Luke Albert

Case Analysis 5 Whistleblowing

Chelsea Manning was loyal to the United States public by releasing the footage in the video. The United States military gunned down, bombed, and murdered innocent civilians and children. These acts of the military are not loyal to the people and not loyal to the world. As I watched the video in disgust and fright, I could not believe that our military was truly like that. They were cheering about killing innocent people and children. The footage on the film was murder, and maybe one could excuse the beginning however the relentlessness and ugliness of the united states military continued. They showed their true colors when they would celebrate killing bystanders and children. To them murdering children and bystanders were just numbers to their kill list, however, what they don’t see is a human being born into that god-forsaken country. Those kids and civilians were just born there, is that a reason for them to die? Manning’s actions constitute a moral case of whistleblowing. The military lied about what they were up to and hid their war crime murders. Imagine if it were the other way around and there was a country killing random civilians and children in our streets. I paused the video many times because of how disgusted I was. It was hard to watch and I even shared the video to some of my friends showing the horrors of our military and war. In this Case Analysis, I will argue that consequentialism shows us that Manning did act out of loyalty to the United States and that her actions were a moral case of whistleblowing.

One of Vanderkerckhove’s central concepts about loyalty and whistleblowing is that it is okay to whistle-blow when the organization does not meet the standards of loyalty. The organization must have selected terms and definitions to which they follow and if they do not follow these terms then they are being not loyal making it justified to blow the whistle. If the organizations do follow the terms, then they are being loyal to the people and if a whistle were to blow it would not be justified and be immoral.

In the case of this video of the military gunning down and murdering innocent children and civilians, it is not loyal to the United States Public. The United States was at war with Iraq in 2007. The reason for this war was to remove the development and use of weapons of mass destruction that supported terrorists who abused human rights. Now everything the Iraq government was doing was a direct objection to the United Nations and the world law. Our reason was to go in there and change the way they are doing things and take away these weapons. However, in the video, as we saw, the United States military was murdering civilians and children, bombing buildings, vans, and just killing a lot of innocent people. The military personnel were making jokes while murdering fifteen different people for invalid reasons. These were not the standards the government promised to use. They promised to get rid of the evil Iraq organization, not kill innocent children and pedestrians. Therefore, the United States government is not being loyal to the United States public.

Blowing the whistle on the government in this instance would be a loyal act to the United States and the people who live in the United States. Chelsea Manning was acting in loyalty to the United States and her actions were a moral case of whistleblowing. She couldn’t stand to just watch as the United States military murders children and innocent bystanders and not do anything about it. She took control of the situation and exposed the military and the government of their acts of disloyalty and immoral ways at war. Manning knew the consequences of disclosing the information she was about to release, however, she did not care about the consequences because she knew it was the right thing to do and she needed to do it. Manning was sentenced to thirty-five years in jail for the whistle she blew, but she accepted her fate because she did it for the greater good of our country and the world. President Obama would later commute most of her sentence, however, she still took the consequences for the greater good of the world.

I chose consequentialism for this case analysis because I believe Chelsea Manning’s case fits the role of consequentialism or utilitarianism perfectly. This is mainly because Chelsea’s actions were for the greater good of the world. She exposed the disloyalty of the government and showed the truths of their war which created negative consequences for her and the government but overall created positive consequences for the people of the United States and the children and innocent men of Iraq. Chelsea Manning also opened a new door for whistleblowers like Snowden who learned from her experience and could bring more justice to the world overall created even more happy people. Consequentialism, in this case, creates better than bad and that is why I selected this tool for this case.

One of the central concepts from Oxley and Wittkower is that “Loyalty is a form of care and concern for others.” They further explain how loyalty cannot be obligated. They talked about how parents are loyal to their kids and they care for them. Yes, a mother is obligated to take care of their children or else protected child services will take them away there is a deeper mean of loyalty with mothers and children. If a mother just takes care of a child physically by feeding them and cleaning after them, they are not truly caring for them. My mother feeds me, provides me shelter and love not because she is obligated as a mother, but because she cares for me and I care for her. I take care and look after my mother as she does the same to me therefore, we are loyal to each other. When someone cares for another, they are bound to them and loyal to them. For example, I am loyal to my girlfriend because I care for her. I do not want her to be hurt ever and I would never switch up on her. I am loyal to her in aspects of never cheating on her, hating people who have treated her poorly, and protecting her at all costs. I care for her and she cares for me, I am not obligated to be loyal or to care for her. I care for her because of the feelings we share with each other and the experiences we have lived through together so far. Caring is not a physical trait but a constant mental thought of helping, loving, providing, and protecting someone. This creates loyalty between two people.

This concept of loyalty is a form of care and concern for others fits nicely with the case I am presented with. Chelsea Manning has a form of care and concern for the children and people who are being murdered in Iraq. This means she has loyalty for the innocent people of Iraq. However, she also cares about the public of the United States because of how the government is lying to the people. If the United States continues killing innocent children and people, then a cycle of hatred will begin. That cycle of hatred would begin with the families of the murdered children and bystanders. They would take this hate and allow it to build up over time and they would transform that hate on the United States as a whole. Later in the future, the families will act against the United States and kill our innocent children and bystanders. Therefore, Chelsea Manning is being loyal to the United States people by trying to expose the military and stop this cycle of hatred. She is caring for the people of the United States and wants them to be protected. She has concerns for our country as well as the innocent people of Iraq who are being murdered. Exposing the government like she did protect the children of Iraq and further protected the children and people of the United States.

Consequentialism fits nicely here because Chelsea may have exposed the wrongdoings of the military and government and must deal with the consequences, however many lives were saved by her disclosing these videos and information. The soldiers, military, government, and her must deal with suffering however she saved suffering for millions of people in the united states and saved the suffering of many innocent children and people of Iraq. this proves she did the morally right thing by increasing the total amount of good in the world and decreased the total amount of suffering in the world.

Chelsea Manning did the right thing in disclosing those videos the government put out. She saved many lives and is a hero in my eyes. I am sure many people in the military believe she’s a traitor by exposing their malicious acts, but she decreased the total amount of suffering in the world that people must deal with. People may call her a traitor, but wouldn’t the people in the military murdering children and murdering innocent pedestrians be traitors by not following what they said they were going to do? At what point did they say they were going to kill children and innocent people to up their body counts? War is never pretty but there are ways to make it less cruel and the people in the helicopter were treating war as a video game. They were celebrating killing innocent people. They treated those poor people as a kill tag. They never once thought about how the people and children they were murdering have families and homes they were going to go back to at the end of the day. Those people were just like I and others in the United States. They were just unfortunately born in Iraq and must deal with horrible living situations which I hope to never even dream of. I honor Chelsea Manning for being loyal to the United States and making an act of moral whistleblowing. Manning is courageous for what she did. She sacrificed her life and future for the greater good of humanity. Her utilitarianism saved a lot of suffering in this world and I am thankful for her.
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