AUCTORES
Globalize your Research

Psychology and Mental Health Care

Julian Lloyd Bruce *

Open Access

Research Article

Fitness to Serve: Cognitive Decline, Medical Secrecy, and the Case for Mandatory Health Disclosure in U.S. Leadership

Julian Lloyd Bruce

Euclid University / Engelhardt School of Global Health and Bioethics 1101 30th Street NW Suite #500 (Fifth Floor), Washington, D.C. 20007, United States.

***Corresponding Author**: Julian Lloyd Bruce, Euclid University / Engelhardt School of Global Health and Bioethics 1101 30th Street NW Suite #500 (Fifth Floor), Washington, D.C. 20007, United States.

Received date: July 10, 2025; Accepted date: August 12, 2025; Published date: September 05, 2025

Citation: Julian L. Bruce, (2025), Fitness to Serve: Cognitive Decline, Medical Secrecy, and the Case for Mandatory Health Disclosure in U.S. Leadership, *Psychology and Mental Health Care,* 9(7): **DOI**:10.31579/2637-8892/342

Abstract

This paper evaluates the gap in medical and cognitive transparency for senior U.S. leaders and proposes a legally enforceable framework for mandatory health disclosure. Using the delayed revelation of President Joe Biden's metastatic prostate cancer diagnosis and documented cognitive lapses as a focal example, it highlights how existing privacy laws and constitutional provisions permit serious impairments to remain hidden from public scrutiny. Through historical comparison with past presidents' concealed illnesses, analysis of the 25th Amendment's reliance on internal political actors, and review of HIPAA's blanket confidentiality protections, the study demonstrates that voluntary disclosures and informal norms are insufficient to safeguard democratic accountability. Drawing on international practices in the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, it illustrates that transparent health reporting can coexist with stable governance. The paper then outlines a comprehensive reform package: mandatory annual medical and neurocognitive evaluations conducted by independent specialists; a narrowly tailored HIPAA exemption requiring treating physicians to report impairments to a nonpartisan medical disclosure commission; amendment of the 25th Amendment to permit expert referral for incapacity review; and enforcement measures for noncompliance. These recommendations aim to ensure that individuals entrusted with constitutional authority remain fit to serve and that the electorate can make informed judgments about its leadership

Keywords: androgen deprivation therapy (adt); prostate cancer; cognitive dysfunction; confidentiality; mental competency; government regulation

Introduction

In a constitutional democracy, government legitimacy depends not only on adherence to the rule of law, but also on the cognitive and functional capacity of those entrusted with power. The U.S. President, along with members of Congress and the Supreme Court, holds far-reaching authority over national defense, constitutional interpretation, economic strategy, and public safety. These responsibilities require sustained mental acuity, sound judgment, and the ability to process complex information under pressure.

Despite these demands, there is no legal requirement in the United States for elected or appointed officials to disclose their medical history, cognitive status, or psychiatric conditions. This is not a trivial oversight. It reflects a structural vulnerability that threatens democratic stability. The absence of mandated health transparency creates a system where serious impairments may be concealed indefinitely, shielded by privacy laws designed for private citizens rather than public fiduciaries.

This vulnerability has become more evident in light of recent events involving President Joe Biden. In May 2025, it was disclosed that Biden had been diagnosed with aggressive prostate cancer, classified as Gleason score 9 (grade group 5), with confirmed metastasis to the bone [1]. Although the timing and course of treatment remain unclear, such cases typically require systemic therapies like androgen deprivation, which have well-documented cognitive side effects, particularly in older adults [2]. This disclosure occurred against a backdrop of growing concern over Biden's mental sharpness, concern that had been building throughout his presidency.

One pivotal moment came with the public release of audio from Special Counsel Robert Hur's interview with the President. In the recording, Biden struggled to recall essential facts, such as the years he served as vice president and the date of his son Beau's death [3]. Not long after, during the 2024 presidential debate, Biden appeared disoriented, frequently lost his train of thought, and failed to complete sentences—

prompting widespread bipartisan alarm over his cognitive fitness [4]. Reporting later revealed that Biden's aides and close advisors had deliberately restricted his exposure to unscripted public appearances for months, attempting to manage perceptions and avoid scrutiny [5].

These incidents suggest more than a personal medical issue. They reveal a coordinated effort to suppress evidence of cognitive decline and limit public visibility into the President's condition. More importantly, they expose the complete inadequacy of existing laws and ethical standards regarding medical transparency in public office. Although the President of the United States holds unilateral control over decisions involving nuclear weapons, emergency powers, and international diplomacy, there is no statutory requirement for medical disclosure, nor is there independent oversight of the White House physician. The 25th Amendment, designed to address presidential incapacity, remains dormant unless invoked by the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet. Political loyalty, fear of professional consequences, and institutional inertia often prevent this mechanism from being activated when it is most needed [6].

This paper argues that continued application of private-sector medical confidentiality, including HIPAA protections, to individuals in the highest public offices is incompatible with democratic governance. Those entrusted with constitutional authority must accept greater transparency as a condition of service. Annual disclosure of complete medical and cognitive evaluations should be required by law. Physicians treating public officials must be exempt from conventional confidentiality rules and obligated to report findings to an independent, nonpartisan medical commission. The 25th Amendment must also be restructured to allow for external review and independent initiation of fitness evaluations.

The sections that follow will examine the democratic and ethical stakes of cognitive transparency, review the Biden administration's concealment of medical decline, assess the legal gaps that enable such secrecy, and propose a comprehensive policy framework to restore public accountability and institutional resilience.

Methods

A literature review was conducted using PubMed, Google Scholar, and legal databases to explore the relationship between cognitive decline, medical confidentiality, and the fitness of public officials to govern. Priority was given to peer-reviewed articles, legal analyses, and policy documents published within the last five years to ensure contemporary relevance. Sources were selected for their credibility and multidisciplinary relevance, including perspectives from neurology, ethics, constitutional law, and political science. International disclosure norms and historical case studies were reviewed to contextualize systemic risks. No medical diagnosis is made regarding any individual; all health-related references are based on publicly available information from official disclosures and reputable media sources. This review seeks to inform institutional policy, not individual health judgment.

The Democratic Stakes of Cognitive Fitness

The authority vested in high-ranking federal officials in the United States is both unique and far-reaching. The President directs military operations, oversees international diplomacy, manages national crises, and holds unilateral control over the nuclear arsenal. Congress exercises the power to declare war, appropriate federal funding, and legislate across virtually every domain of American life. The Supreme Court interprets the Constitution and delivers decisions with permanent implications for civil liberties, electoral processes, and the boundaries of executive power. These roles require not only political competence but sustained cognitive clarity, sound judgment, and the mental endurance to respond to rapidly evolving situations.

In nearly every other high-stakes profession, routine evaluation of cognitive and psychological fitness is expected. Military personnel are subject to behavioral and mental health screening to determine deployment readiness. Commercial airline pilots undergo regular medical and neurocognitive assessments. Judges may be removed from the bench due to cognitive decline, and law enforcement officers are evaluated after critical incidents [7]. These evaluations are not discretionary. They are built into the professional structure to protect the public and ensure operational effectiveness.

In contrast, the political sphere operates with no comparable standard. There is no legal requirement for routine cognitive assessments, no obligation to disclose medical or psychiatric diagnoses, and no independent oversight to verify the continued fitness of top public officials. This discrepancy is ethically indefensible. Elected leaders are not private individuals acting in their own interest. They are fiduciaries entrusted with public power, and their cognitive capacity directly affects national well-being. In a system that depends on informed democratic consent, voters must be able to assess whether those in office are fit to serve.

Recent events have made the consequences of this gap undeniable. In his recorded interview with Special Counsel Robert Hur, President Biden struggled to recall the years he served as vice president and the date of his son Beau's death—basic facts that any cognitively intact individual would be expected to remember [2]. During the 2024 presidential debate, Biden failed to articulate coherent responses, lost his train of thought repeatedly, and demonstrated an alarming lack of verbal fluency [4]. These episodes unfolded while the country faced serious international and domestic challenges, including foreign conflicts, economic instability, and increasing political polarization. That the President may have been cognitively unfit to manage these responsibilities raises urgent concerns about the resilience of American institutions.

The failure of the Cabinet to consider invoking Section 4 of the 25th Amendment only deepens this concern. Under current law, the Vice President and a majority of Cabinet members are tasked with initiating the process to declare presidential incapacity. Yet these individuals are appointed by the President and may be motivated more by political loyalty or career preservation than by the national interest [6]. Without external checks, even obvious signs of decline can be ignored. This is not a failure of law alone, but of design. The system relies on informal norms and internal decision-making rather than enforceable constitutional safeguards.

Moreover, this problem is not confined to the presidency. Members of Congress influence military deployments, healthcare policy, and global diplomacy. Supreme Court Justices, appointed for life, shape the legal foundation of the nation for decades. If any of these individuals suffer from cognitive impairment, the consequences are not hypothetical. They are reflected in policy failures, judicial misjudgments, and security risks. The public deserves protection from such institutional vulnerabilities.

A functional democracy depends on more than elections and laws. It requires confidence that those in power are capable of discharging their duties. Without mandatory standards for cognitive fitness, the government risks drifting into dysfunction, not from lack of laws, but from a refusal to confront incapacity when it occurs. The stakes are too high for inaction. Cognitive transparency is not an optional feature of democratic governance. It is one of its core responsibilities.

President Joe Biden's Diagnosis and the Culture of Concealment

In May 2025, it was revealed that former President Joe Biden had been diagnosed with advanced prostate cancer, classified as Gleason score 9, Grade Group 5, with confirmed metastasis to the bone [1]. This diagnosis carries a poor prognosis and typically requires aggressive treatment, including androgen deprivation therapy (ADT), chemotherapy, or newer hormonal agents. Among these, ADT is especially associated with cognitive side effects, such as impaired attention, memory loss, and reduced executive functioning, particularly in older patients [2].

Despite the serious implications of the diagnosis and its likely cognitive impact, the White House never issued a detailed timeline of Biden's condition. The public was not informed when he was first diagnosed, when treatment began, or which therapies were administered during his time in office. The decision to disclose his condition only after he left office raised immediate questions about whether his mental performance had been affected earlier, during his tenure. Under current U.S. law, there is no requirement for elected officials to report major medical conditions, and HIPAA regulations prevent physicians from releasing such information without consent [8]. In the absence of a legal mandate, the public remains dependent on voluntary disclosures that often prioritize political considerations over transparency.

This episode fits within a long-standing pattern of presidential health secrecy in the United States. Historical examples include Franklin D. Roosevelt, who concealed his heart failure and paralysis during World War II; John F. Kennedy, who secretly managed Addison's disease and chronic pain with a combination of steroids, amphetamines, and narcotics; and Ronald Reagan, whose second-term forgetfulness was not fully understood until his Alzheimer's diagnosis after leaving office [9, 10]. In each case, concealment of significant medical issues denied both the public and government institutions vital information needed to assess executive capacity.

What makes Biden's case especially troubling is the contemporary context. Unlike his predecessors, he governed during a time of constant media scrutiny, widespread public access to information, and extreme political polarization. Even under these conditions, his administration issued only brief medical updates and vague physician statements. These summaries did not include cognitive or psychiatric evaluations, nor did they address the potential side effects of treatments known to impair mental clarity. The President's physician, a direct appointee, operated without independent oversight, and there was no external mechanism to verify the content or completeness of the reports released to the public [11].

Meanwhile, signs of cognitive decline were already visible to the public. Observers noted repeated memory lapses, reduced verbal fluency, and episodes of visible confusion during press events and public appearances. These symptoms coincided with a serious illness requiring therapies known to affect cognition. Their concealment suggests not just individual discretion but a broader institutional strategy to control public perception and limit political damage.

Taken together, the delayed disclosure, the lack of formal medical documentation, and the administration's persistent evasiveness highlight a deeper structural failure. The United States currently lacks any legal or institutional mechanism to ensure that the public receives accurate information about the physical and cognitive health of its national leaders. Instead, the system relies on trust, political ethics, and personal discretion—all of which can be undermined by self-interest or partisan loyalty. In this environment, the executive branch retains unchecked authority to obscure serious illness, even when it may compromise national governance and public safety [12].

Escalating Evidence of Cognitive Decline

The late disclosure of President Biden's prostate cancer diagnosis raised significant concerns about medical transparency. However, it was the accumulation of observable behaviors, corroborating reports, and public recordings that deepened doubts about his cognitive fitness to serve. These incidents went beyond partisan speculation. They revealed a consistent pattern of cognitive lapses that, in any other high-stakes field, would have triggered formal evaluation and oversight.

One of the most revealing episodes came from President Biden's October 2023 interview with Special Counsel Robert Hur. In the publicly released audio, Biden repeatedly failed to recall basic chronological facts, including when he served as vice president and the year of his son Beau's death [3]. The recording featured long pauses, disorganized responses, and clear signs of confusion. These lapses were not subtle. They prompted widespread bipartisan concern, and legal and medical experts concluded that they could not be reasonably attributed to normal aging [13].

This concern intensified following the first 2024 presidential debate. Biden appeared disoriented and hesitant throughout the event. He struggled to complete sentences, repeated disconnected phrases, and often failed to respond directly to moderators' questions. His performance, broadcast live to millions, was described by numerous media outlets as halting and disconcerting, even by previously sympathetic commentators [4]. The debate shifted public discourse decisively. What had once been dismissed as minor gaffes now raised the broader question of whether the President remained cognitively capable of performing his duties.

Investigative reporting later revealed that these issues were not unexpected within the White House. Senior aides and close advisors had reportedly been aware of Biden's increasing difficulties with verbal fluency and short-term memory for some time. In response, they structured his public appearances to minimize the risk of exposure. Press conferences were carefully staged, unscripted questions were avoided, and high-level interactions were frequently mediated by staff [5]. These measures were not merely protective. They appeared designed to suppress public recognition of a deeper cognitive decline.

While past presidents have also concealed health issues, Biden's case occurred in a markedly different environment. In the current era of continuous media access, rapid documentation, and increasing public awareness of neurological health, the failure to address visible cognitive deterioration reflects a more systemic collapse of ethical and institutional responsibility. Unlike earlier decades, the tools for transparency now exist. The decision not to use them is both telling and dangerous.

Adding to this concern is the absence of any legal or constitutional mechanism to mandate cognitive evaluation. Although the 25th Amendment provides a process for declaring presidential incapacity, it depends entirely on internal political actors, specifically the Vice President and a majority of Cabinet members, to initiate action. In Biden's case, no such steps were taken. Whether this inaction was driven by loyalty, political calculation, or concern over destabilizing the administration, it highlights the vulnerability of a system that relies on discretion rather than enforceable safeguards [6].

These events reveal a fundamental institutional failure. President Biden's decline was not hidden from public view. It was visible, recorded, and broadly acknowledged. What remained concealed was the unwillingness of those in power to respond. Without binding disclosure laws and independent oversight mechanisms, cognitive impairment at the highest levels of government can remain unchecked, compromising national leadership while evading accountability.

Patient-Doctor Confidentiality Should Not Apply to High-Level Political Leaders

Medical confidentiality is foundational to ethical clinical practice. It protects patient autonomy, dignity, and the integrity of the physician-patient relationship. Laws such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) codify this protection, prohibiting the unauthorized release of personal health information. While such safeguards are essential for the general population, their application to individuals in the highest public offices presents serious risks to democratic accountability.

The President, members of Congress, and Supreme Court Justices wield extraordinary influence over national defense, legal interpretation, emergency response, and the use of military force. These responsibilities demand not just political judgment but continuous cognitive competence and sound decision-making. In fields where lives are routinely at stake, such as aviation, the military, and nuclear command, fitness standards are enforced through medical and psychological evaluations [7]. There is no

principled reason to exempt national leaders from equivalent scrutiny, particularly when their decisions carry even greater implications.

Yet under current law, no mechanism exists to override HIPAA protections for sitting public officials. Physicians who treat the President or other top leaders are under no obligation to share medical findings with Congress, oversight bodies, or the public, even when those findings indicate cognitive decline or serious illness [8]. This legal silence permits those with the most power to operate behind a veil of privacy, shielded from scrutiny even as they make decisions affecting millions. The result is a paradox: the more critical the office, the less transparency it demands.

This is not a hypothetical concern. The Biden administration's management of visible signs of cognitive deterioration demonstrates how medical privacy can be used to suppress essential information. The White House medical team reports directly to the President, and there is no independent body verifying their assessments. Physicians are chosen by the very person they are tasked with evaluating and have no legal duty to disclose objective medical data to the public or to any nonpartisan authority [6]. This creates conditions in which medical reports may serve public relations goals rather than clinical truth.

Exceptions to medical confidentiality already exist when patient behavior poses a broader risk. Physicians may disclose protected information to prevent the spread of infectious disease, report abuse, or warn of threats to public safety. These exceptions are justified by a basic principle: when individual privacy conflicts with collective welfare, the latter may prevail. That principle applies with even greater urgency to leaders who hold nuclear launch authority, interpret constitutional rights, and direct the use of lethal force [14].

To resolve this conflict, Congress should establish a narrowly defined statutory exemption to HIPAA for a specific category of officeholders while they are in service. Physicians treating the President, Vice President, Supreme Court Justices, or congressional leadership should be legally required to report any diagnosis or treatment with implications for cognitive or executive function to an independent medical disclosure commission. This body would verify and publicly release relevant information, ensuring accuracy while guarding against partisan misuse. Such a system would preserve the physician's ethical integrity and align legal confidentiality with democratic need.

Seeking high office is a voluntary act that carries unique public obligations. Individuals who campaign for and accept roles of immense national consequence must also accept a different standard of medical transparency. Complete confidentiality may be appropriate in civilian life, but it cannot extend to those whose cognitive fitness is essential to national security and institutional legitimacy. Public trust depends not only on integrity in governance, but on the public's ability to confirm that such integrity is possible.

Legal and Constitutional Gaps

Despite the extraordinary authority granted to high-ranking federal officials, there is no legal obligation in the United States requiring the disclosure of their medical or cognitive status. A President, Vice President, Supreme Court Justice, or member of Congress may experience significant physical or mental decline without any requirement to inform the public, Congress, or other branches of government. This lack of statutory infrastructure creates a dangerous reliance on voluntary disclosure and personal ethics, both of which are vulnerable to political incentives, loyalty, and discretion.

HIPAA, enacted in 1996, reinforces this opacity by granting full medical privacy to all individuals, including those in public office [8]. There are no exceptions built into the law that account for the special responsibilities of elected leaders. Even when serious illness threatens the capacity to govern, physicians are prohibited from sharing relevant information without patient consent. This legal structure treats the President as a private citizen in matters of health, despite the unique national consequences of presidential incapacity.

The 25th Amendment was designed to address such incapacity but is functionally limited by its dependence on insider action. Section 3 allows the President to voluntarily transfer power, which assumes a level of self-awareness and willingness rarely present in cases of cognitive decline. Section 4 allows the Vice President and a majority of Cabinet members to declare the President unfit. However, these individuals are presidential appointees and may be reluctant to act for fear of political backlash, loss of influence, or institutional instability [6]. The amendment provides no role for external experts or independent medical reviewers, and Congress cannot initiate the process unilaterally.

Even if invoked, the 25th Amendment contains a high barrier to enforcement. Should the President contest the determination, a two-thirds majority in both the House and Senate is required to sustain the transfer of power. In today's polarized political environment, that threshold is unlikely to be met unless the impairment is absolute and undeniable [15]. The amendment is therefore poorly suited to conditions such as progressive cognitive decline, where symptoms may emerge gradually and be difficult to quantify definitively in the short term.

There is also no federal statute that permits Congress, the judiciary, or any independent body to mandate a medical evaluation of sitting officials. Nor does the Constitution establish any minimum health or cognitive standard for eligibility to hold federal office. As a result, the U.S. has operated for decades without a reliable system to ensure that those entrusted with the nation's most sensitive powers remain fit to exercise them. From Roosevelt's hidden heart disease to Kennedy's Addison's disease and Reagan's undiagnosed dementia, the pattern of concealment has been consistent and largely unchallenged [12].

The absence of any mechanism for independent review or compelled disclosure leaves the country exposed to leadership failures caused by preventable or manageable medical conditions. Trust continues to substitute for formal accountability. This legal void protects privacy at the expense of institutional stability and public confidence.

Addressing this problem requires structural reform. Congress should establish a legal framework that mandates routine medical and cognitive assessments for top federal officials. Targeted exceptions to HIPAA must be introduced to allow treating physicians to report relevant findings to an independent, nonpartisan medical disclosure commission. This body must be empowered to review records, verify findings, and release medically significant information to the public. Without such reforms, the health status of America's most powerful leaders will remain subject to political discretion rather than legal oversight or democratic accountability.

International Comparisons

Among democratic nations, the United States is unusually permissive when it comes to the medical privacy of its highest officeholders. While no country has perfected the balance between confidentiality and public accountability, many peer democracies have adopted stronger norms or institutional expectations for disclosing the health status of their leaders. These models demonstrate that transparency and governance stability are not mutually exclusive and that disclosure can be integrated into modern democratic practice.

In the United Kingdom, there is no legal requirement for the Prime Minister to release personal health information. However, public service culture strongly favors transparency. When Prime Minister Boris Johnson was hospitalized with COVID-19 in 2020, the government provided daily updates and confirmed that Foreign Secretary Dominic Raab had been delegated temporary responsibilities [16]. The clarity and speed of this transition reflected a shared understanding that continuity of leadership takes precedence over individual privacy.

France offers another instructive case. Although no formal statute compels health disclosures, French presidents are expected to issue annual medical bulletins, and the Constitutional Council has promoted transparency in matters affecting presidential capacity [17]. A turning point came with the concealment of former President François Mitterrand's prostate cancer diagnosis in 1981. The public learned of the illness only after his death. The backlash from journalists and civil society led to more consistent disclosure practices by future administrations, solidifying a norm of medical openness [18].

Germany likewise relies on strong informal expectations. In 2014, Chancellor Angela Merkel publicly acknowledged injuries sustained during a skiing accident and announced that she would work remotely during recovery. More significantly, in 2019, when Merkel experienced visible tremors during public events, her office provided prompt explanations, attributing the episodes to dehydration and reassuring the public of her functional capacity [19]. These proactive disclosures, though not legally mandated, reflect a governance culture that treats transparency as integral to public leadership.

By comparison, the United States maintains a culture of medical secrecy reinforced by legal silence. There are no statutes requiring public disclosure of a sitting President's health status, nor is there an independent agency with authority to review or release such information. Historically, American presidents have concealed significant health issues, including Franklin D. Roosevelt's heart disease and paralysis, John F. Kennedy's Addison's disease, and Ronald Reagan's early symptoms of Alzheimer's [10, 20]. Even informal norms in the U.S. are weak. When medical reports are issued, they are often vague, carefully edited by loyal physicians, and omit critical information such as cognitive assessments.

Other democracies have responded to past concealment with strengthened expectations of transparency. The United States, by contrast, has failed to evolve its legal and cultural approach. The result is a governance system where vital medical information can be hidden indefinitely, even when it directly affects national leadership.

This international contrast reveals a key lesson: transparency does not destabilize leadership. On the contrary, it can reinforce public trust and ensure smoother transitions in times of crisis. In an era marked by political polarization and declining institutional confidence, aligning with global democratic norms offers a practical and ethical path forward. The United States has the capacity to do so. What it lacks is the will to prioritize institutional integrity over individual discretion.

Proposed Legal and Policy Framework

The current approach to medical and cognitive fitness among U.S. public officials contains structural deficiencies that demand urgent legal reform. As recent cases have shown, relying on voluntary disclosure, political discretion, or staff gatekeeping leaves the public exposed to potential governance failures. To ensure the continuity and legitimacy of constitutional leadership, the United States must adopt a legally binding framework for medical transparency, one grounded in law, oversight, and institutional accountability rather than trust alone.

At the core of this framework should be a requirement for annual, publicly accessible medical disclosures from individuals holding high constitutional offices. This would apply to the President, Vice President, Supreme Court Justices, and congressional leadership. These disclosures must include comprehensive cognitive, neurological, and physical assessments, along with the status of any chronic or high-risk conditions such as cancer or cardiovascular disease. Evaluations must be conducted by independent, board-certified specialists who have no affiliation with political offices. Reports should be submitted in full, rather than as summaries or selectively edited statements, and made publicly available through a centralized, nonpartisan platform such as the Government Accountability Office or a newly established public integrity office [21].

To implement such transparency, existing privacy laws must be amended. HIPAA, while essential for protecting the medical privacy of private citizens, is incompatible with the unique obligations of public service at the highest level. A narrowly tailored legal exemption should apply to elected and appointed officials during their time in office. Physicians treating these individuals must be required to report any diagnoses or treatments that could impair executive function to an independent medical review body. These exemptions should remain limited in both scope and duration, designed to ensure accountability while preserving the integrity of the physician-patient relationship [8].

Oversight must be independent and shielded from political interference. A standing medical disclosure commission should be established, composed of experts in medicine, bioethics, and constitutional law. This body would be responsible for reviewing and verifying submitted records, requesting follow-up evaluations when necessary, and ensuring the accuracy and completeness of disclosures. It would also serve as a secure channel for whistleblowers, allowing individuals to report concerns about concealment or medical misrepresentation without fear of retaliation [14]. The commission's role would be to promote institutional transparency while minimizing opportunities for partisan misuse.

Although the 25th Amendment was designed to address presidential incapacity, it also requires reform. It currently depends on voluntary presidential declaration or internal Cabinet action, neither of which can be reliably expected in politically sensitive situations. The amendment includes no mechanism for external medical referral or objective review. A revised model should allow the medical disclosure commission to initiate a nonbinding clinical evaluation based on credible evidence or public concern. These findings would help inform, but not override, the constitutional process, maintaining the balance of powers while introducing expert input [6].

Enforcement mechanisms are essential to ensure compliance. Officials who refuse to participate in mandated disclosures should face formal censure, loss of eligibility for reelection, or the forfeiture of federal benefits and privileges. Physicians who knowingly falsify or suppress relevant medical information should be referred to professional licensing boards. At the same time, staff members, medical professionals, or government employees who raise concerns in good faith should receive legal protections under strengthened federal whistleblower laws and be permitted to submit concerns through confidential, independent channels [22].

These reforms are not intended as punishment but as preventive safeguards. They align the expectations of public service with the standards already in place for other high-risk professions such as aviation, medicine, and national security. By closing the gap between private medical confidentiality and public accountability, these changes would strengthen democratic institutions and help guard against the dangers of hidden illness and undetected cognitive decline.

Counterarguments and Ethical Challenges

Calls for mandatory health transparency for elected officials raise valid ethical and legal concerns. Critics point to risks involving privacy violations, political weaponization, and potential discrimination against older candidates or those managing chronic conditions. These concerns merit consideration. However, when evaluated alongside the responsibilities of public office and the stakes of national decision-making, the case for transparency becomes stronger. The goal is not to eliminate medical privacy but to redefine its scope for individuals in positions of exceptional public power.

The most common objection is that health disclosure infringes upon the individual's right to privacy. While medical privacy is a core principle in both ethics and constitutional law, it is not absolute. U.S. public health law allows for privacy limitations when public welfare is at stake [21]. Public officials already accept constraints on their privacy. For example, financial disclosures and national security background checks are routine

expectations to hold various roles within government. Health information that directly impacts cognitive function or executive decision-making should be subject to similar obligations. If a president holds authority to deploy military force or manage national crises, the public has a legitimate right to understand whether they retain the capacity to do so.

Another concern is the potential for politicization or media sensationalism if health records are disclosed. This risk is real, but it already exists in the current system. In the absence of formal mechanisms, public discourse around a leader's health is shaped by speculation, anonymous leaks, and partisan narratives [23]. Implementing a standardized, nonpartisan process based on clinical evaluation and verified documentation would reduce misinformation and anchor the conversation in fact rather than rumor. Structured disclosure is more likely to minimize political abuse than to encourage it.

Some argue that transparency mandates could discourage capable individuals with chronic conditions or disabilities from seeking public office. This concern can be addressed through thoughtful policy design. A well-crafted framework should focus on functional capacity rather than diagnostic labels. Individuals should not be disqualified because of age or a stable medical condition but should be evaluated based on their ability to fulfill the responsibilities of their role [24]. This reflects the individualized assessment approach used in employment and education, where accommodations are tailored to function, not diagnosis.

A further challenge involves the physician-patient relationship. Medical professionals are understandably concerned that breaching confidentiality could undermine patient trust and deter future care-seeking. However, physicians treating elected leaders are not private providers in the conventional sense. They care for individuals whose health directly affects national governance. In similarly high-stakes fields such as military service, aviation, and intelligence, physicians already follow disclosure requirements designed to protect public safety [14]. These models can be adapted for public office through narrowly defined exceptions that serve the public interest without dismantling the ethical foundation of clinical care.

Finally, some critics argue that such reforms are incompatible with American values of liberty and personal autonomy. But public office is not private life. It is a position of profound responsibility, often involving decisions that impact millions. With such power comes the obligation to demonstrate ongoing fitness to serve. In this context, transparency is not an unjustified intrusion; it is a necessary condition for democratic accountability.

The ethical challenge is not whether privacy should be protected, but how to balance that protection with the public's right to competent leadership. Maintaining secrecy in public office may protect political appearances, but it undermines institutional trust and increases the risk of governance by individuals whose capacity is diminished. A carefully designed disclosure system, grounded in public interest and supported by legal oversight, can help reconcile individual dignity with the resilience of democratic institutions. Failing to act poses a far greater risk, not only to policy outcomes, but to the legitimacy of leadership itself.

Conclusion

The delayed disclosure of President Biden's advanced cancer diagnosis and the public signs of cognitive decline have highlighted gaps in the legal and ethical framework governing the health transparency of U.S. leadership. These events raised serious questions about the adequacy of current safeguards and the reliance on informal practices rather than enforceable standards. Public moments, such as the Hur interview and the 2024 debate, illustrated the risks posed when cognitive impairment is suspected but not formally addressed.

This issue is not limited to one presidency. For decades, the United States has operated without clear requirements for medical or cognitive disclosure among its highest officials. The lack of routine evaluations, independent review, and legal mechanisms for timely disclosure has created an environment where significant health concerns may go unexamined by the public and unchecked by institutions.

This paper argues that individuals entrusted with the nation's most consequential responsibilities must be held to higher standards of transparency. Regular, independent medical evaluations should be required, and findings relevant to cognitive or executive function must be reported to a neutral oversight body. Updates to the 25th Amendment should be considered to allow for external input when signs of incapacity are present but not addressed internally.

While privacy concerns are valid, public office carries obligations that differ from those of private citizens. The authority to govern must come with the responsibility to demonstrate continued fitness to serve. Without reform, the nation remains vulnerable to governance failures stemming from undetected or unacknowledged impairment. To preserve public trust and institutional integrity, structural safeguards must replace assumptions of good faith.

Declarations

All journal policies and submission guidelines were carefully reviewed to ensure full compliance, and the manuscript has not been previously published or submitted elsewhere. The author declares no conflicts of interest. No human, animal, or plant subjects were involved in this literature review, so ethics approval, participant consent, and studies involving plants are not applicable. Additionally, no personal details, images, or videos of individuals are included, which makes publication consent unnecessary. The research did not receive external funding, and no data or supplementary materials are associated with the manuscript. Grammarly AI was used solely to refine grammar, syntax, and paragraph structure. It did not generate ideas or content, thereby preserving the originality of the work.

References :

1. McDonald E (2025) What former President Biden's prostate cancer diagnosis tells us about the disease and treatments. Houston Chronicle, 19 May 2025.
2. Gonzalez BD, Jim HS, Booth-Jones M, et al. (2015) Course and predictors of cognitive function in patients with prostate cancer receiving androgen-deprivation therapy: A controlled comparison. J Clin Oncol 33:2021–2027.
3. Cameron C (2025) Audio of special counsel interview adds to renewed debate of Biden's fitness as president. New York Times, 16 May 2025.
4. Miller Z (2024) Biden's debate performance spurs Democratic panic about his ability to lead party against Trump. AP News, 28 Jun 2024.
5. Restuccia A, Linskey A, Glazer E, et al. (2024) How Biden's inner circle worked to keep signs of aging under wraps. MSN, 8 Jul 2024.
6. Goldstein JK (2019) Celebrating the presidential inability provisions of the Twenty-fifth Amendment. Con Law NOW 10:119
7. Federal Aviation Administration (2024) FAA requires aviation organizations to detect, address safety risks early.
8. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (n.d.) Summary of the HIPAA Privacy Rule.
9. Denean A (2025) Presidents and their long history of being secretive or deceptive on their health. The National News Desk, 22 May 2025.
10. Caldwell D, McKeown TJ (eds) (2018) Diplomacy, force, and leadership: Essays in honor of Alexander L. George. Routledge, New York
11. Fuchs H (2025) Comer calls Biden's physician, former aides to sit for interviews. POLITICO, 22 May 2025.

12. Rozell MJ (2021) Executive privilege: Presidential power, secrecy, and accountability. University Press of Kansas, La Vergne
13. Gong S, Hu ZP, Ghaemi SN, et al. (2024) Cognitive decline and political leadership. Politics Life Sci 43:185–197
14. Hall MA, Bobinski MA, Orentlicher D (2008) Medical liability and treatment relationships
15. Tribe L, Matz J (2018) To end a presidency: The power of impeachment. Hachette UK
16. Mason R (2020) Boris Johnson 'stable' in intensive care and not on ventilator, says No 10. The Guardian, 7 Apr 2020.
17. Sokol RP (1999) Freedom of expression in France: The Mitterrand-Dr. Gubler affair. Tul J Int Comp L 7:5
18. Nester WR (2014) President Mitterrand. In: De Gaulle's legacy: The art of power in France's Fifth Republic. Palgrave Macmillan US, New York, pp 111–150
19. Schiffers M, Plümer S (2023) Obstacles on the path to lobbying transparency in Europe: Assessing the German turning point at the end of the Merkel era. In: Janusch H, Mucha W, Schwanholz J, et al. (eds) Turning points: Challenges for Western democracies in the 21st century, pp 279–308
20. Evans HE (2016) The hidden campaign: FDR's health and the 1944 election. Routledge
21. Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists, Gostin LO, Hodge JG (2004) Public health practice vs. research: A report for public health practitioners including cases and guidance for making distinctions. Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists
22. Myers A (2025) The global rise in whistleblowing laws: International trends in protection. Int Union Rights 32:9–12
23. Kesselheim AS (2002) Privacy versus the public's right to know—Presidential health and the White House physician. J Leg Med 23:523–545
24. Silvers A, Francis LP (2005) Justice through trust: Disability and the "outlier problem" in social contract theory. Ethics 116:40–76

DOI:10.31579/2637-8892/342