

SLI REPORT

Shadow Government



STATE
LEADERSHIP
INITIATIVE

[@RedStatesLead](https://twitter.com/RedStatesLead)
stateleadership.org

Executive Summary

It is a strange feature of American politics that conservative states often enact progressive policies. Republican voters elect Republican governors and legislatures — only to find their states governed by the same DEI mandates, ESG principles, and left-wing administrative orthodoxy that prevail in blue states. This is no accident. It is the product of a coordinated system of ideological entrenchment operating behind the scenes of state government.

At the center of that system are national associations of state officials: nominally neutral, officially nonpartisan, and in reality, the vanguard of progressive governance. These associations issue policy templates, draft regulations, broker federal grants, and shape the internal culture of government agencies. Their materials are rarely scrutinized by voters or elected officials, but they are treated as gospel by career bureaucrats. Through this mechanism, leftist policy becomes the baseline for red-state governance, without a single vote cast.

This report sets out the structure and substance of that quiet conquest:

- **The mechanisms of influence:** Trainings, resolutions, federal funding pipelines, and “best practices” serve to coordinate bureaucratic alignment with progressive causes.
- **The ideological content:** Leftwing ideals like DEI orthodoxy, anti-racism mandates, climate-based economic policy, and federal expansionism are advanced not as options, but as administrative defaults.
- **Case studies:** The appendix contains a list of over 20 national organizations that have participated in this seizure of power. There are dozens more than deserve to be on this list; this is merely a starting point. For each currently on the list, notable transgressions are listed but are far from comprehensive.

The result is not just policy drift. It is a subversion of self-government. When unelected associations dictate how agencies operate — and do so in lockstep with

federal bureaucracies and activist NGOs — the will of the people is rendered moot. Republican officials are not merely thwarted; they are trapped in a system designed to resist course correction.

But states resigning themselves to this subversion as “part of the system” is not their sole choice. As this report shows, states have tools at their disposal: withdrawal, oversight, reform, and the creation of rival associations. What they lack is not authority, but clarity of purpose. This report provides both: it names the problem, dissects the machinery, and proposes remedies grounded in constitutional principle and political courage.

Investigated Organizations

Association	Revenue (\$Millions)	Members	Employees & Volunteers	Founded
<u>NAIC (Natl. Assn. of Insurance Commissioners)</u>	\$156.60	56	N/A	1871
<u>AASHTO (American Assn. of St. Hwy. & Transp. Officials)</u>	\$121.59	52	330	1914
<u>CSBS (Conference of St. Bank Supervisors)</u>	\$92.85	55	269	1902
<u>ASTHO (Assn. of St. and Territorial Health Officials)</u>	\$70.34	59	345	1942
<u>NASPO (Natl. Assn. of St. Procurement Officials)</u>	\$34.65	56	549	1947
<u>CCSSO (Council of Chief St. School Officers)</u>	\$27.91	58	77	1927
<u>GASB (Governmental Accounting Standards Board)</u>	\$18.58	7	N/A	1984
<u>NGA (Natl. Governors Assn.)</u>	\$15.80	55	N/A	1908
<u>NARUC (Natl. Assn. of Regulatory Utility Commissioners)</u>	\$15.73	53	+29	1889
<u>NSBA (Natl. School Boards Assn.)</u>	\$8.73	50	34	1940
<u>NASEO (Natl. Assn. of St. Energy Officials)</u>	\$7.92	56	38	1986
<u>NASF (Natl. Assn. of St. Foresters)</u>	\$7.15	59	N/A	1920
<u>NCSL (Natl. Assn. of St. Legislatures)</u>	\$6.45	43	43	1975
<u>NASCIO (Natl. Assn. of St. Chief Information Officers)</u>	\$6.36	56	92	1969
<u>AFWA (Assn. of Fish & Wildlife Agencies)</u>	\$6.20	56	26	1902
<u>NAMD (Natl. Assn. of St. Medicaid Directors)</u>	\$5.04	56	27	2011
<u>NEMA (Natl. Emergency Management Assn.)</u>	\$4.84	59	N/A	1974
<u>NAST (Natl. Assn. of St. Treasurers)</u>	\$3.62	~56	N/A	1976
<u>NASACT (Natl. Assn. of St. Auditors, Comptrollers & Treasurers)</u>	\$3.47	136	15	1916
<u>NAAG (Natl. Assn. of Attorneys General)</u>	\$3.26	~52	7	1907
<u>ECOS (Environmental Council of the States)</u>	\$2.99	56	41	1993
<u>NASBE (Natl. Assn. of St. Boards of Education)</u>	\$1.70	150	96	1958
<u>NASS (Natl. Assn. of Secretaries of State)</u>	\$1.46	~56	6	1904
<u>NASPE (Natl. Assn. of St. Personnel Executives)</u>	\$0.65	56	N/A	1977

Overview

I. THE ILLUSION OF CONTROL

Conservative leaders are fond of declaring victory. They win elections, pass legislation, and appoint agency heads with great fanfare, yet, on issue after issue, the administrative state trudges forward in open defiance of their mandate: enforcing equity initiatives, embedding climate policy, and advancing bureaucratic priorities wholly alien to the voters who ostensibly elected the government. This disconnect is not incidental. It is structural.

The illusion is that electoral control yields policy control. The reality is that modern governance runs on rails laid by institutions beyond the reach of any one legislature. National associations of Medicaid directors, insurance commissioners, education officers, budget chiefs, etc. all define the architecture within which state officials operate. Their model policies, regulatory frameworks, and federal guidance documents arrive in inboxes pre-baked and pre-cleared. The republican belief in the importance of scrutiny and debate fails utterly here, as the policies are implemented almost without thought.

Consider a newly elected Republican governor. He inherits agencies staffed by civil servants who attend association conferences, download association policy templates, and submit to association “technical assistance.” They do not require permission to continue these activities, nor do they do not need legislation to justify them. In fact, for most cases, they do not even need to inform their superiors. The real power lies in continuity, and the associations provide it.

This is how states governed by conservatives find themselves adhering to DEI targets in transportation contracts, “equity-centered” Medicaid eligibility policies, and speech codes masquerading as professional standards. These policies are not the residue of prior administrations; they are the active work product of national bodies. Ultimately, this leads to one critical insight: the ideological left does not need to win a single statehouse so long as it controls the bureaucratic bloodstream.

And yet, these associations remain cloaked in proce-

dural neutrality: they call themselves nonpartisan and they claim to represent best practices. But neutrality in form does not excuse partiality in function. If all the “best practices” point to leftwing creeds, the outcome is indistinguishable from ideological capture — only more difficult to detect and harder to dislodge.

The conservative movement has too often accepted this arrangement as the price of professionalism. That is a grave mistake. No state can govern itself if its governance is outsourced. And no voter’s choice matters if the mechanisms of government are set in stone by distant, unaccountable bodies. Elections are not enough. Without structural independence from captured associations, political victory becomes a mirage.

II. THE MECHANISMS OF INFLUENCE

To the casual observer, a national association of government officials looks harmless enough: a trade group, perhaps, or a professional guild. They host conferences. They publish white papers. They offer “technical assistance” and “best practices.” Who could object?

Only someone who reads the fine print.

These associations do not merely reflect consensus among bureaucrats but, in fact, create it. Their tools are varied, but their goal is singular: to steer the internal policy machinery of state government, regardless of which party holds power. How they achieve this influence is subtle in appearance, but powerful in effect.

1. Policy Documents as De Facto Regulation

Associations routinely issue model legislation, regulatory frameworks, and “guidance” that is adopted wholesale by state agencies. These are not suggestions in any meaningful sense. Bureaucrats, eager to meet professional benchmarks and federal compliance goals, treat these templates as mandatory. The result is a form of governance by memo: policy without politics.

2. Trainings and Professional Development

What begins as a seminar ends as an orthodoxy. State employees, especially mid- and senior-level admin-

istrators, are sent to association-led trainings where they receive instruction on the latest DEI frameworks, climate reporting metrics, or equity mandates. These sessions are not politically neutral. They are ideological indoctrination with a bureaucratic gloss.

3. Federal Grant Partnerships

The associations serve as middlemen between federal agencies and state offices, offering grant application assistance and implementation support. However, this is only for projects aligned with progressive goals. Want money for “transportation equity”? There’s a grant for that. But want funding for race-neutral road improvement? Good luck. The result is soft coercion through selective subsidy.

4. Consensus Manufacturing

Perhaps the most pernicious mechanism is the illusion of unanimity. By convening agency heads from all fifty states, associations generate statements of “shared priorities” (almost always coded in progressive language) and then circulate these declarations as if they reflect nationwide agreement. Dissenters are marginalized. Conformity becomes the professional expectation.

Taken together, these mechanisms do not merely guide governance but actually substitute for it. The result is to cut legislators out, to sideline governors. And the people, whose consent is the only legitimate source of political authority, are nowhere in view.

This is not how federalism was meant to function. It is how soft despotism operates: through procedure, professionalization, and the slow erosion of democratic control.

III. THE IDEOLOGY THEY ENFORCE

National associations do not merely offer technical assistance or procedural guidance. They embed and enforce a unified ideological program that consistently reflects the values and priorities of the institutional left. And this program is not subtle. It is explicit, formalized, and actively operationalized across nearly every policy domain.

What follows is a structured account of the ideological

content championed by these associations, with representative citations for each domain.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)

- **NAMD (Medicaid)** declared equity — not outcomes — as the “foundational principle” of reform and urged states to prioritize Medicaid services based on racial identity.
- **NAST** created a standing DEI committee, with state treasurers hosting monthly DEI events and embedding DEI into office operations.
- **ASTHO** declared “structural racism” a public health emergency, integrating DEI into all member programming and launching a “Policy Academy” to train officials in anti-racism governance.
- **NASPE** institutionalized equity analytics, requiring states to disaggregate DEI metrics across multiple identity lines and normalize DEI messaging in routine HR operations.
- **NCSL** promoted equity metrics in bail reform, policing, and sentencing. It trained legislators to use “equity notes” to measure the demographic impact of criminal statutes.
- **NGA** amplified blue-state reforms like effective policing techniques and expanding “bias training,” even in conservative jurisdictions.

Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG)

- **NAST** defended ESG investing as part of fiduciary duty, organizing Democratic treasurers to lobby the SEC and Department of Labor. In January 2025, 17 Democratic state treasurers coordinated through NAST sent an open letter endorsing ESG as a prudent investment strategy—arguing that considerations like climate risk and workforce diversity were necessary components of responsible stewardship.
- **NASACT** normalized ESG under the leadership of Treasurer Michael Frerichs, whose 2019 Illinois law mandated board diversity and climate-risk disclosure in public finance. As NASACT president, Frerichs used the platform to spotlight ESG themes

in webinars, training, and publications—effectively positioning ESG as the default model for public-sector financial management.

- **NAIC** required insurers to file climate-risk disclosures aligned with the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), a U.N.-backed global framework. This mandate embedded ESG-style metrics into the regulatory fabric of insurance offices nationwide, including red states with no formal ESG statutes.
- **GASB**, through its 2022 bulletin on “Environmental, Social, and Governance Matters,” urged governments to consider climate change, pollution, and social equity in financial disclosures. These guidance documents subtly expanded the scope of fiscal reporting to include ideologically charged ESG concerns—without legislative input.
- **NARUC** integrated ESG priorities into utility regulation by promoting “energy justice,” water equity subsidies, and diversity mandates in supplier pipelines. Its alignment with the Biden administration’s Justice40 framework encouraged commissioners to allocate investment based on racial and environmental criteria, rather than ratepayer or engineering need.
- **NASEO** used federal grant implementation as leverage to advance “equity-based energy planning” and ESG-aligned electrification mandates. It instructed states to prioritize climate justice and inclusion metrics in infrastructure projects—turning decarbonization into a mechanism for social redistribution.

Gender Ideology and Reproductive Politics

- **NASBE** promotes gender-inclusive K–12 curriculum, pronoun policies, and access to gender-neutral facilities. It opposes red-state legislation that limits gender instruction or transgender participation in sports.
- **ASTHO** defended abortion access post-Dobbs, framing restrictions as public health risks and coordinating its messaging with pro-choice groups.
- **NASPE** supports expanded LGBTQ+ health benefits, including transition coverage, and normalizes DEI-aligned family leave policies.

Election Reforms and Voter Access

- **NASS** coordinated with DHS and major tech platforms to suppress so-called “disinformation,” including content related to the Hunter Biden laptop story. Internal dissent from West Virginia’s Secretary of State described this as a cover-up and a “psychological operation.”
- **NCSL** pushed automatic registration, absentee voting, and centralized ballot access as model reforms, framing them as technical enhancements rather than political shifts.
- **NSBA** infamously labeled vocal parents at school board meetings as potential “domestic terrorists,” triggering a DOJ response. It serves as a prime example of how these associations blur the lines between civic engagement and ideological manipulation.

Federal Expansionism and Bureaucratic Alignment

- **NAMD** has acted as a megaphone for the Biden administration, echoing CMS talking points and resisting efforts by red states to rein in Medicaid expansion or DEI initiatives.
- **NASEO**, **ECOS**, and others serve as implementation arms for Justice40 and other White House climate and equity programs — effectively nationalizing state-level governance through federal-funding strings.
- **ASTHO**, **ECOS**, and **NGA** all help governors and bureaucrats operationalize federal recovery and infrastructure dollars using progressive metrics, insulating those activities from legislative oversight.

Speech Regulation and Censorship

- **ASTHO** coordinated directly with the U.S. Surgeon General’s office in 2021 to combat “health misinformation,” urging platform takedowns of dissenting views on COVID, vaccines, and abortion.
- **NASS**, through its partnership with **CISA**, directed social media censorship under the banner of election integrity. In practice, the group was silencing political opposition.

IV. WHY THIS MATTERS: POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

The problem is not merely that progressive ideas have seeped into state policy. The problem is that voters no longer govern the governments they elect. The apparatus of state administration — agencies, regulators, boards, commissions — has been structurally reoriented to obey a different master: the ideological consensus produced by national associations. That consensus now overrides, neutralizes, or outright resists the will of elected officials.

And unlike public agencies, these associations operate behind a veil. They are private organizations with no obligation to disclose their internal deliberations, no duty to comply with transparency laws, and no meaningful oversight from the voters they influence. What this report reveals is what is publicly accessible — the surface-level policies, published frameworks, and public statements. But anyone familiar with bureaucratic culture understands that the real damage often occurs off the books: in internal briefings, closed-door trainings, unrecorded webinars, and shared language that travels without a trace. If this report seems damning, be aware that it is almost certainly incomplete.

This is not politics as usual. It is an inversion of democratic legitimacy.

Elections, under our system, are supposed to confer power. They are supposed to produce consequences. However, under the current regime of association capture, the machinery of government runs irrespective of who holds office. A Republican governor may sign legislation curbing DEI mandates, only to find his state agencies still attending DEI workshops hosted by national partners. A state treasurer may object to ESG investing, but find that model policies, fiduciary training, and national rankings all require adherence to ESG criteria. A superintendent may resist gender ideology in schools, but face accreditation pressure from associations insisting that “inclusive pedagogy” is non-negotiable.

This constitutes “shadow governance.” It produces three constitutional pathologies.

1. The administrative state becomes

ideologically fixed.

In theory, bureaucracies are subordinate. In practice, they now act as permanent fixtures of progressive governance. National associations ensure that ideological defaults persist across transitions of power. A Democrat leaves office, and the bureaucracy does not swing right. A Republican wins, and the bureaucracy remains unchanged — or, worse, becomes even more obstructive.

This is not a matter of inertia of habit. It is the result of a professional culture shaped by interstate associations, credentialed “best practices,” and federally funded pipelines that all point in one direction: left.

2. The consent of the governed becomes functionally irrelevant.

If policy is to be set by a national cartel of bureaucrats operating outside any state’s chain of command, then state elections become symbolic. The true levers of power — procurement standards, regulatory frameworks, and policy toolkits — are governed by groups that no one elected and no legislature authorized.

This frustrates the very core of republican government: that the people, through their representatives, decide how they wish to govern themselves. If associations stand between the voter and the policy outcome, then the vote is a broken instrument.

3. Federalism collapses into administrative convergence.

Associations do not respect jurisdictional diversity. They do not tailor their guidance for Texas versus California, or Florida versus Illinois. They issue one-size-fits-all solutions — written by ideologues, enforced by compliance culture, and spread through federal alignment.

The result is administrative convergence across the fifty states. Not because the people of those states agree, but because a national system of ideological conformity controls their bureaucracies. That system functions as a shadow government — visible in name, invisible in accountability, and immune to correction from below.

States were meant to be laboratories of democracy. Today, they are test sites for policy laundering — where associations smuggle in agendas no legislature would pass, and no governor would champion in public. Unless we dismantle this structure, elections will become ceremonial, power will become bureaucratic, and sovereignty will become hollow.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem is structural, but the response need not be timid. States possess both the authority and the tools to reclaim control over their bureaucracies. The only requirement is the will to act — and a refusal to accept “professional consensus” as a substitute for constitutional government.

What follows is a blueprint for governors, legislators, and agency heads to dismantle ideological capture and restore democratic accountability.

1. Audit and restrict association membership.

Conduct a full inventory of every national association to which state agencies belong — including dues payments, conference attendance, policy adoption, and external partnerships.

- **Prohibit membership** in associations whose activities conflict with state law or legislative intent.
- **Require legislative approval** before any agency may join or renew association affiliation.

Example: At least eight Republican attorneys general have withdrawn from the National Association of Attorneys General over ideological abuse. More should follow across all domains.

2. Sever the pipeline of model policies and “best practices.”

Association-generated policy templates are treated as default settings — unless they are blocked.

- **Issue executive orders** instructing agencies not to adopt external model policies without in-state review and justification.
- **Bar the automatic implementation** of “guidance,”

“resolutions,” or “frameworks” from national bodies unless explicitly ratified by elected officials.

Example: NAIC has quietly enforced DEI directives and climate disclosures through state insurance offices — despite voter opposition.

3. Prohibit ideological training and DEI programming.

Most associations offer DEI “technical assistance” under the guise of workforce development. These are Trojan horses.

- **Ban the use of state funds** for association-led DEI trainings or DEI-based performance metrics.
- **Direct HR agencies** to exclude DEI programming from hiring, promotion, and retention practices.

Example: NASPE and NASCIO promote internal DEI metrics, dashboards, and even demographic quotas within state HR and IT departments.

4. Build parallel associations and infrastructure.

Do not merely play defense. Construct alternative institutions committed to political neutrality — or better, to accountable governance.

- **Fund or join counter-associations** like the State Financial Officers Foundation (SFOF), created to resist NAST’s ESG alignment.
- **Convene regional consortia** of ideologically aligned states to share policy, technical expertise, and staff development programs outside progressive networks.

Example: SFOF has already provided a successful model for parallel financial governance, challenging ESG groupthink in public pension management.

5. Enforce transparency and political oversight.

The administrative state thrives in darkness. Shine a light.

- **Mandate annual public disclosure** of all association

affiliations funded by taxpayers, financial obligations, and policy adoptions by state agencies.

- **Establish legislative review committees** to monitor the influence of national associations and identify conflicts with state priorities.

Example: Many associations, such as ECOS and NGA, embed federal grant compliance into their policy blueprints. Legislatures should be aware of, and prevent, agencies from binding themselves to federal priorities behind closed doors.

6. Condition funding on fidelity to state policy.

No agency should act as a state within a state.

- **Tie budget authority** to demonstrated compliance with statutory direction and ideological neutrality.
- **Empower inspectors general or state auditors** to review how association frameworks embed into agency procedures.

These recommendations do not require novel powers. They require resolve. The states are not helpless clients of a national bureaucracy. They are sovereign. It is time they acted like it.

Appendix of Sins (Not Exhaustive)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE TREASURERS (NAST)

NAST is the national membership body for state treasurers, intended to support collaboration on financial education, debt management, and public trust fund oversight. In practice, it has used that platform to advance ESG investing, embed DEI into internal operations, and promote progressive-aligned causes from cannabis finance to race-conscious asset management.

- **Ideological bias led to the creation of a conservative alternative:** In 2012, a faction of [Republican treasurers broke](#) off from NAST to form the State Financial Officers Foundation (SFOF), citing concerns that NAST had become politicized. SFOF founder Derek Kreifels, a Kansas official, said he launched the group in direct response to NAST’s promotion of progressive causes in public finance. The schism has since deepened, with NAST embracing ESG and federal activism, while SFOF positions itself as a non-ideological alternative pushing back against “woke capitalism.”
- **NAST-affiliated treasurers organized in defense of ESG investing:** In January 2025, 17 Democratic state treasurers coordinated by NAST [sent an open letter](#) to the Department of Labor and SEC defending ESG-based investing in public pensions. The letter argued fiduciary responsibility requires consideration of climate risk, diversity, and workforce policies, framing ESG as prudent rather than political. This advocacy placed NAST squarely on the side of progressive investment strategy, despite Republican objections that it violated fiduciary duty by injecting activism into financial stewardship.
- **Institutional DEI commitment across member offices:** NAST formally created a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Committee in 2021, with leadership actively encouraging state treasurers to integrate DEI frameworks. Massachusetts Treasurer Deborah Goldberg [highlighted the group’s DEI milestones](#): monthly

events since 2019, adoption of a DEI policy in 2020, and a strategic DEI plan in 2021. NAST’s goal, per its own materials, is to embed DEI into hiring and operational standards across state treasury departments.

- **Cannabis policy advocacy aligned with progressive reform:** In 2022, NAST adopted a formal resolution [supporting expanded banking access](#) for the cannabis industry. The resolution urged federal accommodation of state cannabis markets, positioning NAST in line with progressive legalization and financial normalization goals.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AUDITORS, COMPTROLLERS AND TREASURERS (NASACT)

NASACT convenes state fiscal officers to shape standards in accounting, auditing, and treasury management. It has quietly institutionalized progressive priorities through ESG-aligned training, equity-themed contracting preferences, and partnerships that elevate DEI as a core competency of public financial management.

- **Formal advocacy for DEI in government financial governance:** In a 2022 [public comment on financial standards](#), NASACT urged expanded adoption of “diversity, equity, and inclusion” principles in state finance. The letter celebrated governments that had begun hiring more minority-owned firms and emphasized the need to appoint minority professionals to public finance boards, signaling an ideological commitment that goes beyond neutral best practices.
- **Integration of DEI into training and workforce strategy:** In a [2021 NASACT webinar](#) focused on the post-pandemic government workforce, “Diversity, Equity and Inclusion” was explicitly listed as a key tenet of the desired “flexible, high-performance” public-sector model. NASACT publications have repeatedly framed DEI not as optional, but as a necessary best practice in recruiting, retaining, and managing the state financial workforce—promoting a cultural shift within state finance offices toward equity-based personnel policies.

- **Promotion of ESG-aligned leadership and priorities:** NASACT’s selection of Illinois State Treasurer [Michael Frerichs](#) as its [2022–23](#) President reflected ideological leanings. Frerichs was the architect of Illinois’ 2019 Sustainable Investing Act, which required state and local entities to integrate ESG criteria—including board diversity and climate risk—into all financial decision-making. Under his NASACT presidency, the group’s events and materials amplified ESG themes, despite ongoing political backlash against ESG investing from numerous Republican state treasurers.
- **Normalization of sustainability and social justice in public finance:** During Frerichs’ tenure, [NASACT programming](#) highlighted green bonds, climate disclosure rules, and social equity metrics in government investment policy. These choices effectively positioned NASACT as a [champion of ESG](#)-aligned public-sector finance, in contrast with red-state efforts to depoliticize or prohibit ESG mandates in state funds.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MEDICAID DIRECTORS (NAMD)

NAMD brings together state officials who administer the Medicaid program, ostensibly to coordinate implementation and policy innovation. In recent years, it has redefined its mission around “equity” mandates, pushing racialized eligibility reforms and ideological coordination with federal health officials.

- **Declared equity—not outcomes—as the bedrock of Medicaid reform:** In 2021, NAMD announced that “advancing equity in Medicaid” would be a strategic priority, [declaring equity](#)—not efficiency, coverage, or outcomes—as the “foundational” principle for all future reforms. Its agenda did not merely suggest sensitivity to vulnerable populations; it demanded that all policy proposals be filtered through a racialized “health equity lens,” pre-committed to favoring certain demographic groups over others. This reorients Medicaid from a safety net to a tool for social engineering.
- **Institutionalized racial preferences in health policy:** In a [2022 policy brief](#) on “equity,” NAMD explicitly called for Medicaid to prioritize certain racial groups for services, highlighting that behavioral health providers are “disproportionately white” and urging Congress to reshape the health workforce accordingly. This is not equity in any neutral sense—it is a call for race-conscious resource allocation in one of the largest government programs in the country.
- **Leveraged DEI ideology to reshape Medicaid operations:** Beyond rhetoric, NAMD has actively embedded DEI into Medicaid governance. Its strategic documents urge states to restructure policy, staffing, and performance metrics to align with diversity goals. This reprograms what was once a technocratic, means-tested benefit into a bureaucratic platform for identity politics.
- **Accepted outside progressive funding to entrench ideology:** NAMD’s equity crusade has been bankrolled by [other foundations](#) interested in the same liberal policies. These philanthropic subsidies effectively nationalize blue-state policy within red-state bureaucracies, bypassing legislative control and tying Medicaid administrators to ideological benchmarks written in private boardrooms, not public statutes.
- **Functioned as a loyal partner to the Biden administration’s health agenda:** NAMD has coordinated closely with HHS and CMS under President Biden, echoing White House priorities on behavioral health, equity audits, and Medicaid expansion. Rather than acting as an independent advocate for states, NAMD has served as a megaphone for federal and ideological alignment, often in direct opposition to conservative state policy.
- **Acts as a pressure mechanism against red-state reforms:** In states where governors have sought to trim Medicaid rolls, limit DEI initiatives, or focus Medicaid narrowly on core medical needs, NAMD’s policy positions and “best practice” briefs offer a bureaucratic counternarrative—implicitly portraying such reforms as backward, unjust, or non-compliant with evolving equity norms.

ASSOCIATION OF STATE AND TERRITORIAL HEALTH OFFICIALS (ASTHO)

ASTHO represents state and territorial public health leaders, offering guidance on disease control, emergency response, and health system management. It has politicized that role by declaring racism a public health emergency, defending abortion and gender ideology as health rights, and serving as a conduit for federal misinformation suppression efforts.

- **Declared structural racism a “public health emergency”:** In 2022, ASTHO formally [proclaimed that systemic racism](#)—not a disease, but a political diagnosis—constituted a public health emergency. It then mandated that all ASTHO initiatives be run through a health equity filter, embedding this ideological lens across technical assistance, hiring, and member programming. A [dedicated Health Equity team](#) and “Policy Academy” were launched to help states operationalize anti-racism. The premise was clear: every policy is a racial issue, and every disparity a moral failing of the system. This is public health by way of critical theory.
- **Saturated public health with DEI ideology:** [ASTHO adopted](#) the “Truth, Racial Healing, and Transformation” framework—an [activist-designed DEI program](#)—for internal culture change and member training. Through its Diverse Executives Leading in Public Health (DELPH) initiative, ASTHO explicitly aims to alter leadership demographics in state health agencies to reflect identity quotas. These moves go beyond equal opportunity and veer into ideological capture, making race and equity the criteria for both personnel and policy.
- **Championed expansive, coercive COVID policy:** Throughout 2020–2022, ASTHO was a full-throated cheerleader for federal mandates and restrictions, [applauding the Biden administration’s](#) vaccine mandates for employers and federal workers as “necessary” and rebuffing concerns about liberty, due process, or state sovereignty. ASTHO’s then-president, Nirav Shah, became a media fixture—defending top-down interventions and ridiculing dissenters. The [association advocated](#) for billions in new pub-

lic health funding to entrench these powers, arguing that federal aid should prioritize equity-focused hires like community health workers and racial outreach staff. What began as an emergency response quickly became bureaucratic empire-building.

- **Promoted censorship under the guise of public health:** In 2021, ASTHO eagerly embraced the U.S. Surgeon General’s advisory on “health misinformation,” calling on social media platforms to [suppress dissenting views](#) on COVID-19 and vaccines. It helped coordinate with federal officials to flag “myths” and conduct takedown campaigns, while branding critics—like the authors of the Great Barrington Declaration—as threats to public health. The association’s embrace of information policing extended to vaccines, abortion, and other hot-button issues, positioning ASTHO as a kind of ideological enforcer cloaked in bureaucratic neutrality.
- **Used abortion messaging to defy red-state authority post-Dobbs:** After the fall of *Roe v. Wade*, [ASTHO did not stay neutral](#). It circulated talking points highlighting the “health risks” of abortion bans, signed joint letters with pro-choice medical groups, and framed abortion access as essential to maternal health—implicitly signaling to state officials where it stood, even as governors in red states sought to rein in bureaucratic messaging. ASTHO provided an off-the-books megaphone for progressive reproductive policy in defiance of democratic outcomes.
- **Pushed blue-state health policy through a national pipeline:** ASTHO has consistently advanced the progressive health playbook: [pushing states to expand Medicaid](#) under the ACA, promoting single-payer systems and public options, and rebranding gun control as “violence prevention.” It also treated climate change as a health emergency and built a “Public Health Equity Corps” to embed young ideologues in state agencies, where they would work on “climate resilience,” “health equity,” and other euphemisms for political activism. This approach—known as “Health in All Policies”—enables health bureaucrats to intrude into housing, education, criminal justice, and environmental policy, all under the pretext of promoting wellness.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (AASHTO)

AASHTO sets technical standards and policy frameworks for state transportation departments and infrastructure planning. While it once focused on engineering and logistics, it now prioritizes racial equity mandates, DEI hiring goals, and climate ideology — repurposing transportation networks as tools of social justice reform.

- **Committed state DOTs to a race-conscious policy overhaul:** In November 2020, AASHTO’s Board of Directors [unanimously adopted an Equity Resolution](#) that redefined transportation policy through the lens of “racial justice.” The resolution directed departments to target investments toward “underserved communities,” implement workforce diversity mandates, and expand contracting preferences for Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs). The aim was not nondiscrimination, but active demographic engineering—embedding racial identity as a planning and staffing criterion.
- **Established an Equity Task Force to embed DEI ideology operationally:** To enforce its resolution, AASHTO [created a dedicated Equity Task Force](#) that now trains state DOTs on using “inclusive” language and “intentional” equity framing in public outreach. It develops model policies and coordinates with HR and planning officials to restructure hiring, communications, and engagement protocols. In practice, this means bias training, racial audits, and identity-based stakeholder processes being pushed into even the most technical corners of transportation planning.
- **Lobbied Washington to align federal DOT policy with progressive social goals:** In 2023, [AASHTO sent a letter](#) to the U.S. Department of Transportation urging the federal government to “directly align” with AASHTO’s equity mission. It asked for more flexible funding to pursue racial justice initiatives, expanded community outreach in “marginalized areas,” and support for workforce inclusion

policies. Rather than maintaining a neutral stance between states, AASHTO effectively tried to bind federal DOT priorities to the political aims of its own DEI campaign.

- **Normalized race-based mandates in government contracting:** AASHTO has vigorously promoted the [continued use of DBE quotas](#) in transportation procurement, supporting both federal and state-level [race-conscious contracting](#). As a downstream effect of this establishment “best practice,” many Republican-led states instituted (and still enforce) set-asides that prioritize minority-owned firms in DOT projects. Critics have pointed out that AASHTO’s framework substitutes racial preferences for race-neutral competition, embedding DEI compliance into the heart of public infrastructure spending.
- **Reframed infrastructure as a vehicle for social transformation:** In line with its “Equity Resolution,” [AASHTO has declared](#) that it supports “equity and social justice objectives” as core to transportation’s mission. That redefinition extends to its support for progressive infrastructure goals like complete streets, electric vehicle incentives, climate resilience programs, and prioritization of “historically underserved” communities. This philosophy shifts the purpose of transportation planning from facilitating mobility to correcting perceived social injustices.
- **Influenced state policy well beyond blue jurisdictions:** Because AASHTO serves as the technical standard-setter and policy coordinator for state DOTs, its race-conscious directives are not confined to liberal states. Through its resources, training, and federal partnerships, AASHTO pressures even conservative agencies to conform to its equity framework—entrenching an activist agenda under the guise of professional best practices.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS (NAIC)

NAIC is a standard-setting body composed of state insurance regulators, responsible for coordinating oversight, data collection, and financial solvency requirements in the insurance industry. It has increasingly

wielded that authority to inject progressive ideology into actuarial standards — questioning sex-based risk ratings, advancing climate-risk reporting, and laying the groundwork for ESG-aligned supervision even in red states.

- **Redefined actuarial neutrality as potential racial bias:** In 2020, [NAIC's Executive Committee launched](#) a “Special Committee on Race & Insurance” to investigate how traditional underwriting metrics might “disadvantage minorities.” This initiative adopted the “disparate impact” doctrine, asserting that neutral factors—such as credit score, ZIP code, or even claims history—must be reevaluated if they correlate with race. The effort did not target intentional discrimination, but merely different outcomes.
- **Framed it as insurers’ “duty” to promote racial justice:** NAIC’s then-president [openly declared it](#) the insurance industry’s obligation to address “racial inequality” and diversify its leadership ranks. This rhetorical shift moved the regulator’s role from enforcing solvency and fairness to demanding demographic parity and ideological alignment—functions never delegated to them by law or voters.
- **Challenged gender-based pricing despite clear risk data:** [NAIC officials have questioned](#) whether using sex as a rating factor—long upheld by actuarial science—constitutes unfair discrimination. In particular, they raised concerns about charging young men higher auto premiums, despite overwhelming data showing higher accident rates. One [NAIC-sponsored article](#) even floated banning gender rating outright, modeling their logic on California’s 2019 prohibition. This signals a willingness to override data-driven risk modeling in pursuit of social symmetry.
- **Embedded DEI doctrine into regulator training and culture:** In 2023, NAIC rolled out a [DEI training program](#) for insurance regulators, focused on “cultural competency” and “bias in regulation,” with over 1,000 state officials participating. It also launched an annual DEI Conference and maintains a “Diversity Leadership Forum” to share identity-focused best practices. These efforts standardize a bureaucratic DEI framework within state insurance

offices, regardless of the politics or priorities of the states they serve.

- **Anchored U.S. insurance regulation to global climate orthodoxy:** In 2022, NAIC adopted a [new climate risk disclosure mandate](#) modeled on the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), a U.N.-backed global standard. The policy requires major insurers to report annually on carbon impact, “climate resilience,” and Board governance of climate risks. NAIC called it a “landmark step” in climate regulation—but the effect is that red-state regulators now enforce ESG-style climate metrics authored by international technocrats.
- **Aligned state regulation with the Biden administration’s climate agenda:** By requiring TCFD-aligned reports and pushing carbon-conscious governance, NAIC effectively conscripted insurers into progressive climate planning. Even in states with no such mandates, insurance commissioners are pressured to adopt climate auditing, decarbonization targets, and ESG frameworks—under the banner of “risk regulation.” This hijacks a neutral public function (insuring against loss) for climate activism through a regulatory backdoor.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS (NARUC)

NARUC represents the state commissioners who regulate electric, gas, water, and telecommunications utilities. Originally a technical policy forum, it has increasingly served as a transmission belt for federal climate strategy — advancing Justice40 implementation, encouraging race-conscious investment strategies, and nudging red states toward net-zero energy targets regardless of legislative support.

- **Formalized race-conscious contracting preferences in utilities:** At its [2020 annual meeting](#), NARUC adopted a resolution urging investor-owned utilities to lower certification requirements for minority- and women-owned vendors. This “Diversity Owned Certification” push was [aimed at expanding procurement](#) for identity-based businesses, effectively

pressuring regulated monopolies to build race- and gender-conscious supplier pipelines. NARUC's Subcommittee on Supplier and Workforce Diversity now works to embed [these standards](#) across the sector.

- **Pushed DEI mandates into utility hiring and commission staffing:** [NARUC created](#) a Select Committee on Regulatory and Industry Diversity to advance workforce diversification—not only within utilities but also within state commissions themselves. The committee openly promotes inclusion goals tied to race, gender, and veteran status, signaling that regulatory agencies should no longer be staffed based on neutrality or expertise, but on demographic composition.
- **Rebranded public utility service as a vehicle for social equity:** Between 2021 and 2022, NARUC passed multiple [resolutions invoking](#) “water equity,” calling for federal funding to permanently subsidize low-income water and wastewater bills. The association also endorsed universal broadband expansion with a particular emphasis on “underserved” and “historically marginalized” populations—effectively converting infrastructure priorities into mechanisms for social leveling and racial preferences.
- **Trained regulators to engineer equity outcomes through rate design:** NARUC partnered with advocacy groups like the Regulatory Assistance Project to [host trainings](#) on “How the Regulatory Process Can Advance Equity.” These sessions guided commissioners on how to require utilities to direct investments into minority neighborhoods, structure rates to minimize burdens on certain customers, and enforce DEI expectations through the regulatory approval process—an outright shift from neutral oversight to values-based economic redistribution.
- **Adopted the federal “Justice40” climate equity agenda:** By 2023, NARUC had [aligned itself](#) with the Biden administration's Justice40 initiative, which mandates that 40% of the benefits from federal climate spending go to “overburdened” communities. NARUC distributed an “Energy Justice” brief to its members explaining the program and encouraging state-level compliance. It defined energy justice in ideological terms: remedying “historical harm” and ensuring equitable participation in the energy sys-

tem—language that recasts energy policy as a form of reparative justice.

- **Endorsed the ideological framing of utility policy as “justice”:** NARUC's materials now use terms like “energy justice” and “water equity” as guiding frameworks, not mere rhetorical flourishes. These concepts center race and class in regulatory decisions traditionally governed by economics, engineering, and reliability. This marks a fundamental reorientation of utility regulation away from ratepayer fairness and system efficiency, and toward identity-driven redistribution and permanent intervention.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE ENERGY OFFICIALS (NASEO)

NASEO unites state energy office directors to share technical guidance and coordinate federal grant strategies. Behind its procedural language lies a full-spectrum push for progressive climate ideology: equity-based energy planning, forced electrification, “just transition” mandates, and deep integration with federal decarbonization and climate justice agendas.

- **Anchored state energy offices in racial justice ideology:** Around 2020, NASEO's Board of Directors [adopted a formal Equity and Inclusion Resolution](#) that framed energy policy through the lens of America's “history of racial oppression.” The resolution called for eliminating systemic disparities in energy access and costs, explicitly instructing State Energy Officials to embed equity metrics into policy. NASEO followed this with the creation of an Energy Equity Task Force and a [2022 RFP](#) to hire an “Energy Equity Advisor,” signaling its transformation from a technical body into a vessel for social justice activism.
- **Helped states bake equity goals into climate spending:** NASEO positioned itself as a key intermediary in [implementing the Biden administration's](#) green spending agenda, especially under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and Inflation Reduction Act. It guided states in designing energy efficiency and solar subsidy programs targeted specifically at minority and low-income communi-

ties. The objective was not just carbon reduction, but redistribution—using public funds to align state energy systems with progressive definitions of equity and environmental justice.

- **Promoted climate “justice” over market-based energy strategy:** NASEO communications have [celebrated state programs](#) that mix climate goals with redistributionist objectives—such as subsidized solar for low-income renters or grants for “inclusive” grid modernization. Its events routinely spotlight topics like “energy democracy” and “equitable decarbonization,” promoting the idea that energy systems should be restructured to serve identity-based political goals rather than least-cost delivery or technological feasibility.
- **Soft-homogenized red and blue states under a common progressive blueprint:** [Working jointly with NARUC](#), NASEO led the “State Energy Justice Roundtables,” blending utility and energy planning under one social equity framework. From 2019 to 2025, states as ideologically divergent as Texas and New York received near-identical toolkits on EV infrastructure, net-zero building codes, and workforce diversification in green energy. The result was policy convergence not driven by local voters or markets, but by federal-nonprofit coordination led by NASEO.
- **Synchronized state agendas with the Biden administration’s equity-first climate vision:** At NASEO’s [2021 Annual Meeting](#), a keynote speech was delivered by Shalanda Baker, the U.S. Department of Energy’s new “Deputy Director for Energy Justice.” She announced DOE’s reinvention of energy investment strategies to prioritize “racial equity” and “clean energy for all.” NASEO’s spotlighting of this message and tight collaboration with DOE helped normalize the idea that energy policy should serve as a delivery mechanism for progressive redistribution—even in states where voters did not endorse such goals.
- **Positioned equity rhetoric as non-negotiable in state energy policy:** Through its resources, programming, and federal partnerships, NASEO ensured that nearly all state energy offices adopted language around “resilience,” “opportunity,” and “affordability” that masked an underlying push for top-down, equity-focused climate governance. In

doing so, it helped insulate progressive policy from electoral accountability by embedding it in bureaucratic planning and administrative grant conditions.

ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL OF THE STATES (ECOS)

ECOS is composed of state environmental agency leaders and plays a coordinating role between state and federal environmental policy. Rather than represent the diversity of state environmental priorities, it has become an echo chamber for EPA-driven climate politics — championing ESG-style disclosures, racial equity tools, and DEI performance standards across environmental permitting and regulation.

- **Redefined environmental protection through the lens of racial equity:** Beginning in 2021, [ECOS established](#) an Environmental Justice (EJ) Workgroup and Steering Committee that made equity—not pollution reduction—the centerpiece of state environmental leadership. Its stated mission is to reduce “environmental burdens” in “underserved” communities and to expand “environmental benefits,” a formulation that substitutes social redistribution for neutral regulatory enforcement.
- **Formally adopted a national race-conscious agenda for state agencies:** In 2022, [ECOS released](#) an “Environmental Justice and External Civil Rights Vision, Principles, and Priorities” document. This playbook explicitly advocates that state environmental departments incorporate racial and socioeconomic equity into permitting, enforcement, and public engagement. In effect, ECOS advised all 50 states to align their environmental regulations with the Biden administration’s equity agenda.
- **Built state-federal alignment under Justice40 and Title VI enforcement:** ECOS has been an [active participant](#) in the White House’s Justice40 initiative, which mandates that 40% of climate-related federal investments flow to “disadvantaged communities.” ECOS helps states create the necessary mapping tools, outreach programs, and grant infrastructure to comply. It also promotes alignment with Title VI civil rights enforcement, encouraging states to use

federal anti-discrimination law as a lever to reshape permitting, enforcement, and funding priorities along identity-based lines.

- **Institutionalized the progressive EJ agenda regardless of state politics:** Through coordination calls, technical assistance, and template policies, ECOS ensures that even red-state agencies are exposed to the federal EJ agenda. It convenes caucuses, maintains an External Civil Rights subcommittee, and offers best practices for embedding equity in state operations. The result is a bureaucratic conveyor belt: progressive policy is smuggled into state environmental departments under the guise of federal compliance or technical consensus.
- **Supported the revival of Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs):** ECOS has [endorsed the use of SEPs](#)—settlement agreements that allow polluters to fund community-based projects instead of paying federal fines. These projects are often steered toward EJ goals and local activist groups, transforming penalties into slush funds for progressive environmental activism. Though previously curtailed by the Trump DOJ for lack of legal grounding, SEPs are now promoted by ECOS as tools for advancing “community equity.”

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION (NASBE)

NASBE is the national body for state school board members, focused on K–12 policy, governance, and professional development. Beneath its mission of supporting school boards, it has adopted and exported the ideological liturgy of gender identity, “anti-racism,” and inclusive pedagogy—pressuring states to adopt contested social agendas in the name of educational equity.

- **Embedded “educational equity” as the overriding framework for policymaking:** NASBE [openly declares its mission](#) to advance “equity and excellence” and trains state boards to evaluate all decisions through a race- and identity-conscious lens. Its Leading for Equity and Excellence Program (LEEP) [trains state officials](#) to set explicit equity goals—like

reallocating resources based on race and revising discipline policies to correct statistical disparities—transforming governance into a vehicle for social justice enforcement.

- **Promoted CRT-adjacent curriculum and identity-based pedagogy:** In [publications and training materials](#), NASBE urges adoption of “culturally responsive” teaching, advocating for schools to address systemic racism, privilege, and power structures. Its magazine, *The State Education Standard*, has [published issues](#) on “racial justice in schools,” encouraging state boards to embed anti-racist frameworks across curriculum, teacher training, and assessment. NASBE has discussed dismantling gifted programs if demographics appear skewed, redefining fairness as equal outcomes across racial categories.
- **Aggressively advanced gender ideology in K–12 policy:** NASBE has produced [model guidance on LGBTQ inclusion](#) that calls for pronoun policies, access to gender-neutral facilities, and incorporation of LGBTQ topics into health and social studies curricula. It opposes state efforts to limit gender instruction or restrict transgender participation in sports, framing such legislation as discriminatory. NASBE’s materials align closely with progressive legal interpretations of Title IX and are supported by collaboration with groups like [GLSEN](#) and the [Trevor Project](#).
- **Pushed social-emotional learning (SEL) with ideological undertones:** Under the banner of “whole child” development, NASBE has [promoted SEL programs](#) that teach emotional intelligence, empathy, and social awareness—but often with an embedded equity message. State boards are encouraged to address identity development and trauma-informed education, incorporating frameworks that emphasize marginalization and systemic harm as key components of student wellbeing.
- **Provided messaging tools to deflect parental push-back:** As parents began confronting school boards over CRT and explicit content, [NASBE coached board members](#) on maintaining decorum, limiting public comment, and [reframing equity](#) as universally beneficial. It [presented opposition as political noise](#) and trained officials to justify progressive

changes using more palatable language, shielding boards from accountability while preserving their ideological trajectory.

- **Acted as a clearinghouse for progressive policy guidance across cultural fronts:** NASBE regularly [issues reports encouraging states](#) to diversify the teacher workforce, adopt bilingual education policies, and support initiatives like free menstrual products in schools as matters of “equity.” Its programming and resources consistently reflect the broader cultural goals of the progressive education movement—advancing race-conscious, gender-inclusive, and anti-traditional reforms through state-level levers.

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS (CCSSO)

CCSSO convenes state education commissioners and superintendents to shape academic standards, teacher licensure, and school accountability policy. Though presented as a professional consortium, it has entrenched ideologically charged agendas—including “anti-racist” pedagogy, gender identity accommodation, and alignment with federal equity benchmarks—into the very scaffolding of public education governance.

- **Codified equity of outcome—not opportunity—as the goal of public education:** In a defining 2017–2018 position paper, [CCSSO declared](#) that equity means achieving equal student outcomes across demographic groups, not merely offering equal access to resources. This doctrinaire framework—closely aligned with critical race theory—urged education leaders to “talk about race,” address their own unconscious biases, and set explicit racial equity targets in policymaking.
- **Promoted CRT-aligned and gender-inclusive curricula as equity imperatives:** Following the 2020 protests, CCSSO actively supported “culturally responsive” standards that integrate discussions of systemic racism, power, and identity into the classroom. It [partnered with Learning for Justice](#) and GLSEN to disseminate curriculum resources centered on LGBTQ+ inclusion and racial justice. Many

CCSSO-affiliated states revised instructional materials to downplay “Eurocentric” content and elevate progressive narratives—inviting criticism from parents and legislators.

- **Launched a national campaign to racially engineer the educator workforce:** CCSSO’s *Vision and Guidance for a Diverse and Learner-Ready Teacher Workforce* [laid out a roadmap](#) for states to recruit more teachers of color and require anti-bias and inclusive teaching practices. Its initiative calls for tying cultural competence to teacher readiness and frames racial diversity among educators as a core component of student success—subordinating merit to representation.
- **Framed pandemic response through an equity and identity lens:** During COVID-19, [CCSSO prioritized](#) “equity-centered” remote learning and mental health strategies. It directed states to use federal relief funds to close digital access gaps and support students of color, English learners, and students with disabilities. It also participated in the #StopHate campaign to combat racism and xenophobia in schools, reinforcing its ideological positioning even amid crisis response.
- **Institutionalized progressive values across state education leadership:** Through guidance documents, national working groups, and federal advocacy, CCSSO consistently steered state superintendents toward race-conscious, identity-focused reforms in teacher training, curriculum, and policy framing. Its top-down model pressures states to internalize a vision of K–12 education as a tool for dismantling systemic bias—regardless of local electoral mandates or cultural norms.

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION (NSBA)

NSBA represents local and state school boards across the country, offering advocacy, legal resources, and training. Once focused on district-level management, it has taken an openly adversarial stance against parents and dissenters — famously labeling them as potential domestic terrorists — while advancing progressive curricular norms and censorious speech codes.

- **Framed parent dissent as a threat warranting federal intervention:** In September 2021, NSBA sent a [now-infamous letter](#) to President Biden equating vocal opposition at school board meetings—over COVID mandates and “studies of race”—with “domestic terrorism” and “hate crimes.” The letter requested DOJ and FBI involvement, leading to an Attorney General directive that many viewed as weaponizing federal law enforcement against parents. Though [NSBA later apologized](#) for the language, the episode revealed the organization’s alignment with a centralized, security-first response against the will of the people.
- **Consistently advanced progressive positions on K–12 policy:** NSBA’s policy platform has long reflected a left-of-center agenda, [advocating for “educational equity,”](#) opposing school vouchers and privatization, and lobbying for greater federal funding. It supports expanding community schools, broadband access, and other wraparound services often framed as equity tools—prioritizing systemic reform over traditional academic outcomes.
- **Backed racial sensitivity training and DEI-aligned curricula:** [NSBA supported efforts](#) to reinstate federally funded racial sensitivity and anti-bias training after the Trump administration’s 2020 ban. The association [defended DEI frameworks](#) and called for curricula that include “culturally inclusive” content—language closely tied to the progressive push for CRT-adjacent instruction in schools.
- **Signaled support for expanded federal oversight of local education:** Through its federal lobbying and alignment with Biden administration priorities, NSBA has helped [normalize a larger federal footprint](#) in education governance—especially on issues of discipline policy, equity enforcement, and curriculum content. This undermines local control and shifts school board authority toward Washington-driven cultural agendas.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICIALS (NASPO)

NASPO serves as the national forum for state procure-

ment leaders, tasked with improving purchasing efficiency and vendor policy. In recent years, it has shifted from neutral procurement advice to ESG-style supplier diversity mandates, equity-based scoring rubrics, and contract preferences that reflect ideological values over cost or performance.

- **Formal promotion of supplier diversity as procurement doctrine:** NASPO has institutionalized race- and gender-based contracting preferences as standard practice. Its 2024 [supplier diversity report](#) offered “actionable tips” to expand procurement with minority- and women-owned businesses, while its [Pulse blog](#) publishes regular implementation strategies. Almost every state—guided by NASPO—[has adopted percentage targets or set-asides for diverse suppliers.](#)
- **Integration of DEI into procurement infrastructure and policy guidance:** Beyond supplier diversity, [NASPO encourages states](#) to embed DEI metrics into procurement operations—such as modifying certification rules, tracking spending by vendor demographics, and elevating “inclusive procurement” as a key performance goal. DEI is treated not as ancillary but as central to the legitimacy of the procurement process.
- **Support for environmentally preferable purchasing programs:** NASPO’s [Green Purchasing](#) and sustainable procurement guidance urges states to award contracts based on environmental criteria like recyclability, emissions, and resource efficiency. In a [2022 survey](#), over 75% of states reported adopting such practices. NASPO even promotes scoring preferences and percentage boosts for vendors offering “green” solutions, explicitly endorsing climate-conscious procurement.
- **Reframing of procurement as a lever for progressive policy enforcement:** In combining DEI, climate, and social impact priorities, NASPO recasts procurement from a neutral, technical discipline into a value-laden instrument of policy enforcement. Bids are no longer judged solely on price or quality, but on alignment with broader ideological benchmarks—effectively subordinating economic criteria to political values.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS (NASCIO)

NASCIO assists state IT executives with digital infrastructure, cybersecurity, and modernization strategies. But it increasingly frames those technical goals through an ideological lens — promoting DEI in tech hiring, equity in digital access policy, and social governance priorities in procurement frameworks for information systems.

- **Institutional embrace of DEI in IT leadership:** In response to social justice movements post-2020, NASCIO launched a major DEI effort culminating in its [2022 Diversity & Inclusion in State Government IT report](#). The Executive Committee unanimously endorsed the initiative, signaling a clear ideological commitment to “promoting inclusive work environments” and embedding DEI into the workforce culture of state IT agencies.
- **Framing diversity as essential to IT modernization:** [NASCIO’s 2022 study](#) warned that failing to diversify would “jeopardize innovation and modernization,” urging CIOs to embed inclusion in recruitment, advancement, and organizational structure. The association rejected colorblind or merit-only hiring paradigms, promoting demographic tracking and affinity groups as “best practices” for inclusion.
- **Creation of DEI infrastructure within state CIO offices:** The report highlighted case studies (e.g., Tennessee and Colorado) where state CIOs established D&I Councils, implemented DEI dashboards, and formalized training on unconscious bias. These structures institutionalize progressive personnel and workplace policies across state IT departments.
- **Elevating DEI as a strategic imperative:** [In the 2024 State CIO Survey](#), 62% of state CIOs said DEI was now part of their agency’s culture or a formal strategic goal—up from fewer than half in 2022. The report quotes one CIO: “Younger employees expect to see real commitment to DEI. If we don’t meet that expectation, we won’t be competitive in the labor market.” This recasts DEI as not merely a moral im-

perative but a strategic necessity.

- **Equity as a policy lens for digital services:** NASCIO has advocated [integrating DEI principles](#) into state cybersecurity and digital access strategies. For instance, its guidance on closing the digital divide and expanding cybersecurity explicitly calls for incorporating “diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility” into state tech planning — extending social justice frames into the technical realm.
- **Partnerships with DEI-focused consulting and advocacy groups:** [The 2022 report](#) urges CIOs to consult external experts and join peer networks centered on inclusion. It names NASCIO’s collaboration with organizations promoting “equity-driven leadership” and suggests states contract DEI consultants for policy audits—a common mechanism for importing progressive ideology into technocratic functions.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE PERSONNEL EXECUTIVES (NASPE)

NASPE links HR leaders across state governments to share hiring policies, workforce metrics, and benefit structures. It has become a DEI delivery system, embedding identity-based workforce analytics, promoting race-conscious professional development, and pushing states to view human resources through a lens of “structural equity.”

- **Promoting DEI as a state workforce imperative:** NASPE has positioned diversity, equity, and inclusion as a foundational component of modern public sector HR. [Since 2020](#), the association has hosted dedicated DEI roundtables and [webinars](#), framing [inclusive hiring and workplace equity](#) as both a moral obligation and a talent acquisition strategy.
- **Institutionalizing DEI through policy infrastructure:** [NASPE surveyed state HR offices](#) on DEI implementation and found widespread adoption of practices like implicit bias training, the appointment of Chief Diversity Officers, and data-driven DEI goal-setting. NASPE disseminated guides on how to audit recruitment pipelines and remove systemic barriers (e.g., unnecessary degree requirements, biased test criteria).

- **Advancing equity analytics beyond representation:** NASPE’s [2023 webinar](#) “Beyond Representation” signaled a shift toward intersectional analysis of workforce data. By encouraging states to disaggregate DEI metrics (e.g., by race, gender, disability, and veteran status), NASPE promotes outcome-focused equity strategies over traditional EEO compliance – a hallmark of progressive HR ideology.
- **Embedding progressive hiring and benefits policies:** Through its influence on state HR executives, NASPE has [supported inclusive employment](#) policies such as “ban-the-box” hiring for applicants with criminal records, expansion of LGBTQ+ health benefits (including coverage for gender transition), and state-level pay equity reviews. These reflect an alignment with contemporary left-leaning workplace reforms.
- **Shaping culture through values-based programming:** NASPE materials consistently stress that a strong internal [culture of DEI is essential](#) to being a “model employer.” Its events and publications encourage states to embed DEI into organizational values, promote cultural competency among leadership, and normalize diversity-focused messaging as part of routine HR communications.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION (NEMA)

NEMA coordinates state emergency management directors, offering guidance on disaster response, resilience planning, and federal grant navigation. Though its mission is logistical and apolitical, it increasingly incorporates progressive language around “climate equity,” promotes DEI in emergency operations, and integrates social justice frameworks into disaster preparedness and funding allocation.

- **Embedding DEI in emergency preparedness:** NEMA’s [2021–2026 Strategic Plan](#) commits to “actively pursuing a diverse and professional emergency management workforce,” reflecting a formal institutional shift toward DEI principles. In 2024, NEMA launched a dedicated [Diversity & Equity Commit-](#)

[tee](#) to promote inclusive recruitment, outreach, and workforce development practices.

- **Cultural competency and outreach to underserved communities:** Under the leadership of [officials like Sima Merick](#), NEMA emphasized that state and local agencies must diversify their personnel and improve communication with communities historically underserved during emergencies. This includes ensuring emergency alerts are accessible across languages and technologies and incorporating equity considerations into preparedness messaging
- **Partnerships to advance equity mandates:** [NEMA collaborates](#) with external advocacy organizations such as the Environmental and Energy Study Institute (EESI) to conduct policy briefings on how to integrate racial and socioeconomic equity into disaster planning. These alliances help push social equity as a core principle of emergency management operations.
- **Promotion of climate-change alarmism and “climate equity”:** NEMA has supported FEMA’s equity-focused initiatives, such as the BRIC (Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities) program. It encourages states to prioritize funding toward “overburdened” or disadvantaged communities, aligning emergency mitigation strategy with the Biden administration’s [climate and environmental justice](#) goals.

CONFERENCE OF STATE BANK SUPERVISORS (CSBS)

CSBS represents financial regulators from all 50 states, aiming to streamline non-federal oversight of banks and fintech entities. Recently, it has adopted ESG-inflected regulatory language, prioritized diversity benchmarks in financial services oversight, and built frameworks that mirror progressive federal guidance on “inclusive” financial access and climate risk.

- **Built permanent DEI infrastructure across its own staff:** In 2022, CSBS [expanded its internal Diversity Council](#) and formed a leadership subcommittee to oversee DEI implementation across the enterprise. It also formalized five identity-based Employee Resource Groups—African American, AAPI, LGBTQ+

Pride, Women’s Network, and Diversity Network—embedding ideological affinity groups into CSBS’s organizational culture.

- **Used its flagship bank survey to elevate ideological benchmarks:** The [2023 CSBS Community Bank Survey](#) spotlighted the “DICE” (Diversity, Inclusion, Culture, and Engagement) initiative at Midwest BankCentre as a model to emulate. The survey praised the bank’s DEI performance—including full executive participation and 20% staff involvement—as a “game changer,” encouraging similar programs at state-regulated banks.
- **Advocated federal cannabis banking reform as a social justice measure:** CSBS [urged Congress](#) in 2022 to pass the SAFE Banking Act, citing equity concerns and public safety risks. The group emphasized that granting financial access to marijuana businesses—legal under state law but banned federally—is a necessary political move.
- **Advanced progressive financial inclusion priorities:** CSBS has [promoted](#) more Minority Depository Institutions (MDIs) and Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs), aimed at serving underbanked and minority communities. It has supported initiatives to reduce racial disparities in mortgage lending and small business credit allocation.
- **Endorsed ESG-style climate regulation in banking supervision:** Since 2021, CSBS has facilitated state engagement with [climate-related financial risk](#). It hosted panels on sustainable finance, joined the Network for Greening the Financial System by 2022, and has encouraged banks to integrate climate scenario analysis—despite several red states rejecting ESG-based oversight.
- **Nationalized left-of-center priorities through state regulatory systems:** CSBS has acted as a conduit for federal priorities on DEI, cannabis normalization, and climate regulation. By embedding these frameworks in technical bank supervision, it has extended progressive influence into financial governance even in Republican-led states that oppose ESG agendas on paper.

ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES (AFWA)

AFWA connects state wildlife and conservation officials for coordination on habitat, species, and recreational policy. Traditionally grounded in science and resource management, it now promotes “inclusive conservation,” uses DEI as a benchmark for outdoor access, and aligns with progressive funders to reshape state policies around race and environmental justice.

- **Embedded DEI into agency guidance through the “Relevancy Roadmap”:** In 2019, AFWA and the Wildlife Management Institute [released](#) the “Fish and Wildlife Relevancy Roadmap,” a comprehensive policy blueprint instructing agencies to adopt DEI principles to attract “non-traditional” participants in outdoor recreation. It urged reforms to outreach, hiring, and programming to align wildlife governance with identity-based goals.
- **Formed a formal DEI Working Group and launched internal assessments:** At its 2020 Annual Meeting, AFWA convened a [Diversity & Inclusion Working Group](#) to institutionalize equity initiatives across state agencies. In 2022, [AFWA began a full internal DEI assessment](#) and [created](#) a “Values and Leadership Team” to steer the development of a DEI framework for its operations and staff policy.
- **Extended DEI training and frameworks to state agency members:** AFWA provided formal DEI training to both its own staff and state wildlife officials. Its frameworks influenced member bodies like WAFWA (the Western Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies), which conducted a regional DEI survey in 2022. State agencies, such as Oregon’s Department of Fish and Wildlife, have followed by adopting dedicated DEI strategic plans.
- **Joined ideologically driven partnerships to reform outdoor culture:** In 2021, AFWA [joined](#) the “Together Outdoors” coalition, focused on making nature-based recreation more “inclusive” for people of color, LGBTQ+ individuals, and others. The coalition promotes systemic cultural changes to outdoor norms and policies through grant funding, toolkits, and best-practice models shared across state agencies.

- **Aligned with national coalitions to reshape workforce demographics:** AFWA [leaders joined](#) the Forest and Wood Products Inclusion Council in 2022, a federally funded, cross-sector initiative co-chaired by the Society of American Foresters. The Council aims to draft a National Action Plan to reduce racial and gender disparities in natural resources fields—pressuring state wildlife and forestry agencies to adopt explicit demographic workforce goals.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE FORESTERS (NASF)

NASF links state forestry agencies in coordinating wildfire management, forest health, and timber industry regulation. Its original technical focus has given way to climate-centered grant-seeking and DEI conditioning, with an emphasis on “justice-based” land management and inclusion metrics in forestry workforce development.

- **Steered state forestry toward federal climate policy integration:** As a [founding member](#) of the Forest-Climate Working Group (FCWG), NASF co-authored recommendations used to shape forest-related climate provisions in the bipartisan infrastructure law and the Inflation Reduction Act. These included support for reforestation grants, carbon sequestration incentives, and ESG-aligned climate forestry funding.
- **Updated its climate platform to reflect federal climate priorities:** In 2020 and again in 2023, NASF formally revised its policy platform to align with the Biden administration’s desires: climate adaptation, carbon market development, and “resilience-building” strategies. The [platform emphasized](#) the role of forests in “dealing with climate change” and aligned NASF with federal and international climate governance structures.
- **Institutionalized DEI language in state forest action plans:** [NASF encouraged](#) all member agencies to integrate DEI benchmarks into their required State Forest Action Plans. This has led multiple states to set goals for reaching “underserved communities” through forestry services and to increase participa-

tion of minority landowners in cost-share programs.

- **Endorsed the Forest and Wood Products Inclusion Council:** In 2022, NASF joined the [Inclusion Council](#)—co-led by the Society of American Foresters and funded by the U.S. Endowment for Forestry & Communities—which aims to “establish a more diverse and inclusive workplace culture” in forestry. This initiative pushes state agencies to treat demographic diversity as a core metric of professional legitimacy.
- **Linked forest ecology with human diversity in public messaging:** In a 2022 Black History Month interview with U.S. Forest Service Chief Randy Moore, [NASF emphasized](#) the connection between ecological biodiversity and racial diversity in staffing. Moore stated, “Much like a healthy forest has diversity, so too should the workforce that manages these forests,” embedding DEI into the philosophical core of the agency’s public narrative.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION (NGA)

NGA is a bipartisan organization representing the governors of the U.S. states. While it formally maintains political neutrality, NGA often functions as a conduit for federal priorities and cross-state policy alignment. Through its Center for Best Practices and convenings, NGA provides technical assistance, policy toolkits, and access to philanthropic and federal partners. This institutional structure enables NGA to diffuse model policies across state lines—including many with progressive ideological origins—regardless of a state’s partisan composition.

- **Used federal recovery funds to promote racial equity agendas:** In 2021, [NGA launched](#) the State Equitable Recovery Coalition, with philanthropic backing, to help governors embed racial and economic equity into post-COVID recovery plans. Technical assistance included narrowing racial health disparities and boosting minority-owned businesses—explicitly tying equity outcomes to federal stimulus deployment.
- **Facilitated DEI executive orders in multiple states:** Following its [2020 survey](#) of state DEI policies, NGA

published guidance and [promoted case studies](#) such as Colorado Governor Jared Polis’s executive order requiring equity integration across all state agencies. Many governors subsequently followed suit with similar executive directives, reinforcing DEI mandates from the executive level down.

- **Promoted progressive health equity frameworks across states:** NGA’s [2023 health equity report](#) highlighted structural reforms like creating Chief Equity Officer roles (e.g., North Carolina) and embedding anti-racism practices in state health departments. The Association convened workshops on “centering community voice” and “equity impact assessments,” pushing a public health model aligned with progressive advocacy.
- **Advanced left-leaning criminal justice reforms through model sharing:** In 2021, NGA [documented and promoted gubernatorial action](#) on reforms long associated with progressive demands—such as bans on effective policing techniques and restraint methods, restrictions on no-knock raids, and mandatory “bias” training. Oregon’s Racial Justice Council was highlighted as a model for institutionalizing racial equity in policing and courts.
- **Encouraged state-facilitated student debt relief via federal workarounds:** NGA advocated for using American Rescue Plan funds and Biden administration guidance to expand Public Service Loan Forgiveness. In 2022, [it showcased how governors](#) helped cancel or refinance student debt—framing student debt cancellation as a valid state-federal collaboration.
- **Mainstreamed Biden-era climate goals through state energy mandates:** NGA publications [encouraged governors to pursue](#) carbon-free electricity, aligning with the Biden administration’s climate agenda. The group urged the use of Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and Inflation Reduction Act funds to drive industries that are fundamentally propped up by federal funding: EV adoption and renewable energy mandates.
- **Positioned equity and climate as bipartisan state imperatives:** Through events, publications, and technical support, NGA normalized progressive goals—such as decarbonization targets, inclusive

workforce pipelines, and racial justice reforms—as default policy priorities, even in red states. The Association’s model playbooks and cross-state convenings applied subtle but structural pressure to conform to federal-progressive policy frameworks.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES (NCSL)

NCSL is a bipartisan membership organization for state lawmakers and legislative staff. It provides policy research, tracks legislation, and facilitates collaboration across chambers and parties. Despite its official neutrality, NCSL has played a pivotal role in diffusing progressive frameworks—particularly in health equity, criminal justice reform, DEI, and election law—into the policy models adopted by red and blue states alike.

- **Mainstreamed health equity as a legislative imperative:** In 2020–2021, [NCSL compiled and distributed](#) summaries of dozens of state laws aimed at reducing racial health disparities, offering model legislation and highlighting equity-focused strategies for Medicaid and COVID recovery.
- **Advanced racial justice reforms in criminal law and government staffing:** Following the 2020 riots, NCSL [produced reports](#) on racial disparities in policing and sentencing, convened bipartisan working groups on bail reform and diversion, and taught states how to use “equity notes” to gauge bills’ demographic impact—injecting progressive equity metrics into legislative analysis.
- **Funded and empowered race-based caucuses within state legislatures:** NCSL’s 2021 annual report [emphasized support](#) for the “Quad Caucus” of minority legislators and the Women’s Legislative Network. It framed these affinity groups—representing over 1,300 lawmakers of color—as “integral” to NCSL’s work and boosted their budgets and influence under the banner of DEI.
- **Promoted identity-based hiring and inclusion mandates in state capitols:** NCSL formed a Legislator Staff Subcommittee on Workforce Diversity and provided DEI training to legislative offices, encouraging states to formalize diversity metrics and embed

“inclusive workplace culture” into public-sector HR.

- **Backed Electoral College circumvention through the National Popular Vote Compact:** NCSL [tracked and amplified](#) the National Popular Vote Interstate Compact (NPV), which would effectively abolish the Electoral College. As of 2024, NCSL reported that 16 states and D.C. had joined the compact, and its [publications featured](#) NPV advocates while framing the Electoral College as outdated and undemocratic.
- **Normalized progressive voting reforms as technical best practices:** In the 2020–2023 period, NCSL hosted webinars on [countering election “misinformation,”](#) promoted automatic voter registration, and profiled no-excuse absentee voting and other left-aligned reforms as administrative improvements—shaping the default policy conversation on election law.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL (NAAG)

NAAG is the national body representing state attorneys general, providing coordination for multistate litigation, policy research, and legal training. Though formally bipartisan, NAAG has come under fire from Republican attorneys general in recent years for advancing a progressive legal agenda, leading to a mass exodus from the organization and growing partisan distrust.

- **Mass Republican withdrawal over “leftward shift”:** Between 2021 and 2022, at least eight Republican attorneys general—including those from Alabama, Texas, Missouri, Montana, and Arizona—[formally withdrew from NAAG](#). Their public statements cited the group’s ideological bias, with Alabama AG Steve Marshall stating, “I can’t justify spending taxpayer dollars to fund an organization that seems to be going further and further left.” The departures marked the most significant fracture in NAAG’s history and signaled a rejection of its perceived alignment with progressive litigation strategies.
- **Use of settlement funds to entrench internal progressive projects:** Several exiting AGs [accused NAAG](#) of diverting millions from multistate settlements—especially opioid litigation—into internal grant programs and advocacy efforts controlled by NAAG

staff. These funds, they argued, were being used to bankroll policy campaigns and litigation trainings that reflected left-leaning priorities, without proper input or accountability from all member states.

- **Litigation agenda aligned with progressive causes:** NAAG played a leading role in coordinating multistate lawsuits against industries such as Big Tech platforms and energy companies—often in concert with Democratic-led states. While some cases had bipartisan support, [Republican AGs charged](#) that the group’s priorities skewed toward high-profile consumer and environmental enforcement that mirrored Democratic talking points.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIES OF STATE (NASS)

NASS brings together secretaries of state to oversee elections, business services, and records management. While its public posture emphasizes election integrity, it has quietly collaborated with federal agencies and social media platforms to monitor and suppress political speech, while advancing progressive voting reforms that often contradict state legislative priorities.

- **Partnership with DHS and tech companies to suppress speech:** By 2022, [NASS was collaborating](#) with the Department of Homeland Security’s Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) to flag “false” election-related content for removal by social media platforms. This partnership enabled state election officials to play an informal but powerful role in online censorship. In 2020, [NASS worked directly](#) with the policy teams of Twitter, Google, and Facebook, urging faster removal of “mis/disinformation” on all these crucial platforms, and eventually had [fully integrated this suppression effort](#) into its “#TrustedInfo” campaign, which directed users to official sources while urging platforms to police dissenting narratives.
- **Internal dissent over censorship and federal collusion:** In a July 2024 op-ed, West Virginia Secretary of State Mac Warner [condemned NASS’s posture](#), accusing it of “stifling free speech” and covering for federal malfeasance. Warner criticized NASS for

refusing to discuss the suppression of the Hunter Biden laptop story at its 2024 conference, calling out the association for tolerating “the psychological operation – the lie – that was perpetrated on the American public.” His rebuke reflected a deeper split: that NASS, under Democratic leadership, has conflated “disinformation” with political dissent and delegated truth arbitration to government bureaucrats and tech censors.

- **Promotion of mail voting and pandemic-era election expansions:** During the 2020 pandemic, NASS [provided guidance](#) and model practices for expanding mail-in voting, ballot drop boxes, and [contactless registration systems](#). Its virtual briefings emphasized continuity of access, encouraging member states to adapt emergency rules to increase turnout—steps that many conservatives warned lacked security guardrails. These measures, developed under crisis conditions, were subsequently institutionalized in many jurisdictions.

GOVERNMENTAL ACCOUNTING STANDARDS BOARD (GASB)

GASB sets financial reporting standards for state and local governments, with direct influence over how public funds and obligations are disclosed. Though its role is highly technical, it has begun incorporating ESG metrics, diversity reporting, and equity-centered accounting principles — subtly shifting fiscal governance away from transparency and toward ideological signaling.

- **Redefining financial reporting to include ESG and DEI:** In its [2022 technical bulletin](#) “Environmental, Social, and Governance Matters,” GASB explicitly acknowledged climate change, pollution, racial equity, and “inclusion” as potentially material to government financial disclosures. The report recommended that governments evaluate how these non-fiscal factors could impact their financial statements—expanding the scope of reporting to encompass ideologically charged issues like environmental justice and social inclusion.
- **Coordination with DEI-focused oversight body:** GASB works directly with the FAF’s Diversity, Equi-

ty, and Inclusion Committee, which was established to “integrate DEI across the organization.” In 2024, GASB staff held [formal quarterly meetings](#) with this committee, reflecting a sustained internal governance commitment to DEI not just in outcomes but in the standards-setting process itself.

- **Strategic planning aligned with equity and sustainability:** The FAF’s 2022–2026 [strategic plan](#) committed the GASB and FASB to “build on its commitment to greater diversity, equity, and inclusion” and to explore their “contributions to future sustainability reporting.” This signals an institutional direction toward embedding social equity and climate goals into the very fabric of accounting frameworks—a stark departure from the traditional mission of fiscal clarity and political neutrality.
- **Paving the way for ESG-style mandates in state and local governments:** By expanding the definition of relevant financial data to include racial equity and climate resilience, GASB is effectively encouraging state and local governments to consider “equity audits,” environmental liabilities, and other ESG-aligned disclosures. These standards could serve as soft mandates that nudge public agencies to adopt policy positions—under the guise of accounting transparency—that mirror the left’s broader policy goals.



**STATE
LEADERSHIP
INITIATIVE**

@RedStatesLead
stateleadership.org