

Webcast med Helga Zepp-Larouche: Opbygning af en international fredskoalition

Onsdag den 21. juni 2023

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hej, velkommen til vores ugentlige dialog med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af og formand for Schiller Instituttet. Det er onsdag den 21. juni 2023. Jeg hedder Harley Schlanger, og jeg vil være jeres vært. Hvis du vil deltage i diskussionen, kan du sende dine spørgsmål eller kommentarer til os på questions@schillerinstitute.org eller skrive dem på chatsiden, og Anastasia vil sende dem videre til mig.

Helga, der er meget at tale om: Der er Blinken i Beijing, afrikanske ledere i Kiev og Moskva, rygter om en optrapning fra Biden og NATO, da modoffensiven ikke går som forventet; også at præsidentkandidaterne Trump og Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. begge kommer med relativt stærke kommentarer mod krigen og udtaler sig negativt om NATO's permanente krig. Og så er der dit initiativ til en international fredskoalition. Hvor vil du gerne starte?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Det er virkelig en verden, der udvikler sig hurtigt. Jeg kan komme med korte kommentarer til alle de punkter, du nævnte. Først og fremmest lod det til, at udenrigsminister Blinkens besøg i Kina gik godt. I det mindste mødtes han med den kinesiske udenrigsminister, og derefter mødtes han med præsident Xi Jinping i en halv time, som efterfølgende sagde, at mødet var produktivt. Nu skete der desværre det, at præsident Biden, før Blinken forlod Kina, under en privat fundraising-middag kaldte Xi Jinping for en "diktator". Og det har forårsaget en meget vred reaktion fra det kinesiske udenrigsministerium, og deres talskvinde, Mao

Ning, kaldte det en absolut uacceptabel provokation. Og spørgsmålet er faktisk troværdigheden: Hvis Blinken siger én ting, har kineserne nu gentagne gange slået fast, at det vestlige ledere siger ikke betyder ret meget. Og når Blinken så siger én ting og forsøger at – jeg ved ikke, hvad han præcist sagde; jeg havde ikke oplæsningen, men hvis præsident Biden så siger noget i den retning, sætter det igen spørgsmålstejn ved det hele. Jeg synes virkelig, det er et problem!

Samtidig er den kinesiske delegation med premierminister Li Qiang både i Tyskland og i morgen i Frankrig til en dialog mellem regeringerne, som ifølge de foreløbige rapporter vi har her fra Tyskland, ikke var dårlig, og det skyldtes hovedsageligt delegationens sammensætning, hvor udenrigsminister Baerbock og forsvarsminister Pistorius ikke deltog på tysk side, så især fra Baerbock kom der ingen besynderlige bemærkninger, så det var nyttigt for diskussionen. Så lad os sige, at der er en stærkere impuls og en erklæring fra tysk industri lige nu om, at det er helt imod deres interesse at “de-risikere”, og “de-risikere” er under alle omstændigheder bare et andet ord for afkobling, fordi den endelige effekt ville være den samme. Så jeg synes, det gik relativt godt, omstændighederne taget i betragtning.

Rapporterne fra Ukraine, som nu offentliggøres i mange vestlige medier, er naturligvis, at den såkaldte ukrainske offensiv egentlig ikke var særlig vellykket, hvilket meget alvorligt sætter spørgsmålet om at afslutte denne forfærdelige krig, som stadig koster flere menneskeliv, på dagsordenen. Og i den sammenhæng må jeg sige, at den udtalelse, som præsidentkandidat Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. udsendte, selv før hans tale i New Hampshire, at han igen citerede udtalelsen fra den tidligere israelske premierminister Naftali Bennett, som sagde, at fredsforhandlingerne faktisk var på nippet til at lykkes i marts 2022, og at det derefter var interventionen fra især briten Boris Johnson, der ødelagde det, fordi Johnson gav

beskeden til Zelenskyj om, at NATO insisterer på, at krigen skal fortsætte. Så jeg synes, det er meget vigtigt. Kennedy sagde også, at han kræver, at Biden kommer med to undskyldninger, en til det amerikanske folk, fordi han i realiteten har ført den amerikanske hær ind i en forfærdelig krig, som er helt imod det amerikanske folks interesser; og for det andet, endnu vigtigere, til det ukrainske folk, fordi det tilintetgør deres land.

Så jeg synes, det er meget vigtigt, og jeg havde ikke tid til at læse Kennedys tale, som han holdt i går, men jeg så bare nogle noter om den: Han opfordrer USA til at vende tilbage til John Kennedys fredspolitik; jeg mener, det er i bund og grund, hvad vi havde lagt frem i en appel til USA's næste præsident for at gøre præcis dette. [https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/urgent_appeal_by_citizens_and_institutions_from_all_over_the_world_to_the_next_president_of_the_united_states] Vi er begyndt at indsamle mange underskrifter fra hele verden, fordi mange mennesker overalt i verden ønsker, at USA igen skal fremstå som en fredsmagt. Så jeg synes, det er meget opmuntrende, eftersom man har Trump, som absolut har sagt nogle hårde ord om krigspolitikken, og som vil være kandidat, uanset hvad den juridiske forfølgelse af Trump vil være. Så efter al sandsynlighed vil man have Trump på den republikanske side og efter al sandsynlighed Kennedy på den demokratiske side, hvilket betyder, at der for første gang i meget lang tid vil være en rigtig valgkamp i USA. Så det er meget vigtigt.

Nu har jeg advaret mod at blive grebet af valgmani fra amerikanernes side, fordi, som George Washington sagde, da han forlod embedet, folk ikke skal falde i fælden med politiske partier, fordi partier har tendens til at være repræsentanter for interesser, og derfor ikke den nationale interesse, som en præsidentkandidat naturligvis let kan overvinde ved virkelig at tale for hele landets interesse, hvilket naturligvis kræver meget. Særligt fordi de vigtigste beslutninger om hvor verden

vil bevæge sig hen, krig eller fred, finansielt kollaps eller et nyt paradigme for et nyt økonomisk system, efter al sandsynlighed vil blive truffet længe før den 5. november 2024, og derfor er det vigtigt at holde et internationalt fokus på, hvor verden bevæger sig hen.

Så jeg synes, det er et meget interessant miljø, hvor der findes muligheder. Selvom faren for krig fortsat er ekstremt høj, blev det diskuteret, at ikke alene har Rusland nu placeret taktiske atomvåben i Hviderusland, men USA taler også om at placere taktiske atomvåben i Rumænien og Polen. Russerne har svaret meget kraftigt nej til det, fordi det er de steder, hvor de amerikanske missilforsvarssystemer er blevet installeret, og det er meget tydeligt, at de kan omdannes fra defensive til offensive systemer på ekstremt kort tid.

Jeg kan kun sige, at krigsfaren ikke er mindre, den vokser, og det er derfor, at vores internationale fredskoalitions indsats er så {ekstremt} vigtig. Vi havde den anden, meget vellykkede diskussion – flere mennesker, flere kræfter slutter sig til. Jeg tror bestemt, at det er et modsvar, vi er nødt til at have mod denne voksende krigsfare.

Det er mine indledende kommentarer.

Det resterende er på engelsk.

SCHLANGER: And you can find the press release on the Schiller Institute International Peace Coalition at the Schiller Institute website [https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2023/06/20/press-release-international-peace-coalition-holds-second-meeting/] along with a lot of other information as well as Helga's Ten Principles for a New International Security and Development Architecture [https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/30/ten-principles-of-a-new-international-security-and-development-architecture/]. Again, you can send your questions to questions@schillerinstitute.org

Helga, we have some questions. Here's one from someone who describes himself as a "patriot." He says: "Do you think that many are aware of the media manipulation that this has gone on since before World War I? But given this, how can this Coalition bring consensus?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think that the discrediting of the mainstream media is growing, because a lot of people who think can really see in the first minute of listening to these media or reading them, that there's always a spin, there is never a straight reporting of objective developments. That's a big problem, and that's why our websites, our webcasts and other activities we're doing, like seminars, and this is very important, and I appeal to all of you to help spreading it, build up the viewership in the social media. Get the word around, that we do exist and our efforts exist. That's an organizing activity which is necessary.

And I think that the Ten Principles, or the consensus of the International Peace Coalition—I think it's possible. I don't think it will be the lowest common denominator, because that's what people normally think is a consensus. I think the consensus will come from the human mind being able to think a new paradigm, a completely different level, a higher level, a One, in which you have a higher power than the Many. And this is a philosophical discussion which was coming from many thinkers in the Middle Ages, but especially then in the Renaissance, the great German philosopher, Nicholas of Cusa, developed the method of the "coincidence of opposites," the idea that the human mind can conceptualize a higher One, which is of a higher power than the Many. Now, that was Einstein's idea that a solution can only be found on a new level, which is higher than the level on which all the conflicts arose. And in this particular case, it means to put the interests of humanity as a whole first, not "America first," not "Germany first," not whatever other country first, but to think about American interests, German interests, Ghana interests, Mali

interests, in coherence with the interests of humanity. National interest is allowed, it's positive, but it should not contradict the interest of humanity as a whole.

And right now, given the parameters in which we find ourselves, it means we have to have a new credit system, which gives out credit for the development of all countries—peace through development: That has been our campaign over many decades. It was originally the idea of Pope Paul VI when he put out the 1967 Encyclical {Populorum Progressio} about the development of all people. [https://www.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum.html] And the actuality of that Encyclical and the fight to have peace through development is as relevant today as it always was.

So, it's not a static idea, this consensus or this new paradigm. It's not a static idea, but it's a dynamic idea, because only if all countries can develop, and their respective benefit of each other to each other is working like a great Classical fugue, where all the elements, and all the musical lines, contribute to the unfolding of the totality, then you can have peace.

SCHLANGER: That answer basically answers a number of the questions we have! But I'll go through some of these questions anyway, because there may be other aspects of it that you want to address. From Mushtaq, who is a professor in Pakistan and chairman of the Sindh Democratic Forum, writes that he believes "National interests are the biggest block against the world peace." But he asks for your thoughts on How to ensure that national security can coexist with the establishment of world peace? That is, is national security an impediment to peaceful cooperation?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, no, not necessarily, if you approach it the way I just said a moment ago. Because, frankly—is it really meaningful to waste billions and billions, and even

trillions in dollars and euros and other currencies, on this unbelievable armament and rearmament which is going on right now? The U.S. national defense budget this coming year will be \$1 trillion: That's insane! Just imagine how much the United States could be improved, if they would spend this money on national infrastructure, which is falling apart; on repairing schools, building new schools, which are in terrible condition; on the medical system—you know, many people who have mental problems have been just dumped on the streets, periodically, because it was too expensive to keep them in hospitals. Then the mass shootings—what is this the result of? It's the lack of caring for the education of the pupils, of giving them a perspective for the future. I mean, there are so many ills in the United States which need to be urgently addressed. So the spending of \$1 trillion on defense, on weapons, which are totally a destruction of physical economy, just does not make sense. Actually, one could say, it's against the national security interest of the United States.

Now, obviously, disarmament alone, does not really work. That's the proven history of where we are today. So I think we need to destroy weapons, we need to have disarmament agreements among nations, but it must coincide with the idea to replace this present system, where you have countries armed to the teeth, staring at each other, waiting to ruin each other, and that cannot be the stage of human development where we want to be. I think if we go to a new paradigm, and I'm absolutely optimistic that it's possible, that you have a partnership of sovereign countries—John Quincy Adams, for example, said that. He said, the purpose of the United States is not to go abroad and find foreign monsters, but we have to have an alliance of republics. John F. Kennedy, in his famous American University speech said the same thing. He said, the idea of peace is not a {Pax Americana}, where we force with weapons with a mission of all countries to that peace, but a true peace for all time, for the future. And that's not a utopia. I think that is eminently possible, and I think we can

envision a vision, actually, whereby these weapons systems can be replaced by productive industry. Just think that if all countries would use the capacities, they're using presently for weapons industries and for ever-new weapons systems, if all of that effort, including the creative effort going into the invention of these systems would go into solving the common aims of mankind, finding cures for presently incurable diseases; defending the planet against the danger of an asteroid strike; developing peaceful use of nuclear energy in the form of thermonuclear fusion, this would give us energy security, raw materials security; and the lack of financing has been the key element keeping these programs on a forever kind of trajectory. All of these things can be done, and many, many, many more if we would become reasonable. And since I believe that the human species is capable of reason, I think we can do it.

SCHLANGER: Now, here's a proposal for the organizing from someone you know, Jack Gilroy, who's a peace activist. He said, "What about taking actions against the merchants of death, the arms industry? Should people worldwide show up at the gates of the merchants of death, to expose them as war criminals who profit from death and destruction?"

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Well, it's an idea. I think we need some powerful demonstrations. We, in the International Peace Coalition, are discussing for example, to have a major, worldwide action on August 6, which is the anniversary of the Hiroshima bombing; to have another action on November 22, which is the actual date of the assassination of John F. Kennedy; and probably there are many other incidents in between which we can discuss. I don't know if the gates of these industries is the place to be, because they're mostly remote, and the public would not get much out of it. But I think if we would agree in the International Peace Coalition and make that coalition grow, and then have some powerful demonstrations—maybe in Washington, maybe in other places—I

think that is in my view the more promising idea, and it is extremely welcome that all of you mobilize to the hilt to make that an absolutely thundering success, which cannot be unheard of anywhere in the world.

SCHLANGER: And one of the ways you can do that is to take the copy of the press release of the International Peace Coalition from the Schiller Institute website and circulate it. Get discussions going in whatever venue you have. (<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2023/06/20/press-release-international-peace-coalition-holds-second-meeting/>)

Here's a question for you, Helga, on the situation in Germany, from Takis P., who's an activist in Athens. He refers to Chancellor Olaf Scholz's at Davos, where he said the war in Ukraine will last many years, and Germany will be there for the duration. And he asks, "Do Germans have no concern for the numbers of dead, the destruction of the environment, etc.?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Ah! Well, I think, my feeling is that because the mass media are so absolutely controlled and in Germany, they're probably the most controlled in any country in the world right now, that people are—that there's a lot more opposition and concern than meets the eye. I think there is a large proportion of the population that is sleeping, or they're so event-fixated, or interested to keep their comfort zone, that they don't let any thought to penetrate their minds. That is unfortunately a big problem. And I find this morally completely convulsive, that from Germany, there would be again, tanks going against Russia! It's just totally forgetting the history that the Second World War was, after all, fought by Germans—it was not entirely only caused by Germans; there's a much more complicated picture. But it is a fact that Russia lost, there are now new figures, showing there were 27 million or even 35 million people were killed; also many Ukrainians obviously, but that is beside the matter.

I think we should have learned the lesson, "Never again! Never

again war! Never again war from German ground!" I think it's even in the constitution that Germany should not deliver weapons to areas where you have conflict. I didn't have the time to ask legal experts to actually check that, but if any of you among the listeners have any expertise on that, you're welcome to send in comments on that. Because I think that constitutional issue should be raised. In Italy, right now, there are some peace activists who are trying to conduct a referendum by collecting 500,000 signatures within one month, because it does go against the Italian constitution to send weapons to war zones. And I think it's a terrible thing that the majority of the population seems to be indifferent.

There is, however, and that is also my perception, a growing number of people, below the surface, who absolutely, totally reject the present course of the government! The present German government in the latest polls has only 20% support! They should resign! They are no longer representing the majority of the people.

So, I think I can only answer you by saying, we should do everything possible to break through this dormant majority and get them to understand, if it comes to war, Germany will be annihilated in minutes. If any conflict escalates, and the use of tactical nuclear weapons would come into effect, there are thick, fat targets in Germany that would be in the first minutes eliminated, and the radiation following that would ruin much of Germany. And then the danger of a global nuclear war would be on the table in any case.

But I think we have to wake people up: I really think it's an absolute priority.

SCHLANGER: We have one more question on the war situation from Colin H. which is something you just discussed, about tactical nuclear weapons. He says, "Isn't it the case that by the United States talking about and threatening using tactical nukes, how can this not be expected to escalate the tensions?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Sure it does! And I can only say that the fact that we have several U.S. bases which are the organizing center, headquarters, for the present war, and if it would come to an expanding war, then these places would be target number 1! And they're in the middle of Germany.

So, I can only say, people should wake up, because it's very, very much on the edge.

SCHLANGER: Now, Helga, here's a question on the economy. We haven't gotten too many of those recently, but Terry asks: "Is there any way to restore Glass-Steagall {and} back the dollar by gold?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, absolutely! There is a renewed debate about Glass-Steagall. It erupted especially when, a few weeks ago you had the bankruptcy of several American banks: First Republic Bank, Silicon Valley Bank, some other minor banks, and the collapse of the Credit Suisse and its take over by the Union Bank of Switzerland. There was, for a short period of time, a real panic, and a Glass-Steagall debate erupted. In Switzerland, you had several parliamentarians raising it in the parliament. I think Marcy Kaptur raised it in the U.S. Congress. But then, since now, no banks are collapsing, people are "back to normal," and that is just foolish: Because nothing of the problems that existed some weeks ago have vanished—to the contrary: The longer this bubble continues, the greater the danger is of a sudden collapse.

So I would say the debate must be spread, because the effort by the Global South countries, including Russia, China, the BRICS, there is an actual debate to create a new, international currency, not based on monetary values, but based on physical values, commodities. This is the proposal by my late husband, Lyndon LaRouche, who made that proposal many years ago, and it's as relevant today as it was then. ["On a Basket of Hard Commodities: Trade without Currency," by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., July 18, 2000:

https://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2023/eirv50n18-20230505/lar_trade_without_currency_offprint.pdf]

And that is being acted upon. So there is a de-dollarization going on, trade in many national currencies, and I think it's important for people in the West to understand that this is regarded as a threat to the dollar, a threat to the euro, but the Western liberal system sits on a derivatives bubble of \$2 quadrillion outstanding derivatives, in dollar denominations. Now, that is a potential bomb, which can sink the {Titanic} on which we're all sitting. And the only way to save the West would be to have a Glass-Steagall reorganization, put the currencies back on a secure ground of physical economy, and then cooperate with the countries of the Global South in a new economic system. Now, that way, our life's work would be saved. If it comes to a blowout, we may see the fate of what happened in Germany in 1923, with a hyperinflation or with a sudden collapse, as we have seen it tendentially in 2008. But a repetition of 2008 is not going to function, because you have right now all instruments which were used are exhausted, and used up. So to go to Glass-Steagall would be the only way right now how you can protect our life savings, our economy, and that would be the way to link up with the currencies of the Global South.

SCHLANGER: I have one more question for you, Helga, that's on China. You've been doing a lot of interviews, recently, just with Global Times, again [<https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202306/1292838.shtml>], and you just came back from China. [https://larouchepub.com/eiw/private/2023/eirv50n24-20230616/eirv50n24-20230616_015-schiller_institute_delegation_vi.pdf] This is actually a question from last week, but W.T. asks: "Are the Chinese overly concerned with the appearance from non-governmental organizations inside China, or do they let their infrastructure projects do the talking?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the Chinese are very concerned, because

if you forget the anti-China propaganda for a moment, and just look at the situation as it is: When you are in China, the world looks so completely different. The Chinese people are generally very supportive of what their government does. They think the government has done a lot of good for them, lifted people out of poverty, giving them a decent living standard, created a growing middle class. They have many friends in the world: 151 nations cooperate with the Belt and Road Initiative. So, from the Chinese standpoint, the policy of the government has not changed since 40 years! But, then, all of a sudden, in the last few years, one can probably date it back to 2017, the anti-China propaganda started in the West. And it took a while before the average Chinese realized that, but now they are realizing it, and they say, "Why is that?" They really do not understand why the West has turned so radically anti-Chinese. And it is not supported by anything China does, because when you read about Taiwan, military intervention, invasion in Taiwan—if it ever comes to that, it will be in reaction to the fact that the United States pays lip service to the One China policy, which is the international policy of the UN, and then the United States turns around and delivers weapons systems to Taiwan; has state visits as if it would be a separate state; makes one provocation after the other. And if the illusion in Taiwan by certain forces that they can have independence from China would come to the point where Taiwan declares independence, then in that case, China has said they will intervene. But that will then be the reaction to activities from mainly the United States.

So China has not changed its Taiwan policy, it's the U.S. which has changed their Taiwan policy.

I think China, given the circumstances, is doing a remarkable job, by introducing a new level of diplomacy, by keeping relatively calm, patient, offering cooperation, reaching out to all countries, including the United States, including the European countries, and trying to calm the situation. So I

think China is doing a remarkable job from the standpoint of—they're a real anchor of stability! If you look at what China does, and go to China, if you have some vacation, I would advise people to go and travel there, and get your own impression. Because the real China is very different from what the Western media say.

SCHLANGER: Helga, I know your time is limited, but do you have time for one more philosophical question?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes.

SCHLANGER: Scott B. asks, basically, what is man's purpose in the universe. And he said, "If you get this wrong, if the philosophy is wrong, the result will be wrong." So how would you answer this question of what is man's purpose in the universe?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, I think man's purpose in the universe is to multiply and colonize all available, reachable heavenly bodies. The Moon, for sure; I think it's quite on the horizon, maybe in one generation, or maybe more. To have a city on Mars. If we have thermonuclear fusion, we can think about interstellar travel. If we are only 10,000 years of real development—humanity is older than that, but the last 10,000 years were really the super, qualitative development, which is amazing. There's no reason to think that this will stop. The next thousand years will be much more interesting than the previous 10,000 years. So I have a limitless confidence in the ability of the human species to develop.

Now, that happens to be, philosophically, also in cohesion with Nicholas of Cusa, who, already in the 15th century thought that there was a coherence between the lawfulness of the Microcosm and the Macrocosm, the Macrocosm being the universe at large and the Microcosm being the human mind. Now, there is a proof that such a coherence exists, and that is the fact that the human mind can formulate adequate hypothesis.

And the adequate hypothesis leads to scientific discovery about the physical universe. That discovery in science leads to a higher technology, which if it's applied in the production process, leads to an increase of the living standard of the people: greater longevity, higher population-density, which can be maintained; and that's a limitless process.

That's fascinating, because that means that an immaterial idea, something which has been produced in the mind, which has no weight, no size, you can't see it—not as an idea; you can write it down, but an idea is immaterial. But that has an effect in the physical universe of all of these consequences! That means, there is a coherence between the laws of the mind and the laws of the universe, and that, again, means that human creativity {is} the most advanced aspect in the whole universe!

That whole thing is a negentropic, self-expanding process: The Russian scientist Vernadsky basically said the Noösphere will gain more and more dominance over the Biosphere, that is built into the laws of the universe. So I think if you start to think about that, then you get very optimistic, because then you're not an Earthling, you're not bound by the so-called limited resources on our planet Earth (which are not limited anyway, also, because science and technology can transform them completely).

But it also means we are the species in the universe, because it is our purpose—it's not a practical idea for your next door politician, who thinks about reelection four years from now—but it is a matter of almost scientific certainty that our Sun will be a problem in about 2 billion years, and not be safe for human beings to live on the planet Earth any more. Now, some people may think, "2 billion years, why should I bother about that?" But since we are creative, and we are intellectuals, we can think about that: What does it require to make sure that our human species survives whatever

processes will go on, on the Sun, in admittedly the distant time of 2 billion years. So maybe the smarter ones among ourselves should start to think, what should be the directionality in which we pursue our present, basic research & development (R&D), in such a way that in 2 billion years, we are ready to solve that problem?

And I think that's food for thought, but once you start to think that way, you are freed: You are internally freed, you are mentally freed, and that is why the Schiller Institute is called "Schiller Institute" because Friedrich Schiller was so much more concerned about the inner freedom, than the outer freedom. And he was very concerned about the outer freedom. But he was extremely interested in how to make man free, so that you can develop your creative potential to the fullest.

So, therefore, think about 2 billion years from now, think about not only a village on the Moon, read Krafft Ehrlicke's book {Extraterrestrial Imperative}. Krafft Ehrlicke, the absolutely fantastic pioneer of space research, of rocket science: He had a vision about how the extraterrestrial imperative would change the identity of human beings, and I can only tell you, there is nothing more fruitful, especially for young people, than to study the books of Krafft Ehrlicke. Because he is one of the most under-appreciated philosopher-scientists I know of, who has produced a tremendous work, but it's completely under-rated and not known beyond a certain circle of scientists. And we should really find the resources, at some point, to publish the entire collected works of Krafft Ehrlicke. And a good friend of mine, Marsha Freeman, has done incredible work to promote that, and I absolutely intend that the Schiller Institute will follow through with this.

SCHLANGER: Helga, I'm very happy we had the time for that last question, because I think you did give people something to think about, the future of 2 billion years having come into their mind today for how to act. Thank you for joining us, Helga, and we'll see you again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, till next week.