

## **“Mersey Gateway” Inquiry 25 June 2009 – NAAT Closing Statement**

### **INTRO**

1. Good morning, my name is John McGoldrick and I am here on behalf of the National Alliance Against Tolls. We are a small umbrella organisation, which includes a group which opposes the Mersey Tunnels tolls.
2. There are others who have appeared at this Inquiry as objectors, and I think that everyone who has concerns about any aspect of the Council’s plans should be grateful to them for taking the time and trouble to prepare evidence and speak at this Inquiry. We are pleased that we are allowed to make this closing statement. I have tried to be brief, but we have been taking an interest in the Runcorn – Widnes bridge for over five years and there are many things that I want to try and make sure that those here and the Minister are conscious of.
3. We have campaigned neither for nor against a new crossing, but we are opposed to the tolling of any new bridge and even more strongly opposed to the plan to toll the existing bridge. This would be the first ever imposition of a toll on the users of a free bridge, and Halton would be the first place in Britain, where you have to pay a toll tax to move from one side of a local authority to the other.
4. At the start of this Inquiry I gave a brief background to our alliance and the reasons why we generally opposed tolls. I said that tolls had been around long enough to be described as “evil” in Magna Carta. I also said that tolls are a regressive tax which takes no account of the ability to pay or the size of a car. Tolls are also unfair as this area is already burdened with the Mersey Tunnels tolls, but over most of the rest of Britain people can go to work, move around on their daily business and visit family and friends without paying a toll.
5. I pointed out that road users pay about fifty billion pounds a year in fuel duty and other taxes, and that it is outrageous to propose that drivers here will have to pay even more.

### **ALICE**

6. Having sat through much of this Inquiry over the last five weeks, I have felt at times that I have fallen through the rabbit hole and down into Wonderland. The first strange aspect of this scheme is the name, which was the “Second Mersey Crossing” and then was promoted to “Mersey Gateway”, despite the fact that the proposed bridge is many miles upriver and there is already a road bridge and a rail bridge and road and rail tunnels and ferries which are nearer the mouth of the river.
7. Another strange aspect is that the Council have supplied pictures of what they say will be an “iconic” bridge and have gone into a lot of detail about its construction and the working methods to be used by the contractors. But the Council are not the ones who will be responsible for any of this. This is a Private Finance scheme which is sometimes also called “DBFO” which stands for Design, Build, Finance

and Operate. It is not the Council, but the toll concessionaire who will design the crossing and appoint the contractors who will build the bridge and its approaches.

8. Another feature of this Inquiry is that it could just as easily be taking place at the other end of the country. At one session last week, I was the only one present apart from those paid to be here and a Council supporter who mentioned to the Inquiry that he lives in Stockport. In week three one of the objectors - the Warrington Road Residents Association – asked some of the Council’s expert witnesses whether they lived in Halton. Not one of those asked said “yes”.
9. Another indication that many of those at this Inquiry may not be familiar with the area was after some witnesses had made reference to the Daresbury Expressway, and the Council had on a couple of occasions given out Google maps which showed the Daresbury Expressway as starting at the existing bridge. I suggested to the Inquiry that in fact the stretch of Expressway between the existing bridge and where the new bridge was to join the Central Expressway was called the Bridgewater Expressway. There was not a single person present at the Inquiry who seemed to be aware of this and it was as if the Runcorn side of the river was some sort of Terra Incognita.
10. When we had the evening session in Runcorn it was even suggested that people would need the post code for Runcorn Town Hall so that they could find it with the aid of their sat navs. Fortunately all those at the Inquiry did manage to find Runcorn Town Hall and what they faced there was overwhelming opposition from Runcorn residents who have various concerns but primarily that a new six lane crossing is to be aimed straight at the heart of Runcorn’s residential area.
11. The Inspector has said that he has never seen so much paper in 25 years of involvement with Inquiries. Unfortunately this large volume of paper has obscured rather than illuminated the important facts. Even when we and other objectors were allowed to submit further material, it has invariably been trumped by the Council submitting another piece of paper.
12. An Inquiry is an opportunity to ask questions and get at the full facts. That is the theory, but the reality is that for a complex scheme with 19 Council witnesses this is difficult, and many times when objectors were asking questions, the Council witness said that the item queried need to be asked of a different expert. We have also been trying to ask questions outside of this Inquiry using the Freedom of Information Act and experienced problems that meant we had to go the Information Tribunal.
13. Part of our long term interest in these plans was how did it come about that a scheme for a new untolled bridge ended up as one for not only a tolled bridge but tolls on the existing bridge as well. In November 2004 the Council had said that no tolls “remains Halton’s preferred solution” yet it seems that while they were saying this they were submitting a tolled scheme to the Government. Though according to evidence submitted by the Council they did not pass a resolution to this effect until July 2007, nearly three years later.

## **OBJECTIONS / CONSULTATION/ SUPPORT**

14. One of the features of this Inquiry has been the relative lack of objectors. I would have expected that the first ever imposition of a toll on the users of a free bridge that has 80,000 vehicle crossings a day, would have resulted in thousands of objections and hundreds of people wanting to speak at this Inquiry.
15. There were indeed about 500 objections, but I have been told that most of those were planning objections and that there were only seven - seven - objections to the Order that will place a toll on the existing bridge. Does this mean that the other bridge users didn't care that they will have to pay a toll or was it because they were not fully aware of the plans or how to object?
16. The Council have said that they carried out full and open consultation and that people knew the salient points of their plans. Though many of the residents of Runcorn strongly disagree that there has been adequate consultation and one resident at the evening meeting referred to consultation leaflets apparently dumped en masse into a wheelie bin. Many people only seemed to be aware of how a new bridge would affect them because of the efforts of one man who also appeared at the Inquiry as an objector.
17. The Council may suggest that the reason that there are not more objections to their tolling plans is because apart from a few people like me, the bridge users and local residents think that a toll is a price worth paying and that this is demonstrated by the results of their consultation and by the support that they have had by letter and by people appearing before this Inquiry
18. The Council said in their evidence that they had support from 80% of businesses during the consultation. I asked whether the businesses who supported the Council knew about the plans to toll the existing bridge. I was at first told that they didn't, but later the Council said that businesses did know. This was despite the fact that the Council submitted a rebuttal to our evidence which included the full scripts used in the two telephone surveys of businesses and that neither script made any mention of tolls on the existing bridge. The Council then submitted a statement from the firm that carried out the surveys saying that it was "made explicit to respondents" that both bridges would be tolled. It is difficult to see how it was made explicit if it was not in the scripts.
19. The claim that businesses support a toll even if it were only on the new bridge is also difficult to reconcile with a statement in one rebuttal that the Council made to us which said that "As would be expected, the proportion of respondents opposing a toll was higher than those who would support a toll". If I may emphasise that, the Council witness said that more businesses opposed a toll on the new crossing than supported a toll. I asked that witness whether businesses opposing the toll had done so even though they had been told that "journey time reliability" would be "improved". The answer was yes – they had been told that. This opposition from businesses is very difficult to square with the Council's claims that the cost of tolls to businesses will be more than offset by the saving in journey times and that businesses support the Council.

20. As to the supporters who appeared before the Inquiry and give evidence for the Council, there were only three – three - people . They were Derek Twigg, the Halton MP; a Tory councillor who was speaking on behalf of Cheshire West and Chester Council and a director from Peel Holdings.
21. When asked Derek Twigg, had no idea what the level of tolls could be as per the Orders that he was supporting, and though he said that a new bridge was “crucial to future economic growth” he would not even venture a guess as to whether traffic would go up or down when there were two bridges.
22. The Tory Councillor also had no idea what the tolls could be, though he did know that the traffic was officially forecast to go down. As the day before I had sent him a message emphasising that fact, this was not surprising, what was surprising was that he also said that he thought that the official forecast was wrong. The director from Peel also had no idea what the tolls could be or what the traffic effect was despite the fact that his company have been part of the group behind this scheme. When asked why he had said nothing about the tolls in the letter of support, the director said that his company had no views on tolling. Overall those supporters who spoke at the Inquiry gave me the impression that they were not aware of what it was that they were supporting other than the concept of a new bridge.
23. There is a similar position with the Letters of Support that the Council submitted for the Inquiry’s attention. There were nearly forty letters, including many from official organisations such as the local Police Forces, and one wonders who exactly it was in these various organisations that decided to support this scheme and what they knew about it. Two of the letters of support are from officers of the former Vale Royal Council, even though that Council had submitted an official objection later in July 2008 saying that it was “opposed in the strongest terms to the proposal to introduce road charging for use of the A533 Silver Jubilee Bridge”.
24. Only about one in four of the letters of support even mentions tolling, and one of those – from the Friends of Liverpool Airport – says that to “impose tolls on both the existing and new crossings at Runcorn would .. impose an unfair tax and major disincentive to economic activity on those wishing to access and carry out business with Liverpool and the surrounding areas.” And in case I have not made it clear, these remarks come from an organisation that the Council says supports them.
25. Another supporter that the Council emphasised during the Inquiry was Stobarts. Given that despite the congestion they have expanded their operations here it is not surprising that they would like a new bridge. What is surprising is the implication that Stobarts supports tolls as most hauliers don’t like tolls, and Stobarts was reported in December as asking the Government to in effect exempt hauliers from the M6 Toll charge to encourage hauliers to use that road.
26. At the evening session of the Inquiry in Runcorn Town Hall, the Inspector asked if anyone there supported the Council. Apart from some Halton councillors only one person said he was a supporter. He was a politician from outside Halton. Though on the home page of his website he has a picture of him holding up a “No Tolls” banner. So it appears that his support, like many others, is not for this scheme, but for a bridge without tolls.

27. So much for the supposed supporters, but if I can quickly mention that we were not quite the only ones to complain about tolling. Many of the Runcorn residents who were mainly objecting because of the construction disturbance and the increased traffic also said that “I don’t agree with tolling”. Amongst organisations who objected to the tolling were Halton Businesses Against Tolls and the Forum for Private Business, a national organisation which by chance is based in Cheshire. Various other submissions to the Inquiry also mentioned the adverse impact of tolls, including one objector who appeared at the Inquiry and who last week was awarded an OBE – though not for opposing tolls!

### **LESS TRAFFIC**

28. One of the points that I have been trying to make at this Inquiry is that when the new bridge opens, the result of tolling is that there will actually be LESS traffic overall crossing the river than there is now with only one bridge. This is so counter intuitive that few people may have understood this point. After all why would anyone want to spend millions building a new bridge if there will be less traffic as a result?
29. One day at the Inquiry there were two Halton Borough councillors in the audience and they were incredulous when during a break I said that initially there would be less traffic crossing the river than there is now. When I subsequently raised this point in the Inquiry I was referred to a graph on page 110 of a report that had gone to all Halton councillors in September 2008. I was almost dumbstruck that this graph could seriously be given as evidence that the councillors knew that traffic would fall. One of the Alliance’s witnesses – a Professor of Planning - was also referred to this graph – and he read it as meaning the opposite of what the Council said it was supposed to illustrate.
30. Not only will the cross river traffic initially fall below present levels, in May the Council issued a press release saying that “Forecasts show that the impact of tolls on future traffic levels will result in up to 40,000 fewer trips crossing the river between the Mersey Tunnels and M6, on an average working day in 2030, compared with the toll-free option.” So the Council are in effect admitting that there will be a toll barrier discouraging people from crossing what will be a new border – running from Liverpool towards the M6 and on the way cutting through the middle of Halton.
31. It was said during the Inquiry that some people might consider that reducing traffic was a good thing. I suggest that the residents of Warrington and other places might not agree as they will suffer from increased congestion as car and lorry drivers avoid the tolls. But whatever your views on that, who would build a new bridge to reduce traffic and then claim that it was going to benefit the economy?

## **THE ECONOMY**

32. The Council have made various claims about how this scheme will boost the economy, including the assertion that it will “mean an estimated 4,640 new jobs”. They have supported this claim with obscure analyses, though the figures vary according to where you look. Part of the evidence that we submitted was an earlier economic analysis which showed that a new untolled bridge would mean 3,350 extra jobs. That’s 4,600 jobs created by a tolled bridge and only 3,300 created by a free bridge. Who would have thought that tolling would mean over 1,000 more jobs than an untolled crossings? These extra jobs can’t all be toll collectors! Common-sense and research elsewhere indicates that this scheme will damage and not help the economy.
33. There is also vagueness as to where these 4,640 new jobs will be. Much of the Council evidence referred to jobs in the “Regeneration Area”. When we queried where this was, it turned out not to be an area at all. It is instead a series of pockets of deprivation spread over the whole Liverpool region. Based on the Council evidence it seems that possibly only about 5 % of this area is in Halton. So even if you believed that there were any extra jobs, it seems that few of them will be in Halton and even less in Runcorn that will suffer most of the adverse effects of the new bridge.
34. The Council also pointed out that Halton is the 77<sup>th</sup> worst out of 354 local authorities on the Indices of Social Deprivation. We pointed out the authorities at each end of the Mersey Tunnels (that’s Liverpool and the Wirral) are the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> worst on the Employment indicator – not much of an advert for the benefits of charging a toll to cross the river .

## **FINANCE**

35. Though the Council had 19 expert witnesses giving evidence to this Inquiry there was not one accountant. But then it seems that the Council didn’t need an accountant as there were almost no financial figures in the Council’s evidence. The Council said that this was because the figures were confidential. This means that people are being asked to support something without being told what the price ticket is. The tolls for cars under the proposed Orders could be up to £5 for a return trip, and for the biggest vehicles could be up to £20 for a return trip. Bridge users are told not to worry about this because the Council hopes that the tolls will be less and hopes that there will also be discounts for locals and for frequent users. Derek Twigg even went so far as to repeat the Council’s hope that locals would “travel toll free”.
36. The reality is that under Private Finance, it is the private operator which will control both the new bridge and the existing bridge and the level of tolls will largely depend on what can be agreed with them. Any discounts can of course only be at the expense of having higher tolls for everyone else. There is also doubt as to whether discounts for locals are legal – a question that we raised with the Department for Transport, but have got no reply.

37. The use of Private Finance is a very expensive way of paying for a public asset, and we submitted evidence to that effect from Professor Jean Shaoul and Dr Anne Stafford who are international experts on Private Finance, particularly when used for road or hospital schemes.
38. One feature of these privately financed toll schemes is that there may be secret “funnelling clauses” to ensure traffic uses the toll road by nudging drivers on to the tolled route and doing nothing to alleviate congestion on alternative routes.
39. Another feature of Private Finance is that the estimated comparative costs of providing schemes through conventional public finance rockets in an attempt to make Private Finance seem the better option. In January 2004 the official estimated cost for an untolled bridge was £202 million but by November of the same year, when a scheme for a tolled privately financed bridge was submitted to the Government, the councillors were told that the cost of an untolled bridge was now £750 million. A 375% increase in one year.
40. The Council have said that the Government are helping with the cost. But the only cash in hand will be for buying land. An amount that is higher than it might be because they want a massive amount of space for a tolls plaza and approaches. The only other help is a provisional amount of what is called a “PFI credit” to be paid to the Council over 30 years. But that sum may be more than offset by VAT. As it will be a private bridge there should under EU law be VAT payable, a fact that the Department for Transport have reluctantly confirmed to us. But it seems that the Council are hoping to arrange it so that the bridge is private for the purpose of it being classed as a Private Finance scheme, but is public for VAT purposes. It remains to be seen whether the Council can do this, and if they do whether Government and EU officials will continue to agree this arrangement over the 30 years of the tolls concession.
41. There is in any case an even more fundamental problem, because the sources of Private Finance have almost dried up. This particularly applies to toll schemes, and we have pointed to recent examples of these schemes failing abroad. The Council response included pointing to a recent Private Finance deal for the widening of the M25. But that is a scheme which carries no demand risk because the borrower is the Government who will repay the finance out of taxes and not a private firm who’s finances will depend on risky tolls income. I said “private finance” but as everyone knows the banking system is now dependent upon support from the Government – the same one that says that it has no money available to pay for a bridge here.

### **THE “BENEFITS”**

42. The Council have produced various figures that they claim show that drivers will receive a net benefit even though they have to pay a toll because they will save time. I don’t agree with the value that the Council has put on time saved and it seems that most drivers will not agree that tolls are a price worth paying. The Leader of the Council in effect proved this for us on the opening day of this Inquiry, when on the BBC he said that – “The two bridges will be so close together that to have one bridge free and the other bridge charged would be a waste of money as

people would not use the new bridge and everyone would try and trundle across the present Silver Jubilee bridge.” The Chief Executive was asked about this and he appeared to agree.

43. So it seems to be recognised that given a choice the vast majority of drivers would prefer not to pay a toll but put up with the congestion if that is the only choice that is given them. So the Council and the Government who are lurking in the background have decided that drivers will not be given any choice. Though if this terrible scheme goes ahead many of them will make a choice anyway – individuals and businesses may decide to avoid this area altogether.

### **THE DOMINO EFFECT & THE CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY**

44. The evidence that was given by Dave Loudon from the Mersey Tunnels Users Association included the fact that tolled crossings carry a lot less traffic than untolled ones. He pointed out that despite their vast toll plazas, the eight lanes of the Mersey Tunnels were only able to handle about the same daily traffic as the four lanes of the existing Runcorn – Widnes bridge. That is, each lane of the Mersey Tunnels carries only about 50% of what each lane of the existing Runcorn – Widnes bridge carries. This is partly due to tolls deterring off peak traffic, but mainly because tolling reduces the capacity. The Council appeared to admit this in their rebuttal to us where they said that “the capacity of the tunnels is not governed by the lane capacity of each bore, but by the capacity of the toll booths.” Though the Council later seemed to deny that these words meant what they appeared to say.
45. This effect of tolling on capacity changes a scheme which originally started off with the purpose of improving things to instead making it worse. And the crucial bit is not the building or tolling of a new bridge, but the tolling of the existing bridge.
46. We have referred to this on our web site as a Domino effect. I won’t go through all of it, but the crucial point is that the existing bridge was of course never designed for tolling. It does not have a toll plaza, there are numerous slip roads on and off the bridge approaches and there is not sufficient width as you get nearer to the bridge to erect enough toll booths. The existing bridge was designed to carry traffic as efficiently as possible, not to stop it at a barrier and then not raise the barrier till the driver has handed over some cash. Tolling will drastically reduce the capacity of the existing bridge, not down to 50% as with the Mersey Tunnels but possibly down to 25% or less because there is no room for a tolls plaza.
47. The knock on effect of this is that the Council intend that 80% of the vehicles that currently use the existing bridge will instead be routed over the new bridge and most of that will then go down the Central Expressway through the heart of the new town. The Central Expressway and the Weston Link will be changed to try to cope with the weight of traffic.
48. The Council gave various reasons for this routing, but in my view the real reason is that tolling the existing bridge slashes its capacity so traffic will be forced to use the new bridge and thus the Central Expressway.

49. Many Runcorn residents are concerned that this routing of traffic down the Central Expressway and the changes to existing roads will have various adverse traffic effects including noise and vehicle emissions and accidents. This scheme is already causing a blight and adding to the difficulties of those who want to sell homes. Because of the concerns of residents, the Inspectors earlier this week made a site visit to the area around the Central Expressway.
50. During the Inquiry the Council was asked whether it was correct that the increased traffic was to be routed through the area that has the lowest socio-economic rating in Halton. The answer was yes, and many residents have compared their treatment with those living near Alderley Edge in Cheshire who were extensively consulted over a bypass that is to be built to take traffic away from their village and will of course not be tolled.
51. The routing of traffic down the Central Expressway is a particularly perverse result of the tolling of the existing bridge as at least half of the traffic crossing over from Widnes does not want to go to the new town, it is heading for the M56. It would prefer to use the Weston Point Expressway which is on the periphery of the main residential areas, but it will instead be routed through a relatively deprived area which has higher than average rates of ill health. This is a LOSE, LOSE, situation for bridge users and the residents of Runcorn.
52. Residents will also suffer from major disruption during the construction of the bridge as the construction is bound to generate a lot of traffic carrying materials to and waste from the site. There will also be noise and dust including from land that many residents believe is contaminated. According to the Council figures this upheaval will last about 3 years and there will be about 1,200 people employed at any one time – I wonder how many of these builders will be Halton residents? This upheaval may have been worthwhile in other circumstances, but in this case it will just add to the losses that the residents will face.

### **ALTERNATIVES**

53. Sometimes opponents to a scheme are asked what they would do instead. In my view this scheme is so bad that doing nothing is a real and better option. But apart from nothing there are various things that could and should be done. Some alternatives involve the building of a new bridge and some don't.
54. One alternative that some opponents of the scheme have suggested is putting a small toll on the existing bridge. That would certainly reduce the number of vehicles trying to cross, but for the reasons that I have already explained, it would very substantially reduce the capacity of the existing bridge and would therefore increase and not reduce congestion.
55. Another alternative that doesn't involve building a new bridge is the obvious solution of reducing or removing tolls from the Mersey Tunnels. That would remove traffic from the existing bridge. The Council recognised this back in 2001 when they decided to in effect support increased Tunnel tolls as otherwise the case for a new bridge "could be seriously jeopardised".

56. The authorities could also stop encouraging traffic heading for Liverpool Airport from using the existing bridge. Why are there signs on the motorways encouraging traffic to go through Runcorn? And even more strangely why does Peel Holdings also encourage drivers going to the Airport to go via a bridge which they say is heavily congested and even more importantly is said to be an unreliable route?
57. There are of course many other things that could be done that would at least marginally reduce traffic such as improved and subsidised bus services, but that and other improvements should not be financed by taking billions of pounds from already overtaxed drivers and giving it to a private company. Drivers may decide that they would be better off moving away from this area to one where they are not confronted by toll barriers. And if drivers do so, then who will be liable for the debts to the banks?
58. When road user charges were proposed in Manchester they had a slogan similar to Halton Council's "There is no alternative". In the Manchester case it was "There is no Plan B". Despite this slogan the people in the Manchester area overwhelmingly voted against road tolls. And then Geoff Hoon, the Secretary of State for Transport (or at least he was), went to Manchester on 12<sup>th</sup> May and announced a £1.4 billion package of spending on trams and various roads schemes including a Stockport bypass linking Manchester Airport and the A6. All this after Manchester rejected tolls. Why is it that people in this area will have to pay tolls, while those in Manchester won't? Shouldn't people here be given a vote on this?
59. Given that it is considered that a new bridge is still needed, in our view this mammoth bridge with six lanes, a toll plaza and provision for trams should be scaled down to four lanes with no trams and of course no tolls plaza.
60. Whatever is done with a new bridge, it is imperative that the existing bridge be left as four lanes and not be tolled. That would have two benefits. First of all it is obvious that two four lane bridges gives a more robust and flexible network than having a two lane bridge paired with a six lane bridge. Secondly leaving the existing bridge as it is would substantially reduce the traffic that would go along the Central Expressway, and in particular it would remove most of the through traffic including HGVs and those carrying hazardous cargoes.

## **CLOSE**

61. I am not optimistic about the results of this Inquiry. The only occasion that I am aware of when an Inspector made a recommendation against tolls was back in 1985 when there was an Inquiry into a proposed increase in Forth bridge tolls. Amongst those opposing tolls was a certain Doctor Gordon Brown MP. He said that the charging of tolls was "totally indefensible on the grounds of logic, equity and economic rationality". Gordon Brown persuaded the Inspector, but the Inspector's recommendation was overruled by a Tory Minister.
62. At this Inquiry the Council have tried to give the impression that whether this scheme goes ahead is nothing to do with them because as with the Forth bridge, the decision will be made by a Minister after he has received the Inspector's report. But

the Government who are to act as the judges are the real ones behind this scheme. We have one hope however and that is that if enough people become aware of what a terrible scheme this is, then the Government may decide that it will have to go back to the drawing board. In any case I ask that the Inspector recommends to the Minister that this scheme does not go ahead in its present form. The proposed bridge and approaches should be scaled down, the existing bridge should be left with its four lanes and neither bridge should be tolled.

63. In my proof of evidence to the Inquiry I referred to “learned helplessness”. If I can finish by explaining where I first came across this phrase. It was in a news report of a battle to remove tolls in a run down part of New York state. This is part of what the writer said -

*“It is about more than the money that they take out of our shallow pockets.  
It is about more than obliterating a commuter tax that isn't paid by folks in any other upstate city.  
It is about more than making toll barriers disappear.  
It is about fighting back. It is about not lying down and taking it anymore. It is about believing that, yes, things can change around here.  
It is believing that we are not pawns to fate.  
Like a long-stagnant waterfront and a long-obsolete Skyway and a long-vacant downtown, the two Niagara Thruway toll barriers at city's edge are symbols.  
They stand for our sheep-like willingness to accept the unacceptable, to roll over and take it, to believe that we can't change anything - so why bother trying?  
Psychologists have a name for it: Learned helplessness. Through decades of decline and disappointment, we have embraced a sense of infant-like impotence.  
The only way to kill it is by fighting back. By winning.”*

64. Thank you all for listening.