

Concerned Scientists @ IU
Advocates for Science @ IU



Candidates' Forum on Science and Public Policy
2020 Congressional Candidates – 9th Congressional District, Indiana
May 5, 2020

(1) What do you see as the top priorities for investment of federal funding for scientific research?

D. Liam Dorris (D): An interesting facet of science is we don't know what lies ahead, and it advances best when we support the scientific community without profit-driven research.

We need to fund forward-looking research and development without a profit motive. These funds will serve as grants to public universities and other independent scientific organizations. Many leaps in technology began as ideas from a scientist or engineer in a lab. For example, thorough understanding of Einstein's general relativity is pivotal to the GPS technology many of us use. Lasers were a mere curiosity, but now try to find a home in America without at least one. Scientific theory leads to development of the technologies that dramatically improve our lives and drive our society.

The profit motive, while it does lead to furthering some innovations, also encourages industry to suppress unfavorable data. When funding is transferred to the private sector, profit motive is automatically added to the equation at the expense of cutting-edge technologies.

Furthermore, we must protect the scientists, institutions, data, and funding from the political sphere and haphazard scrutiny from those who would seek to suppress the results of research that might make profitable technology obsolete. For example, we have seen the dangers and consequences of research suppression when it comes to public health and the effects of climate change.

Brandon Hood (D): Due to the existential crisis that is climate change, our top priority for scientific research must be finding solutions that remove fossil fuels from the generation of renewable energy. The construction of solar panels, wind turbines and electric cars will continue to have little to no net-carbon benefit as long as their production consumes huge amounts of fossil fuels and other mined resources.

James O'Gabhann III (D): When it comes to research, the top priorities must be: infection diseases, all issues relating to climate change and other areas as determined by the public and scientists. These decisions need to be made in the commons among an informed citizenry.

Mark Powell (D): 1. The current "Donkey in the Room" is the SARS Coronavirus 2 and so Medical research is of the highest national and international priority. I would add that funding in this area which was lackluster at best will be amplified by this Congress and the new Congress that is seated in January. 2. The Comments of Chairwoman of the House Subcommittee on Research and Technology points to an area that will be necessary for Congress and the Administration to support fully "a federal-state-industry partnership that works with local manufacturing communities to strengthen U.S. manufacturing." This area of technology research along with AI research funding is vital for job retention and development. 3. When I ran in the Congressional primary candidate in 1986, as a 26 young man, I called for America to make a determined effort to journey to Mars. Now as a 60 year old Congressional candidate, I still believe

my vision of Space research funding along with private enterprise partnership is critical for our national security and societal benefit.

Andy Ruff (D): After years of relatively flat federal funding for scientific research, there is widespread need in all areas of research. The top priority is not a particular area of research, but reaffirmation of the value of evidence-based decision-making in the federal, and all levels of government. The era of pseudo-science, ‘alternative facts’, and ignorant dismissal of expertise has to end. Congress needs to proclaim that the ‘war on science’ is over, and back this proclamation with significant increases in funding for all federal scientific grant programs, as well as rebuilding the scientific expertise within the federal government, which the current administration has sought to dismantle.

Tonya Millis (L): Catastrophic Contagions (Research & Cures).

John Tilford (I):

- Reduction of the rate of increase of global warming & moderation of extreme weather effects.
- Medical research regarding viral pandemics.
- Reduction of human damage to environment.
- Equitable distribution and preserve quality of water.
- Equitable distribution and increase quality of food.
- Jim Webb space telescope.
- Alternative propulsion systems for space missions.

Trey Hollingsworth (R):

[declined invitation to take part]

(2) Crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the ongoing crisis of climate change can only be mitigated by relying on the best available scientific data and expertise. How do you envision your future role in ensuring that the government rely on science in preparing for and mitigating such crises?

D. Liam Dorris (D): We need to actually listen to our scientists and bioengineers, and not dismiss or silence them due to political or religious ideology.

The problem is that we, as a nation, dismiss scientific data and research because of the inconvenient truths that we might find along the way. Other times, during the ongoing process of scientific discovery, we find a problem that we deem as ‘too hard’ or ‘too expensive,’ or a problem that would require a substantial amount of time, effort and money to correct. We often even dismiss major problems our scientists warn us about as not being serious until it is too late and in our faces.

We cannot let these things be barriers to progress. We need to recognize that inaction and complacency usually leads to negative impacts that are more costly in terms of effort, and/or money and to our people.

I envision my role as elevating awareness and working to break political and religious barriers that stand between the people of this nation and science. I would work to raise the importance of unbiased scientific data and elevate public perception of the need for such.

Brandon Hood (D): I am not a scientist. Surrounding myself with the brightest minds, and experts to analyze such crises is my highest priority in ensuring that my office has the foresight needed. The hardest part of making tough decisions is having experts that are reliable in their analysis. The tobacco industry provides a perfect example of how corporate malfeasance manipulated scientific opinion for profit. So-

called "tobacco science" can lead to drastic irreparable mistakes on these and other critical issues if leaders are not mindful of properly vetting their influences.

James O’Gabhann III (D): Scientists ought to take a leadership role in questions of science ,and in return scientists should feel comfortable to discuss these issues in a language that the public may understand. K-12 curriculum has an important role to play in the development of a science vocabulary and in debates around issues. My role as a member of the House of Representatives from the NINTH would be that Indiana University is at the round table on these critical issues. For myself, I would persuade the Speaker to the best of my ability to appoint me to the House Science Committee, or the House Appropriations Committee and its Science Sub -committee.

Mark Powell (D): I would work with Congressman Bill Foster of Illinois, the only physicist in Congress to resurrect The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment. While those FTE positions were cut years ago, the need for professional nonpartisan scientific expertise is critical for the development of public policy.

Andy Ruff (D): A crisis poses both danger and opportunity. The current economic shutdown provides a rare opportunity to hit the ‘reset’ button and start funding research and development that will provide a sustainable future for the U.S. and the entire world. Globalization means that we are all in this together, and 2020 provides an opportunity for the U.S. to resume international leadership, for which we are still uniquely positioned. This is not the time to ‘bail out’ the fossil fuel industry. Once again people can see Mount Kenya from Nairobi, can see the Himalaya from New Delhi, and can see Claremont from downtown L.A. This ‘pause’ in business as usual is a once in a lifetime opportunity to save our planet, as well as ourselves.

Tonya Millis (L): Congress needs to continue with Hearings and interviews with doctors and scientists who are experts in their fields so that the ‘Public at Large’ can be informed. Education is key.

John Tilford (I):

- Speak out. Explain. Set example(s).
- Introduce legislation based on science. Sponsor others’ similarly based house resolutions. Vote accordingly. Too many members sponsor but do not vote for. However, I cannot replace those in Congress, and those who voted them there, who deny science and believe as Asimov described so succinctly, “Democracy means that my ignorance is just as good as your knowledge.”
- Education is both the critical problem and the ultimate solution.

Trey Hollingsworth (R):

[declined invitation to take part]

(3) The coronavirus pandemic has revealed weaknesses in both the US system of governance and the scientific and medical systems that support public health. Which of these weaknesses can be addressed by Congressional action and what is your plan to address them?

D. Liam Dorris (D): As an anti-corruption candidate, my first answer would be to remove big money from politics and demand that our elected officials are beholden to people and not corporations and wealthy. This would be a giant leap in the right direction for the scientific and medical communities. This would remove one of the biggest weaknesses with the current system in one strike.

The best way to remove big money from politics is to propose a constitutional amendment that overturns Citizens United vs. F.E.C. (2010) and return elections to public funding. Removing the influence of big money in elections would make elected officials beholden to the people rather than to corporations or the wealthy. This would remove a significant amount of corporate influence driven by profit motives on our elected officials and drive more movement toward public research and away from private research.

Furthermore, I would support legislation to make it so that patents developed from public research are bought by the U.S. government for public use for a specific amount of time before the patents become available to private corporations.

Brandon Hood (D): Congress has the power and obligation to create an apolitical pandemic response team that cannot be disbanded. Legislators must mandate storage of PPE at strategically advantageous locations throughout the United States. The weaknesses we are seeing in the health and science services are a manifestation of the vacuum of leadership in DC.

James O’Gabhann III (D): I support a single payer health plan for the purpose of eliminating inefficiencies in our health system through delivering care during future pandemics, providing preventative health care and addressing our mental health needs and drug related illnesses at the earliest stages. The funds that we save from these inefficiencies--- in addition to other funds - may be directed toward seeding future research that is NOT profit or political driven but rather science and factual driven on behalf of the public good.

Mark Powell (D): First, we need to assess the time line to temporarily nationalize the health system in this country. From critical care hospitals to outpatient surgery centers medicine has become for profit money makers that infects the systemic distribution of compassionate care. Therefore I will advocate after this temporary status that all health centers, be part of nonprofit corporations where percentages of administration are monitored so that CEO’s are not making millions and CNA’s are making \$12 per hour, livable wages paid to staff will decrease turnover and provide motivation for continued compassionate care. There would be two metrics of positive management in hospitals and other health care centers, I would envision: patient/family feedback and staff satisfaction. Second, we need to make sure medical coverage in these new nonprofits are staffed with people who enjoy healing their patients and not having to worry about school loans. I would work with the GOP members to craft a bipartisan bill that would eliminate their career preparation debt for their service to the American Health System. Third, I would make sure that health centers in urban and rural areas were given additional funding to provide incentives to personnel to serve in these areas where shortages are now growing.

As chief of staff to the Health Policy Chair in the Michigan House of Representatives from 2001-2003, these staffing issues were always brought up for discussion. Fourth, we have seen through the living out of this pandemic that viruses do not respect national borders, therefore, I would advocate as we implement our nonprofit model for all health care centers in our borders, we work with our Canadian and Mexican neighbors to see where cooperation and sharing of resources can eliminate duplication and streamline manufacturing and supply chain effectiveness in North America.

Andy Ruff (D): The weakness is in the current administration, not democracy as a system of government. The pandemic highlights the importance of informed, participatory democracy, and I predict that voter participation in 2020 will significantly exceed the 2018 surge. The low mortality rates in Germany, Finland, and elsewhere with comprehensive healthcare systems demonstrate conclusively to value of prevention versus cure. It is time for the U.S. to adopt a national healthcare (not health insurance) program, and whether this is a staged approach with annual decreases in the minimum age requirement for Medicare, or a more accelerated transition, depends on the pace with which American society can adapt to the new global realities.

John Tilford (I):

- Intelligently targeted and sufficient federal funding for research.
- Encourage citizens' buy in and personal support through speaking engagements in the 9th District and via social media.
- Require states' appropriate share of medical funding and health care staffing expenses to be met, or progress made toward being met, as prerequisite for federal assistance – the amount of each state's share/progress to be determined by one federal board in consideration of their individual situations. Yes, I hate boards too, but so often the states most in need are the ones whose people vote against their own interests, e.g., for representatives who resist humanitarian provisions of health care such as the Affordable Care Act.
- But the bottom line in more ways than one: push to establish a National Health Service similar to those of the UK, Canada, and other enlightened, practical, and less radicalized nations. 'Wish I had space to describe my son's experience in London and a Scottish conversation my wife and I overheard near Glasgow. The former punch line: "Oh, that's right. You're an American and don't know what health care is. Get your sick ass to the office on the corner." The latter: "Your son is waiting too long for a free liver transplant? Go ahead and pay for private health care."

Tonya Millis (L): The coronavirus revealed the CDC (Centers for Disease Control) was unprepared for a crisis it was designed to handle. The CDC is an extremely large beurocracy that is over-funded and outdated. After the coronavirus outbreak in the U.S., FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) took over and managed responsibilites that should have been under the CDC's purview. I am recommending shutting down the CDC and streamlining their procedures & responsibilities into FEMA. That would save the taxpayers billions of dollars as well as to better serve the welfare of our citizens.

Trey Hollingsworth (R):

[declined invitation to take part]

(4) What do you see as the most effective ways to improve government leadership in combating climate change? As a Congressional representative, what will you do bring the federal government, state government, and the private sector together in addressing the challenge of climate change?

D. Liam Dorris (D): The first step is to recognize that there is a problem with how we govern, and that we are facing an existential threat largely due to our own historical ignorance. Exxon-Mobil, for instance, has known of the threat of climate change since at least the 1960s, but because they are beholden to their own profit motive, they worked to suppress that scientific knowledge for far too long. There should be no doubt that this exacerbated the problem we face today when much smaller adjustments in the past would have made the problem more manageable and reduced the severity of the consequences we are now up against. This same company, Exxon Mobil, spent just under \$10 million lobbying the government in 2019 alone. This is a major problem with how we govern, right now, and we need to confront it head-on.

I would push for a return to a progressive marginal tax rate of 80% and provide a 100% tax write-off of money spent in research and development. Additionally, the laws governing this should be written by a panel of scientists, elected officials, and major corporations that govern how that is defined and where focus should be placed so that all perspectives have a fair say. I would then challenge and encourage the private sector to do what it does best: compete. With a strong incentive from the government, the private sector strengths can shine through and make sure this is a multifaceted response, rather than leaving everything to either the private sector or the government alone.

It is not my intent to punish for-profit corporations, but to give them a reasonable standard then respond to their good actions of contributing to the betterment of humanity with rewards like tax breaks.

Brandon Hood (D): The best way to lead effectively on climate change is by establishing universal standards for clean energy. Many alternative energy sources are billed as renewable, though they rely heavily on fossil fuels and mined minerals. The lasting effect on the environment from these practices should be widely known. Greenwashing is a common practice to mask the harmful effects of producing biomass, biofuel, electric cars, solar and wind energy. We have to confront the truth and clearly define a sustainable path forward to change our addiction to these deadly ways of being.

James O’Gabhann III (D): I do not think that any one stated it better than Jay Inslee, Governor of Washington and a Candidate in the Democratic Primary on climate change. (For reference, the statement was worked on by Sam Ricketts and Bracken Hendricks and is sometimes referred to as the gold standard for an environmental policy proposal.) The three sectors addressed were power generation, transportation, and buildings ----which is responsible for nearly 70 percent of carbon emissions in the United States--- and what must be done to clean them up. However he did not stop there and offered an international component by using the tools of foreign policy that would include: trade ,aid ,robust diplomacy. I have proposed to use the seventeen UN Sustainable Goals as a benchmark as my Rural Green New Deal for the NINTH Congressional District which follows the Green New Deal but with a rural focus . Essentially, the Rural New Deal would transform local economies into carbon neutral environments with the accompanied challenging jobs in research and application. In the health field, it would be similar to what is happening in Kokomo where a GM factory is converted to address the pandemic. Although, we will need more success stories and an infrastructure following the pandemic---- if we expect to address climate change in an aggressive manner that it demands.

Mark Powell (D): On my website (pastorpowellforcongress.webs.com) I lay out my platform on these matters: Global warming is real, and we are seeing more and more effects of it every year. The only debate on what we will do to act responsibly. Logic commands us to take care of the earth and all creation. You and I are responsible for this crisis and in so many ways we have failed. I support government action and personal action to care for our planet and to protect and treat animals humanely and respectfully. I believe and will support...

1. Immediate Action to create the United States Department of the Environment!!!
2. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions sensibly.
3. Protecting our forests, national parks and arctic regions worldwide by investing in environmentally compassionate technology and jobs

Andy Ruff (D): Congress simply needs to end corporate welfare for industries that exacerbate climate change, and provide tax incentives for sustainable existence. Many international corporations already understand that their future depends on this fundamental transformation. We need to put people back to work, but instead of trying to prop up a doomed system, Congress needs to use this opportunity to build a sustainable future. The youth of the world understand that it is their future that is a stake, and the reign of the greedy 1% has revealed itself for what it really is.

John Tilford (I):

- Similar to the answers for number (3) and substitute “combating climate change”.
- I use the following “thought experiment” regarding extreme weather events in discussions: We are riding in a weather race car powered by heat. The worn path it follows day by day and month by month is banked on the hot and cool sides – pulling the car toward the historical mean, generally higher in summer and cooler in winter. Now we have more heat powering the car. We can, and do, now exceed the ability of the banks to confine our usual path and we have more and more extreme weather; we can, and do, jump the banks in unpredictable ways.
- Return to the higher automotive gasoline mileage requirements of the Obama administration, the same standards supported by the automotive manufacturers and maintained by California in spite of the Trump administration’s reductions. Less gasoline used, less carbon emissions.

- Likewise, restore the limitations of Mercury emissions from coal-fired electrical power generation.
- Further: do not subsidize fossil fuel sources for power in any way. Water, wind, solar, and now tide power sources are financially competitive and emit no carbon dioxide whatsoever. Indiana's legal measures against solar power in private homes (reduction in fees paid by grid energy companies to private residents during solar surplus hours and reductions in state income tax credits) and supports for coal power are embarrassing and ultimately counter-productive. Coal is dying, solar will win. Do not try to hold up a falling elephant. Better, get ahead of the wave of the future – train citizens for solar and wind jobs.
- Educate all three: federal, state, and private sector. None are so blind as those who will not see. All can win if they choose to do so. They need to be shown and convinced.

Tonya Millis (L): From my perspective, the majority of people want clean air. They want a safe & clean society for their families going well into the future. Congress should continue to inform and make recommendations for healthy living in general while not infringing on the personal freedoms of each individual. There is a balance here.

Trey Hollingsworth (R):
[declined invitation to take part]

(5) Public health research demonstrates that access to healthcare is one of the primary barriers to healthy outcomes for American citizens. Given the ongoing loss of work-related insurance for millions of Americans, how would you address this emerging public health challenge?

D. Liam Dorris (D): There is no freedom of choice in employer-based healthcare. Healthcare is a human right.

The health of all citizens should be considered, and as we are seeing during this crisis, not having a universal healthcare system has put the lives of all at risk, many have died, and many more will die. Insurance companies make profits off denying care to people who are insured, and that is inhumane to say the least. A focus must be on people over profits.

I support Medicare for All.

The Affordable Care Act was certainly a step in the right direction, but clearly isn't working as well as a universal healthcare system. Passing Medicare for All would effectively replace the Affordable Care Act by making it obsolete.

We have the system in place to do it, and we would have to vastly expand it's infrastructure by taking existing insurance companies and their personnel and retooling them for the M4A system.

It should also be noted that most businesses, both small and large, will benefit from this; they no longer will have to negotiate with insurance companies to provide health benefits to compete for working class talent. The process of negotiating for healthcare is an unnecessary step that companies would be relieved of upon the passing of Medicare for All.

It's what's good and right for both the people and business.

Brandon Hood (D): Healthcare must be guaranteed free at point of sale for all. Healthcare is a basic human need that all must have met. Access to decent housing is an unconventional example of basic preventative medicine. Guaranteed healthcare and housing are parts of my platform advocating for a Universal Basic Standard of Living for all Americans.

James O’Gabhann III (D): I covered this question in point number #4 by creating a single payer health plan. Single payer makes more people financially better off because it controls the over inflated costs that we now pay for them through employee and out of pocket expenses. Further, providing health care by small business is an enormous burden and is a threat to being competitive in the international market. Businesses should compete on the basis of the working opportunity and pay ; and employees should be free to start their own business without leaving their own healthcare plan behind. Simply put market principles do not hold true to health care due to the fact of over inflated costs. We must have a system where we may go in default mode and necessary protocols in the next pandemic and/or climate change crisis. Lives cannot be lost due to a fractured delivery care system. Healthcare does not adhere to market principles and cannot be placed within that context. The COVID 19 Pandemic has shown that our health system is on a life support system that is not sustainable.

Mark Powell (D): I cover this matter broadly in Question 3 from the stand point of the temporary nationalization and evolution toward a nonprofit health care model. That begins the discussion of how to addresses health services will be rendered. The second issue is payment of services. This Pandemic has shown the wisdom of universal health coverage where all people have access to compassionate care without worry of cost. With the advent of a new American nonprofit health care system and Congressional Health Insurance access for Middle Class (\$120,000 and below) the access and cost sharing for individuals in the Middle Class and poverty level will be in place to provide for secure financing for services.

Andy Ruff (D): It is simple. The era of employer-based health insurance is over. Removing the insurance industry from healthcare is already being achieved by record unemployment, which makes the transition to healthcare access for all Americans that much easier to achieve.

John Tilford (I):

- Obvious: create the United States National Health Service. See earlier answers regarding this topic in number (3).
- The early years of the Clinton administration showed how complex and ultimately assured to fail was the “try to please all parties” approach to reforming national health care. Get it done. Bite the bullet. It’s time. (Aaron in London example. Polly and John near Glasgow story.)
- All other modern states and many second and even third tier have national health services. None have ever changed to the US model, which resembles in the worst ways the New York City subway system.
- The savings due to elimination of multiple layers of for-profit “insurers” and health systems (sound familiar, Indiana University Health?) can be used for better quality, better outcomes.
- Consider the recent declines in life expectancies in the United States in spite of having by far the most costly health care system on planet Earth. The US trails almost all other developed nations in other significant health metrics.
- Our businesses are handicapped by their employee health insurance burden and find it handicapping in international competition.

Tonya Millis (L): The private sector and free markets have evolved regarding insurance and medical treatment necessary for ones life and dignity. Over recent decades, Employers have improved regarding the benefits they offer, and private insurance is now responding to the needs of individuals who are self-employed. There is need for improvements. On this issue, the federal government should stay out of the way and let ‘We the People’ lead the way in science and free market principles.

Trey Hollingsworth (R):

[declined invitation to take part]

(6) Climate change, COVID-19, and nuclear arms proliferation are global problems, affecting all countries. What role should the United States play in global scientific and environmental diplomatic agreements? What role do you see yourself playing in Congress in bringing a global dimension to scientific or environmental decisions?

D. Liam Dorris (D): Our first role as a nation is to be a citizen of the world.

The fact is that we have not shown leadership in the international community, and we have been resistant for a long time. Our own allies are certainly skeptical of US. The international community could use bold leadership that the United States has provided in the past, and we should rise to the challenge. But the hard truth is that we need to be able to take care of ourselves before we can be a true world leader, again.

The role I see myself playing is one of working to remove the barrier big money creates in our political system. Our nation has been hamstrung by the interests and influence of a few; the consequences of which reach to all corners of the world. In addition to fighting against the obstacles here, I would coordinate with international scientific bodies in order to make informed decisions and better shape policies

Brandon Hood (D): My role as a legislator will be in guiding the public conversation towards positions of peace and preparedness. If there is a need for developing additional international deliberative scientific bodies, I would absolutely participate in that effort by generating the political will to do so.

James O’Gabhann III (D): The United States needs to play a leadership role through collaborative relationships with the international and regional organizations throughout the world and in particular Africa, the continent with the least material resources and the most demanding health challenges. I would fully fund the United Nations and hold nations accountable on reaching the 17 UN Sustainable Goals. We will need to take a break from military escalation and nuclear proliferation --and never come back to these sparring heads---and rather use these resources to fight inequality , poverty, mitigate climate change and pesky microbes.

Mark Powell (D): The United States must lead. I would like to serve on the House Foreign Relations Committee where these issues can be acted upon. It would be my great honor to follow in the footsteps of House Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Lee Hamilton (D-IN) (1993- 1995).

Andy Ruff (D): American global leadership was a post World War II outcome of having a large, industrial economy that was not severely damaged by the war. China has already eclipsed Japan as the world’s second largest economy, and with a quarter of the world’s population (and half the world’s population in eastern and southern Asia, it is a question of when, not if, it will become the global economic center. How the U.S. responds to the current situation will significantly determine whether we continue to be a center of technological innovation and global leadership, or like the United Kingdom, become a former world power. Military might is irrelevant to the current environmental, economic, and public health emergencies facing our country. I will be proactive in pursuing a harmonized, global strategy for building a sustainable future. If America leads the effort for saving the planet, I believe most of the world will follow.

John Tilford (I):

- When I first started working for the Defense Intelligence Agency in 1994 and mentioned My Indiana Home – I was immediately accepted. [Senator Lugar’s counter proliferation of fissile](#)

[materials measures](#) had made their work much easier and the world much safer. The United States, albeit drug into the lead role by Lugar and Nunn, did it.

- The same approach can work again. Artic mining rights are a current example crying out for leadership.
- What can one House Representative do? Consider Frank McCloskey and ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia. The owner/manager of a tea shop near Kelvingrove museum came out to greet us after a waitress discovered we were from Bloomington, Indiana. He was from the former Yugoslavia. “Frank McCloskey saved my life when I was twelve. The Serbs were gathering all the males in our village to kill.”
- Consider [Charlie Wilson in Afghanistan](#). I was the Chief, Afghanistan Cell for Admiral Jacoby, the J-2 for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from April to October 2002.
- I’ve self-assigned work of national significance: while a by-name requested member of the South Asia Branch, Production Directorate, Defense Intelligence Agency I heard on NPR at 0530 while driving to work terrorists had broken into the Indian Parliament on 13 December 2001 and killed several representatives. Both India and Pakistan were critical to our post-9/11 efforts. By 0430 on 14 December after working through the night I had a draft “Indian Retaliatory Options Against Pakistan, TS, N/F” ready for review. Received thank-you notices from the offices of SECSTATE (Powell) and SECDEF (Rumsfeld), among many other decision makers and commands around the world, including the military attaché in New Delhi.

Tonya Millis (L): Diplomatic engagement by our leaders along with global scientific research needs to continue and be encouraged.

Trey Hollingsworth (R):
[declined invitation to take part]

(7) During the past several years, scientists at federal agencies have found their work increasingly ignored or marginalized. How can Congress better support scientists and protect the integrity of science produced at federal agencies? What specifically will you do to make science part of deliberations and decision-making in Congress?

D. Liam Dorris (D): It’s not just the scientists at a federal level; all scientists are being increasingly ignored and marginalized. Nearly all scientists agree that Climate Change is an existential threat, yet our government still is dismissive of them because it might cause the corporations and the wealthy to make less profit.

I will defer to my previous answers, removing big money from our politics. Without that, I don’t see Congress or the nation improving the situation. Again, an amended constitution removing big money from politics is the only way to solve this issue.

Recent history has shown that we are reactive instead of proactive. Events that have shaped this nation in my own lifetime were singular events, which brought us together for a short time, but have no lasting effect, and we have shown a level of desensitization to events of increasing magnitude. We must act quickly and decisively to eliminate the root cause to the major issues this nation faces.

I have and will continue to listen to, and promote, scientists and the data they produce, and will do everything within my ability to bring them to the forefront of the national conversation

Brandon Hood (D): The scientific community needs a non-partisan voice in the legislative process. Making decisions through a quasi-governmental agency, not dependent on elections, with powers to affect the regulatory process could solve this problem. Such an agency would need to be created.

Ensuring that the voice of reason and science has a solid position in all legislative considerations must be of the highest order of importance.

James O’Gabhann III (D): Well.... it would really help if there were more scientists that ran for public office or became involved in organizations such as yours. I am a member of various science organizations although some of my subscriptions have slipped. Further, we need more emphasis on science education at all grade levels.

I supported Elizabeth Warren in the Primary because of her platform for the need for structural change in so many areas. One area that is needed is public finance of elections so we may attract a broader base of the public in elections. In the meantime, I will have scientists on my congressional staff or nearby for consultation in all areas of American life. I would like to work with the local science community at IU to draw upon the varied expertise that will be needed to address these sticky issues in science. I am not an expert but I value facts and expertise in knowledge and wisdom. My strength is I know what I don’t know.

Mark Powell (D): In my second answer I touched upon working with Congressman Foster in resurrecting the OTA. There are also multiple Congressional Member Organizations (CMO’s) that I would want to be part of in my first year, Public Health and STEM Education are a couple I would like to be an active member. Not only would we have the opportunity to hear from the scientists in DC at the various agencies but an institution like Indiana University would be a wonderful resource to draw from and invite faculty or graduate student research that would have an impact upon our nation. I would take every opportunity to cheerlead for IU’s faculty, students and staff. If nominated by the Democratic Party and chosen by the people of the 9 th District in November, I would like to have STEM interns working for the Office of the United States Representative. When I was chief of staff for the Associate House Speaker in Michigan, I would usually have at least 2 interns from MSU or Lansing Community College each semester. I wanted to have interns do more than just filing or answering calls. I pledge to spend time answering their questions and letting them see if there was an interest in government service.

Andy Ruff (D): The problem described above lies primarily with the Executive Branch, not Congress, except that Mitch McConnell and Senate Republicans have been the great enablers of the Trump Administration’s self-serving approach to governance. The 2020 election is not just about removing a sociopathic president that is a threat to the Republic itself, but also removing the sycophantic stranglehold on Congress that has defined the past decade. America must renew its spirit of bipartisanship, in which compromise is not a bad word, and a greedy, winner-take-all approach is roundly condemned as un-American. Congress legislates, allocates funding, and provides oversight, but it is the responsibility of the Executive Branch to faithfully implement policies and procedures, and to protect our nation from clear and present danger. The current administration has failed the American people, as well as the basic tenets of the U.S. Constitution.

John Tilford (I):

- Require removal of federal scientists to be only “for cause”. Tie to whistle blowers’ protections. Support and protect Inspector Generals.
- Demand scientists respected in related fields be present in any congressional committee or subcommittee meetings expected to involve their specialties.

Tonya Millis (L): Congress should promote private market access to scientific breakthroughs. When it comes to the needs of our national well being, Congress should support those who have shown promise through limited grants & loans. Congress represents the people and should not marginalize scientific work and achievements.

Trey Hollingsworth (R):

[declined invitation to take part]

(8) The last three years of the Trump administration have seen significant efforts to roll back the regulatory involvement of federal environmental protection laws and implementation. The federal government has argued that in many cases that this should be left to the states. What do you see as the proper role of the federal government in setting environmental policy? Should the federal government be involved in regulating greenhouse gas emissions?

D. Liam Dorris (D): The proper role of the federal government is to take charge, and we should absolutely be regulating greenhouse gas emissions, the survival of humanity depends on us doing our part.

Environmental issues, including but not limited to greenhouse gas emissions, affect all the states of this nation and the world. The reason there is a push to hand this over to the states is to enable corporations who find regulation restrictive to find or lobby for areas with less restrictions, in order to increase profit at the expense of the environment and humanity, by proxy.

We are living in a time where it is greed versus humanity.

We know the root cause. There are only two questions remaining.

1. When will we decide to act?
2. Will we act before it's too late?

Brandon Hood (D): It is the federal government's job to set regulatory standards for pollution. Greenhouse gasses are the main cause of climate change and must be offset. National security forces agree that climate change is a threat to our future. No state should have the power to undermine progress on this existential threat.

James O'Gabhann III (D): I am the antithesis of the current Administration and my congressional opponent in the General Election. The role back of federal regulations is a harbinger of more to come unless we are active in 2020. This is our moment to say.....NO MORE! No more privatization of our military, our education system both at K-12 and higher education, research centers and the list goes on..... The lack of respect for our institutions have been too long in the making. This is the time to turn toward responsible regulation with incentives and to work with the States and the world on a carbon -free environment. Any thinker will tell you that all systems need feedback loops. Regulations provide for those loops to keep a system in balance. Currently, I think most would agree that we are terribly out of balance.

Mark Powell (D): In my platform I call for creating the Department of the Environment. Because rank is important in DC, I would want the Secretary to be 7 th in line of succession after Defense and ahead of the Attorney General. I would love to see Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. in that position someday soon. With that said, you could only imagine the action and energy that Department would have in setting policy, cleaning up America, making sure our public lands are not polluted and emissions would be addressed not only in DC but at the UN and in other multinational conferences.

Andy Ruff (D): We need to eliminate the influence of special interests in state and federal government. In some cases, states are out in front of the federal government in environmental policies, but many other cases they lag far behind. A system of checks and balances requires action by both state and federal government. This is not an either/or question. Environmental problems, like public health issues, do not respect geopolitical boundaries, so yes the federal government should be involved as part of

a multi-tiered effort by cities, states, and the international community to confront the problems that threaten our survival as quickly as possible. We have been aware of the greenhouse gas problem for decades, but no serious action has been taken by industrial and industrializing countries. The problem we have created will not disappear overnight, and we need decisive action now if we want our children to inherit a livable planet.

John Tilford (I):

- See the Obama administration record, and yes.
- See the answers to number (4) California, auto gasoline mileage, automobile manufacturers had agreed.
- Regulations pertaining to quality of life-essentials such as air, water, and food must be federally established and enforced. Some states are capable and qualified to do so, many are not. All US citizens are entitled by the Constitution (“ . . . promote the general welfare”) for these.
- Certainly efforts to slow and ultimately stop global warming must involve the federal government – the only level empowered to enter in to international agreements. Stifling heat and extreme weather events do not respect state boundaries.

Tonya Millis (L): My answer to environmental policy and greenhouse gas is the same as my answers to questions #4 and #6. Adding; as a Congresssional Candidate, I am running against the 3 R’s (too many Rules, Regulations, and Runaway debt). Part of the role of Congress is our National Defense including the need to protect our Country from pandemics like the coronavirus. We can do this without burdening our citizens with a bloated beaurocracy. We can be both safe with our livelyhood and prudent with our money.

Trey Hollingsworth (R):

[declined invitation to take part]