



Who Defends Democracy and Decency? Let's Maintain Standards for Maintaining Standards*

Carl Taswell†

Abstract

The health of societies and individuals remains fundamentally connected to the integrity of democratic and educational institutions responsible for scientific and medical research. Healthy open societies must examine the erosion of democratic and ethical standards that has occurred in politics and academics over the past several decades. This report extends the author's concept of *darvomanic misconduct* as a blend of denialism, duplicity, and reality inversion, which destroys both democratic governance and research integrity. This darvomania manifests as political corruption, academic corruption, and the prevalence of plagiarism, ghosting, and censorship of public open scientific debate in research publishing. As case study, the misappropriation, plagiarism, and ghosting of the foundational research published by the PORTAL-DOORS Project in the historical record of published literature exemplifies this darvomanic misconduct by those who lack a commitment to research integrity. Structural reforms must be enacted to prevent worsening of the corruption. In politics, politicians, leaders, and advocates of political parties must be held to the same ethical standards as community safety officers, judicial independence must be strengthened, and voting should become a mandatory civic duty. In academics, misconduct will be stopped and prevented only when accountability standards are maintained with open, transparent, public, independent investigations of misconduct, enforcement of the retraction of fraudulent research, and compliance with ethical codes of conduct established by organizations free from conflicts of interest. Both democracy and science are threatened by unchecked misconduct, and only through collective courage, accountability, and the maintenance of standards can society defend its foundational values of democracy, decency, truth, integrity, and justice.

Keyphrases

Scientific truth, research integrity, darvomanic misconduct, idea-laundering plagiarism by authors, idea-bleaching censorship by editors, denialism with duplicity by publishers.

Contents

[Brain Health Requires Democratic Health](#) 1

Civility, Courtesy, Tolerance, and Respect	2
Leadership Requires Integrity	2
Darvomanic Denialism and Duplicity	2
Darvomanic Misconduct in Politics	3
Darvomanic Misconduct in Academics	3
Impossible to Have It Both Ways	4
Morals, Ethics, Integrity, and Character Matter	4
Plague of Plagiarism by Protected Professors	5
Retraction of FAIR Principles for Plagiarism	5
Archaic Laws No Longer Serve the Planet's People	5
Maintain Standards for Maintaining Standards	6
Citation	6
Affiliations	6
Disclosures	6
References	6

Brain Health Requires Democratic Health

- Brain health requires individual, family, and community health.
- Community health requires public health and safety.
- Public health and safety require social and societal health.
- Social and societal health require healthy open societies.
- Healthy open societies require democracy, not autocracy.
- Brain health requires democratic health.

A functional cooperative society relies on the premise of a cascading hierarchy of health that bridges the micro-level of individual biology to the macro-level of political organization. Individual brain health does

* Report presented 2025-10-09, [Guardians 2025](#), 4th BHAVI Guardians Conference.
† Correspondence to ctaswell@bhavi.us.

not exist merely as a biological phenomenon isolated within the head of a person. A person's brain health remains intrinsically connected to family and community health. The biopsychosocial model of human development demonstrates that both physiological and psychological well-being require a stable, supportive environment (Engel 1977; Wade and Halligan 2017; Nakao et al. 2020). Consequently, community health acts as a prerequisite for public health and safety, which in turn form the foundation of social and societal health. When observing this hierarchy through a sociological lens, it becomes evident that social and societal health cannot flourish in a vacuum of authoritarianism. Healthy open societies require robust democratic frameworks rather than autocratic regimes. Autocracies inherently suppress the free exchange of information, foster environments of chronic stress and fear, and weaponize public health and social support systems for political control. Therefore, a direct, undeniable corollary exists: individual brain health ultimately requires democratic health. The preservation of non-corrupt democratic institutions remains a public health imperative. Without the transparency, accountability, and collective agency afforded by democratic governance, the systemic support structures required for individual physiological and psychological flourishing inevitably collapse.

Civility, Courtesy, Tolerance, and Respect

- People talking to people, scholars listening to scholars, politicians negotiating with politicians.
- People, scholars and politicians should hear each other.
- Scholars should practice citational justice and refrain from ghosting other scholars with willful disregard.
- Politicians should practice representational justice and refrain from ghosting other politicians with willful disregard.
- Ad hominem personal insults, lies, and attacks against others should be prohibited from both academics and politics.
- Academicians and politicians should bear a duty and responsibility to serve as role models and safety officers for their communities if they wish to serve as leaders of those communities.

A thriving democratic and academic ecosystem relies on the continuous respectful exchange of ideas. Civil conversations and dialogue require people talking to people, scholars listening to scholars, and politicians negotiating with politicians. The operationalization of this ideal necessitates strict adherence to civility, courtesy, tolerance, and respect. However, hearing one another goes beyond mere auditory reception. Hearing and listening with understanding require a structural commitment to fairness in representation and attribution. In the sphere of academia and scholarly research, this requirement manifests as a mandate for *citational justice* (S. K. Taswell, Triggler, et al. 2020; S. K. Taswell, Athreya, et al. 2021; C. Taswell 2022). Authors who wish to publish their research in compliance with scholarly publishing ethics must complete their due diligence, correctly attribute ideas and inventions to their original creators, and stringently refrain from ghosting the historical record of published literature. Dismissive and ghosting reviews (Craig and C. Taswell 2025) involve the willful disregard and intentional erasure of preceding scholars from the historical record. *Authors who fail to study, learn, acknowledge, and correctly attribute the history and published literature of their field of inquiry do not deserve to*

be called scholars or recognized as distinguished professors. Analogous to citational justice in academics, the political sphere should demand *representational justice*. Politicians must refrain from willfully ignoring their constituents, opposing factions, or demographic realities they are sworn by oath to represent. Furthermore, the discourse in both domains must be sanitized of malevolent tactics. Ad hominem attacks, fabricated narratives, and personal insults must be strictly prohibited because they degrade the epistemological and social foundations of rational debate. Academicians and politicians do not merely participate in their respective domains. They bear a profound duty to serve as role models and safety officers for their communities. Those who seek the privilege of leadership must accept the accompanying responsibility to foster environments characterized by intellectual and social safety.

Leadership Requires Integrity

- “The supreme quality for leadership is unquestionably integrity. Without it, no real success is possible, no matter whether it is on a section gang, a football field, in an army, or in an office.” — Dwight D. Eisenhower.
- “The fish rots (stinks) first from the head.” also “Piscis primum a capite foetet.” Wiktionary attributes source to Adages of Erasmus. Other sources attribute to diverse origins.
- Leaders who fail to maintain truth and integrity fail as leaders because sooner or later they betray, corrupt, or lose their followers.

The structural integrity of any organization — whether a geopolitical state or an academic institution — depends upon the moral integrity of its leaders. As Dwight D. Eisenhower famously noted, “The supreme quality for leadership is unquestionably integrity. Without it, no real success is possible, no matter whether it is on a section gang, a football field, in an army, or in an office.” Integrity is the binding agent of the social contract; it assures followers that their leaders are operating in good faith and for the collective benefit. Historically, the consequences of institutional decay resulting from corrupt leadership have been summarized by the adage that “the fish rots first from the head” (piscis primum a capite foetet). This proverb underscores a fundamental sociological truth: ethical decay is rarely a grassroots phenomenon; it cascades downward from the echelons of power. When leaders in academia or politics fail to maintain standards of objective truth and ethical conduct, they inherently fail as leaders. Over time, the absence of integrity leads to the betrayal and corruption of their institutions, ultimately resulting in the loss of their followers' trust. Without trust, authority devolves into mere coercion, and the foundational pillars of both scientific inquiry and democratic governance crumble.

Darvomanic Denialism and Duplicity

- DDD as *Defending Democracy and Decency* for the good of the people, by the people, for the people.
- DDD as *Darvomanic Denialism and Duplicity* from the authoritarian's playbook for exploiting the people and grafting from them to enrich further those who already have most of the power and money — the rich get richer and poor get poorer.
- At *Guardians 2022*, Taswell discussed “lying, liars, and lies”, the dangers of the malevolent propaganda and lies in information wars, and the “global pandemic of darvomania” as a public health hazard (C. Taswell et al. 2022).

- Darvomania was defined as a term by “combining the acronym *DARVO* for the phrase *Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender* (from the published work of Dr. Jennifer Freyd) with the word *mania* well-known to lay persons, citizen scientists, and professional clinicians and medical doctors” (C. Taswell et al. 2022).
- The pandemic of darvomania has worsened since 2022, infects many spheres of life, not just politics but also academics, and threatens to destroy decency in both politics and academics.
- Court Justices must be subject to term limits, and earn their positions by impartial judicial service to their communities, without favor or fealty to political partisanship.
- Citizens should be required to vote in elections similar to their duty and responsibility for paying their taxes; elections should NOT be subject to gerrymandering and political partisan manipulations about who can vote.

To counteract and stop the decay of institutional integrity, there must be a concerted effort to champion *DDD as Defending Democracy and Decency for the good of the people, by the people, and for the people*. However, this defensive movement for good has not yet defeated the malevolent forces for evil, also abbreviated as DDD for Darvomanic Denialism and Duplicity. Conduct with DDD for the evil of darvomanic denialism and duplicity has been instructed directly from the authoritarian playbook, designed to exploit the populace, consolidate power, and funnel wealth upward from the poor to the rich. The resulting socioeconomic polarization systematically destroys the middle class, a demographic historically vital to the stability and prosperity of the democracies and democratic republics. The mechanisms of this exploitation were explained at [Guardians 2022](#), which highlighted the existential dangers of “lying, liars, and lies” within modern information wars. A central theme of this discourse has been the “global pandemic of darvomania” framed explicitly as a public health hazard (C. Taswell et al. 2022). The term *darvomania* synthesizes the acronym *DARVO* for the phrase “Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender”, which was originally introduced by Dr. Jennifer Freyd to describe the behavior of psychological abusers (Freyd 1997; Harsey and Freyd 2020), with the suffix *mania* denoting both a widespread contagion of behavior in lay usage as well as its technical meaning in psychology and psychiatry. This darvomanic pandemic has dramatically worsened in recent years, metastasizing beyond politics to infect the academic sphere. The alternative hypothesis posits that it began first in academics and then spread to politics. By promoting and rationalizing reality inversion with chronic repetitive deceit (deception and manipulation), darvomania threatens to obliterate the very concept of decency across all institutional frameworks.

Darvomanic Misconduct in Politics

- American democracy is broken by darvomanic misconduct and must be fixed if the American people want it to survive another 250 years.
- Political leadership should be earned, not purchased; Citizens United and Trump v US must be reversed and rescinded; Presidents are not Kings or Queens, and no person should be exempt from the rule of law.
- Political leaders should be required to adhere to the same standards as required for all safety officers serving our communities in America.
- Department of Justice (DoJ) can no longer be administered by the Executive Branch; DoJ should be administered by consensus coalition of independent Inspectors General and/or the Judicial Branch if and when Justices are held accountable for standards of ethical legal practice.

The infiltration of darvomanic misconduct into the American political apparatus has broken the nation’s democratic infrastructure. If the republic is to survive its next 250 years, structural reforms must be implemented to strip authoritarians and plutocrats of their disproportionate influence and control of our nation. Political leadership must be earned through merit and public service, not purchased through dark money and corporate lobbying. Legal precedents that commodify political speech, such as Citizens United, as well as rulings that place executives above the law, such as Trump v. United States, must be reversed and rescinded. Presidents are not monarchs, and the fundamental democratic principle that no person is exempt from the rule of law must be proactively reaffirmed. Furthermore, political leaders must be held to the same rigorous ethical standards required of community safety officers. To prevent the weaponization of the justice system, the Department of Justice (DoJ) must be decoupled from the Executive Branch. It should instead be administered by a consensus coalition of independent Inspectors General, or transitioned to the Judicial Branch, provided that Justices themselves are held accountable to strict, enforceable codes of ethical legal practice. Supreme Court Justices must be subjected to term limits and must earn their tenure through impartial jurisprudence, wholly divorced from partisan fealty. Finally, to ensure true representational justice, electoral participation must be treated as a mandatory civic duty, akin to the obligation of paying taxes (Malkopoulou 2014; Dionne and Rapoport 2022). By mandating voter participation, the system can eliminate partisan manipulations and voter suppression tactics designed to engineer electoral outcomes.

Darvomanic Misconduct in Academics

- Prototype example of darvomanic misconduct in academics: the largest case of plagiarism and ghosting in modern history of science against published and USPTO patented research work that has been publicly, freely, and openly accessible online since 2007 at the [PORTAL-DOORS Project](#).
- Documented and described in detail in a series of numerous reports and proven with item-by-item mapping analysis in the Craig et al 2019 report “[DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics](#) from the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the Semantic Web” (Craig, Ambati, et al. 2019).
- “Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters” reports: 1) “A Case Study on the [Absence of Accountability for Integrity](#) in Research Publishing”, also [BHA-2019-16](#), presented at ICATES, C. Taswell (2024); 2) “A Case Study on Misconduct by [Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists](#)”, also [BHA-2020-16](#), presented at HICSS, C. Taswell (2025a); 3) “[Falsifying the Historical Record of Scientific Reports](#) in Knowledge Engineering versus Maintaining Standards for Objective Truth in Publicly Funded Research”, also [BHA-2025-17](#), presented at ICATES, C. Taswell (2025b).

The destructive power of darvomania has not been limited to electoral politics. It has profoundly corrupted the academic and scientific communities. The prototype example for this misconduct has now become one of the largest cases of plagiarism and ghosting in the modern history of science, perpetrated against the scholars who contribute to the PORTAL-DOORS Project (PDP). The foundational research for PDP has been publicly, freely, and openly accessible online since 2007 (Taswell, 2007). Despite the availability of this published research, and despite direct communication and interaction at conferences with those authors who both plagiarized and ghosted the publications, the core concepts were misappropriated and rebranded without attribution. This academic misconduct has been meticulously documented and proven through rigorous item-by-item mapping analysis. Craig Ambati, et al. (2019) provided a definitive comparative analysis in their report “DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics from the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the Semantic Web”, detailing the precise epistemological and methodological similarity with conceptual equivalence between the original PDP work and the later plagiarism with ghosting, aggravated by the purposeful manipulative use by the plagiarists calling something FAIR when it was nothing but the opposite. The systemic failure by complicit for-profit publishers and de facto for-profit universities in to address this darvomanic misconduct has been dissected and analyzed in a series of reports on the “Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters”. C. Taswell (2024) provides a comprehensive case study highlighting the absence of accountability for integrity in research publishing, demonstrating how complaint investigators actively aided and abetted plagiarists. C. Taswell (2025a); C. Taswell (2025b) documents further how the widespread falsification of the historical record of published literature involving this case represents a catastrophic failure to maintain standards for objective truth in publicly funded research.

Impossible to Have It Both Ways

- FORCE11, Go-FAIR, RDA, MCBK, AMIA, IEEE, and other organizations and conferences that promote the propagating plagiarism of the Wilkinson et al 2016 FAIR Principles plagiarism cannot ‘have it both ways’ while claiming ‘fairness’ at same time.
- A logical self-contradiction exists when promoting the FAIR principles while ironically hypocritically and unfairly contradicting those principles by propagating the plagiarism of Wilkinson et al 2016 and simultaneously ghosting the original published work of C. Taswell (2007); C. Taswell (2010).
- Why have the plagiarists refused for two decades to engage in public debate about the historical record of the published literature?
- Why have they failed to cite and discuss this published literature, instead promoting themselves as ‘distinguished professors’ while refusing to do their *due diligence*, instead engaging in *willful disregard* of an extensive body of scholarly research that has been available open access to the public without any paywalls since 2007?

The organizations and coalitions — including FORCE11, Go-FAIR, RDA, MCBK, AMIA, and IEEE — which have continued to promote and propagate the plagiarism found within the Wilkinson et al. (2016) FAIR Principles, are operating under a profound logical self-contradiction. It is epistemologically and ethically impossible to ‘have it both ways’

simultaneously. One cannot claim to champion the cause of ‘fairness’ in scientific data management while simultaneously and hypocritically contradicting those very principles by propagating the plagiarism of Wilkinson et al. (2016) and actively ghosting the original, foundational work of C. Taswell (2007); C. Taswell (2010). This contradiction begs a series of critical questions: Why have the plagiarists and their institutional defenders refused to engage in an open, public, objective, scientific debate regarding the historical record of the published literature for the past 2 decades? By what standard of academic rigor can individuals promote themselves as ‘distinguished professors’ while entirely failing to perform basic standard due diligence? This behavior goes well beyond mere oversight. It constitutes a *willful disregard* of an extensive, open-access body of scholarly research. As Athreya et al. (2020) demonstrated in their ontological analysis of “equal or equivalent entities”, the failure to recognize and properly attribute identical, equivalent, or entirely derivative conceptual frameworks is not a matter of subjective interpretation or opinion, but instead a fundamental breach of scientific methodology and historical truth.

Morals, Ethics, Integrity, and Character Matter

- “Many people say that it is the intellect which makes a great scientist. They are wrong: it is character.” — Albert Einstein.
- Quoted in “Integrity in Scientific Research: Creating an Environment That Promotes Responsible Conduct”, 2002, US National Academies Press, available at www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK208712.
- For more information and resources on ethical standards in scholarly research and publishing, refer to the work of COPE (the Committee on Publishing Ethics) at publicationethics.org and other organizations that promote integrity including Academic Integrity, Coalition for Integrity, Transparency International, Global Integrity.
- For inspiration from the satirist and mathematician Tom Lehrer, watch the videos 1953 Lobachevsky aka Plagiarize (with lyrics) youtu.be/gXlfXirQF3A and 2023 Epic Song Compilation youtu.be/9p5kY4UjGdk.

The prevailing culture in modern academia frequently over-indexes on raw quantitative outputs — measured by citation metrics, grant funding, and publication volume — while severely under-indexing on qualitative aspects of research, especially character. This discrepancy constitutes a dangerous miscalculation. As Albert Einstein astutely observed, “Many people say that it is the intellect which makes a great scientist. They are wrong: it is character.” (CAIRE 2002). The intellect can generate hypotheses and analyze data, but it is character that ensures the data is not fabricated, that prior art is respected, and that the resulting knowledge is used for the betterment of society. To combat the erosion of academic character, researchers and institutions must actively engage with and enforce the frameworks provided by organizations dedicated to ethical standards. The Committee on Publishing Ethics (COPE), the Center for Academic Integrity, the Coalition for Integrity, and Transparency International all provide robust guidelines for maintaining the moral high ground in research. *When these standards are abandoned, academia devolves into a theater of the absurd.* This absurdity has long been recognized by cultural commentators. The mathematician and satirist Tom Lehrer perfectly captured the cynical reality of academic

theft in his 1953 song “Lobachevsky” (popularly known as “Plagiarize”), a critique that remains tragically relevant in the 2023 compilations of his work. Satire, in this context, serves as a poignant reminder of the moral failings that the scientific community must urgently rectify.

Plague of Plagiarism by Protected Professors

- Controlling and curing the plague of prevalent plagiarism by professors with power and money in academia, who are protected as tenured faculty without fair due process for their victims, will require courage on the part of all participants who wish to promote moral ethical teaching, education, and research with true scholarship.
- Some have excused their silence and inaction by pleading that they do not wish to be the ‘science police’. Many have engaged in one or more of the four forms of non-response to complaints about abuses of power: *the silent treatment, the pass-the-buck treatment, the sham investigation, and the kangaroo court investigation* (C. Taswell 2024).
- But what is the meaning, relevance, or value of any professional code of ethics and conduct if it is never enforced due to the presence of willful disregard and the absence of accountability? Investigations should be conducted openly by independent organizations devoid of any financial conflict of interest (C. Taswell 2023) which necessarily excludes the academic universities and for-profit publishers.

The current academic ecosystem is plagued by the prevalent plagiarism perpetrated by protected professors. These individuals, shielded by tenure, immense financial resources, and institutional prestige, operate with impunity. Controlling and curing this plague requires immense courage from all participants who genuinely wish to promote moral, ethical teaching and objective scholarship. Unfortunately, many academics excuse their own silence by claiming they do not wish to be the *science police*, thereby abdicating their responsibility to their respective fields. When complaints regarding abuses of power and intellectual theft are actually filed, institutions frequently engage in one of four forms of darvomanic non-response: “the silent treatment, the pass-the-buck treatment, the sham investigation, and the kangaroo court investigation” (C. Taswell 2024). This systemic failure raises a critical question: What is the relevance or value of any professional code of ethics if it is never enforced due to willful disregard and a total absence of accountability? To restore integrity, investigations into academic misconduct can no longer be handled internally. They must be conducted publicly, openly, and transparently by independent organizations devoid of any financial conflict of interest (C. Taswell 2023). This strict requirement necessarily excludes the universities that employ the accused and the for-profit publishers that benefit financially from the plagiarized work. It also excludes those offices that claim to be independent but in fact remain subject to and controlled by financial or political conflicts of interest.

Retraction of FAIR Principles for Plagiarism

- Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles 2016 and 2018 should be retracted for their plagiarism of C. Taswell (2007); C. Taswell (2010) and their continued ghosting of an entire body of work from the original author easily findable and freely accessible at [PORTALDOORS.org](https://portaldoors.org).

- Musen et al 2020 and 2022 should be retracted for their propagating plagiarism of Taswell 2007 and 2010, and their continued attempts to falsify the historical record of published literature with their collusion ring that has operated as a plagiarism cartel ghosting other authors.
- Investigators who wish to cite the relevant concepts, ideas and vision of fairness should cite the original collection of PDP Principles from C. Taswell (2007) doi: [10.1109/TITB.2007.905861](https://doi.org/10.1109/TITB.2007.905861), C. Taswell (2010) doi: [10.3390/FI2020156](https://doi.org/10.3390/FI2020156), re-named as the DREAM collection of principles in Craig, Ambati, et al. (2019) doi: [10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003](https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003).
- Detailed analysis of this case of plagiarism has been documented in C. Taswell (2024); C. Taswell (2025a); C. Taswell (2025b). This summary adapted from C. Taswell (2025a) HICSS-58-8336, “A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists”, HICSS-58-8336 slides.

Maintaining standards in science requires the courage to correct the historical record when it has been corrupted. Consequently, the Wilkinson et al. FAIR Principles of 2016 and 2018 must be officially retracted due to their direct plagiarism of C. Taswell (2007) and C. Taswell (2010). Their continued existence in the literature represents an ongoing, active ghosting of an entire body of foundational work that has always been freely accessible at [PORTALDOORS.org](https://portaldoors.org). Similarly, subsequent publications that have built upon this stolen foundation, such as Musen et al. (2020) and (2022), must also be retracted. These authors have engaged in *propagating plagiarism*, continually attempting to falsify the historical record through the use of a collusion ring. This ring operates dually as a *citation cartel*, falsely inflating the impact of its own members, and as a *plagiarism cartel*, systematically ghosting external authors whose prior work they have misappropriated and plagiarized. Moving forward, investigators who wish to cite the relevant concepts, technical architectures, and overarching visions of data fairness must bypass the plagiarized literature and cite the original collection of PDP Principles. These are correctly sourced from C. Taswell (2007) and C. Taswell (2010), and were subsequently restated and renamed as the DREAM collection of principles in Craig, Ambati, et al. (2019). Only through timely retraction of plagiarism and proper attribution of original sources can the scientific community dismantle the infrastructure of academic cartels engaged in darvomanic misconduct.

Archaic Laws No Longer Serve the Planet’s People

- We now live in an era of rapidly spreading global pandemics — infectious diseases do not respect geographic jurisdictions or government borders.
- We now live in an era of information wars with darvomania funded and fueled by oligarchs — politicians and election campaigns do not respect geographic jurisdictions or government borders.
- Academic publishers engage in instantaneous worldwide publishing while exploiting archaic laws based on local geographic jurisdictions enabling them to avoid responsibility and accountability for addressing complaints about darvomanic misconduct in scientific research.
- Coalitions of nonprofit and humanitarian organizations must join together in cooperation and collaboration to incentivize better

adherence to codes of conduct — because without enforcement of these codes of conduct they will continue to be rejected with willful disregard by those who reject truth in science and integrity in research.

264 The enforcement of scientific and political integrity is currently ham-
strung by a critical mismatch between globalized behavior and localized
legal frameworks. We live in an era characterized by rapidly spreading
267 global pandemics—whether they are biological infectious diseases or
psychological contagions like darvomania fueled by oligarchic wealth.
Neither biological pathogens nor international information wars re-
270 spect geographic jurisdictions or sovereign government borders. De-
spite this global reality, academic publishers and political bad actors
exploit archaic laws based entirely on local geographic jurisdictions.
273 This practice, known as jurisdictional arbitrage, allows multinational
for-profit publishers to engage in instantaneous, worldwide publishing
while legally shielding themselves from responsibility and account-
276 ability. When complaints about darvomanic misconduct, copyright
infringement, or plagiarism are raised, these entities hide behind com-
plex international corporate structures and the localized limitations of
279 libel or intellectual property laws. To counter this, coalitions of non-
profit, non-governmental, and humanitarian organizations must unite.
Through global cooperation and collaboration, they must create binding,
282 borderless incentives for adherence to international codes of conduct.
Without such transnational enforcement mechanisms, these codes will
continue to be treated with willful disregard by those who inherently
285 reject both truth in science and integrity in research.

Maintain Standards for Maintaining Standards

- Behavior using the malevolent strategy and tactics of darvomanic misconduct is disturbingly similar in both politics and academics.
- Darvomanic misconduct in politics destroys democracy and decency.
- Darvomanic misconduct in academics destroys truth in science and integrity in research.
- How bad will it get before things get better again? Must it improve in politics before it improves in academics? Or vice versa?
- Darvomanic misconduct must be prohibited.
- When it occurs, darvomanic misconduct should be reported.
- Research published by darvomanic misconduct should be retracted.

288 The critical question remains: *How do we maintain standards for main-
taining standards?* The analysis of both the political and academic
landscapes reveals a disturbing symmetry. The malevolent strategies
and tactics of darvomanic misconduct — deny, attack, reverse victim and
291 offender — are deployed with equal efficacy and devastation in both
domains. In the political arena, darvomanic misconduct destroys the
foundations of democracy, decency, and human rights. In the academic
294 arena, the exact same psychological and institutional manipulations
destroy objective truth in science and integrity in research. This parallel
decay prompts difficult questions regarding the trajectory of societal
297 health. How bad will the systemic corruption worsen before a breaking
point is reached that triggers enough of a remediating reformation that

conditions improve? Must the political environment be sanitized of
darvomania before the academic environment can heal, or does the pur-
300 suit of scientific truth serve as the catalyst for broader political reform?
While the timeline for recovery remains uncertain, the immediate re-
303 quired reforms must be adopted now. Darvomanic misconduct, in all
its forms, must be strictly prohibited by institutional charters and legal
306 frameworks. When it inevitably does occur, it must be reported fear-
lessly and investigated independently, free from all conflicts of interest,
especially financial. Disclosures must be mandatory so that the public
309 can *follow the money* to assure that it serves the common good for truth
in science and integrity in research. Any legislative policy implemented
or scientific research published through darvomanic misconduct must
312 be unequivocally rescinded and retracted. Only by demanding absolute
accountability can society defend both its democracy and its decency.

Citation

Brainiacs Journal 2025 Volume 6 Issue 3 Edoc D4MF33921.

Title: “Who Defends Democracy and Decency? Let’s Maintain
315 Standards for Maintaining Standards”.

Authors: Carl Taswell.

Dates: created 2025-10-04, presented 2025-10-09, updated
318 2026-06-29, published 2026-06-29, revised 2026-07-04

Copyright: © 2025 Brain Health Alliance

Contact: ctaswell@bhavi.us

NPDS: [LINKS/Brainiacs/Taswell2025WDDDMSMS](https://links.brainiacs.com/Taswell2025WDDDMSMS)

DOI: [10.48085/D4MF33921](https://doi.org/10.48085/D4MF33921)

Affiliations

Brain Health Alliance Virtual Institute, www.BHAVI.us, Ladera Ranch,
327 California, USA.

Disclosures

The author has no financial, employment, relationship or other con-
330 flicts of interest to declare. As explained in [C. Taswell \(2025c\)](#), we do not
provide active hyperlinks or formal citations to references “for which
we advocate formal retraction regardless of whether for plagiarism,
333 ghosting, and/or other forms of scientific misconduct that violate the
requirements for research integrity.”

References

- [1] A. Athreya, S. K. Taswell, S. Mashkooor, and C. Taswell. “The Essential Enquiry ‘Equal or Equivalent Entities?’ About Two Things as Same, Similar, Related, or Different.” *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 1.1, PEDADC885 (1 Dec. 30, 2020), pp. 1–7. DOI: [10.48085/PEDADC885](https://doi.org/10.48085/PEDADC885) (cited p. 4).
- [2] C. CAIRE. *Integrity in Scientific Research: Creating an Environment That Promotes Responsible Conduct*. Ed. by National Research Council, Institute of Medicine, and National Academy of Sciences. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press, 2002. 216 pp. ISBN: 0309084792. URL: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK208712/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK208712.pdf (cited p. 4).
- [3] A. Craig, A. Ambati, S. Dutta, P. Kowshik, S. Nori, S. K. Taswell, Q. Wu, and C. Taswell. “DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics from the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the Semantic Web.” In: *2019 IEEE 11th International Conference on Electronics, Computers and Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)* (June 28, 2019). Pitesti, Romania: IEEE, June 2019, pp. 1–8. DOI: [10.1109/ECAI4792.2019](https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI4792.2019)

- 109/ECAI46879 . 2019 . 9042003. URL: <https://portaldooors.org/pub/docs/ECAI2019DREAMFAIR0612.pdf> (cited pp. 3–5).
- [4] A. Craig and C. Taswell. “From the ‘Best of Our Knowledge’ to the ‘Best Available Knowledge.’” *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 6.3 (Oct. 9, 2025). <https://guardians.bhavi.us/pub/docs/BHAVI20251009Guardians-ACraig.pdf>. ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: [10.48085/U90B95F7E](https://doi.org/10.48085/U90B95F7E) (cited p. 2).
- [5] E. J. Dionne and M. Rapoport. *100% Democracy: The Case for Universal Voting*. The New Press, Mar. 22, 2022. 208 pp. ISBN: 9781620976777 (cited p. 3).
- [6] G. L. Engel. “The Need for a New Medical Model: A Challenge for Biomedicine.” *Science* 196.4286 (Apr. 1977), pp. 129–136. ISSN: 1095-9203. DOI: [10.1126/science.847460](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.847460) (cited p. 2).
- [7] J. J. Freyd. “Violations of power, adaptive blindness, and betrayal trauma theory.” *Feminism & Psychology* 7.1 (1997), pp. 22–32. URL: <https://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jjf/defineDARVO.html> (cited p. 3).
- [8] S. Harsey and J. J. Freyd. “Deny, Attack, and Reverse Victim and Offender (DARVO): What Is the Influence on Perceived Perpetrator and Victim Credibility?” *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma* 29.8 (June 2020), pp. 897–916. DOI: [10.1080/10926771.2020.1774695](https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2020.1774695) (cited p. 3).
- [9] A. Malkopoulou. *The History of Compulsory Voting in Europe: Democracy's Duty?* Routledge studies in social and political thought 101. Dec. 19, 2014. 184 pp. ISBN: 9781317693338 (cited p. 3).
- [10] M. Nakao, G. Komaki, K. Yoshiuchi, H.-C. Deter, and S. Fukudo. “Biopsychosocial medicine research trends: connecting clinical medicine, psychology, and public health.” *BioPsychoSocial Medicine* 14.1 (Dec. 2020). ISSN: 1751-0759. DOI: [10.1186/s13030-020-00204-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13030-020-00204-9) (cited p. 2).
- [11] C. Taswell. “DOORS to the Semantic Web and Grid with a PORTAL for Biomedical Computing.” *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine* 12.2 (2 Mar. 2007). In the Special Section on Bio-Grid published online 3 Aug. 2007, pp. 191–204. ISSN: 1089-7771. DOI: [10.1109/TITB.2007.905861](https://doi.org/10.1109/TITB.2007.905861) (cited pp. 4, 5).
- [12] C. Taswell. “A Distributed Infrastructure for Metadata about Metadata: The HDMM Architectural Style and PORTAL-DOORS System.” *Future Internet* 2.2 (2010). In Special Issue on Metadata and Markup., pp. 156–189. ISSN: 1999-5903. DOI: [10.3390/FI2020156](https://doi.org/10.3390/FI2020156). URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/2/2/156/> (cited pp. 4, 5).
- [13] C. Taswell. “Epistemic Injustice, Open Access, and Citational Justice.” *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 3.2 (Dec. 30, 2022). ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: [10.48085/X3B678B7A](https://doi.org/10.48085/X3B678B7A) (cited p. 2).
- [14] C. Taswell. “Reproducibility, Validity, and Integrity in Scholarly Research: What Accountability for Willful Disregard?” *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 4.2 (Dec. 31, 2023). DOI: [10.48085/L3570F30F](https://doi.org/10.48085/L3570F30F) (cited p. 5).
- [15] C. Taswell. “Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on the Absence of Accountability for Integrity in Research Publishing.” In: *Current Academic Studies in Technology and Education 2024*. Ed. by T. A. Oliveira and M. T. Hebebc. abstract in Proceedings of the ICATES 2024 Conference. May 3, 2024. Chap. 12, pp. 298–325. ISBN: 978-6256959675. URL: <https://www.isres.org/current-academic-studies-in-technology-and-education-2024-74-b.html> (cited pp. 3–5).
- [16] C. Taswell. “Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists.” In: *Proceedings of the HICSS 58th Conference*. Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS), Jan. 8, 2025. DOI: [10.24251/HICSS.2025.791](https://doi.org/10.24251/HICSS.2025.791). URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/10125/109639> (cited pp. 3–5).
- [17] C. Taswell. “Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: Falsifying the Historical Record of Scientific Reports in Knowledge Engineering versus Maintaining Standards for Objective Truth in Publicly Funded Research.” In: *Proceedings of the ICATES 2025 Conference*. ARSTE, 2025, pp. 90–97. URL: <https://www.portaldooors.org/pub/docs/ICATES2025-049-Taswell1250502.pdf> (cited pp. 3–5).
- [18] C. Taswell. “Who Watches the Watchers?” *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 6.2 (Dec. 24, 2025). ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: [10.48085/TD4A9B756](https://doi.org/10.48085/TD4A9B756). URL: <https://brainiacsjournal.org/links/brainiacs/Taswell12025WWW> (cited p. 6).
- [19] C. Taswell, A. Craig, A. Athreya, and S. K. Taswell. *Citational Justice*. Guardians 2022 Symposium. Oct. 9, 2022. URL: <https://bhavi.us/pub/docs/ASIST2022Guardians1009CTaswell.pdf> (cited pp. 2, 3).
- [20] S. K. Taswell, A. Athreya, M. Akella, and C. Taswell. “Truth in Science.” *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging and Computing Sciences* 2.1 (1 Dec. 31, 2021), pp. 1–9. DOI: [10.48085/M85EC99EE](https://doi.org/10.48085/M85EC99EE). URL: <https://BrainiacsJournal.org/links/brainiacs/Taswell12021Truth> (cited p. 2).
- [21] S. K. Taswell, C. Triggler, J. Vayo, S. Dutta, and C. Taswell. “The Hitchhiker’s Guide to Scholarly Research Integrity.” In: *2020 ASIS&T 83rd Annual Meeting* (Oct. 22, 2020). Vol. 57. Wiley, 2020, e223. DOI: [10.1002/pra2.223](https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.223). URL: <https://portaldooors.org/pub/docs/ASIST2020HHGuide0610.pdf> (cited p. 2).
- [22] D. T. Wade and P. W. Halligan. “The biopsychosocial model of illness: a model whose time has come.” *Clinical Rehabilitation* 31.8 (July 2017), pp. 995–1004. ISSN: 1477-0873. DOI: [10.1177/0269215517709890](https://doi.org/10.1177/0269215517709890) (cited p. 2).