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[00:00:00] **Speaker 1** Yeah. I think after the interview, if we want to get some video of you and the dog, I think that would be fun.

[00:00:05] **Speaker 2** Yeah, he's. He will jump on you, but.

[00:00:08] **Speaker 1** Well.

[00:00:09] **Speaker 2** Sam, I'll keep him away, Right. He's just. He's just a doll.

[00:00:14] **Speaker 1** Yes. Dogs know that. I am hesitant about them, and that just makes them want to.

[00:00:20] **Speaker 2** Look at that shirt I can tear off.

[00:00:21] **Speaker 1** Yes, that just.

[00:00:23] **Speaker 2** So I used to tell people, you know, don't padam he's going to jump on you, You know, Now I tell them more that I used to tell them he's going to jump and use that, okay? And then they'll be like, Oh, it's fine. I've got dogs. And he jumps and rips their shirt off and they're like, Shit. So I'm a little bit like, No, no, please don't touch him, because he just gets excited. One more.

[00:00:46] **Speaker 1** Thing before we.

[00:00:47] **Speaker 2** Start.

[00:00:47] **Speaker 1** Yeah, Can you just turn your shoulders and kind of square up with Jack? Zach?

[00:00:52] **Speaker 2** Zach. Zach.

[00:00:53] **Speaker 1** Oh, I answer to most things same. And I am rolling. Zach, whenever you're ready. All right, Well, I want to start with how do you actually pronounce your last name? Probably the most important question for your for your voters.

[00:01:09] **Speaker 2** That question makes me smile. I say pro to say what's. And the reason it makes me smile is I get phone calls from people all the time, from all across the state telling me I'm pronouncing my name incorrectly. But I say pro to say what's.

[00:01:22] **Speaker 1** And so would they. How do they want you to pronounce it?

[00:01:25] **Speaker 2** They want me to. Some of them will say Pratasevich, and they'll they'll leave me messages with a wide variety of alternate pronunciations that they believe to be preferable.

[00:01:38] **Speaker 1** I'm assuming that you learned to pronounce your last name a long time ago.

[00:01:43] **Speaker 2** When I was a child, correct? Correct.

[00:01:46] **Speaker 1** Okay. So the family heritage says this is how you pronounce it.

[00:01:50] **Speaker 2** Correct.

[00:01:51] **Speaker 1** Okay. And does it give you heartburn when you hear it done incorrectly on the news? Or is it more of just it's on as you can find it on the ballot box or. Okay.

[00:01:59] **Speaker 2** Yes. Longest name on the ballot is what we say. I'm used to it being pronounced incorrectly. I'm used to being in school when they were taking attendance and you could tell when they were getting to that name they call out, you know, maybe Paynter and Potter. And then all of a sudden it was this hard stop as they just looked at the names. So I'm used to it, okay, I'm used to it.

[00:02:21] **Speaker 1** Well, I'm the topic this election. What were some of the reasons that made you decide to want to enter the race.

[00:02:27] **Speaker 2** How critically important the races and how critically high the stakes in this race are? I was at a pretty comfortable position in my life, quite frankly, and I sat back and started thinking about this race last spring. And the more I thought about it, the more I couldn't sit back and let Partizan far right extremists hijack our Supreme Court because everything we care about is on the line. Everything I care about is on the line. I think that everything many, many people care about is on the line. I've had contested races. I like to campaign. I like people. The issues are so absolutely critical. I decided to get into the race.

[00:03:08] **Speaker 1** How did you come to the decision on how you would talk to voters about what you care about versus how some other candidates in this election are trying to keep everything pretty plain talking about the law and the Constitution.

[00:03:23] **Speaker 2** Well, right. And I mean, I think that we pretty much know how much people care about certain issues. We pretty much know. So my position really is people who are just talking about the Constitution and the law, that's a personal choice of theirs, I suppose. On the other hand, they may not wish to share what their values or ideas are on some of the issues that are really, really important to voters. So when I talk to voters, I say I can tell you what my values are. I can't tell you what I will do on any particular case, but I'll tell you what my values are. I'll tell you what I think is important. And that's really how I frame it when I talk to people, because obviously I have to follow the Constitution. Obviously I have to follow the law. But people are very, very concerned about a wide variety of issues. They're concerned about women's right to choose. They're concerned about fair maps, they're concerned about community safety, They're concerned about clean water. They're concerned about marriage equality. So we talk about those issues in terms of what my values are.

[00:04:29] **Speaker 1** So how do your values then translate to decisions from the bench?

[00:04:34] **Speaker 2** Well, I still have to follow the Constitution. I have to follow the law. But I think we all know that there is a significant ability to interpret the laws, the stare decisis, what has come before us. There's significant things that can be interpreted in different ways. And you can tell that just based on how courts split on their decisions and how there can be a very well-reasoned. Opinion and a very well reasoned dissent. Right. So you can tell that there are, you know, well-thought out decisions on both sides. But it's pretty clear to me it's very, very clear to me that women and men in this state are very, very concerned about a woman's right to choose. Very, very concerned about it. And so I tell them, you know, you should know my value. You should know my value. And my value is that bottom line is, you know, discuss the issue with your clergy, discuss it with your medical care provider, discuss it with your family or your significant other. But in the end, that decision is really your decision. That's what my value is. Where you come down on it. If a case is brought in front of the court, that's a separate evaluation.

[00:05:52] **Speaker 1** Along this path towards announcing and running. Did anyone say, Well, maybe you shouldn't broadcast those values so loudly in this kind of campaign? Maybe this is you should code your language a little more so the voters know with a wink what you what you intend. But you don't say it so plainly.

[00:06:13] **Speaker 2** I don't know why I would do that. I mean, I certainly hear from the far right. She's telling you what she's going to do. The criticism is if she's telling you what her values are, she's telling you what she's going to do. Certainly, I've heard the criticism, but I think voters want to know. I mean, these issues are really, really on the forefront. They want to know what kind of values a Supreme Court justice is going to bring. So here's what I say to that. We have had so much extremism. We have had so much of a thumb on the scale. We have had so much where you can kind of predetermine what an outcome of a case is going to be. And that's just absolutely wrong. You need a Supreme Court justice who's going to follow the law and uphold the Constitution. That's what you need. And so you need to, like, let people know what you're thinking. Common sense and change. We're trying to get away from all of that extremism and bring common sense and change to our Supreme Court. And that's really what I keep going back to common sense and change. And that's what people want. They're tired of the dysfunction on the Supreme Court. People tell me that they think the courts should be different, wholly different than the legislature. And from time to time, the executive branch, they should be steps above. They should be places of integrity. And it is so different. The role of the Supreme Court and the way the Supreme Court distinguishes itself from the legislators and sometimes from, you know, the executive branch, it's very different. And you want to bring that back. You want to bring back that change, that common sense, that decorum, that dignity, that integrity to the Supreme Court.

[00:07:58] **Speaker 1** You mentioned before some of the hard right wing rigidity and decisions that have come out of the court. Can you give me some examples of what you think are some of the most egregious?

[00:08:09] **Speaker 2** Well, for one, the one case that I would say I agree with the dissent on would be the redistricting case. I also say it's very, very challenging to tell people they're going to get a fair day in court when, you know, certain people are going to vote with a certain block all the time. When Dan Kelly called out Brian Hagedorn as, quote, supremely unreliable because he voted against the block and exerted his independent thought. And he's labeled as supremely unreliable, like it's a bad thing. Being independent is what everybody should do. You shouldn't be able to predetermine what a Supreme Court is going to do. They should be following the law, upholding the Constitution. Then you'll hear, look at this. On several occasions, Justice Hagedorn didn't do what we thought he should do. Now he's supremely unreliable. Maybe he should have been called independent and thoughtful. Right. And so that's what you're dealing with. You're dealing with one person who's running for the court, calling people supremely unreliable when they exert independent thought.

[00:09:26] **Speaker 1** Do you think you'd be closer in line with Justice Hagedorn on the court in terms of people not being able to predict where you might vote?

[00:09:34] **Speaker 2** I think in many cases, yes. I think that is very interesting. I've talked to many members of the Supreme Court and I said, Do you ever disagree on cases? And they say, Sure, we do. The three Supreme Court justices who, in my opinion, uphold the law, uphold the Constitution. They disagree amongst themselves. And that's a good thing. People should be able to disagree, work to. Other in boil down what the highest law in our state, our land should be.

[00:10:06] **Speaker 1** Justice Hagedorn is an interesting comparison because obviously there are conservatives who feel he isn't what they thought he would be when they campaigned for him and raised money for him and voted for him. And there are liberals who are very surprised that he hasn't fallen in line with some of the conservative bloc. Is he someone that we should hope more candidates and more justices are like, or is he someone that it's hard to follow where he he's going in his trajectory and his decision in any given time, maybe concurring over here or concurring with literally only a few paragraphs in a decision instead of joining one side or the other.

[00:10:43] **Speaker 2** Every Supreme Court justice should be fair and impartial, every single one. That should be the standard that we are held to fair, impartial, reviewing the facts, reviewing the law, sometimes reviewing legislative history, you know, stare decisis, extraordinarily important, the Constitution, extremely important, but fair, impartial. That's what we want from all of our justices. I think you want to be able to go into a courtroom, as I indicated earlier, you want to go in that courtroom and not feel like there's a thumb on the scale and you're not getting a fair shake. What part of my judicial philosophy and I handle some really tough cases that just came off of three years in Homicide and sexual assault court. Before that, I did two years in a high intensity drug drug dealing court. It was called drug court, but lots of high intensity drug dealers handled domestic violence court handled some really, really tough cases. And my goal always was once somebody came into court and you rendered a really harsh sentence, that at least that person felt like they had a fair day in court, that I listen to everybody, that I listen to their statements, their families statements, their attorney listened to the state, listened to the victims of the offense, and put together a fair and just sentence. And that's what you want from anybody. You want to feel like you've actually had your day in court. So critically important.

[00:12:14] **Speaker 1** When you look at the other candidates running in this primary and obviously, I'm sure you would say you are the the best choice for voters. But do you think the other candidates are also qualified for the Supreme Court?

[00:12:26] **Speaker 2** I don't. I think you have two people on the right who are very similarly aligned, that are very extreme, that don't reflect the people in this state. I have a friendly opponent on the left. My opinion is I have longer, broader, deeper experience than he has. So, you know, that's where I come down.

[00:12:50] **Speaker 1** In terms of what you want voters to think about. Sometimes they approach a primary in terms of electability, and sometimes they approach it from their own personal views of who they think would look best or be best on the court. How would you like voters to approach this?

[00:13:05] **Speaker 2** Well, both, of course. Of course, you want people to think that you're the best candidate. You also want them to think that you're electable. So I've got this broad background. I worked for 25 years in the district attorney's office before I ran for judge. I had a contested race. When I ran for judge that I got a lot of collateral benefits out of. I didn't think so at the time, but currently a lot of collateral benefits out of running a contested race. And then I've been a judge since 2014, so I've got a lot of experience, lots of different kinds of classes I've taught with for the Department of Justice training prosecutors in Columbia, South Carolina, adjunct professor of law at Marquette, very, very active in the community. I think I'm a very good choice. I also think I'm extremely electable. We have over a thousand endorsements, and by endorsements I mean really good endorsements. Justice Rebecca Dalit, Judge Lisa Neubauer, People all across our entire state attorneys, community leaders, elected officials, labor unions, we have lots and lots of really, really good support and people working really hard for us across the state. Fundraising records just came out yesterday. Our fundraising reports. We broke a record with how much money we raised and we actually raised more money than all three of my opponents combined, which was, you know, quite, I think, a feather in our hat when we looked at it and a feather in the hat really, of the people of the state of Wisconsin who recognize the issues and what is so important and what is at stake in this particular race that we out fundraised everybody combined.

[00:14:51] **Speaker 1** When voters look at things like fundraising and endorsement and support, how much should they put into whether, you know. Comes from the left or the right, or if that paints a picture of, oh, well, this is more of the Democratic leaning, this is more of the Republican leaning.

[00:15:06] **Speaker 2** Well, we're trying to get support across the board. You know, if you look at my supporter list, yes, you'll see a lot of people that you would consider align as a progressive or as a Democrat, but you'll see a substantial amount of people who are Republicans on that list, too, including some elected officials. So when you take a look at the list, you know, I'm trying to appeal to everybody. If it were up to me, I'd like to have everybody's vote. I understand That's impossible. Right? But I think that where I come from, what I stand for, you know, I believe very, very strongly in community safety. Very strongly and community safety. I'm a good friend of our men and women in blue. I support law enforcement. I have that district attorney's office, you know, background and experience where I worked really hard to protect communities, keep people safe, prosecute some of the most challenging, difficult, violent offenders in our community. But I've also been able to make some really hard decisions on who gets a second chance, who should have probation in the particular case, who should be allowed out in the community. So I think if you look at, you know, my supporter list, you'll see a lot of people who are law enforcement, you'll see a lot of people who are criminal defense lawyers and you'll see elected officials on both sides.

[00:16:25] **Speaker 1** When when you hear from someone like Dan Kelly saying that, well, we can predict how you vote, you're signaling too much because of where your background is. But he claims that he's completely independent, that no one will be able to tell. But he's appeared at Trump rallies. He's been endorsed by Republicans. He's was appointed by a Republican. Is it better to be out and open about where your support is or to pretend that you're in a lane.

[00:16:49] **Speaker 2** While pretending you're in a lane is so disingenuous? I look at Dan Kelly. He was recently touring the state with of all people of all people, Michael Gabelman on an election integrity tour. What were they trying to do? Peddle the big lie that the 2020 election was stolen? We all know that election wasn't stolen. We know in his last race he was doing some of, if not all of his campaigning out of the Republican Party headquarters. Right. So, you know, when he made the comments that he made at the forum, they're quite frankly, laughable that those could come out of his mouth with a straight face.

[00:17:31] **Speaker 1** But will voters know all that?

[00:17:33] **Speaker 2** Well, that's something that we will soon find out. I don't know. I hope so.

[00:17:38] **Speaker 1** Should that matter? If we can all judges set aside those personal beliefs and backgrounds when they reach the bench?

[00:17:46] **Speaker 2** Well, I think many judges can put aside their personal backgrounds and their personal beliefs and their personal thoughts. That's what we're trained to do every single day. But remember, Dan Kelly's been on the Supreme Court. I was watching an interview or I was watching an old debate with him and Jill Crosby, and she challenged him and she said, tell us one time, even one, when you didn't vote with the far right block when you couldn't give an example. What does that tell you? So we know because of his track record, where what he's going to do.

[00:18:24] **Speaker 1** He's been he's an interesting character in this election in that he's been campaigning almost as an incumbent, even though he lost his effort for reelection. Should voters take anything away from the fact that he's lost already? Considering that was in the midst of COVID, that was during a presidential primary year?

[00:18:42] **Speaker 2** I don't think so. I mean, he lost by something like 160,000 votes. I think that that tells you that the people of the state of Wisconsin have rejected him as a Supreme Court justice. So obviously, he wants to run again. Anybody who wants to run can run. It's a democracy. So he's here and he's running. And I see that he's garnered a bit of support from the far right. You know, I think that the people of the state of Wisconsin are going to evaluate whether or not they want him back.

[00:19:22] **Speaker 1** Another opponent in this race is Jennifer Doro, and she gained fame through appearing as a judge that reached a lot of celebrity status. How much should we put into that? Pushing her, her her name recognition forward and rocket fueling her campaign? I mean, is that what should qualify her for the bench?

[00:19:42] **Speaker 2** No, absolutely not. Now, Darrell Brooks, a very difficult, so to speak, defendant who committed some violent, atrocious crimes. No doubt about it. I've. I've spent three years in homicide and sexual assault court, two years with those drug dealers, a year with those domestic violence offenders. Darrell Brooks, personality is not a unique personality. I've seen his personality in court over and over and over with the types of cases that I've handled. That's our job as a judge to handle that type of personality amongst many others. You know, my house has been under surveillance on numerous occasions because of the types of people that I deal with, because of the death threats that, you know, I have had, you know, that affect myself, my family, my neighborhood. So propelling somebody into running. Due to one particular case, I think is wholly inappropriate.

[00:20:46] **Speaker 1** Let's step back a little bit. Can you wrap up there, boil down your judicial philosophy? Is it fair to even try and do that?

[00:20:54] **Speaker 2** Sure. My judicial philosophy is really simple. Everybody gets a fair shake. I'm impartial. I'm not a partizan. I am not a wild, extreme partizan. I want everybody to come into court, have their day in court, and I will make decisions based on following the law, following the Constitution, upholding the Constitution, the statutes, and everything that I need to do to make a fair and appropriate decision. I've made many decisions in my career as a judge where I've had to put my personal opinions aside. I have also a very strong belief in judicial independence. You have to be independent of the people in the state of Wisconsin. They deserve that. They absolutely, positively deserve somebody who's independent and can follow the law and isn't beholden to special interests. So fair. Independent integrity. I'll protect the community. I'll follow the law and give the people of Wisconsin what I think they so richly deserve, which is the change that they need. The change in common sense. Coming back to our highest court.

[00:22:03] **Speaker 1** How do you believe we should interpret the Constitution in terms of the era in which it was passed versus how it applies to today's society?

[00:22:11] **Speaker 2** It's an interesting question. People either think the Constitution is a stagnant document or they think the Constitution lives and breathes a little bit. I think we have to find that the Constitution lives and breathes because it's a document that has to adhere and be used in changing times. I mean, you look at one that constitution was written. Women couldn't vote. People had slaves. You just look at everything that has changed. You look at the amendments to that constitution. The Constitution has to live and breathe and be adaptable to today. That's what makes it the truly remarkable instrument that it is.

[00:23:02] **Speaker 1** So how do you balance that with the the threat of judicial activism? And what does judicial activism mean to you?

[00:23:10] **Speaker 2** Well, judicial activism, you know, was a term that was so frequently used by the far right to be flung at, you know, progressives. Then you have the United States Supreme Court in. DOBBS In my opinion, engaging at judicial activism at its highest level, you know, taking away from women rights that they had enjoyed for 50 years, three generations of women counting on. DOBBS Many women only alive or counting tomorrow excuse me, many women only alive during the era of Roe. And suddenly the privileges and freedoms that they took for granted and I think some people did take for granted they have been stripped away and removed. So it's a really fine balancing act of the Constitution. And, you know, it's living, breathing contours.

[00:24:06] **Speaker 1** So is judicial activism a phrase that should mean anything more, or has it been so abused in its application that you can't look at it as anything other than a political statement?

[00:24:17] **Speaker 2** I think that judicial activism at this point is a political statement. I really do. And I think it was a political statement that, like I said, was typically used by the far right against, you know, progressives. But, you know, you look at it and like I just indicated, in my opinion, they have engaged in judicial activism.

[00:24:38] **Speaker 1** One of the cases that you've talked about that I want to touch on is the redistricting case here in Wisconsin. The least changed methodology. Could that be viewed as judicial activism in that there is no legislative or precedent history that brings up the phrase loose change?

[00:24:54] **Speaker 2** I agree. There's no legal precedent. There's nothing in the Constitution. There's nothing in case law. So you get this lease change rule that, quite frankly, if you talk to an uneducated voter about it, they might say, you know, it sounds like a kind of make sense. Right. Kind of on its face makes sense, kind of keeping the districts together. But when you think about it more broadly, you understand absolutely what's happening here is to keep the districts in place, to take the votes away from Milwaukee County, Dane County, large metropolises, and really impact people's ability to cast a meaningful vote.

[00:25:35] **Speaker 1** It's interesting that at the forum, Dan Kelly was talking about the only way to change the Constitution should be through an amendment, and that has to go through the legislature. And the legislature is constrained by the districts and the boundaries that are set that have been approved by the Supreme Court. It just feels like a very neat circle.

[00:25:55] **Speaker 2** Well, yes and no. But this is where I say democracy's on the line. You look at what's happening in our state. You look at what the Republicans did with the redistricting. You look at the fact that the maps were, you know, ten years ago a problem. I would say that the maps are a bigger problem. You'll hear people argue that the Republicans used very, very sophisticated computer technology to draw those maps and to draw those maps in a way that are absolutely the most favorable to them. So that's when I say, yes, those maps are rigged. And yes, let's look at the dissent in that particular case. But you look at it, you look at the state of Wisconsin with eight congressional districts. Two of them are held by Democrats and six by Republicans. You look at the state assembly, you look at the state Senate, you look at the numbers. They don't reflect the people. They absolutely don't reflect this state. You know, I tell people in very simple terms, elections here are decided by very small margins. You know, Governor Evers won his race in 2018 by 1.1%, and this time he won by just over 3%. Josh calls attorney general Race was very close. Ron Johnson's victory over Mandela. Barnes was very close. The state treasurers race very, very close. So we know that the races are extremely close. We know that people are very closely divided as Democrats and Republicans. And then you look at those numbers and they're absolutely ludicrous.

[00:27:44] **Speaker 1** So what? One of the things that was in the dissent from from the Supreme Court regarding redistricting case, especially after it came back from the U.S. Supreme Court, was that they felt that the court could hold a trial to actually determine whether it was warranted to add an additional district under the Voting Rights Act in Milwaukee or not. Is that an issue you would expect to come back before the court, given that the dissent almost envisioned it?

[00:28:09] **Speaker 2** I would think so. I would think so.

[00:28:12] **Speaker 1** So what should voters be thinking about in that context when they realize that this election could put someone on the balance that would have a say in that?

[00:28:22] **Speaker 2** Well, I think that the voters need to recognize and I think many of them do, that there are seven seats on the Wisconsin Supreme Court. Three of them are currently held by, quote unquote, progressives. Three are currently held by quote unquote, conservatives. And there's one seat that's open. And whoever prevails, things are going to be either much more of the same or they're going to change markedly. But there's going to be an area, a venue, so to speak, where some of these issues can be heard, where the issue as to the maps can be heard, the issue as to women's rights can be heard, where some of these issues can actually be aired out with a fair hearing.

[00:29:11] **Speaker 1** What have you felt in terms of the national attention given this race and that Wisconsin Supreme Court races used to be relatively sleepy, so to speak? Yes. And now we've got New York Times articles talking about, you know, the most important race you haven't heard of.

[00:29:27] **Speaker 2** Yeah, it's really interesting. I have to say, quite frankly, I was surprised because I share that assessment. Usually these Supreme Court races are kind of sleepy and it's a little bit challenging to get out the vote. And it's a spring election. And in Wisconsin, we know that a spring election means a primary in February, which is right in the heart of winter. So, yes, I was I would have to say, somewhat surprised by the national attention.

[00:29:52] **Speaker 1** Do you think that will have an impact, either through the ability to fundraise or through whether voters. As are aware, in increasing turnout?

[00:30:00] **Speaker 2** I would think so. I would think so. I mean, many people that I know read the national press and, you know, contact me about it. I would think that it brings that much more to the forefront. I also think that it's obviously going to assist with fundraising. One way or another.

[00:30:20] **Speaker 1** I want to go back and look at a couple of the old Wisconsin Supreme Court cases that have been pretty good besides redistricting, very controversial. One of them was Wisconsin legislature versus Paul. And Dan Kelly was on the court at that time. And he was the deciding vote in a case for three that took away some of the powers that the governor had during the middle of COVID. If you had been on the court at that time, would you which side would you have been on?

[00:30:46] **Speaker 2** I don't know. And I'll tell you this, you know, obviously, I've got a lot of concerns about public safety, but, you know, executive orders and extending executive orders, those are interesting, complicated, intricate cases. So, you know, I'm not just going to pull a rabbit out of a hat and say one side or the other, because I really am contemplative and I like to think about the law and think about all of the issues.

[00:31:17] **Speaker 1** And that one was an interesting one because there was very clear state statute that gave powers to the executive branch in the time of a pandemic, which we obviously were in. But then there were also broader constitutional questions. And that does play into the values that someone can bring to the court, how they prioritize what is written into statute versus the broader constitutional questions.

[00:31:42] **Speaker 2** Correct. I agree with that. And it's interesting, we sat back and I read our Wisconsin Constitution one day last week. It's a beautiful document. And I was not aware that it was one of the oldest constitutions in the United States in its original form, though it's been amended many, many times. It's just it's a beautiful document. I would say this in regard to the poem case, I told you I am very, very much a proponent of public safety, but I also know that there are some very, like I said, technical, complicated issues in that case.

[00:32:20] **Speaker 1** Another case was the Tiguan case revolving around drop boxes in voter access. That was another one that was decided four three, and that has a big implication on the elections coming up. What do you think about that decision?

[00:32:35] **Speaker 2** I think that I agree with the dissent in that decision.

[00:32:40] **Speaker 1** Do you think that the access to drop box could be an issue come this April?

[00:32:44] **Speaker 2** I don't know if it will. Well, obviously, we're not going to have a Dropbox is back this April. Is it going to potentially be an issue? Yeah, I think it's potentially an issue that could impact the election.

[00:32:57] **Speaker 1** And just last week, the a Republican appointed the Wisconsin Elections Commission was celebrating the fact that there was lower turnout in Milwaukee, specifically among African-American and Hispanic areas of town. What do you make of that comment? And do you think that's a sign for February and April?

[00:33:18] **Speaker 2** So that's a multifaceted question. I would say this I was startled by the comment because while we know, we know that the far right wants to suppress votes in Milwaukee County, we know that they do. We know that they do. Given the redistricting cases, we know that they do due to the drop box cases, nobody has ever really come out and said it that boldly and that publicly and that shamelessly. That just struck me that that particular person did that. Now, I know Democrats are calling for his removal. I don't know what's going to happen in that regard, but it startled me and it was so bold. It was so absolutely bold. Do I think that voter turnout is going to be suppressed in Milwaukee County come February and April? I certainly hope not. We're working very, very hard with our get out the vote efforts. And I would hope that if somebody would know how hard and how gleeful somebody would be to see that voter turnout was depressed in the Milwaukee area, that they would get out and vote. Right. I mean, I would think that and hope that it would have that effect on people because, you know, I try to tell people the only thing that's really, really an even playing field between all these people impacting all of these races is that everybody gets just one vote and your vote counts absolutely as much as anybody else's vote. And it's just such a. Critical cornerstone of our democracy. And so to see somebody being so gleeful about that border depression, like I said, was just startling.

[00:35:08] **Speaker 1** Is that something that that could come before the Supreme Court or is it more likely just something that needs to be handled by the voters themselves or the legislature?

[00:35:19] **Speaker 2** You're talking about like whether or not that person to be removed.

[00:35:22] **Speaker 1** Not necessarily the removal process, but the larger concept of voter suppression?

[00:35:27] **Speaker 2** Well, I think the larger concept I think we all know it. We all know it from the redistricting. We know it from what the far right is trying to do with the maps. We know it. And so far, they have prevailed. We know with the drop boxes, we know so far they have prevailed. So I would say to everybody, absolutely. Get out and vote. Come on, people.

[00:35:49] **Speaker 1** All right. Is there anything else that you'd like to add?

[00:35:51] **Speaker 2** No.

[00:35:52] **Speaker 1** All right. I think we have everything. Thank you so much.

[00:35:55] **Speaker 2** You are welcome. How did you do that? With no note.

[00:36:00] **Speaker 1** I never use notes.

[00:36:01] **Speaker 2** How did you do that? With no notes. Seriously, how did he do that? With no notes.

[00:36:07] **Speaker 1** I get distracted if I have notes.

[00:36:09] **Speaker 2** I don't know how you did that with no notes. And those are really good question.

[00:36:13] **Speaker 1** Thank you. I try to stop before I come to him. You want to do the class? If you don't.

[00:36:20] **Speaker 2** Know what's.

[00:36:20] **Speaker 1** Clap. Okay, so we we have two cameras. They want to sync up the video and the audio at the same time. And so if you have a clap, you have the motion of the hands coming together in the sound. So when he gets to the edit bay, he can see a of the same time. Oh, cool. So you want to leave when he'll let you know when he's ready, he's going to.

[00:36:40] **Speaker 2** Oh, how cool is that?

[00:36:41] **Speaker 1** It's kind of. It's the equivalent of a Hollywood clapboard.

[00:36:43] **Speaker 2** Oh, that's so cool.

[00:36:44] **Speaker 1** It says the same thing, But we don't.

[00:36:45] **Speaker 2** Have all that happen every year. Perfect. Oh, my gosh. Oh, yeah.

[00:36:50] **Speaker 1** That's great. Thanks.

[00:36:51] **Speaker 2** Cool. Is that.

[00:36:53] **Speaker 1** All right. So, Brandon. Yes. I would like to get a little video of the dog without us getting mauled. What would you prefer for a set up for that? Do you want to go follow her in there? So is there, like, any work you can be doing right now? Or we'd be doing something where you just want to play at the table, at the bar? Yeah, if you wanted to.

[00:37:12] **Speaker 2** Sam, you want to bring him out on a leash?

[00:37:14] **Speaker 1** All right. You do have another segment. 515.