



**Panel 1: ASKING AMERICANS: POLLING ON U.S. GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT AHEAD OF 2024**

**Introduction:**

Mr. Frederick J. Ryan, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation and Institute

**Pledge of Allegiance:**

Senior Master Sergeant Maria Villa, Royal High School Air Force, JROTC  
Cadet Staff Sergeant Isabel Villa, Royal High School Air Force, JROTC

**Invocation:**

Commander Glenn Orris, Chaplain, USS Ronald Reagan (CVN 76)

**Moderator:**

Brianna Keillar, CNN

**Panelists:**

Sen. Joni Ernst, U.S. Senator, Iowa

Dr. Alexander Karp, Co-Founder and CEO, Palantir Technologies

Rep. Adam Smith, Ranking Member, House Armed Services Committee

Mr. Marc A. Thiessen, Former Chief Speechwriter, President George W. Bush

###

**Announcer:**

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation and Institute, Mr. Fred Ryan.

Fred Ryan:

Good morning everyone. Good morning and welcome. 10 years ago, right here at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, an idea became an event. In the decade since, that event has grown into be a must-attend annual gathering for cabinet secretaries, civilian and uniformed military leaders, members of Congress, defense industry executives, the national media and the defense community as a whole. And today, it is my honor to welcome you to the 10th annual Reagan National Defense Forum, or what's become known as the Davos of Defense. I'd like to start our morning by inviting Senior Master Sergeant Maria Villa and her sister Cadet Staff Sergeant Isabel Villa from Royal High School Air Force Junior ROTC, to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. They'll be followed by Commander Glenn Orris of the USS Ronald Reagan with the invocation.

Senior Master Sergeant Maria Villa:

Put your right hand over your heart. Ready? Begin. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Commander Glenn Orris:

Good morning, I invite you to join me in prayer.

Gracious God, source of all wisdom and giver of all strength. As we gather this morning, we are mindful of the diverse ways that we may name and experience you. And yet, whatever our differences, we pause now together, united in our love of liberty, to invite your presence here among us, to give you thanks, and to ask your blessings. We give you thanks first for this 10th Reagan National Defense Forum, and for the immeasurable contribution that this forum has made to the causes of freedom and democracy around the world. May the time we spend together today build upon that priceless legacy, and ensure that one decade is only the first of many to come. And we give you thanks for the service, whether in uniform or otherwise, of all those gathered here today, and for the unwavering commitment to freedom and democracy that they bring. Given such a gathering, may no connection be missed. May no opportunity be lost. May no voice be unheard among us that would bear fruit in a better world, a more free and democratic world for all humankind.

Finally, we give you thanks simply for this morning, another beautiful morning in America, and for the inexhaustible hope that it offers us. Whenever our days are darkened, whenever our values are threatened, whenever our resolve is tested, may doubt and fear find no home within us. Rather, may our spirits also rise like the Sun, unshaken and undismayed. Gracious God, our 40th President, Ronald Reagan, showed us that lasting peace is only achieved by a steadfast resolve to defend freedom. So in a world where tyrants may be tempted by weakness, grant us the determination to stand firm and the values that we hold dear. Bless this meal we now share. Bless this time we spend together, and renew in each of us an unshakeable commitment to President Reagan's vision of peace through strength. All this we pray, trusting in your grace. Amen.

Fred Ryan:

Thank you and please be seated.

A major cornerstone of Ronald Reagan's national security policy was his strategy of peace through strength, which has been the underlying foundation of the defense forum since it was launched 10 years ago. A second cornerstone is the Reagan Doctrine, a commitment by the United States to support free nations around the world against the threat of authoritarian regimes. Today, more than any time since his presidency, the Reagan Doctrine is being tested in places like Taiwan, Israel, and Ukraine. We're especially honored today to be joined by Ukraine's Ambassador to the United States. Please join me in welcoming Ambassador Oksana Markarova. Thank you for being here, Ambassador. And as you can see, we stand with you.

In his final State of the Union address, President Reagan gave Congress a special charge. He said, we must protect peace and deter war by making sure the next President inherits what you and I have a moral obligation to give that President: a national security that is unassailable and a national defense that takes full advantage of new technology and is fully funded. At the Reagan Foundation and Institute, we believe that every president deserves that fully funded national defense, because as President Reagan so firmly believed, only a strength can ensure our peace. The very purpose of this forum is to ensure that no American, no elected official, no military leader, no friend or foe forgets that truth. Today, American strength is being tested around the world in ways that would've never seemed likely at the first Reagan Defense Forum, Russia's invasion of Ukraine, Hamas brutality in Israel, China's unrelenting pressure on Taiwan. All are connected, and all are watching to see whether America will continue to stand firmly on the side of freedom.

The strength that ensures peace, however, is about more than weapons and military personnel and budgets. Though President Reagan proved how important those were. It's also about strength of resolve, a shared commitment across party lines to do what is right for our national security, for our allies, and for democracy itself. Our adversaries are watching, and if our resolve is weak, if isolationism is weighing in on our politics, if our people are divided, they know they have an opportunity to advance their authoritarian goals. The Reagan Defense Forum includes leaders from across the political spectrum as well as US allies and partners. The fact that we are all together with a common purpose sends a powerful message to our adversaries. Today we will hear from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

We'll welcome the Secretary of Commerce to the Reagan Defense Forum, along with industry and technology executives, leaders in the arsenal of democracy. And we welcome senior members of Congress from both political parties and former government officials with deep national security expertise. These leaders are here to grapple with the very real threats we face today and how we must respond to them. We must also understand how and where the American people, our fellow citizens, want us to lead. So it's become our tradition to begin by discussing the findings of our annual Reagan National Defense Survey. That way our conversations throughout the day are grounded in what we have heard from the American people. So let's begin. It's my pleasure to welcome our first panel, which includes Senator Joni Ernst of Iowa; Dr. Alex Karp, CEO of Palantir Technologies; Congressman Adam Smith, ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee; Mark Thiessen, former Speechwriter to President

George W. Bush; and moderating the panel will be Brianna Keilar from CNN. Please welcome them.

Brianna Keilar (00:12:37):

Fred, thank you so much for that introduction, and thank you to everyone who is helping pull off this RNDF, and of course the Reagan Library for having us here so that we can gather and discuss and debate politely and seek some answers to some really important questions that come obviously at such a critically important time. And with such critically important voices that we have on our panel this morning. We're going to be touching, as Fred mentioned, upon some of these significant findings of this survey of foreign policy attitudes. And you actually -- you should have a printed copy of that, or you should have gotten one at some point. And you can also access that if you have the RNDF app. And also we're taking audience questions. So, if you go on the app, and you go to the agenda, it looks like a little calendar, you click on that, find this panel. There will be a prompt where you can ask a question. So just submit your question there. It will come to me magically through this iPad and then we can ask our panelists that.

We're going to start about how threat perception has changed over the last five years that this survey has been conducted. We have a slide on that if we can -- where are we putting those? We have a slide on what Americans are perceiving as the biggest threats to the United States. They were allowed to choose one. And as you can see, China obviously at the top there, Russia, Iran, North Korea, having taken a dip here over the last five years. And Senator Ernst, obviously there's a huge jump that we are seeing here for this perception that China's the greatest threat. Russia was dipping, popped up during the Ukraine War, has come down a little bit here in the last year. Iran actually always very low, maybe raising questions about how people are perceiving Iran's relationship to this threat in the Israel-Hamas war. Do you look at this and see US perceptions in line with reality?

Senator Joni Ernst:

Well, I do think, and thank you for that, and it is great to be back here at Reagan this year. I do think when we have leaders that are talking about these issues, obviously it's raising different perceptions out in the public. So I think that lends to the results that we see here. With Russia, you're absolutely correct. When they invaded Ukraine almost two years ago now, it did pop up on Americans' radar, and because we were talking about it, the media covered it. You don't see as much in the news anymore about Russia and Ukraine because now -- wow, we are focused on Israel. We are focusing on other issues, Taiwan. But the issue with China is that they do tend to be not just located in the Indo-Pacific, but they are everywhere, and Americans are really paying attention to that because there is great competition there, not just in the military or defense space, but obviously economically and other areas as well. Yes, it depends on what the leaders are talking about. That's what Americans are going to focus on.

Brianna Keilar:

What do you think Congressman?

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

Well, I think that the important thing here is to understand how those threats are connected. And yeah, you can rank one higher than the other depending on how you look at it. But what's going on here and what we need to do a better job of is developing a national and then global narrative to counter this. Because we didn't really notice that there's a huge connection between China, Russia, Iran, even North Korea, and then terrorist groups. They are coalescing around a message, and that message is that the world is worse off because of the US involvement in it. And they drive this message all the time. And by the way, there are people on the far right and the far left who pick those messages up and amplify them. I get emails regularly accusing the US of all manner of horrific things over the course of now or 80 years ago, soft peddling what Russia has done, explaining how it's just the US narrative that Russia has done this wrong or China's done that wrong, and we don't appreciate how coordinated all of that is.

You're seeing it with Iran supplying weapons for Ukraine -- sorry, weapons for Russia. Russia now providing weapons for Iran. So they've done all that. And what's our message in response? We should have a coordinated message that basically says what these people want to do is they want to tear down the protections that are out there that we've built up in partnership with allies -- by the way, not just the US dictating, but a global coalition of partnerships and alliances. They want to tear that down so, basically, they can abuse the world. That's what they want to do. We need to build and broaden that message and deliver it. Getting into a debate about: okay, today is Iran a bigger threat or is China? It is a very broad narrative that we must more effectively counter, in a bipartisan way, I may add.

Brianna Keilar:

I think one of the really interesting things you'll see as you look at this survey, and there are many questions, but -- I think a lot of them are very much worth digging into -- there's one when it comes to perceptions specifically of China as a threat to the US. And Dr. Karp, I think maybe you can speak to this because of Palantir's work, but when you ask Americans in this survey how they perceive it, they perceive that the US military conventionally is far superior to China, but that America significantly lags China when it comes to AI and emerging technologies. And when you actually look at the facts, well maybe you can look at -- fact check that for us. Where are we really? Because it seems that there may be a discrepancy between perception and reality.

Dr. Alex Karp:

Well, thank you for having me. I'm actually quite honored to be here. And before I get to that, I've always been interested partly, because I've had to be, about the difference between IQ and wisdom. And in Silicon Valley we have historically had the smartest people in the world, but most people don't have the sense God gave a goat. And the American people are also among the smartest people in the world, but we have a wisdom advantage. So when I see that, what I really see is Americans are intuiting that if you want to hurt China and Iran, you better be able to be stronger than China, because it's the dominant economic force in the world. And it is actually different because you're competing against an adversary with peer-like economy, peer -- or in some cases better -- engineering, and advantages and disadvantages in how they run their country.

On the AI front, the misperception that most Americans have comes from something that is -- it's this weird thing when you're the best in the world at something like America is. America is by far the best in the world at entertainment, music and software. It's so dominant in software that our B-League, if we have five products, any one of those products would be the most important, most valuable startup in Germany. By far. The most important question any VC asks before they invest is: Where's your company? And if it's not here, you're going to have a hard time. And I was talking to someone who was saying off the record, and I've heard this many times, that Xi says openly we're behind in AI, and that's because they are.

And we underestimate, partly because a lot of the AI innovation goes into domestic commercial companies, and that's a separate issue, how do you get that advantage into the most important part of our economy, which is defense, or I would like to call offense, against our adversaries. I don't know why we have to wait to be attacked -- but we don't do that at Palantir. We don't wait to be attacked. But the reason for the misperception is when you are just naturally good at something, you assume that somebody who's naturally good at things we're not, like in general they're as good or better at hardware. They have a system we wouldn't want to live in, but it appears to work. And so that's just wrong. The issue for us is how do we make sure the advantage we have gets to the most important people and those people are in this room, and that is the issue we have. The issue they have is they're behind, and they know it. And they have an advantage because they know it, and we have a disadvantage because we may not know it.

Brianna Keilar:

Marc, what do you think?

Marc Thiessen:

I think -- my old boss, Don Rumsfeld, always used to say Americans have a pretty good inner gyroscope. That they tend to -- given the right information -- they tend to come to the right conclusions. And I think what this poll is showing is that Americans have a pretty good inner gyroscope. What you're seeing in that poll I think is just a confidence in America's ability to be better than China, and a confidence in our system. The poll number that actually jumped out at me most in this poll was: When asked which former President Americans approve of more than any other, Ronald Reagan won overwhelmingly, with 65% in approval. And you hear sometimes in some quarters of the right, the question is now what time is it, that we've got to stop talking about Ronald Reagan so much -- he's dead, people don't really remember him anymore -- and the Democrats keep talking about FDR, and he died in 1945. Joe Biden wants to be the next FDR. Everyone running for president ought to want to be the next Ronald Reagan.

And what we see in this poll, if you go through it, what's so encouraging is that so many Americans and Republicans still support the principles of Ronald Reagan, even when they're not being advocated to them and not being championed if you look at the poll. And it shows: an overwhelming majority support the Reagan Doctrine policy of aiding allies, like Ukraine, like Taiwan, and Israel, overwhelming majorities support -- think that it's important that Ukraine win, including 70% of Republicans. Overwhelming majorities believe that we need to increase national defense spending and follow a policy of peace through strength. And they're doing that despite the fact that no one is really

championing those ideas in our public. I mean if you just look at Ukraine, quite the opposite in the Republican -- the support for Ukraine in the poll is unchanged over the last year despite a very active campaign on the part of the isolationist right to say that it's not in our national interest to support Ukraine, and an absolute lack of leadership quite frankly from the Republican presidential candidates at advocating for why it's in our national interest.

And the Biden administration, which is sort of doing the right thing, but when's the last time you heard Joe Biden give a speech on why winning in Ukraine is in our national interest? He talks about how we have to -- it's a battle between democracy and autocracy and we'll stand with them as long as we can. But why is it when I worked for George W. Bush during the War on Terror, a week didn't go by where the President of the United States didn't go before the American people in some form and explain -- give them an update on the progress in the War on Terror, explain to them where we were on the battlefield, why it was important that we prevail, what the consequences were if we failed and why it's in America's national interest. And then ask them for their support. Nobody's doing that. And even on the right or the left, the President or the Republican candidates. And yet half of Republicans who consider Joe Biden to be the most catastrophic president in their lifetime still support Biden's policy of supporting Ukraine. So I just think that in all these things you see Americans look at the world, they see the dangers, and they have a good inner gyroscope. They're getting this, and imagine how much more the support would be if there was some active leadership exercised on the left and the right to explain to them why it's in our national interest, to explain to them why we should be doing the things we're doing.

Dr. Alex Karp:

The only thing I would say is I don't want to -- the polls are very good, but we in corporate America, we who are running publicly traded companies are an abysmal failure at standing up to people who are anti-American, who are breathing the vapors of a thin new religion at elite schools, who actually believe it would be better to have the world run by China than by America. And we're silent. As far as I can tell, there are only three companies that have been publicly pro-Israel on October 7th, there's Booz Allen, sometimes we disagree with them, there's Anduril, and there's Palantir, three companies. We have to do better. And that's not a problem with the politicians, of course the politicians don't do enough -- with notable exceptions -- but somehow the corporate elite of this country thinks when it's time to make money, you stand up, and when it's time to stand up, you go play golf. And we've got to change that. That's our fault. That's no one else's fault.

Brianna Keilar:

Let's take a look actually at where Americans in this survey are standing on security assistance to different countries: Israel, Ukraine and Taiwan, you see the support is extremely high there. Congressman, I saw you nodding as you listened there.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

I think overall we're in the right place on where the American people are at, that they do in fact understand this. But I do completely agree that we need to make that case more consistently. It was the point I made earlier, whether it's President Biden or Republican

presidential candidates. But look, I mean the elephant in the room here is we've got a whole lot of domestic crap that's going on that's distracting us from that, and certainly the Trump presidency and January 6th and everything that went into that. Yes, this is what the people would say, but if you ask them the question: What's most important to you right now? Republicans would talk about inflation and the economy. Democrats would talk about protecting democracy and pro-choice. We have to break through that noise and consistently make the speeches as to why Ukraine is connected to everything and connected to our prosperity, connected to our economy. So I completely agree that we need to make that case, but you have to understand domestic politics. I mean, if you're running for president in the Republican Party and you stand up and talk about the economy and talk about Joe Biden, you're going to get a lot more support than if you stand up and start making a speech about Ukraine. But we have to find members and companies who are willing to do the opposite to make that case, because it is the crucial foundation of all of that.

Brianna Keilar:

I mean, we can't dismiss that people are, I think, turning inward. They're very worried about their personal situations, Senator. They're looking at -- there are some good economic indicators, but when you're looking at some key inflation numbers that people really experience, when you're looking at housing numbers, they've got a lot of economic concerns right now. There's this isolationism strain that we are seeing. When you look at that Ukraine number in particular, and we're especially seeing with some House Republicans, I would say, a desire to definitely fund Israel, not fund Ukraine, and maybe it doesn't quite represent what we're seeing from the public looking at that. What do you say to that? What argument do you make? I don't know if you do, if you sort of go to the other chamber and try to convince them to get on board, even though they may have some constituents who aren't.

Senator Joni Ernst:

Absolutely. And I do look at this from the Iowa perspective. I think about my neighbors, how do they view this, what do I hear from them? And in southwest Iowa, a very rural area, people do struggle. We have small businesses that are failing. Farmers have high input costs. And then they wonder, well, why are we sending all of these billions of dollars to Ukraine to support their small businesses through humanitarian aid efforts when my small business is failing here in the United States and our federal government is not assisting me. So those are the questions that come to me when I'm doing my 99-county tour every year. So I've taken that stance, and what I've found is helpful in discussing Ukraine is that, okay, let's take a real hard look at where those dollars are going, make sure it's transparent so the American people know how those dollars are being spent, and it is fighting for our own freedoms when we're investing in Ukraine.

Now I take the stance that we should be supporting militarily. The United States can be the arsenal of democracy. We should do that. We do that quite well. Alex's folks do that well, any number of folks here do it quite well. So that's what we can focus our dollars on. But maybe the humanitarian aid, in order to satisfy some of our constituencies, maybe we need to be more transparent about where that's going and show the return on investment. If we are going to invest in Ukraine, this is what it's doing for you, the American people. So having those conversations in the House is very important. But you



see when people talk about the fact that the Ukrainians are doing such incredible work fighting for their own nation. And the fact that we don't have blood invested in Ukraine, maybe we have weapon systems invested in Ukraine, but we're not sacrificing our young men and women. They get that and they're appreciative of that. So we need to talk more about what Ukraine is doing, how we're enabling the fight, and not let it disappear from the headlines as well.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

I'm sorry, I want to make one thing perfectly clear. A majority of House Republicans support Ukraine. I would say a comfortable majority of House Republicans. But the problem is, what's happened in the House Republican caucus is they've let a very small group of people dictate. And I just want to let everyone know for four straight years when we passed the defense bill, every year we got the defense bill done, there was some segment of my caucus that said, this is unacceptable, don't bring it up. And they fought us, and I had to sometimes fight with the speaker, majority leaders say, bring it up. So people are going to be pissed with the end result, and that's okay. It's a majority. Alright. And I would listen to them very politely and say, I hear you. Here's everything we did. Well, if you bring this up, I'm going to blah, blah, blah. I said, well knock yourself out. Let's go. Alright, we're going to bring it up.

And that's what's frustrating to me. Ukraine has the support. You bring Ukraine up for a vote right now, over 300 votes, but the Republican leadership in the house has, we refused to bring that up. They've began to infect the Senate a little bit. I know there's bipartisan support over there and say, well, the Republicans say we don't want to go first because we don't want to make Mike Johnson look bad. Let's all look good. Bring it up. It'll pass in the Senate and the House.

Marc Thiessen:

I had Brian Fitzpatrick on my podcast recently, he's a member of Problem Solvers Caucus, and one of the things he said is that when he's on the floor -- he works across the aisle all the time, he's one of the most bipartisan members -- he said Republicans come up to him on the floor and say, I can't vote for Ukraine, but I hope it passes. And Democrats come up to him and say, I can't vote for border security, but I hope it passes. I mean that's what you're dealing with is that a lot of people are afraid of the very vocal isolationist minority because they think that the public is more anti-Ukraine than it really is. Nobody supports Matt Gaetz.

Senator Joni Ernst:

No, Matt Gaetz supports Matt Gaetz.

Marc Thiessen:

The only reason he has any power in the house is because his faction of the Republican Party put up so many bad candidates that he has such a small minority. If we had a 20-vote majority in the house, no one would care what Matt Gaetz had to say.

Brianna Keilar:

Mark, you bring -- I was just going to ask because -- sorry, go on, Senator.

Senator Joni Ernst:

I was just going to say to Mark's point there is that in Congress you have to have intestinal fortitude to do the right thing. And sometimes you're going to go against certain groups that are out there on the fringes, but you know what? You got to stand up and do what's right, and supporting Ukraine is right. We need to do that. Supporting Israel is right. So thank you Alex for stepping forward with your company, but for heaven's sakes, we are now in an era of milquetoast politicians and leaders, and we've got to start standing up and doing the right thing. Again, we need leadership, we need clearly defined goals and objectives, and we lack that in America today.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

Sorry, not Joe Biden. He's standing up for Israel, he's got people protesting. He's standing up for Ukraine and he's taking a lot of heat from the left and he's doing it. So he needs to be recognized for that.

Brianna Keilar:

I want to touch on your column Marc in a second, but first I want -- Dr. Karp, you were the first CEO to go to Ukraine and visit with President Zelenskyy. So obviously this is very top of mind for you.

Dr. Alex Karp:

Well, look, I think when you look at those numbers, you see a world-historic, awesome, and truly humbling country with a problem that's not showing up there -- if you looked at the numbers, it would be they disagree with this -- actually it would be if you did this poll at Harvard, you'd see very different results. And that's the problem we have to actually deal with, because those are the future leaders and we want people in 20 years sitting here with a basic understanding of decency. What those numbers say is Americans are decent people and are differentiated from any large society we've seen in the history of humanity. Those are those numbers. The problem is we're losing on -- the people that we're losing on are disproportionately the future. And we have to confront that as leaders and explain to people and be willing. A lot of people won't work at Palantir, but unfortunately for our adversaries, many of the best people in the world only want to work at a company like Palantir.

Now on Ukraine, on October 8th I ended up talking with very senior Israelis and I begged them, I said, the one mistake you cannot make is the mistake I believe -- I support obviously defending Ukraine, and I see it as like jailhouse rules. You let Russia come into our cell, it won't be the last time. And this is what we do not teach our elite institutions. It's not like, oh, hey, we switched papers. But you have to show Americans in a visual way the savagery of our adversaries. Americans, as these numbers show, are way too decent to ever imagine what Hamas would do. Almost no American can imagine what Hamas did. Very few Americans can imagine what Russia does and why. You have to show them. And we have to have a more direct dialogue with people that's visual and passionate and where you say, yeah, you're just completely full of that. You have to have that dialogue. We do not bring that dialogue. And of course the American people wander off because if they don't believe you believe -- I mean, really believe -- and you're not showing them the actual facts, they have other priorities. And they do see a looming

China, which really scares them. And so, I think there's a lot of room to improve these things, but I think that's the mistake that was made.

Brianna Keilar:

Marc, you had just a fascinating column on Ukraine this past week, which I just learned took three months to report out, and that makes sense. It's definitely worth a read, and you make the point -- I'll just say what the headline is: "Ukraine Aid's Best Kept Secret: Most of the Money Stays in the U.S.A." 90% of it, and explain -- some of it's here being spent here in Simi Valley, industry is humming across the US. Explain this to us.

Marc Thiessen:

So that is the best kept secret about aid to Ukraine. And it's interesting because if you look at the Reagan poll, 50% of Republicans support continuing aid to Ukraine, seven in 10 think it's important for us to win, but how can we get that number up? If you look at the Reagan poll, 79% of Republicans think that we are worried about our defense industrial base and the fact that we can't produce weapons. And what if we told them that aid to Ukraine is doing that? So we went through and looked at all of the contracts, all the money, that -- where it's going here in the United States, we actually have a map in the Washington Post and also on our website on AI -- we identified 117 production lines in 31 states and 71 cities that are producing weapons for Ukraine. And the money that we're spending on military aid as opposed to humanitarian aid that you described is staying here.

It's creating jobs for Americans, it's creating hot production lines for weapons that we'll need for other conflicts. It's strengthening our national security. Perfect example: the United States had not produced a single Stinger missile since 2005. And the reason for that is because Al-Qaeda didn't have jet fighters. China does. And so, we hadn't produced any Stinger missiles. All of a sudden, now we've got a \$465 million contract to produce -- start producing Stinger missiles again for the Ukrainians. We are creating in St. Charles, Missouri, we're building two weapons, the Joint Direct Attack Munition-Extended Range, and the Ground Launched Small Diameter Bomb. These are weapons that didn't exist and wouldn't be being built if it wasn't for aid to Ukraine. They're going to be helpful in any conflict. We're giving weapons from our stockpile, which are often decades old, and giving those to the Ukrainians and replacing them with modern versions. So where actually the whole aid to Ukraine is a military modernization program for the United States of America. It's creating jobs, it's strengthening our industrial base, it's giving us hot production lines that have been dormant in some cases for decades, and that's going to improve our national security. Why don't we tell that to the American people?

We came up with this map and we sent our data. We literally have a database with all the contracts, all the cities, all the production lines, and we sent it to the Pentagon and they said, your data's better than ours. I mean, this is something that the president should be shouting from the rooftops. I'd like to see Joe Biden going to the Lima Tank factory and asking why is the --

Brianna Keilar:

In Jim Jordan's district.

Marc Thiessen:

Right? Yeah. Jim Jordan's district and J.D. Vance's, J.D. Vance's state, two of the most vocal anti-Ukraine senators. They should be going to Joe Biden and saying, we want to send more Abrams tanks to Ukraine because we build the best Abrams tanks here in Ohio. Those two weapons systems in Missouri that I just described, \$600 million is being spent in Missouri to build those weapons. Josh Hawley is one of the most vocal opponents of aid to Ukraine. Why is he opposed to jobs for his district? Why is he opposed to jobs for his state? Joe Biden should be taking Zelenskyy to the United States and visiting these factories and showing the jobs that are being created. So we need to be better about making the case to the American people, not just that this is a fight between our democracy and autocracy, which it is, not just that this is important for a moral case, this is in America's national interest. What we are doing is we should be making the "America First" case for helping Ukraine, because it exists and we're just not doing it.

Brianna Keilar:

Would that fly with Democratic voters if the President did that?

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

Well, there's a tiny flaw in it with a lot of Americans, not with Democratic voters. It's like we should be sending more weapons in the world so we can blow more people up. I mean, I realize where I am and I realize this is the wrong audience to make this point, but there is that concern and something we haven't talked about yet that I think is important. Another part of the message is if we are going to deter those adversaries, it can't just be the military, okay, we have to do a better job of saying, here's all the other things that we are doing diplomatically working with other countries. And it's interesting, I think Alex made a very good point about just how evil and awful Russia and Hamas and those groups are. And that's a big part of our argument domestically. Yes, you can quibble with stuff that the US has done or others have done, but compared to the adversaries that we face. And George W. Bush did a very good job of articulating this. I'll give that credit. It's terrible.

But you go out to the rest of the world and you have that debate. And I'll tell you, I would love to see polls of the world. Who do you think works, US or Russia? And I think what you probably hear is, eh, they're both kind of awful. Alright? We need to go out and make that case globally as well because we are beginning to lose support. And this -- taking us in a different direction here, part of our strength is our economic power. Well, China, Russia, the BRICS countries, you saw they added Iran amongst other things, they're aware of that and they are trying to build allies around the world. So they build an economic strength, not just China's economic strength, but partners that can counter US influence. We are not winning that argument to the degree that we should in this room. We're all right, we're all -- but the rest of the room, it's like if we told the rest of the world, hey, the reason we're in Ukraine is because we want to make more tanks to shoot people, I think there'd be a little bit of a problem.

Dr. Alex Karp:

Look, I'm a huge admirer of your work. I think that's not a great argument. And I think if you made that argument in these districts, what they would say is, yeah, I'm standing

against my interest because I believe your argument is morally wrong. We have the moral high ground. We should not cede it by saying we're making money. Of course --

Marc Thiessen:

You can make both. You can make --

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

Well, we shouldn't cede it by saying that the reason we're doing this is because we want to make more tanks.

Dr. Alex Karp:

You have to win the argument -- you have to win the argument with people who disagree with us. Everyone here, if you make that argument in Europe or in Harvard University, people are like, okay, great, so you're saying we're going to -- one of the key lessons of Silicon Valley. Silicon Valley dominates the world in the most important area, which is technology, and primarily software, now AI. We make moral arguments. We build our companies around those moral arguments, unless we're consumer internet in which case we're mostly lying, and then we make a lot of money. And what I don't like about that argument is it's like, yeah, we're making money. We're making money.

Marc Thiessen:

I didn't say we're making money. We are creating jobs. We are creating hot production lines for the concerns. I mean, when you look at the polls, people think -- are worried about China. This is helping us to prepare for -- to defend against China. Our effort in Ukraine is actually making it less likely that China will invade Taiwan.

Dr. Alex Karp:

Let me put it to you this way --

Marc Thiessen:

You have to make it from a national interest state.

Dr. Alex Karp:

There's true and persuasive. You're making a true argument that's not persuasive to people I would talk to.

Marc Thiessen:

Okay, well, most Republican voters, where we're lagging, care about national interest. I mean, the problem we're making is we're making the arguments purely in moral -- I'm a believer in making the moral case for helping Ukraine. It's the right thing to do, but it's also the right thing to do for America. It's also the right thing because it's in our national interest.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

Can I put a slight spin on it? Because the part of it that I thought was good was to say that we need to be able to defend ourselves. We have a major industrial base problem. Even

if the Ukraine war hadn't happened, as China is rising, we've got to catch up on hypersonics. we had to catch up as you mentioned on Stingers and all of that. So the moral argument, you don't move away from the moral argument by saying, Ukraine is helping us put ourselves in a better position to defend ourselves. You do move away from the moral argument if you say, "Hey, cool, we get to make more missiles that we get to shoot off all over the world." Make it about deterrence and defense, not about that offensive capability.

Dr. Alex Karp:

If you make the argument to the American people, which we all support, that by winning in Ukraine, we are not only going to hurt Russia, we're going to hurt China, but we're going to do it in a way where we learn lessons that give us military and economic superiority over China, you will see Americans follow it. But the argument that is being made now is we do not show people either in Israel or in Ukraine what's actually happening on the battlefield. Then we make this kind of argument, when instead, we should be saying we have the moral superiority and the way the Ukrainians won on the battlefield, we are going to learn those lessons, we are going to import them to America and we are going to scare the bejeebers out of China. That's an argument Americans will follow. I don't see people making that in my industry enough, and you have to link them. And again, we have an industry that has been the best in the world at doing this. We should just copy what it does and make those arguments. And I think we will do -- but again, these are really strong numbers. Now I know we in this room believe we have a political problem because Trump is doing well, but in reality, we have a great country and maybe we will just do very well to listen to the American people.

Brianna Keilar:

Let's look at the defense spending number and where Americans are on that. But also you mentioned, Dr. Karp, the moral high ground. It's very much up for debate right now in America. It's a very loud debate that is going on when it comes specifically to Israel. And I'm wondering how you all are looking at that, especially you see in the House, there are Democrats who want to attach conditions to aid to Israel, will support for Israel -- high here, but you mentioned there's different audiences where the numbers would be different, Dr. Karp, how much and how significant is it that that number could dip if questions about the legitimacy about how Israel is executing its war continue to balloon?

Dr. Alex Karp:

You're asking me?

Brianna Keilar:

Sure. I'd like you all to --

Dr. Alex Karp:

It's very hard to see the future. I think what -- first of all, there were unfortunately way too many people on October 7th who were happy. And we have to acknowledge we have a huge problem in the western world with anti-Semitism. And we cannot -- not all criticism of Israel is anti-Semitism, but a larger portion of it is than we realized, and we have to call it out. And I'm one of the largest donors to the Democratic Party, and quite frankly, I'm calling it out and I'm giving to Republicans. If you keep up with this

behavior, I'm going to change. A lot of people like me are going to change. We have to really call this out. It is completely beyond the bounds. That's before you get to the Israel thing. Most Americans, again, most Americans who are not at elite institutions see this battle for what it is.

You see one side which is powered by terrorism, that is using terrorist means and that will expand its footprint to the West if it's not pushed back. And I am not a legislator, but I am running one of the coolest companies in the world, and I'm telling young people: you are breathing the vapors of a dangerous new fake and self-destructive religion when you are sitting at your elite school pretending because you watched TikTok twice and got an A-plus on some crazy paper because your professor couldn't get a job anywhere else, that you actually understand the world, and you're not welcome at my company. That's what I can do.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

Perhaps the wrong moment to dive in here, but I do want to point out just for your donations, it's not the Democratic Party that's doing that, speaking as a Democrat who has been attacked by those very same people. It is a fringe group that aspires to take over the Democratic Party. We have thus far held them off, I would dare say far more effectively than the Republican Party has held off Donald Trump. Just want to throw that out there for sake of argument. But as far as Israel is concerned, no, we should not condition the aid. Yes, we have a right to be in a regular conversation with Israel about the fact that if the world perceives that the Palestinian people, broadly speaking, are being dismissed as irrelevant, that is a problem for Israeli security. If you want to put aside humanitarian issues and what we should do about the Palestinian people, okay, but in terms of Israeli security, I think we've seen fairly clearly that Netanyahu's strategy of dismissing a two state solution and basically trying to push them aside is not in the best interest of Israeli security. Don't condition the aid, but we absolutely ought to be having those conversations. And again, President Biden is, okay. We're supporting Israel unequivocally, we're also talking to them about how to go in. If you go back to October 8th, 9th or 10th, what they were talking about doing and what they ultimately wound up doing, it's different because of that conversation, have the conversation --

Marc Thiessen:

Can I disagree slightly with what you just said? And first of all, with great respect for your courageous stand on this, and the fact that you've been personally attacked for all that, but with all respect there is -- the virus of anti-Semitism has infected the Democratic Party, and it's not just on the fringes. There is anti-Semitism on the right and there's anti-Semitism on the left, but they are different phenomenons. On the right, it's a fringe phenomenon. It's the Charlottesville marches. You don't see neo-Nazis marching at Harvard. You don't see professors professing white supremacy at elite universities. And quite frankly, you see it in the halls of academia. It's an elite phenomenon on the left, and it's in the halls of Congress. Ilhan Omar and Rashida Tlaib should have been kicked out of Congress, the way George Santos was recently, months ago. They're virulent antisemites.

And not only did the Democrats not police them -- when Steve King said, "What's wrong with white supremacy?" The Republican Conference stripped him of his committees and

kicked him out of the Republican Conference. The Democrats have not done that for Ilhan Omar and Rashida Tlaib. In fact, after she made those comments, Nancy Pelosi put her on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which sets policy for Israel. So, we all have a responsibility, I think, to police our movements. We who are Republicans, who are conservatives, we need to make sure that the alt-right stays “alt” and stays out of the halls of Congress, out of the halls of power. Democrats have to do that too on their side. And they haven't done it. They haven't policed their academics. They haven't policed Congress.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

I've got to just say one quick thing about that. You're talking about two members of Congress, the leader of the Republican --

Marc Thiessen:

The Squad, they have allies --

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

The leader of the Republican Party Donald Trump said there were good people on both sides of the show.

Marc Thiessen:

I'm not going to relitigate that, but that's not what he said.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

That's the guy who is in charge of the party, not just some elected official on the fringes like Steve King or something.

Senator Joni Ernst:

I'm going to address the Steve King issue because he is from Iowa. Okay, so not only did he lose his position on the committees though, the good Republicans in Iowa in the primary voted him out. So we see Republicans taking care of those issues in Congress. We do not see some of the other districts out there doing that. And I know we've strayed away from this --

Brianna Keilar:

I said I'd be the guardrail Senator --

Senator Joni Ernst:

I'm going to turn the floor back over because we have many other important issues to talk about.

Brianna Keilar:

Consistently high support for increased defense spending. And then if we can move on to look at the AI slide here. It's interesting though, when you get into specifics about how you ask Americans about how they would spend that money. Maybe it's not a huge surprise to a lot of you, they do not have a grasp on all of the details, but the views on



harnessing the power of AI for military use, it's fair to say that Americans are pretty squeamish on this. However, significantly less so when you pose the question to explain that safeguards would be used and that AI being integrated into the American military would provide an advantage over China. It's really interesting.

Senator Joni Ernst:

It is very interesting. And just full transparency, how many people today can actually define what AI is? What is artificial intelligence? What is the definition? You go back home to Iowa and you talk about AI, it's something totally different. And yeah, see everybody has, yeah, that's artificial insemination. For those of you that aren't familiar, for those that aren't familiar with animal husbandry, I come from an ag state, so AI is very different. So when we're talking about AI and how does that translate out across the United States, what is it? How is it defined? Is it algorithms? Is it robot -- I mean, most folks could not tell you what it is. So this too soon to say, yeah, that's the breadth of America right there.

So, I am the ranking member on the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee in the Armed Services Committee in the Senate. And this is the area that we focus on. We talk about hypersonics, we talk about AI, we talk about critical minerals. All of that is incredibly important to our military and the breadth of ideas and solutions that can be found through AI, incredibly important. But what is it? What do we need to focus on? We need to define it. So I am one of those that I think it's a good idea. I do. But with that being said, it also scares the holy bejesus out of me if we're not using it appropriately. Okay? So that's where having the discussions with a number of the groups that are involved in AI is very important. Investing in this is important, but as a government, we're not the ones that can keep up. It's going to be the other outside public or private sector industry folks that are going to find us a way forward. And that's why I do think investing in the Office of Strategic Capital, putting more investment towards it, I think it's incredibly important, but we have to maintain communication on what is AI, what are the developments in AI and how do we make sure that we have those human safeguards in place and then communicating that to our constituents.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

If I could just quickly, and I want to hear from Alex on this, it's not a good -- it's necessary, okay? Good idea, bad idea, if we don't successfully integrate AI into our military, we're -- China, a whole bunch of people are going to go running past us. It is absolutely necessary to having the national security that we need, but I will yield to the experts more on that.

Brianna Keilar:

Can you speak specifically about, I think that's part of it is Americans do not understand how it is used. Palantir is obviously big in the AI tech space and with some sensitivities, but in Ukraine, how is it being used?

Dr. Alex Karp:

Well, if you want to select just a simple thing, I want to find an object the size of a Coke bottle in a desert the size of Texas, and I need to do it quickly. That is a problem that you'll need algorithms, what laypeople call AI to do. And without that, you're going to

spend thousands of human hours and your adversary, if your adversary has as many humans and those humans are willing to work around the clock, i.e. your adversary is China, you're going to lose. So AI really has two components for American security. The most important thing that's going to happen no matter what anyone does in this room, is the American economy is going to outperform every economy in the West. We have a business in Europe. In Europe, it's like 10 years ago, and you can't talk to them about what it means to implement things where you are essentially augmenting the value of a human or replacing a human.

In this country, every single company in America wants a way of making their margins better, their systems work better, their workers more efficient. They want to bring manufacturing from Japan and manufacture like you were in Japan with American workers. And this is going to completely transform our GDP relative to other countries, and hopefully that will be used to power the critical work in the US government. If you asked a different question, you asked Americans, define AI as a software -- piece of software that actually works. Okay, let's just call it that. Whether it's algorithms, large language models, it's something that works as a product. And you asked Americans what percentage of the DoD or anything is being spent on that, you'd probably get an answer like 20%, 30%, it's under 1%. We really have to change how we spend on these things.

We are ahead of China, but we cannot beat China when they're spending -- going to spend 20, 30% of their total budget. And we're arguably spending, no matter how you count the numbers, 1%, and where does it help? One of the things that's really cool about AI, broadly defined is it accelerates things that are working into a different level. So if your tank works, you can make it better. Your supply chain that's broken can be made to work. Your plane can be guided -- by the way, you talk about the industrial base. Yes, we don't have enough munitions, but if you use software, you can get a 10x efficiency ratio on those. So you need 1/10th, you need less money, and it goes a lot further. And then I don't want to make this all about the talking to the American people, the American people intuitively are wise. The American people look out and say, huh, our software companies are the best in the world. I wonder what they're doing on defense. And you want to connect with the American people. You've got to connect to things they see, they use, and that actually will change how the American people will support these things.

Brianna Keilar:

I want to talk now a little bit about how Americans see the military and other institutions, and I will say, I think the panel has been so compelling that you all have not been submitting your questions. I have a few questions, but we've actually already answered them so I can't grab -- but if you do have a question for the panel, please go ahead. I am refreshing here. If we can go to the next slide as we look at how Americans view the military, this is incredibly -- okay, it's alarming, right? So the good news for the military is that you have much more trust and confidence than the news media or Congress, which is unfortunate for some of us up here. Also, it's plateaued. But the dip, that dip is incredible. You're looking at over the last five years, a dip of 24%, which I think alarms many people in this room. And this is happening as we are against this backdrop of the politicization of the media or of the military, also the media, but of the military, which I do not think we can ignore the effect of American perceptions on that.

So sort of a jump ball here of your thoughts on what's happening, why it's happening, and if this can be turned around because the effects are significant.

Marc Thiessen:

It's a huge problem in politicization of the media too. It's not -- as well as the military. I mean, if you look at all those trends, every one of those institutions is on a downward slope. So it's not just the military. And I mean, if you think about what we've been through in the last few years, the worst pandemic since 1912 or 1918, the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, the worst racial unrest since the 1960s. Now the worst land invasion of countries in Europe since World War II, wars on two continents going on. There's been a lot of tumult in the world in the last few years. And I think a lot of Americans think that our institutions have failed us more broadly. They don't trust the media, they certainly don't trust Congress. And so this is a broader problem that we have a collapse in trust of our institutions.

That's a huge problem. I'll give you an example of it on the media. So for years, Americans were told with bated breath that the President of the United States had collaborated with Vladimir Putin to steal an American election. And it turned out to not be true. And that really did a lot of damage to the credibility of the news media. You fast forward to 2020 and that same president effectively tried to steal an election and said that Joe Biden had lied and said that Joe Biden had stolen the election and the media, which is supposed to be our neutral arbiter of truth, nobody believed them anymore. It's like the boy who cried wolf. I mean, there's politicization entering into a lot of our institutions, into the public health institutions, into the media and other places, and is destroying trust across the board. And when we need them and when they need to be trusted, nobody trusts them anymore. And so, we really need to push back on this and stop the politicization of news. Stop the politicization of our public health institutions, stop people -- Americans are concerned about woke-ism in the military. And I don't think we should be holding up general officers over it, but we need to really deal with this because our whole system is based on public trust of our institutions. It's the legitimacy and it's the effectiveness of our entire country is based on it. And if it's lost, it's very hard to recover it.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

Yeah, I do want to point out, Congress actually has not been on a downward slope. We were down.

Brianna Keilar:

You've been consistently terrible, consistently awful,

Marc Thiessen:

That's a slight downward slope. There's not far to fall.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

We've lost no ground, but I think he's fundamentally correct and what's happened with the military, and for the moment I'll be neutral on which side is more to blame for this, the military has been sucked into the cultural conflicts in America. And I think all

members of Congress on both sides would be wise to stop doing that because the military has just been pulled into that. And so, you do have people on the left who think the military is too conservative, you have people on the right who think they're too woke, and both sides are pounding away on that. And they're undermining the credibility of a really important institution by doing that.

Brianna Keilar:

Yes, we're all alarmed by that.

Senator Joni Ernst:

I had a great conversation yesterday with Hoover, Secretary Mattis and HR McMaster and talking about the trust and confidence in the military. And this is really disheartening for me having worn the uniform, serving in our great Iowa Army National Guard. My daughter wears the uniform today, she is active duty, as is her husband. And it's very frustrating. And to the Congressman's point, it's coming from both sides. We hear about the wokeness in the military and we hear about, oh, those that from the left that are targeting, oh, they're a bunch of racists in the military, but where is that coming from? It's coming from the outside. It's not coming from the people in the military. Because I know when I served and I served in a number of very diverse units, I wasn't just in the Iowa Army National Guard. I served in reserve units across the south where I was the minority both in gender and race. And none of us looked at it like that. We were just one institution. We were one team.

But it's the people on the outside that are trying to divide us within the military. And I would caution us when we talk about wokeness in the military or racism in the military, stop because it's not in the military. It may be the civilian leadership, maybe our civilian leadership is woke. But I don't see that amongst the great men and women that serve in uniform. Thank you. But we truly do have incredible young men and women that are serving our nation, and we do a great disservice by labeling them as woke or as racists, and we should not do that to the people that are actually stepping up and serving our country. So let's do the right thing and make sure we're treating our members of the military with dignity and respect.

Brianna Keilar:

Yeah, thank you for saying -- it's a number that I personally really wanted to discuss. My husband recently retired from the Army after 25 years, and we have two boys who idolize him and they're obviously more likely to go into that line of work. And I look at that number constantly and it troubles me so much as I think about how it affects actually the day in, day out for our service men and women. Alright, thank you, you guys heeded what I said and you sent in some questions. So I do want to end just with a final question, I'm sorry that we didn't get to more, but someone asks, how do we balance our desire to support our allies and partners with their continued underfunding of their national security apparatuses? What levers do we have that will force them to take their security as seriously as we do?

Senator Joni Ernst:

I will jump in first. There have been a number of initiatives that have been proposed in Congress, and I'll specifically address NATO and the 2% spending by our allies that

engage in NATO. Many of the countries that are in NATO don't spend 2% on their own national defense. And so, what's the mechanism there? Senator Dan Sullivan has had an effort for a number of years to withdraw different types of training exercises or supports if they don't start doing more on their own behalf. So that is leverage, money talks, and we want more people to engage, but we also have to let our allies know that we are there and we will be spending appropriately to support their efforts in self-defense when it's in our interests as well, and clearly defining that. So we do have to find a way to encourage others to do more. The United States, like I said, we are the arsenal of democracy. I think we should continue to be that, to do that. But we have to have greater engagement as well around the globe. But America first, not America alone, we've got to encourage others to step up. But the United States is the great convener. We should be pulling all of these entities, all of these countries together and really encouraging them to do more.

Ranking Member Adam Smith:

Yeah, I think it's important to do that. I do think I've never fully bought into this narrative that the rest of the world is freeloading on us. I mean, post-World War II, we did take on responsibility for security in Europe, took on responsibility for security in Korea -- South Korea and Japan. But nobody in the world has benefited more from that than we have. Okay, our economy, I don't know what the statistics are now, but at one point we were responsible for 20% of the world's consumption. Our country benefited from the peace and security that was brought about in all kinds of ways. And so, I worry particularly in this moment, we're not in a position to be pushing away allies. Alright? We need friends, we need alliances. By and large, I think the NATO alliance has benefited the US quite a bit. Yes, we should absolutely push them to contribute more. And they have started to more because of Russia than because of anything we did. But let's remember that those alliances benefit us probably more, but certainly as much as any of those countries that were berating to send more money.

Dr. Alex Karp:

Just to this point, if you look at the rough numbers, if you look at market cap of American companies, say compared to European or any other companies, we're back to the 60's where America's just dominant. So in contradiction to what I said before, I think first of all I should make the economic argument, which is we are winning, and it's going to get worse and worse and worse for our NATO allies because of -- they're making terrible investments in tech. And I say this as I have screamed at people in Europe where -- that's not going to change. And it's so bad that-- and this is a bad idea, it's not practical, but we'd be better off having, at least when it comes to AI enhanced weaponry, if they paid less, but absorbed some of our costs. Because what really a lot of these programs are doing, if we're being honest, it's just taking 2% and spending on their local industry, which in the hardware context might be a good idea.

But if you have a software industry, you're killing by creating protection and keeping companies like mine out, you have no future in the area. That's the most important thing. And so, I would be a little more gentle on this because we're winning, but I would be a little harder on what does your AI enhance weapons system actually do? Is it essentially welfare? Or is this real? And force real accounting. Because 1% on something that's real is a lot better than this 2% fake -- It's fake, we get to say we did it kind of thing. That doesn't serve anyone. And yeah.

Marc Thiessen:

On the allies point -- close by bringing it back to the Reagan Institute poll, when told that our support for Ukraine, Israel, and Taiwan is part of a strategy, the Reagan doctrine, to approach -- to help allies defend themselves from aggression, support rises by 10 points. Americans instinctively understand that we need to work with allies to advance our interests and protect freedom around the world. It's still Reagan's America.

Dr. Alex Karp:

And crucially, you have to have a narrative. You have to have a story. You have to tell that story.

Marc Thiessen:

And a strategy. They want to see that there's a strategy behind it and we are doing it. We're following the Reagan Doctrine when it comes to Ukraine and Israel and hopefully Taiwan. So it's still Ronald Reagan's America.

Brianna Keilar:

Thank you all so much for the wonderful discussion. I really enjoyed being a part of it. Thank you all as well for being really a wonderful audience. And we hope that you enjoy the day and that this has set the tone for it. Thank you.

###