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**Case Analysis - Whistleblowing**

In this paper, we dive into what it means to be loyal and what loyalty looks like specifically in a professional atmosphere. Loyalty can be defined in many ways based on individual experiences, perspectives, and/or ideologies. From the standpoint of Wim Vanderckhove (author of the first article), defines loyalty as the mindset and will of an individual toward an entity in more ways than just one. Jullinna Oxley and D.E. Wittknower (authors of the second article) define loyalty in professional ethics as loyalty not being a requirement, but a course of action appreciated by employers as they generally commit to those they employ. Not to say it is necessary to remain extremely loyal to the people or company that employs you rather than abiding by what you are told to do. Loyalty and what it means to be loyal in any circumstance is subjective and is often interpreted differently. In this Case Analysis, I will argue how Deontology backs Manning’s moral case of whistleblowing is justified and was in fact a showing of loyalty to the United States.

The first piece of writing was an easy read, we examined Wim Vanderckhove’s theory on loyalty and how it tied into the whistleblowing of a former Army soldier Chelsea Manning. In Wim Vanderckhove’s article, *Whistle Blowing and Rational Loyalty* he breaks down how loyalty and whistleblowing do not challenge one another; he views them as being on two playing fields unrelated to the other. Vanderckhove dissects the understanding of loyalty by dividing it into four parts: (1) loyalty is an attitude directed towards an object, (2) loyalty is learning through an attitude, (3) loyalty has an explicit external referent, and (3) loyalty is mutual. Through developing an understanding of how Vanderckhove describes the concept of loyalty it can be argued that Manning’s actions in exposing the corruption going on in Iraq were a show of loyalty to the United States.

 When we look at the four parts of Wim Vanderckhove’s definition of loyalty we can justify the actions of Manning. Manning’s whistleblowing was not done with ill intent or the intent to betray her country. We can relate that to ‘(3) loyalty has an explicit external referent’ as she made zero attempts to hide what was going on in Iraq, and ‘(1) loyalty is an attitude directed towards an object, (2) loyalty is learning through an attitude’ specifically because she felt what was going on was wrong which drove her ‘attitude’ towards keeping the situation confidential. For example, if we look at an individual and their loyalty towards the company that employs them, that loyalty is not driven by the CEO or owners of said company and what *they* stand for. The loyalty comes from what the standards and principles that the company was built on and whether or not that is carried out long after the founders are gone. It is important for companies that preach their principles to the public and employees to stand on them and treat all parties involved according while conducting themselves in that light. This is where loyalty in a professional or business light stems from.

 Sometimes with new management, the principles and practices of previous owners can get engrossed in corruption or greed and spread throughout a company. Through the lens of Deontology, there is a moral calling to always do what is right even if that means whistleblowing in our case. Through the ideology of Deontology, it would be immoral for an employee to not be a whistleblower if they’re aware of the wrongdoings of their company, especially when those wrongdoings are affecting many. Kant's Deontology philosophy urges individuals to do what is right even if what is right produces bad results as the consequences should not play a factor. To the employee(s) that feels they must stay loyal to an employer or company, Kantanism argues that is your moral duty to be a whistleblower in any event where the actions of the company are deemed a threat to the principles originally set by the company.

 Understandably so, this can be seen as an act of betrayal by the company and its higher-ups if they do not consider their actions immoral to start. If Whistleblowers broadcast information that is false or breaches the privacy of others completely unwarranted, then that is an act of betrayal or dishonesty. When comparing Wim Vanderckhove’s definition of loyalty, and Kantanism ideology paired with Manning’s whistleblowing case we can develop a more concise understanding of the events that transpired in Iraq. Manning was not disloyal to the United States and acted under the moral duty that is deontology with the intent to invoke a more professional society in America.

In the article, *Care and Loyalty in the Workplace* by Julinna Oxley and D.E. Wittkower, unlike Wim Vanderckhove’s article they include the point of care to associate in defining loyalty. In this explanation by Oxley and Wittkower care includes loyalty, making it so loyalty cannot exist without the presence of care from an individual. In Vanderckhove’s article although he agreed to this ideology he only agreed to an extent. He compares loyalty in personal relationships and how care plays a factor there is understandable, however, should not factor into workplace relations. Loyalty with care is generally done unconsciously because when you care you act off of willingness which thus insinuates that a person who does not care can not display loyalty in any sense.

Yet there is another form of loyalty mentioned known as a fiduciary duty which is basically contractual loyalty. Simply put is what is referred to as ‘your job’. It seems as if it is assumed individuals will stay loyal to a company and their employers because they ‘wanted’ to work there. Even if an employee were to remain loyal to a company that does not guarantee the security of that job, they can still be let go. Most jobs are not secure in the sense that if they can find someone to carry out the tasks of your job better or is more qualified it will go to them, leaving you unemployed.

 Concerning Kant's philosophy of Deontology, it would seem to be your moral duty to act with care when displaying loyalty. A Kantanist would agree that to be loyal you must care and if you care then you will naturally disregard the consequences since you are acting on something you feel strongly about. When discussing how to or if one should display loyalty within the workplace I would say it is conditional but appropriate. I believe that Manning's accusations of disloyalty are dismissed by the definitions and explanations of Oxley and Wittkower.

 In review, the two articles we discussed covered the meaning of loyalty and loyalty and care in the workplace backed by the Deontologist ideology while comparing it to the whistleblowing case of Chelsea Manning. Both articles in my opinion defend the act of whistleblowing on work-related issues if the act itself is immoral and the whistleblower is whistle-blowing in hopes to provide a better work environment for themselves and/or coworkers. Anyone who strives for the betterment of others and rebels against corruption, lies, and the poor treatment of others is displaying an immense amount of loyalty to *those* people, disregarding the organization. Any individual who goes beyond the fiduciary duties of a company through whistleblowing is a display of immense loyalty. Deontology/Kantanism acknowledges how Manning's act of whistleblowing was an act of morality if you integrate the definition of loyalty as a moral obligation. An obligation that is based on the criteria of Kantianism and goes against anyone who may use deception is acting immorally, and that everyone should be treated with a mutual level of respect, which unfortunately the United States government was not.

In conclusion, I have argued how Kantanism has shown us through the lens of Vanderckhove, Oxley, and Wittkower’s articles that Chelsea Manning demonstrated loyalty toward the United States. She released classified documents on the grounds of discrepancies that needed addressing within the military and it was her loyalty to the principle beliefs our country was built on that led her to blow the whistle on events in Iraq, by way of Wim Vanderckhove’s definition. Manning also exhibits “care and loyalty” described by Julianna Oxley and D.E. Wittkower with her intent to expose documents standing on the beliefs the United States government is supposed to uphold. Many may hold a different belief that Manning was in fact disloyal and a traitor, especially upon going through the extent of our justice system. Others, like myself, see her actions of whistle-blowing through the eyes of a Deontologist philosopher and see it as a morally good decision. In Manning’s defense, the United States Army's actions were interpreted as deceitful therefore making it Manning’s moral duty to expose the wrongdoings underway.