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[00:00:01] **Speaker 1** I'm wrong. All right. Well, I guess let's get started by talking a little bit about the past and how we got to here, because a year ago, there weren't a whole lot of people outside your district in Wisconsin that had heard your name. But now you you definitely have a lot of people that know your name, even if they haven't met you yet. Walk me through a little bit of the path that led to you going from sitting in the assembly to deciding to run for governor.

[00:00:23] **Speaker 2** Great question. Well, I I'm about getting things done. And if you want to reference election integrity as a catalyst for engagement, I think that's a good place to start for me. I did watch the election in November of 2020 and after it was over and things had changed a little bit, there was a different type of noise to me. There was there's always complaints after an election because one person wins and one person loses. And usually the ones that scream the loudest are the ones that didn't get their way right. But this was different. This was different. And there were specific comments about the types of things that may have taken place. They were all allegations. Right. And so I listen to that. And it's like, you know, there's a point there because how do you go from flatline to spike? And then, you know, something was weird about that 3:00 in the morning saying, right. So I started to listen. I engaged I was approached in late December or very early January to put my name on a letter to the vice president at the time. Vice President Pence to time out on January six or something isn't right here. We got to look in a little deeper. So I engaged to try to do something to bring out truth and transparency even before things got dicey. And then that passed because there was the right thing and nothing really got addressed. I was paying attention to the campaign in elections. There was a transition between former chairperson Ron Kessler to current chairperson Janelle Branch. And and then in March, March 10th, she had her first campaign elections hearing, and they had an attorney from Green Bay come down, Eric Cardwell. And I was sitting about this far away from him and just listening to him talk about what happened in Green Bay in 2020 November. That should not have happened and what happened, what didn't happen, rather, that should have. So he was talking contrast and I'm like, wow, this just isn't. And I started to think, well, what if it happened in Green Bay? It could have happened anywhere and maybe not just in Wisconsin. So that's when I really got interested in the mechanics of the elections process. The latter part of March, the assembly met on the floor and a AR 15 was a resolution that said We want to give more help to the assembly body to research this. So there was an acknowledgment by the body that says we need to do more to make sure if something really bad happened, we need to address it, fix it. And so I was always I'm process improvement oriented. I'm all about efficiencies and getting things done right. If you have an error problem, you address root cause. You solve that so that you don't repeat the error, right? So I'm into crisis management mentality at this point. I'm like, something wrong happened here. Erica doll spoke at it. We got to fix it, right? So from March to May 60 days, it took that long for the speaker to announce an individual which was happened to be a Supreme Court justice, a skip Supreme Court justice gave him, and it took another 30 days to get him into the position. So right around July 1st, he got into position. And then on July 15th, here's where it launched for me. I'm watching the Arizona preliminary results on their audit and they were getting into ballot issues, chain of custody issues, machines. The database hadn't come into play yet, but the machines was a big deal back then. And they were really trying to reconcile how many people actually did vote and all that stuff. So that was another red flag. So I had a rerun. I'm like just like in March, I was very concerned about the mechanics of process and execution and on the 15th. And so I sent a text message to the speaker. And by the way, it's the only time we've ever had any exchange about this. I sent him a text and I said, we need to do more for was in Wisconsin right now bad stuff happened and we have to really get intense with an investigation. And he responded back and text. Send Gabelman an email. Well, what's his email address? Crickets. I didn't get a response and I'm like, I don't have time to wait for this. So urgency is a big thing for me too. If you want to talk characteristics. High sense of urgency, right? I didn't want to wait, so I just put out a press release and it's all in my report. Rampton I just I was kind of like I've say so from July 15th of 21 to current day essentially is a litany of expressions about get something done. That was my modus operandi. We need some results. I'm just a member. I'm not the chair of a committee. I'm not a speaker and a governor yet. I need to see something get done, otherwise I have to do something about it. So that's when I really launched into to really push this thing. And I started to. Get requests from people across the state to come to their county locations and or fellow Assembly District locations to speak at. What do I know? What am I working on? What do I see? What do I think? And I accepted their invitations. Well, then that started to get a little rub going with some of my colleagues because I was going into their their districts to talk about an issue that they apparently didn't want to talk about it. Because I asked the people, I said, why are you asking me? Because our rep in our senator doesn't don't want to talk about it. They don't they don't act like you. So then what happened is I came into it and I expressed truth. It's all truth. My Let There Be Light series of press releases was part of my expressions that came up. The data we were collecting information started to show something more than just nefarious acts was going on. So then my colleagues all got mad at me because I was going into their districts speaking about this when they didn't want me to. And then their constituents were angry at them because I was doing my job. And then they said, Well, Tim, don't don't say yes to the question. I said, I can't say no to the. They're asking me. I'm a sir. I'm a state representative, period. Yes, I'm for the 59th District, but I'm a state rep. And just like the speaker is supposed to represent the entire body, which is the entire state essentially for assembly. He should be out there addressing this proactively as well. And he wasn't. He was obstructing me and Janelle and ultimately Justice Gabelman and anybody else who was poking for truth, obstructing layers of indifference and apathy and deflection. That's been going on, by the way, for 20 months for me now. And I'm being attacked and accused of things like I'm a conspiracy theories. No, I'm not. I just want truth and transparency and everybody else should, too. So to me, it's very puzzling to hear, you know, criticism about something all of us should be concerned about. This is not a party thing. It's not a partizan issue. This is a an issue of about our Constitution. It's an issue about the state of our republic and our freedoms. And if you if you think it's a trivial thing, then then you don't understand those issues. And that's the scenic answer to your question. I got engaged and I got known all over the state, and then while I'm going up, you need to run for governor. I'm like, No, I'm not. I'm not really interested in doing that. You know, I've got work to do. I want to get this resolution across because then I turn it into a resolution and formally push for a bill to get to the floor to pull back our ten electors. And they're telling me you've got to run for governor. No, I'm not. That's not what I had planned on doing. Well, then it got to be January, December, January. I'm doing my let there be light and revealing incremental steps of truth. And then I came back out with a resolution. I came out with justification for the resolution. Every clause element in the my 71 slides presented on my side speaks. That's a justification for constitutional support. Constitutional attorneys and experts said, yes, you can, yes, you can. Yes, you can. And I presented it to the body. And then I get this. No, you can't. No, you can't. Yes, you can. No, you can't. And all we're doing is this right. Nothing is getting done. And they're angry at me because I'm talking to their constituents. So somebody even said on January 18th, why don't you just run for governor? Because you're going all over the state anyway, mostly just run for governor. So between that and the realization that I'm not going to get anywhere with these layers of deflection and indifference, this has to get addressed. And 99 to 1 in the assembly or 61 to 1, which is the majority, or even in the Senate, 33 to 1 or 21 to 1, which is majority if you've got multiple layers of of indifference and apathy. And I don't think that's a place for me to stay. You know, if you have indifference about something this important, this is historic, it's unprecedented. And so you can't think at it like we're going to handle it the old way. We always know you have to do it this way. Right? And that's what I was doing. I just want to I want to truth. I want a transparency. I want a closure so I could move on so that when I go vote, I know it matters. And it's it's going to count properly. But I can't sit around and wait for these people to get it. 2000 meals just came out. I know if you saw it, but you should. I haven't seen the movie called Rigged yet, but I want to check that out. And there's more information coming out that's going to probably surprise everybody in the state and the country. It's about what happened in 2020 and everybody who should have gotten aboard and followed my lead on are 120 is going to wish they would have because the truth is going to set us all free and we're going to really know what happened. So that's my senior catch for your question. I'm also trying to do the work for the people and for the Lord because that's who I work for. First, praise God from whom my blessings flow. I'm going to continue pushing this no matter what happens on August 9th, no matter what happens on November 8th, this issue of of fraud has to be dealt with once and for all, for everyone. This isn't a party thing, it's for everyone.

[00:09:48] **Speaker 1** So obviously you've butted heads with Speaker Vos repeatedly over this issue and statements, and that's why he took your staffer away. Is that the moment that. Kind of launched you publicly. I mean, you were known before then and especially grassroots, but that was that change that the attention.

[00:10:06] **Speaker 2** I think that's a great. You're right. That's a great question. So on January 4th of 2022, I did let there be light one. And within ten days to January 14th, I did four more. So I had one through five. Let there be light five was on Friday the 14th. The following Tuesday I presented the full package with the clause data and the justification from the constitutional attorneys on the 19th of January, which is a Wednesday. That's when the requisition for my full time staff was taken away on the 20th of January. They put out they not not the speaker. He should have put something out. Why? He took my staff away. He didn't. He had joined finance members who he has wrapped around his finger. And the leadership team we as wrapped around his finger, put out a press release to say Rampton was saying something like Perkins Coie. I think that's the name of the law firm that represented Hillary Clinton, was in cahoots with the speaker and he was working with them. I never said that. Never said that there was some information I gathered from a lawsuit that was filed by Karen Mueller, part of the Imus Center, for I forget what the name of her firm is. And they reported that through Gateway Pundit and a reporter made the statement about Perkins Coie. So that was that press release on Thursday. The 20th was false. And I asked two of the members of leadership who signed off on it, where's the evidence of that? Well, we don't have that. Well, then why did you sign it? We were told to do so. So I think the optic was and this is how the speaker works with pretty much everything. Everything is about optics. He wanted to do power numbers, 14 to 1. 14 people can't be wrong. This one guy's got to be wrong, right? Well, guess what? 14 were wrong. The one was right. The one is still right. And what they did on the 20th of January was more than misinformation. It was to try to discredit me or marginalize me for doing the right thing. Let there be light. Five is what I think. Tip the speaker over the over the edge because in there if you haven't read it you should it calls out his association as president of and Cecil National Conference of state legislators and that that organization that for the organization organization was involved in orchestrating drop box usage across the state specifically in some of the swing states. Well, the speaker also had a letter that his lawyer authorized that he had said it's okay to use drop boxes him. And at the time, Majority Leader Fitzgerald, I was signed on September 25th of 2020. Before the election, they authorized the use of drop boxes. That's illegal. Should have never allowed that to happen. And what bothered me about that action was he did it on his own. It never came to the body. If it was a legislative change, it should have been a bill and it never came to the floor and never talked about as a group. It didn't even go through GCR to check for rules. He just did it by himself. You can't do that. He's not king. He's not he doesn't have the authority to do it. But they did it because whenever the speaker does something, I guess it must be right. Right? No, it's not. So he was illegal. He broke the law. So when I called him out for that, that's what he meant. Oh, man. Getting too close to truth here. So then he took the retaliatory act against me because I was too close to truth. So but at the information so and he really did wrong for the people of Wisconsin. I think he's compromised and that's why he doesn't want to engage in this.

[00:13:35] **Speaker 1** What did that that action and the resulting attention do in terms of when you went somewhere to speak to people, in terms of their knowledge of you or their reaction to you, the momentum that has in that run up for governor that.

[00:13:49] **Speaker 2** That week was an interesting week. So the 18th was a caucus where I was attacked and vilified by a handful of members. About six essentially the next day was the requisition. The next day was the press release. On Friday, the 21st, I put on a rebuttal to the press releasing that was wrong what they did. And here's why. And I never said that nothing ever happened with that. By the way, it's okay to throw somebody under the bus, but it's not okay to have them admit they were wrong, apparently. But anyway, to your question, I continued the requests spiked and I'm like, You got to come here. You got to go now. I'm looking for a helicopter, an airplane. I mean, I'm all over the place. And it was a beautiful, beautiful obligation of me to serve the people, period. I wasn't thinking about running for anything yet, but the requests came flooding in to me directly, and I said yes. And I tried to get to as many as I could. I would walk into a room and I would get standing ovations. I would do a presentation. Sometimes it was 15 minutes, sometimes it was 2 hours and 15 minutes, depending on how much latitude I had. And I would get standing ovations after they the people, the people wanted somebody to acknowledge that something bad happened and that we're going to try to figure it out and then we're going to do something about it. I was the one that was saying that even more than the chair of the campaign elections, far more than the speaker. I asked the question about reclaiming the ten electors because from basically July 15th of 21 until November, a couple of months later, three months later, roughly all I felt was rhetoric. Look, investigations, forensic investigations and audits. But nothing was physically getting done. So then you start to think about whether retention of 22 months per statute on all the information from an election, they're running the clock out. They're running the clock out. So I stuck a stake in the ground and said, let's pull back our electors. Let's reclaim the ten that went. Shouldn't have never been certified, should've never gone. Let's pull them back. So then President who got 306, would be down to 296 and then nothing happens after that. I was the first person, the only person in the country to ask that question. That's one of the national spotlight elements that occurred. I got some press back then. I didn't do it for that reason. I don't keep score on on bills. I don't keep score on press releases. I don't say, look at me, look at me. I just want to get things done. And I could see they were running the clock out and I had to do something drastic because it was a drastic situation. Unprecedented. Historic. No rules here. Do something right. So boom, sticking around, ask the question and shake it up. And that's what happened. And it's been shaking ever since. And I think that action, that proactive action is help become the catalyst for others to do. There's a lot of smart people, a lot smarter than me that are poking into the data. 2000 miles is an example of that. We've got to get the the judicial side, the law enforcement side engaged in this more. We had an opportunity in Racine County with this special board of deputies that should have been prosecuted by the D.A. But she, for some odd reason, said they don't live in my district, so therefore they're not in the jurisdiction I have, so I can't prosecute. That's crazy talk. And I'll say publicly on this expression here, one of the things I was told and there's email evidence coming from the Racine County Party itself that the D.A., I think her name is Teresa Hansen, was in communications daily with the speaker's office after the information by Sheriff Schmaeling and Lieutenant Lowell was presented to her. There was a lot of communication going on with the speaker. Now there's evidence of that. You got to ask yourself why. And then a couple of weeks later, she comes out with this, can't do anything about it. That obstruction, was it done on purpose to shut down that that prosecution? That would have given me great credence to the resolution. It would have really accelerated the necessity for doing something like reclaiming the ten. But I think that's why it was done. It was done to shut it down.

[00:17:54] **Speaker 1** In the time span between I guess let's back to mid-winter when a lot of that came to a peak and then the run up through. Now, are you seeing the the grassroots people you're speaking to? Are they more engaged on this issue or are they kind of branching out into all issues when when they when they hear you speak and when they what they want to hear from you?

[00:18:17] **Speaker 2** Another good question. They are they're energized beyond measure. They're grateful that somebody has the character, the conviction and the courage to do the right thing for a situation that needs to be addressed. The grass roots other candidates for this position, by the way, the governor seat, they talk grassroots, can't hold a candle to it. Compared to me, these people adore what I'm doing because I'm the fighter they've wanted for decades to be in a place to make a difference, to ask the questions, to get things done, and don't let stuff go along and get along. And I'm that guy and I've been that way. The school board, same thing happens there. I mean, I come in and I see injustice. I'm I'm drawn to injustice like a fireman is to a burning building. I want to run in there and fix it because I know in my heart I can do it. I just got to see what's going on. Make an assessment. Boom, here's a solution or here's a Band-Aid to get us to a solution. But either way, I want to incrementally make it better. So they're they're adoring the fact that I'm engaged in this patriot groups, county party chairs, and many of their members are fans of me. That's why there wasn't an endorsement at the convention, because Rampton got up and said, You know what? This is not good for the people. They have a small bunch of individuals in the state. Tell you who you're supposed to vote for. It's to me, unconstitutional. Why would you do an endorsement at a convention before the primary, which is designed to allow the people to have a voice to pick the person who they want, not who, you know, the establishment wants or the the machine. I call it the machine. So, yeah, they're they're really liking what I'm doing and and the freedom fighters out there. I'm the America first candidate. I'm the only gubernatorial candidate who can see the America first. I'm the one that's got the most experience. I'm the one that's proven. I'm battle tested and improving to go against the grain. You know, as I mentioned earlier, I swim in shark infested waters and swim against the currents all the time because it's the path least taken. And many times, as hard as it is to return in an effort to return on investment, it makes it all worthwhile to me. I'm not doing it for scorekeeping. I'm doing it because it's the right thing to do. So and I will continue.

[00:20:32] **Speaker 1** It's interesting that since since 2015 and Donald Trump and his rise to the presidency, like a lot of a lot of candidates, have tried to become the next Trump, capitalize on that style, that tone, that tenor. But what really seems to embody him was his ability to go against the party, create his own path, and carry the grassroots with him. And it seems like you were trying to swim in that same lane in that sense of as opposed to some of the other candidates who are trying to go the establishment route or trying to create the endorsement level. Do you feel a connection that people maybe that they see a similarity enough that they're trying to be drawn to that?

[00:21:07] **Speaker 2** Absolutely. I didn't do it by design, though. I mean, it just happened. It's a natural thing for me. If there's a problem management or crisis management skill that it takes to do what I do. I think I share that with the president. He has the same solution minded business approach, solve problems. I'm a solution minded guy as well. The people expect him to do something for me. I don't expect anything. I've heard comments about what he may do as far as support for the Wisconsin gubernatorial candidates. I know the others are crying and begging and pleading for it and I'm like, I have his number, I have his number. I will not call it. I'm not going to ask. I'm not going to beg. I'm not going to bargain. I want whatever happens to be as natural as it can be from him to me. And if it doesn't happen, he's going to have some explaining to do to a lot of patriot groups and a lot of grassroots in the state. And if it does happen, I think he wins Wisconsin in 2024. Easy.

[00:22:11] **Speaker 1** Let's talk a little bit about the party convention, because that is the epitome of establishment politics, the Republican Party. What did you expect going into that? Because that is kind of the antithesis in some ways to some of the grassroots. And what did you actually feel once you got there?

[00:22:28] **Speaker 2** Well, I expected to learn a lot because it was my first I'm not much of a swamp dweller. So although I've been in politics for 14 years and been part of the state legislature for four years, I never went to a state convention before. I didn't feel I felt it would be awkward for me to go however I went this time because I'm running for something. And they asked me to come because they wanted me to speak and I happened to be the first name drawn from the governor's presentation. So I kind of had to be there, but I expected to learn a lot and I did. And some of it was good. Some of it wasn't. I did not believe the endorsement by the party was the right thing to do for the people. And even if I would have been approached by the chairman to say, Rampton, you're the guy 100% everybody wants you. I would have said, I can't prove this, by the way, because it physically can't happen. But I will tell you, as Lord as my witness, I would have said, No, I'm not taking it. Let the process run out through the primary. Let the people in it run and do their thing to try to see what comes of it. Because diamonds in the rough mentality is part of my answer here. How do you know what you got? Unless you're really challenged. So if I if I'm the leading candidate and I think it will be in the next 30 days, the other people maybe have characteristics or qualities that would be good to be involved in government. That would be a good resource pool for the next governor to consider choosing to fill key positions. Right. You don't know that if you cut it off too soon. So that was one of the value props I was looking for to let this play out. Let's see who acts professional and who has maturity and discipline and has substance, or they're going to just be crying because, you know, they expect to be the one and they're going to get desperate and start throwing mud, you know. So there's going to be character opportunities for people to witness here in the next two and a half months as well. So I wanted everything to play out naturally, and that's why I was against the endorsement. I was number two on the first ballot. Everybody else dropped off. So it was between me and our K. And on the second ballot I was I had a sign from the Nicholson camp and I'm walking around going, no endorsement. And here I'm a guy that I had a chance to maybe win it. And if there would have been more than 1600 people or 1700 people in a room, you know, there's about 6500, right? Delegates in the state. So they had 20% turnout. 20%. Another 20%. A lot of them were cohort and orchestrated to vote a certain way because they wanted to end this thing on that day on the 21st of May. They still didn't get it done. That's a huge loss for them. I don't care how they paint it. I don't care what she says or what anyone says from that campaign. She didn't bring it home because of your previous question. The grassroots showed up in force and they said, No way are we going to let this orchestrated coup happen. We want this to play out for the people. And it did. So I was really happy that it played out that way. So I think they'll change their agenda next time and they won't do it quite the same way.

[00:25:39] **Speaker 1** In terms of the numbers, obviously her campaign is promoting now, she got over 50% in the endorsement, even though it didn't carry. She needed 60% for that. 50% would obviously win in the primary. But I'm sure your answer is that the numbers in a selected small pool that can the setting is not reflective of what the whole term.

[00:25:59] **Speaker 2** Not even close. Right off the bat, you're talking 20% of the mass and that's a mass of delegates. 5.9 million people in a state, 3.4. 4.5 are eligible to vote. 4.5 million. I don't believe 4.5 million if she nobody is going to get 50%. So it it's apples and oranges. You can't take a snapshot like that and claim victory when the victory level was 60 and you didn't get there. So you failed. That's how I look at it. And I see 40 plus percent for the no endorsement coming from the voice of the people, which is the voice of God, in my opinion. And the people said no. That's the victory. The 40 plus percent that said no to endorsement is that is the real victor for the 21st of March.

[00:26:46] **Speaker 1** Well, let's go back a little bit to the voting process that was held there, because there's some people that are saying, well, how can you trust the voting that occurred there? If there's so many questions about election integrity in general, how can you trust the results of any election? How do you put faith in results in the security of any kind of election, whether held at a party convention or any of that's happening in the state right now? When you have concerns about the overall system. How do you explain that to your voters and how do you justify that?

[00:27:16] **Speaker 2** Well, I if I understand your question correctly, the process, as I saw it again, I'm a first time person. In fact, it gave me a delicate take to say I was on the floor and I was participating in the vote process. There was an envelope. There were slips given out by the chair of each party holding different stakes for the parties are up and the people are there, whether there was somebody in that group or not. And and then the ballots came back to the chair and they put them in the envelope and signed off on it and then gave it to the runner who gave it gave it back to the people in the back room. And then there were were spotters there to watch all this. So we had election observers in the room at the time, and there were some other people in the room too. I know for the resolutions I'll jump ahead here. But on Saturday afternoon, later in the afternoon, they had some resolutions that were basically calling on the speaker to step down. He was in the room watching the count with his wife at the time that that should have never happened. They should not let him because he's too close to the to the question. Right. That to me is a conflict of interest. But, you know, I guess you can go wherever you want. She thinks he can do that. So. But back to the whole point of the integrity of the process, what I saw looked good. I had a spotter in the back when they were counting the ballots for the gubernatorial deal for us and they were showing it online real time. So you could see incremental changes in percentage and count. So it was about as transparent as I think you could, a smaller body, 1600 people. We're not talking 5.9 in the state. Right. Or 50 states in the country. The opportunity for fraud probably wasn't in existence because we weren't using drop boxes.

[00:28:50] **Speaker 1** So let's run through some of the main concerns you have, especially given that really nothing in election law in Wisconsin has changed from 2020 to what we're going to see in August. What what are your concerns for August and what confidence do you have that there won't be a repeat of any of the concerns that you've had from the past?

[00:29:09] **Speaker 2** I have very little confidence that we will have fair, safe and legal elections starting in August. We'll have a rerun in November of 2022. And if we don't get the right gubernatorial candidate elected, who is the one you're looking at right now, we may not have correction done to this properly for 2024. So you're right to say that has anything physically or tangibly happened since November of 2020, the answer is no. No party members will say, Well, we tried to pass some bills. We got them through the legislature, but the governor vetoed them. In my humble opinion, although maybe one or two of those bills might have helped a little bit, they weren't solution oriented. They were more for optics to separate us against them and give them talking points for the election. I had six bills. One in particular I'll just mention protect our includes a log file data of the of the devices to the voting machines dominion and s and specifically in your protection of data. All the work seem to see through matters of interpretation as we only keep the ballot data, we don't care about anything else. Well, it's part of the process that the statute claims. You have to retain all the records for the elections process, which means the data on the hard drives, because it would prove and it has, that they're accessible from the Internet, from a smartphone. If you walk by a machine during an election and turn your Wi-Fi on, you're going to see an opportunity to connect to a machine. You go to the password to get in, apparently. But my point is machines are hackable. They're approachable through the Internet. And that's a huge question for us. The ballots themselves can be defrauded, if you would. What's the the counterfeit? Counterfeit ballots can be created. The chain of custody issues are still a concern. We have issues with the machines. And if data can be manipulated and I know Mike Lindell is looking to pursue dominion specifically because there's evidence that that can happen. You take a data file, you put it into a machine, you can change it and bring it out. It'll be different. That's that's got to get fixed too. There's something with the machines that allows for the corruption happening as well. So I'm apprehensive. I'm going to audit my August 9th primary forensic audit. I've got people teed up already that are going to do a data analysis. They're going to watch every vote like they should have and and will going forward from November of 2020. They're going to watch August of 2022 because I want to make sure there aren't any spikes. I want to see right down to the county, right down to the wards in the county, I want to see the percentage of turnout. I'm going to see all of that because in my humble opinion, with the evidence I have, I can show nefarious acts, illegal acts, fraudulent elections. For the last two and a half decades, I got data that goes back to Clinton against Dole in 1996. Okay. So if we have had this problem going on for two and a half decades, part of the issue might be learned behavior. This isn't an anti clerk statement, but I believe possibly that some municipal clerks and or county clerks might be doing things perhaps wrong because it's the way they've been doing it for the last ten or 15 years or 20. Right. We have to make sure that they are following the rule and letter of the law as they do their jobs. And I believe most of them, if not all of them are. I'll digress to make one more point and I'll get your next question. Here's another example of concern about the voter list 7.1 million names there, 5.9 that live in the state, 4.5 are eligible to vote 18 or above. 3.3 to 3.5 actually do vote. So the number of voters is half of what we have available with names in the list. As a clerk, municipal clerk or a county clerk, you have access to the wistful database. You can log in from Racine County and you could dial into Eau Claire County's data and change it. So we've got lots of problems with the data being in the same file. All 7.1 ineligible should be over here and eligible should be over here. They're on the same server. Bet hackable. You got you got access to all the data. One stop shop to hack you can hack the servers in the White House probably in the most protected place in the world. Right. They're hackable, too. And they were. So you can you think you can hack the server that has the data for the withhold for Wisconsin election? Absolutely.

[00:33:45] **Speaker 1** So who committed the fraud? Is it the clerks? Is it candidates? Is it parties? Is it our third party groups? Is it nefarious actors who actually committed the fraud?

[00:33:58] **Speaker 2** Well, statute 946 point something says I can accuse anybody of an illegality. If I have a concern or alleged concern, I supposed to give it to law enforcement or judicial element and let them investigate. So I can't answer the question directly, but that's where we're at. One of the things I first heard was you're just mad because your guy lost. Then it was that one went away to show us the proof. Show us the proof. All the proof started coming out. Then it was okay, that one went away. Or you can't reclaim this one constitutional, which is not correct either, in my opinion. The people who say you can't do it are the ones that don't want it done, and the reasons they don't want it done are up to and including the possibility or probability that they're compromised. Right. And so now we're getting to the point of these these investigations stalled. So the mules and the and the geospatial cell tracking pings that are coming out to prove that people were. In a place multiple times which happened to be in a Dropbox. And so there's correlation now to person and action. And then these investigations are going to start to peel onions of truth around who did what and when. Where did you get the ballots from? How did you get paid? So they're going to be able to track back into the source. So the cynic answer to your question is the investigations we finally have happening now that are going to get to the source and qualify. The illegality is happening as we speak and there's more coming in the next couple of four weeks about the depth of illegalities that happened with our elections. So buckle up. I don't have all the information, but I'm hearing from true the vote and people connected with them and some individuals from various areas in the country that we have more tangible data coming to get to the question of judicial prosecutions, convictions, all of that's coming. So I've been on the right side of the fence the whole time. I know I have in my heart. I know I have in my head. I wanted to just search for truth. And I'm glad I landed on the side of asking questions instead of saying nothing to see here, because there's plenty to see here. It's going to come out and it's going to be vindication. On top of vindication. On top of vindication for me, the guy who has been taking the arrows and the bullets and the accusations and the criticisms for 20 months now, even from my own party and primarily from the speaker, he wants this thing shut down bad. You should ask yourself why.

[00:36:36] **Speaker 1** Well, that is the next question. And you said a word just a little bit ago in your last answer, you said compromised. People are saying that are critical of your of your stance, saying, well, why wouldn't Republicans work harder to expose this if it happened? Are the political leaders compromised in this? Is that why there's not more people that are vocal on your side?

[00:36:59] **Speaker 2** In my opinion, yes. How they need to be investigated. Judicial should do that. Law enforcement should do that. How can you explain the level of indifference and deflection if you don't have some skin in the game? This is a defensive posturing one on one going on here for 20 plus months now. If in an individual's heart you want to solve something like I do here, you're all in and I'll do everything I can to peel the onion to truth, to get to the core of the root cause. And then we'll have the revelation will minimally have revelation will have ultimately where we need to fix to solve. So we don't repetition. I don't have that kind of support coming from leadership. And the reason why the other members of the body don't as well is because they're told not to. Now, that's another conversation.

[00:37:48] **Speaker 1** More of them be willing to come forward if it wasn't behind.

[00:37:51] **Speaker 2** Yes, yes, I'll see without question. And the proof is because behind the scenes, not publicly, you'll see. I don't know how you do it. You got the stones and holy smokes. And I could never do that. But I really like what you're doing. And, you know, I'm praying for news. They'll say stuff like that, but they won't come out publicly. No. On Let there be light for I had three members join me on a press release that emanated from my office branch and Scott Allen from the 97 and Wicker's from the 83rd. And that's the only time I had more than myself saying Something's wrong here, right? At least from my office. I'm not a chair of Campaign Elections General Branch, and she's done some things too. But we didn't work together. You know, we talk once in a while, but she does her thing. I do my thing. Mike Ableman is doing his thing. The patriot groups are doing their thing. Everybody's working to get truth out. Because I'll tell you, when you start talking to stuff and you start seeing, you start connecting the dots, literally, this is how they did this is I did the mail in ballots. They did on purpose. They flooded the the the mailboxes, let's just put it that way, extraneous on purpose. So they would get a bunch back unfulfilled. Then they took those and they matched them to the non propensity voters in the list to create ghost or phantom ballots. And then they put them in the boxes through the mules and into the drop boxes. So the, the perpetrators of the fraud which will come out when they're investigated and proven to be so.

[00:39:09] **Speaker 1** I know you explained why you can't say who you think committed the fraud. Can you definitively say who you don't think like? Can we say we don't think the clerks in municipal court across Wisconsin were involved or we're not accusing individual candidates or.

[00:39:24] **Speaker 2** Well, I'm a big fan of municipal clerks and county clerks. What they do is tremendously important. It only takes one anywhere because they have access to the entire list from any one location. They can access everything in any county, and they can make changes. And all you have to do is change the record from inactive to active, create a ballot against it, run it through the system, and then go back and put it back to inactive and cover your tracks and nobody knows. So that's why when you do a forensic audit, you want to correlate. Not only the numbers of ballots, but the names on the ballots. And you have to win for mail in ballots. You have to have the envelope and the signature and all that. A lot of the envelopes are M.I.A. Interestingly enough, they're all seen with the log file data. Dominion and S.A. are in a big hurry to scrub the drives and put new images on trusted build. Right. That's what they called it. Why? Because when you replace an image and when you replace an old image with a new image, you're wiping out everything. So IP addresses are gone, time and access points are gone. It did upload something. Did you download something? All that. So everybody's in a hurry to scrub stuff and clean it up to make it look. But the clerks, I think for the most part, definitely not. You know, the ones that are going to be culpable here. I think some nefarious acts with the the big five and the mayors, which is what they gave them in L.A. was pursuing and of course, the Zuckerberg money. And he did his report, by the way, his 138 page report probably was about 75% of my 71 slides. He took a lot of data, which is fine, but he added some really good points to make his report very comprehensive. And he also acknowledged the necessity for looking at reclaiming and or he used the word to certify. I, I don't know if I agree with the word. I don't know if the certified is a word I want to nullify and or reclaim the ten electors. It's not to certifying the election. It's saying we're not going to let the ten that went to the president go to the president. And that takes me back to my previous comment, three or 6 to 296. Well, nothing happens anywhere unless other states do the same thing. And that's what we need. And other states probably would follow. One would just take the lead, right? You can get that down below to to 70. And then you've got a constitutional crisis. It goes to the House. The House takes care of it. One vote per state. And that's who the president is going to be. And it might be two different people or multiple people are going to be picked from it may not be the same two that ran head to head in November 2020, but gets us back to the point of correcting the problem, holding people and or process accountable and getting our trust and faith back into the process. And right now, we don't have it.

[00:42:02] **Speaker 1** What is your opinion of the Legislative Audit Bureau's report and the Wisconsin Institute for Law and Liberty? If you want a very conservative law firm, one of the most highly respected nonpartizan agency.

[00:42:13] **Speaker 2** Great question. I remember when their audit report came out, I was in the hearing room at the time, and all I remember was a lot of disagreement coming out of the Wisconsin Election Commission. They didn't agree with this report that initially said this and they should have said that, and that's not right. And so all I saw was this between the two agencies.

[00:42:32] **Speaker 1** But the SEC wasn't saying that they were they were nit picking some of the criticism. But the audit bureau found no evidence of fraud, and WEC wasn't disagreeing with that. WEC wasn't the one saying there was more fraud. So the disagreements had nothing to do. Right.

[00:42:45] **Speaker 2** But there were some there were some concerning statements that the Audit Bureau made about the work that they were not agreeing with. And the reason they said it was they saw some areas where they should have done things different or better, which allowed for that to happen. They didn't do the forensic type. There was a question, what about this? Did you check this? No, we didn't go that far. I remember Representative Marco had asked a question, something to the effect of how deep did you go? And he said, we didn't we didn't check that those you have to you have to go to the fullest degree, to the farthest level you can when you forensically investigate something. And the audit bureau didn't do that. So I don't know. I just saw it as one of those rhetoric moments where we go through the mechanics and somebody presents something and we're all supposed to say, well, there's nothing to see here. And that that wasn't getting to the heart of it. If that was the case, then what? What's with this geospatial cell ping data and all the tracking that they're finding? All that's electronic? Just you can't you can't dispute this stuff. It's fact. Right. So, I don't know. They didn't dig deep enough. I don't think Mr. Government has dug deep enough. And those places I could go deeper too. And I was just close. Let there be light find was pretty revealing. We'll let the investigators continue their process and we'll get to the truth.

[00:44:04] **Speaker 1** What about will.

[00:44:07] **Speaker 2** I? I don't know. I no comment on will I. I don't. The mechanics of their process to me wasn't thorough enough either. I can't draw a conclusion based on something that's done superficially, whether it's Audit Bureau or Wisconsin Institute of Law, Liberty. They weren't surgical enough. They didn't get into the to the weeds deep enough because the truth is found when you get below the layers. I think they gave up after a while because they weren't finding what they thought they'd find and that it's not the right kind of attitude to have when you're investigating something of this importance.

[00:44:38] **Speaker 1** I know there's a lot of concerns about drop boxes. What is the difference between a Dropbox and a mailbox in terms of security or any other thing? When it comes to a method of returning a ballot.

[00:44:50] **Speaker 2** Drop, boxes are specific for one ballot at a time to be put in. Which. When you you're a mule and you're trying to stuff a bunch of tin. They're fallen on the ground because it doesn't work. In a hurry, right? Got to get him in there before someone sees me. Mailboxes are not secure. They're not watched. These drop boxes were put in places where people weren't watching them. They're supposed to have cameras on them working. They didn't have cameras on them either. So the mailboxes don't have cameras on them. Mailboxes are four USPS only. Apples and oranges difference? No, you can't put a ballot in a mailbox. That's to be in a drop box.

[00:45:29] **Speaker 1** If a well well, a mail in absentee ballot, which is essentially what's.

[00:45:32] **Speaker 2** Right with the envelope. That's true. You can put it in for the USPS element. Otherwise, you have to give it to a clerk to.

[00:45:39] **Speaker 1** But I mean I mean, I've voted absentee in the past and I ultimately I've never used the drop box, but I have put mine in a mailbox and put it in my own mailbox, and then it's gone through.

[00:45:49] **Speaker 2** And then it goes to the clerk and then they've got the letter with the signature and everything tie so you can correlate. That's what happens when you use it.

[00:45:56] **Speaker 1** But I mean, would you have concerns about the security of people if there are fraudulent ballots? What's the difference between putting a fraudulent ballot into a Dropbox versus putting a fraudulent ballot into a post office?

[00:46:09] **Speaker 2** I have. Well, you're talking the ballots are not secure. They're not they're they're counterfeit material. They can be made counterfeit. There's no chain of custody when you put it in the mailbox. A lot of concerns about that. We need to have same day, you know, on paper, same day, hand count. You know, we've got to have that kind of stuff done. The machines are throwing opportunity for fraud in the chain of custody. Elements are wide open for fraud. The flooding the zone with with mail in ballots and getting returns so you can create it's all set up setting us up our elections process have been has been set up over the years to be manipulated and used for certain kind of outcomes. And what's interesting is interesting to me is who determines what the outcome is going to be. Our turn now. We're going to win this time because we let you win last time. I mean, what's how how do you determine how the outcome is going to play out? I guess whoever cheats more, maybe, I don't know.

[00:47:06] **Speaker 1** So as governor, obviously, I'm assuming you'd sign a bill limiting drop boxes. Would you also reign in absentee voting? Yes.

[00:47:14] **Speaker 2** Yes.

[00:47:14] **Speaker 1** To what extent? Who would be allowed to still vote by mail, if anyone?

[00:47:23] **Speaker 2** Probably would be a very small list. Indefinitely confined was not part of the consideration that was abused as well. Where did that jump? Up from 60000 to 240000. Four times as much. And some people weren't indefinitely confined to just use it. I would tighten up the exposure of the balance. I would tighten up our own chain of custody. I'm not a big fan of machines. Sorry, ladies and gentlemen, it's too open ended for for fraud. And the list itself. You know, it's interesting. I just turned in signatures to be on the ballot for governor, and they're scrutinized really close. You know, are they legible and someone sign off and is a date. Right. And I'm thinking to myself, you know, if the Wisconsin Election Commission paid half as much time on their voter list as they do signature petitions to be nominated for the ballot, we probably wouldn't have a problem with her on her voter lists, but they don't do that. So I don't know why. Anyway.

[00:48:21] **Speaker 1** Think in terms of hand counting ballots that would require that would mean we wouldn't have results on election night. Are you okay with that?

[00:48:29] **Speaker 2** Well, we kind of didn't happen for a while. They go on for a couple of days and an industry council. So I would be happy with that because to do it right, if you break could break the districts down into sections and you have people that are there to help address that volume. I think it can be done and used to be done that way for the longest time they went to machines. I don't know why to accelerate the process perhaps. But when you offered machines to do the routine, you open up the door for accessibility and internet. I don't think people envisioned that would happen. They obviously didn't envision the cell data would be traceable as well. Otherwise everybody will have their cell phones on when they were stuffing boxes.

[00:49:09] **Speaker 1** So early on, when some of the concerns that you're talking about were brought up, there were a lot of Republicans saying, stop saying this. You're going to make Republicans not want to vote. You're going to hurt us in future elections. What is your response to that?

[00:49:25] **Speaker 2** The damage of of their perspective on the election was already done. The people this is this the election integrity which is an interesting word. It's really more like election fraud. Problem is the number one issue in the state. It's still is at the state convention. I made a comment to that and I got major applause in the room. They already felt concerned. They already have anxiety about it. They don't trust it. Whether I see it stuff happened or not isn't going to make them stay home or not. I told them The worst thing you can do is stay home and not vote. So I took that statement as one used for deflection to try to squelch it, make it go away, don't talk about it, then say no. When they ask you to come to the district, it's not going to go away. It's not and it hasn't. And it won't until it's resolved. So to pretend by not talking about it, then it'll go away. That's just that's the wrong logic here.

[00:50:33] **Speaker 1** You've made a statement that's very interesting that you said you're not sure who decides who will win, because we obviously had changing party control, tight elections both ways. So the theory is if someone was going to commit fraud, why would they only win by a small margin or why would they lose ever? So are you saying that Republicans and Democrats collude in terms of who wins elections or.

[00:50:59] **Speaker 2** I only said that because I don't I think things have been going on for 25 years, tangible things and and not just at the presidential or gubernatorial levels. It could be different seats as well. Depends. Supreme Court justices could be an area that was targeted to make sure that you could flip a seat. I I'll I'll say this to your question. I believe that in 2016, partly because she was what was it on Time magazine or Newsweek, Hillary Clinton's picture was on the night before the election. November 2nd. They put her on the cover. They felt it was a done deal. She was going to be president. I believe they felt that way because they knew the mechanics of how they were going to manipulate the outcome, whether it's the ballots chain of custody machines, whatever, they had their game plan. It wasn't big enough to cover the amount of votes that came in for the Republican challenger. And he won. And it shocked them to the core. They were never going to let that happen again. So in 2020, there was no way he was going to get reelected because we were in do everything we could on steroids to make sure it didn't. And so I think to get to your question, I think it's been going on both sides. Who does it more maybe is the difference and maybe it isn't a choice. It just happens because it happens. I don't know. This is where you know, it's a thought. It's not an accusation. It's it's it makes you wonder. It's a curiosity. How does it how are outcomes determined if everybody's doing it wrong or affecting the outcome? It's an interesting dynamic. I'd rather just focus on here's what they're doing to do it wrong. Let's resolve this. Take it off the table, get rid of drop boxes. Absolutely. By the way, I was saying, well, it's going to be addressed by the Supreme Court I think this month. Drop boxes should be illegal going forward, and that's going to be a huge dent in the process. And I think that will really help August 9th primary. It will help in November as well. But we still have issues with the Wisconsin voter list. We still have issues with the integrity of the ballot themselves, and we have issues of a chain of custody. So and the machines I still apprehensive about August and November of this year.

[00:53:22] **Speaker 1** It's just when you see in illiberal democracies around the world or autocracies where they hold elections, that the autocrat wins with 90% of the electorate or 70% if they want to make it look like it was mildly contested. And we don't we don't ever see those those don't exist in Wisconsin.

[00:53:39] **Speaker 2** No. No.

[00:53:40] **Speaker 1** So obviously, it's a lot of time spent on that one issue. And you are running on more than just that issue. So kind of walk me through a short list of some of the other things that you think are important and also that people talk to you about, because there's probably an element of some people looking. It was like the one trick pony candidate. But you are you want to be more than that.

[00:53:58] **Speaker 2** So you heard that the way you said. That tells me you heard the one trick pony. Did you hear that?

[00:54:04] **Speaker 1** Well, it's an old phrase, but.

[00:54:07] **Speaker 2** Well, I would say that I heard that, too. And that's a statement that came out from people who want to marginalize me as a candidate. They have no idea what's in my heart or in my head. So to your question, the thing I want people to remember about me or to know about me, it regarding election integrity is not that subject matter itself, but it's the manner in which I addressed it. I am very aggressive on addressing injustice. I'm all in on this. But it's not justice. It's the way I work. It's the way it's my management style. I'm a crisis management guy. I'm all about efficiencies and getting stuff right. So when I look at election integrity, I'm all in on it and I'm not saying it right. But not just that medical freedom, appalling constitutional rights and ending tyranny in our state is is equally as important. They're all the same. The subsequent ones I'm going to mention, they're all the same. These are the things that if you want someone to get aggressive and get something done with, I'm the guy to do it right. So education, not indoctrination, a lot of concern about what's going on in the classroom nowadays. And I think it traces back to, you know, this initiative or on CRT critical race theory as well as Project 1619. I think Common Core is something to do with it that that was introduced to our state back door. By the way, I call it Common Core came in the back door. Governor Doyle and then Superintendent Evers took $3.4 million and introduced the Common Core Process to our state through the DPI into the various public schools. At the same time, by the way, I'll digress for a moment. Act ten with Governor Walker at the time had 72 hearings before it became law. Common Core, which was introduced through the DPI and changed significantly. The instruction and curriculum methodologies in state should have gone through legislative oversight, should have had committee hearings, should have had bills at least or at least one to say, Here's we're going to do it, here's how and here's why. And it's been approved. It's been vetted, right? Zero. Nothing happened with Common Core. It came in the back door. It was snuck in and introduced and populated throughout our state. And nobody no, no legislative oversight, that kind of stuff won't happen on my watch. We have to make sure we follow the rules and everything's got to run through legislative oversight. That's the job of the executive, I believe, not just to sign off stuff that you get, but to make sure it's done right so that you know what you're signing is legal and just the government accountability. Big deal for me as well. We have a lot of agencies in this in the state that work to do things for the taxpayer and use a lot of taxpayer money. I want to assess their efficiency factor. So I want to know what their measurement criteria is for success. Pro-Life. I'm pro-life without exception. Life begins at conception. Life is a gift from God. It's not the baby's fault in how they were conceived. We have to stop killing babies. That's my line. I stick to it, and I believe that wholeheartedly. I want zero money for Planned Parenthood. I want to go into pregnancy centers to help women with health issues, not to abort children, but to save them. Agriculture is a big thing for me.

[00:57:11] **Speaker 1** I can cut it just first because I want to make sure I have clarification, conception or fertilization. Would you sign a bill that would ban abortifacient birth control?

[00:57:24] **Speaker 2** I'm saying that life begins at conception, which is fertilization. Aren't they one in the same?

[00:57:32] **Speaker 1** That's what I'm asking. There's yeah, there's a.

[00:57:34] **Speaker 2** There one in the same.

[00:57:35] **Speaker 1** Way some people would say implantation. Others say the actual fertilization, because there are methods of birth control that work in different ways, that if an egg is fertilized, it can still be.

[00:57:46] **Speaker 2** You have live cells merging and splitting and generating life as soon as the fertilization happens. You have conception. You have life.

[00:57:58] **Speaker 1** So thank you. I just want to.

[00:57:59] **Speaker 2** Clarify, you know, I talked about about government agencies or agricultural agriculture. No, no farms, no food. Right. Agriculture is the heart of our our our state and our nation. And salt of the earth. People are just fantastic people we have to do more for. EG they were hurt real bad. It's not just dairy and cattle, it's it's potato farms. I heard in state are struggling this year. Cranberry farms are in trouble. It's part of my convention speech as well. So agriculture in general, I don't think there should be any limits to it as far as what category of agriculture. Small business and large businesses as well need help as well. We were hurt bad the last couple of years with the acts around COVID and stuff and a lot of them went under and they're permanently gone. We have to get back to that new business and open for business mentality in our state to bring in more business and more people so we can have a more robust state fiscal responsibility. I got to say this, too, on on this program, I've been accused of squeaking when I walk because I'm so tight. It's kind of said that tongue in cheek a little bit. But I want the state to squeak, too. So I think we always have surpluses every biennium, budget cycle. And to me it tells me we're taxing too much. We're in the top ten and how we tax anyway in the state, in the country, rather our state. I want to have us in the bottom ten. So I want to look at either reduction, reduction of the sliding scales, which is the percentage of withholding and or I want to look at flat tax, which might eliminate that because we go to a flat and or eliminating the state income tax. But we have to do something to get us out of the top ten. And so ultimately, whatever reduces the burden of taxation on the people of the state, especially our elderly, I want to maybe look at something special for them because they've been paying taxes their whole life and they're in a place now where they don't have to carry the burden like they used to. I think they have enough burden in their life the way it is. So I'd like to see what they can do for the elderly, their us against them mentality. I mentioned that to you off line. Um, every, every one of the 99 reps in the assembly has approximately 59,000 people. They're responsible for every one of them. And then the Senate, the same thing, about 180,000, because they've got three Assembly districts to one Senate, they have a responsibility to deliver to their constituents. Every idea should be considered from whomever it shouldn't be by party or person. It should be by the merit of the idea, the merit of the bill. And so anything that makes a difference for the people and does something that the majority can agree with, we should do it. It shouldn't be by ours and. DS And blue and red. It should be. What's the merit of the bill? So I want to work on getting that fixed too. I did that, by the way, in my first session I had. I work to build relationships with the people in the body because I knew I would be working with them. And I have friends across the aisle that I can go to any day of the week and have conversation with. And it's good. So we need more of that. Drug abuse and opioid abuse is out of control in the world. Wisconsin is no exception. We've got to address treatment and prevention and we've got to stop the influx of some of these nasty chemicals like fentanyl. That's 100 times more potent than morphine. That's a priority for me as well. Human trafficking is a big deal in the state. People probably aren't as well aware of what's going on with that subject matter, but it's a big deal and it's it's hurting our state. We're we're a thoroughfare, apparently from for some odd reason maybe. But the whole Chicago Milwaukee thing and the center of the country, Wisconsin has an issue with human trafficking and we have to address it. It's got to be eradicated as well. And I think the last thing I would mention is broadband. It is important to me because it's the accessibility for education and schools everywhere in the state is accessibility and functionality for businesses everywhere in the state. And as I travel the state, whether I'm talking about election integrity or campaigning, I have lots of places that are dead spots. And so that's a problem because in the last four years or two budget biennium, we've as a state, we've spent approximately $275 million to help improve that. And I all evidence to the contrary, it's done anything in the state. So it's a big deal. I could talk a little bit about roads in Department of Transportation. I think we need some work there, too. That was a big deal four years ago. It's still a big deal. The current governor said he would do something about that and he didn't. Well, I'll make sure that it's on the front burner of consideration and action as well. So our infrastructure is hurting and it's the weather, it's the salt, and everything's starting to show its wear. And then you've got safety issues, you've got functionality issues. We got to we've got to get our our highways and our infrastructure addressed as well. So those are the things I'm very serious about. Anything that comes across my desk, whether it's from constituent concern or through the legislative process for signature, will be a priority as well. I'm not here to obstruct. I'm here to get the right things done and get them done quickly. The dated issues are a big concern for me. We keep kicking the can down the road. I'm going to stop doing that too. So I project the probability of being probably one of the most active busiest governors this state ever had. Because I'm very high on urgency and I'm very focused on my conviction and my passion and my courage to get things done. And then last comment I'll make as far as how I envision managing the state. I'll be teaming up with fellow conservative governors like Ron DeSantis in Florida, like Carol Lake in Arizona. I believe she'll win her gubernatorial race. I'm also connected in friends with Doug Mastriano in Pennsylvania. So there are some like minded individuals that have conservative values and principle conviction on how to run government and run a state. And so I'll be teaming with those guys. And so then when you get that power and numbers effect where you get multiple states doing things for their states or by the way, it can be done. And also you get this propagation going across the country. I think some really good stuff can happen in the next four years if you get right person, right role, right time. And for the governor of Wisconsin, that's Tim Rampton.

[01:04:17] **Speaker 1** When you look at the other candidates in this field for this primary, are you running against them? Do you need to distinguish yourself from them? Is there a concern that with Rebecca Kleefisch and her her or establishment knowledge and her name recognition that the three challengers, the three men, could kind of divide the vote of what's not already in her camp?

[01:04:39] **Speaker 2** That's a fantastic question. That really is that strikes a nerve with me in this way. Every voter should envision themselves as the manager who's going to hire the president of the company they work at. Their responsibility as voters is magnified and compounded significantly by the importance of their selection. So it should beg the question, what's the criteria for selection? You've got to know what the role requires first. Then you've got to look at the candidates and the qualifications and the characteristics and character that they bring to the table. And you see if that matches and if you if it if it melds to the role, you have a great probability of having success. If you pick the right person, the right time. The way you asked your question as act was was very good because I do not look at the other candidates. As far as I'm concerned, they don't exist. My focus is. Here's Ramsden. Here's what he brings to the table. 45 years in the private sector, multiple organizations, multiple industries, multiple cultures, not just one company, seven. And consistency across the board. And all seven of them show us that I can go into a place and I can address tools, organization, process people, human resources, finance and audit. I can look at something. Those are like seven spokes in the wheel, by the way. And if you know anything about what the spokes function is in a wheel, if you have it loose, the wheel wobbles. If you have a tight, it's crooked and it wobbles. You've got to make that spoke just right. Right. That's what I do in the private sector. I come in and I assess whether it's one spoke or seven. Could be more than that in state government. But I'm just giving you some framework here and I want to see what's what's the right thing to do at the time. There's no template anywhere that fits the current challenge. So you everything's built from scratch. You work with the resources you have. You work with the money you have, and you try to improve a situation based on the inputs. That's how I work. And that proven mentality over the course of 75, excuse me, 45 years and four and a half decades, combined with my public sector experience of ten years as a school board member from board president to vice president, those are the two positions I held. And right now I'm VP and that's all I want to be a little too busy to be president, so give it to somebody else. But and then the four years in legislature, the other value proper bring to the table as I'm in the legislature and all the candidates and say that they can't say they have 45 years of multiple industry experience, number one. Number two, they can't say they've been in the body of the legislature for one session or more like I can. It's a lot different from the inside looking out and I know what works in the legislature and I know what doesn't work. And for me personally, I don't have time to fix what's broken in the legislature right now. It's in the courts and they're going to need personnel changes as well as learn behavior changes with the culture. But I can get it from the other side when it's 1 to 1 ratio. That's why I'm running for governor as well, because I have the depth of experience, the depth of capability, the proven fortitude to do the right thing for the people. And regardless of the ramification, I'm loved and adored by many in the state right now. I'm probably just the opposite with a whole bunch to right, because I'm all about truth and transparency. I'm not go along and get along. I am not going to be a rubber stamp for anybody, legislative or otherwise. Lobbyists. Hidden agenda. Special interests? Nope. I try to stay away from money. That's another thing that's going on in this race. Money should not be allowed to buy seats. You want it? When you got me going, you want to look at it. The approval rating for governance, whether it's the federal level in Congress or the state level in our legislature, what are we talking here? 10%. 520, if you're lucky. Right. Why? Because we keep doing it the same way you keep. Well, he's got a lot of money or he's got more signs out or or she she was something before and and she says she's going to do this and do that. That's superficial stuff. Look at the core of the person. Look at the character, look at the the capability that they can show that they've done and where they've been and who they are. And I'm fighting fights right now at the local level with my school board regarding finances and curriculum. And I'm doing it at the state level. We're doing right things for our elections process. I'm the only one that's standing up mostly. Janelle, I've got to give her credit. Mike Gable got to give him credit. But I continue to fight the fight because it's the it's of, by and for the people. That's what we need in governance. If you get people who have the same mentality as our founding fathers did when they served back in the day, you're going to get better results from. Governance bodies and so we need more remittance involved, in my humble opinion, at all levels. People who care about doing it the right way for the right reason, not for themselves and not for optics. I don't think anything prestigious of me as a person being a school board member or a member of the state legislature right now. And I will not think anything prestigious of myself if I'm governor. It's a servant role. They're all servant roles, and they should serve of, by and for the people. Those are the things I bring to the table. That's what makes me the real deal here. I don't have the superficial stuff that that's the old, old method of of of elections. Right. Or the other one is I think the governor just did something regarding burning books. What did he say? Something about eliminating books. Banning books. First of all, you make somebody afraid of something and then you tell them who's to blame. So they're going to ban books you can't have bring books and those darn Republicans are going to going to do that. So you got a head on Republicans that said I was against them division. That's what you do when you're on defense, by the way. If you had something decent to run on, you wouldn't have to go to defensive, you know, negative mudslinging. You could say, I did this, I did that, I did this. I deserve your vote. If you don't vote for me, fine, then I won't be reelected. By the way, that's how I feel about this, too. I jokingly say, But I'm serious when I say it. When I win on August 9th, I'll go head to head against everyone else. I won't just be the governor because there are some independents in there. So and I'll win that race to win it for the people. And the people will be the big winners when I cross those two finish lines. Now, if something were to happen or I'm not successful in August or November, I get to stay home and play with my cat. And I'm okay with that because the question is, I'm offering myself as a sacrifice to the people. I'm bringing all this stuff with me that's going to tell you right off the bat, I'm going to make a difference and raise the bar and get it done. And I'm I am what they've been looking for for decades. But if it doesn't work out for nefarious reasons and we spoke about that earlier, it doesn't work out. I'm okay with that. I'm not going to freak out and get desperate and cry in my beer. I like beer anyway. My point is, I'm doing this for the people for all the right reasons. I'm the solution they've been searching for, and I don't worry about what other people are doing or saying, and my time will come. Everything's about cadence and pace. My message is going to get out my signage or get out my word. My name will get more recognized and they're going to go, Where is this guy been all this time? And it'll happen just before August 9th.

[01:12:21] **Speaker 1** I want to touch on something you just mentioned. You said that if you don't win on August 9th, you be happy to go on through life, play with your cat, do whatever. But you also said previously that you would definitely be auditing your own election and that you don't believe that enough has changed since the last set of elections, that there isn't the possibility of fraud being involved. We already know that the establishment is not in your camp and so the very people who have possibly manipulated elections before are still there. So how do you reconcile those two things? If you audit your own election and if you lose that, you will just go quietly into the night? Or will you continue that fight if you have the evidence?

[01:13:04] **Speaker 2** I will definitely continue to fight if I had the evidence. What I was focused on when I made the statement was, I'm not desperate about this. I'm not going to mudslinging. I'm not going to go defensive. I'm bringing to the table what I can offer the people. And that's their choice. If they have the right management mindset and they know the rule and they look at my characteristics and my capabilities and my success and my my experience and credentials, I think it's an easy choice. That's why I threw in I threw in essentially last. The other one came in after. But that's a whole other conversation. And I did it because I wanted the people to have the better choice, maybe the best choice. I don't know. I'm not seeing anything of me. I'm saying about me, like, well, I'm going to offer myself if they agree, I win and they win if I don't. Look, I tried, but I know one thing I can't do is stay in a body that I know is not working right. It's dysfunctional and it's got levels of corruption in it. And there's a 30, 30 people plus leaving the assembly. A lot of unhappy folks. Yeah, something's not right. And it's all about leadership. By the way.

[01:14:12] **Speaker 1** You mentioned money, and I want to touch on that. You are the only one without a billionaire or your own millionaire background to fund the campaign. And you said that's how it's always been done, but that's also how traditionally things have been won. It's been done because it works. So how is this a fight of David versus Goliath? Yes, but it's the money versus the grassroots. Yeah.

[01:14:33] **Speaker 2** David versus Goliath has been mentioned many times and we know what happened there. We also know if you want to throw in the Kentucky Derby, rich state, rich strike or something, they call me. And you don't want. Maybe it's possible miracles happen to Lourdes with me. I know he is. I feel him every day. It's my calling to try this and do this for him and for them, the people. And I feel very confident about being successful. Money plays a part. I am no good at it. I didn't. I gave money back as an assembly rep. People would donate. And I said, I don't I don't need it. I, I made the decision to run. It's my choice. I'll take care of it. Thank you. Little harder to do for statewide race, I got to admit. And of course, then you get r.p saying you have to have $100,000 or more by March 15th and you have to have 1000 donors or more by March 15th. Not you and not PACs. By the way, I found that out on February 15th and I pretty much had zero. I got that number. Both of those plateaus surpassed within three weeks, three and a half weeks at best. There was phenomenal grassroots support, heavy in the state, but not just in Wisconsin. I got national push as well because I was on media all over the place because of my request about reclaiming. And so I'm unbanned and I'm on Lindell TV and Joanne Houghton, Pulitzer and Conservative Digest. And so I got my name out of some of those groups and moneys were coming in from all over the country. So that helped me get there. And it's sustained now it's it goes like this, you know, for me, I'm not a millionaire. I'm not the party favorite, but experience level. I beat them all combined eight years as lieutenant governor. What has the individual done in eight years as lieutenant governor? I'm sorry. I cannot think of anything. Act ten doesn't count. That's Walker right to work. That's Walker. I mean, the governor did those things. I I'm just saying.

[01:16:39] **Speaker 1** Technically, she wasn't even the one that she wanted.

[01:16:42] **Speaker 2** To that.

[01:16:42] **Speaker 1** To too. So in terms of the party, you win the primary. Will you accept the party's help? Will you accept outside billionaires who have supported your your current opponents coming in and supporting PACs or giving money to help you push you over the finish line in November?

[01:17:00] **Speaker 2** Great question. I would like to by the way, these are really good questions. I'm not saying that, you know. Compliment your approach. I really do appreciate the thoroughness of your points. Um. Interesting. I'm not sure. I'm not sure. Maybe the party thing. I don't think it's so much about money. It's about, you know, helping with the messaging and getting my name out so I can go head to head against evil. I know he's at, what, ten or 12 million or something? Or maybe more. Who knows? Um, I probably got to do something to mitigate that, but I'm very apprehensive about opening myself up to special interest or PACs because in my opinion, that's where you start to deviate from working out and for the people and you start working for the favor. And so I have I have an issue with that. So that would I have to be very clear. You want to give some money to the campaign? Fine. Don't expect anything in return. You know, something like that may have to happen. Um, I'm not going to be bought, and I want to. I don't want to be beholden to anybody but the people. So if that prevents me from being elected, I can get up the next morning and say I didn't change my characters the same. My conviction is the same. I'm true to myself. I did not compromise myself or my position for the seat. I won't do that. Just like I won't call the president and ask him anything. I don't. I won't do that. It's not me.

[01:18:29] **Speaker 1** You've made a number of references to your faith and in your in the convictions behind that, you made a reference of sacrificing yourself to the people. Can we view that in a biblical light? Yes.

[01:18:41] **Speaker 2** Drink water, Timothy four over seven. Something to that effect. I view myself as a vessel for his will to the people. It's not about me. I don't care about me. I could stay home and cut wood and play with my cat. I could work my tail off to do the right thing by and for the people and raise the bar of the state. Be the best governor we've ever had. It's up to them. It's up to them. I I'll do what I can to get my message out, to get the option of consideration in their face. But what they execute and how they look at it. Are they the to the. Oh, I already made up my mind and I'm not going to worry about it. Or is FSC going to rule and then not even vote? I don't know. I'll do the best I can. But I'll tell you what, I'm not going to spend millions of dollars. I don't have any way to try to get them to drink the water. You know, I can maybe lead them to that, but they're going to have to do a little work on their own part. And if they don't and don't vote, you're going to just go and check a box because someone told you to. Then you're not voting. You're being a puppet. And that's part of the problem with governance bodies. They're all puppets. They do what you're told. I don't. I do what the people want me to do. And that's what makes me different.

[01:19:55] **Speaker 1** All right. Is there anything else that you'd like to add?

[01:19:59] **Speaker 2** This has been fun. This is the kind of time I like to have to talk about me and talk about my thought process and my approach. A lot of times when I go to these events, you know, they give you a five or 10 minutes and you got to hurry up and say a few words and maybe you get your attention to somebody. I do. Apparently they give me ovations every time, but I really like that. You can get into the weeds on things and you can start to see what truth and conviction I've been told them the real deal. I'm not phony. I'm not superficial. I call it like it is. I'll do the best I can with what I have to work with. I'll work with all the people. I. I really believe that. Um. We're going to. We're going to shock them. It's going to be an interesting time. Richard Rich, Strike Rampton, anyone? One is going to take it take it at the finish line. So it's been a pleasure. Thank you so much.

[01:21:02] **Speaker 1** Thank you. I appreciate your time. This was wonderful. All right. We are good.