

rich example of religious behavior.” He chooses there, in particular, the first Letter to the Thessalonians, about the sudden coming of the Lord. Some of you may know this story, that you never know when the Lord is coming, you have to be attentive for the time.

What Lehmann then does, is to say that this is the *Kairos*, the moment which determines the fate. Lehmann claims that there is a remarkable relationship in this affinity of time and being to the theology of St. Paul. (Yet, as we noted earlier, Georges-Arthur Goldschmidt pointed out that the affinity was rather to Hitler’s *Mein Kampf!*)

And then Lehmann says that Heidegger’s notion of fear, this fear of death agony, which is the entire determining aspect of life, is the same as the suffering and martyrdom

that Paul is talking about. And then he says that “Paul opens up the most extreme possibilities of human existence.”

Lehmann notes that Heidegger was able to make use of Aristotle in the most productive manner, for his own questioning.

What is most outrageous about this, is that Lehmann treats Heidegger in the most objective and positive manner, as if nothing were wrong. He says, finally, “The destruction of traditional theology through Heidegger was shocking, obviously; but his conviction that ontology could not be based in the traditional theological form, he already says very clearly in *Being and Time*.” So, he does not find this very objectionable, that theology does not have to explain ontology; and, he says, all the questioning of Heidegger is in vain, if

Mainz bishop hears a different drummer

At noon on Aug. 30, the office of the Catholic bishop in Mainz, Germany, faxed a letter to the office of the Schiller Institute in Laatzten announcing that the Esbacher Hof, an educational center of the Diocese of Mainz, was cancelling the room rented by the Schiller Institute for that evening. The agreement with the Esbacher Hof had been made as early as Aug. 10, but the cancellation came only hours before the meeting was to start.

The theme of the meeting was “Why the Planned U.N. Population Conference Should Not Take Place.” The reason given for the abrupt cancellation was that this subject does not correspond “to the special character of the house as a church educational institution of the Bishopric of Mainz.”

Never mind that Pope John Paul II was one of the first to express his “profound concern” about Cairo and has repeatedly stated that “the future of humanity is at stake.” And never mind that for months, the Schiller Institute had been working internationally to prevent the convening of the International Conference on Population and Development, which convened Sept. 5 in Cairo, Egypt. Never mind that by the end of August, not only had many governments in the Muslim world spoken out against the conference, but some even boycotted it or downgraded their delegations to Cairo: Mainz is marching to a different drummer!

Apparently, the bishop of Mainz, Karl Lehmann, does not want to see a scientific debate conducted which would show that the malthusian premises behind Cairo—the notion that the world’s “carrying capacity” for human popu-

lation is limited and reaching a breaking point—are scientifically groundless. The Schiller Institute’s meeting was cancelled based on, among other things, an alleged “extreme belief in science and progress” on the part of the institute.

There are no limits to growth

Indeed, since its founding in 1984, the Schiller Institute has promoted a scientific and social policy which, if implemented, would provide ever-larger numbers of people with an ever-higher standard of living. However “politically correct” it may be, the “limits to growth” thesis is scientifically absurd.

On July 5, Klaus-Henning Rosen warned in the Bonn Social Democratic publication *Blick nach Rechts*, against “unholy alliances,” and decried the Schiller Institute by name for “discrediting the U.N. population policy.” Rosen, whose past history of retailing the lines coming from Communist East Germany and its dreaded Stasi secret police has not been forgotten by observers of German politics, defended in that article the long-disproven predictions of the British East India Company’s Parson Thomas Malthus (that human populations will grow faster in numbers than the food supply) and warned against the growing “number of reproducibles.” Rosen demanded, “It would be desirable if the Catholic Church would make clear here that partners in the style of LaRouche are not wanted.”

On cue, the secretary of the German Bishops Conference, Fr. Wilhelm Schaetzler, “in consultation with Bishop Lehmann,” adhered to the “politically correct” line dictated by Rosen. Schaetzler indicated, “in relation to the impending Cairo world population conference,” that “we are neither interested in a dialogue with the LaRouche organization nor in cooperation with the organization.”