy was one of doom: he was murdered in the bathhouse attached to the palace wall, with a net thrown over him while he had one foot in the bath and one on the ground. Shakespeare’s Macbeth makes the same kind of prideful mistake on being told that “no man of woman born shall harm Macbeth” (IV: i) (Craig, 1919). Macduff qualifies to murder Macbeth as a cesarean birth, “from his mother's womb untimely ripp'd” (V: viii) (ibid.).

Heroes’ miserable fates are often the result of multiple, mutually exclusive geasa. In the continuation of the Agamemnon story, Agamemnon’s son Orestes is told he must kill his father or become an exile and a leper, or kill his mother and be hounded by the “the Furies who torment the mind of criminals” (Parker et al., 2007:184). Whistleblowers are Oresteian Heroes, suffering from conflicting loyalties. On witnessing wrongdoing, they may either blow the whistle, being disloyal to their organization and suffering retaliation and its consequences, or keep their counsel, thereafter to be “tormented” by guilt, especially if they continue to witness unwitting victims being harmed.

Heroes in history

Whistleblowing may be understood as the arising of an archetypal heroic moral impulse, which has been repressed since the beginnings of the huge social changes wrought by the
Industrial Revolution in the mid-nineteenth century. The Enlightenment view of man as defined by his faculty of reason lay in high contrast with the former medievalist view of the cosmos as being one of good vs. evil, wherein each individual needs to align himself with one or the other (Grayling, 2007; Neiman, 2008). Devoted to understanding how mankind fits into the world, Enlightenment explorer-scientists had to begin by discarding most Church teachings as either in error or irrelevant to the matter at hand. This strategy maintained the closest approximation to a truly open mind they could create, a *tabula rasa*. With the ever-present threat of eternal damnation, and the prospect of excommunication and execution for heresy (Bristow, 2010), publicizing their thinking in new scientific directions demanded heroic courage (*Wired UK*, 2012). In its new methods, Enlightenment thinking demanded that reason, founded on sensation, was to provide all data worth recalling, and in this way was to shed all the encumbrances of centuries of prejudice and ignorance (Gairdner, 2008). The default preconception was that anything discarded as a matter of faith would be rediscovered as relevant data to an impartial observer (ibid.). Limitations to scientific method with which we are familiar, to do with *a priori* restrictions of the scope of investigation due to theoretical, political or financial influences on research, would not have been recognizable then. Insofar as “being able to calculate the best means to achieve your ends is the *first* step toward rationality” (Neiman, 2008:185), the Enlightenment Hero would aim to see clearly, and then manipulate his behaviour to achieve those better ends he had imagined.

Framing the problems of moral behaviour in rationalist terms has a long Western tradition. In the tale of Jacob and Esau (*Genesis 27*), Jacob, cleverer than his brother and therefore the better man to inherit power, took a rational approach to the problem of primogeniture, discarding the dogma of birthright and substituting an instrumental solution — elevating
the better equipped man to lead the Israelites. Seen thus, the ascendancy of Jacob is analogous to the ascendancy of Enlightenment method over medieval dogma.

Two hundred years or so later came the sudden unmanageability of the Industrial Revolution’s onslaught of materialism, coupled with Darwin’s fatal blow to the Manichean medieval universe. Originally “one of the most thoroughly spiritual of civilizations” (Gairdner, 2001:110), post-medieval Western civilization had been founded on ideals of personal freedom, self-restraint and limited government. The “liberal history lesson” (ibid.:109) taught that all these achievements came from a victorious struggle of the light of reason against the dark of ignorance. However, during the 19th century, this civilization was duped, by being “deluded ... into believing that [its citizens] behave only in the name of pure reason” (ibid.:110).

In the name of Reason, classical heroism had to be repressed.95 Another hundred years, and successful C.E.O.’s of Wall Street culture were considered heroic, despite being dishonest, “deriding the ‘commons’... and denying ... that they [were] capable of doing wrong” (Ho, 2010). In the aftermath of 2008 bailouts, media rhetoric portrayed Wall Street winners as greedy and corrupt. However, there have as yet been no strong measures put in place to prevent the recurrence of the financial crisis (Knights & McCabe, 2015). Despite public condemnation, by allowing Wall Street to continue business as usual without effective constraint, an implied support is being expressed, a support that might be understood as a sotto voce popular expression of admiration for those whose success is evidence of the ‘right stuff’.

95 In the 20th century, the classical heroic might be understood as re-emerging during labour unionization. However, this constituted a ‘false start’, since the union movement was co-opted, becoming indistinguishable from management in all but discourse. However, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to explore this further.
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Mythological traditions to various degrees have archetypes that stretch the notion of heroism to include a type of smart-at-any-cost self-seeking Hero. In the Judeo-Christian mythos, it is ‘Jacob’ or the ‘Jacobean’ archetype. Perhaps this dark aspect of the Hero, a kind of Anti-Hero, functions most powerfully on Wall Street.

The Jacobean Hero’s light aspect rests on the idea that his efforts are to benefit all those affected by his actions. At its outermost limits, the Jacobean Hero steps into the archetypal realm of the Good King. The Biblical story of Jacob represents exactly this transformation, from the clever Son of Isaac into the tribe’s future Leader. Jacob is born grasping the heel of his elder twin, Esau, (Genesis 25:25-26). In Tom Sawyer fashion (Twain, 1876/1980), Jacob lets Esau suffer through all the work, then emerges easily, profiting from his older brother’s resilience and courage. In collusion with his mother, Rebekah, Jacob steals Esau’s inheritance, deceiving first his brother — trading a bowl of red lentil stew to the hungry hunstman in return for his “birthright” (Genesis 25:29-34) — then his near-sighted dying father (Genesis 27:18-29) to cement the change. Rebekah takes responsibility for this deception upon herself (Genesis 27:13): “Upon me be thy curse, my son,” as if Jacob has only innocently carried out her plan.

Rebekah had received a prophecy while pregnant of Jacob’s destiny as leader. It appears uncomfortably clear that God (and by extension, society in general) favoured one son over the other by virtue of his shrewdness and willingness to exploit his brother for his own gain. This tale makes two points, one with regard to persons, and one about the nature of the world. The unstated assumption is that anyone stupid enough to trade their inheritance for the sake of a bowl of stew is also someone who cannot delay gratification of animal needs when cultural priorities demand, and has neither the maturity, the intellect nor the requisite sense of value to be an effective leader. It also implies obversely that Jacob
makes the better leader in a world in which deception is the norm — who better to manipulate deception for his own benefit (and that of his tribe), than a deceiver?

Jacob inherits his talent for manipulation. In *Genesis* 26:7-12, Jacob’s father, Isaac, lies to Abimelech, neighbouring king of the Philistines. Isaac claims that his beautiful wife Rebekah is only his sister, so that Abimelech will not injure or kill Isaac to possess her. When the lie is discovered, perhaps because Abimelech sees Isaac having what he thinks are incestuous relations with Rebekah, Abimelech asks Isaac why he lied. Isaac reveals that he risked his wife’s safety to secure his own to avoid violent relations with Abimelech. Rather than being insulted by Isaac’s suspicions of his potential for violence, Abimelech is horrified by the fact that Isaac almost tricked him into inadvertent sin by fornicating with a married woman. He understands Isaac’s deviousness in transferring potential sin, taking upon himself what he thought was Isaac’s sinfulness, and Abimelech recommends Isaac be treated with respect. Isaac proceeds to “wax great” (*Genesis* 26:13), receiving the blessing of the Lord and profiting “an hundredfold” (*Genesis* 26:12).

The Homeric hero Odysseus is an equally successful manipulator. Athena, the Greek goddess of war and wisdom, supports him in ending the Trojan war through deceit. The ploy of the Trojan horse (Graves, 1958) bypasses traditional requirements for ‘honorable’ combat which have been responsible for the war being so protracted. Odysseus sees astutely that unless something innovative, if not ‘above board’, is implemented, the war may well be interminable. On arriving home, he saves his wife from shame and his son from early death by employing yet another dishonorable but pragmatic deception (Homer, 2006).

What makes a Hero in one age may not suffice in another. When warfare was one-on-one, a warrior needed physical strength and dexterity with weaponry. In modern times a man
can be a Warrior at a distance, a trained technician deploying complex technology. The man who dropped the bomb on Nagasaki needed neither strength nor principle, but simply to understand the bomb carriage’s technical operation. Archetypal Heroes have been left aside; our Heroes do not need Heraclean strength, nor Perseus’ daring and resourcefulness. Aristotle’s virtue ethics of ‘excellent’ character (Aristotle, 2009) has been replaced by the Enlightenment’s consequentialist exercise of ‘enlightened’ self-interest (d’Holbach, 1770/1984; Neiman, 2008).

Contemporary Western society has embraced the dishonorable but effective shadow side of the Jacobean Hero; in the corporate world, Jacob’s Shadow is preeminent. The alternative to the Jacob archetype, the Heraclean Hero whose light aspect seeks to serve others, seems lost. However, the internationally documented increasing incidence of whistle-blowing (e.g., Faunce, Bolsin & Chan, 2004; Rhodes & Strain, 2004; Verschoor, 2010) may be evidence of the re-emergence of the light side of the Heraclean hero, not in the traditional arena of the battlefield, but as a warrior against corporate and government corruption. This thesis tracks evidence in the narratives of whistleblower subjects that indeed, unconscious archetypal forces are responsible at organizational and societal levels for the activity of whistleblowing.

**Meaning and the military**

If the contemporary Heraclean Hero is emerging through whistleblowing rather than combat, then it is likely that a Heraclean archetype has not informed military warriorship for some time. Investigating the meaning of being a soldier in recent and current conflicts may help to identify whether this is the case. This is not to denigrate in any way the actions of those soldiers who currently put their lives at risk in various peacekeeping or rebuilding initiatives in the Middle East and Asia, but to comprehend their position in a
larger context than that of the individual combatant. The following section unpacks alternative driving forces behind today’s fighting forces, and examines the aftermath of combat.

Until World War II’s end, there were war heroes whose actions could clearly be understood personally and societally as ‘good triumphing over evil’. Heracles’ actions were always the uncontested triumph of good over evil, strength of will conquering the random depredations of nature (Grayling, 2007). Hitler’s Reich easily fit the bill for the archetypal Hero’s Nemesis, the Evil One. Since the downfall of the Third Reich and the atom-bombing of Japan, however, the Manichean aspect of heroism has been muddied by the underlying power/money interests fueling modern wars, the same vested interests which currently motivate and allow Wall Street warriors to engage in daily ‘combat’. After Hitler, there seemed to be no such universally accepted incarnation of Evil in the imagination of the West, and concomitantly; soldiers have not been unilaterally seen as Heraclean heroes. Cold War combatants conducted their battles in the shadows using Jacobean elements of deceit, and so have been portrayed ambivalently (e.g., Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Spy, 2011). The “dominant discourses of war” (Machin, 2007:140) renamed wars as “peacekeeping” in Bosnia and Iraq (ibid.) or “police actions” in Korea (Edel, 1990).

Veterans coming home from post-WWII conflicts have suffered unprecedented rates of suicide, mental illness and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Keteyian, 2009; Chamberlin, 2012). One examination of PTSD in the current U.S. military (Chamberlin, 2012), notes a steep growth curve. The United States Department of Veteran’s Affairs states (2009) 23% of Iraq veterans suffer PTSD. For the first time, the military has

*Stalin never achieved the same demonization as did Hitler, despite the fact that Stalin’s purges murdered almost twice as many civilians as did Nazi forces (Rummel, 1990).
recognized that veterans suffer from secondary PTSD — trauma suffered at one remove not by those directly engaging in armed conflict, but by those who witness its effects (Chamberlin, 2012). Chamberlin contends that the rising incidence of PTSD diagnoses comes from the medicalizing of un-manly behaviour. Prior to and including WWII, where the Western archetype of the Warrior was the patriotic Hero, Heracles emerged on the battlefield; the pinnacle of manliness was incarnated in a soldier performing his duty fearlessly and competently. More recently, however, the diagnosis of PTSD saves face for those susceptible to ‘womanly’ weaknesses — cowardice, collapse or compassion for the enemy. Labelling these behaviours as PTSD does not negate soldiers’ masculine strengths — being impervious to horror or atrocity, and carrying on in the face of terror and death. Chamberlin (ibid.) holds that the increased mental ‘weakening’ of the U.S. soldier since Korea has been due to combatants’ witnessing actions such as the largescale murder of civilians, actions inappropriate to manly combat.

If Chamberlin’s hypothesis were true, there should have been an epidemic of PTSD in the wake of Hiroshima, Nagasaki and the Nazi camp liberations. Despite these atrocities, there was no epidemic of mental illness recorded$^{97}$ among the returning troops. In contrast to Chamberlin, I argue that it has more to do with moral meaning than with the immoral nature of specific acts witnessed. It would seem that the meaning of combat has changed, even if its performance has not. The force putting a warrior in the field is what gives his efforts meaning. Fighting for multinational profit does not have the same moral cachet as fighting to exterminate an evil blight from the world. Accordingly, surviving a battle for profit may not sit well with those who have an inner need to develop and sustain a positive self-image.

$^{97}$ The stress here is on the word ‘recorded’. Many more WWII veterans may have been deeply affected by PTSD than the 5% cited by the Department of Veterans Affairs’ National Center for PTSD, but psychological weakness was stigmatized and many “did not seek treatment and were able to somehow suppress their symptoms and function” (Albrecht, 2009).
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The contemporary Warrior may feel himself demoted to mercenary status. The mercenary, although a Warrior, is not a Hero. This is not to deny that his battlefield actions may be heroic, but the meaning of his combat is not so. A mercenary fights for personal aggrandizement, the increase of personal power through the acquisition of material things and, consequently, the increase in social status which wealth commands. This awareness of the mercenary modern soldier is reflected in popular cinema, where post-WWII wars have been depicted as absurd for-profit exercises where soldiers are either fools, duped by the rhetoric of the state and the military (eg. Catch-22, 1970; The Matrix, 1999; No Man’s Land, 2001; “V” for Vendetta, 2006; Stop-Loss, 2008), or opportunists themselves (War, Inc., 2008; The Expendables, 2010). Profit-seeking warriors enact the dark side of the Hero, fueling the masculine active principle in order to realize selfish desires for power and adulation. All wars produce trauma, but the meaning of trauma is altered when war is waged to enrich international commercial interests. When courage serves power, rather than the weak, allowing the powerful to exploit the weak so as to accumulate more wealth and more power, (Flyvbjerg, 1998; Zakaria, 2008), then it becomes evident, even to soldiers on the battlefields, that there is an ethical disconnect in state rhetoric between professed and actual ends and means. Despite the honorable behaviour of individual soldiers, to call mercenary warfare heroic is to distort the concept of heroism such that it becomes meaningless.

Similarly, the demand that ‘failure not be an option’, changes the meaning of being a Hero in the whistleblower literature. Whistleblower research (Bok, 1980; Abraham, 2004) seems to be saying that the Heraclean archetype is not permitted its shadow aspect. If research (Nader et al., 1972; Graham, 1986; Glazer and Glazer, 1989; Grant, 2002) theorizes whistleblowing as
the principled ethico-political stance of the whistleblower versus the
governing realpolitik of the system; moral wo/man against immoral
organization; the spirited resistance of the precariously sovereign individual
against repressive social control, (Perry, 1998:236)

then it may be interpreted as “a colloquial and contemporary characterization of the
enduring verity of Enlightenment ideals” (ibid.). However, in commending the integrity of
these heroes by counting the terrible cost to them, “the rhetorical subtext may be 'don't let
the bastards grind you down', but the empirical message is that they almost certainly will”
(ibid.). From the armchair, organizational researchers are free to recommend moral action
that results in personal disaster, while vicariously enjoying these dangerous practices.

**Hero repressed: tradition and success**

It is illuminating to locate our current notion of the rational Hero in cultural and historical
context. There is a particular understanding of heroism in contemporary discourse that
insists that the Hero’s conscious deliberation lead to success, even when it is contradicted
by the facts.98 Research supporting this notion is implying either 1) that the Hero has
traditionally been successful, or 2) that without success, action is irrational, and because
widespread failure is to be expected in contemporary times, heroic action is now
especially irrational. These understandings of heroism derive from the current conception
of the “modern subject [that is] tied to the articulation of ... modern reason and the
subject-of-reason, upon which pivots the conceptual framework for an understanding of
the world” (Venn, 1998:135). However, both these premises prove faulty.

In the first instance, it is clear that the hero’s inability to predict his own failure is actually
part of the heroic tradition (Graves, 1958; Guirand, 1968). In ancient traditions, Heroes,
while successful so long as they serve the needs of other weaker and less capable beings,

98 The banner behind George Bush reading “Mission Accomplished” on the aircraft carrier on May 1, 2003
only six weeks into the Iraq war provides a good example.
end in eventual ruin and misery. Eventual defeat for mortal and immortal heroes is generally due to hubris, or character flaws (e.g., pride or lust), over which — e.g., in the Greek convention — the hero has no control but is the helpless victim of the gods' capricious desires and games. For example, we can look at the tales of Achilles, Jason and Heracles (Graves, 1958; Guirand, 1968). All these heroes begin in the most promising way, under the aegis of various deities from the pantheon. The deities provide the heroes with the encouragement — the making of heart — that they need, by speaking positively of their close attendance upon the matters at hand, or by providing them with magical aids. The baby Achilles is tempered to invulnerability in the fire by his semi-divine mother, the Nereid Thetis; with the backing of Amphitrite, the "feminine personification of the sea" (Guirand, 1968:133), Jason is protected throughout his adventures; Heracles is born with perfect physical strength and unparalled virility as the favoured son of Zeus (Guirand, 1968).

After performing the most amazing feats of bravery without question or qualm, they all go on to suffer the most terrible indignities and tragedy: Achilles is killed by an arrow through his vulnerable heel, because in a rage at Hector's having slain his friend, he transgresses the code of combat and drags Hector's slain body seven times round Troy (Homer, 1991); Jason unknowingly eats his own children served to him by his wife, Medea, maddened by his philandering; and Heracles is slain by the poisoned blood given to his wife Deianeira by the evil centaur Nessus, that she then gives Heracles in the belief it will end her husband's infidelities (Graves, 1958; Guirand, 1968). Partly this widespread misery due to lust is a product of the archaic Greek conception of love expressed in the language of the ancient poets, where eros (lustful love) and eris (strife or discord) are two sides of the same coin. Unlike the late medieval notion of chivalrous love that included gentleness and sophistication (Simpson, 1998), the ancient Greeks considered that love —
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what we call Romantic love following 18th Century poets — was actually a form of violence (Helen of Troy, 2005). In the same way in which the destructive drive operates during combat making men berserkers\(^99\), a man overcome by lust no longer responds to Reason. It was their willingness to let go of Reason that was responsible for most heroes’ downfalls in Greek myth (Simpson, 1998).

The Judeo-Christian tradition also presents heroes who suffer. The prophet Jeremiah dies disgraced, loathed for following God’s orders in repeatedly warning his people that they had become debased and would suffer mightily for it (Jeremiah 37:15-38:28). Jehovah’s favourite, Moses, is punished for excessive sympathy for his own fellows by pre-emptive banishment from the Promised Land. He dies viewing the Promised Land he will never enter, along with all the other members of his sinful generation (Deuteronomy 1:37).

[Anti]Hero transformed: ambivalence, action and self-interest

Jungian depth psychology posits a healthy individual, or a healthy society, as one in which the process of individuation occurs, signifying the undoing of repression and the bringing of conscious and unconscious aspects of the psyche into consciousness, integrating to produce a whole, harmoniously balanced Self (v.s. 155-156). If a Shadow is not brought into consciousness, it becomes “darker and denser, and sooner or later it will surface in some destructive way” (Wong, 2009). By devaluing the self-sacrifice of whistleblowers and encouraging the self-interest displayed by non-reporters, the cumulative message of contemporary organizations is that the only good Heroes are Anti-Heroes. A competitive capitalist economy, predicated on trajectories of endless growth and improvement (Höpfl, 2002) represses into Shadow that altruistic aspect of Heracles which puts others’ welfare prior to one’s own. Most whistleblowers begin voicing their concerns by registering

\(^99\) In Norse sagas, warriors entered this state of wild, fearless fury in battle (Davidson, 1978).
complaints internally, in acceptable, organizationally supported channels (Rehg et al., 2008:221). However, when the institution ignores these initial attempts, or it is abundantly clear from the organizational ‘culture’ that wrongdoing is tolerated and resistance is not, whistleblowers then threaten both the organization and themselves by reporting externally (Miceli et al., 2008:82). Ignoring the whistleblower’s initial benign attempts is part of repressing the Heraclean archetype; subsequent whistleblowing behaviour may be understood as the destructive emergence of this aspect of the Heraclean Hero from the Shadow.

When the meaning of a behaviour is changed by its positioning in a cultural matrix of meaning, different deep psychological structures, different archetypes, are triggered into manifesting. Perry (1998) calls for theorizing around whistleblowing reflecting the ambivalence of the whistleblower’s place in society, as a hero and a traitor, depending upon from whose position one is viewing. Perry’s discussion of the “contradictory character of the whistleblowing process” (ibid.) looks at the whistleblower’s social context as shaping whistleblowing behaviour, but appears to discard whistleblowers’ understanding of their own experiences in relation to the wrongdoing they witness. Looking at whistleblowing from a Jungian perspective answers Perry’s call for theory to accommodate the ambivalence of whistleblowing, without discarding the insider’s own understanding of his behaviour.

Firstly, whistleblowing may embody the rationality of Enlightenment ideals (v.s. 186) and the irrationality of pre-Enlightenment thinking. If it signifies the emerging Heraclean Hero, whistleblowing can be understood as acting against “the Enlightenment ideal” of enlightened self-interest (Gairdner, 2008; Neiman, 2008). The Wall Street warrior fights for self-interest, but not enlightened self-interest in that he is “simply pursuing [his] own
economic self-interests ... regardless of any consequences for society” (Knights & McCabe, 2015:200, citing Tett, 2009). His work attaches so strongly to greed, his Jacobean nature has evidently been corrupted. He does work from premises of rational instrumentality, but Jacob’s Shadow appears to have completely overwhelmed his light aspect.

The financial warrior’s obsession with material gain is a reflection of his unconscious beliefs (Maté, 2008:392) and of the culture in which he lives, a commercial culture which “subjugate[s] communal goals, time-honored tradition and individual creativity to mass production and the accumulation of wealth” (ibid.:391). Maté argues, harking back to Frankl and Jung (v.s. 139), that an obsessive addiction to physical pleasure comes from meaninglessness, from the existential frustration of placing the greatest value on selfish attainments, versus the higher satisfactions to be found in making “an authentic contribution to the well-being of others or to the social good” (Maté, 2008:391). Maté claims that much of what people call their personality is constructed by them “to cover up the loss of essence” (ibid.:392), in the hope that they will find a meaningful identity in the images or roles “into which they sink their energy” (ibid.).

If whistleblowing is constructed as an enactment of Enlightenment ideals connected with individual morality and civic responsibility, and if the whistleblower is viewed as the moral individual resisting corrupted regimes, then whistleblowing must reflect the central ideals of Enlightenment thinking, one of which is that a Hero’s morality rests in the rationalist construct of fully informed self-interest. But any morality that results in self-destruction cannot be rational, and is, by definition, unenlightened. Enlightenment thinking becomes doubly problematic at this juncture, because of another concept central to the Enlightenment project, the idea that insofar as “human beings are essentially active
... made to create ideals [they] cannot wholly fulfill ... movement, not rest, [is] the key to human happiness” (Neiman, 2008:166). The two concepts of activity and self-interest considered together, then, mean that a potential whistleblower can neither act to his own detriment, nor choose not to.

The expression of Heracles’ light aspect may be considered enlightened; this aspect emerges when the individual hero applies strength and competence for the benefit of others, combining individual autonomy and social rationality. But Heracles’ shadow aspect, where heroic actions to save others may endanger the hero, betrays Enlightenment ideals. Because emergent archetypes manifest opposing aspects, Heracles’ light aspect is repressed along with his unacceptable shadow aspect. In this way, unconscious loyalty to the Enlightenment ideals informing contemporary social behaviours might account for the repression of the ‘other-than-Jacobean’ hero, the Heraclean, during most of recent history.

Secondly, a Jungian interpretation of whistleblowing reflects ambivalence in extreme cases. When an archetype manifests with either the light aspect or the shadow aspect so predominant that it totally suppresses its opposite, then this archetype reaches its outer limits, and it may take on the signature of another archetype, its central nature shifting to that of another mythological type. Rather than becoming the Good King, on Wall Street, Jacob transforms through greed and a complete lack of empathy for the ‘commons’ into the Trickster, the shadow aspect of the Magus (Tallman, 2003) or Hermes archetype. We have already suggested that it is the Trickster who may be responsible for the moral ambiguity surrounding whistleblowers (v.s. 145). The Trickster activates in situations where the power elite is seen to work against the interests of ordinary citizens without their knowledge and with their unwitting collusion. In several mythologies, the Trickster brings about the ‘end of the world’, the final confrontation between the forces of good and
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evil: in Norse myth, Loki’s deceitful betrayal of Baldur initiates Ragnarok (Guirand, 1968:275); in Revelation (16), Lucifer brings the forces of evil to battle with the angelic hosts at Armageddon.\footnote{100}

The media overtly, and whistleblower literature subtly, encourages us to consider Jacobean heroes as the only real heroes of the present-day. This elevation of Trickster to Hero and moral Warrior is representative of an inevitably absurd cumulative result of the application of Enlightenment ideals.

The Hero as the Son

We now turn to look at other archetypes standing behind the Hero emergent, that might be involved in activating Heracles’ tenderheartedness. The Hero is a masculine archetype of power for good or for evil. On closer inspection, however, the true Hero, whose Light is so bright it practically turns into the Sun of Kingship, manifests when striving to protect others, that is, when nurturing and caring for others. These are the feminine attributes of this masculine archetype, its inner opposite, or anima (CW IXii 29-31). In the \textit{vajrayana} tradition of Tibetan Buddhism, similarly to the way in which Jung constructs the anima of the masculine or the animus of the feminine, \textit{yang} or the masculine is associated with acting skillfully and compassionately, \textit{yin} or the feminine is that which contains wisdom and insight (Keown, 2003:338). It is not until the Hero unites with his feminine aspect — his skill joins with wisdom — that he is complete.\footnote{101} Whether fighting on behalf of the Good King Arthur as one of his Knights, or as an Inquisitor for the Spanish King, a Hero who is not also the Champion of the Feminine is deeply flawed and out of balance, and this repressed feminine will emerge destructively.

\footnote{100} The Trickster is not purely Shadow — all of this destruction brings about new beginnings: eg., in Buddhist myth, the Lord Yamantaka presides over the aeon of destruction, bringing about the end of death. 
\footnote{101} In \textit{vajrayana}, this is represented by the \textit{yab-yum} image, the divine couple in blissful union, where masculine and feminine merge to produce that Reality which is the world.
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I would contend that (v.s. 183-185) post-1945 in Western culture, in moving away from providing protection for the vulnerable, the Hero has been increasingly denied the feminine aspect of his deep nature — he is losing his "tender" heart. Consequently, the Hero is losing his place as Warrior against evil. During the 1950's and 1960's a new version of the archetypal Hero left the battlefield to be either closer to home, where the Hero as "good provider" emerged, or completely off the planet as astronaut or cosmonaut; during the 1960's and 1970's came the compensating Anti-hero on the battlefield and on the streets — "the rebel without a cause"\textsuperscript{102}, where the Anti-hero's passionate disdain for authority and bridling at injustice against his person only incidentally required fighting evil that benefited vulnerable others. Then, from the 1980's on, came the Wall Street warrior, a masculine [anti]Hero working for a masculine monarch, dispassionately indifferent to evil. Organizational researchers have touched upon the Hero as the King's Champion (Abramson & Senyshyn, 2010), but to date there has been no discussion of the Hero as the Queen's or the People's Champion. In contrast to all of these, the whistleblower may be that manifestation of a different aspect of the Hero, he who comes as the Queen's Champion.

In 1996 Jungian therapists and authors Marion Woodman and Elinor Dickson wrote of a change in society's 'conscience' initiated by the Great Goddess as Great Mother archetype. Ancient archetypal representations of mother included personifications of all aspects of the earth, deities that were fruitful and destructive, calm and chaotic, nurturing and neurotic, loving and lunatic (Ivory, 2016). As the Great Mother represented all the creative energies and the material universe wherein these took effect, she was "full of a primitive magic" (Höpfl, 2001:65) both pleasant and "malevolent"(ibid.). When her

\textsuperscript{102} In films portrayed by e.g., Marlon Brando, James Dean, Steve McQueen, Peter Fonda and Clint Eastwood.
children were threatened, she would avenge violations (ibid.:60) by withholding nourishment, and raging against injustice until she had her way. One example is the Greek ‘seasons’ myth of the fertility goddess Demeter, whose daughter is kidnapped into Hades, causing the goddess to kill the world’s vegetation until her daughter is restored to the earth (Ivory, 2016). With the advent of Christianity, the fierce “aspects of motherhood [were] repressed into the unconscious by changing social imperatives” (ibid.:219), imperatives relegating women into passive roles that have persisted into modern times and into modern organizations. Christ’s mother left the earth, disembodied, to become the Queen of Heaven, losing her fierce protective principle. In order to conform to the power of the Trinity, the Great Mother was halved into a meek, chaste and sexless virgin mother, whose Son as conqueror of sin and death is his Father’s son. Mary is no longer able to protect her son, but can only sympathize with human suffering and loss, providing an example of perfect acceptance and humility. Without a body she has no uterus, no creative power, no desire, no lust, and cannot, therefore, harm the newly male potency of God (Höpf, 2001; Ivory, 2016). Incorporeal, she is robbed of natural affection and empathy, “conciliated to the desires of men” (Höpf, 2001:67). This is the ideal woman for modern organizations, whose passivity cannot threaten the rationalist underpinnings of the corporation, but can only submit to an order where “the needs of the organization take precedence over the needs of the person or collectivity, where the organization requires compliant bodies regulated by structures which limit their capabilities, where feminine qualities are representational and masculine” (ibid.:71).

However, what this thesis purports to uncover is the reinvigoration of the lost half of the Great Mother in contemporary society as manifested in whistleblowing. Woodman and Dickson’s concept adds to the notion that whistleblowers are motivated by an emerging
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Hero, from Heracles potentially to Horus\textsuperscript{103}, the Son of the Great Mother. As part of the Holy Dyad, he embodies the Great Mother's \textit{active} principle working against the world's evil. His Heraclean strength and conviction carry him into the fray, but he fares deeper into the moral dimension than Heracles. Horus is the \textit{Champion} of his Mother. His Mother is also deeper than the passive, pleasant, nurturing Mary; she is the Dark Goddess Kali, the Mother who also brings creation out of destruction (Woodman & Dickson, 1996; Ivory, 2016). Horus is represented in Christian iconography as the Christ Child sitting on the lap of Mary Enthroned as the Queen of Heaven, "the Word made flesh, consciousness sitting on the lap of nature" (Woodman & Dickson, 1996:4). The Dark Goddess' divine plan for her Son is to lay on him the \textit{geas} to help guide the world away from patriarchal exploitation, from being 'scorched by the Sun' —preventing the destruction of the earth's ecosystems and populace whether through warfare or commerce.

As masculine archetype, the Hero is bound up with fearless strength of will, physically and psychically manifest in the face of daunting odds. The masculine aspect of Horus is that active principle catalyzed by the feminine, the action of altruism. The patriarchy's Hero derives his power, the power over nature, from strength; the Great Mother's Champion derives his power, power from nature, from the Mother's compassion (Woodman & Dickson, 1996:21). Horus is motivated by a sensitivity to the welfare of others, and his fearlessness may require personal sacrifice. Without a Horus, the Great Mother is inert; in the Holy Dyad of Mother/Son, she is pulled from her inertia to combat the destructive forces of the Dark Father God.

Not since the Byzantine Christ has the Hero been understood as the Queen's champion, bringing His will into line with Her will. However, since the Queen of Heaven symbolized

\textsuperscript{103} In Egyptian myth, Horus, the Son/Sun, was the child of Osiris, god of death, and Isis, the Great Mother of all life (Guirand, 1968).
only half of the archetype of womanhood, the woman of spiritual rather than temporal Purity, Her will had to align with the Heavenly Father's. Christ, therefore, was not a Champion in the sense that Horus was the Great Goddess' Champion. In the "Name-of-the-Father"\textsuperscript{104}, Christ took on the sin of the World and sacrificed himself. This sacrifice of a son by his father is reminiscent of Abraham’s near sacrifice of his son, Isaac (\textit{Genesis} 22:1-13). However, to complete the Christian cosmos, only God the Father can perform a perfect sacrifice, so only His Son is sacrificed and the world saved, whereas Abraham’s son was spared, and the world damned.

A Jungian reading supports Woodman’s case that the contemporary Hero has undergone a transformation. The Christ-Hero is seen as passé — persons deluded into sacrificing themselves are to be pitied. The Dark Jacobean hero holds court in the corporate world, which controls the ‘real’ world (Zakaria, 2008), guided by Jacob’s self-interest and cleverness. Jacob struggles with God — with the Father’s angel agent — and wins, albeit he is rendered imperfect, being wounded in the thigh (\textit{Genesis} 32:24-25). Jacob, now the Wounded Hero, has been empowered in our world since Nagasaki, the point where Jacob knew his power could destroy what the Father had made. This Wounded Hero is not the Champion of Mary Enthroned, but of the Wounded King, whose wound weakens him such that he must request others to act where he cannot. This King is the natural \textit{yang} reflection of the World Virgin, imperfect in his inaction, as she is imperfect in her lack of active compassion. Jacob’s imperfection, his lack of compassion, roots him to the ground. Like the Knight in the service of the Wounded King, he cannot gain the Grail and transcend the good and evil of the World. Like Moses, he is granted a vision of Paradise, but denied

\textsuperscript{104} ‘Name-of-the-Father’ functions as a signifier in Lacan’s realm of the Symbolic (Mason, 2010), manifest in the fact that "people seem to be ready to accept anything insofar as it is perceived to be transmitted from a source invested with authority" (Stavrakakis, 2008:1046). It explains how in enacting the Knight to his King, a Wall Street broker may be seduced by his employer’s narcissism.
entry. We are made to understand through Jacob that Heavenly Good, whenever it is manifest in the World, is always Wounded, always imperfect, always tainted by evil.

Compensating for these one-sided Hero archetypes manifesting in the world, it is possible that whistleblowing embodies Jung’s *enantiodromia* (v.s. 155), the psychic reversal occurring when a forceful repression of one archetypal aspect galvanizes its unconscious opposite into breaking through conscious control:

... [if] anything of importance is devalued in our conscious life ... there arises a compensation in the unconscious ... No psychic value can disappear without being replaced by another of equivalent intensity. (*CW X* 175)

Woodman and Dickson (1996) suggest that the Dark Goddess, Kali, as the enantiodromic power behind Horus, lays on Horus her *geas*, as a curse and blessing for the sake of her world. This is not the pale, aloof figure of the Queen of Heaven distantly ruling celestial kingdoms, but the fiery, earthy Great Goddess of the senses, Mother of the World, ‘*um al dunya*’\(^{105}\), maddening her son, filling him with irresistible, unconscious passion which will erupt into the world to save it. A whistleblower may be an individual who is especially open to the tendencies of the collective unconscious and cannot avoid them, unless he is consciously aware of the forces in the collective deeps calling him to act out this rebalancing (*CW X* 425). If conscious of the deep source of these forces, the whistleblower’s actions will be in response, not only to the conflicts within his immediate work surround, but possibly to similar problems endemic within his industry or profession, and beyond. Whistleblowing “clearly points to a wider epiphany ... a wider moral consensus in society” that becomes “relevant when fundamental values of society are in question and challenged” (Crane & Matten, 2013).

\(^{105}\) This is an Arabic phrase, meaning ‘mother of the world’, used by contemporary Egyptians to describe their ancient nation as the source of all civilization.
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**Hero emergent: whistleblower warrior**

Having seen that an archetypological approach to behaviour might enhance an understanding of unconscious forces motivating whistleblowing, we have explored the Hero. Paralleling the experience of blowing the whistle with certain stages of the Hero's Quest has highlighted the relationship of the Hero to those he defends as determining the meaning of his actions. Looking at the whistleblower as impelled by an emergent Heraclean archetype, as against society's approved Jacobean Hero, puts the whistleblower's 'irrationality' in a new light, where he may be responding to a deeper, more inclusive layer of Jung's model of the layered unconscious, one comprising not just the individual or his family or the organization for whom he works, but the whole of humanity.

Evidence in neuropsychology that courage and empathy are 'built-in' to human physiology parallels the notion that the whistleblower is responding to an unconscious collective need to attend to the wellbeing of all people. There appear to be cortical structures and processes specifically geared to produce altruistic behaviour. Interpreting whistleblowing through the Jungian lens suggests an archetypally fueled rationality that, when conditions demand, expands self-interest to a concern for the interest of all members of a group to which the whistleblower may belong. This alternative rationality also addresses the paradoxical irrationality of heroic whistleblowing endeavours in the face of probable failure; in mythical terms, it is the Hero's unconscious compulsion, his geas, which forces him to act for the benefit of the wider group. Examination of heroes in various periods of history shows the change in the meaning of heroism, depending upon which aspects of the Hero are expressed or repressed in a given cultural context. We have seen how the whistleblower may be understood as a paradoxical embodiment of the
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Enlightenment ideals of self-interest and action, while undercutting these same ideals. Contemporary Western society appears to condone even the shadow aspects of the Jacobean Hero, whereas both light and shadow aspects of the Heraclean Hero have been repressed.

Mytho-poetic analysis, Jung’s ‘amplification’, leads to an appreciation that the Heraclean Hero’s masculinity — the active yang manifestation of the yin principle of compassion — is no longer being fulfilled in defending the weak and powerless. Rather, it is the shadow side of the Jacobean Hero, who protects the powerful at the expense of the weak, that is ascendant. In suppressing feminine compassion in the Hero, in privileging the masculine yang over the feminine yin, contemporary Western society weakens its Hero’s masculine expression. Whistleblowing, viewed through the amplification process, may represent the emergence of the Shadow Hero as Horus, the champion of his Shadow Mother, Kali, the Dark Goddess.

If this is the case, we should be able to detect in whistleblower narratives and dream reports and in DIRG members’ responses to this speech the influence of the various ‘faces’ of the Hero archetype and of the other archetypes encountered to this point. Accordingly, we shall turn next to a detailed amplification of certain excerpts from interviewees’ sharings (Appendix VIII) and DIRG members’ responses to them (Appendix IX). If the themes, images, parallels and congruencies in these sharings indicate the emergence of aspects of the archetypal Hero, we may be able to discern whether these aspects are familiar aspects of the Hero viewed in a new context, or they constitute a new archetype, constellated from various aspects of more traditional archetypes.
Passing through the dark night: Amplification

Nothing in the world made me angrier than inaction, than silence. The refusal or inability to do something, say something when a thing needed doing or saying, was unbearable. The watchers, the head shakers, the back turners made my skin prickle. (Davis, 1974:93-94)

In this chapter, a selection of the interviewees’ and DIRG members’ words are subjected to Jungian amplification, the exploration of mythic, imaginal and conceptual associations that they trigger. If indeed archetypes are constellating during the whistleblowing process of our subjects, what can we expect to find from Jungian amplification of this collected data? Jungian dream interpretation occurs at three levels:

1) recognition of the personal significance of dream symbols in the everyday life of the dreamer;

2) recognition of the cultural significance of these symbols, where the time in which it was dreamed and the cultural context around the dreamer lend meaning;

3) recognition of the archetypal ground of the symbols, seeing them in the context of “human life as a whole ... link[ing] us with the age-old experience of our species” (Stevens, 1994:111).

Amplification’s free association allows “seemingly unrelated thoughts ... to reach consciousness” (ibid.). The streams of tales, images, allusions, sensations, memories, and feelings lead from one association to another. Slowly or suddenly, as these associations gather, a network of meaningful connections develops at all three levels of interpretation. Free associating in and with the collected whistleblower and DIRG speech should then produce linked images and meanings deriving from and returning to specific archetypes, those we have identified above — the Hero (light and dark, Heracles, Jacob and Horus), the Seer, the Trickster, the Good King or the Wounded King, the Great Mother (the
orderly Marianic Queen of Heaven and the passionate Dark Goddess, Kali) — as well as meaningfully interwoven connections between them.

There are four interacting levels of material in the thesis: whistleblower interview material comprises the first level of raw field input; DIRG member responses to this interview material make the second, mediating level of field text; my associations from the DIRG responses comprise a further layer of amplification; connections made in the writing of this chapter finish that process. This exploration follows what can be construed as a hermeneutic path of circular feedback across speeches, subjects and time; a response to one speech may elicit a previous response by that same speaker or another, either present or remote in distance or time, and the responses shape and are shaped by one another. In this way, the chapter may be thought of as a multi-directional expansion into possible meanings of the collected data, some of which may have emancipatory potential, if only in abductively pointing toward further fruitful areas of future research.

The chapter will be structured into sections, each of which elaborates upon one of the strong images or 'threads' of thinking: the maelstrom; Dante's *Inferno* and *Paradiso*; papers and armour; numbers and knowledge; buildings and innocence; embodied messages; levels of significance and solution; and vision opening to understanding. Some of these imaginal threads strongly suggest the activity of several archetypes in an interlinked fashion. Amplificatory exploration of these threads provides an alternative perspective that illustrates the interdependent operation of certain vectors of power, and may suggest novel strategies for harnessing the energy of some of these vectors in the public interest.
Maelstrom: archetypal depth

Musing about the nature of archetypal constellation, the first image that came clearly to my mind’s eye was a maelstrom, showing how an archetypal approach splits off into more dimensions than for example, a Listening Post (LP) technique (v.s. 113). The LP method ostensibly “[draws] upon” the movements of “affective flows” in society’s “structures of feeling”, metaphorically “running through society like underground streams” (Hoggett, 2006:5-6). The stream metaphor suggests that social experience is made up of multiple individual and private experiences, and at the same time is shaped by and shapes larger social and political interactions. To adjust the LP stream metaphor to account for a Jungian perspective, the currents and flows come together/arise from a subterranean maelstrom, rather than in flowing streams. This Jungian view combines the individual and the collective in the present, the past and the future ‘multi-focally’: “while each eye sees a different image, when they work together they not only bring things into focus and start to make sense but also create an otherwise absent dimension of depth” (Blake, 2006:91). The maelstrom is oceanic, having no perceivable origin or destination, but exhibits depth in addition to expanse. The more chaotic image of the moving force of a maelstrom suggests neither the temporal nor spatial directionality of an LP stream, but allows for dis-ordered confluence. The LP concept “structures of feeling” incidentally and arbitrarily positions “social experience” as made up of individual interior experiences within a mental-affective continuum, whereas the maelstrom as a symbol of the archetypal realm portrays a social reality where meaning is multi-dimensionally derived. The maelstrom impacts across and ‘into’ time, across, through and between individuals, thereby incorporating metaphorically the transpersonal nature of an archetypal unconscious that participates in the construction of changing social concerns.
Odysseus told a story of having had an intuition in rush hour to go back home, thinking, "I left the stove on ... but I really didn’t leave the stove on. [I told myself,] ‘You’re just being one of those people who want to dot every ‘i’.” He was laughing at having behaved as if he were an obsessive, and surprised at it, as this was very unusual behaviour for him. A DIRG member responding to Odysseus’ anecdote said, “I was anticipating that he was going to say that there was an accident, and he might have been involved in that accident.” I felt this to be an exciting hint of the method working, and wrote: “... there is another story exactly like that, but from a different interviewee (Diomedes), where he had a premonition not to leave when he normally left for a business trip, but to hold off ... allow[ing] him to avoid being in an accident which could have been fatal.” Diomedes had actually related two of these accident-avoidance tales to me. I remarked that it seemed that at least one DIRG member was accessing stories from other interviewees, stories not presented to the group, but lying at the bottom of the ‘images’ bowl, untouched. I wondered if that indicated

an undercurrent, an unconscious layer, which connects all of us, and all of the interviewees and their stories in a way, and that the day’s process is beginning to allow them to tap into that less-bordered realm ... where things ... are not so sharply demarcated one from the other. (DIRG notes)

The maelstrom captures the idea that similar forces are in play at many different levels at once, and that the dreams and mythic references of participants “may [also] be read as referring to many different levels of experience at once” (Moore, 1992:40). For example, the story of the struggle between the Seer and the Dark King who denies his visions may be seen in the tensions between a particular whistleblower and his employing organization’s efforts to discredit him, but also in the interactions between larger sectors of society and the whistleblowers exposing misconduct in these sectors — as with the lack
of accountability in the massive bailouts after the financial debacle of 2008 (Pearse, 2009),
or the undermining of public trust in climate change science (Goldenberg, 2013).

The maelstrom also brings the mythic element of the poetic into the mix by allowing for
permeability between past, present and future. "When the poet is possessed by the Muses,
he draws directly from [the Goddess of Memory] Mnemosyne's store of knowledge"
(Eliade, 1963:120). The present is conditioned by the past, not in a causal, linear manner,
where events must be situated in a temporal frame, but through accessing archetypal
sources that "reach the depths of being, to discover the original, the primordial reality ...
which makes it possible to understand becoming as a whole" (ibid.).

*Dante: archetypally organized morality*

The most persistently 'invasive' image or metaphor to arise in this work was that of
Dante's *Inferno*, from the Italian medieval poet's *The Divine Comedy*. Odysseus referred
to Dante's work first, in speaking of the dilemma of not being able to choose between
reporting and not reporting because both feel equally impossible. Odysseus thought that
the choice to report about malfeasance occurs "maybe ... at birth or it's developmental",
but that being as it may,

> eventually you are consigned to one or the other, right? And our favourite
> expression was the hottest places in hell ... it's Dante ... are reserved for
> those who in times of moral crisis maintain their neutrality.

When Odysseus made this statement, I was not familiar with this work of Dante's, only
with Gustav Doré's illustrations of it and their portrayal of a Catholic view of Heaven and
Hell. Odysseus' utterance echoed the sentiment of the Angela Davis quote (v.s. 200) I had
already chosen to head up this chapter. Odysseus wondered aloud about that Divine
control of human society of which Dante wrote, and then qualified it in terms more
palatable for a contemporary sensibility: “All the terrible things that are happening in the world, you wouldn’t think there was a divinity that shapes our ends. There probably is something that’s shaping our ends or there’s something in the unconscious that shapes it.” Both Odysseus and Dante’s poem express the belief that the world is ‘shaped’ by influences other than human rationality.

I then began to encounter multiple references to Dante’s poem, evidence per Romanyszyn of “being claimed by the work” (2010:302), having been “open[ed] ...to the place of dreams, symptoms, synchronicities, feelings and intuitions in the research process” (ibid.:300). Just prior to conducting the DIRG session, I ran across a version of the same quotation from Dante that Odysseus had spoken of three times as a central theme of a novel I was reading for light entertainment (Blake, 2010). Over the next few months, I noted a plethora of images and references to the Inferno. On mentioning this unlikely series of encounters to DIRG participants, they speculated that perhaps they were instances of Jung’s synchronicities, improbable “coincidence[s] in time of ... causally unrelated events with the same meaning” (Stevens, 1994:58), that might be attributed to the workings of a transpersonal, or collective, unconscious. Usually, synchronicities are “dismissed as mere accidents in the process” (Romanyszyn, 2010:300), but in an analysis relying on archetypal influence, it seemed important to explore them for “possible unconscious relevance to the work” (ibid.). I took it that these correspondences meant that the research was unfolding in a potentially significant direction. Despite on the surface only wanting to discuss rationally “strategic” measures in their whistleblowing process (v.i. 215), several whistleblower subjects found reassurance in synchronicities facilitating the next step in their struggle:

Every time I needed something, within a day or two it came ... It made us feel like we were doing the right thing because everything we needed was
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coming. It was really weird ... We just felt that it was affirmation that we were doing what needed to be done. (Meleager)

I think that’s the same thing that happened with these people who all just appeared in the configuration ... at the right time. (Odysseus)

Although Meleager and Odysseus would not likely use such archetypal language, we all had become “agents” of our work on behalf of “those for whom the work is being done” ... the ancestors” (Romanyszyn, 2010:285; v.s. 108).

Dante’s underworld “represents the invisible, mysterious, unfathomable depths of a person or a society” (Eliade, 1963:121), and as such the descent into and return from Hell in Dante’s poem carries within it the template for the Hero’s journey. Dante descends to Hell because everyday experience cannot teach “what he seeks to know”; his journey “confers on the bard ... a contact with the other world, the possibility of entering it and freely returning from it” (ibid.) in order to retrieve as Seer and as Artist, knowledge essential for humanity to thrive.

When looking at the significance of the number ‘nine’ in my subject interviews, I ran across a reference to Dante’s constructions of Heaven and Hell as “9+1”, nine circles of Hell plus one (Alighieri, 1949) not quite qualifying, but nevertheless intimately connected in meaning. The very first level of the entire Divine Comedy is “the Vestibule of the Futile” (Alighieri, 1949:89), just outside Hell, wherein those who have never stood

---

106 The enchainment of Jung’s notion of synchronicity with a feeling of being guided is common — “The experience of synchronicity affirmed for me that I was on the right path” (Downs et al., 2002:444) — but Jung was clear (Stevens, 1994) that this in no way automatically invoked deity, rather the surfacing into consciousness of a deeper connection to the collective unconscious, such that just as events may be connected by causality, they may also be connected by meaning. Similarly, in narrative inquiry, the feeling of going in a likely fruitful direction may be experienced along the way, long before narratives are fully analysed and particular findings have been generated (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

107 Dante’s Hell is divided into three regions: the first five Circles for sins of self-indulgence (lust, gluttony, etc.); Circles six and seven for sins of violence; and Circles eight and nine for sins of deliberate treachery.
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fast to a moral stance — a “rabble ... scum, who’d never lived” (Canto III 62, 64) — run back and forth after an “aimlessly whirling banner”, pricked and tormented by wasp stings and bloodsuckers. These souls “never actually did anything evil, yet never took sides on moral issues at times when it might have mattered most, and are therefore condemned” (Birk & Sanders, 2004:16). They are barred from Hell and Heaven, and so after passing from the earth are neither alive nor dead.

This dreary huddle has no hope of death,
Yet its blind life trails on so low and crass
That every other fate it envieth. (Canto III 39-41)

Sayers (Alighieri, 1949) interprets this region as the “abode of the weather-cock mind”, the banner representing “self-interest”, the wasp stings symbolizing the pricks of conscience, and the blood-suckers the “repugnance of sin” (ibid.:139). Souls condemned here suffer from the “thought that, in doing anything definite whatsoever, they are missing doing something else” (ibid.). This thought would, one may assume, be intertwined with emotions conducive to non-action, i.e. being afraid of making the wrong choice, or anxiety about one’s future. If whistleblowing is interpreted through the framework of the Inferno, “non-reporters” (e.g., Seifert, 2006; Moore & McAuliffe, 2012) are destined for the Vestibule. They appear to experience the wrongdoing they witness in a manner sufficiently stripped of its emotional significance — without indignation, disgust, anger — except for those dimensions directly associated with their own wellbeing, as to alter the meaning of the wrongdoing and, therefore, their instinctive response to it. This understanding is congruent with Maxwell’s contention that ‘moral action’ depends primarily upon differences in ‘moral perception’ (v.s. 160-161).

108 All quotations from Dante’s work are from D.L. Sayers’ translations of the Inferno and the Paradiso (Alighieri, 1949 and 1974), unless cited otherwise.
Dante was reputedly the first Christian writer to posit a place where the state of choosing not to choose, the choice of neither faith nor works, is as fixed as the state in which one chooses to do good, and enters Paradise, or evil, and enters Hell (Alighieri, 1949). Dante saw this kind of non-participation as threatening all human society, as have other notables:

The world is a dangerous place, not because of those who do evil, but because of those who look on and do nothing — Albert Einstein (Fernando, 2009:347)

All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing — Edmund Burke (ibid.)

Dante implies that it is better to do evil, whether through ignorance or lack of self-control, than to be incapable of acting. Dante says that those with a tolerance “which will neither approve nor condemn, the cautious cowardice for which no decision is ever final” (Alighieri, 1949:139) are “cursed to actually desire the trip to Hell more than fear it” (Birk & Sanders, 2004:18). This may have been one of the earliest Christian works to take issue with a moral relativism, seeing it as a kind of spiritual stagnation “despised” by God and “his enemies” alike (Canto III 63) — “No reputation in the world it has/Mercy and doom hold it alike in scorn” (Canto III 49).

The “choiceless choice” expressed by many whistleblowers leaves no room for such indecision. For instance, Odysseus found the ‘professionalism’ of journalists which required they report ‘both sides’ of his story appalling. His angry exclamation was, “What other side? The ‘side’ that says it is fine to put patients at risk by not informing them of the dangers associated with experimental treatment? There is no other side!” When he was talking about not choosing to blow the whistle if faced with the choice again, he reiterated the idea that perhaps he had had no choice. “I wouldn’t, but I don’t know, maybe I’d have to! … despite saying ‘I wouldn’t do it again,’ what choice do you really have?” Then he
pretended to be showing a colleague research results indicating that a treatment is causing increasing toxicity: “Oh, what do you think of these? ‘Oh, [Odysseus], I think they’re just fine!’ That’s not going to happen, right? That’s what I mean!”

Although Odysseus meant by “the hottest places in hell” the abode of the most wicked souls, in Dante’s vision the deepest circle of Hell was an icy reserve for traitors, reflecting a basic infernal organizational principle. Sin caused by passion was hotter and lesser; sin caused by cold calculation was colder and more wicked, and the most wicked sin was treachery. The least wicked kind of treachery was against kin, because one had no choice in one’s kindred, and only the upright body of the sinner was enclosed in ice; then betrayers of guests lay supine in the ice, having gone against one of the central tenets of ethical behaviour held since ancient times (Campbell, 1998); and in the deepest level of hell, traitors to their benefactors were completely enclosed in agonizing postures within the ice. Whistleblowers may see themselves as the victims of this last level of evil, as they have been betrayed by those whom they have benefited in the past (particularly if they have been long-time, committed employees) and wish to benefit in the present. According to Dante’s vision, organizational members who cover-up wrongdoing rather than reveal it and those who revile rather than support whistleblowers would be destined for this hell realm.

I was discussing the surprising repetition of the Dante references with my son at one point, mentioning all those ‘non-reporters’ in the Vestibule who, upon witnessing wrongdoing, stay silent. Laughing, he said he was not surprised that there were more and more whistleblowers being forced to come forward, because that level of pre-Hell would be so full of moderns there wouldn’t be room for any more. Some theorists (Bloom, 1987; Berman, 2006) would support my son’s observation that in contemporary society, fear and
excitement serve to mask any sense of doing what one knows to be morally dissonant with what one holds to be true and right. They see consumerist society as shallow and lacking in meaning, because the tiny bites of information with which we are being constantly deluged produce adrenaline flooding, which then confuses the consumer with the “artificiality of meanings attached to consumer products” (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2010:266), causing the attribution of meaning where there is none (Berman, 2006). This sinngebung des sinnlosen\textsuperscript{109} alienates a citizen from his own awareness by reducing him “to the role of a passive consumer” (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2010:266), and represses the meaninglessness of this role. Connecting Dante’s vision with a Jungian formulation appears to link the rising incidence of whistleblowing worldwide (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999) with a rising tide of modern meaninglessness. Mythic heroes are distracted by the hubristic lure of sex and sloth — as Jason was led astray by Creusa, unwisely casting aside Medea and his children by her, and as Odysseus was seduced by the witch Circe on an isolated island. So too, most people appear to be trying to make their lives meaningful through the satisfaction of appetite or potential self-aggrandizement. This yearning is so powerful that they are unable to put aside self-seeking so as to take sides in ethical crises. In Jungian terms, they identify so deeply with the self or Persona as constellated in the dark side of the Jacobean Hero, that they cannot connect with their deeper archetypal Self. In order to correct this global imbalance the opposite unconscious force — which, for our purposes, is the active Heraclean Hero — is mobilizing and erupting globally in the form of whistleblowing against organizational corruption. Not only do whistleblowers have their specific tasks, but on a greater scale they provide rare examples of an altruism that embodies loyalty to causes beyond catering to appetite or the need for social approbation.

\textsuperscript{109} The German philosopher Theodor Lessing used this phrase, that translates as “giving meaning to the meaningless” (1927), to describe the Nietzschean view that history imposes a structure of meaning over events that are, in themselves, meaningless.
"A letter for crying out loud": silence and paper armour

Interviewees and DIRG members spoke of writing letters as antidotes to apathy, breaking the silence of collusion. Ajax mentioned that "the vast majority of people will just keep their heads down; including the ones who think you’re absolutely right ... and do nothing about it.” But he could not understand why more people did not take the trouble to do something quite small and without risk, instead of allowing “everything [to be] hushed up quietly and silently”:

If you had twenty of your colleagues writing to your superior/supervisor ... I doubt very much that they would have behaved in quite the way that they did.

A DIRG member got quite agitated at the revelatory possibilities in the simple act of writing a letter:

A letter for crying out loud. It felt great, it sounds good ... The silence and the letter — is everything closed and unrevealed? ... It isn’t going to stay closed, and I thought, “Yay!”

She was feeling Ajax’s frustration, and thrilled to imagine the truth revealed, as if this could change “everything” into some kind of ‘open’ place.

Ajax and Odysseus spoke about moral decision-making being an extended process, and that when one goes public, it is not like opening a single letter, but a “whole pile of papers”. The decision has ‘already’ been made in the way one has lived one’s life up to that point:

... [A]ctually that fork in the road has already been taken ... certainly long before you get to that point... where you’re making the decision to ... go to the press ... And even then, that choice that was made months and months and years before ... It’s not a single entity when you’re sitting down and deciding, ... this direction or ... that direction. So it’s ... a whole process
... involv[ing] the whole pile of papers that big. It's not ... sudden ... it's dozens and dozens of things ... the piling up of small things. (Ajax)

At the crucial moment of choice most of the business of choosing is already over. You live your life; you choose on how you have lived your life up to a point, and then your lives [sic] choose for you. You don't have a choice. (Odysseus)

Such a holistic perspective on decision-making would certainly explain in one way why the impulse to blow the whistle might be experienced as a one-sided imperative brooking no argument. Only an emotional 'closure', that 'feeling of knowing' (Burton, 2008; v.s. 151), is sufficient to move one from rationally 'weighing' the pros and cons to the actual moment when a decision is made. According to the whistleblower subjects, the decision and the moment are pre-determined somehow mysteriously by the sum total of one's life up to that point. The moment itself exists in the necessarily non-rational space between rational assessment and a decision having been determined. Those whose feeling of knowing is slow to generate closure may be uncomfortably aware that their every decision rests on a leap into or out from this void. Here we have the maelstrom, whirling about and tossing details from one's personal and cultural past into the present, a present embedded in a welter of social particulars, and hurling a moral decision out from the chaos into the mind and manner of the whistleblower. In existentialist formulations (Crowell, 2010), awareness of this chaotic, fluctuating void lurking below human consciousness may lead to an exquisite sense of the absurd, the impossibility of finding inherent meaning in the world or one's actions in it. It may be that some aspect of the process of whistleblowing simply brings this awareness closer to consciousness, making it feel more as if one's actions come from having leapt into the wild waters of this void, and then scrambling out of it, whereas in ordinary situations, the feeling of knowing arises long before such an awareness of absurdity develops.
Odysseus referred three times to the absurd responses of organizations to accusations of misconduct. His employer registered a complaint that he had produced no findings in a study, and then, on literally the same page, of not having let the Research Ethics Board know the findings in time. “What findings? I thought there were no findings ... It was like [they were demanding] a hundred impossible things over breakfast”. Both journalists and colleagues, on first learning of his story, questioned his sanity, because the absurdities were so extreme. Odysseus recalled his introduction to another whistleblower who was “fired before he was hired” as “really quite funny.” Odysseus had laughingly said, “Don’t be all superior that you got fired, ... because I got fired three times.” The other whistleblower had looked around as if to say, “Who is this crazy?” and then discovered it was true, Odysseus had him “three to one”. He also gleefully reported a conversation with an investigative journalist who couldn’t quite believe that the pharmaceutical company had threatened him on paper in an attempt to coerce him into misrepresenting the risks of experimental treatment:

“What, you got a letter saying you were going to be served with all legal remedies?” “Yeah, um-hmm.” And they laughed ... “You know [Odysseus], every time you say something completely friggin’ ridiculous, we say: ‘What, you’ve got a letter to support that?’ And ... you say, “Yeah, here it is.” And it just becomes, “O.K. The next thing he says, it’s not going to be nuts, right?” It’s so crazy ... as a friend of mine said, you have to be brain-dead not to know who’s telling the truth.

Although aware of the farcical aspect, Odysseus also experienced it as quite tragic:

I think it’s a rotten assignment. Your assignment ... should you choose to accept it.110 You don’t choose to accept it, right? [sarcastically] But you really didn’t have a lot of choice, I think, and you found yourself there ...

---

110 This is a reference to a television program, Mission Impossible (1966-1973), where agents were asked if they would accept an ‘impossible’ assignment, and they always did. Meleager also referred to this program, but to emphasize that his assignment — to teach people their rights — only seemed impossible, and could be accomplished with prolonged effort.
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Odysseus seems to be saying that he felt put on the spot to respond by speaking out when encountering an intolerable situation. During the DIRG session, one participant expressed feeling uncomfortable with being “put on the spot”, her mind ‘going blank” when she knew when her turn to respond would be coming up in the circle. It is intriguing that this member should experience actually being ‘put on the spot’ — when asked to respond randomly without anticipating when she must speak — as *not* being put on the spot. It seems there has been a switch here in the meaning of the phrase being 'put on the spot' for its opposite, being aware in advance of a requirement to speak (v.s. 118). This DIRG member’s experience seems to have unconsciously identified with the whistleblower’s initial reluctance to speak out, such that being able to anticipate when she will have to speak is analogous to the whistleblower anticipating having to speak out ... and not wanting to. This contrasts with unexpectedly coming across wrongdoing in the moment, and never even entertaining the idea of not reporting it.

Nestor also referred to images of “piles of paper” as symbolic of knowledge and protection. He saw his professional knowledge on the public stage, working toward changes in political representation and legislation, as shielding him from harm: “My suit of armour is the knowledge I have — whatever papers I have, points that I have. I don’t want to be someone who can be easily criticized based on an error in thinking.” He claimed as a youth to have enjoyed “changing people’s points of view” through argument, and despite a relationship fraught with discomfort, had respected his otherwise difficult father for being “a rabbe, a teacher.” He had early on noticed discrepancies between images of the “official versions” of reality on the front page — in his case, how the U.S. media presented the Viet Nam war in the late 60’s — and the “totally different point of view of people who were actually involved” “back ... on page 33.” He attributed having become personally involved in political action to thinking “it was something that would
bring [me] close to Father, make him proud.” Nestor’s understanding of his motives for engaging in whistleblowing position him archetypally as Hero/Knight in service to the Wounded King.

DIRG members expressed concern that Nestor was shaped by his armour, that “he was the suit of armour” with this “exoskeleton ... that becomes the person”. Another said that “not knowing was very dangerous ... in a violent situation”, and that Nestor’s armour was dangerous because it had to take over. Odysseus also made a reference that could be metaphorically connected to the image of the armour being dangerous for a person: “... the human body can’t tolerate too much iron, especially in the heart”. Perhaps the danger in Nestor’s armour was that he would be vulnerable when mistakenly thinking himself protected, as Agamemnon thought himself protected by augury (v.s. 177). It reminded me of Flyvbjerg’s claim (1998; v.s. 22) that where power is operating, the rationality of power trumps the power of rationality, and knowledge ceases to guarantee defense. If knowledge is going to work as a protection, then that which it allegedly protects against is, in fact, no threat. Nestor’s other option, brought up as equally undesirable by the DIRG participants, was to protect himself so thoroughly against vulnerability, he would lose his humanity, his kind concern for others. This loss echoes the loss of concern for others in the shadow aspect of the Heraclean Hero, which causes his eventual downfall.

**Dreams, feelings and reason: strength in numbers and knowledge**

Nestor and Ajax tried to avoid talking about their dreams or claimed not to recall any but those corresponding directly to their waking lives. Nestor’s wife reported he was dreaming about his public speaking, so he suspected that his whistleblowing was “occupying space when sleeping, too.” Ajax claimed not to recall dreams, only going so far as to talk about “metaphorical nightmares”, anxieties on waking about how to defend himself against the
organization's next retaliatory move. The 'dream-like' experiences that they were willing
to relate were both concerned with protecting themselves through knowledge, through
letter-writing. Meleager also talked about awaking "thinking about" solutions to problems:
"I'll just sleep on them and then I'll wake up in the morning and think about them and a
lot of times ... they come while I'm sleeping."

Despite the lack of protection that having the 'truth' on your side seems to provide, all
three believed that with enough clear communication, bonds forged between people will
collectively lend them the power to defend against and remedy the twisted healthcare
system. For Nestor, especially, hope was found in "the relationships you build up with
people around you who are working on the same thing ... people who have ... similar
beliefs." He said it was "very hard to get people moving" but that together they "were
tapping into energy that's there, it's just dormant." His statement made me think of the
'dormant' energies in Jung's collective unconscious, just waiting to be 'tapped' by the
right combination of necessity, circumstance and personality. Nestor did not think people
could "see the reason" — "You can talk until you're blue in the face about statistics"—
but "they can see the passion." Telling stories did the trick: "If somebody comes and tells
a story, suddenly everybody's listening and some are actually going to want to figure out
how to make it better for that one individual." Ajax also trusted in the power of groups of
letter-writers, asking pointed questions about corrupt individuals and corrupt practice.

Perhaps because these three were interested in wide changes in the way people were
treated by the healthcare system, or in how the entire medical research industry could be
re-focussed on helping people rather than exclusively on profit, they were hopeful about
the capacity of the collective to change things for the better when presented and re-
represented with rational arguments for change. Meleager mentioned having engaged in
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“symbolic actions” — mass arrests in front of the White House — but then having decided with others to go beyond these to more effective “strategic” action.

In contrast, Hector, Odysseus and Diomedes felt the futility of resisting and yet (had) persevered, perhaps because they were struggling in relative isolation, on a much smaller scale, against specific individuals and specific institutions for particular misdemeanours. They were all willing to report dreams and the difficult feelings these triggered:

... dreams of ... court ... the truth comes out you know ... and they're just hammering and hammering, hammering at you about what kind of relationship you had with your mother... as if there was something wrong with it ... that's what you do when you love someone ... how is it you can be so condemned for doing the right thing? (Diomedes)

One DIRG member responded to Diomedes’ dream of the court scene with doubts that “the truth does come out. Whoever is strongest at pushing their point, makes their point.” Another spoke about our collective guilt, as “judge, jury, prosecutor”. Most notable was her omission of the attorney for the defence. No one was included to defend, to protect, to advocate for those being oppressed. One of Hector’s dreams suggested that the defender must work in isolation:

I have been hired by the government to work on a classified project ... we are discussing what it is we are supposed to do...“All I can offer is my personal experience of this”...will that help? ... only those who show up with their group can get a free lunch, others have to pay... so I leave, having no cash.

Hector was perhaps dreaming of whistleblowing, that is revealing “classified” information, and was exquisitely aware of not having the requisite resources because of being unconnected to a group, and therefore having “to pay”. Those who have the backing of a group get “a free lunch”; they can resist without fear of paying the price.

One of Odysseus’ baseball dreams echoed the futility of lone action:
I had this dream of hitting the ball out of the park, right? I don’t have that dream any more, because I know there’s no home run in this. At most you make it halfway to second base before you’re out ... I’m consumed with anger too, but I ... don’t want to play in that big ball field any more, I really don’t.

Panel members initially felt joyous on imagining all the people seeing Odysseus’ home run, “everyone cheering together, all aiming at the same happy outcome”, and then crestfallen that Odysseus had given up the idea of ever “getting home”. With respect to the Heroic Quest, Odysseus’ refusal to play through is disappointing. Losing hope means that after all the effort and the trials, after he has exercised his courage and tenacity, he is ultimately denied the satisfaction of returning home to safety and bringing with him the knowledge he has won at such cost, denied the chance to balance the scales and achieve the peace after battle.

Meleager saw that although the “clear truth” he was articulating was “what most people actually feel and would like to hear”, it was difficult to communicate this knowledge to those denying the truth: “Presenting people with facts can get them to align themselves more deeply and heavily ... in their misbelief.” He was convinced that people actually make decisions “on an emotional level”, and that industry had exploited this psychological truth by instilling “a constant state of fear”, blocking people’s ability to accept frightening, “inconvenient” (Gore, 2006) truths. A DIRG member’s unwillingness to “engage emotionally” on hearing Daskylus’ statement that “there was only one path to follow regardless of the pressure/harassment” or else he would be “complicit in the ... abuse” supported Meleager’s conviction. This DIRG participant believed that to really “go into” what the word “abuse” signified, “would bring [her] down so much” it would be too difficult to deal with other things in her life. She said, “I didn’t even want to go there. I can’t go there, among so many other things that are hurtful, that it is hard to engage with them in the way that they probably merit.” Her statement would have answered Ajax’s
query as to why so many choose not to get involved, when he saw the cost of their efforts as negligible. He did not see that for them, the cost was emotional, projected into the future. Another DIRG member wondered, paradoxically, whether the fear and sadness that motivated a fight for one's rights actually "uplifted" that fear and sadness, that heroic action could release one from the grief that witnessing injustice precipitated. With this conjecture, the member unknowingly repeated the original Listening Post-style formulation for her eligibility for inclusion in the DIRG — that we have all experienced sorrow, anger or fear in response to instances of injustice (vs. 113).

Odysseus agreed that a professional's insider knowledge, although it made clear where one's responsibility lay, was next to impossible to communicate in such a way as to change things:

> It doesn't do me any good all that knowledge, is what I feel ... Because I can tell you that [some people] ... do not release data and license on the basis of insufficient data ... But what good does that do you or me to know that? It's not like our knowledge is knowledge translated anymore ... I feel ... the real knowledge I have, is suspended. It's not activated ...

Hector felt similarly: "It's in limbo ... everything I've ever known is floating about in limbo, which is the wrong place for it to be." This statement might have been referencing Dante once again — Limbo, Heaven's waiting room for the innocent but unshriven — although with respect to knowledge rather than souls. Hector and Odysseus are both tormented by the fact that what they know, which should be common knowledge and therefore part of the general good, is rejected and so exists in a vacuum, without effect.

For whistleblowers acting within the profession to change praxis, rather than on the much larger level of public policy, their knowledge constitutes a burden and a vulnerability. Nestor felt his vulnerability in trying to change things at a political level was assuaged by
his protective knowledge. But this same knowledge made Odysseus feel fragile, because it brought to the forefront that internalized sense of futility, a sense successfully repressed by most of his colleagues. We have seen that acting regardless of the futility of action, makes those who resist vulnerable to accusations of mental or emotional instability (v.s. 46: footnote 31). As part of the campaign to discredit their claims and distract from wrongdoing, whistleblowers are accused of being 'serial complainants', who

[see] problems wherever they go ... to some small extent that's true. Someone who is inclined to object to a scientific thing that someone is writing papers about, to the data, is also likely to have objected to other scientific things in the past ... But in general what you're talking about is multiple kinds of things in the same process ... They turn it into: this is a person who is complaining about everybody, just a serial complainant. (Ajax)

Ajax's 'metaphorical nightmares' arose around coping with potential accusations of being mentally ill:

I woke up in the night thinking about correspondence that I needed to write. The next bit of how I could prevent them from ... trying to make out that I was a raging lunatic. It's almost a routine part of these scenarios that aspersions are cast about people's mental health. It's almost a routine part of the bullying that people experience. That the things you raise are not credible because you're a raving lunatic. Or they might be credible but the reason you raise them in this particular manner is [not].

Hector's dream of two teachers symbolized the burden of carrying knowledge and the vulnerability it creates:

The older teacher is trying to impart a very important lesson to the middle aged teacher who is supporting him in his arms, and having trouble because he is ... holding off death until he is finished. When [he] finishes, he breathes with difficulty, heavily, three or four times and then ... his tongue comes out of his mouth, and keeps coming and coming. It is a very large, flattened organ, very heavy, pale, pale pink and yellow-gray with touches of mucus here and there. His second is ... easing it out of him. When it has finished being collected, the elder collapses and his head sinks to the ground as he lays down on his right side. His skin looks gray now. I hear...
the words, "We are at a place where empathy outweighs common sense by twenty to one."

A DIRG member responded to this dream saying she was reminded of paintings from the Renaissance, displaying internal organs. "We’ve gone back in time to Renaissance Italy, and there’s biology and scientists poking around." This comment brought to mind the explosion of new information at that time, that new heroism of the Enlightenment scientist-explorer in defying tradition and the power of the Church (v.s. 178). Just as those scientists were seeking to separate fact from opinion and dogma, so too were my whistleblower subjects attempting to untangle the truth from lies in the representations orchestrated by retaliating organizations.

The dream’s closing comment called to mind a section of the *Inferno* where Dante’s guide through Hell, the Roman poet Virgil, representing Reason, says that pity and piety are mutually exclusive:

> Here pity, or here piety, must die  
> If the other lives; who’s wickeder than one  
> That’s agonized by God’s high equity? (Canto XX 28-30)

Dante meant that it is wicked to pity the wicked, for in so doing one doubts God’s judgment and punishment. Here one recalls Moses’ punishment for his heroic hubris of over-empathizing with his fellow Israelites (v.s. 188). A rationalist version of the same idea is found in the instrumentalism of Kantian ethics, which holds that sympathy without remedy is irrational and futile (v.s. 159: footnote 89). Hector’s dream seems to be saying that this lesson has been discarded for its opposite, and that currently there is so much indulgence in futile ‘feeling with’, or at least the preoccupation with appearing empathetic, there are no viable solutions available.
Buildings: transparency and innocence

Ajax discussed profession-wide corruption. He cited, for example, scientists signing their name to studies when they have not seen the data, and ultimately refusing to look at the data, even in circumstances under which considerable evidence suggested that the data was being manipulated. Even if they were unsuccessful, he did not see his own efforts as hopeless, but he viewed "going after" individuals for specific wrongdoing as part of a much wider campaign to abrogate entrenched unethical procedures and practises that were widely accepted as the norm, and that this campaign was cogent not only within medical research but in all research organizations. He maintained that going after the few key people in each area of fraudulent research might be possible:

... you have this cohort of completely corrupted academics ... who are facilitating publication of fraudulent results of clinical trials or suppression of results of clinical trials. You're talking about maybe in critical areas ... a dozen people. I think those people need going for. I think they need all their activities exposed, all their funding exposed. I think they need a concerted effort to humiliate them and to bring attention to the sort of things that they do ... That's not basically what whistle-blowing is supposed to be about, but I think that often that is what it is about and what it should be about.

Nestor spoke not about individuals, but about "monoliths of profit". The hospital where he used to work used to be service-motivated, but he saw recent construction as flagrantly symbolic of having bought into the for-profit model:

Now they've put in two towers ...and there's a third one going up ... If you look where all the building is now, it tells you a lot about society where the big buildings are going — banks and other financial institutions — building these huge towers and hospitals.

Ajax used the same wording, "massive monolith", to refer to what Nestor was saying the enormous buildings represented, "a system that can do whatever it likes and there's
nothing to do about it” (Ajax). Since at least Biblical times, towers have been symbols of institutional power and, therefore, of straying from obedience to God’s plan. The Tower of Babel, for example, symbolized humanity’s misuse of the divine gift of intellect and language (Genesis 11:1-9); its construction marked the beginning of humanity’s collective history of strife and conflict. Buildings which may be interpreted as symbols of societal trends and values commonly occur in dreams, and buildings were the main ‘characters’ in some interviewees’ dreams:

It was a publicly available, but official new building — in the way that a library is — and we were all on the ground floor. This floor was separated into many different areas ... [by walls] of clear glass, so the whole thing was transparent and you could see what other individuals or groups were doing in other areas. Some areas could be made more private by dark curtains if necessary. I was inviting people to come and go, and collaborate creatively with others while there. The idea was that you could come, create, refine and disseminate whatever arose. It was an intellectual and artistic ‘salon’ of sorts.

I am at some kind of an outdoor rally at the Parliament Buildings. There are many, many people there, all in 'black shirt' outfits like Gestapo ... I go to a room with muted lighting in the Building ... like a shrine, where there is a wall of bones, human bones, all stacked up interspersed here and there with silver and leather, etc. Judaica, and it is all surfaced with a blue-green ceramic floor to ceiling. There are bricks being mortared over them by one of the black shirts. [The leader] comes in, looks at me and orders with a wave of the hand to remove the bricks, and then looks at me for an instant, appealingly, as if to say, “See? I’ve started already.”

In the first dream, it is the transparency that features most strongly. In this glass building it is plain what others are up to. It is a symbol of the transparent conduct that medical professional rhetoric espouses but which, as all the whistleblowers could agree — e.g., Odysseus’ opinion of the obvious distortion of research data (v.s. 219) — is often not evident. One of the DIRG members found the dream “really encouraging”, that something “available for the people to take part in and create for themselves was in the early stages of being built.” Another stated “it was easy to get to instead of hard to get to”, because the
glass allowed light in everywhere. It occurred to me that everyone working there would not throw stones, but be particularly careful because all their actions, even when they were covering their tracks, would be open to public scrutiny. One member, however, found her “cynicism about things being transparent” coming up. She said she had a fantasy about the world being “all visible, and the sacredness of solitude” being recognized, but also expressed reservations that “we can talk about transparency, but do we really want to see everything all the time?” What at first sounded utopian, could be seen as an invitation to a terrible tyranny: What kind of surveillance would be required for all of us to know all of our neighbour’s business? What would the price of such knowledge be?

In the second dream, the buildings are a locus of exactly this kind of unhealthy control, bricking in and hiding from sight the sins of the past. The walls are constructed of “human bones”, perhaps symbolizing the social history that went into their construction. The word “Judaica” makes particularly prominent the suffering of large numbers of individuals incidentally required to create and sustain current human institutions. Previously, the dream’s protagonist has approached the leader to confront him, acting as Seer. At first, the Seer only knows about an historical cover-up, but then he accesses knowledge of the leader’s heart. In the dream he feels anger, pity, and then experiences a “wave of compassion ... [and] sadness for his enormous potential being so misdirected in ignorance.” So the dream transforms to one of hope, and the leader accepts the Seer’s insight because of his empathy, and begins to stop the cover-up.

This material introduces the notion of the relative innocence of those who do wrong. As in Dante’s outermost circles of Hell, they have fallen victim to their own natures, as do many mythical Heroes in the end. Ajax says of his colleagues who keep silent that “they remain as sheep”. Meleager speaks of the police who arrested him as “so ashamed to be arresting
us that [they] treated us amazingly well”, and the members of congress who would not put
in place legislation to help the poorest patients as “having a party — laughing and friendly
and no sense that they were there to address a real crisis ... [of] people dying and
suffering. This was no reality to them at all.” As a result Meleager and his comrades do
not try to address any kind of conspiracy — “there’s nothing wrong with a conspiracy
theory if there’s an actual conspiracy ...[but] you try not to let it affect you too much. It is
a reality” — by “accus[ing] anybody of being a traitor or anything like that. We just know
that somebody is being disruptive for whatever reason.” They have chosen to avoid the ad
hominem tactics of corporate counter-resistance (Monk et al., 2015).

Interviewees’ dreams of buildings also suggested knowing and not knowing where one
stood and where one needed to go:

But the dream I still have ... any six-year old brain could interpret this, is
I’m in a hotel, and I haven’t made it to the talk I’m supposed to give, and I
can’t find the key to the room and I can’t find the room I’m supposed to be
in. Sometimes I can’t even find the hotel. So I’m lost [emphasis sic] and ... you wouldn’t believe the time I waste trying to find the floor I’m on, and
the room I’m in, and the meeting room I’m supposed to be talking in ...
I’m lost in a place where I’m supposed to be, but I’m lost in it and I can’t
find it ... and ... I’m in this field still because [I’m] ... looking over the
fence saying, “Please play with me again... I promise I won’t be as honest
that time, I won’t call it the way it is...” because in general, the system has
been purchased by the companies ... So, ...so I’m out ... (Odysseus)

In this dream, the hotel may be interpreted as representing Odysseus’ work life/life work.
His work, a ‘place’ he is only visiting to a particular purpose, is his maze — despite the
onus to be there, his purpose and way of being in it has become obscured. In maze myths,
after accomplishing a terrible task of overcoming the Beast (which normally symbolizes
the baser appetites), the Hero is brought back into the light by a trick provided to him by
the love of his protective deity. Odysseus has not yet finished in the maze, that is, he is
still lost and searching for some way to conquer the Beast, here perhaps the greed against
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which he has set himself. He realizes he is not permitted to tell the truth and he cannot find backing from a strong group to do so. This may explain why Odysseus feels so deeply a sense of cynicism and futility — he has no prospect of ‘coming home’ but is ‘out’ of the game; despite still working in research and enjoying a good reputation as a scientist, he is experiencing his fight against corporate power as having been lost for ages, and knows that he cannot defeat the Beast and find his way out from the maze alone.

Hector and Daskylus both reported that, as the result of having become ill from enduring retaliation for reporting, they “got lost many times [Hector reported getting lost repeatedly in his own neighbourhood], and actually went in the wrong house once” (Daskylus). Because they have been virtually ejected from their careers, they see themselves as not only in the wrong hotel room, but as being in the wrong buildings. The reprisal they have experienced has been enough to knock them completely off course, such that they even have trouble recognizing their safe harbours. This is also part of the mythic Hero’s journey. In the myths of Greek heroes Jason and Odysseus returning home after the Trojan War, and of the Trojan prince Aeneas who escapes the razing of Troy to become the founder of Rome, the heroes are swept out to sea by storms and must face monsters before coming home or arriving at their destined homeland. It is the sea, a symbol for endlessness and unimaginable depth that controls their lives. “Water is the commonest symbol of the unconscious” (CW IXi 40), associated with currents of emotion (ibid. 47; Woodman & Dickson, 1996). The “dark sea of the unconscious” (CW IXi 48) threatens to rush in where consciousness deludes itself as to the extent of its power over its environment: “helplessness and weakness are the eternal experience and the eternal problem of mankind” (CW IXi 44). Incomprehensibly vast and complex forces are pushing our Heroes in a global pattern that, like the oceans, is affecting and affected by individual beings, groups of beings and events in the air, the earth and the water. Rather than being...
irrational or delusional, whistleblowers, from the archetypal perspective of the Hero, are among the few who appreciate the degree to which they are powerless over their own conditions and the tide of events. It is in facing this bleak vista with courage and action that their heroism manifests, rather than ignoring what is not right in their world so as to settle for small comforts.

**Archetypal embodiment: hands and feet**

Jungian archetypal activity is only detectable through the embodied experience of individuals. As it is through the body that the hidden knowledge straining for release from the archetypal realm is communicated, I thought it might be useful to examine the whistleblowers’ references to bodies\(^{111}\). Odysseus told of planning a medical procedure, “something that would have been personally wrong”, and then getting “so sick the night before that — it was an uncharacteristic sickness, I’m never sick — and I had to cancel”, as if his body knew what his mind denied. Significantly, during protest activities, Nestor and Meleager used a huge puppet of the U.S. President, to get across the idea of politicians displaying the semblance of being embodied without a genuine capacity for making a decision or being sympathetic to any but those corporations who pull their puppet strings.

Odysseus identified his having read the thalidomide story and seen the images in his physician father’s “1961 Life Magazine” of the babies lacking arms and legs\(^{112}\) as being what might have first led him to study medicine, in order to help prevent disasters such as those pictured. He said he “pored over that [article] for literally over a decade”. What

---

\(^{111}\) There is a broad literature on the body in philosophy, sociology and feminism (e.g., Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012; Haraway, 1991; Butler, 1993; Weiss, 1999; Gonzalez-Arnal, Jagger & Lennon, 2012). For this chapter, however, rather than beginning with the work of other authors to develop new insights, I was following the promptings of the amplificatory process (Romanyshyn, 2010) generated by the sharings of the whistleblower subjects and DIRG members.

\(^{112}\) A drug widely prescribed for morning sickness in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s as a sedative and anti-emetic, thalidomide was linked to limb reduction anomalies, congenital heart disease, malformations of the inner and outer ear, and ocular abnormalities (Miller & Strömland, 1999).
struck him now was the slow rate at which the story spread from Australia, to Germany and then to North America, specifically because of there being no web-based images. He was sure that now it "would have happened overnight ... and it might have saved people's lives." Odysseus thought those who "described the original foetal abnormalities as related to thalidomide" were at first "called crazy" because of this lack of images as evidence. Then he reconsidered, saying it was just "the usual drug company efforts to deny, delay, divide, discredit". It was interesting that he did not note that, despite contemporary whistleblowers having potential access to enormous distribution of web-based images portraying those problems with which they are dealing, their messages still seem to fall mostly on deaf ears. Although people are saturated with images of wrongdoing, it seems to be that without some kind of intersubjective agreement of millions of viewers as to the meaning of the images, their distribution still has little to no effect. 113

The lack of action in response to images and information may be due in part to something Ajax remarked on, which was that "people will engage with principles — so, [e.g.,] ghost writing [in research] is bad — but they don't engage very strongly with individual examples of that principle they've spent so long discussing." This seems to contradict directly what Nestor said (v.s. 216) about people wanting to respond more strongly to individual's tales of being treated unfairly than to statistics or abstractions. It may be that the discrepancy is due to the numbers of people physically present, or directly in contact with one another, such that they are feeling that, as a group, there is a shared response and

113 People do judge the moral status of images they see, but no longer do they automatically assume images are authentic. So there is no huge increase of that active resistance Odysseus supposed would arise in response to images. E.g., after the G20 Toronto protest, Malla (2010) wondered whether "wagging Magic Marked placards is the best way to wield political influence," mentioning that he felt "compelled" to "get involved, if only as a witness" (ibid.:37). He gave equal weight to witnessing as to acting, perhaps due to some confusion between the virtual and the real. Such confusion has long been of concern to anthropologists interested in advocacy, suggesting that armchair academics cultivate a similar conceit of equivocating description with action (Van Esterik, 1985) so as to excuse their inactivity. It harks back to Maxwell's discussion of the differences between moral reason, perception, motivation and action (v.s. 160-161).
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therefore a shared responsibility to act. Nestor was talking about groups of people, some attending those events he was involved in setting up that he termed ‘speak-outs’, getting together specifically to hear and then to plan what to do about the tales of wrongdoing that are recounted. On the other hand, Ajax was referring to individuals hearing of scientific misconduct through the grapevine, and then writing a letter to inquire/remonstrate about it on their own initiative.

It seems that individuals rarely respond on their own recognizance, possibly due to a Bystander Effect (Latané & Darley, 1970), where the number of individuals witnessing an emergency varies inversely with the number of those individuals willing to actually help on the spot, since “everyone thinks that someone else is going to engage with it” (Ajax). In contrast, a witnessing group can collectively “muster the wherewithal” (v.s. 169) to organize a response or set of responses because individuals become accountable for their commitments to respond once on record with other members of the group. It is possible to think of those defending a principle by writing letters emphasizing points of argument as Heroes who are Champions of the King, acting unsupported on their own in the world. Those who come together in groups that share a joint commitment to help when they hear individual victimization tales appear to be acting on a different archetypal template, that of Champion(s) of the Queen and Her People.

Hands as symbolic of ‘decisions to be made’ emerged in Daskylus’ and Diomedes’ tales. Daskylus spoke of a supervisor’s hands as representing the power to grant or withdraw support to an ill colleague: “He had his hands out as he was speaking. I leaned over and asked him to please go with this hand”, the one gesturing as he spoke about allowing the colleague to access medical leave benefits. Diomedes referred to his father’s hands. Upon being read the nurses’ notes secretly smuggled to him which detailed that Diomedes’
mother had been subject to a possibly fatal criminal negligence, "... my father folded his hands and looked down" and insisted that Diomedes fight for "justice" for his late mother. Nestor also mentioned the hand with reference to making a decision — here the decision to 'stand up and be counted'— in talking about being jailed for staging a protest. He said that being incarcerated as a component of civil disobedience was "like putting your finger up in the wind and waiting to see what happens ... putting your hand up." This image could be that of a student waiting to be called on in class, waving his hand madly about with the answer, while the teacher ignores his knowledge, or keeps him waiting in the hope that others will respond. As in the student image, the whistleblower's ability to share knowledge seems to depend utterly on the 'King's pleasure', the power in the room that may be waiting for a less threatening alternative than hearing the truth spoken.

DIRG members responded strongly to a dream in which a large, aggressive turtle had climbed up a whistleblower's legs, and he had nonchalantly attempted to "sweep it off, saying, "Get off! Get off, you silly thing!" They associated it with a denial of danger: "... he is just brushing it off ... Throw it off! Or stab it with your sword! ... Why are you not realizing the real terror of this?" and, "He should be terrified! ... He should protect himself from this." The allusion to the sword recalls images of the Heraclean Hero as Dragon-slayer, serving to rescue the local populace from its depredations. Perhaps DIRG members are reacting to the 'dormant' status of Heracles' light aspect, and insisting it awaken in the presence of evil. They are demanding an alternative to the Jacobean Hero, who, unless the Beast's demise is to his advantage, trivializes danger and potential damage. DIRG members reacted to this image with the same kind of horror they expressed when they learned of Diomedes' mother having had her legs broken by her caregivers, who then covered this occurrence up. Despite not wanting to think about the "abuse" (v.s. 218), they experienced both horror and outrage. They compared the nurses' actions to
Chapter six: Passing through the dark night

those of a hit-and-run driver, wherein initial innocence at having made a mistake, transforms to cowardly malfeasance in refusing to make amends for it. In terms of the *Inferno*, the nurses had chosen to move from an outer ring of Hell — for the sin of sloppiness, perhaps, or in Diomedes' mother's case for the alleged incontinence of intoxication — into a deeper level, for the more serious transgression of betraying the interest of their patient by covering up that error and causing further serious injury as a result.

*Individual malady or societal malaise: strata of significance*

One of the major thrusts of the thesis is that it looks beyond the individual whistleblower, his personality or his employing organization, and instead sees whistleblowing as a phenomenon that comes out of organizational or societal dysfunction, with the individual whistleblower acting as the necessary but purely contingent vehicle for archetypal *enantiodromia*. The archetypal pressure for this resistance is increasing in the "new capitalism" (Sennett, 2015), a society built increasingly upon the twin neoliberal illusions of individual autonomy (Knights & McCabe, 2003) that rejects "the paradox of individuality ... [that] can be constructed only through social confirmation" (Bauman, 1992:88), and the socially benevolent side-effects of unfettered trade (Sennett, 2006; Fleming, 2015). Whistleblowers represent the emergent opposite of that obsessive self-interested objective of the corporate elite — which is to "[disrupt] and [deregulate] impact of moral behavior" (Bauman, 1989:215) so as to maximize short-term economic profit regardless of moral or political cost (Sennett, 2006; Bauman, 2007; Fleming 2015).

Whistleblowers trying to communicate a corruption across an entire industry, as in the distortion of pharmaceutical research, are regularly accused of being conspiracy theorists. Ajax believed that
[Y]ou get all these accusations by people who don’t look at it properly and say: ‘that’s conspiracy theory’. You’re talking about a huge conspiracy here and that’s the problem ... All a conspiracy means is that more than one person gets [sic] together with one other person to commit an inappropriate act. That’s all it is ... and [sarcastically] that never happens!

Hector saw the variation in levels as the real obstacle in stopping such misconduct. He looked at fixing the same problem over and over as a Sisyphean undertaking, where ‘evil’ behaviour acts in the same way as an organic pathogen, and is similarly difficult to pin down and eradicate:

... How can you possibly stop these things at such a small level, at the level of a single institution? But can you solve it if it’s being replicated all over? It’s like a virus that just moves around and as it does, mutates slightly to accommodate whatever is the latest threat.

Hector believed that “a lot of energy [is] being wasted looking at things that are too small and not ... problems [at] the systemic levels.” Nestor, in his emphasis that the best stories in the ‘speak-outs’ “show[ed] how people’s lives have been ruined by the medical system, not just by the drug companies or whatever,” also aimed to attack problems which were widespread, rather than small scale and particular. Meleager concurred that issues need to be addressed at the largest possible political level where, at the same time, one does not lose sight of the effects on individual’s lives, otherwise what you get is truly “just kind of tinkering and none of the tinkering ha[s] improved outcomes.” Meleager contended that there is no interest in hearing about solutions at the higher administrative levels where authority to act on these problems actually rests:

It’s such a game, you know. Foundations come in and give groups all this money to put in place non-solutions. They have all this money for advertising, but you come in there with ... real facts and they don’t want to hear that because it goes against all the money ... They’ve managed to make an industry out of ostensibly helping another industry and don’t want that threatened. There is a whole non-profit industrial complex that exists to maintain the status quo.
Ajax echoed Meleager’s opinion of these ‘helping’ bodies, and was quite clear that it was not enough to go after a single instance of misconduct. Such tunnel vision led only to these groups “jumping onto the carcass like a bunch of vultures”. Ajax had in mind more of a pillory, where “the only way to draw attention to systemic problems is by pointing out really serious examples of that particular systemic problem and the level to which it has got,” and exposing and publicly humiliating all the responsible accessories. Ajax understood that, although actual occurrences are all unique, they must be tied to widely accepted values in order to have any meaning. By using a specific case as a kind of pillory, Ajax hoped to spark some kind of emotional response such that other cases of which this might be representative would be brought under an equally critical scrutiny.

Ajax hoped that the consequences of one act would become a deterrent, if punishment for one person’s or one group’s wrongdoing might become symbolic of what will come to others. So far, however, it appears that consequences have been insufficient to prevent further wrongdoing, a few million dollars in fines for firms whose gross income may amount to billions of dollars (Kesselheim et al., 2010). Nor does exposure of criminality seem to be sufficient; the health care system is already “so collapsed and corrupted ... that they ... have ... massive scandal[s], say thalidomide times three” (Odysseus) and still no one is willing to redesign those parts of the system that directly endanger the public (Hector):

Look at Vioxx for example. [It] probably killed 100,000 ... middle-aged American men. And yet the response to that has been almost nothing. No one ... stepped back and said ... ‘Let’s rethink the system.’ No one went to jail. This stuff came out and nobody cared. Nothing, a big nothing. (Ajax)

Meleager is convinced that the only way to get society-wide, meaningful changes is in seeing all the specifics that need to be done as part of a broader social movement: “... if
we keep focusing on a single issue, none of us is going to have the strength to overcome that obstacle ... But if we actually see our connection and start working together then we might actually have a chance.” To this end Meleager and Nestor, and other whistleblowers whose efforts go toward changing conditions by helping the political system to re-focus on those who need their help rather than being in aid of entrenched power and wealth, see their “mission impossible” as teaching people:

... We have to teach people that they have rights ... that their rights are being violated and how to stand up to that ... It's not just about health, it's about ... a grassroots that's willing to demand health care and education and housing and child support and for [sic] the human environment.

On hearing Meleager’s vision of remedies at a wider public level with its demands for a compassion that is missing from or overlooked by institutions, a DIRG member said:

The goddess is showing the shadow side of the feminine, and we are in a state of panic. We’ve never dealt with this before, because we have painted this image right from the Virgin Mary with how ‘perfect’ the feminine is... and now she’s saying, “I’ll show you my dark side”.

Another made reference to “trusting your intuition and listening, and acting on it”. Both these comments, although the DIRG group had not yet been introduced to the idea of the Hero as Champion of the Mother, articulated essential aspects of this new turn, emphasizing the newly emergent focus on compassion as belonging to that dark side of the Great Goddess. Diomedes linked this compassion with the nobility of the historical Hero. He recalled his ancestor, his great grandfather, a Baron but also a socialist, whose concern was the wellbeing of his ‘serfs’, technically “peasants ... signed into indenture for 20 years.” The Baron believed that these workers “should be given acreage and then paid a good wage or a fair wage to work on the estate ... keep[ing] whatever they made on their acreage ... for their family.” He was a hero to many, having helped rescue over 800
people in a 24 hour span when the Danube flooded until he was “totally exhausted.” Yet, because of his compassion for his ‘inferiors’, he was incarcerated for two years for seditious “conspiracy ... [to] overthrow the government”, and “came out ... blind.” This Heraclean Seer was punished for his visionary labours, for being ‘ahead of his time’, suffering Dante’s punishment for sorcerors or fortune-tellers (in the Eighth Circle of Hell, Canto XX 13-15) particularly fitted to the ‘crime’ of seeing into a possibly better future, by being blinded in the present.

Suggestions of an archetypal plan underlying Meleager’s vision was also articulated by Meleager himself. In speaking about the ‘movement of movements’, he talked about having created a “Shadow” government, one which demonstrates what acting for the people could look like:

There are very real solutions for every crisis that we face and actually the majority of people support those solutions. Governments are doing the opposite. That’s why another project that we just launched last week was a shadow government project. ... eighty people ... who are really top in their field ... responding to what the government does. People know that they want to leave [the Democratic party]...but they don’t see something tangible to go to. So we have to show them there’s something tangible to go to.

Meleager is aware of the vital role that vision plays in social change. Without being able to envision an alternative, people cannot understand that there are many ways to accomplish the same ends, and consequently do not pursue alternatives with the passion and persistence needed. By setting up a Shadow of it, Meleager in essence condemns the existing political structure —

Ralph Nader says ... the difference between Republicans and Democrats is the velocity with which their knees hit the floor when the corporations come running (Odysseus) —
but not the potential of the current political process to serve the public good.

**Vision and re-vision: opening vistas, embracing understanding**

Throughout, many spoke of the central trope of vision, being able to ‘see’, which is to feel and to understand what constitutes an ethical response to the perception of a given situation.

In bemoaning that his insider knowledge of the corruption of medical research “is having no impact”, Odysseus stated that because “the [medical] profession’s lost the struggle … [i]t’s not going to change any more. It’s gone.” He was astonished that my profession has been so corrupted and that my so-called intelligent colleagues believe this is the real thing … anybody who looks at any of this and has half a brain and one eye open is going to see that the whole thing has been completely corrupted. I mean, there’s no question, it’s so obvious … For me it’s transparent, how the literature has been distorted.

This remark evokes the symbol of the light aspect of the Odin archetype, the Norse king of the gods (v.s. 133: footnote 80). Odin sought knowledge to make him an effective leader, and paid the price of losing one eye. Anyone “with one eye open” has, therefore, paid a steep price for knowledge hidden from most, and, in Odysseus’ opinion, has traded the vulnerability of ignorance for that of having insight into unacceptable praxis.

Ajax explains that his resistance is not primarily against the “bad science” that he sees clearly, but against those who pretend their lies represent an undistorted view of things as they are:

You see the world in a particular way and this is how it should work and when it doesn’t, it’s irritating. [But] it’s not just about the world; it’s about the people who make it look the way it looks, say it does look. … That people can think that they can behave that way and get away with it with impunity, which they [do].
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As the Seer, Ajax is “not so much empathizing with the person who’s being victimized, as objecting to the bullying.” Ajax and Hector agree that tolerance for such behaviour, once discovered, ‘has no place’, or ought not to.

Several whistleblowers’ dreams centred around a revelation of how things ‘truly’ are, the knowledge of which carries a moral imperative to action. These dreams have images of veils lifting, clouds parting, new structures allowing for increased clarity, extent and depth of vision. The first talks about being able to see all the way around the world in an international exhibition:

Expo ’67 or some such ... in a valley ... Nearer all is ... bright white ...; farther is ... a channel cut right through the earth to the Orient, also white ... one can see a mock-up of United States and North America as if in a diorama or 3-D map, with a view starting from the Florida peninsula and the Gulf of Mexico progressing to the north.

The global vision could emanate from the current pre-occupation with economic and cultural globalization. Such expanded vision might imply that the local actions of whistleblowers have repercussions planet-wide: ‘think globally, act locally’. The “channel” cuts directly through the globe; archetypal influences on a species scale are not restricted geographically, but link populations directly through a deep layer of the collective unconscious.

Another reiterates this planetary vision as one of “unfolding” joy:

... viewing the earth from probably a mile or so up and travelling rapidly over woods, fields, but mostly vast plateaus [and] ... rock formations or ranges ... aware of passing over the curvature of the earth, as vista after vista opens below me. The feeling with it is one of great joy, but not a personal joy, rather a boundless feeling, enjoyment of the earth below in all its beauty and expanse, and a relaxed interest, rather than restless curiosity, in what is unfolding there.
The dreamer sees the earth as a whole, getting ‘the big picture’. This view provides sufficient detachment from immediate details to allow the dreamer to ‘think big’: “from up there I am fine if I don’t have to see ... the specifics of my life ... to completely detach from all of it, floating above it”. There is a sense of protective solidity in seeing the ‘bones’ of earth, the rocks underlying the landscape, communicating a tone of happy security found in one’s home, or in a sanctuary. The vastness here, as opposed to images of the enormous uncontrollable threat posed by the ocean of the unconscious (v.s. 226), promotes a calm joy. In that it is “not a personal joy”, the dreamer suggests that it is the scale of the vision, a view inclusive of everyone, which is directly responsible for its positive effect.

The third similarly refers to a view from a height:

... the next room ... is huge ... In [it] is some kind of holograph of a part of the curvature of the earth as if seen from several miles up. It is completely detailed, cloudy and when the clouds part you can see the terrain below ... One student says, “There’s a hole in the pollution!” and ... sure enough, there is a break in the clouds. I ask him, “Is it over the pole?” as if we were speaking of the ozone. He affirms that. I then begin to walk over the projection, fighting a bit with vertigo when the clouds part beneath my feet, feeling like I am flying very, very high ... [and] the surprise of being able to do this, but no one else seems to remark that it is unusual.

In the two latter dreams, distance yields wide vision. Just as astronauts see the earth and its curvature as one unit, so too may an archetypal perspective allow for a view of issues and elements pertinent to all earth’s inhabitants. It is when “pollution”, contamination which disguises the actual terrain, lifts “over the pole” that unimpeded vision is possible. There is a form of detachment here that may permit being able to see one’s context clearly. The lifting may be seen as the emergence of one polarized aspect of an
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archetype\(^{114}\) into consciousness, where a new balancing brings clarity. Each time the viewer sees clearly, there is a feeling of vertigo, of being off balance when in balance, similar to the way in which a sailor acclimated to the movement of a ship beneath his feet experiences unsteadiness on returning to solid land. The whistleblower is struck not only by his unusual view (of that against which he resists), but by others’ denial of its significance.

A fourth dream refers directly to heroic action causing/resulting from expanded vision:

A group of us are attending a live theatre performance, close to the stage. We go through a dark and shadowed alley or tunnel, to get from ‘real life’ to the stage set. It is a classic story of good and evil, and there is a Chinese warrior woman, who at one point gives up her upper garment for her hero colleague to use ... The ‘hero’ swings this garment around and around, until he opens up a crack in the fabric of the universe overhead. It is a sort of tunnel, all blue-silver and shining and coruscating inside like intense moonlight seen through agitated water ... any such break will always appear as a tunnel from our standpoint ... [At the] end, the hero appears out of the void high up upon some kind of elevated platform, and in the spotlight he is bearing a strange new set of scars around his face, in two colours in a stylized lion’s mane pattern. He is/is to wear the Lion Mask.

The speaker first travels from everyday life into the shadowed interior, the unconscious. The Hero takes the proffered ‘garment’ of an Oriental woman, and swings it round. The Norse God, Thor, also swings his hammer in this manner (Guirand, 1968) — causing an atmospheric maelstrom — so we have a ‘swinging’ from East to West and then round and round. There is an evocation and balancing of opposites here — East and West, skillful male and compassionate female, surrender and resistance — that brings about a healing transformation. In the dream and in Thor’s mythic handling of his hammer, the movement

\(^{114}\) Indeed, Jung’s later writing theorized that, since the multiplicity of the empirical world rests on an underlying unity, alchemy’s unus mundus (CW XIV 769), polarized archetypal tensions exist on a planetary basis.
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causes a ‘crack’ in spacetime, allowing for completely new energies to enter the human realm (Thor, 2011).

A DIRG member picked up on the idea that the Hero’s movement “caused the crack” by forcing a “more primitive” energy to manifest, which made the dreamer become “really wild” and “[let] go of the stage, and the formality”. This response fits with the movement of an Heroic archetype, erupting into the world in an uncontrolled, “wild” manner. ‘Moonlight’ and ‘water’, both symbolic of the feminine and the unconscious (v.s. 226; Estes, 1992), imply that these helpful yin energies are being drawn from the unconscious. Another DIRG member commented on the intuitive side becoming active: “We’re part of nature and we know how to do things without being taught.” At the play’s close, the Hero has been elevated by his Quest, purified, displaying permanent, unalterable evidence — in two colours, in one reading the masculine and the feminine — of having drawn into consciousness, on his “face”, his primitive, intuitive side, so as to have become a whole, victorious individual. In a way similar to Nestor’s armour being worn by him and being him, the energies of the Hero’s Persona and his Self merge — the Lion Mask is worn by him, and is him.

The theme of clear and obscured vision being connected with energy arises in another excerpt from Nestor. He mentioned at one point that he was dealing with speaking out even while sleeping. He went on to describe “good days” and “bad days”, those with and without the “energy to do what I want to do”. He ascribed these good feelings on awakening to an excellent connection with those engaged beside him in his efforts to change the medical system, and impaired personal relationships with a feeling of enervation. At this, a DIRG member called him her “twin brother”, saying, “Some days you are really focussed; other days really blurry — this is life.” She points out the
conscious and unconscious sides of human awareness, sometimes awake while sleeping and other times sleeping while awake.

Another member suddenly interjected what seemed an unrelated image: “I see myself standing in a rose garden in the hot sun with all these bees buzzing around. It smelled nice.” This image seemed a strange intrusion until I came across the section of Paradiso (Cantos XXX-XXXIII) where Dante bathes his eyes in a river of light, such that his sight is strengthened to the point where he may witness the intense light of God’s dwelling place, the highest level of Heaven. Dante symbolized this realm with a snow white rose, a symbol of divine love, as the red rose signified earthly love in medieval literature (Alighieri, 1962:324). The petals of the white rose are rising tiers of the thrones of the saints and faithful souls, and the angels are the bees “waft[ing] to and fro”, carrying “the peace and burning love/they gathered” (Canto XXXI 17-18) to the souls of the redeemed.

Aspects of the dreams of opening vistas are echoed in Dante’s words:

For now my sight, clear and yet clearer grown,
Pierced through the ray of that exalted light
Wherein, as in itself, the truth is known.
Henceforth my vision mounted to a height
Where speech is vanquished and must lag behind
And memory surrenders in such plight. (Canto XXX 52-55)115

The poet speaks here of the impossibility of expressing what he sees through the medium of language, and that this impossibility becomes more acute as his vision of the ‘truth’ becomes clearer. Dante refers to heights as do the whistleblowers’ dreams since, metaphorically as has already been noted, what is known from a great height or great

---

115 For those readers who have Italian, the original reads: Ché la mia vista, venendo sincera e più e più intrava per lo raggio/ de l’alta luce che da sé è vera! Da quinci innanzi il mio veder fu maggio/ che 'l parlar mostra, ch'a tal vista cede/ e cede la memoria a tanto oltraggio.
distance comprises far more than what is generally known or seen.\textsuperscript{116} In the whistleblower dreams achieving a height comes first; for Dante, it is clarity of sight that is a prerequisite for having great vistas open. Jung points out that the direct apprehension of archetype, the knowing of things in themselves, is impossible (\textit{CW} VIII 263-282). Archetypes may only be ‘known’ intuitively through a poetic appreciation of the myriad of meanings associated with symbolic images. Longfellow’s translation of \textit{Canto XXX} (Alighieri, 1974) renders lines 54 and 55 as: “our intellect is overwhelmed so deeply it can never retrace the path that it followed”, suggesting, as does Jung, that the en-lightened vision that allows unconscious material to be brought forward into consciousness is subject neither to rational analysis nor to mundane memory, and consequently difficult to communicate upon ‘returning’ from the visionary realm. In terms of the Hero’s journey, we see here the Hero who, having won through difficulty, is gifted with a new kind of ‘in-sight’, allowing him to consciously see that part of himself, the Self empowered by divine grace, that has heretofore been hidden in his unconscious although extraordinarily active in his behaviour.

The kindling of Dante’s new sight is a symbol of a state of grace being achieved by means of vision. In Dante’s poem, where he sees the Virgin in this realm as the Queen of Heaven, yet “one with redeemed humanity” (ibid.:332), it is the poet’s clarity of vision that leads to this state of more perfect understanding. This brings to mind that difference noted between the Marianic “unattainable” (Simpson, 1998) Queen of Heaven being distant and aloof from her children (v.s. 195), whereas Kali’s heat, the compassion of the Dark Goddess for her son, brings her close to her children. It would seem that Dante’s expanded vision allows him to see Mary aligned with Kali, both sides of the archetype of womanhood conjoined, Mary’s new “humanity” redeeming her through a newly kindled active love.

\textsuperscript{116} Mountain height is an archetypal image. In Tibetan tantric iconography, Mount Meru is the centre of the world. ‘Scaling’ this height in meditation is a metaphor for achieving the ‘great view’ of the Buddha, \textit{summa sambuddha} (Namgyal Rinpoche, 1998).
Keeping the notion of Dante’s Paradise in mind, it may be that whistleblowers’ inability to express why they blow the whistle — “What other side? ... There is no other side!” (v.s. 208) — or why they experience the impulse to report immoral conduct so intensely is related to the nature of their vision of the world. We have long been accustomed to the idea that much art — whether poetry, paintings, music or dance — expresses creative visions that the imaginations of non-artists cannot sense. Could it be that whistleblowers are also Artists, but of a different type? ‘Traditionally’, Artists bear special witness to the realm of that absolute Beauty which is the Good. Whistleblowers, on the other hand, bear the geas of witnessing and acting upon what they perceive in the realm of Truth, where Truth is an expression of that which is Good. This interpretation aligns nicely with the pragmatic approach chosen to inform the thesis. The ‘circumambulation’ (Jung, 1964) in our amplification around notions of vision and artistry accords with the pragmatic formulation of truth as one particular sub-category of the Good, that “species of good” (v.s. 87) that unites with Truth.

If, as Maxwell insists (v.s. 160-161), it is people’s moral perception that determines whether there is sufficient impetus to act morally, then this perception depends wholly upon moral imagination. If, per Jung’s understanding of archetype, unconscious archetype determines apprehension and makes individuals susceptible to certain particularly human patterns of perception, then a heightened sensitivity to archetypal processes would deepen the moral imagination. In this frame, whistleblowers are more sensitive than most to these certain archetypal processes, implying that their perceptions are conditioned differently than most. This perceptual difference means they actually experience wrongdoing in their organizations more intensely, so intensely as to absolutely demand some kind of remedially intended action, without any contradictory perception or thought of self-preservation. Upon encountering an ethically intolerable situation, in order to re-establish
balance, the collective unconscious initiates the activation of archetypes, one that manifests the Light. The whistleblower then becomes the channel for a "kind of unknowing knowing" (Simpson, 2010: 175).

**Coming home: circling back to the beginning**

We began this chapter seeking links between "seemingly unrelated thoughts" (Stevens, 1994:111; v.s. 200), connecting research participants’ free associations to those archetypes surmised as contributing to the impulse to blow the whistle. Evidence of archetypal activity would grant meaning at the three levels of Jungian interpretation: personally, culturally and for humanity in general. Our mytho-poetic analysis yielded interpretations and observations around heroic themes of courage, persecution, hubris, *geas* and divine assistance, establishing the central function of the *object* of moral decision-making in human consciousness and in determining meaningfulness in life. Tensions between aspects of various archetypes were revealed: between the self-centredness of the dark Jacobean hero and the altruistic orientation of the light Heraclean hero; between the detached Great Mother Mary and her shadow aspect as Kali; and between Horus’ championing of the Queen through protection of ‘the people’ and the Knight’s single-minded dedication to his King. Throughout, the tensions and contradictions in the supposed effectiveness of resisting individual ethical misconduct vs. resisting collective or societal malefaction recurred in all the major imaginal themes. Multiple references to dark and light aspects of the Hero, the King/Father, the Queen/Mother, the Goddess, the Trickster, and above all, the Seer and Artist emerged on several occasions from sources independent of one another in time, experience and location. All these connections related to the whistleblowers personally, to their wider profession and industry, and to society as such. Certain themes — e.g., Dante’s poetic moral vision, the chaotic nature of decisions, the conditions and effects of perception, and the protection of self, of particular others and of others in
general — were repeated in the words of various interviewees and DIRG participants in reference to influences consciously perceived and those speculated to be active in the unconscious.

Multiple connections were evident among associations. "Seemingly unrelated thoughts" (Stevens, 1994:111; v.s. 200) around the maelstrom as a metaphor for archetypal influences moving through society were linked to Dante's medieval visions of moral consequence. There were parallels and connections to the notion of professional knowledge as a form of armouring when wrestling with society-wide problems in the most basic areas of human life, such as health care, and the ethics of work and profit. The opposite notion was also produced, where professional knowledge coupled with moral vision made one vulnerable to persecution in the doing of what could not be left undone.

Knowledge also re-connected with the maelstrom around decision-making, in Dante's 'Vestibule of the Futile', and in participants' beliefs about whistleblowing behaviour growing out of the totality of an individual's life, time and context, where the moment of decision was seen as unconsciously informed by multiple layers of personal and collective history. Whistleblowers working in groups experienced hope around their prospects, whereas a sense of futility permeated the prospects for 'loner' whistleblowers.

Images of buildings were understood to link to the Seer, representing the social value of bringing light into areas normally darkened, and the concealment and exposure of histories of sin. Also connected here were notions of being lost, especially lost in an oceanic unconsciousness as repressed aspects of the Hero and the Great Mother were constellating from the unconscious. Images of body parts led to considerations about principles and persons, each sparking moral perception and therefore action through different channels. Queries about the dualisms of witnessing and acting in the Bystander Effect produced
images of the King’s champion, whose courage is used to cover up the extent and nature of danger, as opposed to the Queen’s champion, the dragon-slayer, who is capable of combat as he is fully awake to the nature and degree of evil. Discussion of conspiracies led to images of vultures and the pillory: the former suggesting that grappling with specific instances only distracts from dealing with the true nature and systemic extent of wrongdoing; the latter recommending starting with specific instances of misconduct to make its spread throughout society recognizable and therefore remediable. The image of the blinded Seer was linked to that boundless compassion that arises from great knowledge to include those ‘normally’ outside his concern. And lastly, images of opening vistas allowing for compassion beyond normal boundaries brought up the last theme of individuals with extraordinary vision, Seers and Artists. These were linked to Dante’s rendition of Heaven as a reward for heroic morality, and to the idea that compassion varies directly with detachment from egotistic personal concerns or pre-occupations in favour of greater awareness of an archetypal Self.

Having worked with several preliminary understandings about whistleblowing to emerge in this chapter, the next and final chapter begins by re-iterating the framing of any such within the theoretical and methodological limitations of the study’s mytho-poetic analysis of social experience. In subjecting a selection of images and powerful wordings of the whistleblower interviewees to the DIRG panel’s ‘reverie’ in order to elicit further images and associations, the study’s analysis follows potential paths of meaning. It is in the analysis of the linkages between these images and associations, in exploring how their various meanings converge and diverge, that the MPASE suggests the conditions of possibility for whistleblowing in contemporary society. The study begins to provide a window on the social perceptual spiral of how society’s unarticulated but nevertheless powerful unconscious understandings of loyalty, freedom and resistance may influence
whistleblowers' experiences of wrongdoing and resistance, and how this resistance may in turn unconsciously shape the way in which the larger society perceives whistleblowing and the necessity for it. Looking at the phenomenon of whistleblowing through archetypology's lens emphasizes the "ethical register" (Ezzamel & Willmott, 2014), foregrounding the need to view particular examples of whistleblowing not only in the context of the organizations in which they occur, but in the context of the larger systems in which they are embedded.

An exploration of the conceptual relationships between myth, dream and waking experience and a brief analysis of the notion of intersubjective agreement lead into a discussion of some of the main themes emerging from the study: the feminine in the masculine, symbolized by the Hero Horus; the linear vs. the recursive view of ethical action and moral growth; whistleblowing understood as the result of confronting the collective Shadow, possibly providing a template for the gradual overcoming of 'unenlightened' self-interest; and whistleblowers as the vanguard of a newly condensed archetype of the moral Artist, constellating in response to a global power elite that downplays the need to support healthy human collectivity. The thesis closes with suggestions for beginning to implement these new understandings about whistleblowing into professional, educational and organizational research, as applicable to a wide variety of subjects, across industries and professions and potentially as part of in-house change strategies. Mytho-poetic analysis is established as a possibility for weakening the organizational tendency for 'shooting the messenger' that so often characterizes the response to the reporting of ethical misconduct. Throughout, the thesis highlights the particular suitability of Jungian method to multi-level interpretations, and how MPASE reiterates the crucial importance of identifying the level at which understanding is reached, so as to fully appreciate its implications for organizations and society.
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Returning home with treasure: Conclusions

Where outrage itself is exhausted, even despair is impossible. The resulting inertia is not the result of an ideology ... But anyone who wants to oppose it must oppose an ideology that makes inertia the most rational response. (Neiman, 2008:77)

Erinyes/Eumenides117: Why shoot the messenger?

This work began with questioning what might have been responsible for having spoken out during my own midwifery practice against what I perceived as unethical practice, both clinically and philosophically, despite having ‘reasoned’ against this course of action. As was discussed in the second chapter, most of the organizational literature around whistleblowing makes positivist claims about the nature of whistleblowers or their employing organizations. These consist of socially constructed personality traits or variables descriptive of various types of organizations (e.g., in what industry, whether public or private sector, large or small scale, and so forth), in order to build up a predictive profile of the types of individuals likely to blow the whistle. Reviewing this work, it became clear that further correlative studies would not likely contribute significantly to the sketchy understanding of whistleblowing behaviour. I do not mean to be seen as rejecting the positivist claims around whistleblowing because they are positivist, but primarily because many studies tend to ignore conflicting evidence, they do not preserve a sufficient degree of validity and reliability, and consequently fail their own tests for rigour. The positivist project, while definitely useful in many ways, is so limited118 with respect to whistleblowing that there is a need for “new theoretical models or perspectives that will inspire scholars to think about whistleblowing in new ways” (Wolfe Morrison, 2009; also

---

117 Translated as “the angry ones”/“the kindly ones”, the Furies were Greek mythic figures whose primordial function was to “avenge violations of the natural order, including ... gross inhumanity” (Evans, 1970:107).
118 Stevens (1994), a Jungian scholar, suggests it is not the existence of positivist findings that are questionable, but that their meaningfulness is limited unless they are considered in an interpretivist net of significance.
Perry, 1998). This thesis presented a distinctive perspective that contributes to the field with “a hermeneutic approach linking individuals with social contexts, conscious experience with unconscious motivation and moral reasoning with moral motivation” (v.s. 75). The thesis’ main contribution to the literature, that their motivation may be understood more clearly when whistleblowers are viewed not just as individuals but as enacting a necessary organizational and social role, means that whistleblowing activity is most fruitfully considered when the societal conditions of its production and reproduction are taken into account. Drawing upon Jamesian pragmatism — that prioritizes ethical purpose above ontological or epistemological considerations — it proposed that an exploratory study looking at the narratives and dreams of whistleblowers and subjecting them to group free association in order to appreciate the unconscious factors involved in whistleblowing might yield additional understanding of those conditions pertinent to blowing the whistle. From a Jungian archetypological perspective, the resultant work argued that necessary conditions for whistleblowing partially rest in the collective unconscious. It was speculated that “whistleblowers in some way are especially sensitive or susceptible to urges coming from [Jung’s collective unconscious] realm” (v.s. 79). Working with interview material from medical whistleblowers and from a Dream/Image Reflection Group responding to excerpts from this material, associations led to an understanding: that whistleblowers may be especially galvanized to action by a novel condensation of archetypes, the combination of Hero, Seer and moral Artist, an archetype constellating perhaps for the first time in humanity’s history in response to threats originating on a global level.

Two conceptual frames appeared most significant from the outset. One was the initial ‘spark’ for this particular work around notions of successful financiers and whistleblowers as representing different sorts of Heroes. My attempt to make sense of the ‘heroism’
ascribed to Wall Street financiers commenced when I was “surpris[ed]” (Weick, 1995:2) by what seemed to be a denial of the disjuncture between heroism and untrammeled greed. In utilizing a Jungian theoretical framework with its notion of an archetypically grounded collective unconscious, the thesis re-theorized whistleblowing teleologically. Albeit acknowledged implicitly, the primacy of teleology recognizes that “values are integral to the nature of knowing and being” (Barad, 2007:37) and that, therefore, “the ethical ... is of no lesser significance than what is taken as real (‘the ontological’) or what is counted as knowledge (‘the epistemological’)” (Ezzamel & Willmott, 2014:1014). This is distinct from a scholarly approach that, relying on an assumed dichotomy between external and internal conditions, characterizes whistleblowers as victims of an implied social determinism, as “reluctant dissenters, moved neither by altruistic nor selfish concerns, but rather by a tide of events over which they feel they have little control” (Bouville, 2008:582; also Rothschild & Miethe, 1999).

The other frame arose from my own experience and that of other whistleblowers, that ethical problems seemed to us to be produced most often by systems and ways of organizing, rather than being solely due to the actions of unethical individuals or the incompatibilities between individuals. Further or perhaps consequently, it appeared that whistleblowers who themselves saw their actions as addressing company-wide, industry-wide or societally ubiquitous wrongdoing also experienced their efforts as more potentially or actually ‘successful’ (v.s. 92-95; v.i. 275), both for themselves and for those on whose behalf they spoke out. The thesis repeatedly emphasizes the need to view the whistleblower as having an important organizational and societal role, not just as one individual objecting to the organization’s treatment of an(other) individual.
Pantheon: Between sector differences

The literature review demonstrated why it is helpful for researchers to discuss the ethicality of whistleblowing with specific reference to particular practices. Focusing on actual details avoided the "logical incompatibility" of the "tendency to construe whistleblowing as mandatory and whistle blowers as heroes" (Bouville, 2008:584), since in actuality many whose role mandates reporting do not do so for fear of punishment (Estlund, 2005). Although there are quite a number of studies focusing on the financial (e.g., Seifert et al., 2010) and medical (e.g., Moore & McAuliffe, 2012) sectors, the literature's dominant approach looks at whistleblowing in general, referring either to inventories across public employee populations (Miceli & Near, 1985, 1992), rolling misconducts into general categories (Near et al., 2004), or deriving conclusions from hypothetical vignettes (Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010). These practices gloss over misconduct intrinsic to systems within a specific sector that has political origin and political ramifications:

Whistleblowers' unearthing of unethical micro-practices in organizations may serve a much larger purpose. When these practices are seen in combination to prevail across industries and entire sectors, then whistleblowing makes visible unethical political strategies, which attempt to render invisible the actual workings of power. (Monk et al., 2015:311)

Generalizations across multiple sectors may be misleading in that measures mean something completely different from sector to sector, although words used to describe them are the same. For example, 'serious' financial fraud determined by a threshold of $100,000 (Rothschild & Miethe, 1999) may affect only a few; whereas misrepresentation of medical research data for one drug may have been responsible for the deaths of up to 61,000 people (Abraham, 2005; v.s. 51). Further, research must differentiate between sectors in order to avoid conflating [un]ethical with [il]legal practices (v.s. 47).
This study focused on medical whistleblowers, but many investigators concur (e.g., Hasnas, 2006; Kenny, 2014) that also in other sectors, compliance often entails unethical behaviour:

... the problem was not simply about one or two greedy managers giving into temptation, but rather it was a systemic one. The system was set up in such a way that it almost forced people to rip off their clients (ibid.:165).

To address the concern with unconscious factors and the recognition of social influences on individual behaviour, the thesis combined methods from psychosocial research and Flyvbjerg’s phronesis (2006, 2012). Speaking of the thesis as a whole, this study’s interpretive associations have added substance to the link between the importance of individual and collective experience to whistleblowing. Images and associations linking the three archetypes of Hero, Seer and Artist during interpretation brought to the surface support for an unconscious collective ‘wish’ (Gabriel & Schwartz, 1999) to make particular acts of whistleblowing resound with significance for ever-larger groupings of people. Such an interpretation has ramifications for organizations in aligning with Campbell’s position (1988) that, given the global nature of all major contemporary ethical concerns, “we need myths that will identify the individual not with his local group [nation, company, faith, ethnicity, etc.] but with the planet” (ibid.:24). In this frame, whistleblowers embody those archetypal concerns that shift the focus from problems of loyalty and ethical behaviour within organizations, to their impact within the greater societal matrix.

Orpheus: Emergence of opposites

One of the complex tasks with an exploratory study of this kind is determining what a ‘finding’ should look like, and when an array of linkages uncovered is meaningful.
Interpretations relating to the data cannot go beyond being just that, interpretations (v.s. 65). They do not pinpoint ‘causes’ nor do they necessarily provide positivist predictions (v.s. 40, 59, 68). As every experience can always be represented, understood and interpreted differently, these kinds of processes can yield only “a sense of how things go, have been going, and are likely to go” (Geertz, 1995:20), outcomes that are “virtually always provisional, open to refinement, correction and re-evaluation” (Gabriel & Schwartz, 1999:7). My amplification of the subjects’ interviews and the DIRG responses to them represented steps in attempts to make sense of our lives. But because sensemaking “involves identity, retrospect, enactment, social contact, ongoing events, [and] cues” (Weick, 1995:3), this effort produced a collection of imperfect explanations, which in speaking “unambiguously about ambiguity ... provide[d] a rich source of knowledge” (Gherardi, 1995:27).

Mytho-poetic interpretations may not be proved or disproved in the same way as findings in the natural or mathematical sciences (v.s. 86-88, 140). One way of comprehending the explanatory potential of mytho-poetic analysis is to compare it to musical forms. Lévi-Strauss saw musical forms as being “borrowed unconsciously from the structure of ... myth” (1978:51), and he compared a mythic “solution” to a resolving chord in music, one that brings with it a sense of completion for the hearer. Granted, this sense may only rest in a particular context, for a limited time and with limited significance, but it resonates no less strongly for all that.

One particular point of Lévi-Strauss’ musical metaphor supports the rationale for mythic exploration in making meaningful the superficially random events of everyday. It concerns the meaning of the connections between amplified archetypal symbols. Mytho-poetic interpretation conceived as arising from an archetypal realm can be viewed as
“penultimate truth”, suggesting through metaphor an ultimate that “cannot be put into words” (Campbell, 1988:163). Because archetypal symbols “encompass more than can be said” (Stevens, 1994:109), it is the linkages between images, the ‘stories’ whence they arise, that produce meaning. As we have seen (v.s. 108,201), such linkages are not linear. Mythic stories are not sequential (Lévi-Strauss, 1978), but synecdochic or perhaps even fractal, where a specific detail can suggest an entire body of meaning to which it may be connected, and often feeds back on itself hermeneutically to further refine and enhance this sensed significance. Because of this recursiveness of archetypal imagery, we ‘read’ the meaning of a myth as we do an orchestral score, “as a totality ... [where] something which was written on the first stave at the top of the page acquires meaning only if one considers that it is part and parcel of what is written below on the second stave, the third stave” (ibid.:45) and on succeeding pages. It is in this way that Jung’s *enantiodromia*, the “emergence of the unconscious opposite” (*CW VI* 709)\(^{119}\), can be apprehended. Noting the manifesting of one aspect of an archetype (e.g., the expression of the dark pole of the Jacobean hero), means that its opposite (e.g., Jacob’s light aspect) is being repressed. It is not until one views from a greater conceptual ‘distance’ the totality of the situation in which these aspects are being manifested or repressed that it becomes apparent that the one archetypal direction is a condition and consequence of the activity of its opposite. It is the totality of both directions considered together that may point toward possibilities for significant change in an individual or a collective. In this light, the significance of whistleblowing is inextricably part of the discourse grappling with it, the wrongdoings initiating it, the retaliations against it, the legislative and judiciary attempts to encourage it, and the particular experiences of each whistleblower. It is the analysis of whistleblowing subjects’ experiences as *embedded in entire systems* of collectively ‘agreed upon’

\(^{119}\) This emergence is the first step towards resolving an ethical problem when unsavoury aspects of a situation or actors in it have been avoided through repression into unconsciousness (v.s. 140).
understandings — within organizations, professions, cultures, nations and so forth — that reveals meaning.

All the king’s horses and all the king’s men: Intersubjective agreement

In combining certain aspects of narrative and psychosocial inquiry in the empirical portion of the thesis, there is the sense of “accept[ing] ambiguity and allow[ing] for learning along the way” (Bateson, 1994:235). In narrative inquiry, acceptance of the author’s interpretations depends upon them being derived from understandings about whistleblowing from having experienced it; in psychosocial analysis, the quality of interpretation is said to be directly tied to ‘intersubjective agreement’ within the multiplicity of voices producing and interpreting data. That the intersubjective agreement about a matter may vary from group to group neither proves nor disproves any underlying truth. Members of a group may be wrong. To rely on intersubjective agreement as any kind of pointer towards truth is problematic, because within a universe that is constructed on shared understanding of perception, there is no way to reconcile differences in belief. Mytho-poetic analysis from within a Jungian frame bundles both understandings without needing to establish ‘truth’ independently, and allows interpretative significance to be made explicit at both individual and collective levels. Thus, mytho-poetic method may reveal the “‘dark side’ of [organizational] activity” (Ezzamel & Willmott, 2014:1028) beyond a legitimacy that derives from apparent “adherence to a prevailing and ostensibly shared system of values” (ibid.:1026).

Briefly questioning the notion of intersubjective agreement may clarify why it is important not to become embroiled in trying to determine whether an author’s or a collective’s interpretations are ‘more significant’. It also shows how a mytho-poetic analysis can simultaneously endorse the significance of the experiences of a single author and of
groups of individuals ‘co-authoring’ the work. If each individual’s view is as weighty as that of the next individual, including those individuals whose opinions and experiences do not *prima facie* match up with those of their fellows, then how can any one’s experience/associations be ruled out as less valuable? Experiences may only be ruled out as less valuable when they are already assumed to be so by virtue of the fact that they are a ‘minority’ opinion, begging the question of their value. Even the notion of ‘agreement’ is problematic: in what ways, precisely, must the opinions, associations, images or memories of individuals be similar, and to what ‘sufficient’ extent, as to constitute being ‘in agreement’? Insofar as every person’s experience is inarguable *qua* experience, and if we have adopted Weick’s acceptance of the fact that we are all participating in a fiction, personal or shared, of the “as-if” world (v.s. 88), then any kind of basis upon which preferment of either a single author’s ‘authority’ or a group’s ‘intersubjective agreement’ rests, appears to have disappeared.

Because none of these conundrums can be resolved definitively, the superiority of the understandings agreed upon by multiple voices is by no means established as against the understanding of a particular individual, whether or not it is agreed to by other persons. What this questioning does begin to indicate, however, is that there can be no clear way to distinguish the value of one individual’s experience and understanding versus the value of the experience and understanding of many. In this thesis, then, the experiences and understandings of individuals and of groups have been equally necessary to produce new understandings, and both have been shown to be integral to the mytho-poetic method of the study.

In the following paragraphs, this study’s findings have been framed by examining the conceptual relationships between myth, dream and experience. Then, keeping constantly
in mind the crucial variances between different levels of collectives, interpretation and
significance, the chapter reflects upon certain associations permeating the amplificatory
work: the interweaving of masculine and feminine archetypes in whistleblowing;
alternative views of the ‘purpose’ of life and the role of emerging unconscious opposites
in social ‘development’; and the emergence of a newly condensed archetype of moral
artistry. From there, potential directions for further research made possible by Jungian
theorizing around whistleblowing are discussed.

Myth to dream: Process to aspect

According to Jungian psychoanalysis, “unsuccessful repression or an unfulfilled desire”
(Gabriel, 1999:309) may manifest as a neurosis, e.g., a mental obsession or a behavioural
compulsion. Jung believed neurotic symptomatology is “teleologically oriented, a soul’s
search for its meaning” (Papadopoulos, 2006:30), and found that working with these
symptoms brings their meaning to consciousness. Because it is not accessible through
introspection, logic or concrete evidence, unconscious material can only be accessed
through conscious manifestations such as “symptoms, symbols, dreams ... cultural
artefacts and so on” (Gabriel, 1999:310). Translation of unconscious material into
conscious symbols can make the energy that had been used to repress shadow material
newly available, “depend[ing] on the courage and strength of the individual psyche to deal
with the energy ... and ... chaotic forces” (Ryland, 2000:389). Even the attempt to “put
together apparently irreconcilable opposites and bridge over apparently hopeless splits ...
usually has a healing effect, but only when it is done spontaneously” (CW IXi 718). If we
see whistleblowing as symptomatic of having repressed a need to address wrongdoing,
then its purpose is to allow this repressed material to reach consciousness, even if this
precipitates negative repercussions.
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Dreams are comprised of symbols of things in the unconscious. Returning to the iceberg image (v.s. 134: footnote 81), symbols act as their visible tips, hinting at a much greater submerged expanse. Dreams limited to superstitions (... if you dream of a fish, you will inherit money) or the mundane (... you went to a party last week, so last night you dreamed of a party) do not admit to the vastness of the unconscious realm from which they spring. If dreams are the conscious manifestation of unconscious processes, and if myths are the manifested convergence of unconscious material from the gathered dreams of the collective (Armstrong, 1998), then mythic material may have many alternative meanings, even when paradoxically contradictory. A dream may express the emotional ambivalence of simultaneously strong positive and negative feelings about the same object (Gabriel, 1999), which, when considered together, unite as “an overall signifier” (ibid.:309), in the same way as do ‘selective facts’ during the interpretation of narratives (v.s. 88).

For example, the subject’s dream of the scarred Lion-masked Hero (v.s. 239) may symbolize multiple levels of unconscious material, spontaneous portrayals of the damaged individual self and the victorious archetypal Self (Stevens, 1994). The Hero’s championing of the Mother requires permanent damage to his persona. The whistleblower’s dream of the transparent building (v.s. 223) may refer to the dreamer’s unhampered access to all the components of his personal conscious and unconscious. It could be expressing the yearning of the archetypal Self for interior harmony to be realized externally through the individual self; as a DIRG member said, the fantasy about the world being “all visible, and the sacredness of solitude” (ibid.:207). Whenever there is the combination of good and evil outcome to heroic action, good at a collective level concomitant with harm at an individual level, we can surmise there are multiple iconic archetypes being activated by a processual archetype (v.s. 143). With whistleblowing, the Self, a processual archetype symbolizing a compassionate wholeness of being, may be
understood as activating Horus' embodiment to surface those repressed light dimensions of Heracles and Jacob at the urging of the Dark Goddess.

**Masculinity: Preoccupation and occupation with self and other**

The conceptual dimension of masculinity was brought under scrutiny by this thesis. In its investigation of the archetypal Hero beyond a simplistic categorization of all Heroes as masculine, this work claims that it is the feminine-in-the-masculine, Horus' altruistic heart, Heracles' defence of the weak and Jacob's responsible leadership, that has been repressed and is re-emerging through whistleblowing activity. Some authors position "the tug of war between unregenerate instincts and overbearing culture" (Gabriel, 1999:15) as a binary between feminine emotion and masculine reason, feminine wildness and masculine control. Traditionally the 'powerful' male attributes of logic-based decisiveness, competitiveness, and opportunistic instrumentalist rationality have been viewed as superior to the 'weak' feminine attributes of emotionally-based (and so, non-rational) ambiguity, nurturing and compassion (Gherardi, 1995:15). Enlightenment values underlying free market thinking figure personal autonomy, action and self-interest as the good, whereas concern for others is valued solely insofar as it benefits the individual (v.s. 174). Similarly, the contemporary masculinist focus on goals and achievement devalues feminine aspects of the self that focus on relating — "feminine attributes ... concerned with process and journey" (Downs et al., 2002:446) and an ethical concern for others — as drawing energy away from individual self-interest (Knights & Tullberg, 2012).

This ranking is expressed in the media celebrity of soldiers, CEO's, cops, detectives, cowboys and doctors (Ruth, 1990). The masculinist "preoccupation with the self" (Knights & O'Leary, 2006:1) and with "signifiers of success and superiority" (Knights & Tullberg, 2012:400) may exclude an abiding awareness that self is always being shaped in relation
to others. In a society that is changing from a masculinist stance to one incorporating the influence of the feminine in its compassionate concern for persons as ends not means, the growing awareness of others is enmeshed with a moral imperative that “acts to dislocate ... egoism” (Ezzamel & Willmott, 2014:1034):

... moral judgment is what we ‘always already’ exercise in virtue of being immersed in a network of human relationships that constitute our life together. (Benhabib, 1992:125)

Some authors (Estes, 1992; Woodman & Dickson, 1996) assume that it is the loss of the feminine that has produced the rifts in contemporary society, and that only feminine archetypes can restore our world to health. The argument is made (Höpfl, 2002; Connell & Wood, 2005; Knights, 2014) that it is the masculinization of the workplace and of society in general that results from and conditions the incessant rationalist search for control over the future while “suppressing feminine principles of passion, spontaneity and caring emotion” (Gabriel, 2014:580). This masculinist realm is rendered “better — simpler, safer, more transparent” (Bauman, 1992:100) by being monitored so as to eliminate ambiguity, mysteries, traps in the attempt to “exclude physicality, disorder and the dirt and the feminine from the construction of the organization as a purposive entity” (Höpfl, 2002:13). Archetypology connects the repressed uncontrollable side of life with the maternal archetype. The archetypal mother, ‘incarnated’ as goddesses throughout human history (Guirand, 1968; Bowles, 1993) and suggested by womb-like images of vessels and eternal flames signifying the endless emergence of life from the creative matrix (Höpfl, 2002; CW IXi) reflects on the one hand goodness, “solicitude and sympathy... wisdom ... that transcend[s] reason; any helpful instinct or impulse; all that is benign... that cherishes and sustains, that fosters growth and fertility” (CW IXi 158) or on the other, passion and darkness, “anything secret, hidden, dark; the abyss, anything that devours, ... that is terrifying and inescapable like fate” (ibid.). Masculinist discourse disavows the
uncontrollably anarchic nature of reality and rejects dependency, thereby “reducing the questing behaviour of organizations to unrelieved rationality and power motivation” (Hopfl, 2002:17), and “reducing the notion of the feminine to nurturing, domestic and servicing functions”(ibid.). In banishing the dark side of the maternal, the light side is also jettisoned, leaving no space for the feminine virtues of “sensitivity, good communication, emotional management” (Hopfl & Matilal, 2007:199), the caring and trust that organizational and societal rhetoric claims to value (ibid.). The “relegation of the feminine from the organization” (Hopfl, 2002:11) implies its removal from social life on a larger scale. In parallel, this thesis argues that the betrayal of the ‘heart’ of the hero, the feminine-in-the-masculine manifesting as the self-sacrificing empathy of the particular whistleblower, implies society’s broad abandonment of the maternal and the feminine. However, the increasing incidence of manifestation of this heroic heart as whistleblower is emblematic of an unconscious societal shift towards a new acceptance of and demand for the social reinstatement of the feminine.

However, in analyzing the heroism of whistleblowing through an archetypal lens, this thesis has proposed that it is the lost light side of the masculine archetype of the Heraclean Hero, that side which is intimately enmeshed with the Seer and the moral Artist, that has caused the ‘psychic wounds’ in our society (CW VI 105). Since the absent heart of Heracles symbolizes the feminine-in-the-masculine, the tender-hearted and compassionate protector, the wounds left by this loss are mended by the emergence of Horus, the Son of the Holy Dyad of Mother and Son (Woodman & Dickson, 1996). When whistleblowers resist wrongdoing for the sake of citizen others, they are enacting Horus, who fights against the Father’s destructiveness for his Mother’s sake.
Masculine and feminine are always intertwined archetypologically, there being always the _yin_ in the _yang_ and vice versa. Expressed masculinity has its dark repressed side, “man’s... detachment from his manliness” (Grosz, 1993:205). ‘Manliness’ emasculates itself by denying its feminine-in-the-masculine Shadow, repressing feelings and concern for others while justifying the resultant hard-heartedness. Manliness strengthens itself by consciously facing those aspects of the masculine which have been discursively disavowed, aspects that tend to tyranny, cruelty and greed. Rather than whistleblowing being the result of a re-emergence of the feminine archetypes, it is Horus’ re-integration of the feminine-in-the-masculine, thereby becoming consciously responsible for curtailing the dark side of the masculine, that constructs whistleblowing as part of the collective unconscious urge toward a new wholeness.

This activity plays out in the world of the corporate ‘citizen’, where expectations have altered, reflecting changes in society’s understanding of what generally constitutes masculinity. “Old fashioned content of bourgeois masculinity” (Connell & Wood, 2005:361) used to include a “standard of gentlemanly conduct and courtesy” (ibid.:360), including assuming the mantle of noblesse oblige as one’s fortunes rose. However, any kind of response beyond a concern for the bottom line is commonly seen as “an obstacle, even a threat” by those “young, dynamic people” (ibid.:351) currently transforming organizational practice. Discourse about work experience must be stripped of emotional significance to be acknowledged. Other than as part of an exercise in PR, emotion —

_120_ Positivist whistleblower research (e.g., de Graaf, 2010) carefully avoids making emotionally loaded claims in response to the moral outrage of most of their subjects, despite the fact that it is just this outrage that may ignite whistleblowing responses. Psychosocial research technique, however, contends that instances of emotional stripping indicate the repression of uncomfortable material; it is the researcher’s job to re-surface this material (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000). The phronetic and Jungian treatment in this thesis re-import the significance of the emotional aspects of whistleblowers’ experiences.

_121_ E.g., the _de rigueur_ empathy of CSR rhetoric for the issues of stakeholders other than company stockholders.
passion, empathy, fear — is "disavowed" (P. Hoggett, personal communication, 13 January 2012) and repressed, as it may open the doors to a forbidden unmanageability.

Twenty-first century organizational life demands working long hours under pressure to respond to every new demand instantaneously. This is said to create a perennial state of near-panic, while having to appear in control (Connell & Wood, 2005). Any lack of mastery over contingencies must be masked in order to maximize a successful presentation; anything short of dispassionate control every moment damages the individual's reputation. Such conditions are not conducive to "the rock-solid confidence in men's position in the world ... that an earlier generation of businessmen" (ibid.:360) might have had.

Organizations increasingly rely on "social and psychological structures that repress individual differences" (Downs et al., 2005:446) and produce rigidity by 'mapping out' individuals and, in many cases, entire groups (Scott, 1998). Such mapping "transform[s] the real, diverse and chaotic into a new, more uniform [membership] that closely resemble[s] the administrative grid of its techniques" (ibid.:15). The strength of this effect varies with scale (Connell & Wood, 2005). Because a certain conformity facilitates organizational ends, a culture of "mutual dependence and mutual scrutiny" (Connell & Wood, 2005:353) is fostered. The scrutiny makes reporting of an appearance of non-conformity to masculinist templates in "dress, political opinion, and reading" (ibid.) mandatory, while requiring that reports of ethical malfeasance be repressed. To legitimize "collective power, institutional power, and personal authority" (ibid.:359), the organization insists on a Procrustean bed, where members who don't fit are made to fit by
ignoring their existence through a kind of discursive casuistry\textsuperscript{122}, which outlaws the kind of language and thinking that demands any outlier concerns be addressed.

At the same time, the level at which concerns are recognized is strictly controlled by those with the authority to determine whether and how to deal with ethical problems. In general, “ethical standards are conditioned by and a consequence of individuals recognizing their social interdependence rather than treating interests as ‘internal to the self’” (Roberts & Jones, 2009:858), but interdependence may not be recognized beyond that level benefitting those exercising power within the organization. The masculinist preoccupation with the self characterizes discourse at the level of the individual and the organizational, and prevents larger collectives — e.g., national, international, human, ecological — from being viewed as pertinent. To some extent, individuals have lost sight of the fact that they are inescapably conditioned by their social contexts because of the masculinist preoccupation with self in their work lives. More significant, however, are the limits that the organization sets as to the extent of the embedding that is permitted consideration. “Individuals can transcend or reconcile differences through living their social interdependence” (Knights, 2015:210), but only within the confines of the allowable discursive context\textsuperscript{123}. Actions conditioned by and consequent to networks of social relations outside those limits, let slip the aims and desires of the organization down the ladder of priority, in so doing becoming potentially threatening and, therefore, inadmissible.

\textsuperscript{122} Casuistry, defined as reasoning used to resolve moral problems by applying theoretical rules to particular instances, may connote speciously clever but unsound reasoning used to eliminate cases as ineligible for application of the rules (Oxford University Press, 2015) — something invariably found in whistleblowing protection legislation (FAIR, 2012).

\textsuperscript{123} Limits may also be set by a profession (e.g., medicine) or multiple organizations (e.g., a hospital and a university) or organizations and professions (a hospital and medicine) with converging interests.
In Miceli and Near’s (2005) analysis of new directions of whistleblowing research warranted by positive psychology, they state,

[c]hanging the law may not be enough ... managers, employees and members of society need to undergo a cultural transformation such that whistle-blowing is viewed as potentially positive for those involved. (ibid.:98)

However, they also contend that

As long as society, organizations, and organizational members continue to view whistleblowing as negative — something about which to feel shame or guilt — we will continue to experience unethical corporate behavior. (ibid.)

Miceli and Near seem to have it backwards. So long as most individuals tolerate unethical corporate behaviour by choosing to remain silent in the face of harmful activity for the sake of the bottom line, whistleblowing will be viewed as negative by most “managers, employees and members of society” (v.s.). It is in this way that “[w]hat [whistleblowers] represent goes beyond ethics in the modern sense of concern with ... principles, or ... mutuality or ... justice” (Grant, 2002:397), but engages directly with the enactment of the notions of right and wrong. This thesis has proposed that the rising incidence of whistleblowing is accompanied by the increasing recognition of its potential capacity to protect public welfare by exposing and remedying harmful practices, and a concomitant demand for whistleblower protection. This trend may be signalling a shift away from masculinist obsession with the control of externalities and impression management, the manipulation of self and public image, and public opinion for the purposes of increased corporate profit and individual prestige, and toward the need to support a wider social good.
Chapter seven: Returning home with treasure

The meaning of life: One-way journey, or circling home

In Freudian psychoanalysis, where the unconscious is solely a collection of repressed personal material, there is a functionalist tendency to see maturity developing in a linear fashion. The individual accesses the contents of his/her personal unconscious in order to re-establish his emotional and intellectual stability. Thus, stability and order is the hallmark of a mature individual and a mature society is a collective of such stable individuals. This notion harks back to the thesis image of the underground streams (v.s. 202), flowing from various sources in a single direction. In this frame, any conceptual splits — for example that separating preoccupation with self from concern for others — which “produce compromise but no lasting resolution ... [being] always in tension and always moving to and fro” (Gabriel, 1999:15) are not acceptable components of the endpoint. With an archetypological approach, however, health is a dynamic state, not static, and the purpose of an individual’s life takes on meaning beyond his/her own individuality through the process of what Jung termed individuation.

Rather than separating the individual from society, individuation tends to promote human commitment and devotion to ... collective [aims]. (Leader, 2009:516)

The thesis has argued that the maelstrom better symbolizes this unfoldment, with its multiple sources and multiple directions (v.s. 202). In this perspective, the individual and the various levels of collectives in which he is embedded change continuously in a dynamic state demonstrating overall equilibrium, but multiple variations when viewed in detail. Changes toward equilibrium in archetypology look like those of an autopilot system, where hundreds of tiny corrections are continuously made to keep on a particular course overall, rather than forging ahead on a straight course between two points.
One of the basic philosophical arguments informing this thesis was the pragmatic link between what is conceived of as ‘the good’, and the purpose of life. Conflict, within and between persons, is "a fundamental feature of the psychoanalytic conception of the individual, culture and society" (Gabriel, 1999:14). Jung saw the eternal tension between "unregenerate instincts and overbearing culture" (ibid.:15) as subject to adjustment solely through psychological effort to resist those forces seeking to tear down harmony. From this Jungian world view, values that determine whether a life is purposeful “are not confined to maintenance of the body and economic concerns of the day” (Campbell, 1988:148). As an overview of the whistleblowing literature has shown, tacit moral judgments about the status of whistleblowing have changed from deeming whistleblowing a disloyal act only acceptable in certain narrowly defined conditions, to accepting that it is a necessary component in codes of conduct and deserving of encouragement and protection (Monk et al., 2015). Although it seems on the one hand as though the insistence of the corporate world to discard the ethical in the face of the profitable is becoming more widespread (Connell & Wood, 2005), with whistleblowers at least, it may not be that the "ethical is ... conflated with the normative" (Ezzamel & Willmott, 2014:1021). Rather, the literature may be reflecting what appears to be a slow shift in society’s conception of what constitutes goodness.

Because corporate reliance on free-market thinking rests on the Enlightenment values of personal autonomy, action and self-interest (v.s. 152,190-191,231), the lack of power associated with the feminine because of a masculinist need to focus on goals and achievement has obscured those aspects of the self that are more about relating rather than controlling (Knights, 2014). “[F]eminine attributes ... concerned with process and the journey” (Downs et al., 2002:446) and an ethical concern for others are presumed to draw energy away from the individual self-interest of masculinist discourse (Knights &
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Tullberg, 2012). Interpreting whistleblowing as a re-emergence of lost ‘feminine’ heroic attributes need not represent a radical imperative to dismantle contemporary organizational structures. Rather, it calls for organizations more feasibly to recognize and act on the extant but dormant compassionate possibilities in their activities. This could satisfy the growing demand for integrity to support the public’s collective trust (de Graaf, 2010), and, in archetypological terms, answer Kali’s call to redress the wrongs being perpetrated upon her children.

This thesis has suggested the obverse of the belief that good acts rest on reason, and evil acts are associated with unreason or thoughtlessness (Arendt, 1971; Neiman, 2008). The premise that those who do good are acting rationally in order to have a positive effect produces confusion when this action is against their self-interest, especially when they have a “lot to lose, with many resources and good prospects” (Ajax), for acting against one’s own interest is seen as unreasonable. I have argued that this confusion is the direct result of Hobbesian notions of prerequisites for ethical action: James’ “strenuous mood” (v.s. 161), Neiman’s opinion (2008) that good behaviour which is not merely self-serving is “never the product of will-lessness or inertia, but takes definite effort to achieve” (ibid.:331), and Arendt’s (1971) observation that thoughtlessness lurks at the root of evil: “The sad truth ... is that most evil is done by people who never made up their mind to be either bad or good” (ibid.:438). Rather, noting that volition may be unconscious (v.s. 134-135), I have proposed that many, including most whistleblowers resisting serious wrongdoings, do good as the result of non-rational processes, or stay silent as the result of a rational cost/benefit analysis that serves to rationalize their repressed fears and insecurities.
As we have seen (Chapter 4), archetypes activate in response to social problems. Conditions for activation include situations too dreadful to accept consciously — the clash of two paradigms such as the dominant masculinist paradigm where money and control are valued, vs. an ethical paradigm that places money and control at the service of life and dignity — so that there is widespread disbelief and denial, and a resultant "divided mind" (Ryland, 2000:386). This study has produced an archetypological insight that the moral crisis in global business produces such divisions, yielding whistleblowers on the one hand and non-reporters on the other. At the collective level, the rupture is in evidence between organizational retaliation and denial, and the lofty values articulated in legitimate mission statements and codes of conduct (Vandekerckhove, 2006; Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2010). Archetypes constellate in these gaps between knowledge and action, the compulsion to report and the unreason of retaliation (Ryland, 2000). The thesis has argued that the whistleblower’s compulsion to speak out is symbolic of a gradual coming to consciousness of repressed aspects of culture and personality. In dealing with "deeply systemic" problems that may be "intentional inadequacies within ... bureaucrac[ies]" (Gupta, 2008), whistleblowing has the "potential to restore wholeness and health to the psyche" (ibid.:388) by reconciling the "pairs of opposites" (ibid.:389), such as conscious and unconscious material, "regardless of whether it is rationally understood" (ibid.). Jung’s model, in accounting for "both individual and collective phenomena within one psyche" (ibid.:395), avoids problematizing the dichotomies between conscious and unconscious, self and other, since the individuation of each individual contributes to the healing of the collectives within which it is embedded:

[w]hen one thinks of the state of the world and of evil as a collective problem ... it is only in the individual that any important problem can be solved (Hannah, 1999:137)
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This study has suggested that when an individual confronts the society’s Shadow, i.e. is exposed to the powerful unacknowledged forces in the culture, he may either allow it to activate the “darkest recesses of his individual shadow” (Casement, 2006:105) or bring it to consciousness, thereby integrating it and avoid having it erupt from the unconscious destructively. If one person finds a way to live harmoniously with his dark side, then so may the world. The individuation process of confronting and integrating the Shadow is the vehicle whereby one’s life purpose — that of becoming “fully autonomous and authentic” (Rozuel, 2010:37) — is realized. It is a life-long process, one that moves to and fro, with new experiences being repressed and expressed in the continuous dance between the Ego and the Shadow. Where the archetypal Self increasingly “transcen[ds] ... individuality so that we can connect with others through the consciousness of our shared humanity” (Rozuel & Kakabadse, 2010:434), the individual may weaken masculinist dominance by overcoming the preoccupation with self.

_Horus resplendent: Moral artistry_

The study has explored Jung’s notion of individuation with respect to whistleblowing, a process that allows opposing forces within the individual and society to unite in creating a healthy and balanced, yet ceaselessly shifting, human community. Emergent archetypal shadow aspects may manifest destructively as PTSD in military veterans whose heroism is tainted by the ‘collateral damage’ they cause on behalf of mercenary interests (v.s. 185); they may be expressed creatively in whistleblowers who strive to protect an innocent public from questionable organizational agendas. The healing of the split between opposites always constitutes a moral problem (Casement, 2006), as it may proceed in either a positive or negative direction, depending upon the readiness of the person[s] to recognize and deal directly with these shadow aspects.
In the discussion of the Hero as Horus we have seen glimmers of what such a union may augur. Under conditions of crisis where the “neurotic disassociation” (ibid.:100) from unacceptable aspects dissolves, there may be a “metaphysical realization, which is that you and that other … are two aspects of the one life, and that your apparent separateness is but an effect of the way we experience forms under the conditions of space and time” (Campbell, 1988:110).

[T]he more individuated the ego, the more indistinguishable it becomes from the self. (Colman, 2006:161)

Merging with the archetypal Self implies greater awareness and greater responsibility. “Those who toe the party line do not choose their own way but submerge their potential for wholeness in a relatively unconscious existence of collective conformity” (Stevens, 1994:152), whereas individuation fosters a perception of and responsiveness to the needs of the collective (Leader, 2009).

Where others are experienced as part of the greater Self indivisible from one’s own self, only altruistic behaviour makes sense. Then action is based on individual ethical self-determination rather than conformity to moral norms. Jung distinguished moral conscience from ethical conscience (CW X 856-857): moral conscience springs from a fundamental “moral reaction” arising from the collective unconscious (Robinson, 2005) and produces a society’s moral codes; ethical conscience manifests from the unconscious in opposition to moral codes when such codes deviate markedly from that same original moral reaction. Moral codes are shaped over time by social change, but ethical conscience discards conventional morality when needs trump rules. Departure from societal moral norms occurs uncontrollably when the individual has not yet explored the contents of his
Shadow, or it arises without compulsion in a manageable fashion as a result of having ‘owned’ the Shadow (Stevens, 1994).

Jung’s understanding of an individual as having access to a kind of universal awareness that clearly shows the illusory, transient nature of the everyday Ego is more commonly found in the philosophical literature of theology and mysticism. Organizational scholarship already alludes to this conceptualization in portraying whistleblowing as contemporary sainthood (Grant, 2002). In a state where there is only the object of consciousness, the subject having seemingly dissolved, then love for oneself is love for another — and that is said to be compassion (Namgyal Rinpoche, 1998). The actor is the vehicle for compassion, its embodiment.\footnote{124}{"To talk of the embodied mind [or, in this case, embodied state of compassion] is to confirm a psychological distinction between the internal and the external without lapsing back into a discredited body-mind dualism" (Moll, 2004:52).} Perhaps whistleblowers are experiencing this kind of consciousness, where they similarly embody empathetic concern; they do not ‘want’ to act empathetically, they ‘are’ an embodiment of empathy.

However, this thesis has not gone so far as to dub whistleblowers saints, albeit they do seem to have extreme understandings of duty, responsibility and one person’s relationship to others. A saint has a conscious awareness of the interlinked embeddedness of all life; whistleblowers’ awareness of this panorama appears to be unconscious, producing that ‘choiceless choice’. It is probably not, therefore, the archetype of the Saint that fuels whistleblowing.

Maxwell’s discussion of compassionate empathy (v.s. 160-161) identifies that only a moral perception — an awareness of the ethical dimensions of experience — as acute as sensory perception and coupled with an equally sensitive moral imagination, sufficient to imagine exquisitely the experience of others (Krebs, 2005; v.s. 103), may be sufficient to...
produce moral activity, especially when such activity is not directly beneficial to the actor.

In exploring the archetypes and looking for those involved in whistleblowing, we looked at the Hero, the Seer and the Trickster in terms of who benefits from their constellation (Chapters 4 and 5). We also came upon the Artist (v.s. 164), and speculated that, unlike the visual artist, it may be that the ‘art’ of the whistleblower is moral, his especial sensitivity in the realm of morality, and his particular capacity similar to that of the archetypal Horus — enormous love and compassion. Perhaps just as a ‘born artist’ may have “a genius for [artistic] discovery” (Underhill, 1960:65), so the whistleblower may also have a moral genius. This genius is evidenced not in moral thinking but in moral action, just as the painter’s is in painting, not in theorizing about art. Underhill’s musings about creativity are consonant with whistleblowers’ claim of having no choice:

the whole personality then absorbs or enters into communion with certain rhythms or harmonies existent in the universe, which the receiving apparatus of other selves cannot take up. (ibid.)

Under normal circumstances, most people “give up [their] whole consciousness to the occupation of the senses” (Underhill, 1960:56). Yet, artistic genius brings to consciousness those aspects of life which are normally suppressed (ibid.). “In artistic subjects ... images, balanced harmonies ... surge up mysteriously without the intervention of the will, and place themselves before the mind”, so that what the artist perceives is “indistinguishable from the ordinary accompaniments of intense artistic activity” (ibid.:272). If we grant that manifesting archetypes force individuals into “specifically human patterns” (Jung, 1976:52) of perception and apprehension (v.s. 132), then whistleblowers’ incapacity to resist speaking out may also be the natural ‘accompaniment’ to their ‘intense’ activity. The strength of the artist’s perceptions “is such that they ... emerge into the conscious field ... temporarily dominating the subject” (Underhill, 1960:57). When there is total
concentration upon an object, “utter focus coupled with exhilaration” (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2010:262), self-consciousness dissolves and artists ‘lose themselves in their work’, which, traditionally, is to make Beauty manifest. If, however, we suspect that the archetypal Artist is at work in the whistleblower, then their work is moral, which is to reveal Truth (in the pragmatic sense, as a subspecies of the Good).

The Enlightenment perspective rests on an individual’s Cartesian sense of self as an autonomous ego independent from others (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin & Venn, 1998). However, in Jung’s cosmos, concentration that obliterates egoic awareness, such as artistic “experiences of immersion” (Ezzamel & Willmott, 2014:1025), re-centres upon the archetypal Self. When the ‘inner center’ is recognized, this “assumption of independence” may be simply a “convenient fiction” (ibid.:1032), as the Ego realigns with the archetypal Self in the “inner center” or “psychic nucleus” (von Franz, 1968:169), losing its autonomous moorings. Because actions are determined in large part by unconscious forces, then they also in this way point to a reorientation around an archetypal Self that is “the centre of totality, just as the ego is the centre of consciousness” (CW VII 405; v.s. 156). These shifts may be transiently pathogenic, but not a “form of futile suffering” (Stevens, 1994:125). Through having reoriented around the archetypal Self in an embodiment of Horus’ compassion, whistleblowers, constellating the Artist, obtain the “receiving apparatus” (v.s. 273) particularly attuned to society’s “previously unfulfilled archetypal needs” (Stevens, 1994:138) — they are drafted into society’s service.

Several whistleblower subjects regularly found themselves as recipients of cries for help, indicating that others saw them to have a highly developed moral perception with its concomitant willingness to act:
... my first thought was for them, I didn’t like that fact of how they were being treated ... [and thought], “Well, we’re not going to let this happen, we’re going to stop it!” ... I was the caretaker ... I was the one who helped my sisters out — actually anybody. (Meleager)

For some reason employees always seemed to come to me for help ... I was afraid and so was everyone around me [but] ... it was important to send a message ... that people cannot just be discarded for doing the right thing. (Daskylus)

From Adam’s expulsion to Noah’s flood: Levels of resistance

This study contended that whistleblowers may be seen as participating in a particular kind of creative process. Perhaps the ‘success’ of whistleblowers is also like that of artists, varying from genre to genre, with some genres more widely accepted than others. Genres in whistleblowing are dependent upon the level of resistance. Congruently with the notion that whistleblowing emerges from unrecognized organizational and societal pressures, rather than as a result of individual choice, the whistleblower narratives of the thesis indicate that a whistleblower seems to be more successful when he is resisting things at a systemic level — i.e. he is successful in that his life is not compromised in the same way or to the same degree personally, financially or careerwise than if he tries to remedy misconduct at a more personal, particularized level. Amongst our subjects, Meleager, Nestor and Ajax attacked the systemic problems in the field of medicine within which they worked, at the highest political level and across the medical research industry respectively. Diomedes, Daskylus, Hector and Odysseus tried to address problems centred within those particular organizations where they worked — the nursing home, municipal long term care service, hospital and midwifery practice, and hospital and university respectively — and primarily attributable to the wrongdoing of a small number of persons, or wrongdoing that affected a small number of victims. Members of the first group have retained a sense of energetic urgency and continue their organizing in the hope of eventually making a
difference; members of the second have either been forced to give up their efforts or carry on what seems to be an endlessly debilitating battle.

Systemic resistance allows a whistleblower to be part of a group of resisters, minimizing his vulnerability, whereas acting alone maximizes this personal vulnerability. When misconduct is resisted at a systemic level, having grown beyond the level of personal threat or potential threat to specific victims, then it becomes more difficult for wrongdoers or those with regulatory responsibility for addressing whistleblowing to discount it.

Personal grievances (e.g., wrongful dismissal, bullying, breach of contract, discrimination), should they become known publicly, are not so potentially damaging to the employing organization and as such, are dismissable or addressable, both without necessarily courting scandal. However, whistleblowing relating to income-generating potential across a sector, an industry or a large organization demands the attention of the wrongdoer[s], as this kind of whistleblowing has ceased to be an unpremeditated and perhaps unconsciously controlled response, and instead has transformed, through collective action, into strategic response, a conscious tactic.

Further, the whistleblowers whose efforts are on behalf of others rather than themselves are fulfilling the archetypal imperative, the ‘moral of the story’.

Issues or actions ... are ethically significant to the extent that they are an outcome of direct attentiveness to the Other, and so are minimally mediated by self-concern. (Ezzamel & Willmott, 2014:1023)

If Horus constellates in response to the geas to bring balance back to the world, then according to this study, the world has been found to be more supportive and productive of ‘success’ proportionately to the level of systemic entrenchment of the wrongdoing. 125

125 The world being more responsive to higher level problems rests on Jung’s alchemical notion of the unus mundus (CW XIV 702), the assigning of a kind of consciousness to the whole world, such that specifics that
With our whistleblower subjects, this might explain the comparative success of those whistleblowers resisting systemic problems as opposed to problems experienced only on an individual basis. As Ajax mentioned, a problem encountered by “one person in one instance is trivial” because it generally does not affect the way business is conducted, and revealing malfeasance at an individual level rarely holds perpetrators to account. Organizational concentration on trivial specifics in whistleblowing cases may also be a corporate strategy to obscure larger questions (Monk et al., 2015). However, as he also stated, it is essential to begin with specific cases, as “the only way to draw attention to systemic problems is by pointing out really serious examples of that particular systemic problem and the level to which it has got”. In the literature review (v.s. 49), I argued that the ethicality of whistleblowing can only be appreciated in making specific reference to particular practices, but that the higher level origins of these problems must be recognized. Futile attempts to ‘fix’ a specific problem without recognizing its systemic source are made across industries.

If we look back to the first chapter, the outcome of attending to problems without recognizing higher level effects are in evidence. The opening narrative elucidates the trajectory of neoliberal technical rationality that originates in the Enlightenment requirement for individual action as opposed to non-action in the face of difficulty, where “the development of technical expertise is not subject to any particular purpose but the duty not to neglect what is possible to attain” (Bauman, 1992:94). The rationalist arc of endless development (Ciuk & Kostera, 2010) begins with incorporating technical solutions to ethical problems, but proceeds to discard ethical problems arising therefrom. Even have implications for the health of the whole are more significant than those which do not. Discussing this further is beyond the scope of the thesis.
when they are shown over time to have morally unacceptable implications\textsuperscript{126}, the abandonment of technical advances is “automatically classified as retrograde and ... reactionary and condemnable” (Bauman, 1992:94).

Henik’s (2008) subjects remark that nursing notes exhibit a lack of system-level concerns, but instead are all aimed at individuals, allowing the systems to continue to malfunction. Examining specific practices is the only effective way to focus in on “deeply systemic problems” that are hidden, in part by the reluctance of those unintentionally complicit to accept that “inadequacies” are “intentional”, even within “bureaucrac[ies] charged with protecting our health” (Gupta, 2008).

In this way, whistleblowers who organize to fight develop a useful notoriety, like creative artists who spawn entire schools of painting, “persons who acquire or inherit their vision” (Underhill, 1960:431). Whistleblowers who strive to remedy higher levels of misconduct are better positioned to attract others to continue their resistance. With the global increasing incidence of whistleblowing and the attempt to protect whistleblowers legislatively, we are witnessing what might be the very beginnings of a chain reaction, a wildfire spreading into all areas of organizational life. This thesis has claimed that in a Jungian frame, light archetypal aspects have been repressed by organizational power until they have reached a critical moral ‘mass’, and have begun to erupt in an uncontrolled response, with whistleblowers pitting themselves against large corporate interests to stop systemically entrenched misconduct. Once these eruptions are brought into ‘the light of day’, they spread into the public arena to inhabit social consciousness in multiple areas.

\textsuperscript{126} Even though the cesarean section rate in North America has been shown to be medically unjustifiable (World Health Organization, 1985) and home birth at least as safe as hospital birth (v.s. 4), medical associations continue to endorse unnecessary intervention for most pregnancies (Monk, 2007).
It is also this attending to levels that informs Ajax’ considered solution to the problem of non-support facing so many whistleblowers and preventing their efforts from having impact. In concentrating on wrongdoing that is systemic, there is less tendency toward insult and demonization of individuals, and instead a leaning toward understanding of whistleblowing as aiming at re-balancing, not destruction. His suggestion to make a statement in a letter about what is happening and question people about where they stand ethically can provide ethical guidance without seeming adversarial to those ‘in the know’ within an industry:

If you had twenty of your colleagues writing to your superior/supervisor saying, ‘You know, what you seem to be doing here is a little bit odd. I’d like a little bit more information about it and could you explain the rationale for your decision?’ I doubt very much that they would ... behav[e] in quite the way that they did.

Although there is no “surefire way of integrating organizational shadow, “open discussion ... of the shadow robs it of its power” (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2010:278). Settlements on a case-by-case basis are unending, because “[e]xit appears to be the only choice, when loyalty is questioned and voice impossible” (Parker, 2014:281). However, letter writing provides conscientious individuals with a voice. Discussions arising from such questioning could produce suggestions for systems-based remedies that would be communicated to all the writers and recipients, who might then monitor their implementation.

Further, this kind of approach might help to prevent the elimination of cases as legislatively ineligible. Organizations supposed to ‘protect’ whistleblowers do not tend to use specific cases to support the principles they espouse (v.s. 232-233), and it is not entirely clear whether the disjuncture between principles and actual situations is deliberate or accidental (FAIR, 2012; Monk et al., 2015). With consistent scrutiny within an industry or sector from knowledgeable practitioners, there would be more awareness of cases
falling through legislative cracks (e.g., unsuccessful cases before PIDA in the UK, or those abandoned by the Public Service Integrity Commission in Canada), and more genuinely effective suggestions for amendments to legislation as a result.

Scrutiny is the key, but from the right people — those who understand the minutiae involved in praxis. Just as the sky was cracked by the Hero’s hammer in the Lion-mask dream (v.s. 239), the “system can be cracked if forty to fifty like-minded people are willing” (Ajax) to challenge how regulations are being misapplied or not applied.

Those who witness wrongdoing but refuse to report may have their personal shadows distressingly activated when faced with the shadow aspects of their businesses. Through its whistleblowers, society has begun a collective process of ‘individuation’ by bringing to consciousness threatening and immoral organizational conduct across the board. In this study, we have seen how important it is to differentiate between industries and between levels of collective activity in order to effectively assess what damage is being done to whom, and the level at which remedies might be launched. Nevertheless, this allows for a recognition of “the continuous entrenchment of the same agenda of corporate control” (Gupta, 2008), and for the engineering of collective responses that aim both to protect those resisting and those victimized.

Prometheus: Saving the scapegoats

It is not only practitioners who can help to initiate change in the ethical responses to perceived wrongdoing. In the belief that more people can be actively encouraged to speak out, there is discussion in the UK and elsewhere about ‘teaching’ students to be more courageous and blow the whistle, and funding is being sought to teach psychological
principles that presumably encourage speaking out\textsuperscript{127} at the secondary and post-secondary level. Proponents think that “whistleblowers are people who are simply more attuned to a situation, who are able to step back” (Smith, 2014) and make a rational decision to try and change things for the better. Accepting the premise of this thesis, that whistleblowing may be motivated primarily by unconscious factors, may prevent educators throwing good money after bad unless they account for unconscious factors in operation. Doing so may help to avoid another dismal failure like that of the initiative to produce more ethical business professionals simply by mandating stand-alone business ethics courses in universities (Fisman & Galinsky, 2012; Mintz, 2012).

According to the insights of this thesis, setting up isolated courses in ‘whistleblowing ethics’ will likely function as nothing more than “empty PR for MBA programs and … appease the consciences of those who teach in them” (Fisman & Galinsky, 2012). An alternative approach employing mythical archetypal imagery has recently been tried in leadership research (Schedlitzki, Jarvis & McInnes, 2014). It encourages workshop participants to “go under the surface” (ibid.:10) and engage emotionally and critically with organizational roles, by “re-storying” workplace narratives in terms of Greek mythology. The study purports to take advantage of the metaphorically universal applicability of archetype to contemporary situations (Hatch, Kostera & Kozminski, 2005), and to “disrupt thinking and encourage reflection” (Schedlitzki et al., 2014:5) about the socially constructed and individually interpreted nature of organizational stories. It would not be difficult to extend Schedlitzki et al.’s approach (2014) to “re-story” whistleblower scenarios, both in educational and workplace settings.

\textsuperscript{127} Requiring that students be instructed in ethics may be attributed in part to a reaction against the contemporary aims of higher education “of production and consumption … [for] educating the “good employee” rather than the “knowledgeable citizen”” (Cunliffe, Forray & Knights, 2002:492).
The findings of this thesis also point towards a slightly different understanding of such an approach, and a possible extended application as a result. Schedlitzki et al. (2014) concentrate on participants' engaging in a process of rational reflection to “explore and project inner thoughts and feelings on themselves and the organisational situation” (ibid.:10), even when they assert that it is “the emotional aspect of the lived experience” (ibid.:7) of re-storying that is reported as having had the most impact. According to the Jungian framing of this thesis, mytho-poetic work has equally powerful unconscious effects. It may trip the psychic switch whereby repressed shadow aspects of organizations and people's roles within them begin to surface. Extending re-storying by adding additional layers of mytho-poetic amplification, as explored in this whistleblowing study, could encourage the inclusion of potential shadow material while allowing repressed material to emerge more freely, with fewer consciously-imposed restraints. As a result of this kind of conscious integration of unconscious material, participants' willingness to engage more directly with ethical problems and confront the organizational 'conscience' might very well be strengthened. Having entertained some unsettling scenarios in settings where moral reason, perception and emotion intertwined are seen to condition action, participants' perceptions may shift, short circuiting communal tendencies to 'solve' crises by scapegoating, reducing the directing of fear and frustration “against a single victim ... a member of the community who is taken ... isolated and, finally, massacred by everyone” (Bishop, 2010:149)\(^{128}\). Rather than members of an organization tending toward a rageful blaming of anyone who increases awareness around helplessly or innocently being complicit in misconduct —

\(^{128}\) Witness the demonizing of Sadam Hussein. Despite the conclusions of several investigating commissions into Hussein's personal support of Al Qaeda and his 'arsenal' of WMD's to the contrary, a "large and undimining minority of Americans continues to believe these were both the case" (Telhami & Kull, 2011:8). Also charges of sexual criminality against Julian Assange keep "Assange trapped in the U.K. while the U.S. continues to pursue its unprecedented espionage case against him and WikiLeaks" (Lawless & Ritter, 2015).
Chapter seven: Returning home with treasure

As soon as the world catches sight of the single individual who strives, immediately there sounds a general cry to oppose him ... to surround him with barriers and limits, to slow him down in every way, to make him impatient, morose, and not just from without but also from within to bring him to a halt (Goethe, 1810/1960:97)

— those who have become aware of the scapegoating mechanism in their Shadow may not need to follow along with the unhealthy tendency to label one individual as guilty, though he may be no more guilty than any other of anything other than expressing this guilt.

As this thesis focuses exclusively on medical whistleblowers, researchers might directly extend this project by applying similar methods of data collection and analysis to whistleblowers in other industry sectors. Using mytho-poetic method might also unearth new insights in other kinds of studies, especially those seeking to understand the conditions informing particular spheres of activity within organizational settings.

Whether or not the studies acknowledge a Jungian dimension to their method, this type of work could permit material that has been aggregating in the organization’s Shadow after having been “excised from organizational discourse” (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2010:277) to emerge, so that it can be acknowledged and addressed. The thesis has demonstrated a way to create a new archetypologically inspired ‘language’ for communicating potential and actual ethical dilemmas and possible solutions, without unduly ruffling sensitive feathers. Further research using the mytho-poetic analysis of this thesis might expand and refine this imagistic ‘language’, providing a valuable new set of tools for speaking out.

The open-ended nature of such a myth-based approach lends itself to creative options that cannot be predicted.
Conclusion: Myth and mandate

The most pressing of Flyvbjerg's phronetic questions, I think, is the last: If whistleblowing is indeed the product of a globally-based, unconscious species initiative, "What, if anything, should we do about it?" (Flyvbjerg, 2006:274; v.s. 86). What practical implementations, beyond the two suggestions of letter-writing collectives for practitioners (v.s. 211, 279), and myth-based re-storying of blowing the whistle (v.s. 281) are made possible, if any, by this thesis' Jungian theorizing around whistleblowing?

There are two intertwined manners in which the method and understandings of this thesis may be applied to impact future work; methodologically in organizational research, and possibly in other disciplines, by applying the mytho-poetic method to elicit and interpret narrative data in future studies129; more concretely, in expanding the repertoire of conduits through which progress may be made in moving organizational cultures toward a bona fide concern with issues beyond improving the bottom line.

Foremost and most obviously, research could extend the subject matter of this thesis into whistleblowing outside of the medical profession and into other professions, for example into engineering, seeing how attempts by oil companies to suppress reports of dangerous oil rig design (Abbott, 2010), or pipeline hazards (CBC, 2014) are experienced. Secondly, other organizational phenomena than whistleblowing could be brought under scrutiny. By looking at organizational members' narratives about their experiences and dreams and a DIRG panel's associations to them when dealing with the rhetoric of such constructs as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), current critical examinations (e.g., Orlitzky, 2013), could be extended into discussions of unconscious judgments and potential

129 To review the steps of the method, v.s. 124.
pathways for returning to the original ethical rationales for such constructs, i.e. in the case of CSR, corporate participation actually contributory to the public good.

Thirdly and generally, regardless of particular issues under investigation in such studies, participation in this thesis' methodological approach could familiarize organizational members with a way of speaking about their work that is safe, not geared to scapegoating messengers or vilifying those committing wrongdoing. MPASE concentrates on perceptions of what is happening 'above' and 'under' the surface of day to day activities, both everyday particularized perceptions, and archetypally expressed unconscious perceptions. The latter, even when quite oblique, may unearth unsavoury aspects of business that usually go unarticulated, but are known to have damaging consequences, both for the individuals and for the organization as a whole. Using this method, participants can deal with matters at the backs of their minds, matters that, in a more formal forum like a departmental meeting might bring up specifically litigious material for which the articulator would be punished (Jump, 2012).

Of late, there has been a growing trend to substitute rhetorical 'solutions' to ethical problems — CSR, SWOT analysis, or 'best practice' — eliciting unbridled enthusiasm for what amounts to a form of organizational cheerleading, rather than implementing meaningful changes in corporate behaviour (Velasquez, 2003; Orlitzky, 2013). The couching of all problems within the context of these discursive structures may be seen as a contemporary exercise of Orwellian "newspeak" designed to make it difficult to express any worldview other than that of the elite, and making heterodox ideas practically unthinkable (Fleming, 2015). This study's method could provide a new language (Schedlitzki et al., 2014), one that escapes the confines of organizationally orchestrated parameters of thought and allows the concealed struggle with the dark side of the
organization to emerge, thereby providing a new potential for “integrating the Shadow” (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2010). In the Jungian frame, this Shadow is understood as all the perceptions that are and have been hidden away from consciousness in an effort to avoid difficult consequences (CW IXii). Just as in waking life people may deny something in the hope that it will simply disappear, unconsciously they may ignore the truth with the same hope. It is axiomatic within depth psychology that it is better to try to recognize and express the Shadow so as to deal with it ‘in the light’, than to deny or trivialize its impact (Bowles, 1991). If not,

a collective Mr Hyde ... surfaces as powerful and usually uncontrollable impulses. The stronger the attempted control of the identity of the organization, the stronger grows the shadow. (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2010:259)

Just as the method of this thesis has permitted whistleblowing to be understood as an organizational and societal phenomenon, eluding the tendency to get caught up in trivia about personalities or procedures, in the same way other organizational processes could be explored. MPASE could be applied, for instance, to investigations of excessive turnover of personnel, to amending or creating a code of ethics for a profession, or to a selection process for a new executive officer. Mytho-poetic analysis can encapsulate the ‘maelstroms’ of feelings, thoughts and fears surrounding these issues, bringing them into the discussion in a way that produces less defensive responses from participants. When dealing with grave breaching of legal limits, because of its inclination for comprehending issues within collective contexts, the method might also assist in discriminating between those aspects of matters that can be dealt with in-house, and those with larger repercussions that would be better handled by the courts or the media.

The thesis also yields interesting methodological implications around the principle of Jungian *enantiodromia*. Firstly, when a researcher covers ‘both sides’ of a matter, it is not
only that the work is thereby balanced conceptually. What this thesis demonstrates is that considering in a Jungian fashion the 'light' and 'dark' aspects of any event or process side-by-side — i.e. the phenomenon under scrutiny and its shadow — actually yields new understandings of the nature of those aspects and the meaningful relationships between them. Thereby, the possibilities for change will become evident at levels beyond that of the single unit of analysis, giving the research potentially more impact. "... [T]he totality of both directions considered together" (v.s. 254) may help to more fully understand the role that expression/repression play in producing or inhibiting collective behaviour patterns that at first glance may not be appear to be susceptible to particularized analysis, as that of case studies. MPASE provides a way to avoid getting mired in individual case details, and instead to concentrate on discovering the social meanings of these details. It constructs a meaningful bridge, moving from mining narratives for individual practices at issue toward an accumulation of evidence identifying widespread perceptions undergirding an unethical social praxis.

Moreover, it is not only the two-sided nature of phenomena that the Jungian approach of this thesis yields which may prove useful, but importantly, the emphasis upon unconscious influences at work in study subjects, in researchers, in organizations and in society as a whole.

Non-reporting with respect to whistleblowing supports the exercise of power through the deliberate suppression of knowledge, an exercise that can only be sustained with the unconscious approval of this suppression by those upon whom power is exercised. We are facing an unprecedented popular view — if not actual incidence — of the tolerance of misconduct:
... for the first time in history it is publicly held to be acceptable for corruption to exist and be lionized at all levels. (Neiman, 2008:17)

This thesis supports an understanding that just as for the individual, in a Jungian cosmos a global disregard for injustice and a resignation to corruption requires a counter-initiative. Despite reservations about the possibility of global change for the better in a unified direction, the approach this thesis has taken may help to enlist "the holistic and helpful contributions of the unconscious mind to individual and social development" (Dobson, 2009:150). According to Jung's view, "individual psyche[s] mirror the cultural macrocosm" (Woodman and Dickson, 1996:27). Organizational research has predominantly searched for an account of whistleblowing arising from organizational traits or personal traits (v.s. 38-43). Jung understood action to be partially catalyzed by unconscious factors; most organizational research looks for unconscious triggers at the shallower levels of Jung's unconscious realms — that is, in the individual, family, tribal or national strata (Hannah, 1999) — where factors arising from organizational culture can be construed as resting in the clan or tribal layers. However, because for the first time in history almost all of humanity is part of a global 'culture' run by capitalist interests (Vitali, Glattfelder & Battiston, 2011) and because also for the first time in history these interests have the capacity to make the planet uninhabitable in multiple ways, then it may be the rescue of all of humanity at stake.

The mytho-poetic analysis of this thesis has supported the idea that unconscious motivators for whistleblowing are arising from a greater collective, that of a layer subsuming the large group, the layer of the "primeval ancestors" (Hannah, 1999:17). This work has suggested that in a world such as ours, so far out upon the limb of reason and swinging dangerously close to the void, in archetypological terms the Great Mother is
devoting more and more energy to her destructive Kali avatar in order to break her Hero-Son, Horus, out of his centuries-long sleep.

In this frame, then, whistleblowers are the individual mouthpieces of a great psychoid tsunami rushing out of the unconscious toward the redemption of humankind through the saving grace of the Dark Goddess. Despite the fact that the discourse would either have whistleblowers disenfranchised for 'disloyalty' or their concerns discredited, the significance of whistleblowing as enacting a powerful potentiality for change is being recognized. Functioning in response to the constellation of a newly mixed archetype of Hero (action), Seer (motivation) and Artist (perception), whistleblowers communicate their singular perceptions of moral failings, of the iniquity of the age and of persons, and of the pressing need for reckoning.
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APPENDIX I

THE ‘BIG FIVE’ QUESTIONNAIRE (excerpts adapted from Revised Neo-Personality Inventory, Digman, 1990.)

Sample openness items
I have excellent ideas.
I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.
I do not have a good imagination

Sample conscientiousness items
I get chores done right away.
I like order.
I shirk my duties.

Sample extraversion items
I don’t mind being the center of attention.
I keep in the background.

Experimental Measures

Professional identity
1. My values are similar to the audit profession’s values.
2. I am proud to tell others that I am an auditor.
   Participants responded based on a 5-point scale:
   1= Strongly agree, 2= Agree, 3= Neutral, 4= Disagree, 5= Strongly disagree

Locus of commitment
1. I am more committed to my firm than to the individuals with whom I work.
2. I am more responsible for the success of my firm than the personal success of my colleagues.
3. I identify more with my firm than with my co-workers.
   Participants responded based on a 5-point scale (see above):

Perseverance of reporting intention
What is the highest level to which you would report this event?
1. Would not tell anyone
2. Would tell my peer
3. Would report to someone at the same level as the affiliate in-charge
4. Would report to someone at the level above the affiliate in-charge
5. Would pursue to as high a level as needed to get satisfactory action

(Taylor & Curtis, 2010:35)

APPENDIX II

The following are Bok’s questions the whistleblower asks himself to weigh the consequences of blowing the whistle, reflecting levels of the three elements comprising the decision to blow the whistle: dissent, loyalty and accusation.

Dissent: when a whistle blower claims their dissent will achieve a public good, they must ask:
- What is the nature of the promised benefit?
- How accurate are the facts?
Loyalty: when a whistleblower breaches loyalty to their organisation, they must ask:
- Is whistleblowing the last and only alternative?  
- Are there no internal channels?  
- Is there no time to use routine channels?  
- Are internal channels corrupted?

Accusation: when a whistle blower is publicly accusing others, they must ask:
- Are the accusations fair?  
- Are the motives not self-serving?  
- Does the public have a right to know?  
- Is the whistleblower not anonymous?

(Rocha & Kleiner, 2005:83-84)

APPENDIX III

Letter of Information to Potential Participants

June 30, 2013.

I am a doctoral student at the University of the West of England*, in the Faculty of Business and Law, currently researching why some medical professionals choose to make their ethical concerns known, despite potential negative consequences for doing so. Practitioners from the UK, Canada and the United States are being invited to offer their views on the subject. This letter invites your participation in an interview to provide material for part of the work.

So far, research has been unable to identify objective factors which reliably motivate speaking out. I hope to unearth unconscious factors motivating medical professionals to reveal what they see as unethical practice. To that end, we will explore times in your life when you ‘took a stand’. Further, it will be important to include any dreams which you feel were/are triggered by your having taken a stand. I will provide you with the kinds of questions we may be discussing prior to the interview.

If you agree to be interviewed, you will be asked to sign a Letter of Consent to Participate in Research, attached, wherein you agree to have your remarks in the interview recorded and used in the research. You will be sent an electronic interview transcript, with an invitation to elaborate or clarify the material. Upon request, you may have an electronic copy of the completed thesis. While I undertake to represent your ideas accurately, you may not concur with the the interpretation of all your opinions or remarks.
You will remain anonymous in the thesis, and we will discuss how your interview material
will be attributed. Transcript copies will be kept in a locked file, and only myself and
academic supervisors, Prof. David Knights and Prof. Margaret Page*, will have access to
them. You may request that the transcripts be destroyed after the thesis is completed.

Please contact me for further information on any point outlined above. You may also
contact the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) of UWE at
http://rbi.uwe.ac.uk/intranet/research/ethics/ or contact Alison Vaughton or Amanda
Longley at rbi.rss@uwe.ac.uk or telephone 0117 32 82872.

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study.

Yours sincerely,

Hilary Monk**, M.A., B.Ed., OTC
PhD Student Faculty of Business and Law
University of the West of England
131 Main St. Picton, Ontario, Canada K0K 2T0

(*My doctoral work began at the the University of the West of England under the direction
of Professors David Knights and Margaret Page, but was completed at Open University
under the direction of Professors David Knights and Caroline Clarke. **I began doctoral
work under my maiden name.)

APPENDIX IV


To Co-participants:

I agree to participate in Hilary Monk’s** research for her doctoral dissertation, and I
understand that the research has been reviewed and approved for compliance with research
ethics protocols by the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) of the University
of the West of England.

I agree to participate in a recorded audio interview for Hilary Monk’s** doctoral
dissertation as described in the attached Letter of Information to Potential Participants. I
understand that there will be one planned interview session, lasting 2 to 3 hours. I
understand that my anonymity will be protected and that I will be able to indicate to Ms.
Monk** how I would like the interview material to be attributed.
Appendices

I understand that upon request I may receive electronically a transcript or an audio copy of my interview and may offer corrections or additional insights. I understand that portions of the transcripts may be presented anonymously to other participants in the research to elicit their responses and trigger other thoughts upon the matters in question. I understand that, beyond this, the interview transcripts will be kept in a locked file and will not be available to anyone except Hilary Monk** and her supervisors, Prof. David Knights and Prof. Margaret Page**.

I understand that I can request that the transcripts be destroyed after the completion of the research and that I have the right not to answer questions.

I acknowledge that I may not completely agree with the researcher’s interpretation of the interview material.

(name)
Research Participant

date

Hilary Monk**
Principal Researcher
date

(*, **) v.s. endnote, Appendix III)

APPENDIX V

Questions for Interviews
(Original wording is included in italics; revised in normal typeface)

Introduction (Reiterated in face-to-face interview, *spoken aloud only*):

I am trying to learn more about what it is that motivates some people to act on conscience despite knowing that it might bring them problems of all kinds. To this end, I am happy to look at memories of incidents and emotions, dreams, images, stories that might get triggered, ... in fact, anything which comes up and you feel moved to share. [In my history ... 1) I had no choice when it came to a conflict of values 2) the wellbeing of my client always took precedence over protocol, sometimes even my own health 3) I had to follow conscience, even when attempting to ‘follow the rules’ regardless of what the client needed, as most of my colleagues did.*]

Q1: When you think about your youth or your family life, can you recall a time[s] when you were aware of (bullying or cruelty) injustice[s] occurring? What can you tell me about how you experienced this[ese] (bullying or cruelty)injustice[s]?
Q2: Before you decided to become a [physician, researcher, ...] can you recall having a significant response to becoming aware of injustice, or (bullying) cruelty, perhaps in something you read at school, or witnessed, or heard about in the news? What was that like for you?

Q3: Can you tell me about any experiences you may have had in your life which could be considered beyond the ability of materialistic science to explain? Any in reference to practising your profession, or in the way you saw others practice?

Q4: Looking back at your initial decision to become a [physician, researcher, ...], can you recall what motivated you at the outset? At that point, how did you imagine yourself in the future practicing as a [physician, researcher,...]?

Q5: Engaging in practice, can you recall what it was like for you to become aware of injustices?

Q6: Can you tell what it was like coming to decide to resist/blew the whistle/act upon your conscience?

Q7: What did it feel like to make a decision about whether or not to bring your concerns to light? Do you recall having had any kind of internal struggle coming to this decision?

Q8: After you resisted/blew the whistle, can you tell me how those around you responded, and how this felt to you?

APPENDIX VI

Letter of Invitation to potential DIRG members, 5 March 2014

Dear Potential Dream/Image Reflection Group (DIRG) member:

I am a doctoral student, in the Faculty of Business and Law at the Open University in the UK, working under the supervision of Drs. David Knights and Caroline Clarke, and in consultation with Dr. Howard Book of Toronto, Canada. My dissertation explores why some medical professionals choose to blow the whistle, despite potentially grave consequences. So far, research has been unable to reliably identify objective factors that motivate speaking out. From my own experience I hypothesize that unconscious factors may be primarily responsible for whistleblowing. Utilizing aspects of a Jungian approach, I hope to contribute to an understanding of unconscious factors motivating medical professionals to expose what they see as unethical practice.

I have interviewed whistleblowers from the UK, Canada and the United States. They have agreed to share narratives of their whistleblowing and dreams, fantasies and strongly recalled images in relation to their experiences. At this point, I am searching for individual listeners/reflecters, participants in a session free-associating to the interviewee material.

Academically, this comprises a new variant combination of two established methodologies – Lawrence’s Social Dreaming Matrix (SDR) and Listening Posts (LPS), producing what has been dubbed “mytho-poetic analysis of social experience” (MPASE).
Lawrence suggests using a Dream Reflection Group (DRG), which makes "a synthesis of the state of being of the system ... using the evidence of the dreams" (Lawrence, 2007: 165), on the understanding that this will augment the connections between private thought and social meaning. Just so, I aim to augment my personal responses with those of others, in order to point strongly to the social meaning of the whistleblowers' experience.

LPs are designed to identify the "underlying affective and emotional dynamics at work (Hoggett, 2006: 5) in society. In the MPASE model, DIRG members are affected by the actions of whistleblowers, both at a conscious and unconscious level, and they have experiences of witnessing injustice, being forced to act unjustly and/or having been treated unfairly in common with whistleblowers.

This letter invites your participation in this Dream/Image Reflection Group. We will gather at a Toronto site (to be determined) and listen to the whistleblowers' words. With minimal direction from the facilitator, group members will then add free associations to the images, sharing what they evoke. The meaning behind these images will provide us with an idea of the state of the social unconscious around whistleblowing.

Depending upon time constraints and the interest of individual members, further stages in the analysis may be pursued at a group level.

Group members will have the opportunity to offer feedback, adding reflections, responses and modifications to the first draft report of our process. Insofar as this project will be using DRG and LP concepts and techniques in a new way, we may also have the opportunity to write an article to submit to a journal, whose editors may be interested in the exploration of social understandings through this novel approach.

Please contact me directly for further information about this proposal.

In the hope that this project piques your interest and that we will soon be working together, I am

Yours sincerely,

Hilary Monk, M.A., B.Ed. (formerly R.M. [Ont.], C.P.M. [U.S.A.])
228 Storms Rd. R.R. 2 Milford, On K0K 2P0
Tel: 613-827-2769 email: hilary.college@gmail.com

---


Originally, my dissertation supervisor coined the name MPASO for the "mytho-poetic analysis of social opinion”. However, the method concentrates on the 'experience' (so MPASE), not opinions, of persons reflecting on the dreams, images, fantasies and metaphorical language included in subject reports.
APPENDIX VII

DIRG Opening Statement, 16 March 2014 (Spoken)

Today we’ll be exploring a new combination of two academic methodologies — Lawrence’s Social Dreaming Matrix (SDR) and Listening Posts (LPs), producing what has been dubbed “mytho-poetic analysis of social experience” (MPASE). This method concentrates on ‘experience’, yours, reflecting upon the proffered materials. My dissertation looks at medical whistleblowers, the fact that so many of us report that we have no choice when it comes to reporting medical misconduct despite knowing we will suffer for it. Rather than looking at this as a kind of controllable rational process, I maintain that this impulse comes from the unconscious, from an unconscious transpersonal realm, like that of Jung’s archetypes. Working from the assumption, shared and explored by Jung, that there “are underlying affective and emotional dynamics at work in any society”, this session is designed to identify archetypal forces at work, to allow our societal Shadow to make itself known through the Jungian process of ‘amplification’. From your broad knowledge of myths, fairy tales, folktale, art, literature, and culture, I seek to note the awarenesses triggered by whistleblower stories and dreams from “beneath the surface of consciousness. Hopefully, this will provide us a glimpse into the ‘unthought known’, that which you ‘know but don’t know that you know’ – you may have an ‘intuitive sense’ of – but can’t necessarily think about. The group’s ideas should add to my own intuitions about the stories I have collected, provide new directions pointing toward meaningful conclusions.

Each whistleblower has been given the name of one of the Greek mythological heroes returning to Greece from Troy. As the Hero is a masculine archetype, I use the pronoun, “he”. Real world heroes, of course, are female or male.

So get comfy. I will read a piece, once, and tell you whether it was a dream or from waking life. Be attentive to whatever comes up for you – a feeling, a memory, an image, a dream. Don’t worry about what it means, just be aware that it arises. With each piece, I will call on each of you to share these arisings, either to the original piece, or to what has been spoken in response. I will be keeping rough notes of what emerges, and these will be made available to you should you want them. I will also be making sure no one person takes too long. Please be patient with the process ... At the conclusion of the process, we will determine how much input the group members would like to have in the ensuing analysis. So, enjoy our collective journey...here we go!

APPENDIX VIII

Examples of whistleblower interviews excerpts read aloud in the DIRG session:

Dreams

Hector
Turtles, three or four, were around my feet. And then one, very male, with a horn like a rhino on its head ... I’ve seen a big ol’ snapper like that ... trying to climb up my legs and
stomach. I'm semi-prone, and trying to sweep it off, saying, "Get off! Get off, you silly thing!"

**Odysseus**
I'm in a hotel ... and I haven't made it to the talk I'm supposed to give, and I can't find the key to the room and I can't find the room I'm supposed to be in. Sometimes I can't even find the hotel. So I'm *lost* ... I'm permanently, you wouldn't believe the time I waste trying to find the floor I'm on, and the room I'm in, and the meeting room I'm supposed to be talking in and I have this recurring dream that I'm lost in a place where I'm supposed to be, but I'm lost in it and I can't find it ... [I've] got to stop looking over the fence saying, "Please play with me again... I promise I won't be as honest ... I won't call it the way it is..." So, um, so I'm out.

**Images**

**Nestor**
My suit of armour is the knowledge I have – whatever papers I have, points that I have. I don't want to be someone who can easily be criticized based on an error in their thinking ... Sometimes you are. I don't really want to be in a room full of people who listen to Rush Limbaugh ... like my elder brother. I don't talk politics with him. Nobody in the family does.

**Odysseus**
... despite saying "I wouldn't do it again," what choice do you really have? ... And our favourite expression was the hottest places in hell ... it's Dante ... are reserved for those who in times of moral crisis maintain their neutrality.

**APPENDIX IX**

Examples of excerpts from DIRG responses:

Paintings from the Renaissance, displaying internal organs. We've gone back in time to Renaissance Italy, and there's biology and scientists poking around.

the iridescent colours and the movement were most important. The movement caused the crack, and through the crack some process, some progress happened and moving toward some more primitive ... letting go of the stage, and the formality, and becoming really wild

I was real annoyed with that man. "Get away! Leave the poor sheep alone." He's completely misunderstanding what's going on or or how it's going on. If the sheep had an extra foot it should have kicked him. He's meddling in nature... making it flowery *[Her fingers are playing disdainful piano in the air to illustrate 'flowery', and a look of disgust]*

We live in a pyramidal society, a society with a few on top and a lot on the bottom. In a pyramidal society you can't have compassion
... she wants to take care of the whole world. She’s always upset about something, and she’s involved totally in their lives. She gets focussed on this caregiving character of hers. She can’t let go of anybody’s pain

... my childhood where not knowing was very dangerous. I also lived in a violent situation, so I always sat where I could get out if I had to. Over the years, I became my armour as he has. Now I don’t need to do that anymore ... I am identifying with his armour, and I don’t have it anymore.

APPENDIX X

Subject biographies:

Ajax is a researcher who worked with abstracted data about the responses of experimental subjects to pharmaceuticals. On being terminated for reporting to the press on the deliberate misrepresentation of data published under his name, he won in court against his employers and the research’s funding organization. The retaliation did not extend beyond either the work environment or the specific matter which was reported. Although the matter has not been corrected, he still works toward change in research protocols. He has not been disabled by retaliation, nor has his family life been irretrievably damaged, but he has abandoned hope of further work in his field.

Odysseus is a pharmaceutical researcher, who works closely with research subjects. Although his whistleblowing case is still in contention legally, he has won several suits for retaliation against his employers and research funders and enjoys a solid international professional reputation. Reprisals have included attempts at character assassination. His whistleblowing has not truncated his career, nor unduly affected his health. He continues to fight, suspending his disbelief that his concerns will ever be addressed justly, and he is pessimistic about curtailing corporate and bureaucratic greed.

Meleager was initially concerned with not being able to provide medical care to his poor patients. He has left medical practice to become involved in organizing on a national scale for social justice. He is very hopeful, although he believes that the changes he fights for may not be imminent. Although he has been incarcerated several times for civil disobedience, he sees retaliation simply as part of the resistance process.

Nestor, a retired physician, has also been imprisoned for having joined Meleager in whistleblowing and resistance. As long as it does not harm his family, as a retiree he feels relatively immune to retaliation. He works toward decent national medical care through public education and protest.

Hector was forced to leave medical practice after reporting unethical patient treatment internally to supervisors and employers, and then externally to regulatory bodies within medical circles. Retaliatory tactics included withholding pay, termination, blacklisting and defamation. His health has been permanently compromised, and he has lost his livelihood and familial support.
Daskylus was a district administrator who advocated for colleagues against employer maltreatment, and reported externally on unsafe practice in institutions under his direction. Subsequently, he found himself abandoned by colleagues and attacked by employers. Despite good family support, being reinstated at work and having won some compensation, legal problems persist. He suffers from stress-related illness precluding further employment. He is dismayed that those responsible for misconduct have garnered generous severance packages, and are still employed, and is saddened that those in power are only concerned to cover up wrongdoing, not end it.

Diomedes publicly reported the abuse and consequent death of his mother in a nursing home. He was an ‘outsider’ whistleblower whose employment history includes working as ancillary medical staff. Although none of the individuals or the organizations responsible for performing or concealing the wrongdoing — including supervisory medical staff, the investigating police, the prosecuting attorney and the local health ministry — have been punished, and despite financial hardship, he believes the eventual success of his campaign for justice will help prevent anyone else suffering in the same way.