Panic in the Boardroom

Mask-Off Moments, Corporate Fear, Retaliation, and the Pattern of Escalatory Delegitimization

Authors: Ashley Gjovik, B.S., J.D. (ashleymgjovik@protonmail.com) | **Date**: May 26 2025

Abstract: This article examines how powerful institutions, when confronted with lawful and credible challenges to their authority, often respond not with measured legal argument, but with disproportionate escalation. Drawing on political theory, labor law, and firsthand litigation experience against Apple Inc., this case study illustrates a phenomenon known as *escalatory delegitimization*. As Apple faced scrutiny over unlawful labor practices and an NLRB settlement, its counsel abandoned lawful engagement in favor of retaliatory tactics — including public threats— in an effort to suppress protected activity. This behavior exemplifies a "mask-off moment," where the performance of legitimacy collapses and desperation becomes visible. Through the lens of historical resistance movements and modern labor disputes, this article argues that such escalation is not evidence of strength, but of institutional fragility. Calm, lawful persistence in the face of overreach not only withstands intimidation but accelerates accountability. Ultimately, this study underscores how exposing panic within power structures transforms fear into an opportunity for reform.

Keywords: corporate authoritarianism; escalatory delegitimization; mask-off moment; labor rights; retaliation; NLRB; Apple Inc.; whistleblower; protected activity; Rule 11 sanctions; chilling effect; procedural intimidation; legitimacy crisis

Citation: Gjovik, Ashley. "Panic in the Boardroom: Mask-Off Moments, Corporate Fear, Retaliation, and the Pattern of Escalatory Delegitimization." *The Journal of Structural Power & Resistance,* Volume 1, Issue 1, Summer 2025, Silentium Fractum. May 26 2025. https://ashleygjovik.com.

Table of Contents

Introduction

For years now, I've been at the center of an intensifying legal and labor rights conflict with one of the most powerful corporations in the world: Apple Inc. What began as an effort to enforce basic employee rights under federal labor law quickly escalated into an aggressive campaign of retaliation and procedural intimidation.

After successfully reaching a settlement with the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) concerning Apple's unlawful workplace policies, I sought to have that settlement recognized in my parallel civil case. What followed was not a reasoned debate over legal merits, but an unmistakable pattern of institutional panic.

Rather than addressing the substance of the settlement or acknowledging its implications for hundreds of thousands of Apple employees, Apple's litigation team attacked my credibility, accused me of fabricating legal authorities, and threatened sanctions simply for raising the settlement in court. (I swiftly followed a new NLRB charge, in addition to my response with in the civil litigation).

These tactics, while seemingly personal, are not unique. They represent a well-documented response by institutions that feel their dominance is slipping: an overcompensation designed to restore the illusion of control.

This is not merely a story of corporate litigation. It is a case study in authoritarian panic — what political theorists describe as the moment when *"soft coercion"* gives way to *"raw overreach."* Behind the glossy façade of legal formality, the cracks of desperation become visible. Threats of sanctions, exaggerated claims of misconduct, and attempts to suppress public scrutiny are not signs of institutional strength; they are signs of fragility.

This article explores that phenomenon through the lens of my ongoing litigation and advocacy. It examines the legal frameworks that govern retaliatory conduct, the psychological dynamics of authoritarian panic, and the tactical choices that can turn such panic into opportunity. Drawing lessons from historical resistance movements and contemporary labor disputes, I argue that moments of escalation — when the mask slips — are precisely when accountability becomes possible.

Escalatory Delegitimization: the "Mask-Off Moment"

Authoritarian power, whether wielded by a state or a powerful private institution, depends less on brute force than on perception. At its core, such power relies on a performance: of inevitability, of legal legitimacy, and of control. Erving Goffman described power as a staged performance, maintained through rituals of authority — formal titles, legal jargon, tightly controlled processes — all designed to project competence and stability, even in the face of internal decay (Goffman, 1959).

But this performance is fragile. When confronted with credible, public, and lawful challenges, authoritarian actors often abandon their polished façade. In an attempt to overwhelm their challengers and reassert control, they escalate disproportionately. This reflexive overreaction — moving from *"soft coercion"* (controlled processes, hidden pressures) to *"hard coercion"* (public retaliation, procedural abuse, and threats) — is what scholars of authoritarian behavior recognize as escalatory delegitimization (Arendt, 1951).

This term describes the process by which an authority, fearing a genuine threat to its dominance, overreaches in ways that expose its underlying weakness. Rather than neutralizing dissent, this escalation often accelerates the erosion of legitimacy. The governing illusion of lawful, procedural authority collapses, and what remains visible to observers is unvarnished aggression and desperation (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018).

Political science literature identifies this inflection point as a "mask-off moment." The term refers to the psychological and sociopolitical shift that occurs when an institution drops the pretense of legitimacy and engages in naked retaliation.

Historian Timothy Garton Ash, chronicling the collapse of Eastern European regimes, observed how brittle power structures became visible once state authorities resorted to disproportionate force against peaceful movements (Garton Ash, 1990). Similarly, in Serbia's resistance to Slobodan Milošević, the movement *Otpor!* successfully exploited these mask-off moments, using humor, resilience, and public exposure to highlight the absurdity of the regime's escalation (Sombatpoonsiri, 2015).

Importantly, escalatory delegitimization is not a demonstration of strength. It is a signal of internal weakness and insecurity. When an institution perceives those ordinary tools of control — secrecy, legal technicalities, private negotiations — are insufficient to contain dissent, it reaches for more aggressive tactics. However, this escalation often backfires by widening public awareness, galvanizing resistance, and shattering the illusion of competent authority (Chenoweth & Stephan, 2011).

In labor contexts, these patterns are strikingly familiar. When companies face credible challenges to unlawful workplace policies, especially in high-stakes settings involving regulatory findings, they sometimes abandon professional legal argumentation in favor of hostile retaliation. They deploy tools meant to frighten: accusations of bad faith, threats of sanctions, and demands for silence through protective orders. These tactics aim to isolate the whistleblower and deter others from following suit (Fagen, 1992). Yet, historically, such moves often have the opposite effect — they attract scrutiny, signal vulnerability, and empower collective action (Finkel, 2015).

Understanding this pattern is vital for those confronting entrenched institutional power. Recognizing the escalation not as a sign of impending defeat, but as an opportunity, shifts the strategic landscape. Documenting every retaliatory step, maintaining composure, and continuing lawful advocacy in the face of intimidation turns the institution's overreach into an indictment of itself (Sharp, 1973). This article proceeds to illustrate this dynamic in practice through the unfolding conflict between Apple Inc., myself, and the broader labor rights landscape. What follows is a case study in modern corporate authoritarianism — and how its mask slipped.

Apple: Case Study

The conflict between myself and Apple Inc. offers a striking contemporary example of escalatory delegitimization in corporate settings. This example concerns Apple's enforcement of unlawful workplace policies, the subsequent settlement with the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), and the company's aggressive retaliation when those facts were brought to light in parallel civil litigation.

In 2023, after months of investigation, the NLRB concluded that Apple's workplace rules unlawfully restricted employee rights, including rights protected under Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Specifically, policies related to confidentiality and internal communications were found to violate federal labor law.

In 2025, Apple entered into a settlement agreement to revise these policies nationwide, impacting over 100,000 employees (Bloomberg Law, Law360, HR Grapevine, April 2025). The first press to cover the agreement was Law360, which published an article about it on April 9 2025. Additional articles then followed, and I was quoted in a European publication saying:

> "Apple thought fear could hold its system together… But unlawful policies don't become lawful just because people are afraid to challenge them. This federal enforcement action revealed how deeply Apple's power depended on silencing its workers — and how fragile that power truly is."

(The Register, April 10 2025).

As the charging party, I was a signatory to the settlement and continue to hold standing in its enforcement. Instead of complying in good faith, Apple's conduct in subsequent litigation demonstrated open defiance of the very obligations it agreed to under the NLRB settlement.

In my parallel federal civil case — *Ashley Gjovik v. Apple Inc.*, N.D. Cal. No. 3:23-cv-04637 — I sought judicial notice of the settlement, correctly asserting its legal relevance both to Apple's asserted defenses and the systemic labor violations at issue. My motion emphasized that the settlement impacted not only my personal rights but those of Apple's broader workforce, calling for public disclosure to promote transparency (Gjovik, Motion for Judicial Notice, Dkt. No. 194, Mar. 28 2025).

Rather than engage through lawful argument, Apple's counsel escalated aggressively. They accused me of fabricating legal authorities, attacked my credibility, and threatened me with Rule 11 sanctions — a severe procedural measure intended to deter misconduct in litigation (Apple's Opposition, Dkt. Nos. 202–204, April 10 2025). Note, this was immediate after and ruing the international press about the settlement agreement and for each article published, Apple PR had been asked to comment.

Significantly, Apple's attacks over the request for judicial notice were not peripheral to the litigation; they directly targeted my effort to enforce and champion the NLRB settlement, and occurred at the same time Apple was facing international public scrutiny over their misconduct underlying the agreement.

Here, Apple's behavior crossed a critical line. Their attorneys are fully aware of the legal significance of the settlement — it is an agreement between the corporation and the U.S. federal government, overseen by the NLRB. By actively opposing its judicial recognition and publicly attacking me for raising it, Apple revealed that its priority is not lawful compliance or even procedural engagement, but desperate preservation of control at any cost.

This is more than strategic litigation: it is a calculated disregard for their own legal obligations, and they cannot plausibly claim good faith. Apple's lawyers, experienced and well-versed in labor law, understand the risks of non-compliance. Yet, their escalation signals that fear of reputational and legal exposure has overtaken any remaining interest in the orderly resolution of the dispute.

As legal theorist Lon Fuller wrote, the *"inner morality of law"* collapses when participants abandon good faith adherence

to processes designed to resolve conflict justly. (Fuller, 1964).

The sequence of Apple's reactions thus perfectly aligns with the historical *"mask-off moment"* described in political science. When institutions experience a genuine threat to their authority — in this case, federal scrutiny and a legally binding settlement — they may abandon even the appearance of lawful participation, instead resorting to brute procedural force and public retaliation. (Garton Ash, 1990).

Further amplifying the significance, Apple's retaliatory posture unfolded under international media scrutiny. Apple's aggressive litigation strategy, therefore, was not conducted in private but performed on a public stage, increasing its potential legal and reputational consequences.

Moreover, Apple's actions extend beyond litigation tactics to impact the broader workforce. By portraying my lawful filings as illegitimate and threatening sanctions, Apple signaled to its employees — and the public — that attempts to assert labor rights or participate in protected activity will be met with disproportionate reprisal. This tactic fits squarely within the academic definition of escalatory delegitimization: exaggerated retaliation aimed not at legal success, but at suppressing participation and chilling lawful activity. (Chenoweth & Stephan, 2011; Finkel, 2015).

Throughout, I maintained a deliberate strategy of composure and transparency. I notified the NLRB regional office contemporaneously with Apple's escalation, preserved an official record of retaliatory conduct, and documented their attacks as evidence of panic rather than strength. In doing so, I mirrored the tactics of historic resistance movements, which leveraged institutional overreach to demonstrate bad faith and build public support. (Sharp, 1973; Sombatpoonsiri, 2015).

Ultimately, Apple's conduct illustrates with precision how institutional panic leads to self-exposure. Their disregard for the legal settlement, their procedural aggression, and their abandonment of good faith collectively confirm not institutional power, but institutional fragility.

Psychological and Social Dynamics

Understanding the psychological mechanics of escalatory delegitimization is essential to understanding why Apple's response — while aggressive — ultimately accelerates its own decline. Authoritarian systems, whether governmental or corporate, rely heavily on psychological control: the manufacturing of fear, isolation, and inevitability. Their power does not rest solely on legal instruments or institutional might but on the belief that they are too formidable to challenge (Reich, 1933).

When faced with lawful resistance, such systems reflexively deploy tactics designed to rekindle fear. Threats of sanctions, allegations of misconduct, and public smears function not only as legal maneuvers but as psychological weapons. Their goal is simple: to isolate the target, to portray resistance as futile, and to discourage others from joining (Fagen, 1992).

Apple's escalation fits this model precisely. The company's counsel did not limit themselves to arguing the legal irrelevance of the NLRB settlement — they attacked my character, accused me of fabricating legal authorities, and implied misconduct so severe as to warrant Rule 11 sanctions (Apple's Opposition, Dkt. Nos. 202–204, 2025). These accusations, unsupported by facts and lacking specific legal grounding, are designed to trigger fear: fear of professional ruin, fear of public discredit, and fear of procedural entanglement.

Yet psychological research and historical precedent both show that when these tactics are met with composure and methodical exposure, they tend to fail. Instead of isolating the target, they reveal the aggressor's desperation. Erving Goffman, in his seminal work on social performance, noted that when the "backstage" of power is exposed, and the orchestrators of control are seen flailing, public belief in their authority collapses rapidly (Goffman, 1959).

In authoritarian systems, this dynamic has been repeatedly observed. During the final days of Ceausescu's Romania, desperate public performances by the regime — televised speeches laden with paranoia and bluster — led to mass public disillusionment and rapid regime collapse (Deletant, Ceaușescu and the Securitate, 1995). Similarly, Serbia's *"Otpor!"* movement deftly used humor and composure to contrast the regime's panic, accelerating the erosion of Milošević's legitimacy (Sombatpoonsiri, 2015).

Apple's actions parallel these historical examples. Rather than quietly litigating, Apple escalated visibly and aggressively at precisely the moment their authority was questioned. In doing so, they inadvertently validated the significance of the NLRB settlement and confirmed their fear of public scrutiny.

For targets of such escalation, the counter-strategy is well established: maintain composure, document every retaliatory act, and expose the overreach publicly. These actions serve multiple functions:

- **Legal preservation:** Creating a clear evidentiary record of retaliation strengthens future claims and regulatory investigations.
- **Psychological fortification:** Maintaining calm denies

the aggressor their desired psychological victory.

- **Public education:** Exposing overreach demystifies the aggressor's power and encourages solidarity among observers.

My deliberate approach to documenting Apple's actions, notifying the NLRB, and publicly framing their escalation as a symptom of panic follows this model. Each public filing, each correspondence placed in the record, not only preserved my legal position but also undermined Apple's efforts to isolate and intimidate.

Additionally, the role of public attention cannot be overstated. As media outlets covered the developments, Apple's increasingly disproportionate actions were placed under broader scrutiny. This external observation compounds the psychological impact on the aggressor. Studies in resistance movements have found that when authoritarian actors realize their overreach is being witnessed by neutral or sympathetic audiences, they often experience internal fractures and morale collapse (Chenoweth & Stephan, 2011).

The interplay between Apple's panic and my composed response illustrates a vital lesson: escalation may increase personal pressure in the short term, but it simultaneously creates systemic vulnerabilities for the aggressor. By refusing to yield to intimidation and maintaining lawful, transparent advocacy, it is possible to invert the intended chilling effect and instead chill the aggressor's confidence in their own impunity.

Panic as Proof of Fragility

Apple's escalation of retaliation in response to my lawful enforcement of a binding NLRB settlement is not an anomaly—it is a textbook illustration of what institutions do when their veneer of invulnerability begins to crack. What Apple initially framed as procedural rigor quickly revealed itself as procedural aggression. Rather than engaging substantively with the legal implications of a federal settlement they knowingly signed with the United States government, Apple chose escalation—weaponizing litigation tactics that signal not strength, but fear.

This is a well-documented pattern. From authoritarian regimes facing uprisings to corporations confronted by whistleblowers or regulatory scrutiny, power does not always respond with lawful engagement. It responds with overreach. Political science refers to this as escalatory delegitimization—the moment when those in power abandon lawful resolution and instead attempt to discredit, intimidate, or isolate challengers (Arendt 1951; Chenoweth & Stephan 2011). In Apple's case, that escalation is not incidental—it's strategic.

Apple's legal team, seasoned and deeply familiar with labor law, understands the risks of ignoring or misrepresenting a federal settlement agreement. Their decision to proceed regardless leaves little ambiguity about intent. This is not good-faith participation in a legal process. This is an institution gambling on fear as a final defense—hoping that retaliation will suppress scrutiny, delay accountability, and exhaust my capacity to resist. But in doing so, Apple made its vulnerability visible.

One moment in particular crystallized this truth.

In October 2024, following an extremely unfavorable court decision in my case (now under appeal at the Ninth Circuit), I received a personal phone call from someone who identified herself only vaguely. She called during a workday, on my personal phone, told me she is watching my litigation against Apple, and asked a single question: *"Do you regret filing a lawsuit against Apple?"*

I later confirmed—through a reverse lookup —that this woman was a *Global Security & Legal Crisis Manager* at Apple. She failed to disclose this at the time, instead presenting herself as a detached observer. In hindsight, I suspect my voice was being projected on speakerphone during that call, with Apple executives listening silently.

The purpose of the call was not inquiry—it was psychological warfare. More disturbing, I directly witnessed my former employer constructing a spectacle of the suffering they caused, staged for the gratification of corporate leadership. In that moment, Apple was not simply retaliating; they were observing, measuring, and deriving satisfaction from the harm they inflicted.

In that moment, I understood Apple's strategy with clarity. They were not seeking resolution. They were hoping to hear me say what they needed to justify their campaign: that I regretted resisting, that I wished I had remained silent. That they had finally broken me.

They hadn't. And they won't.

That phone call revealed three essential truths:

1. Apple Legal and Apple Global Security are actively coordinating the retaliation I am experiencing in litigation.
2. Their motive is emotional harm—an intentional campaign of attrition and destabilization.
3. Beyond that, they seem to have no plan. Their strategy is not sophisticated. It is desperate and sloppy (like the *Crisis Manger* calling from her own phone number).

This moment, ironically, galvanized me. Their attempt at psychological sabotage backfired. I committed more deeply

to documenting their misconduct and countering it with precision. I saw clearly that they are not confident. They are afraid.

Social movement theory teaches us that these moments—where power reveals its desperation—are pivotal. When the mask slips and institutions abandon the performance of legitimacy, they open themselves to new forms of exposure. The escalation meant to silence instead becomes evidence.

In *The Narrow Corridor*, Acemoglu and Robinson describe the "Paper Leviathan": a state-like entity that projects authority in limited domains but lacks coherence or legitimacy in others. "*These are entities that have the appearance of a state… but that power is hollow; it is incoherent and disorganized in most domains"* (Acemoglu & Robinson 2018, 338–344). Apple's conduct is not the behavior of a sovereign actor in control—it is the behavior of a Paper Leviathan.

Retaliation is not the end of a story—it is the middle of one. When met with composure and transparency, it becomes evidence of institutional fragility, not strength. It reveals the true nature of power when challenged: anxious, brittle, and exposed.

Conclusion

For individuals and movements facing similar overreach, the lesson is clear: maintain precision, uphold lawful advocacy, and document relentlessly. Panic in an adversary is not merely noise — it is evidence. It is confirmation that pressure is working. It is a signal that the illusion of control is fracturing.

As I continue to pursue justice, engage with regulators and law enforcement, and expose Apple's tactics publicly, I do so with the knowledge that Apple's escalation is not a sign of their enduring power, but a symptom of their erosion. Their panic is their tell and their mask has fallen.

References

Acemoglu, Daron and Robinson, James A. *The Narrow Corridor: States, Societies, and the Fate of Liberty.* Penguin Random House (2020).

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism.* New York: Harcourt, 1951.

Bloomberg Law. *"Apple to Clarify Confidentiality Agreements in Labor Board Deal."* April 10, 2025.

Chenoweth, Erica, and Maria J. Stephan. *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

Deletant, Dennis. *Ceaușescu and the Securitate: Coercion and Dissent in Romania, 1965–1989.* London: Hurst, 1995.

Fagen, Patricia W. *Repression and State Security: State Terror in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Finkel, Evgeny. "The Phoenix Effect of State Repression: Jewish Resistance During the Holocaust." *American Political Science Review* 109, no. 2 (2015): 339–353.

Fuller, Lon L. *The Morality of Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

Garton Ash, Timothy. *The Magic Lantern: The Revolution of '89 Witnessed in Warsaw, Budapest, Berlin, and Prague.* New York: Random House, 1990.

Gjovik, Ashley. Motion for Judicial Notice, *Gjovik v. Apple Inc.*, N.D. Cal. No. 3:23-cv-04637-EMC. Dkt. No. 194. April 2025.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Greitens, Sheena Chestnut. *Dictators and Their Secret Police: Coercive Institutions and State Violence.* Cambridge University Press, New York, (2016).

HR Grapevine, *Landmark settlement | Apple lawsuit prompts nationwide labor rights reset on confidentiality,* April 10 2025.

Law360, *Apple Agrees to Revise Some Worker Policies In NLRB Deal,* April 9 2025.

Levitsky, Steven & Ziblatt, Daniel. *How Democracies Die. Penguin Random House* (2018).

Reich, Wilhelm. *The Mass Psychology of Fascism.* Translated by Vincent R. Carfagno. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1970.

The Register, *Apple settles unfair labor charges brought by fired engineering manager. Whistleblower Ashley Gjøvik hails iWatershed iMoment for iStaff iRights,* April 10 2025.

Sharp, Gene. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action.* Boston: Porter Sargent, 1973.

Sombatpoonsiri, Janjira. *Humor and Nonviolent Struggle in Serbia*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2015.

Smith, Kylie and Martin, Brian. Tactics of Labor Struggles. *Employ Respons Rights J* (2007) 19:193–206.

Acknowledgements

The author conceptualized the article, developed the theoretical framework, and conducted the review and synthesis of literature. This research received no external funding. All materials, equipment, and resources used in the study were personally funded by the author.