

Introduction

A former U.S. Army intelligence analyst, Chelsea Manning, disclosed a plethora of sensitive and confidential documents to WikiLeaks in 2010. The material included diplomatic cables and military records about U.S. activities in Iraq and Afghanistan, which showed the unfortunate deaths of civilians, diplomatic secrets, and possible wrongdoing by the military. The reason Manning said what she did was to make people smarter by revealing what she believes was unacceptable behavior. National security, freedom, and whistleblowing were hot topics after learning about the article. Later Chelsea received a hefty 35-year prison sentence! She served seven years of her sentence before it was adjusted. There is a movie, "We Steal Secrets: The Story of WikiLeaks" that reveals the entire story of her and how the government and public reacted to everything. Some believe Manning acted this way due to genuine concern for freedom and public interest. I can make a point that Kantian deontology would show she was wrong because she did not uphold her duty to protect national security.

Mark Vanderckhove gives a different perspective to look at whistleblowing from corporate ethics, loyalty, voice, and dispute. When someone reports mishaps to someone outside of the company it is called organizational dissent. His main idea is that whistleblowing is a method of expressing discomfort because internal systems aren't working properly as they expected. Vanderkerkhove believes that people who blow the whistle may have trouble balancing their morals with their work duties. Chelsea thought she had a moral obligation to share what she saw as wrongdoing and chose that calling over her pledge to serve the U.S. Army as an intelligence analyst. With the U.S. military actions of civilian deaths, she was led to share the private documents, which resulted in the conflict between her moral duty and her loyalty to the Army.

Vanderckhove also emphasized how significant it is to know the whistleblower's background and their motives. I agree with this point because one's upbringing, family, friends, and interests all play a major role in their actions over the years. She showed signs of mental stress and loneliness while serving in the military. According to Manning, her leaking the documents was not an overnight decision. The further she got into accessing information, the more of a dilemma it caused for her. Growing tension is a common theme with whistleblowers and eventually their bandwidth to withhold everything boils over unfortunately.

Overall, Mark Vanderckhove's point of view on this shares that Manning's actions look to be a significant attempt to blow the whistle. She felt shut down, defeated, and left out in the Army and strongly desired to make others aware. Her intent behind her actions reflected her motive to bring awareness to citizens, which also aligned with the moral goals Vanderkerkhove shared about whistleblowers. However, it can be opinionated if her actions were necessary and if it was a good reason to expose the information.

Vandekerckhove's approach also takes into account the difference in power between the organization and the person. Manning probably understood she was not “bigger than the program, which impacted her feeling useless. With high standards of serving in the military and strict hierarchy, she may have believed there were no good methods to get her fears across. Vandekerckhove shared that people look outside of organizations for platforms when internal methods for blowing the whistle do not work. In this case, WikiLeaks was the outsider.

Oxley and Wittkower, on the other hand, sought to leak from the point of view of care ethics. They discussed the need for understanding, connection, and other people's well-being, as well as the emotional and relational parts of making moral choices. They stated that moral decisions are built on relations and not on general ideas as well as depending on the situation. Manning attempted to provide honesty and accountability and empathized with the innocent people harmed by the army's actions.

According to Oxley and Wittkower, care of ethics does not completely ignore rules when it comes to human interactions and empathy. Care of ethics puts themselves second. Manning valued the lives lost in war and others impacted by the secret operations. This showcased that she acts morally from a place of care. The video “Collateral Murder” showed a U.S. helicopter attack killing people, changed the way she thought about right and wrong, and made her upset. A view of care ethics perspective Chelsea's decision to share information was based on a intent to stop more harm and protect the well-being of marginalized people. When it comes to care ethics, its important to think about how your actions might affect others involved. Manning assisted war victims; she may have overlooked the potential damage to military personnel, intelligence resources, and diplomacy efforts. Additionally, Manning's actions could be seen as morally brave and honest from the point of view of virtue ethics. In virtue ethics, character and the reasons behind the action are more valuable than just the results or broken rules. The fact that she was willing to take severe consequences shows she valued what she believed was justice and freedom more than her safety and the U.S. safety.

Kantian deontology emphasizes following duties, rules, and responsibilities, and it makes it much clearer to see that Chelsea Manning's actions were out of line. Immanuel Kant's theory is a pivotal cornerstone to deontology. Stating that people should respect others and systems as if they were themselves and not just a means to an end. Actions are only moral if they follow a moral rule that applies to everyone! By choosing to leak classified information, she broke her professional oath, duty, and calling to protect the U.S. and national security secrets. Her responsibilities that she was fully aware of are much greater than her reasons. Considering that her actions could have hurt intelligence work, ruined relationships with other countries, and put soldiers and missions in danger. If every intelligence officer shared secret information based on their personal conscience, the U.S. would crumble in less than 24 hours and become weak. My family has served in the military and I cannot imagine if they crossed the line that they signed up

for to help the U.S. Her choice shows that her sense of justice outweighed her responsibility to her role in the Army in her perspective. According to Kantian deontology, she was morally wrong since it hurt the trust of the army, soldiers, citizens, and the duties she accepted.

Chelsea's job clearly had her responsibilities listed, like chain of command and ensuring the confidentiality of information viewed. Based on Kantian deontology she should have stayed in line with her duty she agreed to fulfill instead of exposing the information regardless of how she felt. Kantian stresses the significance of good goals. Chelsea's goals and intentions may be questioned by others. According to Manning she probably believed she could save lives but it still did not align well with being morally correct. Her actions unfortunately put many lives at risk such as citizens and military personnel.

With deontology applied to this situation Chelsea is seen in the wrong. Deontology states that you should do what you're supposed to do no matter what. Which reminds me of my upbringing as my parents ingrained that perspective to me throughout the years. Caring ethics may view it differently, which could help her reach her goals and provide awareness to moral traits and empathy. Honestly there are other effective ways Manning could have voiced her opinion, brought awareness, and showed empathy.

Overall, Chelsea Manning shows a major moral conflict: compassion over laws and personal belief over duty. Vandekerckhove's idea of whistleblowing helps explain the emotional rollercoaster Manny went through and the reasons why she exposed the information. The ethics of care that Oxley and Wittkower shared helps us understand and value moral drives that are based on kindness and fairness. Based on the moral theory of deontology shows her actions are ultimately wrong morally since she broke her duty and put others in danger. The ending result did not play out how she planned and landed her in jail sentenced with decades. Moral methods should align with the greater good and safety of everyone involved. If Manning thought that way I believe she would not have shared the sensitive information. The information she shared reflected moral problems and she broke the rules due to her compassion for others. Understanding the pros and cons of different ethical views, helps us properly assess the situations with clarity.