

**Episode 2,414: Vivek: “Let’s Avoid World War III”**

**Guest: Vivek Ramaswamy**

**WOODS:**  Vivek, you and I are Harvard grads, and I want to say a little bit about the universities today because of an article you have in the *Wall Street Journal*. But if I may, I want to tell you that next year is a reunion year for me, and that means I have to submit my update for the class report on what I've been up to the past five years.

So, I have one paragraph on family and professional milestones, and then I have this second paragraph I want to share with you. My wife insists they're not going to print this. This is what I wrote:

*"I truly cherish my memories from our old Harvard days. In recent years, I've felt rather more alienated from the class. I don't want to be able to predict my peers' political opinions, but unfortunately, I can. I know what everyone thinks about Ukraine, Covid lockdowns, gender theory, and whatever the next elite obsession happens to be.*

*And in our Facebook group, everyone takes for granted that all right-thinking people agree with them. It would be nice to encounter a few nonconformists in the class here and there, but perhaps that's not really what they trained us to be."*

What do you think the chances are of that getting in the old class report?

**RAMASWAMY:** I'd like to think that the chance of it getting the class report is actually decent. The reason is if this was something you were saying on the front end of it – it's not going to make the front page of it.

But it still allows them to have the veneer of saying that they foster free speech and open debate, except for when it's too far in front. Then I think they would silence it. So, that's the cynical answer to your question.

**WOODS:** All right. Let's go into what you've been saying, that oddly got you into some trouble, and it shouldn't have.

**RAMASWAMY:** It's gotten me in a lot of trouble.

**WOODS:** It shouldn't have. Because, you know, for years we've been hearing the right wing talking about free speech, and open debate, and they hate cancel culture, and everybody shouldn't be called a racist.

But now everybody's being called anti-Semitic, like that's any different. Some people are anti-Semitic, but not everybody. And there have been a lot of calls for voices to be suppressed. And the excuse is: *But this time my cause is just, so I should suppress these people.*

But that's what everybody says.

**RAMASWAMY:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** So, what are you saying in your *Wall Street Journal* article?

**RAMASWAMY:** I'm saying something very simple. The First Amendment protects all opinions. If you're peacefully expressing an opinion, no matter how heinous that opinion is, it's protected by the First Amendment.

So, I have competitors in this Republican primary – take Governor Ron DeSantis in Florida – who just (effectively by fiat) decided that members of one particular student group had to disband. They could not be part of that student group, Students for Justice in Palestine.

That's a classic cut-and-dry textbook First Amendment violation. The government can't say that certain people can't associate and express certain opinions. It's not even like a hard case. This is an easy, straight down the fairway case.

Now, I say this as somebody who strongly disagrees with the contentions of SJP. I think that many of their comments are downright boneheaded and offensive. But the fact that it's an opinion is what allows it to be protected.

And so, these politicians will say things – like, Nikki Haley has said very similar things too, in a different context. That: Well, if they're providing material support to a terrorist organization, then that means that they are breaking the law in Florida.

Or whatever other state can't allow them to exist on a state campus. What was their material support? They weren't providing munitions. They were tweeting. They said: *We support them. We're part of this movement.*

That's not something that counts as material support for a terrorist organization. That's the expression of an opinion, the exact thing the First Amendment was designed to protect. And so, Tom, I'm a First Amendment absolutist. I could care less whether I win or lose an election if I lose over this issue.

Because if the government can decide what we can and can't say – even if it's the things that I disagree with, I will fight to the death to protect it. There's no point. The rest of it doesn't matter. Everything else we debate and discuss and fight over, it just doesn't matter if the government can decide what opinions do and don't get expressed.

And so, I'm an absolutist on this one. I've mostly been at the front end, the tip of the spear in the fight against left-wing cancel culture and left-wing censorship. But we've got to stand on the side of principle.

And I'm pretty disappointed in most of my fellow Republican politicians who are bending the knee, now embracing the methods of censorship when it suits them.

**WOODS:** Well, you may be aware that there is a bit of a movement among some conservatives. Maybe not the politicians, but some of the intellectuals have been saying: *Look, the liberal project has failed. The attempt to construct a neutral public square has failed because nobody really wants that. One side wants to push its ideas on the other.*

*And so, if we have two groups of people, one of whom wants to be Vivek Ramaswamy and let a hundred flowers bloom, and the other side just wants to impose its ideology on everybody, that side is going to win.*

*So, maybe our side needs to be more like their side, and we've got to forget about these niceties like the First Amendment.*

**RAMASWAMY:** I don't think that side wins, though. I think that our side wins over the long run. And this is an age-old debate. I mean, ask Galileo. Yes, he did die on the altar, that's true. But over time the other side actually won.

So, free speech and open debate, the path to truth runs right through it. And that's who we are as Americans, right? So, there are other countries. If you want to do that, you can go to any other country.

For most of human history, it was done the other way. But the premise of the United States – it's in the First Amendment for a reason – is that all opinions, when peacefully expressed, are allowed, period.

If you're peacefully expressing an opinion, the government cannot stop you, directly, indirectly, or otherwise. And then half of this is a free speech culture. Part of this is that we embrace, that's part of our national identity, that you get to speak your mind openly as long as I get to in return.

And this is part of the post 9/11 problem that we had in the Republican Party, and now we're seeing Dick Cheney 2.0 all over again. We can talk about the pro-war component of this, and that's important.

But even the anti-speech component of this, in the wake of the passage of the Patriot Act and the weaponization of a justice system, then by Republicans. What we saw was that certain opinions could not be tolerated.

Now, what did you see? The left then adopted those methods on steroids to say that if you're a conservative, certain opinions can't be tolerated. The weaponization of a justice system to go after your political opponents.

This is fruit of a poisonous tree. The poisonous tree began (the 21st century version of it) in the wake of 9/11 and the aftermath of 9/11. Now what do we see? It's Dick Cheney 2.0 all over the Republican Party, crawling all over the debate stage.

I've seen it twice. I'm going to see it again probably in the next debate as well. This is paradigmatically the Bush/Cheney error that then was perpetuated by much of the modern left, the Bidens, the Obamas of the world, using the levers of government to silence and quash that which they disagree with.

They did it on steroids. I think the right answer is to return to principle, not to use the same levers of power to quash political dissent. That's who we are as Americans. I don't think that's soft. To the contrary, I think that's actually standing with a hard spine of steel in all directions.

And now, more than ever, I think we require that in the presidency. And that's why I'm in this race.

**WOODS:** I think Megyn Kelly got upset at you for this. And I thought: Of all the things.

**RAMASWAMY:** It's interesting. And it's also interesting – I mean, everyone has something that gets under their skin. You know, people were shouting – if they were shouting: *Death to Christians! Death to white people!*

Whatever, I mean, this is the BLM movement a couple of years ago. And ironically, the BLM movement actually had the early strands of anti-Semitism baked into it a few years ago. Back then, some of the same people who were telling me: *Hey, have you ever tried going to one of their events? Maybe you want to listen and be empathetic.*

Are now head over heels about the fact that the same nonsense is coming in a different form, in terms of anti-Semitic jargon on campuses. My view is, across the board, whether you're BLM, whether you're somebody who's denying the efficacy of vaccines, somebody who is denying the existence of climate change.

Now, I personally believe that the climate change agenda is separately a hoax. But whatever it is, whoever you are, I may agree with some of the things you say. I may disagree with some of the things you say. Left-wing, right-wing, it doesn't matter.

You are allowed to express an opinion. That's the American way of life and that's what we stand for.

**WOODS:** Let's talk Israel and Palestine because I have a funny feeling this might come up in the debate. People heard you give a very fiery speech at the Republican Jewish Coalition event, but then at the same time, you've been getting in trouble because you've been tweeting and talking about concern about a wider war, World War Three, war with Iran, the possibility of a wider conflict.

So, can you just clarify what your overall stance is?

**RAMASWAMY:** So, I have very clear views on this. I'm running for US president. I'm not running for the president of any other country. Not the president of Israel, not any other. And I said that exact line at the Republican Jewish Coalition, when I said: *I'm not running for president of Israel. I'm running for president of the US.*

I happen to believe that Israel deserves to have one state, a state that exists, the state of Israel. One state for the Jewish people when they have countless other states across the Islamic world for the descendants of Ishmael.

Well, I think that the descendants of Abraham by way of Isaac has historically viewed the Jewish homeland as their state. I think that's appropriate. But my job as US president is to stand for American interests, so I do not want the US getting involved in another war in the Middle East.

I don't think that advances our interests. I could make a strong case (and I did) that that also doesn't advance Israel's own interests. Israel's founding premise was that it was supposed to stand for its own national self-existence.

Their George Washington figure was David Ben-Gurion, who said: *The nation of Israel was formed to reject the premise that Jews should depend on the fleeting sympathies of others in the West. That didn't work out.*

And David Ben-Gurion said: *No. We're going to defend ourselves and our own homeland.* And I support Israel's right to defend itself I really do, diplomatically, as a partner of Israel. That's what I support, diplomatically, Israel's right to exist and its right to defend itself.

That's a different question from US involvement. And so, my view is the US should not get involved in another conflict in the Middle East that doesn't advance the US interest. To the contrary, we're now learning that we have troops in places like Syria and Iraq where we were told (or at least it was suggested) that we had left.

Now we realize they're sitting targets. We shouldn't be there. That's my punch line focus. I think it is absolutely clear view. It doesn't fall in one of the other neat orthodoxies of the Republican Party – or otherwise, or opponents to the Republican Party.

It's a pro-American view that says: My moral obligation is your next president is to the citizens of this country. That's my exclusive moral obligation, not to anybody else.

That's why I favor ending the Ukraine war, stop funding Ukraine, deliver terms of peace, a reasonable peace treaty, a reasonable peace agreement that would allow Ukraine to have its sovereignty intact but otherwise end this war.

And it's also what I say here in the United States, is that our message to Iran should be: You stay the hell out of this, we stay the hell out of it.

And let Israel get the job that it needs to get done, done without us interfering in either direction, either in the direction of getting militarily involved to fight some war, or in the direction of getting involved to constrain Israel from defending its own homeland.

The US needs to stay out. That's my view.

**WOODS:** I saw what, to me, was a surprising poll showing that even 56% of Republicans wanted to see a cease-fire in Gaza. What do you think about that?

**RAMASWAMY:** I hadn't seen that poll, so that's interesting to me.

**WOODS:** Yeah. MSNBC just ran it.

**RAMASWAMY:** Interesting. Okay. Well, I am skeptical of anything that is force fed by the mainstream media these days, so I'd have to look into the details of that. I've become such a skeptic.

**WOODS:** I don't believe anything except the things you see.

**RAMASWAMY:** I mean, the things I've seen in the last nine months. I really don't believe anything anybody tells me anymore. I've got to see it for myself. But put the polling to one side. This is a moment where people need to be led, right?

We need leadership. People don't necessarily know what exactly to think, and that's okay. We live in a complicated time. It would be weird if everybody had a pre-baked opinion as opposed to responding to facts and arguments. But the job of leaders is to offer a clear and coherent view.

And so, I think I've done that here, and I'm going to continue to stay to offering my own. And it'll be up to voters to decide if that's what they want or not. My sense is many voters in the Republican primary base do want this, but they need somebody to actually articulate it so they can actually see it.

And nobody else in the Republican Party is saying what I'm saying, which is that America's job is to stand for American interests. I do believe, deeply, that Israel is the US's most important ally in the Middle East.

But Israel is not the 51st state, and there is a difference between an attack on Israel and an attack on America. Why do I say that? That sounds obvious. The likes of Nikki Haley literally said: *That was an attack on America.*

That's ridiculous. If you can't tell the difference between an attack on Israel and an attack on America, then you have no place being anywhere near the White House as the next commander in chief. So, I keep my moral obligations straight.

As a father, my moral obligation is to my family. As the next president (if you all put me there) my moral obligation is to Americans, protecting Americans and standing for American interests. I don't think that's complicated.

That's what George Washington would have said. He did say it in his 1796 farewell speech. I'm a George Washington, America First conservative. It overlays pretty heavily with the libertarian worldview, but I call it a George Washingtonian view.

And that's how I would govern this country, including our foreign policy, if I were put in that position.

**WOODS:** There was a bit of controversy some time ago when the subject of aid to Israel – like, monetary aid to Israel – came up. And then again, Nikki Haley (who does not like you, by the way) wasn't satisfied with your answer.

Because it looked as if you were saying: *Nobody should be getting foreign aid from the US*. And then it became: *Well, with Israel, when they say they don't need it, then we'll stop giving it to them, which means never.*

**RAMASWAMY:** Well, I don't think it means never. I'll make that case to you. But here's my view, is stand by prior commitments. If we've made prior commitments, stand by them. And implicit in that aid was a standing $3 to $3.8 billion commitment to Israel.

Now, I could make a case (and I think that many in Israel would find it persuasive) that it's not even helpful to Israel, right? Because then the US is meddling in their affairs, telling them what they can and cannot do. So, I don't think it's good for either party.

And I think there should come a time where it is both in the US interest and in the Israeli interest to say that we don't want this level of meddling. My rule of thumb, Tom, for any new aid – and I'm against the $14 to $16 billion aid package for Israel that's making its way, that the House just voted on.

I'm against that. And the reason why is I don't think that we should be giving foreign aid to any country whose national debt per capita is less than ours. Just think about that. We have more national debt per capita in this country. Why are we giving our money away willy-nilly?

It's like the arguments you used to make for corporations. Your obligation is to your shareholders. Don't just give your money away effectively to subsidize some environmental or social agenda. Well, one of my jobs as US president, I can't use our taxpayer money to give foreign aid willy-nilly.

If somebody else needs something, if they need supplies, sell it to them. We do that. We have those agreements. But this idea of foreign aid, we need to bring it back to zero based budgeting to foreign aid.

Ask what's actually necessary to advance the American interest. That's how we should use our own dollars. So, my view is I'm against any new aid funding this war.

Stand by prior commitments that we've already made, because I do believe that even if there were decisions made in the past, whether or not I agree with them, I stand by the decisions we have made in the past.

And I'll respect that. That's part of what it means to just be a trustworthy actor. But short of that, any new foreign aid, any elective foreign aid, I would end it to any country whose national debt per capita is less than ours.

And any foreign aid period, whether it's to a country regardless of their national debt, would be exclusively grounded in what advances the American interest.

**WOODS:**  The other day – I'm sure you're quite familiar with Congressman Thomas Massie. You've probably met him. But he cast a vote on the question of Israel. He voted "No" because there were certain aspects of it that he thought were going to commit the US to things he didn't want to commit them to.

And AIPAC attacked him for this, and he defended himself. And then they said accusations of dual loyalty are anti-Semitic. Now, Congressman Massie, the last thing in the world he would ever do is accuse people of dual loyalty.

That thought never occurred to him. Those words never came out of his mouth. The insinuation never came out of his mouth. But they more or less called him an anti-Semite. So, that makes me wonder, do you have a particular opinion of AIPAC?

**RAMASWAMY:** I don't, I haven't dealt with them, so I have no opinion one way or another of AIPAC. I can tell you, I have an opinion on the question that Thomas Massie voted on. I would vote the same way. I support his vote on that for the same reasons I explained to you.

I just don't think we should be giving foreign aid to most countries. It's certainly ludicrous to give foreign aid to any country that is literally in a better spot than we are from a national debt on a per capita basis.

Most countries were given foreign aid to actually have a lower national debt per capita than us, so why are we giving our money to them? Sell things to other countries? That's great. If somebody's short on particular supplies, a relationship of trade through allies, that's how we do this.

But I think this question of just giving away our money willy-nilly, I think Thomas Massie is on the right side of questioning the wisdom of that. I question the wisdom of it, too. I stand by prior commitments we've made, because that's what it means to stand by historical commitments.

But don't make new ones that don't advance our national interest. And so, I'm against it in Ukraine. I'm against it anywhere else. I'm against the $14 to $16 billion in this particular case to Israel. I'm in favor of standing for Israel's right to defend itself.

I'm a hardliner on staying out of Israel's way and defending itself. Israel should pursue an Israel First agenda. Ukraine should pursue a Ukraine First agenda. But I think America should pursue an America First agenda.

And that shouldn't be controversial. And there's nothing racist or anti-Semitic or anything else about that. That's pro-American, and I think there's a strong argument to say that's even pro-Israeli.

**WOODS:** Mike Pence dropped out this week. How did you respond to that? Interiorly, what did that mean for you?

**RAMASWAMY:** Unsurprising. I think it means that – look, I think voters deserve a choice. I think he did the honorable thing. But we have Dick Cheney 2.0. It's crawling all over this Republican primary. Voters deserve that choice.

They don't need 4 or 5 of them, right? Mike Pence, Chris Christie, Nikki Haley, Tim Scott, depending on a given day, Ron DeSantis, they're different flavors of something that we've had in the past. And if voters want that choice, they get that choice.

But I don't think they need five of those choices, really the same ideology, the same worldview masquerading in different professional politician clothing, stuff a different suit with the same ideology. I don't think we need five different stuffed suits with that ideology. One is plenty.

And so, I think he did the country a service by getting out of the race. He's a good family man. I respect anybody who stands for the good values in our culture of being an empathetic family man. And so, I wish him and his family nothing but the best.

But I think he made a good decision that, frankly, others in that same lane should be making very soon.

**WOODS:** I don't necessarily want to turn this into a thing about who stands for what on the Republican debate stage, but you did make a somewhat suggestive remark just now about Ron DeSantis.

So, do you think there's daylight between you and Ron DeSantis on this issue of foreign policy? Because on Israel-Palestine, maybe we're getting a little bit clearer message, but I think he's been a little bit harder to pin down than he should have been on these issues.

**RAMASWAMY:** Yeah. I couldn't tell you whether there's daylight between my position and his or not, because that would require me to know what his position is. And I don't think anybody knows what his position is. I think he doesn't know what his position is. That's the truth.

If you listen to what he said on Ukraine, it's like a flag that waves in whatever direction the wind blows on a given day. And look, these are hard questions, so I don't fault him for not having it figured out. But I just couldn't – and I don't think he's going to be the president, so it's not going to be his responsibility anyway.

But he'll have years to figure that out. I just don't know what that position is, so I can't tell you whether there's daylight between mine and his or not. I'll tell you what mine is. End this war in Ukraine, period. Stop giving another dime of support.

Negotiate a clear deal that is crystal clear that NATO will not admit Ukraine to NATO, freeze the current lines of control, and require in return that Putin exit his military alliance with China. That weakens the Russia-China alliance, which is the single greatest threat that we face in this country.

And also, as part of that deal, get Russia to get the nukes out of Kaliningrad, get Russia to get their military presence out of the Western Hemisphere, Cuba, Nicaragua, Venezuela. And otherwise open up trade relations with Russia.

I know you're not supposed to say that out loud, but I do. I think that that actually helps us secure some measure of peace and stability by weakening the Russia-China alliance, moving from a bilateral international order to a trilateral one where neither of Russia, China, or the United States are aligned with each other.

I think that's actually pro-stability, and it's pro-American. So, that's a pretty clear view about where I stand. I have no idea where Ron DeSantis stands.

**WOODS:** Well, this matter of Israel-Palestine has revealed a significant fault line within the Democratic Party, of course, because of the so-called squad, and they're not happy with Joe Biden and so on and so forth.

But within the Republican Party, would you say it's foreign policy specifically where there's the biggest divide among candidates and voters?

**RAMASWAMY:** Yeah, I do.

**WOODS:** Or where do you think this big divide is?

**RAMASWAMY:** I think it's on a couple of different axes. I mean, the most important one when it comes to policy – there are some other divisions that don't really relate to policy, which I can talk about, that relate more to character of leadership and, I think, a generational change that's required, frankly, in both parties.

But as it relates to policy, yeah, it's foreign policy. I mean, everybody agrees that it's not good for men to be stealing trophies from women in the swim lanes. Okay. That's fine. We all agree on that. And different people will show different levels of outrage about it.

The real divide is when it comes to foreign policy, do you believe in exclusively advancing the American interest, or do you believe it's America's job to be a global hegemon that plays, effectively, the role of the global police? That's a divide.

And you can make legitimate arguments on either side. I'm on one side of that divide. Most of the other candidates in this race are on the other side of that divide. It's Dick Cheney 2.0, as I said. And voters deserve that choice if that's what voters want.

I've met people across this country. I don't think that is what they want, but it's fine for a candidate to stand for that point of view. Now, many of them are standing for that point of view because some of them stand to make money off of it. That's the dirty little secret of this.

Take a Nikki Haley. I mean, this is disgusting, right? Somebody who went from being in debt in her time when she left the UN to becoming a military contractor, sitting on the board of Boeing, collecting stock options during this presidential campaign, making 8 million plus dollars.

War is hell, unless you're actually a military contractor sitting on the board of Boeing, in which case war is good. So, that incentivizes some of these people to adopt policies that really are about lining their own pocketbook, not about their actual views.

But other people, I think, genuinely hold this view that it's the job of the United States to be the global police, even if that does lead to armed conflict from time to time. That's the real divide. Do you have a George Washington vision for the future of our foreign policy in this country?

I do. I ask, would this make George Washington proud or not? I think he would be appalled at what he sees today. That's the real divide. And then there's another divide, too, Tom, which is domestic.

Which is, do you want incremental reform, or do you want categorical change, a kind of revolution when it comes to dealing with the administrative state here at home?

Everybody in the Republican Party will give you verbal pieties to breaking down the administrative state and the perils of the Deep State and so on. But the difference between me and other Republican candidates is other ones will look into the camera and say things like: *I will fire Christopher Wray!*

And they're competing based on who says it with more outrage, trying to win over the voters. I think that misses the point. You fire Christopher Wray, you get James Comey 2.0. I think there's only one answer. You have to shut down these bureaucracies.

The Leviathan isn't the figurehead who sits on top. It is the managerial machine, the bureaucracy that sits underneath it. And so, yes, I go far further. And other Republicans have said these are the most idiotic ideas they've heard.

Other Republicans on the debate stage have called my idea to shut down the FBI exactly that. I've offered a very practical plan to do it, which we can talk about if you're interested. I gave a speech about it in DC a couple of months ago, and also gave my legal basis for being able to do that as the US president.

But that's also the real divide, is how committed are we to shutting down the bureaucracy versus just swapping out the figureheads on top of the administrative state? And the irony is these two things are related.

So, if we fix the Deep State at home, I think we actually significantly fix our foreign policy errors abroad. That's a deeper discussion that we could have. But that's where I'm different than the rest of the GOP field on this.

And that's a choice for the voters to make. I think the voters are with me on this. I think that's part of why Donald Trump got elected. But I would go far further with that America First agenda, in part because I'm grounded in the Constitution when I do it.

**WOODS:** See, I think I would turn and say to Nikki Haley: *Look, you've got everything you wanted. You got every war and intervention you wanted, and the world is on fire. None of these regimes are friendlier to Israel or friendlier to the United States now. All you've done is open a Pandora's Box.*

*You should have the shame and the self-respect to shut up for a while. You know, go to a monastery, keep your mouth shut.*

**RAMASWAMY:** But then she can't make money. That's the problem. She doesn't want to go to a monastery. She wants to go to a five-star restaurant and fly around on a private jet. And a person like her can't figure out how to actually create value in the private sector.

So, the only way you do it is use your monetary connections and your financial connections within government to make your own family rich, which is exactly what they've done. I mean, who are the clients of Allied Defense LLC? She hasn't said a word about the military contractor that her own family formed after her time in the UN.

She scratched Boeing's back doing special favors for them, effectively licking their boots for years while she was governor of South Carolina, only to get a seat on Boeing's board afterwards.

So, yeah, if you're the face of the military industrial complex, you don't want to be part of a monastery. You want to be living a lifestyle off the backs of American taxpayers, and that's what these leeches in both parties really do.

I mean, Joe Biden, he's the face of this in the Democratic Party, sending munitions to Ukraine or sending arms to Ukraine, the very country that bribed his son with $5 million. It's a Democratic problem. It's a Republican problem.

I think it takes somebody who isn't bought and paid for as part of that class to be able to drive that change. And I think that's the reason I'm allowed to have these views, is that I'm not dancing to the tune of anybody else but myself.

**WOODS:** What's your website?

**RAMASWAMY:** Vivek2024.com. And actually, as we're having this conversation, launched something that I think will be a movement that helps us, Tom, because I've been shut out of a lot of the mainstream media.

I got a lot of mainstream media coverage early on, but foreign policy is the third rail. Keeping us out of World War Three, that's my job as the next president, and I think we can do it. But I have been shut out. And so, I'm using forums like this one.

I'll be vocal on the debate stage, and the debate stages from here on out. I think that'll lead us to success. But we're launching what we call the peace bomb, funding my direct ability to buy ads. I've done that out of my own pocketbook.

The more money we raise, the more ads we're going to be able to go up to fund education of the American voter on the risks of World War Three. We are marching our way to World War Three, extensive wars from the Middle East to Ukraine and Russia, expanding to other parts of the world.

People don't see that. And so, I want to be on television, but the mainstream media has basically shut out that point of view. It's pro-war Democrats versus pro-war Republicans. I now want to reach voters differently.

And so, between now and December 7th, an ignominious day in our history, when we got into World War Two after the Japanese hit us in Pearl Harbor. That was something that I never want to see happen again in this country.

Keep us out of World War Three. And so, we're dropping the peace bomb between now and December 7th. That's when we got into World War Two. Let's make sure we get out of World War Three this time around.

Small dollar donations, doesn't matter, dollars, crypto, Bitcoin, all open, Vivek2024.com. That actually starts today and that goes through December 7th. And we're going to use all of that to fund education on exactly why World War Three is a bad idea.

And the Republican primary base, I think, is hungry for this message. They're just not hearing it from the mainstream media. So, that's what we're dropping now.

And we're going to do it through paid advertising, if that's what's necessary. I put my money where my mouth is, and hopefully we shift the terms of this debate.

**WOODS:** All right. I'll have that link also in the description of the video, it's Vivek – rhymes with cake, by the way. This is not brain surgery people. Vivek Ramaswamy, whom I had followed before you were running for anything because I read *Woke Inc.*

And as I told you, I gave it to several dozen of my top supporters because I thought it was so important. I appreciate your time today, as always. Thanks so much.

**RAMASWAMY:** I appreciate it, and making this antiwar and pro speech message a success. I think the Republican Party is our last, best chance to actually implement that in this cycle, if we want to win. And people coming in supporting us, that would make a big difference between now and December 7th.

So, thanks a lot.