

---

## The Heidegger File

---

# Ruiz's ideological support networks in Germany

by Elisabeth Hellenbroich

In a March 6 article in the German daily *Süddeutsche Zeitung* about the upheaval in Chiapas, Bishop Samuel Ruiz is quoted: "If I am guilty of anything then it is of the fact that I helped to open the eyes of the *Indios*." Yet the same article reports that Eduardo Castellanos, chairman of Mexico's National Reconciliation Commission (CONAI), demanded Bishop Ruiz's resignation, charging that by defending the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) he not only hardened the battlelines, but very possibly equipped the rebels with arms.

The article appeared to reflect what a spokesman for the German Catholic Bishops Conference described to a journalist as a deep split within the Catholic Church in Germany. One faction wants Samuel Ruiz, a fervent follower of the "Theology of Liberation," which has been officially condemned by the Vatican, to resign at once; the opposing faction thinks there would be a catastrophe in Mexico if Ruiz were forced out. The spokesman claimed that if the German Bishops Conference were to issue a statement even merely "implying" that Ruiz has to go, the proverbial hell would break loose within the German Church, particularly from the base communities.

Indeed, the Bishops Conference is one of the two most powerful institutional supporters of Ruiz and his Zapatista guerrillas in Germany. The other is the Aachen-based charity Misereor, which the Bishops Conference created in 1959 to work for conquering hunger and disease in the world and to deal with development policies. Financed from church offerings and government funds, Misereor disposes of some DM 331 million a year (about \$200 million at the current exchange rate) according to a recent annual report.

The Bishops Conference spokesman insisted that the allegations that Misereor has financed the EZLN were a falsehood spread by the *American Spectator's* Vatican correspondent Mary Bell Martínez and denied by the German Foreign Ministry as well as by two Misereor representatives who visited Mexico in January 1995. He then added that the bishops "stand fully behind Bishop Ruiz."

As for Misereor, when a journalist asked an official to what extent Misereor has financed EZLN weapons purchases, as alleged in Mexico, the answer was that such financing is "in every respect to be excluded." Misereor is not supporting any "such type of rebellions," for "violence as a means to structural changes is not the right way." But while claiming to seek only peaceful solutions, Misereor did state that over the decade 1984-94, some DM 4,984,500 were shipped to the three dioceses of Chiapas, supposedly to fund development programs such as the securing of food production, growing "organic coffee" without chemicals and pesticides, anti-erosion and soil improvement programs, and consultancy programs for the defense of human rights. The spokesman said that every year Misereor sends to San Cristóbal de las Casas in Chiapas, the "relatively small" sum of DM 50,000 for human rights.

Yet on Aug. 19, 1994, Misereor paid for an ad in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* headlined: "Legal Protection." "Your Misereor contribution is in good hands with Samuel Ruiz," proclaimed the text. "With it he pays for justice. Justice for the indigenous in Mexico. He does this because he has been a friend of the indigenous for 25 years and has their trust. As bishop of San Cristóbal he is there body and soul: when their land is stolen, when their wages are withheld, when they are abused and swindled, and when their language and culture are despised. Even when the indigenous revolt was bloodily repressed in January, he didn't leave them. He was the one who was spontaneously appointed and entrusted by them to negotiate with the government. They see him as one of theirs and can rely on him, such that Misereor can imagine no one better in Chiapas for using donations from Germany in the way the donors want."

The same Misereor which rejected allegations of having funded the Chiapas rebellion did tell a journalist that of the DM 5 million that went into Chiapas over 10 years, half of it went to a consortium handling Guatemalan refugees in the state. Reports say that this refugee camp is used as recruiting ground for terrorist activities. Among the 59 Misereor-aided

projects published in their 1993 report, the item “Guatemala” lists DM 230,000 for “health” programs for the indigenous in the diocese of Quezaltenango—right on the border with Mexico. Moreover, according to the Mexico City daily *El Heraldo* on Feb. 4, 1995, Misereor’s representative in Mexico, Kopf Krauz, turned over a document to the Mexican Bishops Conference declaring that Misereor had delivered \$7.5 million (three times the amount stated in Germany) to Samuel Ruiz over the last ten years, half of which was earmarked for Guatemalan refugee camps in the San Cristóbal diocese, and the rest for “aid programs” designed or approved by the bishop. Krauz appeared, *El Heraldo* reported, because of the “Mexican bishops’ insistence on knowing the EZLN’s sources of funds.”

Another pro-Ruiz organization sponsored by the German bishops is the Essen-headquartered Adveniat, set up to help the Ibero-American churches. Their spokesman told *EIR* that Adveniat supports various “pastoral” causes in Mexico, including buildings, vehicles, and education projects. But she sharply distanced Adveniat from the charge, printed in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* on March 6, that it paid for the private CB radio equipment used by the guerrillas for communication. If you want to know how much of the aid money went to Chiapas, she added, you will have to ask the German Foreign Ministry or the embassy in Mexico.

Pro-Zapatista propaganda is also welcome in the German media, where after more than a decade of the Christian Democratic Union and Christian Social Union’s dominating the Bonn government, the Catholic parties have considerable clout. As recently as March 8, 1995, the Arte TV Program (a German/French co-production) aired an exclusive interview with a pipe-smoking Subcommander Marcos. In a romantic “macho” style familiar to Germans from the Baader-Meinhof Gang in the 1970s, “Marcos” swaggered that his guerrillas will never give up their arms, that they are not seeking death but that they have to defend life by facing death, and have recruited and trained 1,000 troops in the past year for this.

## The poison of Heidegger

What motivates the German Catholic Church and its people who influence the media, to come out more and more strongly in favor of Bishop Ruiz and Subcommander Marcos?

The answer lies in the existentialist philosopher Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), who elevated the “irrational” to the status of a fundamental value. As Helga Zepp-LaRouche proved in a speech printed in *EIR*’s Sept. 16, 1994 issue, Heidegger was a raving Nazi who was rehabilitated after World War II by the British, French, and American victors for use in the “reeducation” of Germans, and whose ideas formed the current chairman of the German Bishops Conference, Bishop Karl Lehmann.

It was Heidegger who made Friedrich Nietzsche, the Na-

tional Socialists’ favorite philosopher, fashionable through his lectures in the 1920s, by crediting Nietzsche in particular, with heaving out the window Plato’s concept of universal Ideas, the idea of the Good, followed by Christian metaphysics; Nietzsche’s nihilism, which Heidegger admired, was exactly the revaluation and depreciation of all universal values. Heidegger became famous with his 1927 *Being and Time*, and in his 1929 *What Is Metaphysics?* he threw overboard 2,500 years of metaphysical tradition.

For Heidegger, there was no absolute being, no God as source of divine natural law, nor was man in the image of God, God’s helper in creation. Rather, he fixated on investigating the *Dasein*, man’s existence as man. Man’s primary experience, Heidegger claimed, is fear; and the essence of man’s existence is the transcendence into Nothing.

For Heidegger, technology is the power which turns man away from the real meaning of his life. In *Being and Time*, he calls the condition of being turned away from the actual meaning of one’s life, the “oblivion of being.” Man in the course of the history of western culture, says Heidegger, has forgotten the essentials of human life. People live life in an unactual way and they look for entertainment in their flight from the death agony. The actuality of true life lies in the banal, the basic experience of “being thrown.” That is the depth of Heidegger’s existentialist philosophy: Man is part of the world, and he must live with it in sorrow. The individual’s fear of his death, at the end of his unactually-lived life, is the basic subject of existential philosophy.

Heidegger’s fervent admiration of the Nazis—no surprise given his hatred for Christianity—was revealed by Víctor Farías in his book *Heidegger and Nazism*, published in 1987. In his speech in 1933, upon being made rector of the University of Freiburg, Heidegger proclaimed: “The university has to conduct a decisive fight in the National Socialist spirit, which must not be suffocated through humanizing or Christian conceptions.”

“Continuously, your courage should grow,” said Heidegger, “for the saving of the essence and the elevation of the most inner force of our people in its state. The Führer himself, and he alone, is the present and the future German reality and its law.” In the Freiburg student newspaper in the fall of 1934 he wrote: “Not theorems and ideas should be the rules of your existence. The Führer himself and he alone is the present and future reality and its laws.”

The occupying powers assured the rehabilitation of Heidegger in Germany in 1951, despite his Nazi past. His full reintegration into the academic world, and the fact that it became obligatory to teach his work in the theology faculties, were part of the misnamed “denazification.” Heidegger and the ideologues of the Frankfurt School—Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Hannah Arendt (Heidegger’s mistress), and Herbert Marcuse, who, like Heidegger in the 1920s, considered Nietzsche’s “immortalism” a basis of their own “critical theory”—were made the center of the postwar ideol-

ogy of a “reeducated” Germany.

In the 1930s, Heidegger had avidly defended the Nazi blood and soil ideology and the Nazis’ collective conscience; after the war, in line with the critical theory of the Frankfurt School, he paved the way for postmodernism. Thus, in 1953, he said: “It is not nuclear war that represents the greatest threat, even if that is the worst thinkable; but more threatening, is the peaceful, continuous development of technology, because it robs the thinking human being of his essence, of his ability to think.”

### The case of Bishop Lehmann

This brings us to the case of Bishop Karl Lehmann. On the occasion of the U.N. population conference in Cairo in September 1994, Lehmann authorized the publication of a paper by the German Bishops Conference in cahoots with sundry economists, called: “Economy, Globally and Ecologically: Reflections on the Protection of Resources and Maintenance of the Environment.” The paper called for “sustainable development” and a malthusian economic policy, aimed at curbing the world population growth—an unabashed echo of the same nihilistic “principles” defended by Leonardo

Boff, Hans Küng, Eugen Drewermann, and other “Theoliberati.”

It turns out that Lehmann, from the early 1950s to the 1960s, had been a devout pupil of Heidegger, studying philosophy at the University of Freiburg, where Heidegger had just been reinstated. In 1961, Lehmann presented a 1,400-page doctoral dissertation at the Gregorian University in Rome, entitled “On the Origin and Meaning of the Existential Question in the Thought of Martin Heidegger,” based on his study of Heidegger’s *Fundamental Ontology*. Father Henrici, currently bishop of Zurich, was his thesis adviser. The thesis is now available only in an excerpted version in the public university libraries. A journalist who requested it from the Gregorian University was informed that Bishop Lehmann is in possession of the three-volume dissertation and would have to grant his “personal recommendation” in order for anyone to consult the copy at the Gregorian University. In the available extracts, Karl Lehmann wrote that Heidegger represents an incredible new “beginning” in western European history, meriting a “painstaking word by word” study of his texts.

In 1966, Lehmann published an essay in the *Philosoph-*

## Misereor’s fellow travelers

The Samuel Ruiz aficionados in the German Catholic Church keep company with a spectrum of New Age outfits spanning liberals, social democrats, and communists. Among them:

- *Der Überblick*, a self-styled “Magazine for Ecumenical Movement and International Cooperation,” and *Forum*, a magazine for “development policy action groups.” Both are Hamburg-based.

- Edition ID-Archiv Berlin Amsterdam, a publishing outlet for the Red Army Faction (popularly known as the Baader-Meinhof Gang) support network; printed a book in June 1994 featuring early texts of alleged Zapatista leader “Subcommander Marcos” and supportive reports from the non-governmental organization human rights networks.

- The Third World Action Information Center in Freiburg.

- The Latin America Information Post (ILA) with its Oscar Romero House in Bonn.

- The Society for Endangered Peoples and its magazine *Pogrom*, especially the February-March 1994 issue.

- The International Youth Social Service (IJGD) in Berlin: calls on youths to join in the “Qué Tal” programs in Chile, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica.

- Editorial Nautilus, Hamburg. Published a Spanish-language “solidarity” declaration with the ELZN on Feb. 2, 1995 under the title, “Our Solidarity Is with the Zapatistas.” Among its signers: the former East German commentator Karl Eduard von Schnitzler, notorious for over 30 years as Mr. “Black Channel,” a TV propaganda channel of the East German secret service, the Stasi.

- Certain social-democratic trade unions, such as the Hesse state education and science union, whose chairman Hartwig Schroeder wrote an article for the national daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* on March 27, 1994 making plain the racist stereotypes underlying the pro-Zapatista networks. In it, he lauded the Chiapas rebellion as a “reflex” against the 1992 celebrations of Christopher Columbus’s landing in the Americas. The indigenous feel that they are the “heirs of an old and rich culture,” opined Schroeder. “The last Aztec ruler Cuauhtémoc is a national hero while Hernán Cortés” (who led numerous indigenous nations as well as his small band of Spanish troops to victory over the Aztec empire) is, for Schroeder, “historically a nobody.” “Awareness of a certain tradition is gaining more and more political ground. The resistance against exploitation and not being granted elementary and political rights . . . this new awareness awoke with the 1992 quincentenary celebrations.” Now, thanks to the Zapatista rebellion, Mexico could become “democratic,” and the indigenous communes part of Mexico’s political life and society, Schroeder wrote.

*isches Jahrbuch* on the “Christian Experience of History and the Ontological Question in the Young Heidegger,” where he revamped Christian theology to fit the rehabilitated Nazi philosopher’s mumbo-jumbo. Thus, “Heidegger’s notion of fear, this fear of death agony, which is the determining aspect of life, is the same as the suffering and martyrdom that St. Paul is talking about.” Or: “The destruction of traditional theology through Heidegger was shocking, obviously; but his conviction that ontology could not be based on the traditional theological form, he already says very clearly in *Being and Time*”—the book published in 1927, just before Heidegger emerged as a raving Nazi apologist.

The same Bishop Karl Lehmann, in a book published in 1993, upholds precisely the method of the moral theologians whom Pope John Paul II took to task in his 1993 encyclical *Veritatis Splendor*: those who by referring to the purely subjectivist and individual interpretation of freedom, relativize freedom and overlook the fact that it can only exist in connection with a higher, a divine natural law.

For Lehmann, there is no such thing as a norm concerning the “Christian image of man.” Rather: “The theological image of man is dependent on the historically formed understanding of man. There is not the chemically pure theological image of man, given that the interpretation, for example, of ‘man in the image of God’ carries clearly the footprints of a certain time.” And he concludes: “Each theological image of man is historically determined, given that it stands in its relation to the relative self-conception of man at a given time. There is no ideal normative image of man.”

Having rejected the notion of man in the image of God, Lehmann naturally favors a reinterpretation of the Biblical text of Genesis, in light of today’s “ecological crisis” and the awareness that man has plundered the planet Earth. “Now we must work out norms for how the conditions for life can be maintained on this Earth. . . . If we read attentively the important investigations of the Club of Rome on *Limits to Growth*, we can show how man’s only chance consists in a radical change.” For Bishop Lehmann, the Club of Rome report shows the need “to change the fundamental ethical norms of our society.” A Copernican-scale spiritual revolution is needed for realizing this—not only practical change, but a general change of consciousness.

For Lehmann, the task of Christian man is “to exercise a new thinking which leads to a perceptible responsibility between man and God and world history and nature.” Maybe in this effort “we can have an encounter with the thinking of the late Heidegger,” who indeed offers a treasure trove of deep-sounding verbiage with which to give “philosophical” cover to the arguments of those who justify looting and oppression in the name of “sustainable development” and “planetary consciousness.” And lo and behold, Heidegger’s 1951 lecture, “Building Dwelling Thinking,” contains just the grist for Lehmann’s mill: “Saving the Earth is more than to use or abuse it. Saving the Earth does not subdue it, from

whence there is only one step toward limitless exploitation.” Or: “Man only lives truly if he keeps all dimensions of his existence in balance and does not miss himself. For Heidegger this means: Save the Earth, receive the sky, expect the gods and assist the mortals.”

### **The case of Boff, Drewermann, and Küng**

With this open sore festering at the top of the German hierarchy, one can hardly be surprised at the ever-growing New Age and “Theology of Liberation” orientation within the German Catholic Church. The famous “Theoliberati,” Leonardo Boff, Hans Küng, Jean Baptiste Metz, Eugen Drewermann, and their co-thinkers, are frequently invited by the Munich-based Catholic Academy and favorably quoted by the Hanover-based Catholic Institute. Their “theology,” as Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger summed it up in his critique of Theolib guru Gustavo Gutiérrez in 1983, “is not to have a social revolution. . . . It is a permanent ‘cultural revolution’ (inspired by the ideas of Marx, Freud, Ernst Bloch, St. Simon, Jeremy Bentham) and the creation of a new man.” Ratzinger, the prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, went on to write, “The real criticism of this kind of theology, is its philosophical irrationalism which deploys religious forces as justification for the irrational . . . which would become totalitarian.”

Despite (or perhaps because of) this clear rejection by the Vatican, during the 1992 Columbus celebrations, the Brazilian ex-priest Leonardo Boff was a prominent guest in many a German event. At a seminar in the Tutzing Evangelical Academy, this author heard him make inflammatory speeches against the Spanish conquistadors and in praise of the mysticism of the indigenous Indians. What was most astonishing was that, despite his overt preference for mass-murdering pagan cults over Christianity, Boff won the full support of Germany’s leading moral theologians as well as spokesmen of the Bavarian Catholic Academy. Throughout 1992 Boff was hailed in *Misereor*’s magazine as the “advocate of the poor” and given voluminous coverage to expound on his reasons for quitting the priesthood, to promote the 1992 Rio U.N. summit (which sought to impose a world environmental dictatorship), and to deliver his sermons about the oppressed *Indios* in Venezuela and Brazil.

Boff’s human-rights veneer wears thin when it is realized that his zeal is not to dispel the dehumanizing poverty and backwardness which enslaves many indigenous people, but rather to promote the same New Age paradigm fanatically espoused by Conservative Revolutionist Newt Gingrich, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and by Gingrich’s idol, futurologist Alvin Toffler: a post-industrial utopia in which a small elite runs the computers, and 95% of humanity is doomed to illiteracy and misery. In this fascist vision, “left” and “right” political labels are irrelevant. Boff’s 1994 book, *A New Earth in a New Era: A Plea for a Planetary Culture*, is a plea for a “cultural revolution” centered

around the syncretic “religion” forged by such monied institutions as Stanford, Esalen, and Tavistock Institute (London) as a battering-ram against the optimism rooted in scientific and technological progress.

In this book, Boff asserts that there is no “binding divine and natural law” as ordained by God’s injunction to man in Genesis, “Be fruitful, multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it.” Instead of conceiving of man as created in the “image of God,” Boff sees man as a “cosmic being with a planetary consciousness. . . . If we look at the planet Earth we see Gaia”—the Earth Mother goddess whose worship led to human sacrifice, and which was rejected categorically by Judaism and Christianity. The “Gaia” thesis, cited approvingly by Boff, portrays the Earth as a living supra-humanism which keeps a dynamic balance between the physical, chemical, and energetic elements. According to Boff, we are cosmic brothers and sisters with the plants and the animals. “We want a new consciousness, a new noösphere. A new cosmogenesis. . . . We are in a phase of deep cultural and civilizational changes. . . . We enter into a new level of consciousness,” he raves.

What Boff means by that is what Alvin Toffler calls the “Third Wave” (information) society, which comes after the “Second Wave” industrial society. Boff outlines a schema of the old and new society, in which the “new” society emphasizes communal life, ecology, and cosmic consciousness.

Boff speaks of a life in syntony and synchrony with the movements of the planet Earth, while attacking Christianity, in particular the Roman Catholic Church, for having been an “accomplice of genocide and ethnocide—whose traumatic effects are still felt by the survivors up to this day.” For Boff, this is all the more deplorable since the official church does not want to recognize its historic guilt, as was evidenced by the 1992 Latin American Bishops Conference in Santo Domingo, celebrating the 500th anniversary of Columbus, or the 1994 Synod in Rome of the African Church. Christianity, by striving to impose universal values (exemplified by the recent *Catechism*), therefore becomes pathological, in Boff’s view, and will hinder the new civilization, whereas he who opens up toward multiculturalism will be good for “planetarization.” “Mankind is in a difficult transition—from the nation-state to the world-state, from the worldwide to the cosmic; from mass to energy to information and communication; from macro to micro from materialism to holistic spiritualism . . . we are before a new planetary civilization.” In another book on ecology and mysticism in 1993, Boff effusively praised the Club of Rome study *Limits to Growth*, and called for the defense of “sustainable growth,” the euphemism for the genocidal policies which were on the original agenda for the 1994 Cairo conference on population.

### **Drewermann praises Aztec human sacrifice**

One of Boff’s German co-thinkers is Eugen Drewermann, who was dismissed from his post as a priest in Pader-

born in 1992 after his much-publicized challenges to Catholic moral teachings. Drewermann, in order to “free” this world from its anthropomorphism and its ethical fixation on Christian values, wants to return to animism and totemism and therefore is fully in agreement with the trend launched by Nietzsche, Freud, and C.G. Jung.

For Drewermann, in his book *The Deadly Progress*, Friedrich Nietzsche was the one who eradicated Christianity’s otherworldliness, who exposed the oppressive, lying morality of Christian anthropocentrism, and who is responsible for “having freed from its narrowness the radically ergocentric [=work-centered] worldview of Biblical historiography by reminding us of the mythical world of the Greeks and thus fundamentally of the world of myths as a whole.” (By “Greek myth,” he means the maniacal cult of Dionysus.) Drewermann devotes pages to quoting the Club of Rome report and discusses how world population can be limited to 2 billion people.

Drewermann’s book makes no bones of his admiration of the Aztec religious practice of cutting out the hearts of living victims by the tens of thousands. He argues that human sacrifice among the primitives served to maintain the balance of the “Great Mother”: “The human sacrifices of the Aztecs were necessary, so that the Sun, the salvation of the world, could win back its power out from the hearts of men; and even if the Aztecs did conduct wars with the aim of exploiting, their wars did serve as a means to capture sacrificial prisoners for the Sun God. Within this worldview, death is not the enemy, but a serving part of life, and war is an eternal institution so that life can have permanent duration.”

Then there is Hans Küng, the much-publicized Catholic dissident theologian, perhaps the most influential of Heidegger’s spawn. In his 1991 book *Global Responsibility*, Küng speaks in favor of a “paradigm shift” into a postmodern, post-industrial society. “Progress, this great god of modern ideologies . . . has revealed its double face and the belief in progress is lost. . . . Economic progress shows its human consequences: destruction of the natural environment, resulting in social destabilization, lack of resources, infrastructure problems, environmental pollution, deforestation, acid rain, ozone hole, population explosion, debt crisis, nuclear death . . . we are threatened with the self-destruction of our planet,” writes Küng.

What Küng understands about the new world ethos, is inspired by British intelligence mouthpiece Arnold Toynbee and his plea for “multicultural” societies. So Küng calls for a post-colonial, post-industrial, post-confessional, interreligious world: a kind of pluralist, holistic synthesis as he calls it, between all cultures and religions. Küng’s New Age syncretic religion would have no room for the Ten Commandments, the Beatitudes, or the mandate of Genesis to fill and subdue the Earth—but plenty of room for the culture of death which fosters “Zapatista” terrorism.