



**Wisdom: on what
is missing**



**English podcast
transcript**

Wisdom: on what is missing

English Transcript

Zürich: METIS Podcast Transcriptions 2023

FM = Frederike Maas

MH = Michael Hampe

GS = Gert Scobel

FM: Hello, and welcome to Wisdom Talks, the internet portal for intercultural wisdom literature and wisdom practices, at www.metis.ethz.ch. “Weisheit: Über das, was uns fehlt” is the title of a book by Gert Scobel, our guest today. He is known to many of our German-speaking listeners through educational formats on ZDF, on 3sat, or even on YouTube. In his eponymous show, he deals with philosophical, social and scientific questions that have – or should have – relevance for people's lives, as the title of his book on wisdom suggests. In today's podcast, Gert Scobel is interviewed by Michael Hampe, the initiator of the METIS project and professor of philosophy at ETH Zurich. The two talk about wisdom as a strategy for coping with complexity, the possibility of broad-based education on wisdom, and also Gert Scobel's personal experience with wisdom practices such as meditation. My name is Frederike Maas, and I hope you enjoy the podcast.

MH: Welcome to ETH's wisdom podcast, Gert Scobel.

GS: Hello, Mr.Hampe.

MH: Today we're not talking about a specific wisdom literature, but about a whole network related to the term 'wisdom'. Gert Scobel has published several books on the topic, including: “Weisheit: Über das, was uns fehlt” [Wisdom: About what we are missing],

published in 2018. This book is about Cusanus, about Buddha, about brain research, about pedagogy, about meditation; many things related to wisdom. One passage in this book particularly struck me as someone with a background in philosophy. There is reference to Laozi, who is said to have said that the wise man does not follow any rule when he is confronted with a situation for action, rather, he searches for what fits the situation. And if I understood correctly, you, Gert Scobel, quote Laozi rather approvingly. You believe that this understanding of wisdom, where the wise man does not follow any rule, is correct. And if you're a philosopher, you look for principles in a situation of action that causes you difficulty, like the categorical imperative, you look for a rule that is generalizable. Or you turn to utilitarianism and try to reduce the suffering that might arise or is already there. But that doesn't seem to be acting wisely in yours or Laozi's sense. Can you elaborate on that, what that means, not following a rule but acting appropriately?

GS: Yes, one notices your philosophical training. Because with this question, of course, you are right at the center of what constitutes wisdom. The paradox of Laozi's formulation is that it sounds like a rule. He formulates a rule that aspires to rulelessness. And I believe that something that always makes wisdom appear in Western eyes as – how shall I put it – an inferior form of action or an inferior state is precisely this lack of rules, which has something esoteric, random and, above all, precarious about it. For how do we get through everyday life, how do we get through life? By learning rules and sticking to them to a certain extent. This applies socially as well as in the private sphere. And what Laozi is saying here in very few words is: first, to recognize what the difference is between rule-governed behavior – which is what Western philosophy usually recommends – and wisdom; and second, I think this is implicit in this remark, that what we know – and we know what rules are and how to follow them – we have to leave behind. This is incomprehensible first and seems to be completely arbitrary. Because we need some point of reference. And I think the problem is solved, however, if you see it – in this case, because it's Laozi – in the Daoist context. And this Daoist context – I'm going to say it very flowery and metaphorically – is related to the fact that life is compared to a river. And such rivers, of course, have a riverbed and such rivers usually have a direction. What Laozi means when I translate this is: all situations in which wisdom, but also prudence and knowledge, occur, are – if you analyze it to the end – actually complex situations. And by complexity I don't mean something vague, which is

complicated; because complicated things can actually also be explained when broken down into details. But I mean what complexity research understands by complexity. Simply put: a system with many elements that interact with each other. And this leads to interactions that cannot be predicted in principle. And in such an environment, wisdom comes into play. That means, following rules has limits. And that's what Laozi anticipates in this sentence, it seems to me.

MH: I find that very interesting. Then wisdom, according to Laozi, and you, means being able to engage with the complexity of a situation, being willing and able to perceive that complexity. And then also to let one's own actions somehow flow into it. This seems to be quite unusual compared to the common understanding of wisdom. Because one concept of wisdom, which you find even in Plato, who criticizes the seven wise men, is that wisdom has something to do with calendar sayings: "As soon as the guarantee is given, the disaster begins", "Nothing in excess", and such are often regarded as wisdom sayings. And I still remember a situation in my studies where a sinologist asked a professor of ancient philosophy if we could do something together on Chinese and Greek philosophy. And then the professor of ancient philosophy replied: "No, you can't actually do that, because the Chinese don't have philosophy at all, they just have proverbial wisdom." So, there is – or there was, hopefully not anymore – the perspective that wisdom is exhausted in sayings, which have a rule-like character, while philosophy argues and gets involved in complexity through analyses and extended reflection. And what you have just explained about Laozi and your own understanding of wisdom is a bit at odds with this. So, there may be wisdom sayings, but wisdom does not consist in delivering the right saying at the right time.

GS: That's not a simple question. First of all, I would like to answer that wisdom is characterized by the fact that you know the rules, but in the decisive situation you act in a way that is appropriate, long-term, to that specific situation. That means, wisdom is about the solution of existential, in my eyes always complex questions. Because simple questions are to be answered according to simple rules. I don't need wisdom for that. Ordinary prudence is enough and indeed the rules that I can apply are enough. But when it comes to a wise decision or a wise action, it is not clear which rule I should apply. Because these rules often contradict each other, or I ask myself in a specific case: Is this really the case now in

which I should apply this rule - for example, of justice, as it is laid down in the law? And I think what you can show is that wisdom is not always a violation of this rule. Because there are wise decisions that fit the rule exactly one-to-one. But there are other situations where there is a deviation from that same rule. And there is no rule on when to deviate and when not. That's the first problem. And as far as China is concerned, we would have to do a deep dive. Because, first of all, I think that it would be absolutely presumptuous, and in my eyes also totally wrong, to say that the Chinese can't think and that's why they haven't philosophized. But the way in which philosophizing is done, and above all how language works, is completely different from ours. It starts with the fact that Chinese has no grammar. During the past few days, I have been reviewing the beginning of the Daodejing again and again, and according to the sinologists and China experts, as far as language is concerned, just the addition of a comma changes the meaning of the Chinese words. Because, as I said, there is no grammar, they just stand next to each other. And just a few words apart there is 'dao', meaning to walk, and 'dao', meaning to speak. But that is not understandable for us at first. So, there is first of all a linguistic difference. And the second thing is that afterwards – that is, when I have acted wisely – I can of course try to express it in a metaphorical way. And if you take the Daodejing, but also texts of Chan Buddhism, for example, they are "post-event", so to speak. They are formulated after the event, in the same way that Chinese or Japanese poetry is formulated. And that's rather – for our taste, that is, if you come from analytical philosophy – very breezy, very flowery. And lastly, I think at some point there will be a book written about Chinese pragmatism. I think China has a very pragmatic philosophical approach. But it's a different form of pragmatism than American pragmatism. However, that's really a very philosophical discussion, only indirectly related to wisdom.

MH: We can come back to language in a bit. First, I would like to address this problem of how knowledge and reasoning relate to wisdom. If you say that knowledge has to do with the fact that I possess certain information, based on which I make assumptions and then conclude and argue according to rules and in the end do something, perform a certain action, on the basis of a certain argument, then of course this takes time and possibly the course of argumentation in my head does not do justice to the complexity of the situation at all. And at first sight, rather naively, one could think that the wise man doesn't have to

argue, as he has intuition, he has inspiration. He doesn't have to somehow go through a long train of thought, but for some reason he absorbs the complexity in a different way. I know, you are familiar with all the studies by Gigerenzer about gut decisions and so on. Does this difference between knowledge and wisdom, or between argumentative deliberation and appropriate action, ultimately boil down to the fact that there are people who have good intuition and other people who have to follow rules because they don't have intuition?

GS: I don't think that's true. That is, if you go by the research that Paul Baltes did at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development. Baltes was in fact a gerontologist and psychologist, who was interested in what wisdom actually is, because that's the only positive quality, so to speak, that old age brings with it. So, if you start with Baltes' research – maybe we'll touch on that later – then you learn that wisdom is not something that you are born with. Wisdom is not something that you just do, that simply comes by intuition, but wisdom is something that you have to learn and that you have to work for. Behind your question, I think, is the romantic notion of some philosophical genius who is able to have super-intuition and thus beats everyone else, so to speak, in the chess game of life. I think that's really more of an illusionary notion. It may apply to one or the other, but it is really the exception. And on that note: you said that we analyze by trying to know as much information as possible about a system, for example, and then we infer how that system will behave and we adjust accordingly. That's a perfectly correct decision for closed systems and for linear systems. But if you take – and there are many such examples – something as simple as a double pendulum; that is, a pendulum which is attached to a pendulum that rotates. Then you can't predict the motion of this second pendulum with any physics that is known to us, even though you know everything about both pendulums. You know all the laws of motion. You can measure the momentum. You can measure the velocity. You can measure the weight. You have all the information you need. But complex systems are nonlinear, dynamic, dissipative systems, the physicist would say, which in principle cannot be predicted beyond a certain point. Back to your question: This means that even if I have all the rules and all the information, in reality I am dealing with a complex system with a tipping point, beyond which this information and these rules no longer help me. Wisdom, so to speak, is prepared for that to happen with great regularity in complex systems. And that, interestingly enough, is what is captured both in the Daoist-Buddhist tradition, but also in

Socrates, with the concept of not knowing. Not-knowing is the unmarked area, so to speak, where I cross the boundaries of what I know and enter into a space, metaphorically speaking, where those rules suddenly no longer apply. I stand in the middle of the fog. I can no longer see anything. What can I rely on? And Gerd Gigerenzer, whom you quoted, in connection with the research of Nobel Prize winner Reinhard Selten, has dealt with the fact that we very often have to deal with situations that represent bounded rationality. What does that mean? It means that we do not have all the information, not all the laws, not all the knowledge, but we still have to decide. How do we do that? That's where an uncertainty factor comes in. And his research shows that in complex decision-making situations and under time pressure, we make use of heuristics. Heuristics are, if you will, simple calendar sayings that help us, roughly, to reduce and apply complex situations in a number of cases. I could give examples of that, Gigerenzer has quite a few. So heuristics, I would say, run parallel to that, and are not necessarily the same as wisdom. Heuristics are simply problem-solving procedures that anyone can use without being wise, and that are also very often used – for example in politics.

MH: Yes, Gerd Gigerenzer once spoke here in Zurich about goalkeepers who run out of the goal at the right time and attack the striker, or just stand still in their box because they know that he will shoot in such and such a way and then display the right behavior in order to keep the ball. And if I remember correctly, he also said that a goalkeeper has to learn that.

GS: Exactly.

MH: Now it's clear that a goalkeeper doesn't make calculations about the movement of the striker and can't simulate a long argument. But still, a good goalkeeper does the right thing when attacked, or if he's not a good goalkeeper, he does the wrong thing. Would you say that a goalkeeper who does the right thing most of the time, that is, runs out at the right time or stays in his goal, is wise?

GS: No, I wouldn't. I would say he just knows his sport. But what is correct about that statement is that wisdom is actually – and this comes from Baltes, and Gigerenzer also got this from Baltes – that we aren't born with wisdom, but actually have to learn wisdom.

Baltes has also pointed out that in a situation where we have to decide wisely or act wisely, we naturally depend on knowing the context. That is, we need to know what rules generally apply there. But at the same time, we also need to know where the limit of the application of these rules is. And then we enter an unfamiliar area, and we have to practice that. There are, of course, especially in the Asian, let's call it philosophies, arguably also religions, exercises and techniques that help you enter this space of not knowing, to gradually feel more at ease, to know more, to better endure ambiguity, fear, all the things that are associated with entering an unknown space, and to cope with it and still navigate well. That's the way I'd describe it.

MH: Yes. Maybe at this point we can come back to language, because many philosophers have noticed that in our language and in our linguistic distinctions there are always certain evaluations, especially regarding big concepts. When you talk about power, for example, you're usually not just describing a fact, but perhaps also evaluating something positively or negatively. And when we orient ourselves linguistically in a situation, then there is often the danger that we carry judgements from the past into this situation, because we describe it linguistically in a certain way. And if I understood you correctly, there are traditions where it is claimed that navigating such complex situations – when it comes to wisdom – has to do with not bringing to the situation the linguistic distinctions to which one has become accustomed. How can you drop linguistic distinctions in the perception of a complex situation?

GS: There are probably different levels of, let's say metaphorically, leaving language behind. This sounds like the ladder that Wittgenstein speaks of in the *Tractatus*, which one throws away. One thing is that one is aware of the limitation of rules. And although you have the rule in your head, so to speak, which acts like an inner voice, you ignore it and you just run out of the goal, in this case, to hopefully catch the ball. Then there are certainly also techniques to practice, feelings, inner perceptions, also language, this conversing with oneself in trying to apply rules, that one leaves behind. These are meditative exercises in the broadest sense, in which one learns to perceive feelings and thoughts over time, but to let them pass. I realize, or my inner voice tells me to apply this rule and stay in the goal. But I have learned that every situation is its own, new, unique situation in which I must, as Laozi

would say, sound out the effectiveness of things. And in this case, that may mean running out now. In another case, it may be that the rule is completely correct and I stay in the goal. And that's another form of leaving language behind, or not listening to inner dialogues and voices.

MH: So, you would say meditative practice is a practice that allows one to notice when one is approaching a situation with certain conceptual distinctions and judgements, and to possibly question that; to say, yes, maybe these distinctions are not appropriate to the situation, I'm going to put those aside now. And because meditation teaches you to put all kinds of thoughts and distinctions aside, you're sort of trained to do that when you're faced with a complex situation. Is that correct?

GS: Yes. And a research project emerges from that, for which – as far as I know – there's really very little empirical evidence. The research project would be that we know from neuroscientific studies that there is such a thing as non-dual states of consciousness. They have a certain neuronal signature. So, you can tell from the outside whether someone is in such a state of consciousness or not. And now comes the experiment: We would have to test whether someone who has learned to generate non-dual states of consciousness through meditative techniques is actually able to solve certain complex problems better than others. While I have pointed out that we enter this realm of non-knowledge in which we necessarily reside when dealing with complex systems, I have implicitly claimed that doing so helps us, for example, generate non-dual states of consciousness in which we let thoughts and feelings go. What is missing is empirical evidence that this really helps us act better in concrete situations – namely, in complex environments. That's an implicit assertion in Daoism, for example. I would say in many Buddhist forms, in fact. The question is, is this assertion true. I think that could be tested empirically. It's certainly not easy. It's a very complex experimental design. But it would probably move our conversation forward if we actually had empirical evidence that this actually helps us in certain situations.

MH: In your book, you talk about Wolf Singer's research on the synchronizations that take place in the brain when someone enters a meditative state. And Wolf Singer himself also meditated. So, it's sort of an empirical approach to meditation. Maybe we should talk a little

bit more about this, because there are two conceptions of meditation, which look a little bit different than the one you just described. On the one hand, there is the idea that meditation is a ritual behavior; that a group of religious people, a sangha, gets together and then performs a certain rite. It may look like that from the outside, but maybe that's not such a wrong description. This sometimes happens in a room where there is something like an altar, a gong sounds and so on. This is very reminiscent of ritual behavior, which we call worship in Christianity. And on the other hand, there are meditative exercises in wellness centers where people try to optimize themselves, to increase their ability to concentrate, to become happier. There, it's more like gymnastics or solving Sudoku, that you somehow think more clearly or more concentrated. But we want to talk about wisdom. And wisdom doesn't necessarily seem to have anything to do with serving God, but it also doesn't necessarily seem to have anything to do with self-optimization. But it must be learned. My question is: What does this third understanding of meditation look like in terms of wisdom? When you say that you can learn wisdom through meditation, you can empirically research that there is in fact a change in the brain. But that's not a ritual behavior and that's not a self-optimization behavior. How would you describe that then? What is meditation as a form of wisdom training? Is it something religious? Is it something athletic? Or is it something else?

GS: That's really very difficult because there are probably hundreds of hybrid forms, all of which are hard to put into systems. So, I'll start at the bottom; it's certainly not 'McMindfulness'. I don't think we mean neoliberal optimizing through mindfulness techniques that help us function better and faster. I do not believe that is how you learn it. You can certainly apply mindfulness, but you can't become wise with mindfulness in that way. The second question, the question of religion, I personally think – and you can argue about this at length – that something like Zen Buddhism or Chan Buddhism is not necessarily religious. I would rather describe it as a certain form of pragmatism. That, for example, certain forms of Daoism have definite religious undertones is undisputed. That even in non-religious forms of learning meditation – breath control and so on – there are rules, absolutely, and there are rites as well. It's reasonable that when you sit down to meditate, to first of all let the breath flow. Now you can say that this is ritual. But it is also very practical and pragmatic. But you asked about a third thing. Probably the answer would be: neither. We are trying to give the third thing a name. If you follow Laozi's advice, you would

say, don't give this third thing a name. Because then you get to know it, you make friends with it, you get closer to it. If you give names, you'll just scare it away. Of course, with the consciousness of Western philosophers trained in analytic philosophy, that sounds downright disastrous. I don't think any analytic philosopher can do much with that. One must remember that we are on the level of coping with life – that is, coping with existential and complex problems – and not on the level of applying mathematical rules in order to better or more precisely grasp certain linguistic expressions. This form of philosophy is more like a chess game or the application of mathematical formulas than what we are actually trying to talk about; namely, how do I solve complex life problems, how do I deal with them? And whether mathematics helps me do that is the big question.

MH: Would it then perhaps be a first attempt to say that people who try to approach wisdom through meditation are cultivating an art of living rather than engaging in a particular happiness technique or religious commitment? This concept of the 'art of living' has, after all, become relatively popular in the West following Nietzsche and Foucault, and perhaps is something like a third thing. Would you agree with that, or do you think it's an inappropriately aestheticizing term for meditative practice?

GS: You could say that, but ultimately, I think the term is a bit fuzzy. Unless one specifies it and says: If, for example, I have mastered the art of painting, then I know the rules of perspective and I know how to mix colors and I also know how to use colors. If you understand art of living in that sense, yes. But I think you can be more precise if, for example, you bring in a dimension – even if this has become a fashionable word and is very trite – of sustainability. In other words, when I act and ask myself about acting wisely, I always have to ask the question: Is this an action that will stand the test of time? Is it just a short-term, ad hoc solution that gets the problem off my back for today, so to speak, but that I then have to face again tomorrow? Or is it a solution that actually helps me solve this problem over a longer period of time, in a sustainable way so that it doesn't come back to me like a boomerang? A good example of that is technology, which on the one hand helps us, but on the other hand creates all kinds of extreme problems through energy and resource consumption, for example. And this idea of sustainability, if I combine that with the idea of the art of living – which I would advise – I don't know what kind of concept

comes out of that, but it's probably not the classical concept of art of living that you have in mind.

MH: Let me dig a bit deeper on that categorization. Not because I'm a fan of labels and categorizations, but because you've argued that meditative practices should also be taught in schools. And now you could say: What's the point of that? Is that something like religious instruction and Buddhist indoctrination? Or is it something like physical education? In physical education you are made physically fit and in meditation classes you are made fit in terms of your ability to concentrate? So isn't there a danger, if you introduce meditation as a school subject, that you'll either be put into the ritual box and the parents will say, now the Buddhists are coming and want to undermine our Christian Occident; or that you'll be put into the self-optimization box and say that the physical education class will be supplemented by the concentration class. So you don't need a label like that to justify integrating meditative practice into the education system?

GS: That's right. And both of these things get thrown at you. Thankfully there is already a lot of research on mindfulness training in schools. And in my eyes, the philosopher Thomas Metzinger has come up with a very clever term, namely 'consciousness culture'. In order to be able to act well, I have to know how I react in certain situations. I have to be able to know, in a kind of self-monitoring process: now I'm very anxious, so I interpret the situation I'm in in a certain way. Now I'm very exuberant, and I do the exact opposite. Consciousness culture actually means nothing other than: I get to know certain states of consciousness – even states of consciousness that are not very common in our everyday lives, like silence for example – and together with others, I ask myself which states of consciousness are actually desirable. There is relatively little talk about this in our culture. And there are definitely states of consciousness that let me recognize which thoughts and actions that can contribute to happiness, and which ones that tend to destroy that. That, by the way, is a definition used by the Tibetan monk and scientist Matthieu Ricard. Wisdom has to do with a discernment that lets us know which thoughts and actions contribute to genuine happiness and which destroy it. And that's where I think states of consciousness play an important role. And when it comes, for example, to working through problems of bullying in the classroom, or forms of conflict, or learning difficulties, states of consciousness always play a

significant role. And I basically have to learn to perceive states of consciousness, to classify states of consciousness and also to be able to deal with them. And I can actually do that in the broadest sense through mindfulness or meditation training. What you specifically name it is probably more marketing and political packaging than actual content.

MH: Perhaps that is something similar to the education of a person. Personality development was also something that was strived for in schools, but today it may sound a bit old-fashioned. But isn't the cultivation of consciousness – the ability to perceive one's own states of consciousness – something similar to the formation of a personality?

GS: Yes. I don't have a problem with that at all. That's why I like the concept of education, if you really understand it in a comprehensive way. If I put it polemically, I feel like what is understood as education in our school system right now is basically training for a certain form of economic and technical performance. But that's not what's meant in the concept of education that you're referring to now.

MH: Now I know from other conversations that you have been pursuing meditative practices for decades, and have gone through koan training, so you've been through this educational process to some extent. I would like to ask you in conclusion, how you would describe the effect – if you can put it that way. Do you think that you can publicly represent the change that has taken place in your own person through these practices? That you can report on what actually happens when you go through something like this yourself?

GS: That's hard to answer, because you have to compare yourself to yourself on the premise that you haven't meditated; and you've meditated for many years. But the question, can you extend that? The simple answer to your question is, yes, it has changed me. It has changed me in a lasting way. And I think it's made me, how shall I say, more tolerable. My Zen master always says if you want to know if you're really making progress, ask your wife, ask your kids, ask the people you work with, they can tell you. I think there's a lot to that. Because you actually notice it in your everyday behavior, how you communicate, how you react to things, how selfish you act, how much you're able to get away from it. And I would say it changed me a lot. Would I recommend it to others? Yes, I would recommend forms of

meditative training that go in that direction – it doesn't have to be Zen at all, it can be something else – to be taught in schools. I think that's an absolutely essential skill to be able to deal with the problems that we have right now – and by that I mean climate change, war, increasing anxiety, resource problems, species extinction – to be able to deal with these problems that are very distressing, that make us anxious, that make us panic, that make us depressed, to be able to deal with those kinds of effects better. I think that's essential. In extreme cases, does that replace therapy? No, it doesn't replace it. It's not a classical therapeutic intervention in the psychiatric sense, although such procedures are increasingly used, for example, in the treatment of depression, yes. But I think it's necessary in order to deal more calmly, more relaxed, with the problems that complex situations confront us with. And that's exactly what we have at the moment. And in the future, I think we're going to have to increasingly deal with the realization that we've brought guilt upon ourselves, that we've failed, that we've done a great deal wrong and destroyed a great deal with our rationality, which we thought could control everything. And now, of course, we are looking for an alternative. And for the time being, we don't have one. It is not provided for in our classical education and in our classical, rule-oriented – as per the beginning of our conversation – ideas about the art of living or the conduct of life. And that's why I believe that this alternative offer, this possibility of changing our attitude to life, is of very great importance for us in the long term. When we talk about transformation today, we don't talk about the transformation of our consciousness. I think this is an elementary mistake. Because when we talk about transformation, we must talk about the transformation of our consciousness. Because we will all have less in the future. We will have to do without. We will be deprived of things that are dear to us. And we will have to deal with that in the future without whining all day or becoming depressed. It won't be easy.

MH: Becoming more tolerable for one's fellow human beings and perhaps also for the other living beings, such as animals and plants, which we have plagued quite a bit in the last centuries, is perhaps not the worst explication of wisdom. We are already at the end of our conversation. Thank you, Mr. Scobel, for the reflection and your personal input.

GS: With pleasure. If I may say one more sentence....

MH: Sure.

GS: One can also turn that into something positive by saying that we can be kinder, to ourselves, to other people and to all other living beings and things. That is perhaps a simple paraphrase, very applicable in practice, not always easy to carry out.

MH: Wonderful.

GS: Thank you for the interview, by the way.

MH: Thank you very much.

FM: I hope you enjoyed today's conversation, also in comparison to the usual format. Please let us know at metis@phil.gess.ethz.ch. I would also like to invite you to follow further Wisdom Talks and to browse the media offerings of the internet portal for intercultural wisdom literature and wisdom practices at metis.ethz.ch. You will find links to the booklets accompanying the podcast, below. Thank you for your time and goodbye.

This podcast was produced by Martin Münnich with support from ETH Zurich and the Udo Keller Foundation, Forum Humanum in Hamburg.