

both dependent and immoral. This theory says that social programs are immoral because they make people dependent. Promoting social programs is immoral. And what does this say about budgets? Well, if there are a lot of progressives in Congress who think that there should be social programs, and if you believe that social programs are immoral, how do you stop these immoral people?

In the strict father frame, it is quite simple. What you have to do is reward the good people—the ones whose prosperity reveals their discipline and hence their capacity for morality—with a tax cut, and make it big enough so that there is not enough money left for social programs. As Grover Norquist says, it “starves the beast.”

For example, as a result of the Republican House’s refusal to either cut tax loopholes or raise taxes to pay its bills, the 2013 “sequester”—an across-the-board cut in government programs—was put into place. Here are some examples of what was cut from various government agencies’ budgets, from a February 20, 2013, article in the *Washington Post*:

- The National Institutes of Health: cut by \$1.6 billion.
- The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: cut by about \$303 million.
- Head Start: cut by over [\\$400 million](#), kicking [57,000 kids](#) out of the program.
- FEMA’s disaster relief budget: cut by \$928 million.
- Public housing support: cut by about \$1.74 billion.
- The FDA: cut by \$209 million.
- NASA: cut by \$896 million.
- Special education: cut by \$827 million.
- The Energy Department’s programs for securing our nukes: cut by \$903 million.
- The National Science Foundation: cut by about \$361 million.
- State Department diplomatic functions: cut by \$665 million.
- Global health programs: cut by \$411 million.
- The Nuclear Regulatory Commission: cut by \$53 million.