

Elijah Warren

PHIL 355E

4/5/20

Old Dominion University

## Case Analysis on Whistleblowing

The footage released by Manning was compelling, to say the least. It showed graphic scenes of the U.S. military engaging targets that were thought to be hostiles. After investigations, it was found that among those that were hit were two United States journalists. The weapons that the militia believed to be RPGs were, in fact, the cameras that the two journalists were carrying. The footage also showed how proud the soldiers were of their feat of killing 12 to 15 people. While the first case of shooting could be defended as a self-defense tactic, the second could not. There was a belief that the Iraqi personnel possessed a weapon capable of taking down the helicopter that the soldiers were on, thus provoking the shooting. However, the second attack on the van that came to help the wounded was unacceptable. The videos that were leaked showed the lack of control and remorse the United States military had when dealing with situations in the middle east. In this Case Analysis, I will argue that deontology shows us that Manning did act out of loyalty to the United States and that her actions were a moral case of whistleblowing.

Vanderkerckhove believes that society is taught that when working for a specific organization, one is to have loyalty towards it. Loyalty to ensure that secrets are to be maintained and are not released to the public. This means that releasing this information can be a capital offense that can harbor serious consequences. This is often found to be the case with many governments found across the world. For this reason, whistleblowing is found to be a risky task that people are wary to do. Whistleblowing, however, is needed to ensure the safety of the public in certain situations. When a person believes that their organization is doing something unethical that is hurting the general public, deontology states that it is that person's duty to do what is right no matter the consequences. Under the study of deontology, it is believed to be the duty or obligation of each individual to do the morally correct thing no matter what.

To unlock the deontology tool, we wrote about the story of Superman putting aside personal feelings and the beliefs of others to do what is morally correct. We can relate the task that Superman takes on to the task that Manning did while in the United States military. Manning saw that the acts being taken out on the Iraqi citizens were unjust and cruel. She witnesses the murder of many innocent civilians on the account that they were suspected gunmen. She then took it upon herself to share the videos and documents that she witnessed with the public. After her identification, she was quickly court-martialed and sent to prison for 7 years for releasing the documents. It was because of her heroic acts of selflessness and courage that the military underwent strict regulations that changed the circumstances needed to engage a target. These changes affected the lives of anyone who encountered the U.S military in a multitude of countries. Even if there are still unjust actions taking place, because of Manning, the public has become aware of the outcomes that these actions cause.

Under the teachings of deontology, it is easy to see that what she did was in the best interest of the country. By releasing the information to the public, she enacted change which saved lives in foreign countries. I feel that others in her position would have failed to make the moral decision to release the documents and risk prison for the betterment of their country. As superman did in the story, she ignored those around her that went with the flow no matter if it was the correct thing to do or not. She was able to take the steps needed to show the American public what kind of actions that the U.S. was taking in Iraq and caused new regulations to be formed to rectify the situation. In a time where there is a fine line between leaking sensitive information to the public as a terrorist attack and releasing information as a whistleblower, it is safe to say that the actions that Manning took were a moral case of whistleblowing.

Oxley and Wittkower speak about how loyalty to a business or organization means wanting the best for the company and taking the steps necessary to make it happen. Sometimes falling in line and going with the flow of what others are telling you to do is the worst way to seek the betterment of an organization. In Manning's case, the United States military was taking actions that reflected badly against the goals and beliefs of the U.S. and its people. To stay loyal to the United States while also wanting the best for the military, the best option Manning had was to show the public what acts that were taking place so that a higher-up entity could take control of the situation.

It can be difficult when not in a place of power to make a change that needs to take place. Often it is found that those in charge do not care to listen or are stuck in their old habits. It is times like these where it is often best to seek help elsewhere. While this can be done in multiple ways, sometimes the best form of help can come from a necessity to change. By Manning releasing the secret documents to the public, she created a necessity for change. The decision-making process on what steps were being taken overseas needed to be thoroughly discussed. In a government-controlled entity such as the militia, practices, and procedures are kept from the public to ensure the secrecy of that information. However, when that militia is representing the U.S. people in foreign countries, it should be agreed upon by the nation as to what events are allowed to take place. Without this agreement, there can be discrepancies on whether the right action was taken or not.

Oxley and Wittkower state that loyalty can not be contractually mandated. This means a lot in the business world because it allows employees to be able to freely make decisions based upon what they feel is right and wrong. Deontology plays a huge role in how people can make decisions for the betterment of the company. Even though a business can not mandate loyalty, it can expect that while working at the company, and an individual is accountable for making the decisions that will benefit them. I feel that the actions that Manning took were for the betterment of the military as well as the betterment of the United States as a whole. It took a lot of courage to stand up for what she felt was the right thing to do and, in the end, she was punished for it. By following the teachings of deontology, she was able to help not only the military but also the United States make a change for the better. It is for this reason that I believe that Manning did the correct thing by being a whistleblower when no one else was willing to step up to the challenge. I hope to see a shift towards more people being willing to step up against morally unjust companies so that changes are made.

In conclusion, being a moral person doesn't mean that one needs to be a slave to a single entity. Loyalty in business can mean many things depending on who is asked. Often it is found that staying silent as an organization wants you to is not the morally correct thing to do for the public. If one is to be

loyal to the United States, they must be willing to put their life at risk to share information that could benefit their country. I feel that through deontology, humanity could come together and create a new world that benefits not only the organizations but those that support them as well.