

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: I'm saying we are now at such a moment where we have strayed away from those guiding principles, and what I'm observing here, the rich cultural artifact and the rich cultural life of the Appalachian region, I believe, has something to give to the world.

That culture and that preservation can be the basis of a kind of a humanness, a kind of a democratic practice, a kind of an inclusiveness that will help close this divide that you're speaking of, between economic development and cultural development and social development, to ensure that the way we organize and structure our society will also make it lead to shared prosperity.

Then I want a society where my artists try to be the best artists they can be, and their artistic projects are rewarded; my cultural makers perform and they go out and they work right through the night. The way I run the hills to build my athletic prowess, they work right through the night to build their cultural products. And when they get out there and they do it, cities pay them to put on performances because it somehow creates this hedonic value and people say, "I want to live in this city because it's a nice cultural feel. I want to be in this space because it's a nice cultural feel."

Dudley Cocke: Welcome on this second day of spring. This is Dudley Cocke, talking to Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson. Fluney, please introduce yourself.

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: Good morning, everyone, but especially my new friends in Appalachia. I'm coming from Lafayette College in Pennsylvania and, most recently, I was in Jamaica working on the economy. I have been at Lafayette College for a number of years, and I focus on economic development issues, but my special focus is on how communities can empower themselves and be agents of their own development and progress.

I'm very, very excited about the opportunity to explore working with residents and citizens of Appalachia. I think it's a special place where people have a deep humanness about their circumstance, about their relationship with each other. I think it's an opportunity for students and faculty like myself to understand this rich humanness and understand how it can contribute to not only civil society being strengthened in the future but also our economic life can be reinvented or remade around some of these core principles of humanness and the development of the latent wealth that exists in many economies with a history of an extractive nature.

[0:03:20.2]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: I'm here with my colleague, Anu Ghai, and we are here to explore whether the opportunity exists to collaborate and partner with institutions, groups and citizens in this region towards the end of their transformation into socially just and inclusive

economies that serve everyone and allow everyone to achieve their promise of pursuing their well-being with dignity.

Dudley Cocke: Welcome. We especially appreciate the international and global perspective that you bring to your work because you've not only worked in the United States but in Honduras and, of course, as you mentioned in Jamaica, the country where you were born.

That global perspective puts me in mind of a question that has come up during your visit. We posed it when we began our conversation as a dilemma, which is: So often here in the United States – maybe perhaps more in the United States than some other places in the world – there seems to be no reconciliation between economic development and cultural development. The two here in the United States seldom are joined, and particularly the relationship between economic development and cultural development seem little understood by policy makers.

I want to back up for just a minute here and frame this issue – at least as I see it. Given your international perspective, I was thinking of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the first statement of the Declaration's preamble, "Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world ..."

I think it's a marvelous statement about a possibility that all people everywhere are created equal. Then it goes on in Article 27 of this same Declaration of our Universal Human Rights to say, "Everyone has the right to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits."

So, everyone has the right to participate in the cultural life of their community. That seems to get at the significance of culture in this equation that we're talking about of economic development along with cultural development.

[0:07:02.0]

Dudley Cocke: Just one other contextual point: I define culture in the widely-accepted way of culture being the intellectual, spiritual, and material and emotional traditions and features of a people. So, intellectual, spiritual, emotional and material traditions and features of a people. Honestly, with that large and encompassing definition of culture, we are talking about the very formation of a peoples' identity.

With that framework in mind, I wanted to ask you some about what causes this disconnect between economic development and cultural development, and what you see as the terms of that disconnection. In cultural development we talk, and you talk, about agency,

empowerment. We talk about first voice, which is agency: people being able to speak for themselves. It is a bottom-up, participatory paradigm.

As an economist, how do we make this bridge between cultural development and economic development so that we get a synergy between the two?

[0:08:39.5]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: Excellent framing, Dudley, and I would like to jump in by saying that it's more than just a synergy between the two. The Declaration you just gave, you need to locate it in the timeframe of which it was given. That timeframe captured the essence of why just a reliance on markets, which looks at only the instrumental value of exchange, could not be and cannot be the basis of economic progress or shared prosperity.

There was a need for us to bring back the human dimension, to bring back people at the center of the process to make economics, which is a science of how do we efficiently allocate resources, be centered around why we organize our resources and economic life. That why it has to do with the larger goals you have spoken of, the goals of not only peoples' sustained well-being, whether it's about their spiritual well-being, whether it's about their cultural well-being. It's about creating the kind of environment that can make them feel like they are living in dignity and living in purpose. That also includes them fully participating in choices and outcomes that affect their everyday life.

[0:10:12.8]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: If we, then, were to try and look at this divide between what we are now in, a very reductionist way of seeing a cultural development or an economic development, that divide comes from when we make decisions in our society and the use of our resources and values be about pricing, having a market price for everything without understanding the value of the things we do.

It is as Eunice would point out that sometimes people understand the price of everything but the value of nothing. We, then, are trying to re-imagine. We are trying to re-understand what it means to create a sustainable economy. This great country and its democracy and its economic life came under threat after World War II when Roosevelt had to, in recognition of this threat, introduce the Economic Bill of Rights, which addresses the importance of people of the economy creating the opportunity for people to live in dignity. The right to be able to provide for your own. The right to enjoy your health, proper healthcare, proper housing, to have a job that gave you dignity.

We can go on and on, but all of those things we now are at a moment again. This is why this conversation is so timely. We are at a moment again where we are seeing economies trying to put a price on everything and not understanding the value of the things that we do.

If we can just interrogate this issue to answer your question and why I'm here, it is because if we just let market values, transaction values, instrumental values be the basis on which we allocate resources or determine valuableness in society, then we understand that does not lead to sustained prosperity. It does not lead to sustained inclusiveness. It does not lead to a kind of a democratic engagement and renewal that allows all stakeholders in society to feel fully dignified and feel as they have a stake in the outcomes of society.

[0:12:59.3]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: They will feel separated, and it is a separation that I think we have to pay special attention to. I am from Jamaica, and I grew up in an extractive economy where it was a post-colonial society. The extractive nature was Bauxite, which is used to make aluminum, and sugar and tobacco. You had the ownership class being on the outside coming in and extracting. It has taken us a long time – 50 years of our own independence – to start appreciating what it is to now have inclusive growth and shared prosperity.

I just spent some time working on the Jamaican economic plan, which the International Monetary Fund has approved of. If you read that plan, you will notice its language speaks over and over and throughout on the importance of shared prosperity, the importance of inclusive development, the importance of democratic dialogue, the importance of making sure that all stakeholders feel dignified and fully engaged in shaping the society. That means that all stakeholders must see the representation of their cultural lives, the representation of their social lives, the representation of their dignified lives being represented in how our economic life is organized. It cannot exclude them; otherwise, it creates instability.

Again, President Roosevelt said it right: Necessitous men are dangerous men. That's why the Economic Bill of Rights was designed to ensure that America's democracy continued to be inclusive rather than narrowly exclusive.

[0:14:47.7]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: By the way, the Appalshop and the role it has played in the whole region that we're here in is a hidden treasure. It is so valuable. It has made this link between economic life and cultural life and peoples' dignity. It is one of those kinds of latent assets that I think what it represents needs to be more broad-based and more infused in how one imagines the recovery, the dignified recovery, of economic life of this region.

What do I mean by that?

Appalshop and Roadside Theater and all of these places, which have been the preservation of cultural life, it has done more than just say, “We are going to preserve your culture.” It has shown how that culture and that preservation can be the basis of a kind of humanness, a kind of democratic practice, a kind of inclusiveness that will help close this divide that you are speaking of between economic development and cultural development and social development to ensure that the way we organize and structure our society will also make it lead to shared prosperity.

I see the work that Appalshop and Roadside Theater and all the organs of it, I see it as being the kind of asset that in exchange, even to markets, will help us close the gap between putting a price on everything and also understanding the value and valuableness of these things that we choose to bring in exchange.

Part of when I come to – whether it is Honduras or Jamaica or New Orleans – I do something that I call “asset mapping.” Asset mapping is important because the easiest way to understand it is that it is the opposite of liability mapping.

[0:16:55.9]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: Too often in these situations where people have been systematically marginalized, we go in and we are very good at mapping what’s wrong with these communities, what are the deficits in these communities. Asset mapping maps what’s right about these communities, what are the things that make them vibrant, what are the things that represent their wealth, what are the things that if they can be bundled and clustered and create new kinds of synergies will create new kinds of values and valuableness to make their lives be enriched?

We do asset mapping, and then we try to understand how to these assets – many of them latent and yet to be transformed into their full economic value. But because these are localized, because these are from the ground-up, it allows for a kind of organic development and a development that in economic terms is competitively advantaged because of its localness. It allows for those things to be part of the platform that then bridges these gaps between just the market pricing things based on exchange value and the market appreciating the valuableness of what is local and what is rich and what should be part of the assets of a community.

I don’t understand economic development as being separate and apart from a development that is inclusive and is mindful of the kind of cultural assets, the social assets and the local assets of a community. Otherwise, it’s an extractive development, which is not sustainable, which is going to be increasingly exclusive and increasingly unstable.

My best response to what you're saying is the United Nations Charter understood that. It was a response to the circumstances where it was clear that the world and major economies understood the price of everything and the value of nothing. What you read was a way for us to bridge and get back.

I'm saying we are now at such a moment again where we have strayed away from those guiding principles, and what I'm observing here, the rich cultural artifact and the rich cultural life of the Appalachian region, I believe, has something to give to the world. It can be assetized. It can be raised. It can achieve market value and, in doing so, allows us to understand how community-based development, organic-based development, grounding-up development, which is platformed and anchored to the unique humanness and cultural relations, can serve as a platform not only for local development, but also as a paradigm that is mobile to other places.

You, too, can invest in your culture and your ways of engaging each other to strengthen your civil society as an economic good. Building the public good through recognizing your assets has tremendous economic value.

[0:20:22.2]

Dudley Cocke: Let me play the devil's advocate for a moment and pretend that I'm an economist of a different persuasion. I want to say to you from the perspective of an economist of another persuasion that I feel like, as someone in the Lafayette College community, that you have been seduced by liberal, fuzzy thinking. That, in fact, you're putting the cart before the horse.

You're saying that economic development and the economy is not the horse necessarily pulling the wagon. I think you've changed things around in the wrong way. My question is: My hypothesis is that it's the economy that pulls everything, so what evidence do you have that this is not true?

[0:21:45.0]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: If listeners had an opportunity to see my face as you were going through this thesis, they would see how much I was smiling and laughing and enjoying what you say.

I bring into this discussion, this thesis, what I do here, decades of experience. I remember in 1996 to 1998 when I played a lead role in introducing Jamaica to the global capital market. One of the first things investors – if I want to focus only on the instrumental value of economics, I am going to be the most narrow-thinking economist.

Investors, the first thing they wanted to do in judging the risk of a country, of whether they can invest in a country and get their returns out, the first thing they did was judge what is the probability of crisis. What's the probability of disruption? What's the probability of social disruption? What's the probability of labor strikes? What's the probability of all these things?

All these things going into the matrix of, "Can I make my investment and get my money out?"

Well, guess what? Everyone does this now, and there's an appreciation that, unless all stakeholders feel fully invested, fully human and fully dignified in national development, that country, that environment is a bad investment. It worked only in undemocratic practices when a military government could suppress peoples' participation in everyday life.

[0:23:31.5]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: It is impossible in a democratic environment – it is literally impossible in a democratic environment – for you to not create bridges between cultural and economic life that allow for a kind of democratic inclusiveness where all stakeholders' voices are not just voices for feedback – "OK, we understand what you're saying. Thank you. We'll go and build a model." – no, but voices that also influence how institutions are developed, how institutions practice democracy, how institutions ensure there is shared prosperity.

The program that I participated in, part of my particular role was to ensure that the urban, inner-city, marginalized kids were invested. We call it a community renewal program. We listen to them. We had democratic dialogue, democratic potlucks. We ensured that their views and their issues and how to empower them were critical.

Now, on the issue of me being captured by liberals, what's interesting about this is that everyone will tell you that I am the most conservative economist they have ever come upon. Everything I've said here today is steeped in conservative economic thought.

John Stewart Mills. When I talk about self-agency, when I talk about empowerment, it is Mills making it clear that we should never give to government the responsibilities of your development rather than building your own capacity to do so.

When I talk about Lafayette de Marquis, which my institution is named after, and positive freedom, it's about building peoples' capacity to afford their freedoms.

My deep conservative economic philosophy is based on the individual and the individual being in charge and accepting the responsibilities of his or her self-development, being the unit root, being the core point, the core focus in economic development. It is not about a state or about a big enterprise shaping your economic life; it's about you having the capacity to build your capacities to ensure that you can have choices.

[0:25:56.3]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: I'll give you an example. We are now seeing in Appalachia where investors are looking at and realizing that there are some skill sets here that our young people have. These skill sets, they realize, that if they could now build a stable supply of these skill sets, they could actually build a product that would have market competitiveness and market profits across America, if not the world.

In other words, I can then come and build into these people. If I just want to focus on instrumental value, how could I make money?

I could say, "Hey, young people, invest in building your human capital. Invest in being intensive in your technological capabilities. If you can do so, then you can also be the next Bill Gates or Steven Jobs or Marc [Zuckerberg], those people who at age 17, 18, 19, 20 were already imagining their great companies. They're not different from you."

All I need to do, then, is invest in your capacity and your confidence to know that you can be a world leader, too.

[0:27:10.3]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: Now, when I say that we want to have this government and economic life make an investment, that's not a liberal issue. The liberal issue would be that you need me to always mind your life for you. Let me, as a government, be paternalistic and do for you because you don't have the capacity to do for yourself.

When I say I want to strengthen your capacity to do for yourself, to take charge of your life, to be your agent of your own development, agent of your community development, that is John Stewart Mills talking. I can't get any more conservative than that. These are deep conservative philosophies, so this is not a liberal overtake. This is actually recognizing that the unit root of development, which then allows a culture and social life and civil society and all those things to all come together to create a society that we have reason to value and, therefore, want to reproduce.

It requires that we be fully invested in achieving our full promise. We understand the responsibilities of self-agency, that we have a responsibility to take advantage of the opportunities to build our capacity, that the market will price us according to how our capacity can create value in that space. That feedback process allows us to achieve dynamic competitiveness.

But note in all of this it starts and ends with the individual being afforded an opportunity to build his or her capacity so they can expand their range of freedoms. If I say that, I am quoting

directly from Lafayette de Marquis, and I'm quoting directly from John Stewart Mills, and I'm quoting directly from Amartya Sen and Eunice. These are all very conservative economists who understand that a national economy is nothing more than an aggregation of individuals who feel fully invested and fully motivated toward the pursuit of their best interests.

[0:29:16.5]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: This is what's going to also transform the Appalachian region. These young people I am seeing are bright. They are motivated. They are ambitious and all I think we should do is find ways of encouraging that, find ways of catalyzing that, find ways of rewarding that.

I am very confident, because I have seen it in Honduras. I've seen it in New Orleans. I've seen it in Jamaica. I've seen it in many other places, so I come at this with the experience of knowing that this approach ... bottom-up but invested in individuals first and foremost at the level of their individualness, and then they come into the collective, into groups, into organizations knowingly fully confident that they have a responsibility to come and create value there because they've built their unique skills.

Then that organization is able to take that cluster and move out into creating greater value. That's the kind of economic development that ensures that we all are invested and remain invested because it represents and it recognizes our unique ability to contribute to it.

[0:30:34.0]

Dudley Cocke: Thank you. One of the hallmarks of conservatism is a reckoning with reality. As one conservative thinker put it, "Reality is that which when you don't believe it doesn't go away."

As an economist, I would be interested to hear where greed fits in the human makeup. Then, if greed is something that human beings must wrestle with, what does that mean in terms of economy?

[0:31:24.6]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: I am not real big on adjectives. Greed is a loaded word because it's a word that captures a judgment. It implies a kind of anti-social behavior. But if I were to transform the word from "greed" to "trying to be the best I can be at whatever I choose to be including making the most profit, or making my enterprise the most successful it can be, or being the best athlete I can, or being the best painter I can, or being the best homecare giver I can," if I stay to say that we naturally as humans want to be the best we can. That includes being "greedy" about the pursuit of being our best.

Then, I can reframe this motivation without the context of what I call – again, another very conservative economist, Douglas North, who won a Nobel prize, who argues that how this motivation to try and be greedy about being your best, achieving your best, whether it is social profits or financial profits, or athletic profits ...

I came to this great country on an athletic scholarship. I understood it was my athletic profit that allowed me to pay for my education. Others, their parents' financial savings and financial wealth could have done it, but my athletic prowess allowed me to pay for my education. Every day I was at class, I knew I was paying for my classes with my body.

[0:33:23.6]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: Was I greedy about being my best? Yes, every morning that I got up and ran the hills, I was greedy about being the best because I was going to beat out the next guy to get a scholarship, so I got that scholarship. Doug North then says that the difference between development and anti-development is reduced to when people pursue their self-interests, their greed.

If the structure of incentives and institutions around them are such that in doing so, it maximizes the societal interests; that is, when pursuit of private interests maximize societal interests, then you get development.

The easy way for you to understand it is to look at what happens around the world when in order for me to be successful at my business or to get into a school, I've got to go pay somebody under the table, I've got to go engage in corruption. Now, in me trying to be my best or achieve my best or pursue my best, I have to engage in an anti-societal behavior. I've got to engage in corruption. I've got to engage in cheating.

Then, I get anti-development. I get society's overall development being reduced because in order for me to be my best, I have to reduce the social capital in society. I want to reframe greed as a pursuit of "me trying to achieve my maximum profit, whether it is social profit, cultural profit, or financial profits or entrepreneurial profits."

[0:35:15.0]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: Then I want to make sure that through the democratic discourse that we have been talking about, through the process by which stakeholders can participate in the shaping of their democracy and their institutions, they then ensure that when I am pursuing my greed, I am not creating anti-social elements. I am not cheating. I am not engaging in corruption. I am not disadvantaging others.

But in engaging and pursuing my best, it enhances. Then I want a society where my artists try to be the best artists they can be, and their artistic profits are rewarded, my cultural makers perform and they go out and they work right through the night. The way I run the hills to build my athletic prowess, they work right through the night to build their cultural products. And when they get out there and they do it, cities pay them to put on performances because it somehow creates this hedonic value and people say, "I want to live in this city because it's a nice cultural feel. I want to be in this space because it's a nice cultural feel."

People then, and the city, they get richer because of tax revenues, because housing prices go up because everyone wants to be associated with that place because it has that rich cultural feel. Even if I never go to a cultural event, I want to feel really, really good knowing that those around me have cultural richness. That's a society I want where all of our greeds are structured and incentivized towards making the whole be greater than the sum of our individual achievements.

[0:37:09.0]

Dudley Cocke: Let's come back to reality here for a moment of our current historical moment, which is where you began, which is that we're at a moment of social crisis perhaps. One of the dimensions of that social crisis is this large divide we have between a very few, as the Occupy movement said the 1% or the less than 1%, and the rest of us. The loss of the middle class and so forth.

If it's not greed that explains that divide and that growing gap, how do you, as an economist, explain it?

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: Outstanding question, and I don't know that its best explanation is me speaking as an economist so much as it is me speaking as a citizen.

What we have observed is the worst in income equality is symptomatic; it is not the cause of the social crisis, but it paints a picture of the top one-tenth of 1% getting a disproportionate share of the wealth – the financial wealth that's been created but also, then, creates a situation where you have more and more and more people who are in the working poor, not being able to achieve a living wage. Globalization and technology change is worse than that, meaning labor right now in the U.S. is not competing globally.

Many of the tasks ... where I come from in Pennsylvania, Reading used to be known for its knitting and those things, but why should they pay \$11, \$12, \$13 an hour for someone to knit when the same activity can be done in Latin America or the Caribbean for \$1 an hour for the same skills? Globalization and technology change allows that happen.

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: Many of your airlines and your hospitals and your enterprises, their back-office operations – their accounting and all that kind of stuff – through broadband and through technology, that stuff now can be done outside of the U.S. Why should a firm that is trying to minimize its cost and provide the best service at the lowest cost to customers continue to pay this high end when they can do it lower?

[0:39:55.8]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: That's a challenge. How do you, then, prevent this from leading to this worsening income inequality which then flips back into your social stuff?

When we were learning economics, we used to focus on the movement of capital without the movement of labor. You could use immigration to ... you could put all those things in and limit the movement of labor. It's meaningless now. You can minimize the movement of labor, and it's meaningless because the task of work, the task of labor, through technology moves.

The task of the back-office operation for a hospital in the United States moves to a business outpost in the Caribbean for one-fifth of the cost. The Caribbean labor doesn't have to migrate to America to do that work anymore. They can stay right where they are and do it. Immigration borders and border control is meaningless. Capital control is meaningless.

So, now, we come to the recognition that the real wealth of any country is its citizens, its human capital. When we look in the U.S., we realize now that the big divide between those who are getting rising income and those who are seeing their real income go down has to do with the extent to which the task of what they do is technology-intensive, human-capital intensive.

The more human capital and the more technology that is embodied in the nature of the work that one does, the faster growth one experiences in one's income. The less technology and human-capital intensity/knowledge-intensity that is in the work, the more one competes globally and the slower one's income is rising. That's part of the new challenge that we face.

[0:42:11.5]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: The U.S. has now reached a point where the Congressional Research Service has said it has the lowest mobility between the classes among all industrial economies. Not my words, their words. If you're born in the bottom 20%, you have the lowest probability of ever moving up. That is a dangerous challenge to what I call the Americana identity, which is "work hard, and you can improve and you can move up, and every 50 years the top 100 rich persons turn over and hard work gives you mobility, economic mobility, social mobility."

The notion that President Obama's words and all the research showing that that mobility now is the lowest among all industrial economies is a frightening challenge to America's sense of its identity, what makes it special, what makes it great. How do we respond to it?

We see a pathetic response by higher-ed where the well-endowed and rich schools will say things like, "If your family income is under \$60,000 or under \$80,000, you can come for free if you can get in. If you're family's income is a particular level, you can only pay if you can get in."

But there's a problem: That is only at the back-end. The front-end, which builds everyone's capacity to achieve their excellence so that they could qualify for these institutions, we have a problem. Your property tax and your tax base determine the quality of your educational establishments.

[0:44:06.7]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: What it means is that poorer area, poorer quality school. Rich area, better schools. You will notice that even though these institutions may make this offer, there's hardly anyone to take it up. We have a systemic crisis. The way things perform and function organically don't allow for the American dream to be realized. They don't allow for the American dream to be realized.

I believe in the American dream. I am a liver of the American dream. I traded my athletic capital into a PhD into advising countries, into traveling around the world to help find ways to empower and build agency. I have an extraordinary life because I live the American dream. But I was able to live the American dream because I was able to bypass the early years, which would have robbed me of the skill set and the confidence to come in and take advantage of it.

Your primary schools, your secondary schools, your lower schools, where you need to get in there good teaching and good opportunities for kids to build their confidence in those formative years is where I think we need to re-think. Charter schools, which then erode even further the public school ability to serve and, therefore, those who don't have mobility are suffering. It's not the solution, either.

I'm not suggesting that the solution lies in what you see in Europe or what you see in Canada where they have a system of fiscal equalization where there are guarantees about certain levels of funding and certain levels of quality for our schools for everyone as a national right. I'm not saying this.

But I believe that we are at a moment where what Roosevelt did in 1944 with the Economic Bill of Rights, which then triggered a whole series of new institutions – whether it be Medicaid or Medicare or Social Security or the Great Society or the New Deal or all those other kinds of

things – which then broadened opportunities and access so that all Americans could go through a period of shared prosperity, inclusive prosperity, fairness, equity, the great period of America. I believe it is time for a revisiting of the philosophy and the guiding principles of that moment and for America to do the way they've done it, which is to allow state-by-state experimentation in how this can be achieved.

[0:47:14.8]

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: But to address the question of the worsening equality, I think it's a time for America to revisit those guiding principles behind the Economic Bill of Rights where we then recognize that we couldn't just have political freedom; we needed economic freedoms, too, and economic opportunities.

I believe that globalization, technology change and what we're seeing across America right now calls for the revisiting. I just want to add that's why I'm here because what you are doing here at Appalshop and these other places, you have created the paradigm where discourse on these matters – these important matters, these nationally-important matters – can take place without people shutting down. The way in which you have a democracy that allows for each voice to be participating, each voice to be meaningfully engaged, each voice to count is the way I believe we need to now start talking nationally to start this conversation of how are we going to continue on the purpose of this great country that is based on certain guiding principles.

I think to answer your question: This is the moment we're at right now. I'm calling for us to begin a conversation around a new Bill of Rights that will ensure that America modernizes how it continues to create social justice, economic opportunity and make sure that the link between hard work and social improvement is not broken.

Dudley Cocke: Thank you very much. What was your sport?

Gladstone Fluney Hutchinson: [laughs] When people see me, and they see a guy who, in my prime, was 6' 2" and 235 pounds, they thought, "Wow, that must be an American football player."

But in Jamaica where I grew up, the major sport was football, which is the ones we kick with our feet, not the ones where we play with our hands. When we think of football, or what you now call in America soccer, that was my sport. I enjoy it a lot. Now I do some coaching but, more importantly than coaching just the technical aspects of the sport, I coach its values. What does it mean to get up and compete and, whether you win or lose, to walk away knowing that you gave your best?

I coach my team that I don't even look at the score; I look at their effort because if they can learn how to mobilize their effort all the time, every time, that will make them winners and able to deal with the kinds of dynamism and the changes that they're going to face in their lives. Six, seven, eight jobs they're going to have to hold.

I've got to teach them how to get up and go again, not just, "I lost my job. My life is over."

I'm actually seeing soccer as an opportunity to teach life skills.

[### End – 0:50:43.6 ###]