

procedures are pretty convoluted in a way that might interfere with science funding being sensible and efficient. There is jurisdictional ambiguity within the complex system of congressional authorization and

Along with the budgeting process being competitive, the OMB often has more authority over the budget than the groups that understand the science.

government policy making is annoying from a scientist's perspective when trying to get funding quickly for new exploration, but I think that this may be a necessary sacrifice for the overall greater good and safety in our

greater good and safety in our government system.



Scientific organizations within the government compete for funding with other unrelated agencies and directives? Jesus Christ that is moronic; here is everything from legislative complexity to pork

science should assume an elevated position in legislature and politicians should conform their policy to scientific fact. Science in my opinion should be in dialogue with the public

On the other hand, earmarks are not peer-reviewed unlike the proposals submitted to specialized science institutions such as NASA and the NSF.

However, even the peer-review process presents problems as budget constraints force administrators to prioritize low-risk, results-based proposals to the detriment of those which are exploratory or nascent but high-risk.

but high-risk. Additionally, administrators can inappropriately prioritize proposals that originate from established researchers over those of junior scientists.

Unlike the US, the EU Hub is striving towards scientific collaboration, not competition, and they seem to appreciate scientific knowledge for what it can do for society and how it is valuable in informing politics.

So, in short, I like the EU's JRC setup, since it enables and is a public image of science working with policy, but I do not think that the US would be able to replicate it effectively



The main difference from the US approach is that the Joint Research Centre was purpose-built as a single institution that provides independent, scientific policy advice to the EU.

Critically, the JRC is involved throughout the entire policy making process in stark contrast to the sporadic and often limited input sought of scientists in the US.

EU Science Hub is a coalition of hired researchers, funded to research issues and topics that will be used to inform policy in general throughout the EU.

“We turn to the most certain thing there is Science” and that’s where he lost me. The rest of the video was lost on me, because I was busy thinking about “did he mean religion?”

Saying that science is the most/ only certain thing is going to piss off a lot of people who see scientists as a bunch of god denying atheists, and that subtle sentence only reinforces that picture.

Bothun Says: Indeed the idea that Science is about winning and that winning implicitly means creating the truth might be quite dangerous of message to anyone that is actually paying attention

People are afraid. And as religion has shown us in times of fear people are willing to turn to something they don’t understand in search of answers and hope.

The cynic in me suspects that Pfizer is leveraging the fear brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic to gather public support in service of lobbying Congress for some funding

In this video, the narrator talks about “science winning” with a lot of conviction, and I bet if you were to replace “science” with “God” the message received would be the same

Big pharma pushing a message about collective morale and assuring us that their scientists will save us all is suspect