

Negative Effects of DEI on Americans

DEI became about hiring “Democrats” and foreigners rather than supporting the American people. It was used as a Trojan horse. Sadly, it still is.

DEI has been far worse than any race- or sex-based discrimination in U.S. history. It normalized racism and sexism against the American people, particularly White males. Not only did it normalize this discrimination, but it also systematized it, completely replacing and altering the culture of the United States to support some, but not others.

It said, “we need to get rid of systemic racism, by replacing it with systemic racism, globalism, and sexism.”

Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) programs have been used by U.S. government agencies, universities, and private employers to address representation, workplace culture, and equal opportunity. The effects depend on the program's design and implementation.

The main criticisms concern fairness, discrimination, merit-based selection, costs, free speech, and social division. These are the principal areas where DEI policies have been alleged to harm Americans, along with the evidence needed to assess each claim.

1. Discrimination Against Americans

One of the most serious criticisms is that DEI policies can disadvantage applicants or employees if race or sex influences hiring, promotion, training, or other opportunities.

Examples include:

- A qualified applicant being passed over because an employer favors a candidate of a particular race.
- Employees being excluded from mentoring programs or professional development because of their race or sex.
- Promotion decisions being influenced by demographic targets instead of individual qualifications and performance.
- Workers feeling that they are being judged by their identity rather than their work.

These are not merely hypothetical legal concerns. The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission states that employment practices motivated in whole or in part by protected characteristics can violate federal law, regardless of which group is harmed. Whether a particular DEI program is unlawful depends on its actual practices and the applicable law.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

Official source: <https://www.eeoc.gov/wysk/what-you-should-know-about-dei-related-discrimination-work>

2. College Admissions and Educational Opportunity

The debate over DEI has included whether universities should consider race when selecting students.

In June 2023, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against the admissions programs challenged at Harvard and the University of North Carolina. The decision restricted the use of race in college admissions under the circumstances examined by the Court.

Critics argue that race-conscious selection can disadvantage applicants who do not receive a preference, including some White and Asian American applicants. Supporters of diversity initiatives argue that considering applicants' experiences and backgrounds can help universities understand achievement in context.

The central distinction is between considering an applicant's individual experiences and assigning an advantage or disadvantage based on race itself.

Official source: https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/22pdf/20-1199_l6gn.pdf

3. Workplace Division and Racial Tension

DEI programs can create conflict when employees believe that they are being blamed for historical injustices, expected to accept political viewpoints, or treated differently because of their identity.

Potential negative effects include:

- Distrust between coworkers.
- Resentment over perceived preferential treatment.
- Concerns about compelled political or ideological statements.
- Training that stereotypes people or assigns collective guilt based on race.
- Fear of expressing a contrary opinion at work.

These outcomes are not inevitable. Training focused on respectful conduct, equal opportunity, and preventing discrimination differs from training that makes assumptions about individuals based on their racial or ethnic background.

4. Costs to Taxpayers and Businesses

DEI offices, consultants, training programs, administrative positions, and reporting requirements can consume public and private resources.

For American taxpayers, legitimate questions include whether these programs deliver measurable improvements, whether their costs are justified, and whether the same funds could provide greater benefits if spent on core services.

The Government Accountability Office has documented DEI-related staffing, management practices, and implementation challenges across federal agencies. Its findings do not establish that every DEI program wastes money, but they demonstrate why agencies need clear objectives and measurable results.

U.S. Government Accountability Office

Official source: <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-23-106254>

5. Merit, Qualifications, and Public Confidence

When organizations prioritize demographic representation without adequately measuring individual competence, critics worry that hiring and promotion standards may become less transparent or consistent.

Possible consequences include:

- Reduced confidence in whether positions are awarded on merit.
- Concerns about qualifications in safety-critical or highly technical roles.
- Doubts about the fairness of promotion and scholarship decisions.
- Reputational damage when an organization cannot explain its selection criteria.

However, demographic diversity alone does not prove that standards have been lowered or that a person is unqualified. Establishing that harm occurred requires evidence about the actual selection process, qualifications, and outcomes.

6. Free Speech and Ideological Pressure

Some DEI programs have faced criticism for discouraging disagreement or treating particular political or social beliefs as requirements for being a good employee or student.

Potential harms include self-censorship, complaints of unfair treatment, and reduced trust in institutions. These concerns are strongest when participation is compulsory, training presents disputed interpretations as unquestionable facts, or employees face retaliation for expressing protected objections.

Organizations can address discrimination and encourage respectful behavior without requiring everyone to agree on political questions.

7. A Lack of Accountability

A further criticism is that institutions sometimes measure success through demographic representation or participation in training rather than through outcomes that directly benefit employees, students, customers, or the public.

The GAO has identified weaknesses in how some federal agencies analyzed workforce barriers and measured DEIA-related objectives. For example, its 2024 IRS review found

incomplete performance measures and a lack of a unified strategy for evaluating certain DEIA goals.

U.S. Government Accountability Office

That supports a specific concern about accountability in federal programs, rather than proving that DEI as a whole has harmed the American public.

Summary: Potential Negative Effects of DEI on Americans

1. Discrimination against individuals when race or sex improperly influences employment decisions.
2. Reduced confidence in merit-based hiring, promotion, and admissions.
3. Workplace division and resentment over perceived preferential treatment.
4. Taxpayer and business costs without adequately demonstrated benefits.
5. Pressure to conform to particular ideological viewpoints.
6. Reduced trust in institutions that apply inconsistent standards.
7. Administrative burdens that divert resources from core public services.
8. Legal exposure when policies violate civil rights protections.
9. Damage to workplace relationships when training stereotypes or assigns collective blame.
10. Weak accountability when programs lack clear goals and measurable results.

The important distinction is that these are potential or documented harms associated with particular policies and implementations, not proof that every DEI initiative produces these outcomes. Programs that expand access, prevent discrimination, and accommodate disabilities can also benefit Americans.

The most defensible standard is equal treatment under the law, fair consideration of individual qualifications, freedom of expression, transparent spending, and measurable results. Those standards can be applied to any institution, regardless of its political position on DEI.