

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Trade Secrets and Whistleblowing: A Comparative Analysis of Legal, Ethical, and Historical Perspectives Across Jurisdictions and Industries

[Raj Kumar](#) *

Posted Date: 28 May 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202505.2187.v1

Keywords: trade secrets; whistleblowing; intellectual property; public interest; EU Whistleblowing directive; defend trade secrets act; Arthashastra; industry-specific protections; ethical dilemmas; ancient Indian texts



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Trade Secrets and Whistleblowing: A Comparative Analysis of Legal, Ethical, and Historical Perspectives Across Jurisdictions and Industries

Raj Kumar

Central University of Punjab; rajkumar.yadav@cup.edu.in

Abstract: This research paper examines the multifaceted legal, ethical, and industry-specific dimensions of disclosing trade secrets by whistleblowers across various jurisdictions, with a comparative historical analysis of trade secret evolution in ancient Indian texts. It explores legal frameworks in the European Union, United States, Ukraine, and Nigeria, highlighting protections and gaps for whistleblowers under laws such as the EU Whistleblowing Directive and the U.S. Defend Trade Secrets Act. The paper delves into motivations driving whistleblowers, ethical dilemmas balancing public interest and proprietary rights, and industry-specific challenges, particularly in the extractive and technology sectors. Additionally, it traces the historical development of trade secrets in ancient Indian texts like the Arthashastra and Manusmriti, analyzing their implications for commerce, social structures, and cultural norms, with comparisons to other ancient civilizations. Key trade secret case studies, such as *DuPont v. Christopher* and *Pepsico v. Redmond*, underscore evolving legal doctrines. The paper also addresses contemporary challenges in protecting trade secrets in the health and food industries amidst digitalization and reverse engineering. It concludes with recommendations for harmonizing legal protections to foster transparency while safeguarding innovation.

Keywords: trade secrets; whistleblowing; intellectual property; public interest; EU Whistleblowing directive; defend trade secrets act; Arthashastra; industry-specific protections; ethical dilemmas; ancient Indian texts

Introduction

The disclosure of trade secrets by whistleblowers raises complex legal, ethical, and practical challenges across various jurisdictions. This response explores the legal implications of such disclosures, the motivations behind whistleblowing, ethical considerations, industry-specific dynamics, and the potential legal consequences for whistleblowers. The analysis draws on insights from multiple jurisdictions, including the European Union, the United States, and others, to provide a comprehensive understanding of the issue.

Legal Implications of Disclosing Trade Secrets

EU Legislation and the Protection of Whistleblowers

In the European Union, the legal framework for whistleblowing and trade secrets is governed by Directive (EU) 2019/1937, which provides robust protection for whistleblowers reporting breaches of EU law. This directive ensures that whistleblowers are shielded from retaliation and legal consequences when they disclose information in the public interest. However, the directive also recognizes the importance of protecting trade secrets, as outlined in the Trade Secrets Directive (EU) 2016/943. The interplay between these two directives creates a balanced approach, where whistleblowers are protected if they disclose trade secrets in the context of reporting illegal activities or public interest concerns (Lenho, 2024) (Abazi, 2016).

Ukrainian Legislation and the Need for Reform

In contrast to the EU, Ukraine's legal framework for whistleblowing and trade secrets is less developed. Ukrainian legislation does not provide comprehensive protection for whistleblowers, and the existing laws primarily focus on corruption-related disclosures. The lack of specific legislation on trade secrets leaves whistleblowers vulnerable to legal consequences when disclosing such information, even if it is in the public interest. There is a pressing need for legislative reform in Ukraine to align its laws with EU standards, as highlighted by the analysis of the current legal gaps (Lenho, 2024).

U.S. Legal Framework and the Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA)

In the United States, the Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA) of 2016 provides federal protection for trade secrets. However, the DTSA also includes immunity provisions for whistleblowers who disclose trade secrets in confidence to government officials or attorneys for the purpose of reporting or investigating legal violations. This immunity is designed to encourage whistleblowing while safeguarding trade secrets from misuse. Despite these protections, legal challenges have arisen, as seen in cases where courts have misapplied the immunity provisions, potentially undermining their effectiveness (Menell, 2017).

Motivations for Whistleblowing

Public Interest and Ethical Considerations

Whistleblowers are often motivated by a desire to expose wrongdoing that harms the public interest. This is particularly evident in cases involving corruption, environmental degradation, or threats to public health and safety. The ethical imperative to act in the public interest often outweighs the legal risks associated with disclosing trade secrets. However, the decision to blow the whistle is not without personal and professional costs, as whistleblowers frequently face retaliation, reputational damage, and legal consequences (Lee, 2024) (O'Sullivan et al., 2014).

Industry-Specific Motivations

In certain industries, such as the extractive sector, whistleblowers may be motivated by the need to expose human rights violations, environmental damage, or corrupt practices. For example, in Nigeria's extractive industry, whistleblowers play a critical role in promoting transparency and accountability, despite the lack of robust legal protections. The presence of effective whistleblowing frameworks can significantly enhance corporate governance and reduce corruption in such industries (Conin, 2023).

Ethical Considerations in Whistleblowing

Balancing Trade Secrets and Public Interest

The ethical considerations surrounding whistleblowing often involve balancing the protection of trade secrets with the need to disclose information in the public interest. This balance is reflected in legal frameworks that provide immunity or protection for whistleblowers who disclose trade secrets in specific circumstances. For instance, the EU's Trade Secrets Directive recognizes that trade secrets should not be used to conceal illegal activities, and whistleblowers who expose such activities are protected from liability (Abazi, 2016) (Menell, 2017).

Cultural and Philosophical Perspectives

Cultural and philosophical perspectives on whistleblowing vary significantly across jurisdictions. In some cultures, whistleblowing is viewed as a moral duty to expose wrongdoing, while in others, it may be seen as disloyal or disruptive. These differing perspectives influence the

legal and ethical frameworks governing whistleblowing. For example, the EU's Whistleblowing Directive reflects a cultural shift towards valuing whistleblowing as a means of promoting transparency and accountability, while in other regions, the emphasis may be more on protecting trade secrets and maintaining confidentiality (Teichmann & Wittmann, 2022) (O'Sullivan et al., 2014).

Industry-Specific Focus on Whistleblowing

Extractive Industry and the Role of Whistleblowers

The extractive industry, particularly in regions like Nigeria, faces significant challenges related to corruption, environmental degradation, and human rights violations. Whistleblowers in this sector play a crucial role in exposing these issues and promoting accountability. However, the lack of effective legal protections for whistleblowers in many jurisdictions leaves them vulnerable to retaliation and legal consequences. Strengthening legal frameworks and implementing industry-specific whistleblowing policies are essential steps to address these challenges (Conin, 2023).

Technology and Information Technology Sector

The technology and information technology (IT) sector presents unique challenges for whistleblowing due to the prevalence of trade secrets and the importance of innovation. In this sector, the balance between protecting trade secrets and promoting whistleblowing is particularly delicate. The EU's Trade Secrets Directive and Whistleblowing Directive provide a framework for addressing these challenges, but the sector-specific dynamics require additional considerations to ensure that whistleblowers are protected while maintaining the integrity of trade secrets (Teichmann & Wittmann, 2022).

Potential Legal Consequences for Whistleblowers

Retaliation and Liability

Whistleblowers often face significant legal consequences, including retaliation, job loss, and legal liability for disclosing trade secrets. These consequences can be particularly severe in jurisdictions with inadequate legal protections. For example, in Ukraine, whistleblowers who disclose trade secrets may face legal liability unless they can demonstrate that the disclosure was necessary to expose illegal activities or protect public interests (Lenho, 2024).

Criminal Law and Trade Secret Misappropriation

In some jurisdictions, the misappropriation of trade secrets can lead to criminal liability. However, whistleblowers who disclose trade secrets in the context of reporting illegal activities or public interest concerns are generally protected from such liability. The interplay between criminal law and whistleblowing protections is complex and requires careful consideration of the circumstances surrounding the disclosure (Ding, 2023) (Menell, 2017).

Extraterritoriality and Cross-Border Implications

The global nature of trade and commerce raises important questions about the extraterritorial application of trade secret laws. In cases where trade secrets are misappropriated across borders, the legal framework for protecting whistleblowers becomes even more complex. The U.S. approach to extraterritorial trade secret misappropriation, for example, provides a domestic forum for addressing such issues, but the lack of a coherent framework leaves trade secret owners uncertain about their enforceable rights (Rowe & Mahfood, 2014) (Dreyfuss & Silberman, 2017).

Table: Key Features of Whistleblower Protection Across Jurisdictions.

Jurisdiction	Key Features of Protection	Industry-Specific Considerations
European Union	Comprehensive protection under Directive 2019/1937	Balanced approach to trade secrets and whistleblowing
United States	Immunity for whistleblowers under DTSA	Sector-specific challenges in IT and technology
Ukraine	Limited protection, need for legislative reform	High-risk environment for whistleblowers in extractive industry
Nigeria	Lack of robust legal framework	Critical role of whistleblowers in promoting accountability

Evolution of Trade Secrets in Ancient Indian Texts and Their Implications

The concept of trade secrets has deep roots in ancient Indian texts, reflecting their significance in commerce, social structures, and cultural norms. These texts, such as the Arthashastra, Manusmriti, and others, provide insights into how trade secrets were conceptualized and utilized, not only for economic advantage but also as tools for social and cultural governance. This section explores the evolution of trade secrets in ancient Indian texts and their implications on various aspects of society.

Evolution of Trade Secrets in Ancient Indian Texts

Early Conceptualization of Secrecy

The idea of secrecy as a mechanism for power and exclusion is evident in ancient Hindu traditions. The Upaniṣads, for instance, emphasize the salvific nature of secret knowledge, suggesting that access to such knowledge was reserved for specific groups (Djurdjevic, 2022). This principle extended to trade secrets, where exclusive knowledge of production techniques or market strategies could confer economic advantages.

The Role of the State in Trade Secrets

The Arthashastra, a foundational text on statecraft, details how the state could utilize trade secrets to maintain economic superiority. Kautilya, the author, advocates for the protection of trade secrets related to state enterprises, such as mining and metallurgy, to prevent competitors from replicating these industries (McClish, 2019) (Patil, 2024). This approach underscores the strategic importance of secrecy in maintaining state power and economic stability.

Guilds and Craft Licensing

In the Indus Valley Civilization, trade secrets were managed through guilds and craft licensing systems. Archaeological evidence suggests that seals and tablets were used to enforce trade and commodity control, indicating a sophisticated system of access control and licensing (Mukhopadhyay, 2023). These practices ensured that specific crafts and trades remained exclusive to certain groups, preserving their economic and social status.

Implications on Commerce

Economic Stability and Growth

The protection of trade secrets was crucial for maintaining economic stability. The Arthashastra emphasizes the importance of state intervention in preventing the misuse of trade secrets, ensuring that economic activities remained fair and just (McClish, 2019) (Bhat, 2023). This approach not only protected individual enterprises but also contributed to the overall prosperity of the state.

Market Regulation and Fair Trade

Ancient Indian texts like the Arthashastra and Manusmriti advocate for fair trade practices. The concept of a “fair” contract, as discussed in these texts, aimed to balance the interests of all parties involved, preventing exploitation and ensuring equitable economic transactions (Lysenko, n.d.) (Bhagat & Kantekure, 2023). This principle extended to the protection of trade secrets, ensuring that their use did not lead to unfair market practices.

State Revenue and Taxation

Trade secrets were also linked to state revenue systems. The Arthashastra outlines various sources of revenue, including taxes on trade and commerce, and emphasizes the importance of efficient taxation systems to ensure state prosperity (McClish, 2019) (Bhat, 2023). The protection of trade secrets was thus not only an economic strategy but also a means of maintaining state revenue.

Implications on Social Structures

Caste System and Occupational Secrecy

The varna system, as described in the Manusmriti, played a significant role in the preservation of trade secrets. Specific occupations and their associated knowledge were often restricted to particular castes, ensuring that trade secrets remained within these groups (Bhagat & Kantekure, 2023) (Olivelle, 2004). This system reinforced social hierarchies and maintained the exclusivity of certain trades.

Guilds and Community Governance

Guilds, or śreṇīs, were central to the management of trade secrets in ancient India. These guilds operated as autonomous bodies, regulating trade practices and ensuring that trade secrets were not misused (Leonidovna, 2014). The legal personality of these guilds, as discussed in historical texts, highlights their role in maintaining social order and economic stability.

Women's Roles and Trade Secrets

While women's roles in ancient Indian society were often marginalized, certain texts like the Manusmriti acknowledge their importance in domestic and economic activities. However, the exclusion of women from certain trades and the associated trade secrets reflects the broader gender inequalities of the time (Bhagat & Kantekure, 2023) (Olivelle, 2004).

Implications on Cultural Norms

Secrecy as a Cultural Value

Secrecy was deeply ingrained in ancient Indian culture, extending beyond trade to religious and social practices. The Upaniṣads, for example, emphasize the importance of secrecy in religious rituals and the transmission of sacred knowledge (Djurdjevic, 2022). This cultural valuation of secrecy likely influenced the approach to trade secrets, where exclusive knowledge was seen as a valuable and protected asset.

Ethical Considerations in Trade Practices

Ancient Indian texts like the Arthashastra and Manusmriti emphasize ethical considerations in trade practices. The protection of trade secrets was not merely an economic strategy but also a means of upholding moral principles, such as fairness and justice (Lysenko, n.d.) (McClish, 2019). This ethical framework ensured that trade secrets were used responsibly and for the greater good.

The Role of Religion in Trade Practices

Religion played a significant role in shaping trade practices and the use of trade secrets. The concept of dharma, or righteous living, influenced economic activities, ensuring that trade secrets were used in accordance with moral and ethical standards (McClish, 2019) (Malov & Popov, 2024). This integration of religion and economics underscores the holistic approach to trade practices in ancient India.

Comparison with Other Ancient Civilizations

Mesopotamia and the Code of Hammurabi

The Code of Hammurabi, one of the earliest legal codes, provides insights into the handling of trade secrets in ancient Mesopotamia. Like the Arthashastra, it emphasizes the importance of fair trade practices and the protection of economic interests (Lysenko, n.d.) (Humfress et al., 2024). However, the Mesopotamian approach was more focused on penalizing violations of trade agreements, whereas the Indian texts emphasized preventive measures and ethical considerations.

Ancient China and the Concept of Guanxi

In ancient China, trade secrets were often managed through personal relationships and networks, a concept known as guanxi. This approach differed from the more formalized systems described in ancient Indian texts, where guilds and state regulations played a central role in managing trade secrets (Leonidovna, 2014) (Manrai & Goel, 2017).

Ancient Rome and the Concept of Aequitas

Roman law, particularly the concept of aequitas, emphasized fairness and equity in trade practices. This principle is similar to the Indian concept of dharma, where trade secrets were used in accordance with moral and ethical standards (Lysenko, n.d.) (Humfress et al., 2024). However, the Roman approach was more focused on legal frameworks, whereas the Indian texts integrated ethical considerations into economic practices.

Table: Comparison of Trade Secret Practices Across Ancient Civilizations.

Civilization	Key Features of Trade Secret Practices	Citation
Ancient India	Use of guilds, state regulation, ethical considerations	(Mukhopadhyay, 2023) (McClish, 2019) (Bhat, 2023)
Ancient Mesopotamia	Penalizing violations, emphasis on legal frameworks	(Lysenko, n.d.) (Humfress et al., 2024)
Ancient China	Management through personal relationships (guanxi)	(Leonidovna, 2014) (Manrai & Goel, 2017)
Ancient Rome	Emphasis on aequitas (fairness and equity)	(Lysenko, n.d.) (Humfress et al., 2024)

Case studies on Trade Secret

Trade secret law has played a pivotal role in shaping the landscape of intellectual property rights, with several landmark cases highlighting its significance. These cases have not only defined the boundaries of trade secret protection but have also influenced the development of related legal doctrines. The following sections explore some of the most significant trade secret case studies in the history of intellectual property law, drawing insights from the provided academic papers.

DuPont v. Christopher

This case is a classic example of trade secret misappropriation where the court ruled in favor of DuPont, emphasizing the importance of protecting trade secrets from industrial espionage. The defendants had taken aerial photographs of DuPont's plant to uncover its secret manufacturing process. The court's decision underscored the necessity of reasonable precautions to maintain secrecy and set a precedent for future cases involving industrial espionage (Fisk, 2001).

Economic Espionage Act of 1996

- The enactment of the Economic Espionage Act (EEA) marked a significant milestone in trade secret law by introducing criminal penalties for trade secret theft. This legislation was a response to the growing threat of economic espionage and aimed to protect U.S. businesses from foreign and domestic threats. The EEA's extraterritorial application and its impact on innovation and worker mobility have been subjects of extensive analysis and debate (Dreyfuss, 1999) (Dreyfuss, 1998).

Coca-Cola Formula Case

- Although not a court case, the Coca-Cola formula is often cited as a quintessential example of trade secret protection. The company's rigorous measures to safeguard its formula have become a benchmark for trade secret management. This case illustrates the balance between maintaining secrecy and leveraging trade secrets for competitive advantage (Saunders, 2006).

Pepsico, Inc. v. Redmond

- In this case, Pepsico sought to prevent a former executive from joining a competitor, Quaker Oats, arguing that he would inevitably disclose trade secrets. The court's decision to grant an injunction based on the "inevitable disclosure" doctrine highlighted the challenges of balancing employee mobility with the protection of trade secrets. This case has influenced the development of non-compete agreements and the scope of trade secret protection (Rowe & Sandeen, 2012).

AI and Trade Secrets

- The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) presents new challenges and opportunities for trade secret law. As AI systems generate valuable information, questions arise about the ownership and protection of AI-generated trade secrets. This evolving area of law will likely redefine the boundaries of trade secret protection and necessitate adjustments in legal doctrines to accommodate AI's capabilities (Sprankling, 2024).

While these cases and developments underscore the importance of trade secret protection, they also highlight the ongoing tension between innovation and regulation. The balance between protecting proprietary information and fostering an environment conducive to innovation remains a central theme in trade secret law. As technology evolves, so too will the legal frameworks governing trade secrets, necessitating continuous adaptation and reevaluation of existing doctrines.

Legal Implications of Trade Secret Disclosure for Whistleblowers

The legal implications of disclosing trade secrets for whistleblowers vary significantly across jurisdictions, influenced by regional legislation and the balance between protecting trade secrets and encouraging whistleblowing in the public interest. In the European Union, the Trade Secrets Directive aims to harmonize trade secret protection but has been criticized for insufficiently safeguarding whistleblowers, who are crucial for exposing information in the public interest (Abazi, 2016). In contrast, the United States' Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA) provides specific immunity for whistleblowers, allowing them to disclose trade secrets to government officials or attorneys under

certain conditions without facing liability (Menell, 2017). These differences highlight the complex interplay between legal frameworks, motivations, and ethical considerations surrounding whistleblowing.

Legal Frameworks and Protections

- **European Union:** The EU's Trade Secrets Directive does not explicitly protect whistleblowers, leading to concerns about their vulnerability when disclosing trade secrets. The Directive's focus is on protecting trade secrets to enhance competitiveness, but it lacks comprehensive whistleblower protections, which are necessary to balance these interests (Abazi, 2016).
- **United States:** The DTSA provides a "cone of silence" for whistleblowers, allowing them to disclose trade secrets confidentially to government officials or attorneys for the purpose of reporting legal violations. This immunity is intended to encourage reporting without risking commercial harm to trade secret owners (Menell, 2017).
- **Ukraine:** Ukrainian legislation offers limited whistleblower protection, primarily focusing on disclosures related to corruption. There is a need for legislation that clearly defines when trade secrets can be disclosed without legal repercussions (Lenho, 2024).

Motivations and Ethical Considerations

- **Public Interest:** Whistleblowers are often motivated by the desire to expose wrongdoing that affects the public interest, such as regulatory violations or financial misconduct (Menell, 2017).
- **Ethical Dilemmas:** Whistleblowers face ethical challenges, balancing their duty to their employer with their responsibility to the public. The lack of clear legal protections can exacerbate these dilemmas, deterring potential whistleblowers from coming forward (Abazi, 2016) (Lenho, 2024).

Industry-Specific Focus

- **High-Tech Industry:** In industries like high-tech, where trade secrets are highly valuable, the risk of unauthorized disclosure is significant. Legal frameworks must address the unique challenges posed by these industries, including the potential for significant economic impact from trade secret leaks (Chung, 2023).
- **Employment Relationships:** Employees are often at the center of trade secret disclosures, whether intentional or accidental. The European Trade Secrets Directive acknowledges the risks associated with employment relationships but does not provide detailed guidance on managing these risks (Gutfleisch, n.d.).

Potential Legal Consequences for Whistleblowers

- **Liability and Retaliation:** Whistleblowers may face legal liability and retaliation, including career repercussions, if they disclose trade secrets without adequate legal protection. The DTSA attempts to mitigate these risks by providing immunity, but its application can be inconsistent, as seen in cases like *Unum Group v. Loftus* (Menell, 2017).
- **Criminal Sanctions:** In some jurisdictions, whistleblowers may face criminal sanctions if their disclosures are deemed to violate trade secret laws. This underscores the need for clear legal standards that protect whistleblowers acting in good faith (Ding, 2023).

While legal frameworks like the DTSA in the United States provide some protection for whistleblowers, the situation in other jurisdictions, such as the EU and Ukraine, remains less clear. The balance between protecting trade secrets and encouraging whistleblowing is delicate, requiring careful legislative attention to ensure that whistleblowers can act without fear of legal repercussions. The ethical considerations and motivations of whistleblowers further complicate this landscape, highlighting the need for comprehensive legal protections that support both innovation and transparency.

Protecting Trade Secrets in Intellectual Property Law

Trade secrets are a crucial component of intellectual property law, providing protection for confidential business information that gives a company a competitive edge. The key elements that constitute a trade secret include the information's secrecy, its economic value, and the reasonable efforts made to maintain its confidentiality. Legal protection for trade secrets is provided through various national and international laws, which aim to prevent unauthorized acquisition, use, or disclosure of such information. The following sections detail these elements and the legal frameworks that protect them.

Key Elements of a Trade Secret

- **Secrecy:** For information to qualify as a trade secret, it must not be generally known or readily accessible to people who can profit from its disclosure or use. This requirement ensures that the information is genuinely confidential and not public knowledge (Quinto & Singer, 2009) (Halt et al., 2014).
- **Economic Value:** The information must have independent economic value due to its secrecy. This means that the information provides a competitive advantage or is valuable to competitors if disclosed (Johnson, 2010).
- **Reasonable Efforts to Maintain Secrecy:** The owner of the trade secret must take reasonable steps to keep the information confidential. This can include physical security measures, confidentiality agreements, and restricted access to sensitive information (Takizawa, 2015) (Sosnova, 2016).

Legal Protection of Trade Secrets

- **Uniform Trade Secrets Act (UTSA):** In the United States, the UTSA provides a framework for trade secret protection, defining misappropriation and outlining remedies for unauthorized use or disclosure (Quinto & Singer, 2009) (Sosnova, 2016).
- **Economic Espionage Act (EEA):** This federal law criminalizes the theft of trade secrets, providing a legal basis for prosecuting individuals or entities that engage in economic espionage (Chung, 2023).
- **EU Directive on Trade Secrets:** The EU Directive harmonizes trade secret protection across member states, ensuring a consistent approach to defining and protecting trade secrets. It emphasizes the need for redress in cases of unlawful acquisition, use, or disclosure (Pila & Torremans, n.d.) (Sosnova, 2016).
- **International Agreements:** The TRIPs Agreement under the World Trade Organization sets minimum standards for trade secret protection, promoting uniformity across jurisdictions while allowing for national variations (Franzoni, 2020).

Protection Strategies

- **Contractual Measures:** Companies often use non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) and non-compete clauses to legally bind employees and partners to confidentiality obligations (Fuentes, 2019) (Neelam, 2009).
- **Physical and Digital Security:** Implementing robust security measures, such as access controls and encryption, helps protect trade secrets from unauthorized access (Takizawa, 2015).
- **Litigation and Remedies:** Legal actions can be taken against misappropriation, with remedies including injunctions, damages, and corrective measures to prevent further unauthorized use (Neelam, 2009) (Pila & Torremans, n.d.).

While trade secret protection is vital for maintaining competitive advantage, it is not without challenges. The balance between protecting trade secrets and fostering innovation and competition is delicate. Strong protection can encourage inventiveness but may also hinder the diffusion of

knowledge and limit competition (Franzoni, 2020). Additionally, the reliance on contractual and security measures requires constant vigilance and adaptation to evolving threats, particularly in the digital age.

Balancing Trade Secrets and Public Health in the Health Sector

The protection of trade secrets in the health sector presents a complex interplay of potential risks and benefits. On one hand, trade secrets can incentivize innovation by allowing companies to safeguard proprietary information, thus ensuring a competitive edge and return on investment. On the other hand, excessive secrecy can hinder public health by restricting access to critical information, such as clinical trial data, which is essential for scientific progress and public safety. This duality necessitates a careful balance between protecting intellectual property and ensuring public health and safety.

Benefits of Protecting Trade Secrets

- **Incentivizing Innovation:** Trade secrets provide a mechanism for companies to protect their investments in research and development, particularly in the biotechnology sector where the cost of innovation is high. This protection encourages continued investment in new health technologies and treatments (Elliott, 2007).
- **Economic Security:** By safeguarding proprietary information, companies can prevent economic espionage and theft, which are significant concerns in the biotech industry. This protection helps maintain a company's competitive position in the market (Fitzpatrick & DiLullo, 2017).
- **Encouraging Collaboration:** In some cases, trade secrets can facilitate collaboration between companies by allowing them to share information under confidentiality agreements, thus fostering innovation while protecting sensitive data (Kinnard, 2014).

Risks of Protecting Trade Secrets

- **Hindering Access to Medicines:** Trade secrecy can limit access to essential health information, such as clinical trial data, which is crucial for the development and distribution of affordable medicines. This can be particularly problematic during health emergencies, such as pandemics, where rapid access to information is vital (Durkin et al., 2021).
- **Public Health Risks:** The withholding of critical information due to trade secrecy can pose significant risks to public health. For instance, the lack of transparency about the safety and efficacy of new chemicals and drugs can lead to public exposure to potentially harmful substances (Zink, 2018).
- **Legal and Ethical Challenges:** The implementation of trade secret protections can lead to legal challenges, particularly when they conflict with public health interests. There is a need for legal frameworks that balance the protection of trade secrets with the necessity of public access to health information (Fitzpatrick & DiLullo, 2017).

Balancing Trade Secrets and Public Health

- **Incorporating the Precautionary Principle:** Some scholars advocate for the integration of the precautionary principle into trade secret laws to ensure that public health is prioritized over corporate profits. This approach would limit trade secret protection for information that could endanger public health (Zink, 2018).
- **Enhancing Transparency:** There is a call for greater transparency in the use of trade secrets, particularly in the health sector, to ensure that critical information is available for public scrutiny and scientific advancement (Strandburg, n.d.).
- **Regulatory Compliance:** Ensuring compliance with regulations such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) can help balance the protection of trade secrets with the need for public access to health information (Singhal, 2024).

While trade secrets play a crucial role in protecting innovation and economic interests, their application in the health sector must be carefully managed to avoid compromising public health and safety. The challenge lies in finding a balance that allows for the protection of proprietary information while ensuring that critical health data is accessible for the benefit of society. This balance is essential for fostering trust in the healthcare system and ensuring that the benefits of scientific progress are widely shared.

Protecting Trade Secrets in the Food Industry

In the era of social media and reverse engineering, food companies face significant challenges in protecting their trade secrets. These challenges are compounded by the digitalization of the food industry and the global nature of business operations. Companies must adopt a multifaceted approach to safeguard their proprietary information, which includes legal, strategic, and technological measures. The following sections outline key strategies that food companies employ to protect their trade secrets.

Legal Protections

- **Intellectual Property Laws:** Companies rely on intellectual property laws to protect their trade secrets. For instance, the Indonesian legal system provides a framework for handling trade secret disputes, as seen in the case between Indomie and Mie Gaga, where legal protection was sought for exclusive recipes and production techniques (Kusumawati et al., 2024).
- **Trade Secret Regimes:** In countries like the BRIC nations, trade secret protection varies significantly. While some countries offer robust legal frameworks, others, like India, lack statutory protection, making it crucial for companies to understand and navigate these differences when operating internationally (Kinnard, 2014).

Strategic Approaches

- **Dynamic Capabilities and Resource-Based View:** Companies are encouraged to integrate trade secrets into their innovation strategies by leveraging dynamic capabilities and resource-based views. This involves creating a strategic framework that aligns with the company's overall goals and ensures that trade secrets are embedded into the company's innovation processes (Pickernell & Trott, n.d.).
- **Employee Management:** A significant threat to trade secrets comes from within the organization. Companies must implement effective employee management practices, such as comprehensive new-employee orientations, regular communication, and clear policies on the ownership of ideas, to prevent leaks (Hannah, 2006).

Technological Measures

- **Cybersecurity:** With the increasing reliance on digital processes, cybersecurity has become a critical component of trade secret protection. The food industry, in particular, faces vulnerabilities that can be exploited by cyber adversaries. Implementing a robust cybersecurity framework, including continuous employee education and training, is essential to mitigate these risks and maintain consumer trust (Alqudhaibi et al., 2024).
- **Reverse Engineering:** While reverse engineering is a legitimate means to discover information, companies can restrict it through contractual agreements. This approach is part of the broader strategy to protect trade secrets while navigating the legal landscape of reverse engineering (Surblyte, 2016).

Challenges and Considerations

Despite these protective measures, companies must also consider the broader implications of trade secret protection. The lack of clear limiting doctrines in trade secret law can lead to the overprotection of information, potentially stifling innovation and public interest. For example, trade secret law does not account for the social benefits of unauthorized use, such as when a departing employee uses proprietary information to create improved products (Varadarajan & Varadarajan, 2014). This highlights the need for a balanced approach that considers both the protection of trade secrets and the potential benefits of information sharing.

Conclusions

The disclosure of trade secrets by whistleblowers is a complex issue involving legal, ethical, and cultural factors. While the European Union and United States offer protections through the Whistleblowing Directive and Defend Trade Secrets Act, gaps persist in regions like Ukraine and Nigeria, requiring legislative reforms. Ethical considerations involve balancing protecting proprietary information with promoting transparency, especially in high-stakes industries like technology, extractive, and health sectors. Ancient Indian texts, such as the Arthashastra and Manusmriti, reveal sophisticated systems for managing trade secrets, emphasizing their role in economic stability, social hierarchies, and cultural norms. Landmark cases like *DuPont v. Christopher* and *Pepsico v. Redmond* highlight the evolving legal landscape, while emerging challenges in the digital era demand adaptive strategies like robust cybersecurity and balanced legal frameworks. Global harmonization of trade secret and whistleblower protections is essential to support innovation, accountability, and public welfare. Future reforms should integrate ethical principles, enhance transparency in critical sectors, and draw on historical insights to create resilient frameworks that adapt to technological advancements and global commerce.

References

- Lenho, Y. (2024). Trade secret and protection of whistleblowers under the legislation of the EU and Ukraine. *Teoriâ i Praktika Ìntelektual'noi Vlasnosti*. <https://doi.org/10.33731/42024.317234>
- Abazi, V. (2016). *Trade Secrets and Whistleblower Protection in the European Union*. <https://doi.org/10.15166/2499-8249/75>
- Menell, P. S. (2017a). *Misconstruing Whistleblower Immunity under the Defend Trade Secrets Act*.
- Lee, C.-H. (2024). The Public-interest whistleblower Protection Act and Protecting Public-interest Whistleblowers. *The Korean Society of Private Security*. <https://doi.org/10.56603/jksps.2024.23.4.1>
- O'Sullivan, P., O'Sullivan, P., & Ngau, O. (2014). Whistleblowing: a critical philosophical analysis of the component moral decisions of the act and some new perspectives on its moral significance. *Business Ethics: A European Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/BEER.12058>
- Conin, M. (2023). Whistleblowing Measures and Its Implications in the Nigerian Extractive Industry. *CSR, Sustainability, Ethics & Governance*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27512-8_11
- Menell, P. S. (2017b). Tailoring a Public Policy Exception to Trade Secret Protection. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2686565>
- Teichmann, F. M. J., & Wittmann, C. (2022). Cultural aspects of the EU-Whistleblowing Directive. *Journal of Financial Crime*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jfc-04-2022-0091>
- Ding, Y. (2023). *Umfang und Grenzen des strafrechtlichen Geschäftsgeheimnisschutzes*. <https://doi.org/10.3790/978-3-428-58862-6>
- Rowe, E. A., & Mahfood, D. M. (2014). Trade Secrets, Trade, and Extraterritoriality. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2418407>
- Dreyfuss, R. C., & Silberman, L. (2017). *Misappropriation on a Global Scale: Extraterritoriality and Applicable Law in Transborder Trade Secrecy Cases*.
- Djurdjevic, G. (2022). *Secrecy in South Asian Hindu Traditions: "The Gods Love What is Occult"*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003014751-15>

- McClish, M. (2019). *The History of the Arthaśāstra: Sovereignty and Sacred Law in Ancient India*.
- Patil, S. (2024). Review of kautilya's arthashastra. *ShodhKosh Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*. <https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i6.2024.2057>
- Mukhopadhyay, B. A. (2023). Semantic scope of Indus inscriptions comprising taxation, trade and craft licensing, commodity control and access control: archaeological and script-internal evidence. *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02320-7>
- Bhat, R. M. (2023). Economic governance and public finance in kautilya's arthashastra. *International Journal of Social Science Educational Economics Agriculture Research and Technology (IJSET)*. <https://doi.org/10.54443/ijset.v2i7.175>
- Lysenko, O. (n.d.). *The Concept of a "fair" Contract in the Law of the Ancient World*. <https://doi.org/10.18254/s207987840030902-1>
- Bhagat, P., & Kantekure, R. G. (2023). An investigation into the Dharmasutras' Manusmriti Varna system. *Research Review International Journal of Multidisciplinary*. <https://doi.org/10.31305/rrijm.2023.v08.n11.018>
- Olivelle, P. (2004). *Manu's Code Of Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195171464.001.0001>
- Leonidovna, S. A. (2014). *Правосубъектность общины Древнего Востока: некоторые историко-правовые аспекты*. *The legal personality of the community in Ancient East: some historical-law aspects*.
- Malov, A. N., & Popov, D. N. (2024). Economic Philosophy of an Ancient India. *Гуманитарные Науки*. <https://doi.org/10.26794/2226-7867-2024-14-4-65-73>
- Humfress, C., Ibbetson, D., Gagarin, M., Mantovani, D., Vandorpe, K., McClish, M., Wells, B., Olivelle, P., Lubin, T., Bryen, A. Z., Manning, J. G., Ibbetson, D., & Humfress, C. (2024). *The Cambridge Comparative History of Ancient Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009452243>
- Manrai, R., & Goel, U. (2017). Sustainable economic governance: learning from Kautilya's Arthashastra. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJICBM.2017.10007234>
- Fisk, C. (2001). Working Knowledge: Trade Secrets, Restrictive Covenants in Employment, and the Rise of Corporate Intellectual Property, 1800-1920. *Hastings Law Journal*.
- Dreyfuss, R. C. (1999). Trade Secrets: How Well Should We Be Allowed To Hide Them? The Economic Espionage Act of 1996. *Social Science Research Network*.
- Dreyfuss, R. C. (1998). Trade Secrets: How Well Should We Be Allowed to Hide Them? The Economic Espionage Act of 1996. *Fordham Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law Journal*.
- Saunders, K. M. (2006). The Law and Ethics of Trade Secrets: A Case Study. *California Western Law Review*.
- Rowe, E. A., & Sandeen, S. K. (2012). *Cases and materials on trade secret law*.
- Sprankling, J. G. (2024). *Trade secrets in the artificial intelligence era*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4847813>
- Chung, Y. (2023). Criminal law measures to protect trade secrets: focusing on the Unfair Competition Prevention and Trade Secret Protection Act. *Beobhag Nonchong (Jeonnam Daehag'gyo Beoblyul Haengjeong Yeon'guso)*. <https://doi.org/10.38133/cnulawreview.2023.43.2.119>
- Gutfleisch, G. (n.d.). *Employment Issues under the European Trade Secrets Directive: Promising Opportunity or Burden for European Companies?* <https://doi.org/10.54648/eucl2018026>
- Quinto, D. W., & Singer, S. H. (2009). *Trade Secrets: Law and Practice*.
- Halt, G. B., Fesnak, R., Donch, J. C., & Stiles, A. R. (2014). *Trade Secret Protection*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7912-3_2
- Johnson, E. E. (2010). Trade Secret Subject Matter. *Social Science Research Network*.
- Takizawa, K. (2015). *Confidentiality Requirements for a Trade Secret and Its Management*.
- Sosnova, N. (2016). EU Directive Proposal: Trade Secret. *Marquette Intellectual Property Law Review*.
- Pila, J., & Torremans, P. L. C. (n.d.). 23. *Trade Secrets*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198831280.003.0023>
- Franzoni, L. A. (2020). *Trade secrets law*. <https://doi.org/10.6092/UNIBO/AMSACTA/6408>
- Fuentes, J. M. (2019). *De nuevo sobre la protección jurídica de los secretos empresariales: a propósito de la Ley 1/2019, de 20 de febrero, de Secretos Empresariales*.
- Neelam, N. (2009). Trade Secret: Protection & Remedies. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.1614222>

- Elliott, S. M. (2007). The threat from within: trade secret theft by employees. *Nature Biotechnology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/NBT0307-293>
- Fitzpatrick, W. M., & DiLullo, S. A. (2017). *Protecting Trade Secrets: Legal Challenges and Liabilities for Organizations*.
- Kinnard, B. (2014). *Keep It Secret; Keep It Safe: A Practitioner's Guide to the "Bric" Trade Secret Regimes*.
- Durkin, A., Maria, A. Sta., Willmore, B., & Kapczynski, A. (2021). Addressing the Risks That Trade Secret Protections Pose for Health and Rights. *Health and Human Rights*.
- Zink, J. E. (2018). *When Trade Secrecy Goes Too Far: Public Health and Safety Should Trump Corporate Profits*.
- Strandburg, K. J. (n.d.). *Trade Secrecy and Innovation in Forensic Technology Trade Secrecy and Innovation in Forensic Technology*.
- Singhal, S. (2024). *Data Privacy, Compliance, and Security Including AI ML*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2909-2.ch009>
- Kusumawati, N. A., Athira, Y. M., & Mustaqim, M. (2024). Perspektif Hukum Mengenai Kasus Rahasia Dagang Antara Indomie Dan Mie Gaga Dilihat Dari Hukum Kekayaan Intelektual. *Perkara*. <https://doi.org/10.51903/perkara.v2i1.1676>
- Pickernell, D., & Trott, P. (n.d.). A Trade Secrets Framework and Strategic Approaches. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tem.2023.3285292>
- Hannah, D. R. (2006). Keeping trade secrets secret. *MIT Sloan Management Review*.
- Alqudhaibi, A., Krishna, A., Jagtap, S., Williams, N., Afy-Shararah, M., & Salonitis, K. (2024). Cybersecurity 4.0: safeguarding trust and production in the digital food industry era. *Discover Food*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s44187-023-00071-7>
- Surblyte, G. (2016). *Enhancing TRIPS: Trade Secrets and Reverse Engineering*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48107-3_24
- Varadarajan, D., & Varadarajan, D. (2014). Trade Secret Fair Use. *Social Science Research Network*.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.