The Bureaucratic Shield

How Legal Institutions Enable Retaliation, Obscure Criminality, and Undermine Whistleblower Protection

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

"*The Curse of California,"* Tinted lithograph, 19 August 1882.

Abstract: Whistleblower protections in the United States are often presented as robust safeguards against retaliation. In practice, they are fragmented, narrow, and structurally incapable of confronting misconduct that straddles criminal, civil, and administrative domains. This article explores how institutional retaliation is permitted—even enabled—when employers cite lawful motives that appear non-retaliatory under specific statutes, even if those motives are ethically indefensible or illegal under other laws. This legal maneuver—rarely examined outside critical scholarship—functions because agencies and courts refuse to adjudicate beyond their statutory silo, allowing actors to obscure retaliatory motives through facially legitimate explanations (Alford 2001; Bandes 1999).

The article argues that this is not merely doctrinal failure, but an epistemic design flaw in the legal system: by prioritizing statute-specific reasoning over a holistic view of wrongdoing, enforcement bodies become unwitting enablers of impunity. Drawing on interdisciplinary literature, historical comparisons, and contemporary case evidence, will show how retaliation becomes legally invisible when it arises from criminal or cross-domain reporting. The more serious the misconduct is, the less likely it is to fall under a single agency's purview—and the more protected the employer becomes.

Keywords: whistleblower retaliation; administrative law; institutional impunity; cross-jurisdictional governance; legal fragmentation; statutory myopia; epistemic injustice; organizational power; symbolic compliance; judicial restraint; retaliatory justification; bureaucratic design; public interest disclosure; environmental justice; cognitive dissonance; allegory of the cave; legal ethics; state-sponsored silence; procedural harm; regulatory failure

Citation: Gjovik, Ashley. "The Bureaucratic Shield: How U.S. Legal Institutions Enable Retaliation, Obscure Criminality, and Undermine Whistleblower Protection." *The Journal of Structural Power & Resistance,* Volume 1, Issue 1, Summer 2025, Silentium Fractum. May 26 2025. https://ashleygjovik.com.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In the U.S. enforcement landscape, the legal architecture governing labor, civil rights, environmental compliance, and public fraud is not designed to coordinate—and often not authorized to care—about misconduct outside its narrow procedural remit.

This system enables a dangerous contradiction: when whistleblowers identify systemic illegality, retaliation is often dismissed or excused on the grounds that it does not violate the specific statute under review. And in such cases, the institutions responsible for redress abdicate responsibility, claiming that another body—somewhere else—should handle it.

This compartmentalization has been well-documented in environmental justice (Pellow and Park 2002), whistleblower trauma (Alford 2001), and organizational surveillance regimes (U.S. GAO 2024), all of which show how agencies and courts disaggregate human harm into regulatory fragments.

In theory, whistleblower statutes offer meaningful protection. In practice, these protections collapse when retaliation stems from disclosures about criminal or interdisciplinary misconduct. The legal standard requires only that the employer offer a "*legitimate, non-retaliatory reason.*" Courts and agencies rarely ask whether that reason itself might violate other laws, ethical duties, or public safety norms. This produces what I describe as institutionally sanctioned retaliation.

We explore this structure not as a flaw in application but as a systemic design—one that encourages retaliation and discourages accountability. Drawing on legal, sociological, and historical perspectives, including the San Francisco graft trials of the early 1900s (Hichborn, 1915), and environmental worker exploitation in Silicon Valley (Pellow and Park 2002), we show how the U.S. system defends itself from whistleblowers by refusing to see the whole of the wrongdoing they expose.

This article is about institutional impunity, and the legal mechanisms that ensure those who speak the truth are the first to be cast out.

Selective Accountability: A Political History of Performative Prosecution

The famed 1907 San Francisco graft trials stand as a case study in how elite institutions navigate the threat of exposure: not through systemic reform, but through strategic sacrificial prosecution. When scandal is unavoidable, the tactic is not to uproot the corrupt architecture, but rather to perform its purification. This dynamic — of selective accountability used to preserve legitimacy — has echoed across American governance ever since, especially when whistleblowers or external crises reveal systemic rot.

San Francisco's corruption trials began not with a public interest crusade, but with a class conflict among the city's elite. As labor-aligned politicians like Mayor Eugene Schmitz and power broker Abe Ruef gained traction through the Union Labor Party, the city's business elite — including Rudolph Spreckels and the Merchants' Association — responded with a purge. Their aim was not to eliminate graft, in which they were deeply complicit, but to re-establish bourgeois hegemony after labor′s temporary ascendancy (Hichborn, 1915; Walker 1987, 49–51).

Even the reformers were elite dissidents — not radicals, but industrialists from outside the bribery stream. They opposed corruption not on moral grounds, but because it made governance unpredictable and expense accounts volatile. As Rebecca Menes notes in her empirical study of Progressive Era cities, corruption became intolerable not when it undermined democracy, but when it interfered with efficient extraction and profit stability (Menes 2003, 3–10).

In practice, the prosecution focused narrowly. While Ruef went to prison, every corporate executive who paid bribes walked free. The phone, water, and trolley magnates who benefited from the bribery ring were never seriously investigated. This was scapegoat justice, in which public accountability operates as a vent to release pressure while keeping the underlying system intact (Hichborn, 1915; Walker 1987, 50–51).

Gray Brechin's *Imperial San Francisco* sharpens the historical lens. San Francisco was built as a project of extractive imperialism: gold, copper, water, and war contracts. Its ruling class — the Hearsts, De Youngs, Spreckelses — were not aberrations but archetypes. (Brechin 1999, 41–63).

They owned the newspapers, wrote the editorial narratives, and commissioned monuments to their own virtue. This "*monumentalism*" was used to overwrite memory — to convert class violence into civic pride, and to displace political atonement into architecture. (Brechin 1999, 41–63; Hichborn, 1915).

What emerged was a form of elite-managed moral accounting. Scandal became a purification ritual, orchestrated to reaffirm public faith while minimizing systemic change. Political machines might fall, but the financiers behind them often rose. The city would rebrand — cleaner, more rational, and just as profitable.

This template persists. Whether through corporate compliance agreements, university Title IX reviews, or symbolic firings following whistleblower disclosures, modern institutions continue to perform this strategy. They concede individual fault while denying systemic intent. A fight breaks out, a politician resigns, and the enterprise rolls on.

The Architecture of Silence: Institutional Epistemology and Legal Invisibility

Many public discussions about the enforcement of whistleblower rights frame the problem as one of enforcement breakdown or bureaucratic inefficiency. But this view presumes that the institutional goal is justice. In reality, many systems of governance are designed to filter, deflect, and obscure forms of knowledge that pose a threat to institutional legitimacy. Whistleblower disclosures don't just challenge facts — they threaten the narrative coherence of the organization itself.

Whistleblowers resistance is excruciatingly documented. It arrives with emails, timelines, FOIA requests, policy violations, legal citations, sometimes PowerPoints. And yet, their evidence is often met with erasure, fragmentation, denial. Their knowledge is rendered inadmissible, in court, in the structure of recognition itself.

It is a form of institutional anti-memory: systems respond to too much knowledge by dispersing it, labeling it out of scope, or designating it for separate handling. Alford (2001, 39–41) describes how organizations often convert whistleblower truth into psychological pathology. The disclosure is not rebutted — it is reframed as obsession, miscommunication, personal grievance. The person telling the truth becomes the problem to be solved.

Inside legal systems, this reframing is institutionalized. Agencies limit their review to only that which violates their own statute. Courts refuse to hear facts that arise from other jurisdictions. The more serious the wrongdoing — and the more agencies it touches — the less likely anyone is to act. As Pellow and Park (2002, 101–102) observe in the context of environmental injustice, the atomization of responsibility is a design feature, not a flaw.

This architecture of silence has consequences. It produces not just failed investigations but epistemic violence — the structural denial of truth. Whistleblowers are not just ignored; they are disassembled by procedure. Each piece of their report is routed elsewhere. The safety violation goes to OSHA. The fraud to DOJ. The discrimination to EEOC. The labor issue to NLRB. And none of those entities are authorized — or willing — to see the whole picture.

The result is a kind of bureaucratic exile: the whistleblower becomes a jurisdictional orphan, carrying a body of knowledge that no part of the state is equipped — or incentivized — to receive.

Moral Recognition Without Legal Remedy: The Limits of Judicial Disgust

In whistleblower cases, retaliation is often visible — sometimes overwhelmingly so. Termination follows quickly after a report. Coworkers are warned not to speak to the complainant. Responsibilities are stripped. Access is revoked. Evaluations shift from positive to punitive in days. And yet, courts and agencies frequently decline to intervene.

Why? Because retaliation law — like much of U.S. administrative law — doesn't revolve aroundwhether harm occurred. It asks whether the employer's stated reason for their action violates the narrow terms of the statute. If the employer claims a motive that is lawful under that statute, the inquiry often stops — regardless of whether the motive would be illegal, unethical, or retaliatory under other legal frameworks.

Faced with this paradox, some judges or agency officials engage in a form of moral signaling. They acknowledge, sometimes explicitly, that what the whistleblower suffered was unjust, even retaliatory in spirit. But they disclaim the authority to act. Susan Bandes (1999) refers to this phenomenon as "*judicial disgust*" — a moment where moral repulsion enters the legal process but it is then compartmentalized as irrelevant to adjudication.

This performance of empathy functions as a kind of legal palliative care. It offers rhetorical recognition — sometimes even sympathy — but no recourse. Bandes identifies this as a modern problem of jurisprudence: the law purports to be rational, but its rationality often becomes a screen against moral responsibility (Bandes 1999, 10–15).

C. Fred Alford (2001) offers a deeper critique: the disgust is not about the whistleblower's suffering, but about the inconvenience of their truth. He recounts cases where investigators privately admitted the whistleblower was probably right — but closed the case, anyway, citing lack of jurisdiction or insufficient standing. They believe the whistleblower, but they also know what it would cost them to act to protect the whistleblower. (Alford 2001, 41).

In this way, judicial disgust becomes a ritualized discharge of guilt. It preserves the moral self-image of the institution while avoiding substantive consequences. The judge regrets. The investigator sympathizes. The agency laments

the complexity. The retaliation remains untouched.

This phenomenon also allows the system to preserve its narrative integrity. If a whistleblower's experience is too damning, too systemic, then to rule in their favor would be to admit that the system itself enabled the harm. Moral discomfort becomes a pressure valve. It allows the system to feel bad without changing anything.

The Cave and the Court: Epistemic Threat and the State's Psychological Defense

The failure to protect whistleblowers is not just legal. It is epistemological. When a worker exposes misconduct that is systemic, violent, or deeply embedded in institutional culture, they are not just making a complaint. They are forcing the state to confront its own reflection.

Plato's allegory of the cave offers a template. In the cave, prisoners face a wall where shadows play. One escapes, sees the world outside, and returns — only to be ridiculed or destroyed. His knowledge is not welcomed; it disrupts the internal logic of the cave (Plato, *Republic*, Book VII). The whistleblower is returning prisoner: not just rejected but punished for seeing too much.

But the modern cave is not made of ignorance — it is made of legal doctrine, institutional incentives, and bureaucratic design. The shadows on the wall are policy compliance, contract terms, and risk matrices. The goal of the system is not to discover truth, but to maintain a stable field of acceptable knowledge.

When a whistleblower breaks that field — when they reveal criminal conduct, environmental destruction, financial fraud, systemic racism — their claim is not just inconvenient, it is existentially threatening. To validate it would require:

- Admitting the violence embedded in institutional norms.
- Recognizing that harm is not anomalous, but operational.
- And abandoning the idea that the law is neutral, fair, or restorative.

In psychological terms, this produces cognitive dissonance at the state level. Leon Festinger (1957) theorized that when individuals hold two contradictory beliefs — for example, *"we live under the rule of law"* and "*this person was punished for reporting crimes*" — they resolve the tension not by changing belief, but by discrediting the source of disruption. The whistleblower becomes the distortion. The system remains intact.

This dissonance is particularly acute in the U.S., where national identity is tethered to procedural justice. As Bandes (1999) explains, the legal system is a theater of rationalism: its power lies not in what it delivers, but in the illusion of coherence.

As a result, legal actors reflexively:

- Narrow the scope of review.
- Demand "objective" proof from inside compromised systems.
- Or express sympathy while dismissing the case.

This is an institutional survival instinct — a kind of state-level ego defense.

Fragmented Harm: Environmental Justice as a Model of Institutional Non-Responsiveness

Environmental justice movements have long understood that when harm is spread across multiple legal categories, it becomes legally invisible. The more severe, interdisciplinary, or layered the abuse, the less likely any single agency is willing—or able—to act.

David Pellow and Lisa Sun-Hee Park's *Silicon Valley of Dreams* (2002) offers one of the most acute illustrations of this pattern. In the high-tech corridors of Northern California, workers—primarily immigrant women—were routinely exposed to toxic chemicals, reproductive hazards, and cover-ups of environmental spills.

These were manufactured invisibilities, the result of overlapping but uncoordinated regulatory bodies, each of which refused to acknowledge the full scope of harm.

- The chemicals were legal under OSHA.
- The zoning was legal under the municipal code.
- The waste was stored under EPA thresholds.
- The workers were not unionized and so had limited NLRA protections.
- Immigration concerns prevented many from speaking publicly.

And so, no one acted, and people were injured and killed.

Pellow and Park (2002, 101–105) describe how this "*hyper-fragmentation of responsibility*" is not merely accidental — it is the mechanism through which power protects itself. By distributing accountability, institutions can absorb enormous harm without triggering institutional consequences. The state's role becomes not remediation,

but orchestration: ensuring that each body, each claim, each violation is managed in isolation.

This fragmentation has become the dominant structure in whistleblower retaliation as well. When an employee reports criminal conduct that overlaps with labor law, public health, environmental compliance, and civil rights violations, they are shattered across the state. Their retaliation claim is deemed "*not labor-focused*" by NLRB, "*not safety-focused*" by OSHA, "*declined to prosecute*" by DOJ, and "*out of scope"* by DOE or EPA. No agency is authorized to see what the employee sees: a total system failure.

In legal terms, this becomes a jurisdictional problem. In human terms, it becomes a form of cognitive atomization. The whistleblower is forced to explain the wrongdoing in statute-compliant fragments — each one stripped of its context and urgency. What began as a story of corruption or abuse becomes a set of disconnected complaints, none of which meet the threshold for action.

This is not bureaucratic incompetence. It is governance by disaggregation — a method that allows states to perform procedural legitimacy while ensuring that no one has to account for the totality of harm.

Whistleblowers and frontline environmental victims experience the same consequences: disbelief, exhaustion, and isolation. They are told that what they've seen is real, but not actionable. Their injury does not exist in the right format. Their story exceeds the filing system limitations. And so, the harm continues — not as a glitch in the system, but as its core logic. No one is responsible because everyone is responsible.

Statutory Myopia: How Legal Frameworks Codify Retaliation

Whistleblower protection laws in the United States frequently function as instruments of statutory myopia—narrowly defined legal frameworks that inadvertently codify retaliation by constraining the scope of protection.

At first glance, the landscape of whistleblower laws appears robust. Over 20 federal statutes, including the Whistleblower Protection Act (WPA), Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX), and the Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act, offer various forms of protection.

Yet, these laws are often siloed, each addressing specific sectors or types of misconduct. This compartmentalization means that a whistleblower exposing multifaceted wrongdoing may find that no single statute offers comprehensive protection, even neutralize each other, leaving a vulnerable whistleblower without redress.

Legal standards within these statutes frequently place an onerous burden on whistleblowers. For example,, statutes often impose strict filing deadlines and procedural requirements. Missing a deadline or failing to navigate complex administrative processes can result in the dismissal of a claim, regardless of its merits.

Many statutes require that the whistleblower′s disclosure be based on a *"reasonable belief"* of wrongdoing. While this standard is intended to protect individuals who report in good faith, it can be interpreted narrowly, allowing employers to challenge the whistleblower′s perception and intent.

The fragmented nature of whistleblower laws leads to jurisdictional challenges. Different agencies enforce different statutes, and overlapping jurisdictions can create confusion and inconsistency in enforcement. This fragmentation can result in a lack of accountability and protection for whistleblowers.

The cumulative effect of these legal limitations is a system that, while purporting to protect whistleblowers, often codifies retaliation by:

- Imposing stringent procedural requirements that are difficult to navigate.
- Limiting the scope of protected disclosures.
- Placing the burden of proof on the whistleblower.
- Allowing for narrow interpretations of key legal standards.

This statutory design does not merely fail to prevent retaliation; it structurally enables it by creating legal pathways for employers to retaliate without consequence. What remains is a statutory scheme of laws which claim to protect whistleblowers, but which offer the performance of integrity at best. (Rose-Ackerman and Palifka, 2016).

Smith and Martin explain, "*the tribunal itself is set up to control conflict. Its aim is to manage disputes; it was established originally to help ensure that the relations between capital and labor run smoothly. It will therefore advocate compromise wherever possible, and at least part of this compromise involves ensuring that businesses can continue their activities unless they are blatantly illegal or harmful*." (Smith and Martin, 2007).

The Overton Window in Retaliation Litigation

In whistleblower retaliation litigation, employers often exert systemic control over the scope, narrative, and framing of the legal process—effectively constructing an institutional *Overton window* within the court. Just as political actors shift the boundaries of publicly acceptable discourse to render

some ideas thinkable and others unutterable, employers in litigation strategically shape what is legally admissible, factually plausible, and morally legible. (Lambert, 2024).

This narrowing begins with pretextual framing. Employers redefine the dispute as a routine workplace conflict (performance issues, interpersonal friction, or policy violations), rather than a public interest disclosure or a challenge to institutional wrongdoing.

Procedural motions are then used to exclude evidence of the underlying misconduct, severing the act of whistleblowing from the retaliation that followed. In doing so, the employer establishes a narrowed evidentiary corridor: one in which the legitimacy of the disclosure is sidelined, and only the credibility of the whistleblower is on trial.

The court often accepts this narrowed frame as neutral. But it is not. It is engineered. Protective orders, motions *in limine,* discovery limitations, and mental health fishing expeditions are deployed not only to win the case, but to delimit what truth is permitted to appear within the record.

The result is a litigation process in which moral dissent is rendered procedurally incoherent: disclosures become irrational, whistleblower motives suspect, and retaliation reinterpreted as justified employment discipline.

In this way, employers not only defend themselves—they define the boundaries of adjudicable reality. They convert institutional wrongdoing into a contested HR file and transform whistleblower resistance into a question of character.

The legal system, rather than correcting this distortion, often becomes its stage. Like the political manipulation of the *Overton window,* this judicial narrowing enforces silence not through explicit censorship, but through strategic framing that reclassifies dissent as disorder and truth as irrelevance.

The Aesthetics of Compliance: How Institutions Perform Accountability

When an institution is confronted with allegations of serious wrongdoing — whether criminal conduct, workplace violence, regulatory fraud, or systemic abuse — its first response is rarely a full reckoning. Instead, it responds with a performance of compliance. This response is not superficial. It is procedural, media-ready, and deeply embedded in how contemporary institutions preserve legitimacy.

Universities launch "*independent investigations.*" Tech companies retain law firms. Government contractors issue statements of zero tolerance. Boards form special committees. Employees are told not to speculate. Legal teams prepare position statements.

As Susan Bandes (1999) argues in her analysis of legal affect, institutional actors often express *"judicial disgust"* at injustice but disclaim the authority to act. Their language reveals moral dissonance, within a system built to disclaim accountability unless a violation falls neatly within jurisdictional bounds. Goldman warned us more than a hundred years ago that legal oppression and bureaucratic neutrality were functions of imperial power. (Goldman, 1910; Schriempf, 1997).

What is being protected is not the truth, but the organization's public identity — its *"brand of responsibility."* Compliance becomes an aesthetic. A polished surface that gestures toward reform while protecting the architecture of impunity beneath it. C. Fred Alford (2001) describes how organizations co-opt the language of accountability to immunize themselves from its demands. Whistleblowers often confront institutions that respond with the form of ethics but not the substance, issuing new codes of conduct and trainings without addressing the underlying violence (Alford 2001, 81–85).

This is by design. For example, Joel Bakan explained that Enron *"used political influence to remove government restrictions on its operations and then exploited its resulting freedom to engage in dubious, though highly profitable, practices."* (Bakan, 2003, page 99). We know Enron was able to get away with this deception and egregious misconduct for years.

This logic mirrors Gray Brechin's analysis of monumentalism in *Imperial San Francisco* — how the city's robber barons built civic temples and art museums to launder the reputational violence of their extraction. The civic façade was erected not in spite of the violence beneath it, but because of it. (Brechin 1999, 44–46).

Today, the façade is procedural. It is a DEI training in the midst of systemic racism. A Title IX office with no teeth. A whistleblower hotline staffed by corporate risk consultants. In this regime, the institution's goal is not to eliminate harm, but to contain its narrative consequences.

Whistleblowers who persist in naming the truth are increasingly treated as threats to this containment. The problem is not just what they reported — the investigation is "*ongoing*," after all — but that they are disrupting the institutional timeline. They refuse to let the matter resolve itself through messaging. And so, they must be removed.

This is the next layer of retaliation: not the punitive firing or the dead-end transfer, but the symbolic denouncement. The suggestion that the whistleblower is unprofessional,

disruptive, or irrational — not because they lied, but because they refused to submit to the choreography of procedural checklists (failure to cooperate, failure to exhaust administrative options, breach of loyalty, etc.).

In this environment, retaliation is not hidden. It is a consequence of non-compliance with the script. To seek structural change, to demand full recognition of institutional violence, is seen not as courage but as instability. The performance continues. The institution is praised for its transparency. The contract remains in place. And the whistleblower is gone.

Toward Systemic Accountability: Reforms That See the Whole

The institutional failures documented in this article — jurisdictional silos, retaliatory justification doctrines, symbolic compliance, and state-level cognitive dissonance — are not isolated. They are mutually reinforcing design features of the U.S. administrative and legal enforcement landscape.

Real accountability will not come from adding another hotline or compliance module. It will require changes to the structure, scope, and epistemology of institutional oversight. The proposals below are not exclusive, but attempt to show examples of potential opportunities and a new way of viewing these issues.

Create a Cross-Jurisdictional Retaliation Review Mechanism

Most whistleblower retaliation cases fail because they are routed into statutory lanes too narrow to carry the weight of what actually happened. I propose a federally mandated mechanism to receive, consolidate, and coordinate multi-domain claims of retaliation — especially where the alleged misconduct involves:

- Fraud against the government
- Active environmental or public health risk
- Criminal activity by federal grantees or contractors
- Retaliation involving multiple adverse actions over time, or post termination harassment.

This function should be modeled on cross-agency task forces and should include binding coordination mandates between DOJ, DOL, NLRB, EPA, NSF OIG, and others — not informal, invisible, discretionary referrals.

Create a Doctrine of Cross Statutory Illegality

Agencies and courts should be required to assess whether an employer's claimed "*legitimate reason*" for adverse action would be unlawful under any other federal law or regulation. This doctrine of cross-statutory illegality would prevent the laundering of retaliatory motives across jurisdictions.

If an employer fires a worker for organizing with coworkers to report the employer's criminal acts, the NLRB should not be allowed to accept an employer's justification for the termination due to the employee "*reporting crimes*" as a valid justification, simply because the NLRA does not expressly protect "*reporting crimes.*"

The motive should be weighed holistically — and illegality under one regime should preclude justification in another. Certainly, the Congress intended the NLRA would protect workers who chose to organize for mutual aid and protection specific to wanting a crime-free workplace.

What "Protecting" Workers Would Look Like

When whistleblowers come forward—risking careers, livelihoods, and reputations to expose institutional corruption, fraud, abuse, or threats to public safety—they should be met with meaningful legal protection, not procedural traps. Unfortunately, in many cases, our current legal architecture betrays the very people it's designed to protect.

Under a protective framework, once a whistleblower demonstrates that their protected activity was a *contributing factor* to the adverse action taken against them—whether it's termination, demotion, or harassment—the burden must shift decisively to the employer. The employer should then be required not only to prove that retaliation *wasn't* a factor, but also to justify what consequence they themselves deserve if retaliation did occur—not whether any consequence is warranted.

The employer-employee relationship is structurally asymmetrical. Employers control the workplace, documentation, internal investigations, and access to records that often contain the evidence of misconduct. Expecting whistleblowers to meet an onerous causation standard like "but for" or "because of" causation is legally and practically impossible in most cases. *Lawson v. PPG Architectural Finishes, Inc.*, 12 Cal. 5th 703 (2022).

Instead, as articulated in *Lawson v. PPG Architectural Finishes, Inc.*, 12 Cal. 5th 703 (2022), whistleblowers should only need to prove "*contributing factor*" causation by a preponderance of the evidence. This is the standard used in California and several federal whistleblower statutes. It recognizes the reality that retaliation is often complex—and that protected activity need only play a part in the

employer's decision to act.

Conversely, the employer must meet a higher evidentiary bar: *clear and convincing evidence* that it would have taken the same action independent of the protected activity. This framework has precedent in both state and federal law, and mirrors burden-shifting mechanisms in civil rights and mixed-motive discrimination cases (*see McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792 (1973); *see also Texas Dep't of Cmty. Affs. v. Burdine,* 450 U.S. 248 (1981)).

Perhaps the most disturbing and predatory loophole in modern whistleblower litigation is the "After Acquired Evidence" doctrine. Introduced in *McKennon v. Nashville Banner Publishing Co.*, 513 U.S. 352 (1995), this doctrine allows an employer to conduct post-termination investigations to uncover past misconduct by the employee—even after the employer has been found to have retaliated unlawfully.

If the employer can uncover some past infraction (no matter how minor or unrelated), courts can limit or even eliminate remedies, including back pay, reinstatement, or other damages. This doctrine is wielded to retroactively justify illegal retaliation and insulate employers from consequences. *Johnson v. Spencer Press of Maine, Inc.*, 364 F.3d 368 (1st Cir. 2004).

This effectively deputizes employers as private investigators, greenlighting invasive post hoc inquiries that resemble character assassination more than legal defense. It's an open invitation to dig up "*dirt*," compile dossiers, and weaponize surveillance against whistleblowers.

The current system thus provides perverse incentives:

- Employers who retaliate illegally can still win on remedies by finding unrelated faults in the employee's past.
- Courts may acknowledge illegal retaliation but simultaneously deny meaningful justice and authorize punitive measures like invasive surveillance and data collection.
- Employees, even after prevailing on the merits, can walk away with nothing.

This undermines the core intent of whistleblower protection statutes: to encourage employees to speak up without fear of reprisal. In other domains, such as criminal or sexual assault cases, attempts to smear a victim's character during or after litigation can amount to harassment or obstruction of justice. Yet in whistleblower cases, this behavior is normalized and even incentivized by doctrines like *after-acquired evidence.*

To truly protect whistleblowers, courts and legislatures must:

- Codify "*contributing factor*" causation as the standard for liability.
- Mandate "*clear and convincing*" evidence for employer defenses.
- Prohibit or severely restrict the use of *after-acquired evidence*, particularly when unrelated to the misconduct at issue.
- Refocus litigation on the employer's conduct, not the employee's character.
- Recognize the chilling effect doctrines have on future whistleblowers.

Statutes designed to protect whistleblowers should not be neutralized by doctrines that were never intended to apply to them. If we are serious about rooting out corruption, fraud, and abuse, we need legal systems that amplify the voices of whistleblowers—not ones that punish them for speaking.

Expand Criminal Whistleblower Protections and Provide Provisional Status

Currently, there is no general-purpose federal statute protecting whistleblowers who report potential criminal violations outside sector-specific contexts.

Congress must enact a universal protection statute — one that includes:

- Immediate provisional protected status once reporting is made in good faith.
- Emergency injunctive relief from adverse employment action
- Civil damages and criminal penalties for retaliators
- Protections against security clearance revocation or visa coercion.

Until then, DOJ and FBI should adopt internal policy guidance to recognize such retaliation as potential obstruction or witness tampering and offer affirmative communications to regulatory bodies to prevent case dismissals.

Conclusion: A System That Protects Itself

When whistleblowers step forward — especially those who reveal criminal conduct, institutional violence, or state-aligned corruption — they are not only naming misconduct. They are presenting an existential threat to the story the

system tells about itself. And so, they are cast out, because accepting their truth would demand a reckoning.

In this context, even moral outrage becomes strategic. Judges and agencies acknowledge harm with language they know will have no legal effect. They perform disgust in the absence of power. Institutions perform compliance in the absence of justice. And all the while, the machinery of harm continues to turn — intact, uninterrupted, and immunized by design. (Goldman, 1910; Schriempf, 1997).

The real lesson of whistleblower retaliation in the United States is not that the system is broken. It is that the system is working — for those it was built to serve. And unless we confront the political logic of our enforcement architecture, no amount of procedural reform will change that. The question, then, is not whether we need new policies. It is whether we are willing to tell the truth about what the current ones are protecting.

References

Ahmed, Sarah. *Complaint!* (Sept. 2021).

Alford, C. Fred. *Whistleblowers: Broken Lives and Organizational Power*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Bakan, Joel. *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power.* Simon and Schuster. (2003).

Bandes, Susan A., ed. *The Passions of Law*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

Brechin, Gray. *Imperial San Francisco: Urban Power, Earthly Ruin*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Conway, H., & Stannard, J. 'Deconstructing Judicial Expressions of Disgust'. *Onati Socio-Legal Series.* (2019).

Eisinger, Jesse. *The Chickenshit Club: Why the Justice Department Fails to Prosecute Executives*. Simon & Schuster. (2017).

Ferguson, Kathy. *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets.* Rowman & Littlefield. (2011).

Festinger, Leon. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Goldman, Emma. *Anarchism and Other Essays.* (1910).

Hichborn, Franklin. *"The System" As Uncovered by the San Francisco Graft Prosecution*. James H. Barry Co., 1915. Project Gutenberg.

Koehn, J. (2023, December 25). *San Francisco Scandals History: Sex, Bribes, Murder*. The San Francisco Standard.

Lambert, C.A., Ewing, M.E. and Hassan, T. "Watchful waiting: public relations strategies to minimize and manage a fake news crisis", *Journal of Communication Management,* Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 459-481. (2024).

Lawson v. PPG Architectural Finishes, Inc., 12 Cal. 5th 703 (2022). (Once the employee meets this burden, the employer must prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that the same action would have occurred for legitimate, independent reasons even if the employee had not engaged in the protected activity.)

McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green, 411 U.S. 792, 802 (1973). (Once a plaintiff establishes a prima facie case of retaliation, the burden shifts to the employer to articulate a legitimate, non-retaliatory reason for the adverse action.)

Menes, Rebecca. "*Corruption in Cities: Graft and Politics in American Cities at the Turn of the Twentieth Century.*" Working Paper No. 9990, National Bureau of Economic Research, September 2003.

Museum of the City of San Francisco. "Earthquake and Graft Prosecution Timeline 1906–1907." *San Francisco History Museum*.

Pellow, David N., and Lisa Sun-Hee Park. *The Silicon Valley of Dreams: Environmental Injustice, Immigrant Workers, and the High-Tech Global Economy*. New York: New York University Press, 2002.

Plato. *Republic*. Translated by G.M.A. Grube, revised by C.D.C. Reeve. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1992.

Rose-Ackerman, Susan and Palifka, Bonnie J. *Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences, and Reform.* 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press. (2016).

Schriempf, A.T. Radical Disobedience: Emma Goldman's Civil Disobedience, *The Acorn: Journal of the Radical Philosophy Association* (1997).

Scott, James C. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.

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

Spiekermann, Uwe. "Cleaning San Francisco, Cleaning the United States: The Graft Prosecutions of 1906–1909 and Their Nationwide Consequences." *Shady Business: White Collar Crime in History*, German Historical Institute, Sept. 18–20, 2014.

Texas Dep't of Cmty. Affs. v. Burdine, 450 U.S. 248, 253 (1981). (The burden of persuasion remains at all times with the plaintiff, who must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the legitimate reasons offered by the employer were not its true reasons but were a pretext for

discrimination).

U.S. GAO, *Digital Surveillance of Workers: Tools, Uses, and Stakeholder Perspectives,* GAO-24-107639 (2024).

Walker, Richard A. "San Francisco's Haymarket: The General Strike of 1934." *Critical Planning Journal*, vol. 4 (1987): 35–52.

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.

Copyright: © 2025 Ashley Gjovik. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). You are free to share, copy, redistribute, and adapt this work for any purpose, including commercial and academic use, as long as appropriate credit is given to the author. Attribution should include the author's name, the full title of the work, the version number, and a link to the original publication at https://ashleygjovik.com.