Thank you all for coming. I cannot promise an illuminating and interesting lecture, but it is a good place to spend a time other than roaming outside having your coffee. But having said this then, there's no free ride in this society, so my requirement is that hopefully you can give me the harshest of critique and the most reflective comments afterward.

Having set this stand up, giving this lecture all around the world and many times, and often I find it is very hard, because the theory itself is so radical, which means it challenges all the assumptions that we hold about policing.

In that regard, in order to make sure that I'm more saleable, I need to give you a little bit of my background more so than that clip about being a scholar at all. I'm one of those people who started in the street level as a Hong Kong police officer, and when my primal age of seventeen and a half. Why seventeen and a half? Because I lied; I should be getting in at 18, but I lied and got in anyway. I was the only one, incidentally.

So and then that's where my interest lie, and then later I came to the United States, studied law and criminal justice at that, so my research is based on, I hope, some insight from my experience, both in Hong Kong, and now spreading to the rest of China, Taiwan, and those places.

Without further ado, I think that what I want to do in terms of arrangement is, I'll spend maybe half the time, 30 minutes or so, to talk about the theoretical framework, and also, most importantly, about the so-called, [inaudible 1:44] principle.

Every theory has certain principles to it, and use this really as a heuristical device to try to elicit some response from you. I mean just kind of "take your best shot, " and we'll be there, all right?

So what this is all about is that...like I believe that all you know to be an academic and scholar is really to ask the right question more so than get the right answer, because if you ask the right question, then probably you can find the answer, or you're so smart.

So the beginning point, I suppose the whole question is about the theory of policing is that the idea that most of them raise three types of questions, really. The first type being, "Who are the police?" Who are these people in red, green, blue, or polka-dot shirt now, and all these stuff?

And more importantly, I suppose, that this idea that, what do they really do, and with that, how should the relationship between the police and the people, right, how do they react? And then and only then can we talk a little bit about why people call the police.

Here I don't want to be provocative, but every...I think every lecture I gave to police departments either in China, Hong Kong, or whatever, they always ask these kind of questions about, you know,
why do the people not call us? Why don't they call the police?

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to change this. I think that you are better off by asking "Why do they call the police?" So in this article, or in this venture I used to ask the last question first, that is, "Why do people call the police?" So let's start, right?

I would just jump off, right, as I said, to the major principle which the theory is all about. The [inaudible 3:56] theory, of course, is not...it's descriptive, as talked about state police power as a social resource theory, implying, suggesting, that I can as well talk about police resource, or police power as a resource, or political resources, which is the next book coming 2020, or whatever.

But there's two problems, in essence. I don't want ...I call it "duality of police power." The problem that we have for law in this field is that we focus on these police as a state resource, a political resource, reminding me of the Marx and Tsung, and Mao. I talk about well, if you ask them what's the role of the police, it is the instrumentality of the state serving to secure the party and otherwise fight crime, etc., right?

But I think that's only half the story. The other story is that about what the people see, and how they think, and more important, ladies and gentlemen, is how they feel about it, right?

As a matter of fact, all these years, I mean I hope that I'm a charismatic and fun-loving guy, but I was bashed by my instructors, the mentor, every time I bring up some emotion. There's no place in it. If you don't believe me, go down to the library and read those law articles, right?

You may be a vibrant person, but two months from now, you just be dead beat. You'll just go, "Well, well, right, OK?" It also reminds me why Mr. Holmes would once say that the law life is not logic. It is experience. Experience is full of emotions, right?

So if I can employ you, go back next time and write a law article about feelings, because I believe as a trial lawyer feeling is what matters. Logic is not. So having said that, then you know exactly where I'm coming from.

In order to understand this theory, then I suppose the first thing is to do some definition, right? There are three definitions in kind, if I can find it in an appropriate place.

The three definitions are, one, what is the definition of police? Second, what is the definition of "problem?" Third, what's the people's resources? Those are the key terms that provide the foundation for this theory.

Let me repeat again. The three words for them are "police, " "problem, " "resources, " and let me begin by the most simple, which is the word, "problem, " right? My thesis said that when people most know anything about policing, there's law enforcement and crime. That's rightfully so, because that's what they feed it to you, right?

But I beg to differ. I beg to differ, only because I don't think from the people's perspective, or figuratively, if you're one of those persons, as I understand yesterday. I was talking to a wonderful colleague of mine, Senator Casey, remember, there are two kinds of people.

One is people like you who do this Spock thing, right? Imagine, and logic. The other's not. They see things. They see things, right? So if you look at it from people's perspective, which is otherwise than logical and analytical, they see things quite differently, the top down versus bottom up, right?

So my challenge to you is, how do the people from below look at crime, right? How do people look
at crime from below? And then I argue that in order for you to do this, then you've got to ask the next set of questions, is that how do these people feel when they are robbed, when they are being raped, when things bad can happen to them, right?

There I devise only that it's not a crime. The first thing I notice is that a crime is not a crime from the victim's perspective. If indeed it's not the crime, what is it? I need to find some conceptual idea to build my theory on, just like a house, right?

So I said to myself, "The clearest way is to say that you and I have a set of expectations. We expect to be safe. We expect to go to school. We expect to be clean shirt. Why clean shirt? I don't know whether you've been...you've seen a bloody murder that shows all that blood and all. You got to clean them. That's a serious business. So if you're outward expectations of the people, there is the beginning of the story.

The story is that...my thesis is that, when a crime happens, it is not a crime. It is a set of experiences that is attached to the crime, and then with expectations on top, right? I do not expect to be robbed, and I certainly do not expect my shirt to get dirty tonight.

If you understand that, the next question is that, "How do you deal with a problem?" Well the real problem is to have, if you remember, problem is defined as unmet expectations of all kinds, of all kinds. I got that from being the president of the Rape Victims Association.

How many of you know how many percent of rape victims report? 23% or 27%, right? They're bad. How long after they got raped do they respond? Round about 72 hours later, right, on average? So calling the police is not the first problem they have. The first problem is they call their boyfriend, mother, and father, or so on. So, you know, the expectation is otherwise.

And when you talk about expectations, then you question unmet expectations: How can unmet expectations be met? I invented an idea called resources. Resource is the key to understanding why people call the police. Why do people call the police? Because they don't have the appropriate resources to take care of it.

If they have the resources, they will not call the police. That is a scientific statement. If people have resources to deal with the problem, they would not call the police, right? Bill Gates does not call the police. Bill Gates has a lot of security guards, right? Pursue them; but he does not call the police, right? Paris Hilton doesn't need to call the police, right? OK. They let her go after three hours, for having cocaine and whatever, right? She has resources, since she is a star. Those are the resources to deal with it.

So if you understand what I am talking about, in brief, then the next thing is the police. And that's easy, isn't it? If the problem is unmet expectations of all kinds, resources are things to deal with problems of all kinds. Then next to the police is a common resource. And you ought to ask a certain question. Can they, or should they, bring the resources to the people for them to solve the crime? That is what this theory is all about. If you understand the concept, we're all fine.

There are about 12 principles, and growing. It's a bad thing for theorists. I start with nine. This is 12. I am sure after this, it will become 15. There's only 14 people, but still, there is one more, 15, now. So I'm sure it will grow.

The first principle is what I just said to you. I want to read it aloud, so you understand where I am coming from, and so some say something is phony. People confront problems of all kinds, from day one, right? What is the first problem you confront from day one? I don't know; I wasn't there in
the sense that I don't know, but I understand from what my mom said to me, when you drag me out from that womb, they spanked my butt because I didn't want to breathe the air.

That's the first problem you have, right? But you don't call the police, do you? You don't call the police, because they can't help you, right? So, remember, what kind of problems? I don't want you to tell me because we don't have time, but we all have problems.

The second thing I want to reiterate what I said earlier. Problems of everyday life are, as I said earlier, unmet expectations from a lack of resources, implying or suggests that if you have the resources, you don't have a problem at all.

Three, it's now getting to be the guts of the theory. The theory says, there are two ways to solve any problem, right? What would be the two ways to solve a problem? Now that you know the theory base, what are the two ways to solve a problem?

[inaudible question]

Kam:

[inaudible 13:14] sir, what if you don't have resources. What if you can't get resources? [inaudible response]

Kam:

That is correct. Let me talk about Bertrand Russell. I love Bertrand Russell, because he asks all kinds of crazy questions. A student of his asked, what is hell? 'Hell is ABC: A is infatuated, not in love, with B; B is infatuated with C; and C is infatuated with A. And they must stay all together for life. Tough, right? OK? OK. So in essence, this is a situation you can't deal with. You can't deal with this zero sum game stuff. How would you deal with this kind of dilemma? How would you do it? You can't have the resources, because no one will love you. You can't deal with this. What can you do?

What do you do? You lower your expectations. That's very important, right? Most people, as I worked with them -- I was a legal agent for a long time -- when I asked people to contact the police, they always sighed, and say, Why bother? Why bother, right? So they said, Why bother? Why waste your time?

So they adjusted expectations, so there's a new norm now. Only if they are murdered will they call them. Why murder, ladies and gentlemen? Why murder, because you don't want a stinking body in your house, and you get a death certificate to bury them. That's the only reason, right? Otherwise, you don't want to report to the police.

So what I'm arguing is that there are two ways to solve a problem. This has significant policy implications. As in China, right? You know about China. They have this new public relations program, whereby they talk about, [Chinese words] . If you have difficulties, then you call the police.

Except some people who do not do the translation well, and they talk about the fact that if you have a problem -- a problem and a difficulty are two different concepts. The people and the police, I think they think about difficulties; I don't know. But the message the people get is, if I have a problem, any problem, I will call the police.

As a result, this follows: One day, I think it's in [Chinese word] or something, a factory worker,
who is at the heart of the peoples' core, right? And he got home from a bar, I don't know what time it is, but he got home late, he was tired, and he overslept.

And then, since this happened, he tried to get up in the morning and get something to eat. Of course, he overslept, he can't get that, he called up a cop, right? [Chinese words] . And the cops say, what? Yeah, I have a difficulty. [Chinese words]

Well, this is not even funny, isn't it? I have AAA. This is serious. Because AAA wouldn't come in an hour, I called the police to unlock my car. You should ask why? Why would you have AAA and call the police, right? The police aren't there to open up your car, aren't they, for crying out loud, right?

So the gist of the matter is that there are policy implications to what I am saying. On the one hand, we are talking about expectations, and on the other, about the so-called resources level.

The fourth one reinforces the first. Peoples' experience with crime, not cognitively -- I want to repeat, police think cognitively; normal people feel, experientially. That's a big difference between the two. And as such, they look at crime as a personal thing, and not, ladies and gentlemen, as a legal thing. That really is the problem, right? Police have never understood that.

They think they come because they have a legal problem. No, they don't come because of a legal problem, but because they've got a personal problem of an experiential kind. You need to solve that.

That's why most of the people are not happy with the police, because police say one thing, and they deliver another. We're your friend in China -- particularly in China -- We're your friend; we can solve your problem. Call us, call us. And you call them, and every time they got shot. Imagine. I still remember my first lemon date. But [inaudible 17:35] I don't even call anymore, right? There's something wrong with me, I don't want to call, right?

So, it's very important for you to understand what this is, right? Beginning with proposition five, it's all scientific. Scientific, gives you all the right in the world to challenge me. I dare you. Give me empirical evidence to reject these, I'll amend them.

Proposition five, people call the police because they do not have, or are unwilling to spare, the necessary resources to deal with the problem. That is to say again what I said earlier, if you have the resources, you don't need to call police. Or you don't want to call the police, right? And more so, then you should ask, if that's the case, then why do you call the police?

Well, when you call the police, you are expecting two definitive kinds of resources. One, we already know. If you read the American literature, the literature on police is very sparse in terms of theoretical framework, but this is pretty fixed. That is, that people argue that the reason why you call the police is because they have a gun; because they have coercive power. That is the theory.

I say not. I say you call the police because of two things, not one. One, because they have a gun, which is the coercive power of the state. The other is not -- you still remember? I don't know about you, you know, but I was in the divorce business. I picked up divorce in my earlier days, in a four-four day, or whatever that is. And they always -- these are my professors and accountants and lawyers and all. They are going to fight: This issue is mine, this issue is not yours. Let's call the cops. Now, you are lawyers. You are brilliant. Why call the cops? The cops come.

Casey Waugh, 17-and-a-half years old, and ticking, and ask me to decide if a professor's right or a professor's wrong. Why do they call me? I am not in education, nor the intelligent, nor whatever the
deal is there. And I pretend. They teach me. I pretend. The shoes belong to yours for a night; you go to them, like Solomon's dilemma.

What it is, I think that these people call the police is that, come on. I know I'm right, but I can't be the person who judges. You, the state, help me to judge. That's legitimacy of power. I think that that's so important.

It's very much like, ladies and gentlemen, some of you want to be prosecutors. And some of my colleagues went to be U.S. attorneys at the moment, at 22, 24, and I always think that the United States versus -- he said, "I got a real high thing." Real high, it is; the legitimacy issues, you are representing the state to resolve this dispute. And that's not [inaudible 20:32] . That has tremendous implications.

I'm arguing my colleague. My colleague won't accept the proposition. "Well, Casey, at the end of the day, it is about power in the role." I said, "Actually, not."

I think that people call the police. They willingly subject themselves to the police, on account of the fact that they have legitimacy in their hand. Otherwise, you can't deal with them. You cannot use the gun to solve all the problems in the world. In some ways, I'm taking this kind of cheap shot about the legitimacy.

The reason why we are failing overseas, perhaps, is because we no longer carry the legitimacy that we once had, for whatever reasons. But that's far, far few in number, and I'm not going to deal with those.

But, certainly, as the police officers, you call them because of these legitimacy issues. Why is that important? Because most of the resources that you have can be replicated somehow in a society, but the legitimacy is hard -- not impossible, but hard. Let me give you an example.

As a scholar, as an editor, as in all this good stuff, you don't call the police to argue the point about what is good article or bad article. You call the editor and then maybe have some peer review for the article. Well, so, religion, in China -- particularly, if you look at Chinese history -- all of the disputes or most of the disputes, except for the very nebulous, ones are being solved by the head of the house, the father.

The father is an extension of the state, which means the emperor. OK and that places an amount of legitimacy, and the father can kill you. The father can really kill you, do all kind of stuff to you. So, if that's the case, I think it's pretty clear that legitimacy does not need to, but our society it is done.

In our society we institutionalize the ideas that nobody comes except the police and the law, which has tremendous implications for people like us. It is because now you have to turn to the police to solve every other problem, which is not doable or not advisable. So, this idea about legitimacy in turn -- Proposition Six.

Proposition Seven -- now, six and seven talk about the fact is that police power is an emergency power, because at the end of the day, I want to be very mechanical. I want to write a book that allows me to say, "This is what police should do and this is what police should not do, and all this good stuff." So, to say that they are a so-so resource is too big a term; that is everybody and anything can be a social resource.

Imagine today, ladies and gentlemen, you have this, read this paper, you go and have exam, and the computer breaks down. What do you do? Do you call the police? No. Why not, because they come when your car broke down?
Information highway is not -- the police can't help you. The car in the super highway, they can help you. I just, conceptually, can't make it. I argued many times. I said, "He gets here..." The police chief down there in my town said, "The law, Casey, how can I improve the police services?" I said, "Look. Give people what they want. What they want is the information highway, not this, the super highway."

So, this idea about this policing trying to help you must be contingent on the fact that they can help you, but what they can do is that, even if they can help you, it is too large a burden. So, the word is emergency, or what we call "Band-Aiding." They're going to Band-Aid it.

Now, that is a very controversial issue. That got to me. My colleague Goesten, a wonderful gentleman. You should see him. He is just the scholar of all scholars. My difference with him is that he said that, "Well, police should solve the problem, but not the personal problem." So, he said that, "Well, if you have one robbery in the place, it's Friday night, one robbery at 2:00, one at 3:00, then you have a problem. Corroborate, you solve that problem."

I said, "No. You should solve not the robbery problem, per se, which is secondary issues, but the personal problem that comes up." And I give him example. I said, "Look. Can you imagine that you go to the doctor tomorrow, and you said what? I've got cancer." Instead of treating your cancer, your doctor said, "Your father have cancer. Your mother have cancer. You neighbor have cancer. The whole society have cancer. Let's deal with that cancer." What does it do to me?

So, my argument is that. My argument with Mr. Goesten is that. I said, "Look. The problem must be personal. The problem must be an emergency. We judge you not by this so-called dealing-with-society problem at large, but the personal problem that I have in turn."

Proposition Eight, as I said, is scientific. I'll give you a few examples is that the more resources at the disposal of the people, from whatever sources, the less problems that they have. The less problems that they have, it is clear, isn't it?

You look at the rich people. They don't call the police because they don't have the problem. OK, they have security arrangement, they have security guard, they are educated, they're all these things. So, rarely, do problems happen to them.

The second proposition is that if they do have the problem, they're more able to deal with those. OK, I dabble with karate and all this stuff. I rarely call the cops, when people attack me. I can't win all the time, but most of the time I do very well. When I call the cop, I get protected.

So, these are very scientific. If you look at it, the data is always there, the more resources people have, and that also poses implications. The way to reduce police presence -- which is not a good thing, I'm saying -- is to empower the people to solve the problem. I think that that's what I'm driving at.

The next step of the proposition is this. It says something about, now, return to the police. My argument is to the police that we have right now is our only resource. They have a gun on one hand; usually it's the left. They've got law on the other. And they have law and gun, they will travel, and they can solve people's problems.

It may be once upon a time, it may be in certain situations, but it certainly is not compatible with what we call community policing at large. Community policing is to solve people's problems, personal at that. And you are telling me that by marching up and down, and having gun, having law, is going to solve that. That is just not.
So, my scientific theory, if you ask me, is to be resource sensitive. That is to direct your resources to address those problems that a society manifests, in a scientific way. I'm not asking you to do fable here; it's in scientific way.

You've got to ask, what happens if the police do not have the resources, either in kind or in quantity? Well, then, that is also part of the statement. My argument is that, if you do not give them the resources, which I think is happening now in the United States and in China. If you do have the resources, and the right kind of resources, the police would act extra-legally or illegally.

I used to teach a course in interrogation. I said something as follows. If you give me five hours with a person, then I probably don't need to use coercion. But if you give me 15 minutes, I need to give some kind of coercion. Not that I like to, but I have to, to get it.

So, back to a place called Iraq, you've all heard about Iraq. With Abu Ghraib, because you don't have the culture, you don't have the culture, you don't have the language, you do the interrogations and you use force to do it. If you have the culture, you don't have to.

So, in essence, what I'm arguing is that you need the appropriate resources. Police, ladies and gentlemen, is in bad shape and will be in bad shape. I don't want to wish them ill because they are not properly resourced; and not adequately resourced, they just don't have it. If they don't have it, then what can they do?

The last one, Proposition 12, and then probably, after I finish this, I'll talk about this foundational stuff. It's this idea, which is the key at the heart of this whole project, and that is this. I maintain that the person, or institution, I suppose, the person who is closest to a problem should be the person to take care of that problem. In essence, don't call the police next time when you have a problem, right? The police can't solve your problem, because at the end of the day, you need to solve the problem. The issue that we have right now is for quite different reasons.

Police want you to believe that they can solve the problem for you, because there's a conflict of interest. The more they make you scared - I'm not, I'm good friends with them, OK? I don't want to trash - but that's the only reason they're out there talking about the fact that Peter Manning, for example, at MSU, talks about the fact that, look, people, every time the robbery is reported two days ago, you turn on your siren and you go down there. What do you do? You want to impress people that you're around. The fact of the matter is, you have a vested interest to make sure that you are funded in ways, right? When the crimes go down, you say, wow, I'm useful. When the crimes go up, it's not my responsibility, and all this good stuff, and give me more resources, right?

And, I understand the drill. But, the consequence is big. We become dependent on the police, with the blind faith that somehow they can do it for you. And, indeed, they cannot. The only other thing - cheap commentary, don't write it down - is this: I think this romantic intent into marriage the first day and all is the same thing. You're going to pick your partner, into wine, and then four dances later, and they go in the sunset and that kind of thing. It doesn't work that way, does it?

But still, we believe it, and yes, we got those divorces, China and every place. So, we need to correlate this with the police business, which I think that I'm arguing is that, with the police, you should understand what they can do for you and what they can't. If you do that, then, you soon find out they cannot do much for you, right?

For every discount of theoretical stuff, there should be some kind of recommendation. My recommendation is a fairly simple one. That is, you need to try to empower the people, you and me. This is not a liberal or radical, this is just reality. Because in light of what I said, the more resource of people, the less problem.
"Professor Wong, you're kidding me. We can't do this, because resources are always limited." No, that's not what resources that I want to give the impression. Yes, money can buy you happiness, but money does not always solve your problem either, right? So, when I say resources, I want you to imagine that in resources, everything and anything that can solve that problem, including brain power. Thus, education is the key, right? The more educated that you are, the less you will call the police.

And you do this. It's very clear. The police that you have right now is serving on the lower...lower in the sense of education-wise can [inaudible 32:14]. The people that are rich-rich up there, they have different ways of dealing with this, because they are brainy enough, right?

Professor Kim, give an example. Don't do it at that level. I'll give you an example. If you don't want to have to call the police or solve the problem, right? You're miserable as hell, right? Go, walk down the street to me to the center of Buddhism and do some Zen Buddhism with me. How about that? And then, you'll soon find out that nothing is troubling you, right? You are liberated from your secular self, and you go to Heaven for that. That kind of stuff. So, you're really talking about how you handle yourself in terms of confronting a problem.

Now, in the remaining probably about five or ten minutes before I open up the floor, let me talk about-the love and the joy in my life is to talk about how I came to this intriguing idea about this radical theorem.

First of all, in the nature of things, I just put myself on the shoulder of others, right? In the sense that I have....In front of you is the article, I have three statements up there, and I want to use those three statements and only the three statements to illustrate my journey through this. One is that, the first statement talks about the fact that the criminal record for history is not so much that they uncover a particular crime as they reveal about otherwise invisible or opaque experiences. That, to me, that is very, very important.

Because, also, our life in a bureaucratic world, we tend to grasp institutions and concepts to help us to negotiate life in a more efficient manner, and usually it's related to economics at all. But, if you get through the label of it - as another author, I think Gary Backer from Chicago said, there's nothing called crime. Crime is but a label, anyway, right? There's nothing right or wrong with crime. It's just labeled as a crime, then it becomes a crime. Symbolic interaction theory.

I will say the same thing, and Peter Manning said it very well. If you dig deep your head into this label, from resources, going to law school, business school, you soon will find out that underneath that canopy is a lot of budding life to that. As scores of professors, as Miss Wren said, we need to get in touch with that experience, and then you should appreciate about that. In the more glamorous world I came from, if it's called glamorous, it's called inductive or was it deductive theory. You need to go to induction. You need to look at what it is out there before you come to a conclusion. And, that's where I start my journey.

I say, look, a crime is really not a crime. It's not a legal label. Second, there was this idea that was promoted by business courses. Professors talk about police as a coercive force, but the person also said, the American - now it changes, it's not American, it's all over the place now - the American has this kind of repertoire, this habit of calling the police whenever they have a problem. I agree in half. I don't agree with the other half.

If I agree with half, it's only because they do have this tendency to call the police when they have a problem. The other half I don't agree is perhaps that legitimizes the police, that they should get involved more. My biggest strategy is not - I'm not a Tea Party person, incidentally. My strategy is to state that, look, if they want to call the police, fine, but make sure the time is not wasted. So, in
that, I understand the problem is that people do need somebody to solve their problem.

Last statement is by...In 1888, no less, and I found that to be tremendously interesting. That is, this MP in England said, what? If most of the people take care of their own problems, minding their own business, doing their own chore, they don't need the gentlemen. They don't need the police, which is true, right?

Think about your university, a nice clean place. I'm not making, whatever, OK? If you leave things around, you need to hire a janitor. If you don't leave anything around, you don't need to hire a janitor. Janitors are there to pick up after you, right, or that kind of stuff. So, if you understand those, that leaves then one other perplexing question, which Mao did try to...which is also a perplexing question enough that it is very hard to solve.

That is that, "Well, Professor Wong, all you said is quite fine. Love you, give you a Subway, whatever. How do you deal with the issues or somehow or other when you go to see a doctor. You can say you can see a doctor. When you've crime you go to the police, right? So, you can't do it yourself! Don't fool me! You can't ever do it yourself!"

Now, that is two-way, no. First of all, the relationship with your doctor and the common now, other people, is a forced dichotomy. Because Mao made it very clear. I did not, I would not, and I'd be a fool if I do if I suggest ever, that within three minutes you can be a doctor and help your own problem. I didn't say this at all. What I did say, that somehow or other, you are in the driving position. You can try to get something from this expert and that expert, and there's no expert, really. Ultimately, you are your only expert.

Mao said it very clear. You did read Mao, right? Mao is pretty smart. Who is the creator of the world? You. If you are the creator, then you're going to suffer, right? And, the people in China say they know, right? Gai-Ling, Huan-soy, Hai-Ling. If you create the problem, we create this mess out there, we can solve it. Clinton's not going to solve it for you. Obama's not. Bush is not. We create you, right?

Why do you have torture down there? Because you folks voted those people in office. You let it go. Imagine about this. I just got it down...Look, it's very clear that America approves of torture. Otherwise, how can they torture? And, they're still doing it.

So, that critical insight is brought out by this expert? No, there is no expert, in the sense that there is no person who knows you best, including - I close it off - your mother, right? Remember, your mother said, you are my blood, DNA, I know better than you do. No, you don't, Mom. Right, OK? And, if Mom doesn't know you, how do the police?

OK, I'll finish off there, because I can go on and on, because people like us like to talk. But, I would like to hear what you thought, and then whatever question you need, I can learn something from your feedback, ladies and gentlemen. And thank you very much for...