

# DOGE - A Different Perspective

by

Phil Rasmussen

Okay, let's get right to the point. Everyone who paid attention during Trump's campaign for president knew that he promised to:

- Reduce the size of government
- Reduce wasteful spending

When he was elected, he repeated those promises, and even before being elected, the public knew his intentions to form the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE). Thus if the liberals, democrats, and government workers did not know or understand the ramifications of these two promises, these people are too ignorant to even be in government service.

Starting with the first promise to reduce the size of government, this means cutting back on the number of people serving in our government. Everyone should recognize this. In union contracts, the unions ALWAYS have held to the concept of "last hired, first to go." Therefore, the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) and the National Federation of Federal Employees (NFFE) are well aware of this contract clause and should have notified their members. Now the unions are upset with the reduction of federal workers for one reason only – they lose membership and thus dues and power.

But, what about those workers on "probationary" status? Well the law is clear about that. Federal regulations [Title 5, Chapter I, Subchapter B, Part 315, Subpart H, § 315.801](#) (5 C.F.R. § 315.801) covers probationary periods. Additionally, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) uses form [SF-50](#) as part of the employment process.

In short, if a probationary employee does not read and understand what they sign during the employment process, how can the American public trust that employee to do a good job? There is a Buddhist saying that goes, "Take care of yourself before helping others."

The health of our government is very much related to our own health. For example, according to the [CDC](#), obesity is a chronic disease impacting other diseases such as diabetes and heart disease. In fact, obesity has tripled since the 1960s ([USA Facts](#)) to over 40% of our population.

In 1960, the number of government workers was about [1.8 million](#). In 2024, [Pew Research](#) identified just over 3 million federal workers or about a 67% increase. While a 67% increase is significant, it has **a far greater** impact on taxpayers. Programs initiated by various federal departments significantly impact state and local governments, and

thus taxpayers. For example, while EPA has less than 20,000 employees, 90% of its programs are administered by thousands of state and local government employees. Most of these programs are funded with federal dollars.

When a person adds weight and keeps gaining it, he/she becomes susceptible to various diseases and illnesses. Keep in mind that as these diseases and illnesses exacerbate, the ability of the body to function properly diminishes until eventual death. The government is no different than any individual. As it grows and adds more and more workers, the various systems break down until the body can no longer work effectively.

Just as an obese person needs to go on a diet, so does the government. This is best done by reducing the size of the government workforce. The “Government Diet” requires cutting down of workers.

Regarding the wasteful spending, and realigning or possible disbanding of government departments, there are also analogies to our human bodies. For the first analogy we will look at cancer. The [National Cancer Institute](#) defines cancer as: “a disease in which some of the body’s cells grow uncontrollably and spread to other parts of the body.” The [Cleveland Clinic](#) has a slightly different definition, “a disease that happens when normal cells become abnormal and multiply and spread.”

From the government perspective, most, if not all, of the departments over time have overstepped their initial missions or mandates. They have initiated programs that are costly, poorly managed, and relatively ineffective. Like cancer in the human body, these cancerous programs need to be excised (i.e. “surgically removed”). Just like any surgery, the body needs to recuperate and adjust.

Similar to cutting out the cancer in government, perhaps the second analogy is something that liberals, democrats, and the far-left can understand. In 1973, the liberal, Supreme Court ruled on *Roe v. Wade* allowing women to choose abortion if desired. Since then, there has been a continuous battle between conservatives and liberals until the Court overturned its previous ruling in 2022 saying that the issue is not federal but state. Since then Democrats, liberals, and the left have vehemently sought ways around the ruling.

Thus the second analogy is that the current administration is aborting programs and possibly departments. According to a variety of studies, the number one reason for women seeking abortions is for social or economic reasons ([96.5%](#)). [One study](#) determined that **73%** of women said they cannot afford a baby, while the [NIH](#) puts the figure at about **40%**. Regardless of which study is viewed, the dominating reason is financial.

Just as in unwanted pregnancies, the current administration is looking at programs and departments to determine the impact of return on investment (ROI). In other words if the programs and/or departments are holding to their assigned mission, wisely using

taxpayer funds, and prudently sticking to programs that support the security and well-being of America.

If ROI is lacking, there will be an increased probability that the recommendation for those programs and/or departments will be abortion. This should not be a surprise to Democrats or liberals. After all, they have been pushing and supporting the abortion narrative for a long time. The only difference is that the abortions being human, they are of the "[living organism](#)" of government.

For decades, Congress and federal workers have advocated, studied, and dilly-dallied various issues during their tenure in office, and have NOT accomplished any significant or lasting solutions.

Now that Trump is holding these representatives' feet to the fire, they are uncomfortable and resentful. While change is inevitable and very uncomfortable for many, if our government workers cannot adopt, they need to leave. Similarly if a department cannot adopt to change, it needs to go.