

Private Chelsea Manning published evidence of a US Army helicopter attack in Baghdad in 2007 that took the lives of several unarmed civilians, including two Reuters journalists, in the film "Collateral Murder." In 2013, intelligence analyst Chelsea Manning was found guilty of breaking the Espionage Act and given a 35-year prison term. In this Case Analysis, I'll argue that Manning's conduct may be explained in accordance with Vandekerckhove's concept of moral courage and that her choice to blow the whistle was both moral and necessary. In addition, the concepts of organizational loyalty presented forward by Oxley and Wittkower in addition to Vandekerckhove's concept of moral courage are relevant to this case. They both argue that although employees have a duty of loyalty to their employers, this duty is not unconditional and must be balanced alongside other ethical standards, such as preventing harm. In the instance of Manning, her ethical obligation to making public the harm being done to innocent civilians in Iraq surpassed her duty of loyalty to the United States Army. Her actions were therefore moral examples of whistleblowing. In my analysis, I will delve deeper into these concepts, assess Manning's actions, and make the case that she behaved morally given the situation she found herself in.

The concept of moral courage that is proposed by Vandekerckhove is especially relevant to Manning's situation regarding this case. The ability to uphold your moral principles even when doing so involves resisting institutional pressures, personal interests, or social expectations is referred to as "moral bravery". Having moral bravery entails taking chances and accepting the negative consequences of your choices, such as punishment (such as legal action as in Manning's case) or social disapproval. In addition, Vandekerckhove argues that moral courage is crucial for ethical behavior in organizations as it enables people to stand against unethical behavior and further the common good. It was undoubtedly brave of Manning to make available the footage of the Baghdad attack. Despite the potential consequences for her own career and personal life, she took action to expose the harm being done to innocent citizens. Her commitment to the truth, justice, and the well-being of the people motivated her actions. By making the video public, Manning added to the conversation about how the war in Iraq is being fought and the need of keeping people safe.

Using the deontological ethical tool to assess Manning's actions, it is clear that her actions were morally justified. The deontological ethical tool stresses the importance of certain actions, regardless of their consequences. In this case, Manning's action of whistleblowing was intrinsically valuable because it was a form of speaking truth to power and upholding the principle of transparency. Manning had a duty to expose wrongdoing and prevent harm, which she fulfilled by leaking the footage to the public. Deontological ethics explains that there are certain moral duties or obligations that individuals have, and that these duties should be followed regardless of the potential consequences of those actions. In Manning's case, her duty to expose the truth and prevent harm to civilians overrode any potential harm that may have come to her or to the military because of her whistleblowing.

Furthermore, Manning's actions were in line with the principle of transparency, which is an important principle regarding the maintaining of a successful democratic society. Transparency gives the ability for citizens to effectively hold their leaders accountable, as well as to make informed decisions regarding their government and the choices it makes. By leaking the footage, Manning was fulfilling her duty to uphold this principle and to ensure that the public was aware of the realities of the war in Iraq. The principle of transparency holds that institutions, organizations, and individuals should be open and honest about their activities and decisions. Manning carried out this burden successfully and ethically as the footage she leaked exposed the truth about the military's actions in Iraq, which had previously been

kept from the public under a shroud of secrecy and non-transparency. By publicly leaking the information, Manning upheld the principle of transparency and helped to further promote accountability within the military. In addition, her actions also contributed to public awareness and discussion about the ethics of the war in Iraq and the use of military force more broadly.

Oxley and Wittkower's article on whistleblowing discusses the importance of organizational loyalty in determining whether or not whistleblowing is morally justified. According to the authors, organizational loyalty is a two-way street in which employees do have a duty to protect the interests of their employer while also being able to trust that their employer will act ethically and in the public interest. When an organization such as the United States military violates this trust by engaging in unethical or illegal behavior such as the killing of innocent civilians, their employees, or soldiers regarding this case, may have a duty to blow the whistle in order to uphold their loyalty to broader societal values. In Manning's case, her actions can be understood as a fulfillment of her duty to uphold the values of the United States as a democratic society that operates both legally, as well as transparently and ethically. As an intelligence analyst in the US Army, Manning had a duty to serve her country, but that duty was not absolute. Instead, it was contingent upon her employer abiding by all ethical and legal standards. When she did become aware of the military's disregard for civilian life, Manning then had a duty to act in the public interest and was obligated in the protection of the values of transparency and accountability that are fundamental to a functioning democracy.

Furthermore, Oxley and Wittkower argue that the moral responsibility for whistleblowing should not fall solely on the individual whistleblower, but rather on the organization as a whole. This is because organizations have a duty to provide clear channels for reporting unethical behavior, and to ensure that employees who report such behavior are protected from retaliation. In Manning's case, however, it is clear that the military failed to provide such channels and instead sought to silence her by punishing her with a harsh prison sentence. Using a deontological ethical framework, Manning's actions can be justified as she fulfilled her duty to speak truth to power and uphold the principles of transparency and accountability. Deontological ethics emphasizes the inherent value of certain actions, regardless of their consequences. In this case, Manning's action of whistleblowing was intrinsically valuable because it was a form of exposing wrongdoing and preventing harm. Her whistleblowing was imperative to successfully fulfill her duty to protect the public interest as well as her loyalty to the values of a democratic society. Furthermore, her actions were also a good example of moral courage. While Manning faced significant personal consequences for her actions, her whistleblowing ultimately helped to expose the military's disregard for civilian life and helped in sparking a public debate about the war in Iraq and the tactics and conduct used by our military forces. Using the ideas that make up deontological ethics, it is clear that Manning's actions were morally justified. She fulfilled her duty to protect the public interest and uphold ethical and legal standards by blowing the whistle on the military's disregard for civilian life. Her actions were not merely an expression of her own personal values or beliefs, but also an obligation of a universal duty to prevent harm and protect the public interest. Finally, the military's retaliation against Manning further helps to indicate the importance of protecting whistleblowers who expose wrongdoing.

In conclusion, the case analysis argues that Chelsea Manning's decision to blow the whistle on the US Army's attack in Baghdad in 2007 was justified by her moral courage, duty to prevent harm, and obligation to uphold the principles of transparency and accountability. The concept of deontological ethics explains that Manning's duty to prevent harm and expose the truth overrode her duty of loyalty

to the US Army. Additionally, the principles of transparency and accountability are essential to a functioning democracy, and Manning's actions contributed to public awareness and discussion about the ethics of the war in Iraq. The article by Oxley and Wittkower further argues that organizational loyalty is a two-way street, and that organizations have a duty to provide clear channels for reporting unethical behavior, as well as a duty to protect whistleblowers. Overall, Manning's actions were ethical and necessary regarding the harm being done to innocent civilians and the importance of upholding ethical standards in organizations and democratic societies.