

Disclaimer: This transcript was produced using AI and has been lightly edited.

Esty Dinur

And hello, welcome to A Public Affair. I am Esty Dinur. First of all, thank you to the listeners who donated after the CPB money was taken away from us. As we find out, you helped us cover 40 percent of the grant along with nearly 30,000 that we are cutting in expenses that were previously required by the CPB. We are now at 65 percent of the money that was taken away from us. So thank you so very much. Really appreciated.

Today our show is about a new book and film, *The Invisible Doctrine, The Secret History of Neoliberalism*. My guest is Peter Hutchison. He's an award-winning filmmaker, bestselling author, educator and activist, director and producer of over a dozen feature-length documentaries. His work has focused primarily on issues in the social and economic justice space. His films include: *Requiem for the American Dream*, *The Principles of Concentration of Wealth and Power* with Noam Chomsky, *The Invisible Doctrine*, *The Secret History of Neoliberalism* with George Monbiot.

His work in understanding the seeds of hate and violent extremism have resulted in a pair of critically acclaimed films: *The Cure for Hate*, *Bearing Witness to Auschwitz* and *Healing from Hate, Battle for the Soul of a Nation*.

In addition to developing an ongoing nationwide educational and impact campaign supported by the Centre for Prevention Programs and Partnerships. His books include, of course, *The Invisible Doctrine*, as well as *Requiem for the American Dream* with Noam Chomsky. He's a sought-after commentator on issues of hate, racism and masculinity.

And hello to you, Peter. Thank you so much for joining us today.

Peter Hutchinson

Hello from Brooklyn. Thank you for having me. And congratulations on your station, you know, clawing back some of that money that got taken away.

Esty Dinur

Yes, thank you. We're actually celebrating our 50th anniversary, which is in December, but, you know, we're already celebrating it. Yeah, it's thanks to our listeners that we continue doing it. So, yes, thank you, Peter.

I imagine the BBC News as well as my theme there, no change without struggle, no one in power ain't giving up nothing, all sounded familiar, eh?

Peter Hutchinson

Oh, yeah. Yeah. I think that's got to be all of our mantras right now.

Esty Dinur

Yeah. So I want to say I watched the movie. I watched the long version, the two versions. And just to say it's possibly the best looking or the best illustrated long interview that I've ever seen. It's basically George Monbiot sitting and talking, but then there is so much visual wealth around it. So good job on that.

Peter Hutchinson

Oh, thanks. Yeah, we pack a lot into that 75 minutes. George and I collaborated on what ultimately is a script. It may seem like an interview, but, you know, George and I structured, I think, what we felt was the most accessible and concise way to really help people understand and wrap their heads around the history of neoliberalism, its inception, its propagation, where it's come from, how it's come to control our lives. And we see that as an essential starting point in how to look for solutions to find sort of a more equitable society.

Esty Dinur

Yeah. So just to stay for another moment with the visual part, you say at the beginning of the film that it's, you know, you write that it's an attempt to deploy technology against capitalism. A lot of what you did, you did with the help of AI. Do you want to talk about that aspect of it?

Peter Hutchinson

Yeah. You know, we've sort of dealt with a fair amount of criticism and critique around our use of AI, and I think there's all kinds of, I think, very legitimate concerns around emerging technologies like AI. I think the ones that most commonly get pointed to are the potential loss of jobs, potential impact on the environment, the impact on intellectual property. And these were all things that we thought very deeply about. And in fact, this became such a large conversation around the film that we issued a pretty full-throated AI statement that you can find on our website, theinvisibledoctrine.com, which really goes into all of these different aspects.

But I think we used a very early AI generation. We made the film in, well, we're doing a lot of this work in 2023. And what we really thought that the aesthetic fit the film and created the tone that we wanted to create in terms of telling the story of neoliberalism and its impact upon all of us. Some of the aesthetic has been criticized as being sort of ugly and eerie and soulless. And that's precisely the aesthetic that we were looking for.

I think there's this thing that happens, particularly with the early AI generators, where it can't quite do people, can't do hands, can't do faces. There's too many fingers, like faces are partially melting. And I think we really felt that it created this eerie sort of aesthetic environment that I guess if it makes people feel uncomfortable, that's precisely what our intent was. It's really kind of hammer home this idea of this disconnected, atomized place that we've all found ourselves as a result of neoliberalism.

Esty Dinur

Yeah, yeah. I thought that the melting faces were intentional because it did make so much sense. But let's go to the content because we really don't have enough time to talk about everything that you put in there. But let me tell you that besides it being our 50th anniversary, I will personally be celebrating my 30th anniversary on the air in November. And I have asked through the years so many of my guests to define what neoliberalism is. And I've heard many different responses. But I think you and George are correct that we really don't understand what neoliberalism is. Talk about that, please.

Peter Hutchinson

Wow, you really put me on the spot here. It's interesting, right? I feel like it took us 75 minutes in the film and the better part of a book to unpack all that we wanted to say about neoliberalism, what it is and its impact on our lives. But I think, you know, in short, I see neoliberalism as capitalism on steroids. It comes out of this intent to roll back all of the gains that were made during the New Deal era. So its focus naturally is going to be on shifting the tax cut base back to, tax code back to, you know, benefiting the rich more than the rest of us. It has to do with crushing trade unions and corroding that power. It has to do with deregulation and it has to do with privatization.

And I think if a lot of people think of Reaganism and the Thatcher era as sort of being the sort of, I don't want to say it wasn't the height of neoliberalism, but I think it's when we first saw it in its sort of full form. And I think if you look at it through that lens of what it is that efforts being made to claw back all of those gains from the New Deal era, I think for me that encapsulates largely what neoliberalism is, which is basically reducing the size of government and reducing the power of citizens and expanding. The only thing that's liberal about neoliberalism is the freedom that it gives to corporations to operate more freely.

Esty Dinur

Yeah. And you also say that we don't recognize how all the crises that we are facing, that they all come from the same place. Can you distill that for us?

Peter Hutchinson

Well, I think a great example is when you look at the economic crisis of 2008. It was driven by neoliberal principles. It was driven by a deregulated financial market. And so we find ourselves with all of these incredibly complex subprime loans that led to a meltdown of our financial system that ended up just decimating these homeowners who, I mean, millions and millions of people lost their homes during that economic crisis. And what was the result? What was the government solution? Governments came in, they bailed out the banks. They didn't bail out the citizens, right? They didn't bail out these people who had lost their homes as a result of these policies, which were largely driven by these neoliberal principles. And I think for me, that's a great kind of example that encapsulates, I think, the question that you're asking.

Esty Dinur

Yeah. And you talk about it in the film, how neoliberalism creates crises. And when these crises happen, neoliberalism jumps in, or, you know, the people who are practicing it, jumps in and makes more money out of the crisis itself and creates yet another crisis. So is that more or less correct?

Peter Hutchinson

Yeah, I think we can look at this through a lot of different lenses. I mean, there are really, you know, there are very specific examples of this, like, you know, the Pinochet government in Chile. That's a very famous example of how neoliberalism, neoliberal policies were imposed in the wake of a crisis. Similar things happened in New Orleans in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, particularly with the education system, schooling system down there.

But, you know, I also think we see it today in all kinds of subtle ways, right? If neoliberal policies, if they chip away at a functioning society, if they chip away and degrade the institutions that are built to serve us as citizens, and then we can then point to them as no longer being ineffective, because either, you know, someone takes a hatchet to them from the inside and, you know, in the name of the deconstruction of the administrative state, or just defunds them, it's very easy to convince citizens that, hey, clearly these things don't work. Well, naturally, they're not going to work if you are firing 80% of an institution's staff or you are, you know, stripping them of funds, much like what you guys have struggled with at your radio station, right? It's easy to point to it and say, hey, these institutions don't work. We need to get rid of them and we need to outsource and we need to privatize these. We need to hand these things over to people who can deal with them competently.

And this is something that we're seeing time and time again, right? It doesn't matter whether it's the prison industrial system. You know, we've seen this with NASA and the space industry and SpaceX. And, you know, I just read this article today about how SpaceX has never paid a penny in taxes, yet gets billions and billions of dollars from the government every year, right?

Esty Dinur

Which is your and my money.

Peter Hutchinson

That's right. To clarify, the government is not an institute that stands on its own, right? That's correct. That's correct. And that's, you know, those are expenditures, governmental expenditures. We have very little say in where they go, right? We have to pay taxes, but we don't really get a say in how that money is spent broadly.

Esty Dinur

Yeah. And so you described neoliberalism as capitalism on steroids. And now we have neoliberalism on steroids and Trump, who is, I mean, it's just, many times it feels just

incomprehensible that the level of destruction that he's creating. One example is actually physically destroying two satellites that predict or that follow climate change and also very helpful for people like farmers. But if I understand correctly, they actually destroyed their ability to do what they're supposed to do. How to explain something like that?

Peter Hutchinson

Well, it's interesting. Some people have asked George and I when we've been at, you know, post-screening Q&As or book signings, what have you seen differently in the Trump administration? You know, is Trump in fact a neoliberal? Or as some people contend, are we seeing the end of neoliberalism? And I described Trump very much as you just did, that Trump is, you know, you talk about neoliberalism as being capitalism on steroids. Trump is neoliberalism on steroids.

And when, I mean, the wholesale just deconstruction of the administrative state that Bannon talks about and flooding the zone and creating chaos that then becomes opportunity, as we were discussing before, right? I mean, I've never seen deregulation happen at the pace that it's happening now, whether it has to do with the environment, whether it has to do with, you know, corporate regulation. I've never seen privatization happen at the pace it's happening right now. And it's shocking. It's shocking. Not to mention the toll that it is taking on citizens' rights, right? Our right to free speech, even our right to assemble in some cases.

And so it's, you know, I think I've lost track of your original question, but it does all fit together quite conveniently.

Esty Dinur

Yeah, except I, okay, so they destroy everything, which is what Trump is doing right now. To what end? What does it give him and the rest of the few billionaires and people who own everything? And okay, so they're going to own even more because they're going to get what, you know, the little bit that is left for us. But then what? I mean, can they live on a totally destroyed planet? What are we looking at? I just don't understand it.

Peter Hutchinson

Well, I think things operate on two levels here. One is I don't think that some of the people you're referring to necessarily care about the future of the planet. I think, you know, they're far more concerned with their own short-term benefit. They're probably well aware that they're not going to be around, you know, to witness, you know, the complete destruction of the planet. I mean, and this has always been the, you know, the issue with the corporate imperative of the bottom line, right? What's important? Your next quarter earnings are what's important, right? Not what happens five years from now. You know, you have a responsibility to the shareholders, and the only thing that matters is growth and what you see in your next, you know, your next quarter earnings. The other piece of this is that the more the administrative state can be chipped away at, the more that we see our government as being ineffective in not meeting our needs or giving us what we

need, the more we're able to – the more the greater the possibility exists that we will resort to other sorts of control and authority. The more we veer towards authoritarian control, the more we veer towards fascism because people start to look for simple solutions to really, really complicated issues.

And if our government's not serving us, which I think a lot of Americans would argue that's the case right now, then it's very easy to argue for another form of authoritarian control, right? And we've seen this – I mean, we've seen this – I mean, you know, this is an aspect of history that we've seen happen time and time again. I don't need to go into a long explanation of drawing parallels between the rise of the Third Reich in the 30s and what's been happening in Western democracies this past five or 10 years. But the parallels are stunning and really unsettling. Yeah.

Esty Dinur

So let's get back to – well, actually, let me reintroduce you first. My guest is Peter Hutchinson. He's a co-author of the book, *The Invisible Doctrine, The Secret History of Neoliberalism*. He's also co-director of the film with the same title. You are welcome to join the conversation at 608-256-2001 or online.

So going back to how it started – and let's just do it very briefly, but how it started, how it developed, neoliberalism, and why is it that we still don't know what the term means? That is intentional, you say.

Peter Hutchinson

Yes, that is George and my contention. I mean, neoliberalism was really developed by two European economic philosophers, Frederick Hayek and Ludwig von Mises. And they were exiles from Europe in the 30s, and they had seen the dangers and the perils of collectivism on both ends of the spectrum. And they were very wary of collectivism in the form of totalitarianism or Nazism on one end or communism on the other end. And their contention was that too much state control in general is a really bad thing, right? Because they had witnessed this as Europeans.

And so they were working in the States largely – their work wasn't getting a tremendous amount of attention. In a lot of respects, it was seen as being very, very out of step with the times. But what happened is a group of business elites saw this as an opportunity to begin to claw back what would become a lot of what they saw as the losses that they had suffered as a result of the New Deal. And that this was a philosophy that could justify rolling back these regulations, rolling back the power of trade unions. And when capitalism sort of really hit the skids in the 70s, and New York City, for instance, was on the verge of bankruptcy, people were looking for – they were looking for a new way to look at economics. And it had been – neoliberalism – it had been supported by Neoliberalism, it had been supported through the creation of think tanks, through the creation of different economic departments around the United States. It had been supported by some sort of very rich philanthropists who wanted to see this doctrine proliferate. And by the time we

had this really difficult economic time in the 70s United States, that was this opportunity to step in with something that had been formulated and was in a position to really be embraced by a lot of politicians and policymakers.

[CALLER]

I just don't understand how we allow this to happen when laws, the Constitution, is all about we the people. I don't see anything in there about corporations or bribes or big money. Why do we allow this?

Esty Dinur

That's the question, isn't it?

Peter Hutchinson

That is the question. How many hours do we have to tackle this one?

Well, I think, you know, Esty brought this up before. I think there's a reason that these think tanks, for instance, in the United States, operate largely in obscurity. It's for the very reason that you note. These policies aren't being made, you know, by, you know, you and I, we're not voting on these policies. I mean, a lot of people will argue that the doctrine of neoliberalism was really developed in these think tanks, in these academic institutions, behind closed doors, so that you and I aren't included in that process.

And I think the anonymity and the obscurity around neoliberalism, which is, we mentioned this in the film at a certain point in time, the term neoliberalism sort of disappeared. Even the people who were at the forefront of creating this new economic theory thought it more beneficial to not use the word neoliberalism. And so that these policies could be adapted in ways that we really wouldn't understand where they were coming from. And we really wouldn't understand ultimately what the aim was.

Esty Dinur

And you also say, and I think that that's very important, is that part of the doctrine is to make us disunited. And that has been very successful as we see nowadays. There's more loneliness and mental health crises and the inability to get together and work together. And, you know, as myself, as also an activist, not just a journalist, I see it in the work of activism, for one thing.

So we see neoliberalism in its glory in things like Project 2025, right? They have worked on this for 50 years. They have been able to work together and come up with this thousand page document, which is all about how to destroy everything. The left doesn't have these things. So, of course, the left never had enough money to have these think tanks and that we have think tanks. But, you know, there's not this sustained millions and millions and millions of dollars that go to people who can think about these things.

But so we don't have we we're not ready. These things happen to us. And we're like, oh, you know, we have to respond to this. We have to respond to that. We have to respond to everything. You know, there's a million things that come at us and we don't know. We're not prepared for them.

So this is one thing I see. And another thing that I see is that when we try to work together, often we're just not able to because, you know, and I'm sure that's true for the right, too. Egos come into play, childhood traumas, you know, and of course we also know that it's very likely that some of it is intentional and is done by people who have infiltrated organizations specifically to cause this kind of trouble so that we won't be able to be effective. Okay, so that's my speech. What do you have to say to that?

Peter Hutchinson

I think you are 100% on point there, and I think that these are all issues that we tackle in the book and the film as well. We argue that, you know, what capitalism does in large part is it teaches us that success, individualism, competition, it's really the key to, it's the imperative, right? That's what we should all focus on, right? And that's what makes our society great, right? And that success trickles down to everybody else.

I think what George and I argue is that, well, maybe that's something we need to reconsider, right? I mean, what happens with competition and individualism is that we end up becoming very, very alienated from one another, right? We lose a sense of community if we're constantly seeing one another as being someone we're in competition with and we're always out for ourselves, you know, what happens to community? What happens to our sense of belonging?

And so we argue for what we call a new politics of belonging, which looks at a lot of different ways to build community, right? Like we may not have control over these larger, you know, systemic issues that, a systemic structure that's largely driven by oligarchs and billionaires. We don't have that influence on our political system, but we can engage in community and we can make our communities whatever we want them to be, right? You know, it comes back to this issue of all politics being local.

And, you know, we explore all of these different ways that you can invest in community that give you a sense of agency, that gives you a sense of belonging, because all of these, everything from participatory budgeting and democracy to a re-envisioned understanding of what the commons is and how we can take advantage of that.

And, you know, the listener called in and, you know, I can only, you know, I feel that sense of disempowerment. I think so many of us do. And one of the things that George and I talk about is how can we engage in politics and in the democratic process on a more consistent basis? You know, going and voting every two or four years for a candidate in, you know, our current form of representative democracy and assuming and then going

back home for two years and assuming that everything's going to work out just fine. Clearly that's not working for all of us.

And so a lot of these different initiatives and programs and proposals that we explore at the end of the book and at the end of the film are geared towards getting people to think differently about those things.

Esty Dinur

Yeah, and I want to, of course, get back to it because that's, you know, after you reveal what you reveal, that is your message. But before that, we got an anonymous caller who says, this country was founded on capitalism and he's tired of people attacking capitalism. So thank you for listening, even though you're tired of people like Peter and I.

Peter, what do you have to say?

Peter Hutchinson

Well, I think a lot of people argue where capitalism sort of starts as a system. But I think if you want to hearken back to the founding fathers, that's fine. I think that there were some sound representative democracy forms of government that are, they're aspirational. I think they're important, but you also have to take into consideration that that document wasn't written for everyone. That document was written for the landed gentry. It was written for land-owning white males who had the power of the vote. You have to remember that women didn't have a vote, minorities didn't have a vote, and you weren't even empowered as a white man unless you were a person of means, unless you owned land. So it's arguable that, sure, I think you have to question how fair or how balanced or how democratic that initial form of what the caller, anonymous caller, sees as capitalism, what that truly represents.

Esty Dinur

Yeah, whoever you are, caller, I highly recommend that you get the book and read it or find... Where is the film available, Peter?

Peter Hutchinson

Right now, the film is available for streaming on all major streaming platforms with the exception of Amazon, where it was banned, which we can only assume is a result of our treatment of Bezos and Amazon and other oligarchs in our discussion of neoliberalism. Yeah, so again, find the film if you want to spend just 75 minutes or better yet, even get the book because it has more details and read it and see what you think because it all affects you too.

Esty Dinur

I have news for you, especially now as we'll see in what you guys, Peter, call the rule of the clowns or something like that. What do you call it? Well, there is a chapter in the book

and the film called *Revenge of the Killer Clowns*. *Revenge of the Killer Clowns*. Talk about that. We talked about it somewhat, but go deeper.

Peter Hutchinson

Well, I think in the simplest terms, this is another aspect of flooding the zone and creating an ensuing chaos as a result, right? That we used to think of politicians, I think, and world leaders as being, and this is also what corporations want, right? They wanted steady, consistent, reliable stewardship, right? They wanted a government and an economy where they could anticipate what regulations were going to be. They want a steady ship. They wanted to be able to look forward, be able to anticipate earnings. They needed to know what regulations were going to be, which is why now we see all this chaos around when every day there's a new tariff initiative. We watch the market zigzag and go up and down, right? Traditionally, corporations in the business class wanted reliable technocratic leadership.

What we're seeing increasingly is this, and we refer to them as the killer clowns, is these cult of personality, sort of charismatic, wildly unpredictable characters who create enough distraction that it's very difficult for us to see what the intention is and what's going on behind all of the distraction. I experience this every single day. It's really difficult to decide what you need to be focusing on and what is just noise. The signal and the noise have been much, much, much more difficult to track. I think that that's the intent. The intent is if there's enough chaos, if we are distracted by, I don't know, whatever crazy thing Trump might have to say today or this week, it's going to take our eye off of what's really happening behind the scenes.

And you mentioned Project 2025 before, which is crucial, crucial to understanding like the role of the Heritage Foundation in the neoliberal movement. And of course, the Koch brothers, who are one of the richest families in the entire United States. They played a huge role in bankrolling the Heritage Foundation as well as most people aren't entirely aware of this, but they're also responsible for setting up the Tea Party movement.

And in the book, we talk about this mandate for leadership that the Heritage Foundation basically handed over to Reagan during his first term. And that's what it's called. It's an actual document that is an actual document with over 2,000 policy proposals handed over to Reagan. Reagan then passed it on to every member of his cabinet administration. And they say by the end of the first term, 60% of those policy initiatives were installed.

Right. Now, I've heard very similar numbers in terms of Project 2025, which we haven't really heard a lot about since Trump got into office. And, you know, it was really interesting to me to see the Democratic Party try and make a big deal about Project 2025, particularly during the convention. I think there's a real effort to try and educate people about what Project 2025 was and what the implications would be. Clearly, it didn't stick. And I would argue that that largely has to do with the fact that people generally don't vote on policy. They vote on personality. They vote on emotions.

But I heard a number, a statistic from someone who works inside Washington that already 47% of those policies from Project 2025 have already been implemented or are in the process of being implemented. Right. And a lot of those things have to do with, you know, stripping everything from stripping a lot of these, you know, the initiatives to disempowering immigrants to building the prison industrial system out so that we can detain the kind of people that, you know, they're all aimed at different forms of social control, I guess is a better way of saying it.

Esty Dinur

Yeah. So we have only about 10 minutes or a little less than that, but we do have a caller who dropped, but his question is good. So I want to ask you about it, but I also want to leave time for that new story, for that what we can do to change things. So let's just be mindful of time.

[CALLER] was asking about the trajectory of neoliberalism from the Austrian School of Economics to the University of Chicago. And I think, you know, again, that's an interesting part of history.

Peter Hutchinson

Yes. And both Hayek and von Mises, they were Austrian exiles after World War I. And both, and I think this is a really fascinating piece of, you know, University of Chicago is, you know, it's renowned for its economics department, but very few people understand that, you know, that's precisely where intellectuals like Hayek and von Mises were underwritten by business interests to go and teach neoliberal philosophy. Their salaries were underwritten by think tanks and wealthy business elites. The entire, my understanding is that that entire department, the School of Economics at University of Chicago was underwritten by business elites.

And this didn't just happen in Chicago. It happened, you know, in several other schools as well, both in the UK and in the United States. So there is this tradition of, you know, it wasn't that University of Chicago saw these sort of obscure Austrian intellectuals and were like, oh, well, this will be really interesting to include in our faculty, right? It's like, no, the University of Chicago was created and underwritten and paid for by the very people who wanted to proliferate these ideas. And that's very crucial. This is where the power of the purse comes in. This is like a place where these think tanks have a huge amount of influence.

Esty Dinur

Yeah. And I just, I remember after Gorbachev and the fall of what was the Soviet Union, professors from the University of Chicago just came in by the dozens, I think, to Russia and, you know, changed everything. And I was there soon after the fall of the Soviet Union and I could see the results of what happened. We don't have time to talk about that, but I also wish I had time to tell you about an argument I had or discussion, debate I had with a professor of economics from the University of Chicago and how, I don't know, I

suppose because I've been doing it for so long, I could hear how trained he was in diverting and not answering and changing the topic. And, you know, I didn't let him do that, but eventually I just had to stop it because he wouldn't actually talk to me about what I was trying to talk about. So that was interesting.

Anyway, you're talking about building new narrative. You say, or George says somewhere there, political failure is a failure of imagination, which I think is a very, very interesting and very important concept. And I think that we have been under this attack of neoliberalism for so long and now it is at its apex or maybe not even that it's hard to imagine a good world, you know, a world of collaboration and mutual support and working with our mother earth and nature and understanding the connections between nature and us and how we can't live without and so on and so forth.

So talk about that. What is that new narrative? How do we build it and how to start like right now? And we have five minutes, less than five minutes.

Peter Hutchinson

Well, our assertion is that that already exists in many different forms and all we have to do is look at those. You know, there's been a huge amount of research that's come out that's shown that, you know, we are not inherently competitive, that we are one of the most cooperative, adaptive species on the planet. I mean, that's how we've survived, right? We have survived thanks to our ability to be empathetic, thanks to our ability to cooperate with one another. Otherwise, we never would have gotten through the Stone Age, right?

And I think this failure of imagination is crucial and it's one of the things that I really appreciate about reading Yuval Noah Harari, right, is that he reminds us that a lot of these contemporary constructs, they are just constructs, you know, whether you're talking about the stock market, financial systems, money even, they are simply things that we've agreed upon that are real. And they're not real in any tangible sense, you know. They are systems that we've agreed upon as being the systems that we are going to live with and within. And it's within our power to adjust those or rethink them in any way we like.

And so what George and I try and do, and quite frankly, there was only so much time in the film and the book to do so, which is why we're working on a follow-up right now, which will focus purely on these solution-driven positive initiatives. We're looking at everything from... And this is both from when we talk about the politics of belonging and how to empower people and create a greater sense of community, to really remarkable things that are happening within the business sector right now with business stakeholders who are realizing that it's in their best interest to take a look at inequality and belonging and that it actually drives the bottom line.

That when you share company ownership with workers, that you get more... You get workers that are more invested in their work, they're more productive, you can rely on

them more, your company grows faster. And so sharing that ownership and sharing a portion of the wealth of that corporation actually drives the bottom line.

And there's been really incredibly, incredibly fascinating worker-owned cooperatives like the famous Mondragon in Spain, which has existed for over a century now. It's the biggest worker-owned cooperative in the world. It's wildly successful. It operates as a company within the capitalist system, but what it does is that it allows everyone who's part of that cooperative an equal vote in how that cooperative makes business decisions.

They vote on the ratio between... Right now, I believe that the highest earner in that cooperative can only own six times what the lowest earner in that cooperative is, right? Which is very different from what we see in the West in cases where oftentimes that's 400 times, right? But it becomes this question of, well, what is it that we value, right? What do we really value as a society? And what do we need?

Esty Dinur

We're out of time. I just want to make two quick statements: I hope that your new book and film come out before thinking becomes illegal and all of us who still do that are incarcerated or killed. That's my pessimistic side. And I want to end with a statement that you have, again, in the film that we will only endure if we cease to consent.