

Manning's release of classified military footage was an act of whistleblowing that originated from an ethical and rational loyalty to the United States. While it may appear that her release of these classified documents could be seen as betraying her government and country, it is rather a response to her own internal conflict of care where she decided to prioritize the lives and rights of the civilians in Iraq who were harmed in the footage, rather than simply standing by and remaining silent while instances such as these keep occurring. In this case, Manning's actions would be considered as a moral case of whistleblowing rather than an immoral case, as the lives of those affected by these attacks would take precedence in a sense of justice and responsibility over that of an authority viewpoint. For this Case Analysis, I will argue that the ethics of care shows us that Manning did act out of a sense of loyalty to the United States, and that her actions were a moral case of whistleblowing.

In the first article titled "Care and Loyalty in the Workplace" by Oxley and Wittkower, a concept that they utilize is one of loyalty being conceptually grounded in care, and with this in mind, it cannot be obligated to just one specific entity. Yet an employee can still be loyal to an organization, with whistle blowing being an example of an employee's critical loyalty to that organization. Wittkower explains that loyalty is interpreted as a type of partiality to those an individual cares for, and it is justified by the one individual caring for another. In this sense, loyalty is seen as being contextual and thus is shaped by the many different relationships that an individual has, as well as being shaped by the roles and responsibilities in the environment of morality that they may find themselves in. In this case it can be said that an employee's loyalty is considered morally correct when she cares for her employer (in Manning's case, the U.S. Army and Government), and given that she is in an interpersonal relationship with said organizations, she has an obligation to be loyal in a way that contributes to the flourishing of this relationship.

Furthermore, Wittkower states that when these conditions are met, that expressing said concerns through a sense of loyalty is morally praiseworthy and is appropriate given the essence of the relationship. Manning's loyalty is justified in this sense, as she acted out of a concern for the human life lost, and with the moral obligation to those individuals to let the world know about these actions. Not to destroy or discredit her employers, but rather she felt a larger concern of the course of action taken considering the employer caused harm to the public, and her actions were her way to let those concerns be known to rectify the situation and to see that these employers take on responsibility for the deemed "collateral damage" that occurred.

For Manning's case, in her act of whistleblowing she acted out of a sense of moral responsibility to care for others. This action of hers prioritized the safety and well being of civilians in another part of the world over the military and governmental command to stay quiet or keep it a secret. She took a personal risk when she leaked this information and did not care for the repercussions, but her actions called for justice for those affected and were not out of a need or desire to be disloyal, but as an act of care. I believe that Manning's actions were justified, but while she did the right thing there could have been other steps taken to rectify the situation before going to the media itself. It was effective in showing the world the injustices that occurred during this incident, but had she discussed the actions and her concerns with her chain of command beforehand, there could have been an instance where the whistleblowing itself would not have been needed and the government could have taken responsibility without drastic measures being taken, and other classified or sensitive documents being leaked alongside the collateral damage video.

In the second article titled "Whistle Blowing and Rational Loyalty" by Vandekerckhove and Commers, one of the central arguments they make is that rational loyalty is one in which an

employee must discern whether or not their actions are in line with the explicit mission, values, and goals of the organization in which they have a loyalty to. In this, if an employee finds themselves in an instance in which the organization itself is pulling away from these, loyalty would demand that employee to blow the whistle to correct the situation. However, Commers also states that if an organization is demanding this rational loyalty from their employees, that organization should make whistle blowing institutionalized as a reciprocation of that same sense of loyalty. Another term that Commers uses to describe this sense of reciprocating loyalty is bilateral loyalty. In turn, by institutionalizing the idea of whistle blowing the organization is providing an avenue for employees to rectify any concerns of wrongdoing by employees. This aptly applies to Manning's scenario because she did not act out of a sense of disloyalty to the military or to the government, but as rational loyalty would demand of her, she discovered that what was being done in suppressing the actions that are deemed morally incorrect and against what the military stands for, she went out and sought to bring attention to the matter.

As articulated in the previous paragraphs, Manning acted in a way that is in line with the ethics of care. She realized that the U.S. Army had invoked violence against civilians who were mistakenly viewed as enemy combatants, and instead of staying silent and disregarding her morals and the values of what the United States Army should stand for, she acted out of concern and sympathy towards those who were harmed. This is in line with the ethics of care because the reasons behind her actions are out of a sense of responsibility to others, or out of care for the public well being. While she may have shown disobedience to her organization, she practiced both rational loyalty and ethics of care in a way that is morally justifiable despite the objections from those in a seemingly higher authority. My belief in the matter is that although she is morally justified in blowing the whistle in this instance, both parties are at fault for the breakdown in

communication that led to Manning believing that the only way to bring awareness to her concern was through the media rather than through official channels in the Army and government itself. There could have, and according to the rational loyalty idea, should have been an avenue in the organization that provided an internal way for Manning to address her concerns without leaking classified and sensitive information to the public press. However Commers would state that this idea of rational loyalty is in fact a learned attitude, and in turn the organization to which Manning held her loyalty to should devote effort and time to learn this process completely, and on how to reciprocate the loyalty she displayed.

In conclusion, while Manning's decision to blow the whistle and leak classified military footage and documents could be seen as the ultimate form of betrayal to her country and to her obligations to the United States Armed Forces, it is ultimately a decision she made as a result of her moral responsibilities and ethical concerns. Seen through the lenses of both Wittkower and Commerces articles, she displayed a deep understanding and concern for the injustice that was perpetuated against unarmed civilians. As a result of refusing to stay silent to avoid the chastising of the two organizations, she embodied both the concept of ethics of care and the concept of rational loyalty while also maintaining both her own morals and values, but also the same values that are stated by the United States Army. In this sense the actions she took, while there could have been opportunities for internal conversation and communication, are a case in which they are morally justifiable and that she did in fact act out of a sense of loyalty. However, the implications of releasing the classified and sensitive information does have its own implications, especially if the documents did not all have to do with injustice against these civilians, and as a result, the sentencing of Manning in response to the leakage could also be seen as justified.