

Article Reflection, NHPR, DEI Challenges, Support

Republicans make a simple request: no taxpayer funding for race-based programs. DEI targets White males specifically. It is inherently biased, racist, and left-leaning. Because of DEI programming, it is now rare to see White males in college advertisements. At some DEI universities, not one White individual is shown on their websites. Many advertisements have become far too urban, foreign, and *bizarre*.

It is deeply disturbing, as the political goal has become rapid demographic change and exclusion of White Americans rather than equality. Because of radicalism and extremism, but also because of foreign maligned “piggy-backing” campaigns, these facts are clear. It assumes a position of revenge politics rather than fairness. It goes against the natural grain of the United States because it is a form of force rather than freedom.

For example, in New Hampshire, where the population is still majority White, it does not serve their best interests to pay for programs that contribute to their own removal and replacement, or their own loss of access to college opportunities. It is reminiscent of the Expulsion of the Acadians, where a newcomer nation forced them out of their natural territory and into indentured servitude and slavery. The newcomers installed an entirely different culture. Education systems then began indoctrinating Acadians; they were no longer allowed to speak their own language or remember their own culture, traditions, and history. Essentially, the Acadian people suffered genocide, cleansing, and historic erasure.

This trauma has lasted and continues still today for many New Hampshire residents. Centuries later, and fully assimilated into American culture, many are unaware of this history and unaware that they are Acadian. The newcomers succeeded through very similar programming. These were crimes against humanity then, and these historic harms remain today, which is why the Acadian people are a minority population in the USA.

There is no benefit for White taxpayers to fund systems that disadvantage them in order to elevate others. This is the definition of slavery. Democrats create and appeal to fear. They overly sensitize the issue, even though Republicans simply want less suppression, racism, discrimination, and taxation slavery against White Americans.

While many people can understand why Democrats are standing up for certain programs, the existence of girls’ sports and similar programs should be a given. This is not what Republicans are taking issue with. Republicans have been very direct and vocal about exactly what they are against: forced DEI programming and forced mass

immigration and assimilation. It is important to be clear that the spread of fear and propaganda, when the debate itself is very simple and straightforward, is exactly why the agendas of these two parties are now in civil conflict and why social cohesion between them has frayed.

Below, I have listed the logical fallacies I found in the article. Mediation must occur and must support both parties in a way that is amicable and just. Right now, Whites are facing severe and aggressive racism, to the point of economic instability, political trafficking, theft, looting, and homelessness, as well as territorial harms such as Mexican cartel-supported fentanyl overdoses on the streets. This is akin to World War II ghettoization. The patterns are very clear; the extremist and cruel view by radical politicians has been that when one suffers, the other yields results. Now Americans face a Cold War.

Whites make up a slim majority but are increasingly targeted and rapidly diminishing as a demographic. Ethnic White Americans are hardly seen in some cities and are assuredly the new minority. New Hampshire residents deserve our protections. Humanity trumps racial bias and radical extremist ideology, these concerns must be handled with our care and our sincere attention.

White Americans can no longer continue footing the bill so that others may stand on their necks, backs, and graves. We need protections, and we need them now. The future of the USA is not “Black,” “Hispanic,” “African,” “Female,” “Mexican,” or any other category of human beings; it is clearly American. We are not free so long as we are forced against our conscience to support ideologies that actively work to harm and suppress us. Where one is excluded, all suffer.

Cowdrey

Source: <https://www.nhpr.org/nh-news/2025-08-08/nhs-new-anti-dei-law-faces-lawsuit-and-poses-financial-risks-to-schools>

Logical Fallacies:

Article

[NHPR article on New Hampshire’s anti-DEI law](#)

1. Appeal to Fear / Slippery Slope

The article repeatedly emphasizes catastrophic funding consequences:

schools could lose “millions of dollars”

and references “massive” consequences. ([New Hampshire Public Radio](#))

Why critics may call this a fallacy

The argument can be interpreted as:

- “Because there could be severe penalties, the law itself is illegitimate.”

Many laws carry severe penalties. The severity alone does not prove constitutional invalidity.

Counterpoint

The lawsuit’s legal argument is actually more nuanced:

- vague law + severe penalties + no clear standards = unconstitutional chilling effect.

That is a recognized constitutional argument, especially in First Amendment jurisprudence. The media framing may amplify fear more than legal analysis.

2. Slippery Slope Hypotheticals

The article asks whether the law could prohibit:

- girls’ sports teams,
- anti-bullying programs,
- tuition waivers for seniors,
- lessons about bigotry,
- disability accommodations. ([New Hampshire Public Radio](#))

Potential fallacy

This can resemble a slippery slope:

- “If this law exists, then ordinary educational programs may become illegal.”

The article does not establish that those outcomes would actually occur, only that plaintiffs fear they might.

Counterpoint

In constitutional law, hypothetical applications are often relevant when arguing a statute is “vague” or “overbroad.” Courts do consider whether a law could reasonably chill lawful conduct.

So legally, they may encourage readers to imagine worst-case scenarios before courts interpret the law.

3. Ambiguity / Equivocation Around “DEI”

A central issue is that “DEI” is treated as a broad category without a precise definition. ([New Hampshire Public Radio](#))

Why this matters logically

Different parties are using “DEI” differently:

- Critics define DEI broadly as inclusion/support efforts.
- Supporters define DEI narrowly as demographic preference systems.

This creates equivocation:

- the same term is being used with different meanings in different arguments.

That can make the debate appear more polarized than it actually is.

4. Loaded Language / Framing Bias

The article and quoted advocacy groups use emotionally charged phrases:

- “radical”
- “crippling penalties”
- “judge, jury and executioner”
- “desperate attempt”
- “force their political ideology” ([New Hampshire Public Radio](#))

Why critics may object

These are persuasive rhetorical devices rather than factual demonstrations. They encourage emotional interpretation.

Examples:

- “judge, jury and executioner” implies authoritarian abuse.
- “radical activist groups” frames plaintiffs negatively.
- “crippling penalties” intensifies emotional impact.

These phrases are common in political reporting because journalists quote advocates directly, but they are still rhetorical rather than analytical.

5. Possible Strawman Framing

Some arguments imply the law could ban:

- teaching about racism,
- anti-bullying efforts,
- disability accommodations. ([New Hampshire Public Radio](#))

Potential strawman concern

Critics of the article might argue:

- supporters of the law did not explicitly state they wanted to ban those things,
- therefore opponents are exaggerating the law’s intended purpose.

Counterpoint

The plaintiffs’ argument is that vague wording creates uncertainty, not necessarily that lawmakers explicitly intended those results.

So whether this is a strawman depends on whether one interprets the examples as:

- “this definitely will happen,” or
- “this could plausibly happen under vague enforcement.”

6. Appeal to Authority

The article relies heavily on:

- ACLU attorneys,
- advocacy organizations,
- federal judges,
- education officials. ([New Hampshire Public Radio](#))

Logical concern

Statements from legal experts are sometimes presented in a way that may imply:

- “because legal experts say this is unconstitutional, it must be unconstitutional.”

But courts had not fully resolved the merits at the time of reporting.

Counterpoint

Legal reporting necessarily depends heavily on expert/legal interpretation, so some reliance on authority is expected.

7. Incomplete Context / Selection Bias

The article strongly emphasizes:

- risks to marginalized groups,
- uncertainty,
- financial danger,
- constitutional concerns. ([New Hampshire Public Radio](#))

But it gives comparatively limited exploration of:

- public arguments against DEI programs,
- equal-protection arguments from supporters,
- concerns about ideological coercion,
- polling data,
- specific examples supporters view as discriminatory.

Why this is important

A critic could argue this creates narrative imbalance:

- one side’s harms are detailed extensively,
- the other side’s rationale is summarized briefly.

This may shape reader perception.

Stronger Logical Arguments in the Article

Not everything in the article is fallacious. Some arguments are legally coherent:

Vagueness Doctrine Argument

The strongest legal claim is:

1. The law is vague,
2. penalties are severe,
3. schools cannot clearly determine compliance,
4. therefore lawful speech/programs may be chilled. ([New Hampshire Public Radio](#))

That is a recognized constitutional framework and not merely emotional rhetoric.

Overall Assessment

The article contains:

- emotionally persuasive framing,
- speculative hypotheticals,
- broad terminology,
- adversarial political rhetoric.

The most plausible fallacies or weak argumentative techniques are:

- slippery slope reasoning,
- appeal to fear,
- equivocation around “DEI,”
- loaded language,
- partial strawman framing.

However, the article also includes legitimate constitutional arguments regarding vagueness and due process that are not inherently fallacious. The distinction is important:

- some parts are legal analysis,
- some parts are rhetorical persuasion,
- some are advocacy quotes presented through journalism.