

The act of whistleblowing in corporate settings is one of the main things in society that holds companies and organizations in check, especially when they take part in shady dealings that can have a significant impact on their employees as well as the general public. In 2007, the United States military performed an operation in Bagdad, which resulted in many casualties. During this mission, the pilot and the shooter that was assigned, made very disturbing comments, as they took the lives of many people. They justified their actions by claiming that the people they were targeting had weapons. When in reality, the weapon that they had seen on one of the people turned out to be just a camera. Not only did the United States Apache aircraft kill the people that were supposedly involved in the initial shooting that brought the military to that area, but also the shooting from the gunship killed 2 Reuters News Agency staff members. The video and audio of what happened during this mission were then leaked onto the site WikiLeaks, which prompted many debates as to the actions of the United States military in this event. In this case analysis, I will argue that the ethics of care shows us that Manning did not act out of loyalty to the United States and that her actions were a moral case of whistleblowing.

The ethics of care shows us that we have special obligations to show partiality to those we have a relationship of interdependence with. The ethics of care also explains to us that by simply showing partiality to those we have a relationship, with doesn't automatically make us immoral, because sometimes we must show partiality as a way to hold those closest to us accountable for their actions. In the case of Manning leaking the video and audio about the mission that occurred in Bagdad, it can be seen as her holding the government responsible for its actions. The ethics of care demonstrate that caring relationships are a moral basis for treating the ones closest to us as important, but also holding them accountable and also trying to make them better as a result. In Win Vandekerckhove *Whistle Blowing and Rational Loyalty*, the author makes a statement that "Organizations are complex because they tend to be constituted by different parts that do not share one and the same underpinning logic" (Vandekerckhove 225). This statement made by the author is completely correct and evidence of why many individuals decided to become whistleblowers when they experience or feel that the company has done some wrongdoing. Although people in the company may "not share one and the same underpinning logic" (Vandekerckhove 225), it is clear that they share the same goals. A goal of wanting the organization to be better and act in fairness towards everyone, employees and the general public included. Vandekerckhove's statement absolutely makes sense the ethics of care is brought into place because it shows that although some people in the organization may believe that what they are doing to be correct, there are others with a different logic of the situation that might not believe so. This is especially why I think that Manning did the right thing by leaking the video and audio evidence of what happened in Baghdad, because she truly wanted people to see the wrongdoing of what had happened. Manning wanted to work for and support an organization that had the best interests of everyone at heart, but by calling in missile strikes on people, bombing homes, and even killing children, Manning couldn't in full faith support an organization like that, and like the ethics of care states that we must show partiality to those we care about, Manning did the same thing and called them out on it. It was extremely dangerous for Manning to do so, especially going against an organization as powerful as the United States, but Manning wanted them to be a better organization and be held accountable for their actions, even if it meant that Manning might never truly feel at peace again, due to how

the United States government might do to them. The ethics of care discusses what people are owed in certain circumstances, and Manning fully believed that the public was owed an explanation and evidence of what happened in Baghdad to the people who were killed, and also what happened to the Reuters News Agency Staff members. Manning did her duty of providing the public what they were owed, as well as holding her organization accountable for their actions.

Authors Julinna Oxley and D.E Wittkower approach the idea of loyalty in business as a form of care and concern for others, and thus loyalty cannot be obligated either by the corporation or morally. Their approach to loyalty is one that seeks to show that just because a person works for a company they are not inherently obligated to be loyal to them, but rather it is with the basis of care, that loyalty is developed for both parties. Authors Oxley and Wittkower write in their work, that loyalty is a partiality for those you care about, and it is justified because there is a relationship of care between the parties involved in the relationship. Oxley and Wittkower explain that it is care that sets the basis for relationship, which then basically demands an obligation to look out for one another. Although this view is quite different from that of Kantianism, which basically demands that we care about everyone and not use them as sole means to an end and also that we care about promoting the most good in the world. Oxley and Wittkower's approach does seem a bit more selfish because they only state that there is an obligation of care because there is a relationship between people. In applying this view to that of Manning, leaking the video and audio evidence of what took place in Baghdad, the view would've only obligated Manning to whistleblow on the events only because Manning cared about the company and the company seemingly reciprocated that care.

In their work, authors Oxley and Wittkower also explains loyalty as it meant to Simon Keller. Keller believed that loyalty was merely an emotion, and that this emotion was further emphasized when there was a connection to a particular object, in the case of Manning, this would be their connection to the United States military. Keller sees the emotional attachment to particular objects, somehow strains loyalty. He makes the comment that since people don't have full control over their emotions, thus loyalty can never fully be a duty or obligation. Keller goes on to state that loyalty doesn't only apply in the way that many philosophers believe that it does, which is by placing the particular object a person has a connection with, but also by sticking up for that particular object and by advocating for that particular object. Although Keller makes these claims to show that there are different or more genuine ways of loyalty, it does all come back to the idea that loyalty in itself is a result of concern and care for others. This is especially evident with Manning because it was the concern and care for the United States Military and their actions that they decided to whistleblow. Manning's actions to become a whistleblower in regards to the events in Baghdad completely line up with that of what the ethics of care would want anyone to do, when they see ways that they can help people, or in this case, organizations that they care about to become better.

The ethics of care constitute that as individuals we have a semblance of a responsibility when it comes to the things we care about. This care and concern can manifest in the form of loyalty. Our loyalty can then be used as a tool to help the particular object that we have a connection with. In the case of Manning, that is exactly what they did when they leaked what happened during the United States military mission in Baghdad. Manning leaked the audio and video regarding the events because they truly believed that what they were doing was an act of them showing concern and care for the United States military, and wanting them to be a better organization while holding them accountable for their actions. Some people might argue that the act of whistleblowing shows an innate disregard and honestly an act of not caring because of how it will affect the company or organization, usually in a bad manner, but this is simply not true. Whistle blowing is a clear way of showing concern and care for a particular object and demanding accountability of them, and people in these organizations who have the courage to call out their employers display a huge show of care and concern for their organization.