

Liam Clement

3/24/2024

Prof. Dr. Shamim Hunt

PHIL355E, Old Dominion University

On July 12th of 2007, an American Apache attack helicopter squadron engaged with multiple individuals in Baghdad, causing numerous casualties and significant damage. This airstrike was recorded by one of the Apaches' guncams, along with audio recording of American radio communications, showing the incident as it occurred. Later, the video was leaked by Specialist Bradley Edward Manning of the 2nd Brigade Combat Brigade, 10th Mountain Division to Wikileaks. Manning's actions resulted in Wikileaks uploading an edited version of the footage, with added commentary and some cut footage, under the title *Collateral Murder*. Manning was arrested after this, and was tried on 22 various charges, sentenced to 35 years in prison, a reduction in rank to private, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and a dishonorable discharge. Manning was later released from prison due to President Barack Obama commuting their sentence, and later underwent a gender transition. In this Case Analysis I will argue that Deontology shows us that Manning did not act out of loyalty to the United States, and that her actions were an immoral case of whistleblowing.

In Wim Vandekerckhove and M.S. Ronald Commers's article, "Whistle Blowing and Rational Loyalty," Vandekerckhove and Commers argue that whistle blowing is important and imperative to organizations in the same way that loyalty is an organizational need. Vandekerckhove and Commers take note of several arguments that premise this concept. They

offer the arguments of Corvino and Duska as a conflict that applies within this scope, specifically the resolution of this conflict offered by Vandekerckhove and Commers being that loyalty to an organization is only compatible with whistle blowing if the object of loyalty is compatible or coinciding with the object of whistle blowing. This means that whistle blowing is only an act of loyalty if the act of whistle blowing is for the purpose of benefiting the organization that loyalty is supposedly held with. To this end, Vandekerckhove and Commers propose the concept of “rational loyalty.” This concept of loyalty posits that an object of loyalty must hold values and goals that can be considered legitimate, or otherwise “good” or “just.” The individual offering loyalty, in this case being Chelsea Manning, must deliberate internally if the organization they hold as an object of loyalty is deserving of a “license to operate.” If the individual finds that the organization deviates from the goals or fundamental values of that individual deliberating or holding loyalty towards that organization used to justify the organization as being merited in receiving their loyalty, only then is the individual obligated to blow the whistle.

Deontology, or Kantian ethics, argues that a just or moral act can only be done in pursuit of justice or morality. This means that one cannot commit an action with positive consequences, but having negative or selfish intentions, and be considered moral in their actions. Kantianism goes further by offering the concept that respect towards others must be given at all times. Assumptions of one’s status as an immoral person cannot be made, and immoral actions cannot be done towards an individual to ensure a moral outcome. In the scope of Vandekerckhove and Commers’s own proposition, this becomes significantly compatible with their own ideals. Rational loyalty, as proposed by Vandekerckhove and Commers, requires that loyalty be given only to objects that hold a set of goals and fundamental values that can be considered ethically

and morally correct. The assumption that the object of loyalty is moral, therefore, meets both Deontological assumptions and Vandekerckhove and Commers's assumptions.

In the case of Private Manning's actions, we can assume that the object of loyalty was the United States government. Although Manning's actions were, at surface level, done with the intent of resolving an ethical conflict, Manning's actions would need to be done with the assumption that the United States Government had faltered in their own ethical principles in order to warrant whistleblowing as loyalty. However, in the runtime of the video leaked to Wikileaks that was later edited into *Collateral Murder*, multiple weapons were seen in the possession of the victims of the American airstrike. This means that the assumption that the US had faltered in its values would violate the respect for the assumption of guilt or innocence required of Kantian ethics, as Manning would be not only assuming that the US had, in spite of weapons seen, been immoral by nature, and that the victims of the airstrike were innocent by nature. These assumptions and their incompatibility with Kantian ethics are also fully incompatible with rational loyalty, as the assumption of guilt of the United States and its violation of Deontology would require an assumption that the United States was dubious in its own ethics, an action that Manning's oath of service would prove as unlikely from Manning's own point of view.

In Julinna Oxley and D.E. Wittkower's article, "Care and Loyalty in the Workplace," Oxley and Wittkower argue that, as according to Keller's (2008) own argument, loyalty may be considered to be a form of care, perhaps not in a professionalist and official manner, but at a personal and personable level. Additionally, they argue that loyalty cannot exist within a human

relationship with an organization without a form of positive experience with that relationship moving in the direction of the individual from the object of loyalty. Within this contextual framing, they further offer that loyalty comes with several different forms of obligations within the relationship. Oxley and Wittkower argue that the obligation of loyalty is dependent on the nature of a relationship, with the obligation of loyalty being dependent on the level of care one holds in the other member of the relationship. If applied to the case of Private Manning, Manning would only have an obligation of loyalty if they felt a sense of nationalism or of personal affection or care towards the United States or its government. Oxley and Wittkower offer that the requirements for whistle blowing in the case of “rational loyalty,” as offered by Vandekerckhove and Commers, are in agreement with Oxley and Wittkower’s own views, but only in the case that justice calls for it, and that simultaneously, the act of whistle blowing must take into account the obligations of care and respect for the relationship with the object of loyalty. In the case of large organizations such as National Governments and large corporations, this concept finds a conflict, as most personal care is considered to be given to individual persons, as opposed to “faceless” organizations. However, Oxley and Wittkower posit that loyalty, beyond contractual obligation, may still be given to large organizations. Oxley and Wittkower posit that, since business operations may include facets such as public personae and brand-identity, which may create a sense of personhood. Through this, an employee, if they pursue defense of the organization beyond their contractual obligation, may be acting in a manner that deems the organization as an “object of care,” and therefore, according to Oxley and Wittkower’s own definition of care and its associations to loyalty, an object of loyalty.

This concept ties into the Kantian ideal of requiring that respect be given to all actors, and the ideal that all actions must be aligned to the categorical imperative. Although the actions of Manning may show that Manning saw the United States Government as having disregarded and discarded their stated goals or values, Manning's actions show that their loyalty, as well as their moral framework, is questionable at best. Manning's actions show that they saw no obligation to the United States to retain secret information, an obligation that they would have been required to retain in the event that they held the United States Government as an object of loyalty. Additionally, Manning's failure to hold the United States Government as an object of loyalty shows that Manning did not hold the United States as an object of care, either. Because of this, Manning did not evaluate an ethically sound method of resolving the perceived ethical conflict, such as contacting the Army Criminal Investigations Division. Instead, Manning's actions failed to respect the United States Government's ability to act as a Moral Agent, violating the categorical imperative that would be enforced under Oxley and Wittkower's framework.

Private Manning's actions in 2010 were the result of a complex event being brought to the attention of a complex individual. However, as this author concludes, Manning's actions were not likely to be done out of loyalty to the United States. Manning not only violated United States law in a manner that warranted prosecution, but in a manner that exercised no care for the damage that their actions could contribute to the United States. This lack of care shows a lack of loyalty, and the failure to respect the ability of the United States to act as a moral agent further violates Deontological principles. Finally, Manning failed to properly analyze if the United States had faltered in its own values and moral obligations and stated goals. This combination of issues, although contextually framed in a far more complex system of actors and objectives than

just Wikileaks, Manning, and the United States, still shows that within the incidents of both 2007 and 2010, Manning's act of "blowing the whistle" on the airstrike in Baghdad were not actions done of loyalty, and constitute as an immoral case of whistleblowing.