

The video for this case analysis is about when a woman from the US military released a video that showed us troops in Iraq wrongfully killing people that they suspected of having RPGs and other weapons. These troops mistook citizens that were carrying cameras and tripods as hostile and having weapons. Throughout the video, their tone of voice gives the impression that they are not taking the matter seriously and treating the attack like a video game. This action is inexcusable, no matter the situation. In this case analysis, I will argue that deontology shows us that Manning acted out of loyalty to the United States and that her actions were immoral whistle-blowing cases. Even if the action was wrong, it does not give her the right to leak this sensitive information. This information needs to be taken up with the right people before further action can be taken and more assessments are made.

A big topic for this case analysis is whistle-blowing and the moral or immoral implication. This topic is very prominent in Vanderkerckove's article "Whistle-blowing and Loyalty." This article talks about how most business ethics claim that employees have some obligation to the company or employer and whistle-blowing violates this obligation or loyalty. For this reason, I believe that Manning acted out of loyalty to the United States when she released the military video to the public. The information that was leaked was owned by the US government and should not have been shared. She was working at the Pentagon at the time of this leak. This meant that she had an obligation to protect the information that was stored there. If there was an issue with a piece of data, she should have taken it up the chain of command instead of leaking the information.

Next, let's explain how deontology fits into this analysis and why it explains how immoral Mannings actions were. Deontology states that we have to look at a person's reasons for action before concluding it was right or wrong. While she had the right intention when leaking the information, and she may have thought that it was the right thing to do, it was not the moral thing to do. She was responsible for protecting government information, and as part of the government, she could not disclose this kind of information. No matter how bad these soldiers' actions were and her thinking that the information should be out there, it did not give her the right to do so. This information is government property, and it cannot be released without the right authority.

When it comes to how Manning acted out of loyalty to the United States when she released the footage, I believe that she did act out of loyalty. Her actions constitute an immoral case of whistle-blowing because, as stated above, working for the government comes with many responsibilities. In the case of the Vanderkerckhove article, he talks about how there is a problem with loyalty and whistle-blowing. I believe that there is a problem with loyalty and whistle-blowing because, as stated in the reading, an employee has an obligation to the company.

When you choose to work for a company, there are some things that the employer expects of you. For this reason, you cannot just do what you want. You have to follow the rules set by the company if you want to continue to work there.

Throughout the Vanderkerckhove reading, loyalty plays a big role in the argument. This reading states that loyalty refers to a willingness to sacrifice. This statement could not be more accurate given where Manning was working at the time of this leak. The government is very unforgiving when information such as this video footage is released to the public. The sacrifice, in this case, is making sure that only you and your peers have access to the information and no one else. There is no excuse for what Manning did, and as stated many times, there needs to be more review of the footage before a conclusion could be made.

Lastly, how does the Oxely and Wittkower reading fit into this analysis and topic of loyalty? This reading talks about how some would describe loyalty as a desirable feeling but not obligatory. I find this to be a false statement because an employee has an obligation to the job they choose to work for and the responsibilities that come with it. Loyalty is more than a feeling but an obligation that comes with any job. The reading also states that loyalty involves feeling care or concern for an object of interest and the relationship with that entity and managers. This is the reason why Mannings actions to leak the footage was unloyal to the United States. Her intentions were in the right place, but she did not take care of the footage that she leaked and how her managers, in this case, the government, felt about this leak.

Next, let's talk about how deontology fits with this reading. The reading talks a lot about how we should take care of how we view loyalty and the information that pertains to the work that we do. Deontology looks at the reason for why people do things to determine if it is right or wrong. Even though the case analysis is about Manning and her unloyalty to the United States, let's not forget what the soldiers did in Iraq. The actions that they took against these Iraq citizens were also immoral. They should have done more investigation and made sure that they are attacking are terrorists before engaging. These actions are immoral because they are unloyal to the United States and what they stand for.

I believe that Manning should have done, as stated above, to bring this video to the right people for review. This action would ensure that sensitive information does not get leaked to the public. I also believe that this immoral whistle-blowing needs more review and more training so that these actions do not happen again. The reading also puts care with loyalty, and I believe that these are a great fit. I believe these are a good fit because, in Manning, there needs to be careful in the things that we do in whatever job we are doing and make sure that we stay loyal to the employer that we interact with day-to-day.

When we dissect the action of whistle-blowing, we can get a better look at just how immoral this action is and what it can do for a company or organization. The definition of a whistle-blower is someone that leaks information from a private, public, or government organization that is deemed illegal, illicit, unsafe, or waste, fraud, or abuse of taxpayer funds. The definition alone shows how immoral the action is because it is going against the government by leaking information from the government. In this circumstance, it was worse because the information that Manning released was of military operations. As stated above, it could be seen that she was doing a good thing and exposing these soldiers for the wrong that they have done. But that was not for her to decide, and she should have taken it up with the right people.

To conclude, The actions that Manning took to leak the footage to the public were unloyal to the United States, and she should have taken the right steps going through the right people. As the readings from Vanderkerckhove and the Oxley and Wittkower reading, they talk a lot about staying loyal to the company and what that means for the employee. It should not be understated that whistle-blowing is something that anyone should do when in this position, no matter how wrong others' actions are. Again my stand on this topic is that Manning should have stayed loyal to the United States and not have leaked the footage. If she thought that the information was morally wrong, she should have taken it up the command chain. What these soldiers did with killing these innocent Iraq citizens is inexcusable. Still, it should be dealt with within the job or organization instead of just showing it to the world. Some people might believe that she did the right thing and exposed these soldiers for what they have done. This was government property, and she had no right to share the information in the way that she did.