

Talking for Peace – A Karl Kahane Lecture Series

The Bruno Kreisky Forum for International Dialogue
in co-operation with the Karl Kahane Foundation

kindly invites to the lecture of

HAIM HARARI

President of the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel from 1988 to 2001

A VIEW FROM THE EYE OF THE STORM

Welcome address:

Patricia Kahane

Moderator:

Arnold Schmidt

Thursday | February 16, 2006 | 19.00 h

Bruno Kreisky Forum for International Dialogue | Armbrustergasse 15 | 1190 Vienna

Haim Harari - President of the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel from 1988 to 2001

Chairman, Davidson Institute of Science Education.

He is a fifth-generation Israeli born, who made major contributions to Particle Physics Research on the international scene, to Science Education in Israel and to Science Policy and Administration in Israel and in other countries. Currently, he chairs the boards of a new Institute of Science Education in Israel and of a New York Trust managing the investments of the endowment of the Weizmann Institute. His many honors include membership in the Israel Academy of Sciences, major prizes for physics research and for contributions to education and several honorary doctorates. He served frequently on international committees evaluating Austrian research programs. His book *A View from the Eye of the Storm – Terror and Reason in the Middle East* has been published in New York in 2005.

Arnold Schmidt - President of the Austria Science Fund 1994-2003

Arnold Schmidt studied physics at the *Universität Wien*, where he received his Ph.D. in 1962. After spending two years as a postdoc at the *Ludwig-Boltzmann-Institut für Festkörperphysik* in Vienna, he joined the Department of Physics of the University of York, England, in 1966. From 1971 until 1975 he was a research associate with the Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley. In 1975 he returned to Austria and started to work at the *Technische Universität Wien*, first as an assistant professor, from 1979 until 1986 as an associate professor and since 1986 as a full professor. In 1999 he became the first chairman of the newly founded *Institut für Photonik of the TU Wien*. Arnold Schmidt is a fellow of the *American Physical Society* and the *Optical Society of America* and member of the *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften* and of the *Academia Europaea*. In 1994 he was elected President of the *Austrian Science Fund (FWF)*. He was re-elected twice. He has served on a number of national and international advisory boards, e.g. CDG, ESF, EUROHORCS, ESTA, EURAB.

Patricia Kahane

Good Evening. Thank you for joining us here at the Bruno Kreisky Forum to hear Prof. Haim Harari live which is very exciting. I have read your book *A View from the Eye of the Storm – Terror and Reason in the Middle East* with great interest, and right from there I went in the internet to read up your speech. There are many things one could say. I am not here to tell all the content of the book, but I have had a few thoughts about it. In the view of the growing gap, put very simply, between the Western world of ideas and the Muslim world of ideas and its repercussions you have put down a very important fact very clearly

which one does not hear almost ever and especially not in Austria and also not in Europe which is that Israel and its neighbors and the situation between Israel and the Palestinian people is really not the root of the matter of this whole big global controversy, but it is persistently being used a smoke screen all over the media. I don't know why. Maybe it is still easier to blame certain people. Then you have said many things about the world of terrorism and its mechanisms. You have put forward very idealistic and good ideas how one could break the vicious circle. In German there is a saying: "Wenn das Wörtchen wenn nicht wäre", if the word if did not exist then many other things could happen. In my feeling the whole modern telecommunication world is also one of the problems, although we all use it, we all need it, and the whole world thrives on it, but it brings a kind of immediacy which means speed, and speed means snapshots. All we get wherever we are in the world of the situations there are just snapshots, and after snapshots, and live pictures, and streams, comments, and senseless controversies like the one everybody is following now in Western Europe about the caricatures in a Danish newspaper. There one gets on the way to think how many flags have been burned all over the world, and pictures, and caricatures of Jews and the Pope and the Catholics.

What is very exciting tonight, as all these issues are usually being discussed by politicians, or journalists, or public servants, that this evening we are going to listen to and discuss with two eminent scientists, Professors of physics. I really look forward to their different angles and points. Thank you.

Arnold Schmidt

Good evening. I would like to introduce Prof. Harari. Prof. Harari is fifth generation Israeli born. He is a theoretical physicist, he is a particle physicist. He spent most of his life in Israel and a part in the United States, especially in Stanford. As a young man he became a staff member of the Weizmann Institute, and then a Professor. Apart from being an excellent physicist he developed a keen interest in science education, in science policy, and science administration. He became President of the Weizmann Institute and served for 13 years from 1988 to 2001. Saying that he was President of the Weizmann Institute is just a little too shallow because he was THE President of the Weizmann Institute. The Weizmann Institute was a very important institution before he took office, and became an even more important institution because of his presidency. It is an eminent scientific institution for sure. Prof. Harari has made it more eminent. But one real claim to fame or somethings which springs to your mind is that this very eminent scientific institution had always an open eye for using scientific results for other reasons, developing economic things etc. I just mention one thing. Now the revenue the Weizmann Institute earns in a year from intellectual property is about 100 million dollars which is quite an enormous sum. This is not a usual thing for a famous scientific institution. This is a very extraordinary feature, something which lots of people would love to have, but they rarely succeed.

I got to know Prof. Harari in the early 1990's when I became President of the FWF. He helped me a lot in my job. He helped a lot to develop the FWF. He was very instrumental in introducing a now famous prize for Austrian scientists called the Wittgenstein Prize. He also helped to develop other scientific and technological policy endeavours, centers for industrial usage of scientific knowledge, and he served on all sorts of committees here in Austria. So he knows the scene here very well. Over all these years of our relationship we talked a lot about science policy, and learned a lot from him. We talked about other things. We talked about God and the world and this includes, of course, Israel. About a year ago when he was here on one of his frequent visits to Vienna he gave me this book. I went home and read it in one go. I was absolutely thrilled by this book. I found it very interesting and in parts also a little bit disturbing. Maybe this is one good reason why we are here tonight. I gave this book to a number of my friends. They also found it fascinating. And then it turned out that this might be a good audience to share this fascination with.

Haim Harari

It is a privilege to be here. I would like to thank you for inviting me. I want to thank Patricia Kahane and Arnold Schmidt for their kind introduction. I admit that Arnold and I discussed many things between us. He used this local expression that "we talked about God and the world". We certainly talked about the

world. I don't remember talking about God with Arnold. It seems to me that Arnold and I still have a few things to discuss.

You already heard too much about me, but you did not hear the part which explains why I am here tonight. You heard what I am, with slight exaggerations, but it is more important to say what I am not. I am not an expert in political science. I am not a politician. I am not an expert in international law. I am not an expert in Middle Eastern studies, certainly not an authority about Islam, not about the history of the region. I devoted all my life to physics, to science education, and to scientific administration. But I consider myself a normal citizen interested in what is happening around him, reading perhaps too many newspapers, trying to be as informed as possible, thinking about what he reads. It is a fact that I am fifth generation born in Israel, and the last member of my family immigrated in 1897, the first one around 1820. So I don't have any relative who immigrated after 1900. That really puts me in a very unique mixture of emotion and logic to analyse the situation. Emotion from the genetic side and logic from the scientific side. What you will hear from me is a thoroughly unprofessional disorganised view from the eye of a global storm. This view is based more on common sense than on logic. In that way, as I wrote in the book, I am speaking more as a proverbial taxi driver that you engage in a conversation rather than an international scientist.

All of this does not explain why I am here. I am here because of a completely crazy chain of events. You will allow me to take two or three minutes of your time just to tell you, not as an apology, but as an interesting story. I happen to be a member, for the last ten years, of something called the International Advisory Board of one of the largest multinational corporations in the world, a company you all know, and some of you own products of this company. But I will not name it simply because I don't want to blame them for anything I say. This Board which is distinguished, consists of politicians, industrialists, economists and one scientist. It meets once or twice a year. I am usually asked to talk about science, technology and their impact on the world. On one occasion, in spring 2004, the Chairman of this Board said to me: "You are the only member from the Middle East, why don't you give us your own private view of what is happening". I answered that I would do it with pleasure, but it will not be called the view from Israel or the view from the Middle East, it will be "the view from the eye of the storm". I gave the presentation and wrote it down. It was a private meeting, not to be published, off the record, and only the participants got the written text. One person, who got it, sent it to two friends in California. He did not mean anything good or bad, he just wanted to share this article with two friends. That was it. Three months later the article was posted in more than 1,500 websites on the internet. Since I did not do it, the various websites did not know who was the guy that wrote it, half of them claimed that this is an Arab intellectual who lives in Europe, this Mr. Harari. There were debates about who this person is, maybe it is a forgery. And then people started taking things out of context. It was quoted in editorials of prominent newspapers. It was translated to Portugese, Spanish, Italian, French, Dutch, German, Hebrew, Hungarian, all of it without my permission. I received 600 e-mails which I still keep, from people I do not know, either praising, or arguing, or condemning, but mainly asking permission to send to their friends, something which I always refused to allow. People started publishing it under different titles. The internet is totally out of control. And finally I started getting offers to expand it into a book, which I did in order to obey a simple principle: If you have something to say, you better control where you say it and how it is published. If you have nothing to say, the least you can do is shut up. Given that piece of wisdom, I decided to write the book. That is how Arnold Schmidt got me to stand here in front of you.

Having disposed of this long introduction, I would like to explain what I want to say in my comments from the podium and what I would rather leave for the discussion. I do not want to relate to current events. I will only touch very briefly, if at all, on matters such as the Danish caricatures, the Hamas victory in the Palestinian election and the Iranian nuclear program, which are extremely important and are now in the news. I will be more than willing to react and to answer any question on any of these subjects and any other subjects to the best of my knowledge, during the discussion. But in my comments I would like to take a more global view in describing what I consider to be the main global issues, and to take a

longer term view, not discussing the news of the last two weeks or two months or even two years. With your permission that is what I would like to pursue.

I would like to start by making an observation which is related to something I do know about, namely science and technology. We live in a world in which there is an enormous number of political, economic, and social issues, and of course issues of defense, security, and war and peace, which touch profoundly on science and technology. Whether we like it or not, we live in the age of science and technology. What kind of issues? The energy problems of the world, oil, environmental problems, global satellite transmission and its role in communications, AIDS in Africa, weapons of mass destruction, economic gaps, the rising and awakening of China and India, global warming and most of the problems of the global village. All of these touch either only on science and technology or on science and technology in combination with other matters. All of these issues are really at the bottom of many of the things that we will discuss.

This is not a very young audience. But I am sure that many in this audience have a familiarity with a new magic word of the last few of years: "Google". Google is, of course, the greatest hit of the world stock market in the last year. Google is what we do when we forget who is the Prime Minister of Australia, or who won the Marathon gold medal in the Olympics in 1952, or how many people live in Slovakia. 1973 was the year of the Yom Kippur war in the Middle East. It was also the birth of the oil weapon. It was a crucial turning point in the relation between the Arab world and the Western world. But in that same year of 1973 two other things happened. In March of 1973, in Michigan, a baby by the name of Larry Page was born, and in August of the same year in Moscow a baby by the name of Sergei Brin was born. They were born in a world in which there was no telefax, and nobody dreamed about internet or cellular phones. There was no computer tele-communication. The word "hi-tech" did not yet exist. It had other names. There were certainly no personal computers. If somebody would have told the parents of Sergei Brin in Moscow in August 1973 that this baby will become a billionaire. Where? In California. From what? From a mathematical discovery. Used for what? For making billions of dollars. In what way? Selling advertising. Advertising where? In computers. And where are these computers? At home. Every word in this long sentence was unthinkable in 1973. If somebody would have made this prediction to the Russian Jewish parents of Sergei Brin in Moscow in 1973 they would certainly immediately have sent this person to a psychiatrist or to an Institute in Gugging. Today, these two young billionaires are 33 years old, and the young generation, everywhere in the world, cannot remember how life was before Google. Relative to Google, Amazon.com is a matter for adults, Microsoft for elderly people, and IBM something from the last century.

But all of this is the tip of the iceberg of this age of science and technology, in which the most important economic resource is knowledge, particularly scientific and technological knowledge. Proof number one: the per capita GDP of Israel is twice the per capita GDP of Saudi Arabia. This is a fact that most people do not know. Israel, with all its troubles and with no natural resources, has double the per capita GDP of Saudi Arabia. A more astonishing fact: Iran and Germany have more or less the same population. Iran has 73 million people, Germany about 80 million. What Iran produces in one year, Germany produces in two and a half weeks. Listen to these numbers. The same number of people, and this includes all the oil of Iran. Without the oil Iran produces in a year what Germany produces in approximately one week. This is at the root of many of the things that we are going to discuss. Conclusion: if indeed the most important economic resource is knowledge, particularly scientific and technological knowledge, then the best investment is education, particularly scientific and technological education. You simply cannot argue with this conclusion. It would be wise for all ministers of education and finance and for all prime ministers of all countries to register this conclusion.

I don't want to embark here on a detailed discussion of education. I will only say: nothing is more important than education, both in the advanced countries, in the less advanced and in the countries which are a full century behind the rest. Education has many aspects. It is not only science and technology, of course. It is languages, it is international communication, it is moral values, a hundred different things.

There are more than six billion people in the world. Only one billion are full participants in the age of science and technology: Western Europe, North America, and isolated countries like Japan, Australia, Singapore, Israel. There is another billion who are making a big effort to join in: the new European Union countries of Eastern Europe, parts of Russia, the big cities of China and India, Korea, small bits and pieces in Latin America. There are four billion people on this planet who do not participate at all in the science and technology revolution. And many of them do not even know that it exists. This is the majority of the Chinese, the majority of the Indians, the entire Muslim world – more than a billion people, every corner of the Muslim world – of course, there are individual exceptions -, all of Africa, tragically, and much of Latin America. This, of course, is tragic.

In this room, at this moment, there are probably more telephones than people. I am assuming that everyone here has a telephone in his or her pocket or purse, and there must be some people here with two. There is more than a billion people in the world who have never seen a telephone, never touched one, and never used one. Six million Israelis are publishing more scientific papers than 300 million Arabs in 22 Arab countries from Mauritania in the West to the Gulf States in the East. Six million Israelis, which incidentally include almost 2 million who do not participate in the scientific revolution. This are the ultra-orthodox Jews on one side and the Arab population on the other side, again with exceptions. All of these gaps are mind boggling. One last piece of statistics which is even more frightening than all the ones I mentioned: Pakistan and Bangladesh are the second and the third largest Muslim countries in the world. Together they have 300 million people, like the European Union before the expansion. Together their absolute GDP (not per capita!) is equal to Israel, half of Austria.

This is poverty which you simply cannot comprehend. But the real problem is not the poverty. The real problem is their intellectual poverty because we are getting more and more to a situation in which there is an equality between knowledge and affluence. If you are knowledgeable and affluent it is one situation. If you have no knowledge and no education and poverty like in Africa you are deserving an enormous amount of help from the affluent world, but you are not a danger to the world. If you are financially affluent and intellectually poor then you are jealous, angry, and you have every possible tool and desire to endanger the world. You have the tools because you have the thin layer of the people with money that can incite everything, and you have the huge number of poor people whose anger and frustration have to be channelled in some direction, and channeled away from their local leadership who is responsible for these enormous horrible gaps.

There is the old Jewish story about Moses who took the children of Israel into the desert and walked around for forty years until he found the only place in the Middle East where there is no oil. This story is as old as oil. But if you really think about it – and now I am very serious – Moses was no fool at all. Because in these forty years he collected the ten commandments which are, in today's terminology, a piece of intellectual property. If you think about it in a profound way, it is that piece of intellectual property which has led to the fact that the per capita GDP of Israel is twice that of Saudi Arabia. Had he skipped Mount Sinai and turned into Ryadh we would be now there with the oil and someone else would have the intellectual property. It took all of these thousands of years to reach the age of science, and technology, and intellect, and knowledge, but there we are.

Which parenthetically leads us to a side remark. We keep hearing from the politicians and we keep reading in the newspapers about the oil weapon. The oil weapon is a paper tiger. We have seen that, in the last year, the price of oil more than doubled. Have you seen some rapid inflation somewhere? The price of oil more than doubled and the inflation in the Western world did not increase even by 1%. So where is all of this weapon? The fact is that the oil sales of the Arab countries plus Iran are smaller than the product of Holland. They are one third of what California alone produces. Times have changed. This is not 1973. Actually the Western world should hope that some madman in Teheran would increase the price of oil because the problem with oil is not the shortage of oil but the damage that we are causing to our poor planet environmentally. And because of the shortsightedness of our leaders, the global leaders,

we are continuing and will continue to destroy our planet until somebody will raise the price of energy and oil to such a level that we will start saving and developing alternative methods. Actually, there is no oil weapon. This is a curse with a great blessing. The impact of it on the world is very small.

Since I mentioned the oil weapon and I mentioned Iran, one sentence about another topic. The Iranian nuclear threat is a very serious threat to the whole world. But don't get the idea that it means any kind of advanced technology. If I told you that somebody has developed some industry which is now able to produce something that the Americans did in 1945, would you be impressed? What Iran is trying to do – and did not do yet – is reach the technology that the United States had in 1945 and which every Western country could do with the slightest effort, if it wanted to. It is not a question of a technological achievement. That is not the issue at all. It is an important issue, it is dangerous. North Korea is really one of the most backward countries in the world. And they succeeded, between buying it and smuggling it, in doing it. Let's not confuse the technology side of it and the political and military aspect.

The regions in which the population does not participate in the science and technology revolution are exactly the regions in which there is no democracy, by and large. Before we say one more word about democracy we have to understand what is democracy. President Bush sometimes appears to think that democracy means people going and putting an envelope in the ballot box every once in a while. That is part of democracy, that is a very tiny part of democracy. Democracy is freedom of expression, it is education for everybody, it is equality for women, it is equality for minorities, it is religious freedom, it is the freedom of the press, it is the rule of law, it is human rights, individual human rights, it is not to abuse and not to misuse children, it is a decent legal system, and it is a possibility and option of social mobility. Only this combination of things plus the ballot votes plus a few other things is really democracy. The fact that Iraq and Afghanistan and the Palestinian Authority have the democracy which is only the ballot box and not one other item of the whole list I gave here, is a guarantee to elect in every case the most fanatic, inciting possible powers.

In my book, which appeared a year ago, I predicted exactly what happened since then with the success of the Muslim Brothers in Egypt and the success of the Hamas now in the Palestinian Authority. We are not yet sure whether the Shiite ruling party in Iraq is not completely or partly controlled by Iranian money. Most Iraqis are Shiites, the Iranians are across the border, and the Iranians are very much interested in creating an empire which goes from the Persian Gulf to the Hizbullah country in Lebanon. The only thing which is missing for Iran to create this empire is the control of Iraq. Because Syria and Lebanon are already under Iranian influence. If you look at the map you see Iran, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, a wonderful empire from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean within missile range not only of Vienna but also of Berlin and Rome. When I talked about danger to the world I meant danger to the world, not only to Israel.

Having briefly discussed democracy, let us think what science and technology has done to us in a different direction. It created globalisation. Globalisation means falling boundaries between countries as you see here in Europe. It means dominance of multinational corporations which are sometimes larger than countries. It means the possibility of sending information, ideas, news, pictures, lies, defamation and incitement around the globe with the speed of light, and the possibility of sending people, goods, and missiles around the globe with more or less the speed of sound. All of this is happening as a result of modern technology. A Polish farmer, a Sicilian policeman and a Spanish lawyer are obeying the same rules of the European Union. If you call Lufthansa from San Francisco you get some telephone operator who is sitting in India. I sit in my office at the Weizmann Institute and I send an e-mail to a colleague in the next building and he answers me, and then we chat through our computers, and I discover that he is actually now in Hong Kong, he is not in the next building. And I had no way to know it because he is online with me. That is globalisation.

But imagine for a moment that all the boundaries of the world have evaporated, that the nation states have disappeared – we are far away from this situation, but we are certainly going there, Europe is going there, and other regions are going there –, and we all happily live in one country which I will call Globania. In

Globania, like in Albania, the majority of people do not know anything about the age of science and technology, about the age of knowledge. The majority of the people do not know anything about democracy. And this majority is increasing every minute as we speak because it is the ones without the knowledge, without the money, without the resources, and without the democracy who multiply fast. And it is the societies with the knowledge, with the technology, with the science who have zero population growth or in some cases even reduced population. Now if this Globania is one country with a democratic election, the anti-democratic party would easily win, but its victory will be larger and larger from one election campaign to the next. In a nutshell, that is where the problem is. The international organisations, the UN and others, are already, in a way, operating within such a system. How else could Libya have been elected to be the Chair of the United Nations Human Rights Commission? What do you do with this? And this is the result of this dominant majority which is growing. The more people you represent, the less is your economic power. And the world cannot survive a situation in which the weak are multiplying fast and become weaker, and the strong are being reduced in numbers and become stronger. The correlation between wealth and knowledge is only increasing, it is not decreasing. This is not a status quo. The affluence of knowledge is only becoming greater and greater and greater. And the importance of natural resources is getting less and less and less. The only way to solve this problem in the long run is education. And such a situation, of course, leads immediately to terror, to crime, to international conflicts.

The real miserable poor like in Africa, like the poor Indians in South America, like the Chinese peasants in the remote villages of China are not causing any direct danger to the world. But other societies, unfortunately including much of the Muslim world and almost the entire Arab world, are governed by economically affluent rulers, who show intellectual poverty and lack of intellectual property in the broader sense of the word. This is an incredible formula for economic failure, for incitement and blaming others for your weakness, for terror and suicide murders, for all the terrible things that we are seeing. It is this huge number of desperate people which are exploited by people who are not desperate at all. They are affluent, they are strong, their kids are in the best private schools, and they sent somebody else's kids to explode, either in Baghdad or in Tel Aviv, or in London. In a way, countries and societies which produce so many suicide murderers are essentially committing their own suicide. You simply cannot escape this conclusion. They can kill and damage the rest of the world, but at the end they are creating their own suicide.

There is one other item that I want to mention before I conclude. This is a new weapon of mass destruction, namely words and pictures. Global communication in the global village consists of words and pictures. You see horror pictures, pictures of mutilated bodies, and other features, not always representing real facts. Look at the Arab satellite channels like Al Jazeera, Al Arabia, and, much worse, Al Manar of the Hizbullah. You have incredible lies, incredible incitement, incredible defamation without the slightest foundation. I am not talking at all about things which are inaccurate, which are misleading, which are twisted, which are out of context. I am talking about brutal lies. There was never a Holocaust, the Jewish temple in Jerusalem never existed, Jesus was a Palestinian. These are things which are printed every day in newspapers and media. And all of this is spread around the world instantly through the modern media. But then come the words. Words like racism, genocide, war crimes. You just drop this one by one on top of somebody and it will stick. If we could do an experiment, we might announce that Guatemala has performed genocide in Indonesia, or some totally absurd thing like that. I guarantee to you that if, for a few months, you will read it in every newspaper and hear it on radio and TV, not even as an alleged fact but just as a quote from the president of Iran or the leader of the Muslim Brothers, at the end, whenever you will hear the word Guatemala you will think of genocide, racism, war crimes. This is the technique. And then you have a suicide murderer exploding himself or herself in a restaurant killing twenty children and adults in Haifa. What do you read in the newspapers? You read that this was an "activist" representing a "resistance organisation", supported by "peace activists" who are fighting against "war crimes". Now, these are only words. But this is what is being said about the woman who walked into a restaurant, sat for half an hour, watched the families and the children and murdered them. This was not a blind bomb that happened to hit them. She was sitting there, watched all of this, blew herself up, killed twenty, maimed many more. And her picture is in every Palestinian school as a national hero. If these

words are not a delegitimation of a country and a nation, then I don't know what it is. And that is why I am referring to it as a weapon of mass destruction. At the time of Josef Göbbels this also existed. But the point there was that what he said did not run around the world instantly to hundreds of millions of people. The distribution was much less elaborate and much slower.

What do you do? Like in every war there is the tactical level and the strategic level. The tactical level in fighting terrorism is very clear, and we may wish to return to it in the discussion. It is simply to fight in the most resolute and strong way, hopefully with a unified civilised world against not only the terrorists but also against those who send them and those who finance them, while, at the same time thinking seriously how to modify international law in order to be able to cope with state sponsored international terror. That is a very important subject by itself.

On the strategic level, in the long range, the only solution for the civilised world is a multi-generation effort to bring into the 21st century those four billion people who are left behind. It sounds like a statement of some naïve scientist who does not know his right from his left, standing and saying it. But it is either that or a permanent bloody war forever. Yes, there is something else that can work temporarily, but it is not a permanent solution. This is a wall between the affluent world and the other world. It is either a wall or education. And, in the long run, education is the only hope.

In the Third World the investment in education per child per day is 50 cents. Here in Austria, in any Western country, it is approximately 20 dollar per child per day. These are the numbers. What Toyota and General Motors alone sell, is more than the expenditures on education of the four billion non-participants in the technology revolution. Those four billion people get, for their education, less than the sales of these two companies only. So the world can afford more than that. And anybody who tells me otherwise doesn't know what he is talking about. In the end it is much cheaper than the enormous expense of war on terrorism. Incidentally, on the terrorist side this is the cheapest war ever. For the first time numbers were published on the financial support of Iran to the Hizbullah in Lebanon. The Hizbullah is strongly supported by Iran. You know how much Iran is giving the Hizbullah in order to create all of this enormous trouble? 100 million dollars a year. That is half of the budget of the Weizmann Institute. It is the cheapest way to disturb the world in an enormous way. One cheap terrorist can cost all the airport security that you are seeing around the world. One false phone call about a bomb scare can cancel flights and close airports. A fabulous return on investment!

There is a very fascinating exercise that is going on in China which is the only country in the world that is making a clever transition from this poverty to gradual affluence. But we do not have time to discuss it here. We may return to this in the discussion.

All the things we discussed, education, science, environmental problems, global issues, social gaps, and I did not even mention the prolongation of life expectancy, which is another big problem in the long range, all of these have no quick solutions. They are all elaborate complicated questions. On the other hand, modern technology exposes us to sound bites, sixty second descriptions of complex issues, accompanied by the wrong pictures, superficial discussions, and politicians who, at best, see the next elections and sometimes not even that. This creates a terrible mismatch between the timescale and the complexity of the problems, on one hand, and their exposé in the media and the depth of thinking of the people who deal with the problems, on the other hand. This can be summarised by one sentence which I like to quote. It is a sad truth, but it also hints at the solution: "We now live longer but think shorter."

Thank you very much.

Arnold Schmidt

I think the audience now understands my remark that when I read this book I was absolutely thrilled, but on the other hand I was also quite disturbed. I am still in the same shape and in the same mood. Obviously, all what you are saying is true. You can follow it comparatively easily, but it also has this

touch that we don't really get to grips with this thing. The one thing I noticed in the book, not so much today in your words, that actually we Europeans are naïve. We live in a sheltered world. We don't see these big problems, and one day we will learn. You accused me several times in seeing things in a naïve way, in a sort of friendly, liberal, democratic way and nothing else. The one thing you said today, that democracy is not just casting a vote every four years and that's it, but you need all these things around it. This is important. I do understand this, of course. But I then have great difficulties seeing where we could go from now. I understand everything you said about education. I understand everything you said about this enormous mismatch we have in the world which is the cause of all these problems we have, and the problems will be even much larger. You say education is the solution. But I would like to know a little bit more how one should get from here to there. This is something which I find very troublesome. We didn't talk about Israel. Your starting point is obviously Israel. You are a man who knows Israel very well and you know the Western society very well, you know the United States very well, you know Europe very well. You live in both worlds. Because you live in those both worlds you should have a better understanding what to do. In our discussions we had arguments in how complicated it is to integrate our Muslims into Austrian society. I remember that I said, Muslims from the Balkans obviously are not a very great problem, even the Turkish people have not constituted yet a big problem. Maybe this is to come. These was one of the things where you said that we see only a tiny part of the picture, the picture is much larger, the picture is much worse. I would admit this. But then I would really urge you to tell us more about how education can be the solution. How could we introduce these changes which are obviously necessary to a world whose enormous catastrophes you picture so clearly, and which I can follow completely. I don't think we should talk about terrorists and how one should deal properly with terrorists. You have this marvellous story about a man who is close to a school in a Kibbutz, and there is a big winter coat although it is very hot, and the guards get the message that there might be a terrorist close to the school, and this man comes close, so the guards have to make a quick decision thinking that this curiously odd man who is covered with a coat although it is very hot out there is a terrorist, and shoot him with no questions asked. Three weeks after I read this story there was this incident in London with this guy in this coat. I think we should not touch this point on terrorism. I would rather like to know how one could get to what you picture so clearly, namely education. The problem is that education is now completely unevenly balanced in this world. How do we get to a more balanced education?

Harari

This was really not a question. This was a long list of all embracing issues: The alleged naïveté, where to start with education, and both of these branch into several other things. Perhaps I should start with alleged European naïveté. Let us take the story of the caricatures in Denmark which I avoided in my remarks. This has nothing to do with caricatures, make no mistake. A storm which arises four months after the caricatures are published cannot possibly be truly related to the caricatures. The storm started when the caricatures started appearing in a trip of a Danish Imam through the Middle East. But what he showed were not the one caricature that was published but four caricatures, three of which were never published, one of which showed Muhammad as a pig. These were never published by anybody. But he showed them together with the one that was published. A well known technique of lying. You say something with a little grain of truth. You show four caricatures, one of them was published, so you cannot be accused that you invented the whole thing completely. And it was the three others that were much more abusive. I don't know how many people in Europe paid attention to this. The European press has been mentioning this only very briefly. I know that it was mentioned, but not everybody is aware of it. And then just a few months before this whole thing happened a person who is a member of the same party as the Imam in Denmark – and this is a party which is associated with the "Muslim Brothers" – made a speech about the need to liberate Denmark, saying that the Muslims in Denmark are less than 3%, but at the time of Muhammad they were less than 3% in the city of Medina, and they did take over Medina, and therefore being only 3% should not be an obstacle. You may sigh here, correctly, and think that this is crazy. This Imam with his 3% Muslims in Denmark, they have no chance and no hope to take over Denmark. And you are right. Why? Because Denmark at some point will wake up and put an end to it, whether it will happen with 3%, or 5%, or 10% and whether it will happen democratically or undemocratically, and with blood or without blood. Denmark and any other European country at some point will not allow this to

continue. But this has nothing to do with caricatures. Caricatures with Jews drinking blood of children are published every single day in the Middle East by the most prestigious Arab newspapers, and nobody is paying any attention to it, in Israel. On the contrary, in Israel the extreme right-wing takes delight in repeating this caricatures because this, of course, makes people more resolute against the enemy. But that is another story. This is just one little example.

But if you go beyond it just try to think. Imagine that somebody in Bratislava would start shelling Vienna, two or three shells a day, not more, not killing too many people, sometimes missing, sometimes hitting outside, sometimes hitting Lower Austria instead of Vienna. Maybe a shell will fall on Schwechat. And then all the foreign airlines except Austrian Airlines will refuse to fly in. And the Austrian government will approach the Slovakian government because Austria is not going to invade Slovakia, and the Slovakian government will say: "We condemn this very strongly". But it will continue from Slovakia, from the center of Bratislava. What do you do then? What do you do by international law? Do you declare war on Slovakia when the prime minister of Slovakia condemns it in German, but speaks in Slovak to his people and says: "I hope that there will be more martyrs doing it"? What does international law tell you about it? We are all educated to believe in international law, in human rights. This is the essence of democracy. But, in the end, the Austrian army would go into Bratislava to catch these people. It will happen sooner or later. Thank God, it doesn't happen in Bratislava. But that is what we are having from Lebanon for the last 30 years and from Gaza now. And the Lebanese government one day says it did not happen, one day it condemns it, one day it says it is too weak to control these people and one day it says they do not exist. What do you do? So you go into Lebanon or Gaza, you kill these people, then you find yourself conquering a foreign country, so you withdraw, and the whole thing starts from the beginning. When you sit in Europe and you read the *Standard* or *Le Monde* or *The Times*, this all sounds like a theoretical discussion. But believe me that a few explosions in a supermarket change your views. There is an old saying which says that you idealism is inversely proportional to your distance from the danger. But now the danger is everywhere. When I wrote the book there were still no suicide murders in Europe, but then came London. I said in the book that I absolutely guarantee that it will happen. It took only three months from the publishing of the book to the London suicide murders. Europe is waking up, but too slowly, because it is not yet happening, and it is going to happen.

Which brings me to education of the minorities in Europe. There is one thing which I really wonder if you see. I see that the Muslim minorities in Europe are becoming more and more religious, at least in the external signs, more and more fanatic. I can understand a religious Muslim who wants to stay a religious Muslim. We should all respect this. And the Jews are the last ones to say anything about it. But I have never seen a Jewish community that goes to a new country and becomes more religious. They either assimilated or they did not assimilate and kept as religious as they were. But not become more and more fanatic and hostile to the culture into which they immigrated. If you want to preserve your own culture stay where you are. If you are coming to another culture it must mean that you are willing to accept it. I don't necessary mean to assimilate. Don't lose you language, don't lose your culture, don't lose your religion. But here there is a completely new different trend. It looks to us like a joke because it will not succeed. But the trend is to renew the Muslim dominance over parts of Europe. There are explicit Muslim calls for conquering Spain because Spain is considered a traditional Muslim land. I would not recommend that you wake up every morning and worry what will happen to Europe, because this attempted take over will not succeed. Just look at the numbers and at the economic power. At a certain point it will stop. But the sooner one stops it the better off one is.

Education: It will be totally presumptuous for any person or group of people to try to tackle all the problems of education of four billion people. But there are one or two things I can say. The first thing is women. The key to education at a young age is the mother, everywhere in the world. The majority of Arab women are illiterate. And illiterate mothers cannot educate their children. By the time they reach school, if they ever reach school, it is too late. Therefore, the first item is equality, to the extent possible, for women. I consider myself politically to be a few centimeters left of center. But if there is one thing which completely infuriates me about the European far left is that I have never seen a real effort to fight

against the horrible discrimination of women in the Muslim society. If you are believing in women equality, and especially if you are a feminist, and I am a moderate feminist myself, where are the daily demonstrations in front of the Saudi Arabian embassy? Is it okay for women to be treated like they are in Saudi Arabia and in Afghanistan, not being allowed to go to school, never mind putting them into the black thing from head to toe? Not to go to school, not to drive a car, not to leave the country without permission of the husband? Where is the left of the world who believes in human rights and in equality? Not a word, you don't hear about it. This really bothers me.

But back to education. Women are the key. There are very interesting programs going on in Africa because in Africa the governments are collaborating to an extent. I mean there is corruption, there is incompetence, but there is no evil mind. Instead of pressuring Mr. Mubarak to have free elections which only will serve to bring the Muslim Brothers to power, press him to educate the women. And don't forget that the Muslim Brothers are a Nazi invention. You better look at the history of the Muslim Brothers. The Muslim Brothers is a movement that started with the financing and with the initiative of the Nazi party, in the 1930's and didn't change one bit since then. The Hamas is the Palestinian arm of the Muslim Brothers. It is just a different name. But this is what the Hamas is all about. They may change once they are in government, that is another matter. I think there should be much more pressure. Mr. Bush would do much better to fight for women equality everywhere and to make sure that there is women equality in Iraq than have people put the piece of paper in the ballot box, which may lead to a disaster for the world.

The other thing is also to insist on the openness to the world. The war of words and pictures is a very important war. It is not possible to leave the entire Arab world in the hands of Al Jazeera and Al Arabia and all of these networks.

Schmidt

By doing what?

Harari

By broadcasting non-stop in Arabic in the highest level, in the highest quality to all of these places. The scandal of the caricatures will be nothing relative to the scandals that will come when the West will broadcast in Arabic into these countries. Because they will not want to allow it. The Imam in Denmark, incidentally, on the same day that he announced in Danish that he objects to the burning of the Danish flags, was interviewed in Arabic and encouraged it. The same person on the same day. Arafat has been doing it for years, in English and in Arabic on the same day saying the opposite things. And Europe and America never listen to the Arabic broadcasts. My Arabic is as good as my German which means I can more or less understand but not speak. I am telling you it is horrible to listen to what is going on on these networks. I would start the education campaign with TV, media and the internet on one hand and women on the other hand. The rest, we can discuss this for ages.

Question

For many years I come to the Bruno Kreisky Forum with the hope that I am looking and seeking for peace, and I will meet here people who are looking for peace and dialogue. I am from the Lebanon, and we are suffering so much in Lebanon from war. Sometimes we are suffering from all sides. I thought that education will help people come together. Now I say, God save us from educational people who make their plan and make the way to their goal by convincing people, and by changing reality, by changing things from white to black. And we all are convinced. Now I tend to the ignorant people who at least are honest. They cannot sell their ideas better because they don't have the means to sell it. You have been talking about the Arabs. But why don't you mention about what Israel as a government is doing the same way as the Arabs are doing. I want peace. But I don't want to say you, the Jews, are either pigs or heroes. Jews are human beings first.

Harari

I want to participate in a real profound way in the agony of Lebanon which is a country that is really in constant conflict in basically every direction. If there is one country in the Middle East that is really in danger of not existing it is Lebanon, because Syria has never recognised the existence of Lebanon. Syria never had an ambassador in Lebanon because it considered Lebanon a part of Syria. I don't claim to be an expert on internal matters of Lebanon. Lebanon clearly could be and has been for a while the most flourishing point of the Middle East, a wonderful country. It is now partly controlled by Iran, by the Hizbullah. No matter what the government will do and no matter who is in the government in Beirut, the fact is that the strong military force in Lebanon is the Hizbullah, funded by Iran and provided by Syria, trying in every possible way to make trouble. I know the agony that many Lebanese colleagues all over the world feel about their own country. The real tragic problem of the Arab world, in my opinion, is the silent majority. It is clear that among them there are millions of educated Arabs, good people, people who basically are torn to pieces by seeing on one hand what is happening in some of their countries and on the other hand seeing this kind of Islamophobia which is developing in Europe and America. This is something I wrote in my article and in my book. It is really tragic when you meet this individuals. You see how their heart is broken. On the one hand they see their countries which do not function and on the other hand they feel that they have to suffer as belonging to these nations because of what others are doing. The trouble is that this silent majority is not standing up. Here and there, there are religious leaders who are trying to create alliances with religious leaders from other faiths. But they are a very small minority. Most of the silent majority is indeed silent, not unlike the Germans in the 1930's.

Concerning the other issues: I am more than happy to discuss any of the specific problems that are going on between Israel and the Palestinians.

Question

In Britain between 1936 and 1939 the most hated politician was Winston Churchill because he kept on saying that Adolf Hitler was dangerous which people didn't want to know, which people didn't want to hear. What gives you the idea that you will be more successful in Europe than Winston Churchill? What you have done today is something which basically Israeli public relations, Israeli government public relations should do. I saw the other day a children's television clip from Arab children's television which showed a Christian child being slaughtered by Jews who were pulling its blood to a plate, presumable to use it for Mazzes at Pessah. Why is the Israeli government public relations so incredibly incompetent? What is your idea, what is your reasoning for that?

Harari

I certainly do not claim to influence anybody. I am not a government official. I am only a scientist. And I am here because I was invited. I am not on a campaign to change anybody's mind. I am just expressing my own views as a private citizen. Concerning the Israeli public relations I have my own difficulties with it. I don't want to put on the spot the ambassador who is here. He may or may not choose to relate to it. I often say that Israel succeeded in developing forms of electronic warfare against anti-aircraft missiles but not against the telecom media. I don't think that telling the world or showing the world these movies that you have seen is really the issue. One should really discuss the long-range issues where one could certainly do much better.

I want to say one word about the analogies with 1937. There are similarities in the sense that people did not take Hitler seriously and people are not taking the president of Iran seriously. The president of Iran says things that are not very different from what Hitler said, and I am not talking only about Israel and the Jews, I am talking about the world. But there is a big difference, and that is that Hitler represented Germany that was a very powerful country. At the end of the day Iran and its allies are not powerful. They are powerful only if you are asleep. If you are awake they are not powerful at all. That is my only comment. I am not worried for one minute that something as dramatic and traumatic will happen simply because the world has to wake up. I am only hoping that the wake-up call will come a little earlier, and it will save a lot of blood, and especially, and this has to be understood, to the people in these countries.

Because who will suffer from whatever will happen? Who suffered from Hitler at the end? Which nation, at the end, except for the Jews who were killed commercially, so to speak, suffered the most? Germany or France? Germany or Britain? I am sitting here in Vienna. I don't have to say anything about it. At the end it is the nation of the dictator, the ruthless person who tries to destroy the world. His nation is the one that pays the highest price. The sooner this is finished the better off we are.

Question

I agree fully with you that the only solution in the long run would be bridging the intellectual gap. How to come to this solution? Which changes are necessary? Are our political leaders clever and smart enough to find the way to a breakthrough?

Harari

I have my doubts about our political leaders. But I just want to make it very clear that sometimes you get the idea that if you could only replace your political leaders by industrialists, or intellectuals, or business people, or scientists it will be better. It will not be better because to be a political leader is also a very important profession. I don't think there is room for any amateurs in this business. I am really worried very seriously about the future of democracy in the world at large. Too many things are conspiring to destroy it as it is now. Governments are less efficient than the big corporations. The big corporations are also not so efficient, but they are more efficient than governments. And that serves as a different source of focus of power in the world. Number two, in a world of falling boundaries between countries there is an anti-democratic majority. Number three, the terrorists have made a real art of misusing the freedoms of democracy. Every single freedom offered by democracy has been misused by the terrorists. Every single item. If you follow any specific major act of terror, let's say September 11 in the United States, every single freedom has been misused: You are innocent until proven guilty, you have the right to remain silent, you cannot attack somebody operating from a different country, you enjoy free travel, you preach hatred from places of worship, you misuse philanthropy, you misuse fellowships for foreign students, you move money across continents, and on and on. And the two most sacred freedoms, the freedom of speech and the freedom of religion are being used by the preachers in the Mosques and by the satellite TV, and this is why nobody stops them, because they are protected by the freedom of religion or speech.

Democracy is under an enormous attack like it has never been. I am not sure we all realise the severity of it. Add to this the complexity of the problems and the quickness of the attempted solutions and you really have a major mismatch here. Don't think for one minute that I am implying that we should abandon democracy. All I am saying is that democracy had one face in the 20th century. Perhaps at the beginning of the 21st century we should start thinking how democracy can be improved to avoid all of these things. This requires a different look at international relations. Our attitude today does not allow us to utter a sentence like "perhaps we can improve on our present form of democracy". It is not politically correct to say it. And I think that is bad because there are too many bad pitfalls happening with democracy. If we don't change it to be just, fair and functioning, we will end up with a non-democratic system. That will be terrible.

Question

I would like to pick up on what you said, that politics mainly is rather short-sighted because they have to face the next elections. I experienced that there are two basic attitudes towards tackling problems. One is, let's get away from the problem. But the next one which is much more important is, where do we want to go. For that we need a vision. What is your vision of a successful solution?

Harari

I tried it to express it throughout the evening, and I don't want to repeat myself. But perhaps this is a good moment to say that, in spite of everything I said, I am an eternal optimist. Having lived through everything that happened in the Middle East through my lifetime and through the five generations that preceded me, only gives one more reasons for optimism. I will quote one thing that I wrote as a motto for the last chapter of my book. It is that I hope that when my little granddaughter, who is four years old, will write her autobiography, she will start by saying: "my grandfather was an optimist and he was right".

Question

What we witness now is that Europe is being blackmailed. Europe is in situation where it has to make appeasement because the caricatures are really nothing. And now they insult the religious feelings... But Europe is in a situation, and especially Austria with the presidency of the EU now, where it has to give in. I think we have to find ways how not to lose the diplomatic way, but not to give in. It will be faced many times. What happened now will not be the first time.

Harari

I don't know why Europe feels it has to give in and why Europe has to feel blackmailed. Europe is strong, Europe is affluent. Europe should simply not give in, not be blackmailed. All of this theoretical troubles that could happen if Europe will stand up for what it believes in, will simply not happen. I mentioned the oil weapon which is definitely a paper tiger. There are many other things. There are all kinds of examples to this. There was an Arab boycott on Israel for years. And many countries felt that they have to give in because they will lose business in the Arab world. The Arab boycott disappeared. Nobody lost any business in the Arab world. This is just empty blackmail. This is a blackmail without a gun. There is simply no reason for Europe to even consider surrendering to it.

Question

Europe is scared.

Harari

From what? Europe should be more scared to surrender than be scared to stand up.

Question

It is very interesting to have a view from science on all these political issues that we have there. You are saying that at least at the moment in this world we have a certain problem, we have a certain state. Your theory would be to implement more education for the people in Arab countries, in the Third World, societies that do not have human capital resources. My question is not how to achieve this, but to what does that lead? If you are looking at Europe through the centuries, 20% of the society lived very well off 80%, and they were not willing to change that. Today you said what General Motors is producing is half of the GDP of Pakistan and Bangla Desh combined. Who wants to change that? Are we willing here in our society to have a change in that? Looking at the problems that we have the whole situation is a paradox.

Harari

That is why people have to think long-range. You are absolutely right. When somebody in Vienna who is middle class or upper middle class or wealthy wakes up in the morning, the first thing in his mind is not to help the poor people in Bangladesh. On the other hand, if you look at the future it will reach a point that this will have to be the first thing. Whether it will take 20 years or 50 years I do not know. But some day between now and then this will have to become the main issue. The gentleman from Lebanon mentioned the wall that Israel is building between it and the Palestinians. There is also a wall between the United States and Mexico in large parts of the border. And there is now a wall between Spain and Morocco. I guarantee that if the Mediterranean would dry out because of some environmental catastrophe Europe will build a wall along the Mediterranean between it and North Africa. And relative to this wall the Israeli wall will look like a tiny little hedge. That is not a solution. Because that wall is wrong in the long run. It is only a good temporary solution against suicide murders. The reason I am saying what I say is precisely for people of your (young) generation to start thinking about these things before it will be too late. The realisation that we have to solve this problem will penetrate, because otherwise too many people will die. We learned a few lessons from World War II. It cost too many lives. We don't need to learn the same lessons from World War III in the same way. We can start learning them now.

Question

You mentioned Hamas and you mentioned journalism. I read in a local paper in Austria that when Hamas was organised the Israeli government at that time supported Hamas in order to weaken Fatah, the party of Arafat. If that is true there might be a good chance now to discuss peace seriously with Hamas.

Harari

First of all I want to repeat for the third or the fourth time that I am not representing the Israeli government, I am not representing any government, I only represent myself. And I am not always happy with my own government anymore than you are happy here with your government. This is one of the advantages of democracy that we sometimes like our government and sometimes we don't like it. Israel certainly never supported the Hamas. Such an allegation is certainly incorrect. But what is correct is that there were situations in which every effort to damage Arafat indirectly led to strengthening of the Hamas. The Arafat regime was totally and horribly corrupt. One of the main reasons for the success of the Hamas was not so much the belief of the Palestinian people in the slogans of the Hamas or a deep Muslim religious belief. Most of the Palestinians are not so deeply religious. There are even Palestinian Christians who voted for the Hamas and that is definitely not for religious reasons. They just could not take any more the corruption and the incompetence and inefficiency of the old guard of the Arafat people. That may have been one of the main reasons. In that very indirect way you may blame Israel for this. Israel emphasized the corruption of the Arafat people. But every bad thing that happens in the Middle East is always blamed on Israel, sometimes even correctly, most of the time not correctly. This is really for historians to evaluate. The Israeli far left is blaming the governments of the last 10 years, both Labour and Likud, for bringing upon the decline of the Fatah and the success of the Hamas. That is their claim. Whether it is correct? I have serious doubts.

Question

I would like to come back to what you said in terms of using democratic tools, and I would like to come to the Austrian society. Do you think that in the Muslim society in Austria which is the second or third biggest religious group in Austria – and we don't have this colonial background in the problems of England and France – would there be a chance of appeasement and of non-fundamentalisation if the Austrian government would take more measures for integration? I am talking of opening the low cost housings, Gemeindebauten, which only now have been opened for foreigners. There is no real dialogue between the Austrian, the Christian society, the major society and the Muslim society. But if these means of integration by Austrian politics would be stronger implemented, would this be a chance to calm down fundamentalism, at least in Austria?

Harari

I certainly cannot comment on what is happening in Austria. I don't know enough about Austria, and I don't know about the Muslim minority in Austria. But it is clear that for any minority the correct formula would be a combination of integration and preservation of the cultural values of this minority. It is absolutely clear that a Turkish minority in Austria would like to keep some elements of their culture, of their religion, of their language. And this should be respected and honored. At the same time it also has to undergo a certain level of integration, and those who want to assimilate should be allowed to do so, and those who don't want should be encouraged not to. For minorities everywhere in the world, not only Muslim minorities, and not only in Europe, it is never easy to be a minority. There are people here in this room who, in one sense or another, are members of a minority. The problem is always the same. On one hand you would like to raise the economic and social status of the minority and that, of course, discourages any feeling of discrimination. On the other hand if it is an ethnic minority with a different language and religion, it should be allowed to preserve them, but in a reasonable way. And the word reasonable means not to let fanaticism, incitement, and things that did not exist until recently take hold. This is the tragic thing that is happening. It is a sad disaster for the minority itself.

Schmidt

I guess we should stop here because the discussion would just drag on for another hour or two, which would be fine, but maybe a little bit too tiresome especially for Prof. Harari. I would like to thank you for your very interesting talk. It is extremely stimulating, it is extremely rich. I think we all are happy that you came to us. I also thank everybody who participated in the discussion.