

iVoterGuide Questionnaire

Right to Life

1: Abortion providers, including Planned Parenthood, should not receive funds from federal, state, or local governments (including Title X grants).

Agree

Nearly half of Planned Parenthoods do not provide abortion services, but do provide other health care services that are important for women of all ages. In some areas of the country, Planned Parenthood may be the only option for women seeking reproductive health care, and that fact should not be overlooked with over-generalizations about abortion services.

2: I support 'aid in dying' laws which legalize assisted suicide and euthanasia.

Agree

Human beings maintain self determination, and the state should not interfere with the freedom to make one's own decisions - including decisions about death.

3: Under what circumstances should abortion be allowed?

I think that medical decisions should be made by affected individuals in consult with their medical doctor. Without getting into great detail, there are so many potential edge cases that require careful consideration- for example, ectopic pregnancy - where therapeutic treatment would qualify as an abortion but is really a life-saving service for a woman where the blastocyst/embryo will never be viable. I am personally pro-life, but feel very uncomfortable with the broad nature of the current abortion conversation, and think that greater consideration for detail is needed to ensure that women are still able to get the health care that they require.

Economy

1: Redistribution of income is needed to lessen the gap between the wealthy and working classes.

Strongly Disagree

America provides for opportunities, not guarantees. Redistribution of wealth has been proven to disincentivize innovation and initiative, resulting in an overall downturn of the economy. When the economy is weak, countries become vulnerable to the amassing of central power and control, which can lead to totalitarian and authoritarian government models. This Marxist view of society has never resulted in anything but violence, oppression, and failure for the very population it claims to help.

2: The government should cut spending in order to reduce the national debt.

Strongly Agree

Congress should vote to revisit the authorization laws surrounding mandatory spending which accounts for nearly 70% of the total federal budget. This would allow for a review of the Affordable Care Act, which accounts for substantial mandatory and discretionary spending each year. Federal leaders need to forgo centrally-controlled, large-scale spending/aid packages that never produce anticipated results in favor of taxing less. This will enable more effective, local support on community issues.

3: What changes, if any, should be made to the tax code?

If federal leaders are able to stop or reduce spending, then a reduction in overall taxation and simplification of the tax structure will be possible. Initially, changes could be structured in the form of additional deductions. If a solid, reduced pattern of spending is established, the tax code can be substantially simplified. Examples of potential changes would be: maintaining fewer brackets at lower rates, a reduction of the number of deductions to wade through, a permanent revision of the estate tax, and/or a more appropriate corporate taxing structure.

Religious Liberty

1: Religious liberty is at risk in the United States and deserves the highest level of protection in the law.

Neutral

I believe that COVID quarantine mandates in the early days created some threat to religious freedom (mostly freedom of assembly), but that seems to have passed. Regarding vaccine mandates, the Supreme Court has ruled against those with the exception of some medical employees and the military.

2: Individuals and businesses should be required to provide services even if it would violate their moral and/or religious beliefs.

Disagree

Individuals and businesses should not be required to provide services that violate their moral and religious beliefs, so long as their response would not be considered a hate crime or discrimination of a protected group.

3: What should be the relationship between the church and the state?

In theory, the purpose of government and law is solely to protect our individual and God-given freedoms. There is enough evidence in the various writings of our Founding Fathers to demonstrate their intent for the establishment clause to separate the church from the federal government. There is also widespread agreement that the defense of religious liberty depends essentially upon the government not interfering with religion. All of this said, I do believe that God, in the broadest spiritual sense, is woven into the foundational documents and beliefs of America and Americans. As such, I believe it is appropriate and beneficial for children to say the Pledge of Allegiance each morning at school, for our currency to continue to contain the words, "In God We Trust," and other reminders that the idea of America is tied to spiritual faith as long as they are equal and extensible.

Healthcare

1: Under what circumstances (if any) should a government, school, or employer be allowed to require vaccinations?

Medical freedom, particularly in the form of religious and/or medical exemptions should always be honored. People must make the best decisions for themselves and their families based on their specific risk calculus.

2: What most closely matches your view on healthcare: A) Healthcare for all should be guaranteed and funded by the government with no private healthcare option. (includes "universal healthcare," "medicare for all," etc.) B) Healthcare insurance funded by the government should be available for all who want it, along with private healthcare options. C) Medicaid and Medicare should remain available, but no other taxpayer-funded programs are necessary. D) Tax-payer funded health care should be abolished in all forms, and Medicaid and Medicare should be de-funded.

"Medicaid and Medicare should remain available, but no other taxpayer-funded programs are necessary." Although I choose this option, I would alter it to say that no other taxpayer-funded programs have been effective. Though attempts like Affordable Care Act have been made to provide healthcare for all, the end result has been that health care is less affordable for many (some in the middle class are paying as much as three times what they would pay for private health care), and heavily subsidized and incentivized by the federal government also. The standard of care drops substantially with any form of socialized medicine (which universal health care most certainly is), and the costs actually rise in the form of money and lives as a result. I cannot underscore enough that we must move away from government-funded and guaranteed healthcare - it is not sustainable, and it does not result in quality care. A path away from this decision would be to overhaul ACA in favor of a similar option that creates greater competition within the public market (mimicking the competition of a private insurance market), and eventually to phase it out in favor of a return to private health care with vulnerable groups and people who have paid into the system being protected through the continuation of Medicare and Medicaid.

National Security

1: With regard to America's foreign policy, which view most closely resembles yours: A) The United States should intervene whenever freedom is threatened. B) The United States should selectively help countries trying to grow democracy and fight tyranny. C) The United States has become too involved in others' policies and should remain focused on issues regarding our own sovereignty unless in imminent danger. D) The United States should stay out of foreign conflicts completely.

I choose none of these. A good foreign policy must be consistent, but also agile. The best way to establish a sound and coordinated foreign policy is to constantly be assessing American domestic prosperity, American interests, and overall stability. In times where America is struggling with substantial internal strife and/or a struggling economy, policymakers should strive to focus resources inwards and look to deemphasize our role in foreign conflicts. In times where America maintains greater prosperity - as evidenced through security of individuals and a healthy economy, leaders can be more selective about engaging in foreign conflicts, but there should be a consistent and standard policy

governing decisionmaking. For example, if we decide that human rights are important, then we should value all human rights. If we decide that it's important to protect American geopolitical interests by intervening in conflicts, then we must be prepared to pursue all such instances. When we pick and choose impulsively about foreign policy, it affects how other nations and our own citizens view America. There will, of course, be exceptions to our strategy - namely if U.S. sovereignty is in jeopardy. Should America be threatened, the state of our domestic prosperity is irrelevant because we have no choice but to defend our country and our freedoms. The one other item to consider related to conflict and national security is that proactive diplomacy is absolutely essential to engaging with the world and keeping conflict at bay. The longer we neglect proactive foreign policy, the more likely it will result in conflict and/or become a direct threat to American security.

2: I support the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) movement to pressure Israel to withdraw from occupied territories, remove the separation barrier in the West Bank, allow full equality for Arab-Palestinian citizens of Israel, and promote the rights of Palestinian refugees.

Neutral

American attempts at resolving conflicts between Israel and Palestine have been long and many. There are national, political, territorial, cultural, and religious factors involved that manifest through a desire for self determination and land. The complexities and stakes of this long-time conflict mean that Israelis are not likely to be deterred by U.S. support for the BDS movement. The U.S. should instead continue to pursue cease fires, and longer term strategy for conflict resolution.

3: The Chinese Communist Party poses serious military, cyber security, intellectual property, and global economic threats to the United States.

Strongly Agree

Since the rise of globalization (1990s), China has demonstrated intent for regional (and global) dominance, an interest in creating key partnerships with nations that maintain natural resources or share a contempt for Western ideology, and an obstinance in complying with the requirements of any intergovernmental organizations. According to the FBI, there are Chinese counterintelligence and espionage efforts in America that pose great danger to our economy and democracy.

4: What should the United States do to help eradicate the threat of Islamic terrorism?

Islamic terrorism cannot be eradicated, only abated. The United States should do its best to unearth and foil any acts of terrorism (not just Islamic) foreign or domestic, while preserving the rights of Americans and upholding/defending the Constitution. If, per the question about foreign conflict, the U.S. decides it is appropriate or useful to intervene in international terrorist incidents, it should do so sparingly and with clear, measurable, and finite objectives for our involvement.

Immigration

1: The U.S. should do more to physically secure the southern border.

Strongly Agree

Illegal immigration should not be tolerated. Balanced, enduring and transparent immigration reform is needed, and is the most promising way to discourage illegal immigration. An effective immigration strategy requires: enduring transparent policy, relentless enforcement across state and local, shoring up the border with the best technology and manning for land/sea/air, anticipatory analysis to aid response planning, and proactive surge planning..

2: State and federal funds shall be denied to any public or private entity, such as a sanctuary city, that is not in compliance with immigration laws.

Strongly Agree

Illegal immigration is unfair to people who are working hard and waiting their turn to come to America, and it should not be tolerated. Balanced, enduring and transparent immigration reform is needed, and is the most promising way to discourage illegal immigration. State and local law enforcement must be forced to comply with federal laws because their decisions have substantial and far-reaching inter-state impacts on national issues like security and economy.

3: Who should be allowed to immigrate to the U.S. and under what circumstances?

All immigration must be legal. We should try to maintain patriotic assimilation - the idea that American becomes an important aspect of one's identity and loyalty. I'd also like for lawmakers to consider some sort of a merit-based immigration system, and a system of penalties (akin to three strikes) for those who do not follow the rules upon arriving in America.

Values

1: Sexual orientation and gender identity should be protected classes in non-discrimination laws.

Neutral

Under laws enforced by EEOC, it is illegal to discriminate against someone because of that person's sex - and this is supposed to include gender, sexual orientation, and pregnancy. I realize that some constituents in North Carolina would like to see harsher punishments for hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender, and I believe that legislation is already filed in the NC Legislature.

2: I agree with Critical Race Theory (CRT) which asserts that the institutions in the United States are fundamentally racist.

Strongly Disagree

There are likely individuals in any institution that are racist, but that does not make the United States or its systems and institutions racist. Regardless of the bad actors in any organization. CRT should never, ever be used to promote inequality through lesser treatment and shaming of any individual - especially a

child - for things that are beyond their control like the color of their skin. This goes for all skin colors and any other aspect of identity that is beyond one's control.

3: Briefly describe your spiritual beliefs and values.

I was raised Roman Catholic, but I'm non-practicing now. I maintain Christian values and beliefs, and share them with my husband and three children. Every day, we try to pray, show thanks and forgiveness, reflect on our shortcomings, help where there is need, and try to be mindful of our behavior.

Elections and Voting

1: People should be able to vote without photo identification.

Strongly Disagree

Voting is an awesome responsibility, and Americans should treat it as such. In many countries around the world, for example Iraq, people have not only been required to have an ID to vote, many have risked their lives in order to vote. Asking Americans to make a plan to procure an ID to vote seems so small by comparison, and could provide some greatly needed accountability and transparency to a fundamental of the idea of America.

2: What laws would you propose to change present voting practices?

Voting practices are determined at the State level, in accordance with States' rights. As such, I would not consider federal election legislation unless substantial evidence of intentional election corruption exists across several states.

Race Relations

1: Reparations should be given to people on the basis of race.

Disagree

What problem will be solved with reparations? Reparations will most certainly not repair the problems of the past or the challenges of the present. Determining who would receive aid and how much is placing value on human life, and will not necessarily translate into opportunity for this or future generations.

2: Is racism a threat to domestic security in the United States? Why or why not?

When any group of people feel that their security or possibility are limited by another group, it has and will threaten domestic security in the United States. We focus on race, but there are often cultural, economic, religious, and social considerations in issues that are oversimplified by the media to be just about race. This said, racism absolutely exists - whether it is a threat to domestic security is a question of scope and scale, and there is not enough information in the public domain to properly assess. Those with access to the information and who are charged with acting, like the FBI, have stated for years that

there is absolutely a threat to domestic security, and they have cited specific cases in different committee testimony.

Energy & Environment

1: I support the use of hydraulic fracking to extract oil and natural gas resources.

Agree

I believe that we should be pursuing alternative energy sources, but support whatever means are necessary to make us energy independent until we have another affordable and sustainable option.

2: Which comes closest to your view? A) Stricter environmental laws and regulations cost too many jobs and hurt the economy. B) Stricter environmental laws and regulations are worth the cost.

A lot of Republicans between 18 and 35 have written to me because they are passionate about green energy. I underscore this because the future of our party - the people most affected by climate changes - are stating that it is a priority for them, and calling for it to be included in our strategy. I have no issue with climate and renewable energy being longer-term federal goals. I do not support any massive federal investments at this time - not because I don't believe it's important, but because there are many more important priorities we need to pursue federally, including drawing down spending and a holistic review of mandatory spending. That said, there are states - and North Carolina is one of them - that are investing substantially in the renewable energy industry, and I fully support these efforts. If we eventually start to see the majority of states investing substantially in green energy, with only a few stubborn hold-out states, it may make sense to consider federal legislation. But, as a Republican, protection of States' rights ensures that most political efforts begin at a local level and find strong-roots to see the effort through. There would be no basis for pursuing a federal green energy strategy at this time - particularly given the urgency for energy independence due to current events.

Qualifications

1: When you consider your views on a wide range of issues from economic and social matters to foreign policy and religious liberty, which of the following best describes you overall?

Choose not to answer

I am a Republican because I believe in God-given freedoms, defense of the Constitution (all of it), small federal government, conservative spending, and maintaining the most elite defense in the world. This used to put me squarely in conservative, but now I could be anywhere from conservative to moderate because there are so many lexicons. I don't pay much attention to labels; I can find common ground with most any colleague. I will focus on what is good for North Carolinians and Americans.

2: Please provide publicly available information, including interviews and media reports, validating your answer to the previous question (other than your website).

I am linking interviews and interest group questionnaires on my website to make it easy for interested North Carolinians to review my responses. Please note there is sometimes a slight delay in posting, as I

maintain my own website. I am also unable to link any Google Forms and/or closed web-based questionnaires that I do not receive a copy of.

3: Have you ever been convicted of a felony or been penalized in either civil or criminal court for sexual misconduct? If so, please explain.

No.

4: What else would you like voters to know about you, including your legislative priorities?

Because we operate in such an agile environment, I created a tiered system of broad issue areas that is determined via a combination of: how far the issues fall outside of the stated scope of the federal government (per Article One Section Eight of the Constitution), how many Americans will benefit from legislation in an issue area, and whether or not it would be possible to amass enough support for legislation in each area to be successfully passed or implemented given the current political climate. Items in my third tier are not necessarily less important, but are more divisive – even within circles of Republicans – and therefore will take more time and resources and carry more risk of failure. My top priorities (tier one) include: pass a federal budget on time, defend the Constitution, defend the nation (critical functions of Congress). My second tier centers mostly around social issues that will affect most U.S. citizens and help us to lead the way for other nations (i.e. health care, education, environment). My third tier is focused on Americans' concerns for individualism - more polarizing aspects of policy (i.e. pro-life/pro-choice, politics of gender). If tier three receives too much consideration before we make the other tiers healthy, national stability will be in jeopardy.

In addition to understanding platforms, I encourage voters to look at qualifications. I believe the key qualifications of a United States Senator include: Experience, Vision, and Grit. I have 25 years of experience studying, researching, reading, writing, executing, and answering to federal policy and federal budget – more than any other candidate in the U.S. Senate race for North Carolina. I spent two years as a legislative staffer, I spent nearly twenty years as a civilian intelligence analyst and leader for the Department of Defense, and I hold three advanced degrees in International Relations and Security. If you want to know the difference that experience can make, and how it can serve North Carolinians at the federal level, I encourage you to take a few minutes to look at my website and social media. I regularly write blog-style articles and posts on current events and systemic federal issues. A year ago, I was writing about the perils of neglecting foreign policy, early indications of United States inflation, the importance of a broader plan to combat illegal immigration, and the importance of upholding States' rights on issues ranging from education to COVID policies and marijuana legalization. This information could have been used to proactively influence and change federal legislation and agendas, shift national priorities, and serve up legislation that would benefit North Carolinians and Americans.

Experience is crucial to establishing a vision. Representatives have to know where they are going, and have an ability to translate issues that are important to North Carolinians and Americans into strategic objectives. More importantly, representatives have to have an ability to effectively describe the vision so that they can take others with them. Congress is a team sport, and if everyone is unable to work together, we have a President and a court who are more than happy to utilize executive authority and legal interpretation to completely bypass Congress altogether. If you want to know the difference that vision makes, you need to look no further than this year's session of Congress. The agenda put forth by Republican leaders over a year ago assumed that there would be a Republican President and a

Republican Congress. In reality, we have neither. Instead of establishing a new agenda taking into consideration the constraints of the current political climate, Republicans continued to hold up the same agenda. As domestic decisions were made and the world changed, Republicans showed an inability to demonstrate resilience or agility. As a result, Republicans went on the defensive and constituents lowered their expectations. Regardless of what party is in power, or who holds the majority, the function of Congress is to pass sound, well-written, balanced legislation that is good for Americans. When Congress fails to do this, it is a dereliction of duty. When Congress fails to balance and/or pass a budget on time, it's a dereliction of duty. Grit is a passion and relentless perseverance for long-term and meaningful goals. Without grit, vision and experience are never able to be fully realized. Grit is the ability to come back to the arena each day out to work with others to achieve outcomes that are good for North Carolinians and Americans. I worked successfully at the federal level for 22 years - longevity in that environment requires substantial grit.

Candidates generally run their campaigns how they live and how you can expect them to serve. I'm not taking PAC money, donations, or pre-Primary endorsements because I want North Carolinians to select the best representation and vote for free.

Criminal Justice

1: Police officers should be personally immune from prosecution for conduct consistent with departmental policy (qualified immunity) while on duty.

Choose not to answer

Department policy and qualified immunity are different things. Qualified immunity is based on legal precedent while departmental policy is codified sets of processes, procedures, and rules that officers are expected to follow. If a police officer is following departmental policy, then they absolutely should be personally immune from prosecution. Qualified immunity is applied in a legal context and in a retroactive manner, and that requires a case-by-case review of legal experts to determine.

2: I support redirecting funds from police departments to mental health and community programs.

Strongly Disagree

If this questions implies state and/or local funds, then those decisions will be made by state and/or local governments - and as a candidate for a federal Senate seat, this decision is not in my scope. If this question implies federal funds, I believe that this undermines the decisions of communities, and I do not support. An example of activities appropriate at the federal level would be an outreach campaign on mental health, or providing better care for active and former military.

2nd Amendment

1: What restrictions on gun ownership are needed to protect public safety?

Defense of the Constitution is one of my top priorities. As the right to bear arms is a freedom protected by the Constitution, I am going to be very conservative when considering any legislation that would

infringe upon that freedom. The conversation is premature until we are able to gather and perform rigorous analysis on meaningful data. The first step in any area of rigorous study is to define and codify terms. In this case, what comprises a mass shooting, and how do we count? In the absence of agreement, sizeable variance in the number of mass shooting exists across press, academia, non-profit, and government reporting. To this end, RAND Corporation published a table showing how mass shootings were defined and counted by different organizations. Mass shooting fatalities reported across seven different “authoritative” sources for 2019 ranged anywhere from 73 to 628 deaths. Likewise, the number of events counted as mass shootings in 2019 ranged anywhere from 6 to 503. We need to come to a consensus on what the metrics are, and what they tell us, before we can discuss any further legislation.

2: Victims of gun violence should be able to sue firearms dealers and manufacturers.

Disagree

States should be responsible for most gun legislation -not federal. Personally (not as a federal candidate), I think that similar to dram shop cases where bars and restaurants in North Carolina can be sued by parties who were injured by drunk drivers, gun shop owners should be held legally responsible for exercising good judgement about who they sell guns to. Manufacturers should only be held responsible in cases where an injury resulted from a faulty gun or gun-related equipment.