



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 DARVO concept of “Deny, Attack, and Reverse Victim and Offender” from the fields of trauma psychology and interpersonal violence research to the author’s transdisciplinary concept of *darvomanic misconduct* as a blend of denialism, duplicity, reality inversion, and institutional betrayal, 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 and institutional betrayal 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, darvomanic misconduct with institutional betrayal will be stopped and prevented only when accountability standards are maintained with open, transparent, independent, and public investigations of misconduct, enforcement of the retraction of fraudulent research, and compliance with ethical codes of conduct established by independent organizations free from financial conflicts of interest. Both democracy and science are threatened by unchecked misconduct. Only through collective courage, accountability, and the maintenance of standards can society defend its foundational values of democracy, decency, truth, integrity, fairness, and justice.

Keyphrases

Scientific truth, behavioral integrity, darvomanic misconduct, idea-laundering plagiarism by authors, idea-bleaching censorship by editors, for-profit denialism by publishers, institutional betrayal.

* Report presented 2025-10-09, [Guardians 2025](#), 4th BHAVI Guardians Conference.

† Correspondence to ctaswell@bhavi.us.

Contents

Brain Health Requires Democratic Health	1
Civility, Courtesy, Tolerance, and Respect	2
Leadership Requires Behavioral Integrity	2
Darvomanic Denialism and Duplicity	2
Darvomanic Misconduct in Politics	3
Darvomanic Misconduct in Academics	3
Impossible to Have It Both Ways	3
Morals, Ethics, Integrity, and Character Matter	4
Plague of Plagiarism by Protected Professors	4
Retraction of FAIR Principles for Plagiarism	5
Archaic Laws No Longer Serve the Planet’s People	5
Maintain Standards for Maintaining Standards	5
Citation	6
Acknowledgments	6
Affiliations	6
Disclosures	6
References	6

Brain Health Requires Democratic Health

A healthy cooperative society survives as a social collective on the fundamental 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 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 et al. 2017; Nakao et al. 2020). Consequently, community health acts as a prerequisite for public health and safety (Goodman et al. 2014; Goulka et al. 2021; Gourevitch et al. 2022), which in turn form the foundation of social and societal health.

C. Taswell (2024a) has called “for a new nosology and new metrics to evaluate and measure collective, community, social, and public health.” When observing this hierarchy through a sociological lens across the history of civilization, historians of war and peace conclude that social and societal health cannot flourish in a vacuum of authoritarianism (Abed 2004; Hamber 2009; Tobin 2013). Healthy open societies require robust democratic frameworks rather than autocratic regimes (Chapman 2009; Robertson et al. 2021; Wang 2025). Autocracies inherently suppress the free exchange of information, foster environments of chronic stress and fear, and weaponize community health, public safety, and social support systems for political control of the citizenry.

Therefore, a direct, undeniable corollary exists: *individual brain health ultimately requires democratic health*. The preservation of non-corrupt democratic institutions remains a public health and public safety 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

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, Triggie, 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 reviews (Phelps 2023; Phelps 2024) and ghosting reviews (Craig and C. Taswell 2025a) with false firstness claims involve the willful disregard and intentional erasure of preceding scholars from the historical record. *Authors who fail to study, learn, acknowledge, and correctly attribute credit where credit is due with scholarly research integrity and respect for the historical record of published literature (S. K. Taswell, Triggie, et al. 2020) may be termed authors who publish reports, but they do not deserve to be called scholars or recognized as distinguished professors because they refuse to respect that historical record of published literature.*

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 strategies and 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 Behavioral Integrity

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 (1948) 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.” Behavioral integrity serves as the binding agent of the social contract. This integrity demonstrated by leadership assures followers that their leaders are operating in good faith 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” also “piscis primum a capite foetet” (Wiktionary-FRFH n.d.; Martin 2025). This proverb explains a fundamental sociological truth: Ethical decay of a society is rarely a grassroots phenomenon. Instead, 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.

Employers who pay the salaries of their employees must accept full responsibility, and be held accountable, for the misconduct of their employees when those employees violate the institutions’ own declared codes of conduct. This de facto real-world requirement for behavioral integrity directly supports institutional executives who enforce the prevention of institutional betrayal with actions that violate the organizations’ own public ethical codes designed to protect people from harm (Smith et al. 2014; Smidt et al. 2018; Christl et al. 2024; Kristanto et al. 2025). It likewise empowers leaders of high behavioral integrity who conscientiously and actively strive to practice what they preach (Dineen et al. 2006; Chaman et al. 2022; Yang et al. 2024).

Darvomanic Denialism and Duplicity

Over the past decade, have we observed and experienced the death of dignity and decency, now replaced by deception and duplicity with grift, graft, theft, and corruption? To counteract and stop the decay of institutional integrity, there must be a concerted effort to champion DDD as *Defending Democracy and Decency “of the people, by the people, for the people” (Lincoln 1863)*. Use of the word *decency* became celebrated when US Army lawyer Joseph Welch (Wikipedia-JNW n.d.) asked the question “Have you no sense of decency?” at the US Senate Army-McCarthy hearings on 9 June 1954 (Ritchie et al. 2003). However, this defensive movement for the good of democracy and decency 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 (Mesquita et al. 2011), designed to exploit the populace, consolidate power, and funnel wealth upward from the poor to the rich (Fukuyama 2012; Villegas 2018; Glassman 2021). The resulting socioeconomic polarization systematically destroys the mid-

dle class, a demographic historically vital to the stability and prosperity of nations that are 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 21st century information wars ([Franken 2004](#); [Gore 2007](#)).

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, and Reverse Victim and Offender”, which was originally introduced by Jennifer Freyd to describe the behavior of psychological abusers ([Freyd 1997](#); [Harsey et al. 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

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, demonstrated with a proven history of such public service, and not merely purchased through dark money and corporate lobbying.

Legal precedents that commodify political speech, such as *Citizens United v. FEC* ([Wikipedia-CUF n.d.](#)), as well as rulings that place executives above the law, such as *Trump v. United States* ([Wikipedia-TUS n.d.](#)), 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 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 et al. 2022](#)). By mandating voter participation, the system can eliminate partisan manipulations and voter suppression tactics designed to engineer electoral outcomes.

Darvomanic Misconduct in Academics

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). Since 2007, the foundational research for PDP has been publicly, freely, and openly accessible online ([C. 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 PDP, the collection of core concepts from the published prior art and USPTO patented research work for PDP was substantively misappropriated, paraphrased without citation, 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 intentionally 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 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 \(2024b\)](#) 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 \(2025a\)](#) and [C. Taswell \(2025b\)](#) document 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.

A comprehensive recitation of this case of plagiarism and ghosting over the past decade demonstrates idea-laundering plagiarism by authors and idea-bleaching censorship by editors ([S. K. Taswell, Athreya, et al. 2021](#)), refusal to engage in public open scientific debate by for-profit publishers who have instead spread mis-information, dis-information, anti-information, caco-information, and/or mal-information with willful disregard ([S. K. Taswell, Athreya, et al. 2021](#); [C. Taswell 2023](#)), concurrently with the denialism of fair due process at institutions which have suppressed public debate and instead engaged in either ghosting with the silent treatment or ethics washing and virtue signaling with use of the pass-the-buck treatment, sham investigation, or kangaroo-court investigation ([C. Taswell 2024b](#)).

Impossible to Have It Both Ways

Persons at the organizations and coalitions — including FORCE11, Go-FAIR, BioFAIR, FAIRsharing, RDA, MCBK, AMIA, IEEE, and COS which have continued to promote and propagate the plagiarism found within the Wilkinson et al. co-authors’ 2016 FAIR Principles published by Nature Scientific Data editors — operate with a profound logical self-contradiction and demonstrate self-refutation of their own arguments by refusing to practice what they preach. It is epistemologically and ethically impossible to ‘have it both ways’ simultaneously. One cannot claim to champion the cause of ‘fairness’ and the mission of ‘open science’ 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 \(2007\)](#) and [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, objective, scientific, and public debate regarding the historical

record of the published literature for the past two decades? By what standard of academic rigor, quality, and integrity can individuals promote themselves as 'distinguished professors' while refusing and/or otherwise failing to perform their basic required due diligence? This behavior goes well beyond mere oversight.

It constitutes a willful disregard with refusal to cite despite awareness and knowledge of an extensive, open-access body of scholarly research in violation of publishing ethics. 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 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

The prevailing culture in modern academia frequently overindexes on raw quantitative outputs — measured by citation metrics, grant funding, and publication volume — while severely underindexing 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 upholding ethical research and publishing. For more information and resources on ethical standards in scholarly research communications, refer to the work of the Committee on Publishing Ethics (COPE) and other organizations that promote integrity including Academic Integrity, Coalition for Integrity, Transparency International, and Global Integrity. When these standards are abandoned, academia devolves into a theater of the absurd.

This absurdity has long been recognized by cultural commentators. The satirist and mathematician Tom Lehrer perfectly captured the cynical reality of academic theft in his 1953 song "Lobachevsky", popularly known as "Plagiarize", with a critique that remains tragically relevant in the 2023 collection of his work called "Epic Song Compilation". 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

Cui et al. (2025) argued that search by human authors has already ended, artificial intelligence (AI) search has replaced human search, and "only those chosen by AI agents will survive in the delegate economy." Schroeder et al. (2026) warned that "malicious AI swarms can threaten democracy... in information warfare." Prior to the recent use of AI agents, human authors have engaged in dismissive, plagiarizing, and ghosting reviews (C. Taswell 2024b; C. Taswell 2025a; C. Taswell 2025b) on a topic for which search was not necessary because the plagiarists engaged in direct face-to-face conversations with the original author. These plagiarists cannot feign ignorance or falsely claim lack of awareness of the prior art and previously published works by the original author. Thus, true authentic scholarship in open science has been challenged not only by technology transformation with AI, but also by abandonment of academic standards and rejection of publishing ethics.

The current academic ecosystem remains plagued by prevalent plagiarism perpetrated by protected professors (C. Taswell 2025c; Craig and C. Taswell 2025a; Craig and C. Taswell 2025b). These individuals, shielded by tenure, financial resources, and institutional power, operate with impunity. The problem began at *Nature Scientific Data* with the plagiarism unfairly published by Wilkinson et al. in 2016 and 2018 of their so-called "FAIR Principles" and still persists at *Nature Scientific Data* with continued propagation of that plagiarism by David et al. 2020 on "FAIRness Literacy", Barker et al. 2022 on "FAIR Principles for research software", and Aguilar et al. 2023 on "FAIR EVA [...for...] multidisciplinary repositories" without mention of fairness to the original work and author (C. Taswell 2007; C. Taswell 2010) victimized by the plagiarism. Also, without apparent awareness of the irony, Hellstrand et al. 2025 in *Big Data & Society* asked the question "FAIR for whom?", again without discussion of the unfairness to the original author who was plagiarized and ghosted by the promoters of the FAIR Principles.

Controlling and curing this plague — whether labeled intentional plagiarism and ghosting by some authors, or refusal with failure to search and cite the historical record of published literature by other authors — requires courage from all participants who genuinely wish to promote moral, ethical, responsible research and education with objective scholarship in open science. Unfortunately, many academics excuse their own silence by claiming they do not wish to be the science police even in their own fields, thus abdicating social responsibility in their scientific communities. Does peer review remain viable? To lessen conflicts of interest and concerns about political strife in science, should scholars who defend scientific truth and research integrity be required to serve as science police in cross-disciplinary fields?

When complaints regarding abuses of power and intellectual theft are actually filed, institutions frequently engage in one of four forms of darvomanic discrimination against the complainant with "the silent treatment, the pass-the-buck treatment, the sham investigation, and the kangaroo court investigation" (C. Taswell 2024b), as well as the darvomanic threats against the complainant with intimidating letters intended to silence the complaints. This systemic failure raises critical questions about the presence of ethics washing (van Maanen 2022; Schultz et al. 2024), virtue signaling (Ok et al. 2021; Saint-Croix 2025), epistemic injustice (Fricker 2010), sophistry and the abuse of casuistry (Jonsen et al. 2007) with specious, hypocritical, and self-contradictory argumentation as methods of ethics washing, amidst the absence of a fair, moral, ethical, legal due process conducted publicly with transparency and accountability.

What is the relevance, value, or benefit of any professional code of conduct and ethics if it is never enforced due to willful disregard and an absence of accountability? To restore integrity, investigations into academic misconduct can no longer be handled in private with secrecy behind closed doors obligating the complainant to adhere to confidentiality as precondition for the investigation. Investigations of darvomanic misconduct must be conducted publicly, openly, and transparently by independent organizations devoid of any financial conflict of interest (C. Taswell 2023). This requirement necessarily excludes the universities that employ the accused and the for-profit publishers that benefit financially from the fraudulent work as the sole arbiters of truth and definers of misconduct with fraud, fabrication, plagiarism, and ghosting. 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.

Nevertheless, for those institutional leaders who seek to prevent the

institutional betrayal that countermands the institution's own publicly declared codes of conduct intended to prevent harm to other persons (Smith et al. 2014; Smidt et al. 2018; Christl et al. 2024; Kristanto et al. 2025), and for those leaders with behavioral integrity who strive to practice what they preach (Dineen et al. 2006; Chaman et al. 2022; Yang et al. 2024), the employer who pays the employee's salary should be responsible, and held accountable, for the employee's misconduct.

Retraction of FAIR Principles for Plagiarism

Maintaining standards in science requires the courage to correct the historical record when it has been corrupted. A single organization, such as The Center for Scientific Integrity (dba Retraction Watch) should not be considered the sole arbiter interpreting who commits violations of scientific integrity (C. Taswell 2025c). Organizations that promote open science and scientific integrity, including The Center for Scientific Integrity and The Center for Open Science, should practice what they preach without the use of double standards (i.e., "rules for thee, but not for me"). The hypocrisy of unfairly promoting the Wilkinson et al. FAIR Principles while ghosting the victim of their plagiarism must be stopped. Therefore, the Wilkinson et al. FAIR Principles of 2016 and 2018 must be formally retracted due to their direct plagiarism of C. Taswell (2007) and C. Taswell (2010). The continued existence of these so-called FAIR Principles in the literature without sanction of formal retraction 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 internal members (the insiders), and as a *plagiarism cartel*, systematically ghosting external authors (the outsiders) whose prior work they have misappropriated and plagiarized.

Investigators who wish to cite the relevant concepts, technical architectures, and overarching visions of data fairness with open science must bypass the plagiarized literature and cite the original collection of PDP Principles. This collection should be correctly sourced from C. Taswell (2007) and C. Taswell (2010), and was subsequently restated and renamed as the DREAM collection of principles in Craig, Ambati, et al. (2019) for which the acronym DREAM represents the phrase "Discoverable Data with Reproducible Results for Equivalent Entities with Accessible Attributes and Manageable Metadata". Both (a) retraction of plagiarism and ghosting of previously published literature and patented prior art (defined as caco-information in S. K. Taswell, Athreya, et al. (2021)) for which the authors of the plagiarizing and ghosting publications refuse to correct their mistakes (initial omission of citation, refusal to correct the omission, and persistent refusal to engage in public open scientific debate), and (b) restoration of the requirement to cite, reference and discuss the historical record of published literature with correct attribution to original sources (see Research Scholar's Oath in C. Taswell (2021) and Citational Justice in C. Taswell (2022)), must be required, implemented, and enforced for the scientific community to dismantle the current systemic violations of research publishing ethics by academic cartels engaged in darvomanic misconduct.

Archaic Laws No Longer Serve the Planet's People

The enforcement of scientific, academic, and political integrity has been hindered by a critical mismatch between globalized behavior and localized governance. We live in an era characterized by rapidly spreading global pandemics, both biological infectious diseases and psychological contagions with darvomania fueled by plutocratic wealth and power in both politics and academics. Neither biological pathogens nor international information wars respect geographic legal jurisdictions or sovereign government borders.

Despite this global reality, academic publishers and political bad actors exploit archaic laws based entirely on local geographic jurisdictions. This unethical and manipulative practice allows multinational for-profit publishers to engage in instantaneous, worldwide publishing while legally shielding themselves from responsibility and accountability. Jurisdictional arbitrage in support of universal jurisdiction (Dine 2012) may provide a solution to this problem if enough companies and countries adopt, implement, and enforce a practical solution to these problems caused by technology transformation. When complaints about darvomanic misconduct, including intellectual property theft, trademark and copyright infringement, or plagiarism are raised, these entities hide behind complex international corporate structures and the localized limitations of the law within a small jurisdiction, even though they operate on the big stage of the entire world.

For truth and integrity to fight back against these infowars and lawfare, coalitions of non-profit, non-governmental, and humanitarian organizations must unite and cooperate in common cause. Through global collaboration, they must create binding, borderless incentives for adherence to international codes of conduct. Without such transnational enforcement mechanisms, ethical codes of conduct that should benefit the public good of all peoples will continue to be treated with willful disregard by those who inherently reject both truth in science and integrity in research.

Maintain Standards for Maintaining Standards

The essential question remains: *How do we maintain standards for maintaining standards?* The analysis of both the political and academic landscapes reveals a disturbing symmetry. The malevolent strategies and tactics of darvomanic misconduct — deny, attack, and reverse victim and 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 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 health. How much will the systemic corruption in both politics and academics worsen before a breaking point is reached that triggers enough of a remediating reformation to improve conditions for better social and societal health in both government and academia? Must the political environment be sanitized of darvomania before the academic environment can heal, or does the pursuit of scientific truth serve as the catalyst for broader political reform?

While the timeline for recovery remains uncertain, the immediate required reforms must be adopted now. Darvomanic misconduct, in all its forms, must be strictly prohibited by institutional charters and legal frameworks. When it inevitably does occur, it must be reported fearlessly and investigated independently, free from all conflicts of interest, especially financial. Disclosures must be mandatory so that the public

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 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 Standards for Maintaining Standards".

Authors: Carl Taswell.

Dates: created 2025-10-04, presented 2025-10-09, updated 2026-06-29, published 2026-06-29, revised 2026-07-31

Copyright: © 2025 Brain Health Alliance

Contact: ctaswell@bhavi.us

NPDS: [LINKS/Brainiacs/Taswell2025WDDMSMS](https://links.brainiacs.org/Taswell2025WDDMSMS)

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

Acknowledgments

I dedicate this report to the memory of the seven NASA astronauts who lost their lives on 28 January 1986 in the Space Shuttle Challenger disaster (Vaughan 2015; Wikipedia-SSCD n.d.). We must prevent politics (whether or not labeled 'mistakes in judgment', 'normalization of deviance', or 'abuses of power') from altering or corrupting truth and integrity in science, engineering, and medicine. *Let's maintain standards for maintaining standards.*

Affiliations

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

Disclosures

The author has no financial, employment, relationship or other conflicts 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, ghosting, and/or other forms of scientific misconduct that violate the requirements for research integrity."

References

- [1] R. T. Abed. "Tyranny and mental health." *British Medical Bulletin* 72.1 (Jan. 2004), pp. 1–13. ISSN: 0007-1420. DOI: [10.1093/bmb/1dh037](https://doi.org/10.1093/bmb/1dh037) (cited p. 2).
- [2] A. Athreya, S. K. Taswell, S. Mashkoo, 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).
- [3] 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).
- [4] S. Chaman, S. Shaheen, and A. Hussain. "Linking Leader's Behavioral Integrity With Workplace Ostracism: A Mediated-Moderated Model." *Frontiers in Psychology* 13 (June 2022). ISSN: 1664-1078. DOI: [10.3389/fpsyg.2022.726009](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.726009) (cited pp. 2, 5).
- [5] A. R. Chapman. "Globalization, human rights, and the social determinants of health." *Bioethics* 23.2 (Jan. 2009), pp. 97–111. ISSN: 1467-8519. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-8519.2008.00716.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8519.2008.00716.x) (cited p. 2).
- [6] M.-E. Christl, K.-C. T. Pham, A. Rosenthal, and A. P. DePrince. "When Institutions Harm Those Who Depend on Them: A Scoping Review of Institutional Betrayal." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 25.4 (Jan. 2024), pp. 2797–2813. ISSN: 1552-8324. DOI: [10.1177/15248380241226627](https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380241226627) (cited pp. 2, 5).
- [7] 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/ECAI46879.2019.9042003](https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003). URL: <https://portaldoors.org/pub/docs/ECAI2019DREAMFAIR0612.pdf> (cited pp. 3, 5).
- [8] 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 (Dec. 10, 2025). ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: [10.48085/U90B95F7E](https://doi.org/10.48085/U90B95F7E). URL: <https://guardians.bhavi.us/pub/docs/BHAVI20251009Guardians-ACraig.pdf> (cited pp. 2, 4).
- [9] A. Craig and C. Taswell. "When Other Authors Plagiarize Your Work, Will the Journal Stand with You?" *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 6.2 (Nov. 30, 2025). ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: [10.48085/U5E197453](https://doi.org/10.48085/U5E197453) (cited p. 4).
- [10] Y. (Cui and P. van Esch. "The end of search as we know it: Only those chosen by AI agents will survive in the delegate economy." *Business Horizons* (Nov. 2025). ISSN: 0007-6813. DOI: [10.1016/j.bushor.2025.11.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2025.11.006) (cited p. 4).
- [11] J. Dine. "Jurisdictional arbitrage by multinational companies: a national law solution?" *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment* 3.1 (Mar. 2012), pp. 44–69. ISSN: 1759-7196. DOI: [10.4337/jhre.2012.01.02](https://doi.org/10.4337/jhre.2012.01.02) (cited p. 5).
- [12] B. R. Dineen, R. J. Lewicki, and E. C. Tomlinson. "Supervisory guidance and behavioral integrity: Relationships with employee citizenship and deviant behavior." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 91.3 (2006), pp. 622–635. ISSN: 0021-9010. DOI: [10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.622](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.622) (cited pp. 2, 5).
- [13] 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).
- [14] D. D. Eisenhower. *Crusade in Europe: A personal account of World War II*. Doubleday, Jan. 1, 1948. 559 pp. (cited p. 2).
- [15] 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).
- [16] A. Franken. *Lies. And the lying liars who tell them: a fair and balanced look at the Right*. A Plume book. New York: Penguin Group Inc, 2004. 421 pp. ISBN: 0525947647 (cited p. 3).
- [17] 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).
- [18] M. Fricker. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2010. 188 pp. ISBN: 9780199570522 (cited p. 4).

- [19] F. Fukuyama. "The Future of History: Can Liberal Democracy Survive the Decline of the Middle Class?" *Foreign Affairs* 91.1 (Jan. 2012), pp. 53–61. ISSN: 00157120. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23217147> (cited p. 2).
- [20] R. M. Glassman. *Can Democracy Survive in the 21st Century? Oligarchy, Tyranny, and Ochlocracy in the Age of Global Capitalism*. Springer, July 6, 2021. 289 pp. ISBN: 9783030768218 (cited p. 2).
- [21] R. A. Goodman, R. Bunnell, and S. F. Posner. "What is "community health"? Examining the meaning of an evolving field in public health." *Preventive Medicine* 67 (Oct. 2014), S58–S61. ISSN: 0091-7435. DOI: [10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.07.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.07.028) (cited p. 2).
- [22] A. Gore. *The Assault on Reason*. Penguin Press, May 22, 2007. 320 pp. ISBN: 978-1594201226 (cited p. 3).
- [23] J. Goulka, B. Del Pozo, and L. Beletsky. "From public safety to public health: Re-envisioning the goals and methods of policing." *Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being* 6.1 (Mar. 2021), pp. 22–27. ISSN: 2371-4298. DOI: [10.35502/jcswb.184](https://doi.org/10.35502/jcswb.184) (cited p. 2).
- [24] M. N. Gourevitch, N. Kleiman, and K. B. Falco. "Public Health and Public Safety: Converging Upstream." *American Journal of Public Health* 112.5 (May 2022), pp. 716–718. ISSN: 1541-0048. DOI: [10.2105/ajph.2022.306798](https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2022.306798) (cited p. 2).
- [25] B. Hamber. *Transforming Societies after Political Violence. Truth, Reconciliation, and Mental Health*. SpringerLink. Includes bibliographical references (p. 207–232) and index. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag New York, 2009. ISBN: 9781282287747 (cited p. 2).
- [26] 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).
- [27] A. R. Jonsen and S. E. Toulmin. *The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning*. Univ. of California Press, 2007. 420 pp. ISBN: 9780520069602 (cited p. 4).
- [28] D. Kristanto, A. Craig, and C. Taswell. "Structure–Behavior–Action Framework for Coherent Scientific Enterprise." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 6.3 (Dec. 10, 2025). ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: [10.48085/Q273E0FA6](https://doi.org/10.48085/Q273E0FA6) (cited pp. 2, 5).
- [29] A. Lincoln. *The Gettysburg Address*. Nov. 19, 1863. URL: <https://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/gettysburg.htm> (cited p. 2).
- [30] 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).
- [31] G. Martin. *A fish rots from the head down*. 2025. URL: <https://www.phrases.org.uk/meanings/fish-rot-from-the-head-down.html> (cited p. 2).
- [32] B. B. de Mesquita and A. Smith. *The Dictator's Handbook: Why Bad Behavior is Almost Always Good Politics*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs Books, Sept. 27, 2011. 352 pp. ISBN: 9781541701366 (cited p. 2).
- [33] 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).
- [34] E. Ok, Y. Qian, B. Strejcek, and K. Aquino. "Signaling virtuous victimhood as indicators of Dark Triad personalities." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 120.6 (June 2021), pp. 1634–1661. ISSN: 0022-3514. DOI: [10.1037/pspp0000329](https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000329) (cited p. 4).
- [35] R. P. Phelps. *The Malfunction of US Education Policy. Elite Misinformation, Disinformation, and Selfishness*. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2023. ISBN: 9798881830205 (cited p. 2).
- [36] R. P. Phelps. "Worse than Plagiarism: False Firstness Claims and Dismissive Literature Reviews." *Minding the Campus* (Feb. 9, 2024). URL: <https://www.mindingthecampus.org/2024/02/09/worse-than-plagiarism-false-firstness-claims-and-dismissive-literature-reviews> (cited p. 2).
- [37] D. A. Ritchie and E. Bolling, eds. *McCarthy Hearings 1953–54*. <https://www.senate.gov/about/powers-procedures/investigations/mccarthy-hearings/have-you-no-sense-of-decency.htm>. 2003. URL: <https://www.senate.gov/about/powers-procedures/investigations/mccarthy-and-a-army-mccarthy-hearings.htm> (cited p. 2).
- [38] S. L. Robertson and M. Nestore. "Education cleavages, or market society and the rise of authoritarian populism?" *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 20.2 (July 2021), pp. 110–123. ISSN: 1476-7732. DOI: [10.1080/14767724.2021.1955662](https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1955662) (cited p. 2).
- [39] C. Saint-Croix. "Epistemic Virtue Signaling and the Double Bind of Testimonial Injustice." *Philosophers' Imprint* 25 (Aug. 2025). ISSN: 1533-628X. DOI: [10.3998/phimp.4049](https://doi.org/10.3998/phimp.4049) (cited p. 4).
- [40] D. T. Schroeder, M. Cha, A. Baronchelli, N. Bostrom, et al. "How malicious AI swarms can threaten democracy." *Science* 391.6783 (Jan. 2026), pp. 354–357. ISSN: 1095-9203. DOI: [10.1126/science.adz1697](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adz1697) (cited p. 4).
- [41] M. D. Schultz, L. G. Conti, and P. Seele. "Digital ethicswashing: a systematic review and a process-perception-outcome framework." *AI and Ethics* 5.2 (Mar. 2024), pp. 805–818. ISSN: 2730-5961. DOI: [10.1007/s43681-024-00430-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00430-9) (cited p. 4).
- [42] A. M. Smidt and J. J. Freyd. "Government-mandated institutional betrayal." *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation* 19.5 (July 2018), pp. 491–499. ISSN: 1529-9740. DOI: [10.1080/15299732.2018.1502029](https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2018.1502029) (cited pp. 2, 5).
- [43] C. P. Smith and J. J. Freyd. "Institutional betrayal." *American Psychologist* 69.6 (2014), pp. 575–587. ISSN: 0003-066X. DOI: [10.1037/a0037564](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037564) (cited pp. 2, 5).
- [44] 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. 3–5).
- [45] 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. 3–5).
- [46] C. Taswell. "Research Scholar's Oath." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 2.1 (1 Dec. 31, 2021). ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: [10.48085/P3F95585B](https://doi.org/10.48085/P3F95585B) (cited p. 5).
- [47] 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 pp. 2, 5).
- [48] 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 pp. 3, 4).

- [49] C. Taswell. "Biomedical Informatics Needs New Nosology for Collective, Community, Social and Public Health." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 5.1 (July 10, 2024). Presented 2024-07-09 at AIME 2024 Workshop on **AI and Precision Medicine**. ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: [10.48085/W3A8E3D23](https://doi.org/10.48085/W3A8E3D23). URL: <https://brainiacsjournal.org/links/brainiacs/Taswell12024FAIRNNN> (cited p. 2).
- [50] 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. Hebecci. 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, 4).
- [51] 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, 4).
- [52] 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.portalddoors.org/pub/docs/ICATES2025-049-Taswell1250502.pdf> (cited pp. 3, 4).
- [53] 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 pp. 4–6).
- [54] 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 p. 3).
- [55] 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 pp. 2, 3, 5).
- [56] 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/pa2.223](https://doi.org/10.1002/pa2.223). URL: <https://portalddoors.org/pub/docs/ASIST2020HHGuide0610.pdf> (cited p. 2).
- [57] J. P. Tobin. "Editorial: Political abuse of psychiatry in authoritarian systems." *Irish Journal of Psychological Medicine* 30.2 (May 2013), pp. 97–102. ISSN: 2051-6967. DOI: [10.1017/ipm.2013.23](https://doi.org/10.1017/ipm.2013.23) (cited p. 2).
- [58] G. van Maanen. "AI Ethics, Ethics Washing, and the Need to Politicize Data Ethics." *Digital Society* 1.2 (Aug. 2022). ISSN: 2731-4669. DOI: [10.1007/s44206-022-00013-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s44206-022-00013-3) (cited p. 4).
- [59] D. Vaughan. *The Challenger Launch Decision. Risky Technology, Culture, and Deviance at NASA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015. 620 pp. ISBN: 9780226346823 (cited p. 6).
- [60] C. M. Villegas. "The middle class as a culture structure: Rethinking middle-class formation and democracy through the civil sphere." *American Journal of Cultural Sociology* 7.2 (Sept. 17, 2018), pp. 135–173. ISSN: 2049-7121. DOI: [10.1057/s41290-018-0061-2](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41290-018-0061-2) (cited p. 2).
- [61] 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).
- [62] J. Wang. *Exploring the Influence of Mental Illness on the Rule of Law in Authoritarian and Emerging Democracies: A Psychoanalytic Perspective*. Duke University Libraries. Apr. 1, 2025. URL: <https://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/items/862944bf-3019-4f47-8cdf-b1b948c09711> (cited p. 2).
- [63] Wikipedia-CUF, ed. *Citizens United v. FEC*. SCOTUS decision 2010-01-21, opinion [usrep558310](https://www.uscourts.gov/opinions10/10-0121-cv0001). URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizens_United_v._FEC (cited p. 3).
- [64] Wikipedia-JNW, ed. *Joseph N. Welch*. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_N._Welch (cited p. 2).
- [65] Wikipedia-SSCD, ed. *Space Shuttle Challenger Disaster*. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space_Shuttle_Challenger_disaster (cited p. 6).
- [66] Wikipedia-TUS, ed. *Trump v. United States*. SCOTUS decision 2024-07-01, opinion [603us1r57_6k47](https://www.uscourts.gov/opinions24/24-0701-cv0001). URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trump_v._United_States (cited p. 3).
- [67] Wiktionary-FRFH, ed. *The fish rots from the head*. URL: https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/the_fish_rots_from_the_head (cited p. 2).
- [68] F.-H. Yang, C.-C. Chang, and Z.-C. Pan. "The relationship between the behavioral integrity and organizational commitment the mediating effects of the job satisfaction and psychological safety." *Management Research Review* 47.8 (Apr. 2024), pp. 1253–1267. ISSN: 2040-8269. DOI: [10.1108/mrr-04-2023-0284](https://doi.org/10.1108/mrr-04-2023-0284) (cited pp. 2, 5).