



# Life in the Anthroposophical Society

Anthroposophy Worldwide

No. 10 • December 1999



Waldorf Education:  
in the Czech Republic,  
Peru, France, and Hungary  
page 4



Constitution:  
Reports and a Voice  
from the U.S.A.  
page 6

Michaelmas Conference 2000

page 10

Section for Spiritual Striving of Youth:  
New Leader

page 11

Anthroposophy around the World  
Portrait  
Anthroposophical Society  
School of Spiritual Science  
Feature

2  
4  
6  
10  
12

## Giving to Another's Free Will

Some time ago I saw a poster with the portrait of a lady wearing a diamond necklace. It read: "A bad conscience can be this nice!" Can it be a gift to act out of a bad conscience? Are government subsidies for agriculture gifts? Can the government give gifts at all? What about sponsoring an event? Is it a gift? We are challenged more and more to form a clearer idea of what giving is, as a human, creative deed based on a free decision.

Our every-day ego, which thinks also of its own advantage when giving, often stands in the way of true giving. It would like to evaluate what the receiver does with our money – we are responsible for our money, after all. It therefore seems to be in keeping with the times to assign a clear and specific purpose to gifts of money that we give.

However, part of the process of giving involves asking oneself, "How do I get away from my separate self with its wishes and intentions?" Giving begins with active self-forgetting. We awaken another, usually dormant part of our soul: the capacity for devotion – to another spiritual being, a spiritual connection, a person, a child. Giving does not entail interfering with this other being and controlling it, rather it is to create possibilities, create new conditions. *Not* interfering, however, looking away from oneself, is already a threshold, means going through a little death. Trust in other people is necessary to be able to cross this threshold.

Such openness, such bestowing of space through giving, is a prerequisite if spiritual substance different from oneself is to be there, if an individual, unborn element is to be present on the earth and is to be allowed to develop freely. Giving protects the childhood in the other human being, which is in great danger of being crushed by the intellectual, consumption-oriented thinking of adults that hinders creative possibilities.

Giving protects not only the childhood of our unborn, unexpected side, but also our childhood forces. Giving brings nothing back to the giver. Yet a bridge is created from one to the other: "For in mutual giving and taking in the spiritual sphere, human life evolves its true, essential being." (Rudolf Steiner, Letter to the Members, January 13, 1924).

Rolf Kerler, *Goetheanum*

Translated from the German

THE NEXT ISSUE WILL APPEAR FEBRUARY 2000

## Dear Reader

When preparing this issue of *Anthroposophy Worldwide* we were faced with a difficult decision: how should we balance the countless activities worldwide with the intensified efforts to come to grips with the Constitution question? Any space given to the Constitution would not be available for other activities, yet the Constitution is one of the things being pursued in our Society (by a few of us for decades). We have compromised for this issue by condensing the news from around the world to make room for the Constitution, including one point of view from the U.S.A. Several reports have been postponed until next year.

Sebastian Jüngel

## Mutual Recognition

### Waldorf Education Celebration as a Family Reunion

*On October 2, 1999, Peru's various Waldorf schools and anthroposophical institutions met to commemorate 80 years of Waldorf education in the world. In Peru, Waldorf education made its first appearance in 1981, with the founding of Colegio Waldorf Lima.*

The celebration honored the founders of the Peruvian Waldorf "family" – the five kindergartens, a school in its preliminary stages, a curative education school with workshops, a teacher-training – and the founder of both established Waldorf schools, Douglas Pundsack. Demonstrations, short self-portrayals, and small exhibits bore witness to the many activities of these institutions, which are complemented by the welcome and necessary therapeutic centers in Lima and Cieneguilla.

The Waldorf family includes several initiatives in Cieneguilla, which



Photo: Douglas Pundsack

has a kindergarten and a small village Waldorf school that accepts children from all segments of the population, irrespective of whether their parents can pay. A bakery (see photo) donates its profits from supermarket sales to the educational work in Lima.

Mutual recognition is so necessary here. Many expressed the wish for further such "family gatherings" at regular intervals – perhaps even using them to draw the attention of the public to this work.

Arnulf Bastin, Peru

## Anthroposophy Worldwide

"Life in the Anthroposophical Society – Anthroposophy Worldwide" is published monthly. It is distributed by the regional Anthroposophical Societies – in some cases augmented with independently edited news and articles. It also appears as a supplement to the weekly paper "Das Goetheanum".

### Publisher:

General Anthroposophical Society, represented by Paul Mackay

### Editors:

Carol Brousseau (responsible for the English-Language Edition), Sebastian Jüngel, (responsible for this issue), Dietrich Rapp, Ursula Remund Fink, Michaela Spaar, Stephan Stockmar, Justus Wittich

### Correspondents:

Jürgen Vater (Sweden)  
Marianne Möller-Nielsen (Denmark)  
Andrew Wolpert (Great Britain)

We expressly wish for active support and collaboration. The process of building a team of editors and correspondents has not yet been completed.

To receive *Anthroposophy Worldwide*, please apply to the Anthroposophical Society in your country. If questions with the distribution arise, only the subscribers to "Das Goetheanum" should contact the address below. For all others the address is the address of the Anthroposophical Society in your country.

Address: Weekly Paper "Das Goetheanum", Box, CH-4143 Dornach 1, Switzerland, fax +41/61/706 44 65  
e-mail: wochenschrift@goetheanum.ch

© Copyright 1999 General Anthroposophical Society, Dornach, Switzerland

Printing by J.W. Arrowsmith Ltd. Bristol

## More Effective

### Centro de Terapia Antroposófica Foundation



Photo: Marie-Theres Justus

*The Centro de Terapia Antroposófica on Lanzarote, well known now – after many years of work by the Winzer family – has become a complex with a store, restaurant, therapy building, heated ocean-water therapy pool, more than 100 beds, and daily cultural events that serve the immediate area. Its agricultural department, which supplies the store and restaurant with biodynamic products, has come under new management. There are plans to offer horseback riding and riding therapy.*

*This year, the Centro has been offering monthly lectures to the island's inhabitants in Lanzarote's capitol, Arrecife. Attendance is increasing slowly but surely. A eurythmy group began work in May 1999, and 10-12 parents meet each week to study Waldorf education. Plans are underway to rent space in Arrecife for these initiatives. One of the island's inhabitants began a Waldorf kindergarten teacher training in Madrid, in September 1999, with the help of a grant from the Foundation. After restructuring, the Foundation is now better able to support the anthroposophical work in the Centro and on the rest of the island.*

Jan Pohl, Switz.

## What Can Waldorf Do for Marseille?

*Marseille lies directly on the ocean, separated from the rest of the continent by a chain of hills. It pursues its own political and cultural inclinations, and its million inhabitants (including a large percentage of immigrants) are packed close together. Industry is situated outside of the city. All in all, its economic situation is precarious. Although there have been anthroposophical study groups and artistic activities in Marseille since Rudolf Steiner's time (and a branch of the Anthroposophical Society for a few years) no practical initiative has been established.*

The efforts of the past three years have convinced the Association pour la Pédagogie de Rudolf Steiner à Marseille that it is not possible to inaugurate Waldorf education in a traditional sense in Marseille. The diverse cultures, traditions, and standards of living call for new ways of relating and new cultural activities. Active human encounter is needed, not just passive mutual tolerance. This is where Waldorf education must start. The Association does not wish to propagate Waldorf Education, but to offer innovations arising out of it, entering into dialogue with already existing social and cultural groups.

Two years ago, four members of the Association started a Waldorf



Photo: supplied by Willem Meesters

*The group carrying responsibility for Waldorf initiatives in Marseille: (from left to right: Joëlle Chalavoux, Alain Tessier, Anäis Tchidjian, Sylvie Sarxian).*

workshop for children aged 3 to 10: Alain Tessier (class teacher at the Verrières Waldorf school near Paris for 13 years, now teaching at a private French/Armenian school in Marseille), Anäis Tchidjian (currently at the Waldorf Institute at Cycle Pédagogique du Sud-Est), and her sisters Sylvie Sarxian and Joëlle Chalavoux (on the board of the Lachau Waldorf school). The program began one day a week, mainly for the children of the Association's members. Later, local children joined, whose parents had never heard of Waldorf education. When the current school year began, it was uncertain whether the program would continue. However, thanks to the engagement of the parents, it is possible after all.

*Willem Meesters, France*

The Marseille group would very much like to hear from others who have gained experience with non-traditional forms of Waldorf education in large cities.

**Contact:** Association pour la Pédagogie de Rudolf Steiner à Marseille, 5, Allée des Mésanges, FR-13012 Marseille, France, tel./fax +33/4/91 66 64 38.

## Czech Republic

### Growing in Awareness of Pioneer Role

#### First Waldorf Upper School Planned in Prague

The Prague Waldorf school was founded in 1991. The building, a warehouse, had to be renovated almost entirely. The school's first class 8 began in September 1999, raising the question of an upper school.

The school currently has 220 students. The number of applications is two and half times the school's capacity. The school is also doing well from the point of view of criteria recognized by the government. Test comparisons of up to 500 schools, which have been carried out several times, rate the school among the first or second 10% (depending on the kind of test).

The school is also the seat of the Czech Waldorf School Association and the Council of Waldorf Parents. We maintain a web site on the Internet for all of the Waldorf initiatives in the Czech Republic.

However, the school does have a serious shortage of rooms. This year there is still space for class 8, but this exhausts the school's possibilities – to say nothing of the need for workshops, special subject rooms, a gym, a large enough dining hall, etc. There simply isn't enough money to expand.

We are trying to acquire two smaller properties near the school, but these, too, would need renovation.

We now stand before the task of building up an upper school. It would be the first in the Czech Republic! It will be no simple matter to convince the authorities, and the future of later Waldorf upper schools will be influenced by the quality of what we do.

The most important need is for teacher training. We have introduced an intensive three-year upper school teacher training program in collaboration with Ernst-Christian Demisch and Günter Althage. The first year of training is already behind us. For the second and third years it will be necessary to arrange practical teaching experience and observation at Waldorf schools in Germany. This brings with it the additional financial burden of travel expenses.

Other financial burdens arise through the need for translating Waldorf literature (so that its availability is not limited to speakers of German, but can be offered to all interested teachers, parents, and members of the broad public). In addition, we need to

purchase equipment for woodwork, forging, and copper work.

There will be plenty more such problems and obstacles, but this is always the case when something new arises. We know that we will succeed.

*Ivan Smolka, Czech Republic*

**Contact/Support:** Zš Waldorfská, Butovická 228/9, CZ-158 00 Praha, Czech Republic, tel. +420/2/55 10 76, tel./fax 651 94 26, e-mail info@waldorf.cz

## IN BRIEF

**Poland.** Polish friends are planning a Baltic Sea conference in the Danzig area. They would like it to be a continuation of the 1995 conference in Rügen, and a reminder of the major anthroposophical conferences in Danzig in 1926 and 1927. It is hoped that any remaining conflicts between heads and hearts will be overcome. A preparation meeting in 2000 is planned, to gather ideas from the Danzig area, East/West Prussia and Pomerania.

**Contacts and suggestions:** Eva and Michal Vasniewsky, U. Svietojanska 130/9, PL-81401 Gdynia, Poland, tel./fax +48/58/620 27 75, e-mail genesis@polbox.com; Irmgard and Dietrich Bareleit, Mergelteichstr. 41/487, DE-44225 Dortmund, Germany, tel. +49/231/710 72 25; Adam Warchol, Ul. Haffnera 40/4, PL-81708 Sopot, Poland, tel./fax +48/58/551 54 52, e-mail Warchol@polbox.com

## Young Waldorf Movement in Hungary Needs Instructors

*Various anthroposophical training initiatives began simultaneously in Hungary during the unique historical period following 1989. Though the initiators recognized each other's work, they soon developed individual forms of teaching and study, leading to the pluralistic training culture that exists in Hungary today.*

The situation for the Hungarian Waldorf school movement is exceptional. Fourteen independent schools that define themselves as Waldorf schools were founded within just ten years. Hungary has more Waldorf schools than France (developed over 50 years) or Austria (developed over 30 years). There has been no possibility of forming a pool of teachers, who would work at a few schools for decades, then going on to help a new generation of younger teachers. Hungary will soon need about 50 new teachers a year (including teachers for special subjects and the upper school). The existing training courses cannot keep up with the demand.

### Lack of New Teachers and Teaching Instructors

Both the schools and the training courses are struggling with the lack of new teachers. Some training programs are still conducted as a secondary occupation by people who are known for their work in public education, and have acquired substantial competence in anthroposophy (Zsuzsa Mesterházi, for example, is the principle of the School of Curative Education in Budapest, and Tamás Vekerdy, a child psychologist, directs a department for alternative education at a center for supplementary teacher training.) Other trainings are directed by Waldorf educators who, in spite of precariously low income, have partly withdrawn from their work in the West in order to help the Hungarian school movement (Annette Stroteich for the kindergarten teacher training, János Darvas for the basic teacher training – both in Solymár – and

Clemens Schleunig for the eurythmy training). The question of how to support and finance younger Hungarian instructors has become acute. In addition, ways need to be found for them to gradually take more responsibility in questions of training.

Several class teachers are currently completing a cycle. They have already given shorter or longer courses in which they were able to convey their didactic experience to the trainees. Several of these colleagues have also taken on training responsibilities by acting as mentors.

Financing the Hungarian instructors is a problem. The ones that have the most to offer prospective teachers also seem to be the most needed in the young schools. It is very clear that they will be asked by their colleagues to take another class through a cycle of eight years, or (if they have the qualifications) to help start an upper school. In the face of this, what chance do the teacher trainings have?! Johannes Kiersch of the Waldorf Institute in Witten-Annen, Germany, has fervently tried to convey the idea of a particular spiritual/social law: schools that free teachers for valid overriding tasks will be compensated by fresh new teachers coming to the school. (Kiersch is a long-term friend of the Hungarian school movement, who is often in Budapest to teach.) It is not impossible to get funds from the West for short-term projects, so planing periods of three years have been suggested.

### Confronting Tradition

It is a very happy fact that a number of practices have been adopted in

Hungary: the “classic” eight years with the same class teacher, block lessons, celebration of festivals, relatively independent school administration. This is not the case in all the countries of the former Eastern Bloc. The Hungarian teachers have taken up these elements with much enthusiasm. However, as the pioneer phase draws to an end, it is becoming necessary to strengthen the knowledge of the human being from an anthroposophical point of view. Also, there are still many things carried over from the national striving of the Hungarian teaching tradition of the 19th century, as well as from the later communist education that aimed at developing technical and scientific skills only. It is natural that the Waldorf teachers would take this as their starting point – both for inner and outer reasons. The question for the future, however, is whether such initial forms will continue to evolve, or whether they will become the Hungarian Waldorf standard.

### The “Mutual Roof”

A major theme of a recent joint training-initiatives conference (see box) was given the title “Mutual Roof.” Sam Betts, an instructor and advisor in Hungary, presented a vibrant picture of a possible Waldorf center, where the various initiatives, courses, and institutions would work together in one place. It would save a great deal of physical strength. Most of the instructors teach at several places. Anyone who has experienced Budapest's traffic situation will know what a strain it is to travel around the city to the various course locales. It would also be more economical if similar courses that are now taught in separate places were combined. In addition, this would enable more contact among the instructors. The stu-

#### Training opportunities in Hungary:

- a post-graduate weekend course for class teachers at Bárczi Gusztáv Curative Education College in Budapest
- the Waldorf Institute of the Sándor Török Foundation in Solymár, which offers full-time basic training and postgraduate courses
- the Solymár kindergarten training (a post-graduate weekend training)
- the Budapest Eurythmy School (full-time, four-year course)
- a part time training in Bothmer gymnastics (monthly)

*Students of the Waldorf Institute in Solymár*



Photos supplied by Waldorf Institute

dents would surely benefit from such increased collaboration.

Realizing this goal of a joint campus will certainly have to be taken step by step. There is no one around at the moment who possesses the qualifications and the motivation to make a full commitment to it. Nevertheless, a Mutual Roof committee was formed, beginning work in June 1999. The committee will endeavor to

define priorities and collect necessary information. Not everything is dependent on having a joint campus. Various legal questions will be pursued right away, particularly the question of how to get diplomas recognized. There is also the question of possible collaboration with existing colleges. This last question is of course tied to the immense financial difficulties faced by the training courses.



*Kindergarten in Solymár*

A second committee was formed to prepare a regular joint conference in education and anthroposophy that would be held three times a year.

### **Gradual Exodus of Foreign Instructors?**

One of the most prominent individuals within the Hungarian Waldorf movement, Annette Stroteich, has left the country (see box). Is this the beginning of a gradual exodus of foreign instructors and directors? It seems likely. Experienced teachers cannot meet the financial needs of their families in the West on Hungarian salaries; they must be supported by funds from the West. However, it is becoming more and more difficult to awaken interest in the need for such teachers in this part of the world. There may be many reasons for this. It is certain, however, that the further development of anthroposophically-based Waldorf education will need the help of such colleagues for many years to come – especially now, when many schools are expanding to the upper school level. Only time will show how the future will be built on the experiences gained so far.

*János Darvas, Hungary*

## **Community through Individuality**

### **Instructors Conference in Balatonalmádi**

May 28–30, 1999 colleagues from all of the training courses and initiatives involved in Waldorf education in Hungary gathered for a weekend conference. About 35 people attended, all active in some way in the 14 Waldorf schools or 45 Waldorf kindergarten groups as instructors.

A Whitsun element was palpable in the planning and realization of the conference as an act of mutual will. Whitsun has to do with a new community element that emerges through the strength of the individual. This is an important motif for Hungarian culture. The Hungarian folk soul is strong when it draws its strength from the individual. From there it moves strongly out into the world. The work done has an individual imprint. The need for collaboration among the various individual efforts becomes evident only at a later stage.

This conference brought together the founders and many colleagues who had arrived later, to take stock of what can be done together now and in the future, while preserving their current autonomy.

The spiritual guideline for the conference was Rudolf Steiner's Whitsun lecture of May 21, 1918. This lecture offers various interwoven motifs: the East/West polarity, the problem of Central Europe, the great significance of the fourth seven-year period in a person's life for the anchoring of spiritually-founded capacities for work, the passage through a radical individual element as a condition of modern community-building. Again and again the participants returned to the final sentences of the lecture, which state that no general messages can be given anymore: everything depends on spiritual communication being taken in by the ego of the individual.

János Darvas, instructor and educational director of the Solymár course, pointed to the unusual situation for the Hungarian school movement. Zsuzsa Mesterházi, director of the postgraduate weekend teacher training, chaired the discussion of the lecture in a sensitive, inwardly balanced way. Further discussions dealt with questions of Waldorf teacher training. Antal Tolnai, class teacher at the Miskolc Waldorf

school, in northeast Hungary, portrayed the situation of the schools from within, outlining the possibilities of the schools to contribute to teacher training. Tamás Vekerdy, instructor and financial director of the Solymár seminar, energetically chaired the part of the talks that led to concrete decisions. The contribution of Clemens Schleuning, co-founder of the Budapest eurythmy school, gave a picture of the deep connection of this artistic training and the Waldorf school movement.

The remarkable character of the conference in Balatonalmádi was underscored by a notable little celebration in which we said goodbye to Annette Stroteich, who had been substantially involved in the development of the Hungarian kindergartens for the past eleven years. In addition to being responsible for a group of children, she led three teaching cycles, introducing nearly 200 kindergarten teachers to Waldorf education. Diligent colleagues will now endeavor to continue her work.

*János Darvas, Hungary*

## Constitution of the General Anthroposophical Society

*The main themes of this year's Branch and Group Leader Meeting on November 12–14, 1999 were the Michaelmas Conference 2000 (see Michaela Glöckler's report on page 10) and the Constitution of the General Anthroposophical Society, including an open hearing. The plan had been to use this hearing to introduce a draft of a Constitution revision that the Constitution Group (Otfried Doerfler, Michaela Glöckler, Rolf Kerler, Paul Mackay, Roel Munniks, Charlotte Roder, Manfred Schmidt-Brabant) had prepared. However, it was later decided that the draft was not yet ready (see Anthroposophy Worldwide no. 9/1999). The draft was distributed nonetheless by Ger-*

*hard von Beckerath, who had been invited to a meeting with the Constitution Group on October 4, 1999 (see Bruno Martin's report in Anthroposophy Worldwide no. 9/1999). No agreement had been reached about how to proceed, and Beckerath's intention was to supply people with information about the intentions of the Executive Council and Constitution Group. The draft was thus available in time for the hearing, and it was impossible to keep it out of the discussion, although the Constitution Group indicated that they had discarded it. They emphasized several times that the revision process is still ongoing, and that it needs time.*

### Branch and Group Leaders' Discussion

During the closed part of the meeting, Paul Mackay summed up the basic ideas involved in a revision of the Statutes. The Christmas Conference Statutes should provide the starting point. They might be augmented to deal with practical details (a point Rudolf Steiner had also indicated at the Christmas Foundation Meeting). In addition, today we have the question of how to adequately represent the worldwide Society when decisions have to be made. This could be done by complementing the General Meeting with a delegates' meeting.

#### Dismay

Gerhard von Beckerath then drew attention to details of the obsolete draft in order to highlight what seemed to him to be its authoritarian and centralist attitude. The Executive Council and Constitution Group expressed dismay. Von Beckerath and others, for their part, had been dismayed by Paul Mackay's having published Professor Riemer's appreciation of the matter: "Merger through Conclusive Conduct" in *Anthroposophy Worldwide* no. 9/1999. Beckerath saw it as a kind of juridical conclusion, although the agreement at the October 4 meeting had been, so he thought, that one cannot deal with the past in this way, because it is a matter of insight, not legality. The publication of "Merger through Conclusive Conduct" gave the impression that the Executive Council – now that it had found an attorney who supported the view that they had held all along – wanted to quickly create a *fait accompli*.<sup>\*</sup> Above all, it has become unclear whether everything is really still (or again) open for a mutual revision process, or not.

Movement finally came into the discussion when Paul Mackay took up Benediktus Hardorp's premise: Before we can discuss a revision of the Statutes, we need to clarify what legal entity we are part of, and what legal entity the new Statutes would be meant for. Paul Mackay then questioned Hardorp's view.

#### Views on the Legal Entities

Hardorp assumes that the Christmas Conference and its Statutes form the social body into which the School of Spiritual Science was founded. This body is connected with a being that gives the community its spiritual identity. It can die and be resurrected, it can, if we so will, be revived. But since it was not merely an agreement between people (who have been under a "spell" in regard to their consciousness of this since 1925) there can be no merger through a majority decision or through mere (unconscious) behavior that happens or happened. The being of the Christmas Conference cannot simply move from one body to another.

Paul Mackay looks primarily at the real relationship of the Society to the Christmas Foundation Meeting. Is the social body that was formed at the

Christmas Conference Society finished (and thus identical with its legal entity) or is it in development? How has the relationship to the Christmas Conference developed through the conduct of the members? Today's unified General Anthroposophical Society formed itself through the (perhaps not fully conscious) conduct of the members; it is a direct continuation of the Christmas Conference. Nevertheless, Mackay referred to Hardorp's view as a possible alternative, thus bringing openness back into the discussion.

Bruno Martin spoke of similar precious moments in discussion at the meeting of October 4, 1999, where it had been possible to go beyond the ideas of each isolated standpoint. However, this mutuality had not been upheld, due to the publications that followed; the independent Constitution groups not appointed by the Executive Council felt that they had been shut out again. Martin called for an end to advantages based on position. Only then can the discussion be given a general human basis. In conclusion he raised the question of the differing forms of work and leadership for the various spheres within the Anthroposophical Society (worldwide Society, School of Spiritual Science, administration and business). *sst*

### The Hearing of November 13–14

About 500 members responded to the invitation to attend a hearing on November 13 and 14. The starting point for the discussion was vague. In spite of the newest developments in the work of the Constitution Group, an obsolete agenda was still circulating, related to the Constitution Group's previous draft of a revision of the Constitution. Paul Mackay had already written in *Anthroposophy Worldwide* no. 9/1999 that not this draft, but the fundamental questions regarding it and/or the Statutes would be the theme of the meeting. Michaela Glöckler, who chaired the meeting,

stressed from the beginning that the draft was not the subject of the hearing, because it had already been withdrawn. Instead, she asked for concrete suggestions for a revision of the Statutes.

#### Deep Dissatisfaction

For many, the draft continued to be a reality that should be taken into account, because they said it indicated the attitude of the Constitution Group. In other contributions, one could feel a fundamental mistrust or deep dissatisfaction with the Executive Council, although the Council

<sup>\*</sup> According to Paul Mackay, no written evaluation by Hans Michael Riemer exists. However, he did confirm Paul Mackay's portrayal in writing. The term "Merger through Conclusive Conduct" is Riemer's.

was not directly involved in the actual reason for the hearing or any revision draft of the Statutes. Some speakers doubted the openness of the Constitution Group, claiming that they (especially the members of the Executive Council among them) did not take the members seriously, or did not even perceive them, only "noting" what the members said, but not entering into the process of discussion.

### Generalities

Nevertheless, there were some contributions that spoke to the actual reason for the meeting. Ideas were brought forward regarding the tasks of the Anthroposophical Society (looking more outward) and its Statutes (looking more inward). The Anthroposophical Society was described as the body for anthroposophy, and as the carrier of the School of Spiritual Science in particular. Tasks of the Society include: the cultivation of the life of the soul, the introduction of the initiation principle as a principle of civilization, and the connection between deepest esotericism and greatest publicness. The Executive Council should be a heart-organ for the Society, taking up and supporting initiatives. Collaboration with non-anthroposophists is necessary to be able to master the tasks of our time, because there are too few anthroposophists.

In spite of Michaela Glöckler's repeated invitation, few concrete suggestions were made regarding the Constitution. Instead, general principles were stated. In particular, much time was given to the paragraph that deals with the exclusion of members from the Society. No one seems to stand behind this paragraph, whose content is valid according to Swiss association law in any case, even without an explicit mention in an association's statutes. Another theme was the principle of co-opting new members into committees. Many questioned this as a way of working, others defended it. The argumentation ranged from the danger of choosing only one's own friends to join a committee, to co-option as a way of securing a functioning Society. Manfred Schmidt-Brabant and Charlotte Roder pointed out that co-option is a process that is preceded by several stages of consultation.

One speaker thought it important that any agreements noted in a revision of the Statutes be agreements that are possible to keep. Others spoke of the importance of individual responsibility: the Society arises from the individual's own obligation to anthroposophy, whereby it is a major task to cope with the tension between differentiation and unity.

There seemed to be consensus that the central reference point of the Anthroposophical Society is and remains what Rudolf Steiner founded at the Christmas Conference. One speaker also mentioned *The Philosophy of Freedom*.

### Thoughts of the Constitution Group

The members of the Constitution Group were asked about their position regarding the revision of the Statutes. Important to Roel Munniks were: the question of conclusive conduct, the points that need to be brought up to date in the Statutes, and



Photo: Sebastian Jünger

*A humorous sketch: into the wastebasket with all drafts and ideas! They become raw material for something new.*

the representation of the worldwide Society at the Annual General Meeting (because not all members can attend). Rolf Kerler would like to see some work done on the substance of the School of Spiritual Science, the Anthroposophical Society, and the practical initiatives, before a next draft is made. Charlotte Roder found it important to come to grips with the task – on the basis of the Christmas Conference – of connecting greatest publicness with deepest esotericism, and to clarify how a middle path between democracy and aristocracy can be found. Manfred Schmidt-Brabant questioned the extent of what has already been achieved, when seen against the background of the new Christianity (in the widest sense of the term) and the shining through of spirit. Paul Mackay supported Munnik's points and also stressed the wish to be able to *do* anthroposophy. Michaela Glöckler, who regards the Statutes as being an expression of regulated communication, emphasized the Foundation Stone Meditation as our common uniting element. She also stressed the task of the Anthroposophical Society in connection with developing an anthroposophical perspective on history.

### Overall Impression

The wish for discussion opportunities was clearly expressed again and again. Yet the discussion itself was meagre: even informative contributions sometimes revealed an inner tension; not a

few comments were in fact made in a heated fashion. On the second day, Michaela Glöckler asked that people stop applauding the speeches, in order not to create or increase the political party atmosphere. The hearing showed that a culture of discussion based on recognition of one another still needs practice. (In this respect it was similar to the Annual General Meeting of last April, see *Anthroposophy Worldwide* no. 4 /1999.) There also appeared to be great difficulty in really looking toward the future and difficulty in making concrete, constructive suggestions.

One of the main problems seems to be the lack of mutual trust. The fact that repeated efforts of the Constitution Group to express openness, and their effort at better communication, met with no mercy from some of the members, showed how charged their relation to the Executive Council and Section leaders is. One factor is probably the excessive workload that makes it impossible for the Executive Council and Section leaders to answer every single letter. Michaela Glöckler's criticism went in another direction, when she lamented a very palpable passivity that, instead of offering suggestions of one's own, merely criticizes. Polar opposite views exist regarding the tasks of the Anthroposophical Society in relation to the significance of the Constitution question: People either believe it needs to be clarified, so that we can get on with the work, or they believe we cannot get on with the work until it is clarified.

Manfred Schmidt-Brabant spoke of plans to give further space to the Constitution question at the Annual General Meeting in 2000. He also expressed the hope that the process might be brought to a close within an additional year.

The participants stayed together in spite of all their differences, which may be seen as an expression of having a mutual connection after all. However, only the future conduct of the Society's members will show whether a fruitful basis for mastering the tasks of our time can be won from this. *Compiled by S.J. and U.R.*

*Contact Addresses:* The following groups drew attention to their work or presented documents at the hearing:

**Gelebte Weihnachtstagung**, Bockenweg 31, CH-8810 Horgen, Switzerland, tel. +41/1/725 80 74  
**Gruppe "Konstitution 2000"** – Initiative an Alle c/o Internationales Kulturzentrum Achberg, DE-88147 Achberg, Germany, tel. +49/8380/982 28, fax 675, e-mail: kulturzentrum-achberg@gmx.de

**Benidiktus Hardop**, Postfach 10 14 40, DE-68014, Germany, tel. +49/621/422 6311, fax 422 6350, e-mail: Hardop-Partner@t-online.de  
**Leitbild-Arbeitsgruppe Frankfurt**, c/o Monika Elbert, Badener Str. 20, DE-88693 Deggenhausertal, Germany, tel. +49/7555/59 21



## The School of Spiritual Science as a Spiritual University

### Another Perspective on the Constitution Question

*In view of the current Constitution debate, we asked Arthur Zajonc, General Secretary of the Anthroposophical Society in America, how he sees these issues. We wanted to hear a non-European perspective. How does Zajonc regard the debate in Europe from the standpoint of his work and experiences in the U.S.A? What concerns does he have? What suggestions might he have for the future? Stephan Stockmar formulated the questions, and Carol Brousseau spoke with Zajonc while he was at the Goetheanum for the November 1999 meeting of General Secretaries.*

Generally the Constitution question does not figure as prominently in the concerns of anthroposophists in the United States as it does in Germany. (I have followed the debate in the German *Mitteilungen*.) In the U.S., material concerning this question has been sent to people occasionally (through *Anthroposophy Worldwide*, for example, and Heide's material was also sent out to the entire membership). Otherwise, the question has been basically dormant among the vast majority of our members. Of the few people who do take it up, many have some connection with Germany: They were born there, can read the German material, and so have more orientation and are in their souls sympathetic to the way of connecting to this question that is characteristic of the Germans.

#### Threefold Structure of the Society

Having said that, the threefold structure of the Anthroposophical Society in a more general sense *has* been taken up by the Initiative Group of the U.S. Society. Not from a legal standpoint, but asking: What is the appropriate inner, spiritual architecture of the full Society? Rudolf Steiner speaks about the Anthroposophical Society in the narrower sense, meaning the Society with its administrative functions, its concern for the members' life, their study groups, and so on. Then he speaks about the Anthroposophical Society in the larger sense. My understanding of it is that this larger sense is the full imagination of the Christmas Foundation Conference Society, which included the School of Spiritual Science, and also Ita Wegman's clinic at that point in time. So that the Society would have a research institution, headed by the leader of the Medical Section, which would work with Rudolf Steiner to develop new medical practices. One could say that Rudolf Steiner's imaginations at the end of his life had the Society in the narrower sense at its center, but also had a larger conception which contained the full working of the School of Spiritual Science with all of its Sections, as well as the whole Goetheanum itself and its properties, including the clinic and publishing house. So it had a practical, grounded, incarnated aspect, a social aspect through the

Society, and a research and educational aspect through the School.

Four or five years ago in the U.S., we took up what we call the threefold imagination of the Society and began to work towards embodying it – not worrying about the legal and administrative aspects of it, but working with the living dimension of that imagination. What would it mean for the Society in the U.S. to think of itself in the larger sense? To me, frankly, this is where the debate is important and – for me personally, at least – it is not so important with regard to the legal issues. The legal issues should be handled in a balanced, pragmatic, and responsible way. The *spiritual* issues do not actually live in these paragraphs, they live in the people, in their initiatives, and in the relationships that enable them to take certain initiatives collectively. It is there that we put most of our efforts in the U.S.

To make this concrete: over the last five years, we have created a circle of representatives from each of the Sections that are active in the United States. This now operates in addition to the circle of 60 class holders. The Section representatives are beginning to undertake more and more initiative on behalf of the School. We felt that we needed to strengthen the work within the School, broadening it beyond the holding of classes, so that the full imagination of the School could be embodied in it: through the work in each of the individual Sections, collectively across Sections, within the General Section, and including the relation of the Sections to the Societies (of Canada, the U.S., and Hawaii).

Another aspect relates to the concept of the Building Association. The Building Association was an organ of the Society (originally the only legally incorporated entity) that cared for the property and practical aspects of the Society's work. Frankly, up until a few years ago, this was a very underdeveloped aspect of our work in the U.S. It is ironic, because people think of the U.S. as being very will-oriented. Within the Society, I think we were more European in our orientation. Recently, however, we initiated



what we called a builder's meeting, picking up consciously on this idea of a Building Association, a community of people who were, as I characterized it, the "Emil Molt types." What did Emil Molt make possible through his collaboration with Rudolf Steiner? His kind of collaboration wasn't intellectual, it was a collaboration which allowed many practical initiatives to flow out of anthroposophy and into the world. We have felt in the U.S. that we needed to strengthen that work. About four years ago we drew together 33 people from the various corners of the United States who are of this character in one way or another, and out of that first builders' group meeting, we created a kind of organ of the Society which has come to be called the Committee of Anthroposophical Organizations (CAO). This spring we will have a second large meeting of that circle.

Previously, the different institutions (e.g., Waldorf school, BD movement, medical movement, Camphill movement, and finance movement) had been individual initiatives which led a relatively isolated kind of existence. Now, we bring together the leading personalities from the Waldorf school movement (for example) – not representatives of the Pedagogical Section, but organizers such as David Alsop, who heads the Waldorf school association. So around the table you have the full complement of anthroposophical institutions and initiatives, who meet at the invitation of the Anthroposophical Society. It has been a very positive experience. It has also fostered a great deal of good will towards the Anthroposophical Society. The institutions have an interest now in helping to support the initiatives of the Society itself. How, for example, can the Waldorf schools, the doctors, the Camphill initiatives, take up *Anthroposophy Worldwide*, so that it is distributed not only to our members, but to the many, many thousands who are not members, but who



benefit from anthroposophy in these institutions? Now we have a single organ where the whole of the movement sits at a table – not only the intellectuals and administrators within our Society, but representatives of all of the different aspects of the movement. We therefore have two distinct circles: the Collegium, and the CAO. The members of these two groups complement the Anthroposophical Society Council, making three groups in total, one for each of the three parts of the threefold Society.

### **The Constitution Is Not Merely a Legal Document**

The reason I emphasize this, when you ask about the Constitution question, is that I think the Constitution, at least in English, has two meanings. It can mean a document, which is the legal, guiding instrument for the organization or corporation. But it can also refer to the constitution of the human being: the limb system, the rhythmic/heart/lung system, the nerve/sense system. And it feels to me as if this is the essential element of the Constitution. If we lose sight of this, we move away from the living being that inhabits the Constitution, to the forms and legal phrases over which we can debate for a very long time. Steiner speaks in a number of places about how the paragraphs should never become a dominant factor in our thinking, that we should always proceed from the realities that are living in front of us.

You ask whether I feel that the specific changes that are proposed in the Constitution will solve the issues that are facing the Society, will address the historical issues that are still outstanding. Frankly, I think that no document, no words on a piece of paper, can actually solve any of those things. If those words reflect a human process of mutual understanding and activity, carried out by the leadership at the Goetheanum and other people from the German (and Dutch-speaking) Societies, then the process itself may be beneficial, if it is done with good will, if it is done in a way which supports a reconciliation of parties who are otherwise estranged. The words themselves only reflect that process. The rhetoric of high moral position, otherwise, is relatively empty of meaning.

After I joined the Society (in 1970) I was basically unaware for many years of the deep difficulties and divisions within the European Society. I think this is characteristic of many people who are in their forties and fifties. The issues that are still alive and burning in Germany especially (and to a certain extent in Switzerland, Holland, and the rest of Europe) –

these are basically not active issues. Is that good or bad? It is just a simple fact of the matter. I think it is good to be informed about these things, but actually I believe that the future is going to be much more determined by our actions than by the words we put down on a paper.

### **Cutting Edge Research**

One of your questions concerns the way in which the School of Spiritual Science is managed or led. I think this does connect to what I would consider a worthy topic for debate. There are two quite different imaginations of the School of Spiritual Science. One imagination is that research and education within that School take place worldwide, almost exclusively at freestanding institutions like the teachers' seminars in Stuttgart, Spring Valley, or Sacramento. All around the world there are class members who teach at those places. Some of them undertake to do research, to do writing. There are physicians, likewise, who are doing research and teaching at universities and hospitals and smaller clinics. So the School of Spiritual Science lives in an extended network of freestanding anthroposophical institutions.

The institution that exists here at the Goetheanum carries a consciousness function. Heinz Zimmermann for the Pedagogical Section, or Michaela Glöckler for the Medical Section, carry awareness of the many important initiatives that are taking place in adult education, research, publication, and so on. There are conferences and meetings of these people, where the Section leader is either present as a participant, or acts as a convener. This is simply the reality. This is part of the School of Spiritual Science as it presently exists on the planet. I have nothing but great admiration for this. But I would like to at least point out that this is a different picture than the one I carry of the period from 1923 to 1925, when Rudolf Steiner established the School of Spiritual Science. He recognized that there would be hospitals beyond the Ita Wegman Clinic, that there would be other institutions, but also that there was what he called a special relationship between the Ita Wegman initiative and the School of Spiritual Science. It would have become much more like a university hospital, a teaching and research hospital, where people come from far distant places to study.

What might Steiner's imagination have been? I think he pictured laboratories, studios for artists, a hospital, probably a school associated with the pedagogy, a whole variety of institutions staffed by a full faculty of researchers, artists, clinicians, and so

forth, that would be both working practically, and educating the next generation of scientists, artists, and physicians, and so on. And, yes, there would be a network of other institutions that would be reflections of what was going on here. But here, above all, there would be a kind of leadership and a cutting edge quality to the work that was being done. Frankly, I think this picture does not live consistently within the Section Leader Council. Talking with the various leaders, I have nothing but the highest admiration for their variety of pictures of what the future of the School of Spiritual Science should really be, but I still hold to the bold picture of the Goetheanum as a spiritual university.

That there are also going to be other initiatives of the School of Spiritual Science around the world is a given fact. We do not have to worry about that. But I think many people who love the Goetheanum long for this place to have the vitality and vision which Rudolf Steiner originally had, namely a full-fledged, spiritual university here, powerfully present in the coming century, that would have a full range of disciplines, research and education, and practical applications.

So that is the kind of debate I would love to see, and less debate on the language of the Constitution. In some ways I am pleased that these practical issues are being taken up: Should there be a delegate's circle? This is an important practical issue for a modern Society. It is good that we take this up. But this alone will do very little to address the true Constitution question, which is about the full threefold imagination of our Society. I would like to say, let's get this done with, let's take the Constitution question as it presently exists in the texts and do a practical and workmanlike job, realizing that we are probably going to amend it another ten times before the next century is out. That is perfectly fine. It does not mean that we are going to abandon the Constitution that Steiner put down at the Christmas Foundation Meeting. It contained the core principles and core realities of all of the membership. This is the reality that I think still exists, and I feel pretty confident that it will continue to exist. But how will we evolve our picture of the School of Spiritual Science, or of the other sphere which, in the U.S., is represented by the Committee of Anthroposophical Organizations? What would it be like to have comparable organs in other parts of the world, so that we could meet as a full movement and undertake common initiatives, with real respect for each other and true collaboration?

# On the Way to the Michaelmas Conference 2000

## Update and Invitation to Contribute

*A small group is working to prepare the Michaelmas Conference 2000 (Manfred Schmidt-Brabant, Virginia Sease, Michaela Glöckler, and Johannes Köhl). They welcome suggestions from the members (see also Anthroposophy Worldwide no. 4, 1999).*

### Invitations

The planning group wrote to about 100 active members of the worldwide Anthroposophical Society, asking them each to recommend 5–7 participants for the conference. Many of these suggestions reached us in November 1999, allowing us to send out a first batch of invitations.

### How Can All Participate?

We have contacted friends in Japan, Poland, Russia, Sweden, and the U.S.A., asking whether there could be parallel conferences during the summer months which would pursue the same aims as the Goetheanum conference, forming an inner connection with it. We will say more about this in *Anthroposophy Worldwide* no. 1/2000.

### Initial Ideas

We would like to have short motivating talks, and reports from the various spheres of the anthroposophical movement in the following languages: German, English, French, Italian, Spanish, and Russian. We would then like to take up these thoughts in discussion groups and artistic workshops, in connection with the provisional theme of the conference: "Collaborating to Meet the Destiny of Our Time as Pupils of the Spirit," including motifs and guidelines from Rudolf Steiner's *Last Address*. Toward the end

of the day, the work would be summed up in plenum and discussed in connection with commitments for future work. We hope that the conference will produce suggestions and ini-

tatives for the future work of the School of Spiritual Science, the Anthroposophical Society, and its practical initiatives worldwide.

### Warm Request

Please send us your suggestions for motivating short talks and reports of exemplary initiatives and processes – including good ideas for financing – as soon as possible to anyone in the planning group. (Deadline: January 15, 2000.) *Michaela Glöckler*

## LITHUANIA

### First Branch Founded

#### Waldorf Kindergarten Study Group Joins the Society

*In 1998, a Lithuanian emigrant in Australia asked whether there was a group in Lithuania that could be called a branch. Since there was no such group, Rutha and Archibald Bajorat started to think about how a branch might be founded. On September 4, 1999 they were ready.*

In contrast to Estonia and Latvia, where anthroposophy had taken hold since the beginning of the century, there were hardly any known anthroposophical activities in Lithuania, with the exception of a meeting with Marie Steiner in Kaunas in the 1930s. In the 1960s, Oskar Borgman Hansen began intensive work in the Baltic region, but Lithuania was not involved. It was not until *perestroika* that this changed.

A basis for Waldorf education has grown out of the efforts of Danute Žiliene, a philologist (courses for teachers, for example). Waldorf classes were started in several city kindergartens.

In Lithuania's largest Waldorf kindergarten, Rugelis (Grain of Rye), educators and parents met regularly to study works by Rudolf Steiner. From this grew the wish of several participants to become members of the General Anthroposophical Society. The seed of "Grain of Rye" has now sprouted with the founding of the Michael Branch (in Lithuanian, Mykolo šakele).

*Rutha and Archibald Bajorat,  
Germany*

Contact: Mykolo šakele, c/o Mrs. Jurate Lekšienė, Ateities 22-30, LT-5300 Panevėžys, Lithuania.

## School of Spiritual Science

### THE LITERARY ARTS AND HUMANITIES SECTION IN NORTH AMERICA

#### Solemn Founding

*In Anthroposophy Worldwide no. 6/1999 Arthur Zajonc reported on the founding of a Collegium of the School of Spiritual Science in North America. Now North America has taken a further step with the founding on October 8, 1999 of the Literary Arts and Humanities Section. The ceremony was attended by Martina Maria Sam, representing the interim leadership of the Section at the Goetheanum.*

The Literary Arts and Humanities Section in North America held its inaugural meeting on October 8 in Denver, Colorado, U.S.A. In a warmly welcoming and congratulatory letter sent on behalf of the entire Executive Council and the Section leaders at the Goetheanum to mark this special occasion, Virginia Sease noted that the

Section's inauguration resulted from years of purposeful work by many members of the School of Spiritual Science. Brought together by their shared commitment to the literary arts and humanities, class members in the United States and Canada had worked together to identify those members whose lives had led them to this field

of endeavor, formulated an appropriate name in the English language for the *Sektion für Schöne Wissenschaften*, and established an impressively articulate and substantial newsletter. This was done in close cooperation with the Collegium of the School of Spiritual Science in North America and the Executive Council at the Goetheanum. A core group of seven members had stepped forward to carry responsibility for the formation of the Section by striving to make its invisible etheric substance visible in their personal and professional lives. The inaugural meeting included an appreciative review of these preparatory efforts, but focused mostly on the work that lies ahead.

The Section encompasses all of the literary arts and humanities as

they are generally acknowledged in the modern university. Section membership is based on membership in the first class, recognition of one's inner, karmic connection to this area of research, and (because of the utter desolation of the literary arts and humanities in the contemporary world) a commitment to the genuine urgency of the esoteric task for this section. In view of the breadth and complexity of the Section's responsibilities, its members are establishing working groups to focus on particular disciplines and themes. Each member has been sent a survey form to help those who share research interests find one another despite the enormous physical distances separating them on the North American continent. The Section's newsletter regularly publi-

cizes members' announced research topics and projects, and it is hoped that it will be increasingly devoted to publishing the outcome of these researches.

Section members have chosen *Becoming Aware of Language and the Mission of Michael* as the overall thematic focus for their work during the coming year. To clarify and deepen their researches on this theme, members will continue throughout the year to work with the mantras of the fourth class lesson and with Rudolf Steiner's verse "*Wer der Sprache Sinn versteht...*" ("To One Who Understands the Sense of Language"). Members' research will be presented at the Section's next meeting, to be held in June 2000 at the Anthroposophical Society in America's confer-

ence in Fair Oaks, California.

The seven members who took on the responsibility for the Section's formation are Herbert Hagens, Jane Hipolito, Gertrude Hughes, Olaf Lampson, Robert McDermott, Douglas Miller, and Marguerite Miller. Each of these seven has agreed to continue to work together in an advisory capacity as the Section's collegium, focussing questions to bring before the larger membership, serving as contacts with the Society and with the general public, and facilitating the work of the Section membership. Marguerite Miller was asked to serve as the Section's representative to the Collegium of the School of Spiritual Science in North America.

*Jane Hipolito, U.S.A.*

## MEDICAL SECTION

### Collaborating to Build a Social Framework for Anthroposophical Medicine

International Co-worker Conference at the Goetheanum, September 1999

As in the previous year, 750 people from all over the world came for this conference. It was truly a joy to experience anthroposophical medicine as a worldwide movement. The sense of an international consciousness was strengthened for me still further by the English-language discussion group led by David McGavin. I was very impressed by the countless efforts to connect anthroposophical medicine to actual individual people, instead of relating to it in an abstract way.

The core of the conference was formed by two things: Michaela Glöckler's morning lectures, which dealt with the question of how the Section's co-workers could form a worldwide therapeutic community, and the discussion groups, workshops, and plenum discussions. The conference was framed by music played by the Junge Philharmonie Klangwerk and teachers at Orpheus, a music school.

In the evening lectures, Frank Teichmann expanded our horizons for the question of how we can grow into the coming century as an anthroposophical medical movement. He gave precise descriptions of the paths of Parcival and Gawain in the Parcival legends. Because Teichmann only touched on a possible interpretation of Parcival's and Gawain's experiences and insights, the listeners were left free to take the questions home with them and find their own answers. Many (myself included) would have liked to have been presented with more vision for the future. I felt and

realized that each one of us must work to develop ourselves and to contribute in community to the social structure of anthroposophical medicine. All of the lecturers gave mere indications of how the work could be moved forward.

The conference was very stimulating. It also raised questions about the implicit or explicit methods that were portrayed. I had come to Dornach with the hope of finding answers to pressing questions connected with anthroposophy. I returned home with the wholesome, restoring, and strengthening feeling that I can only find these answers in myself: through work and practice, fired by hope for insight and clarity.

To me, this experience of being thrown back on one's own work, and the request that was expressed to be a little more careful in expressing criticism of others, of the Section, of the Executive Council, etc. (formulating it instead in relation to one's own activities), were the main points of Michaela Glöckler's lectures. She simultaneously revealed something wonderful from her personal work: she described the meditative content that she works with daily during the course of the week with regard to the medical movement! Her openness awakened enthusiasm. She stressed that she did not mean it as a hint that one should imitate her. Nevertheless, I became thoughtful...

"Openness" is the cue for my last thought. Many, many people were in Dornach these past two years. Yet

there seems to be a large number of people who feel that they belong to this movement but do not come to the Goetheanum. I would like to suggest that they be explicitly invited to the next international conference (October 1-4, 2000), and that the discussion forum be made the central part of it. I believe that the path to anthroposophical medicine can only be found if *all* truly start out on a path together, in awareness of all. In particular, this would mean that the critical voices have a chance to be heard, be given a chance to participate in the process.

In this sense, I look forward to the next conference. We can only find the "Grail" together.

*Jost Christian Deerberg, Germany*

## SECTION FOR THE SPIRITUAL STRIVING OF YOUTH

### New Leader Chosen: Elizabeth Wirsching

At the 1999 Annual General Meeting I announced my intention of giving up the leadership of the Youth Section (see *Anthroposophy Worldwide* no. 4/1999). A group was formed to suggest suitable people for the task. On the basis of these suggestions, the Executive Council has now asked Elizabeth Wirsching to become the new Section Leader. Elizabeth Wirsching is currently teaching at the Rudolf Steiner school in Nesodd-tangen, near Oslo, Norway. She will move to Dornach sometime next year. More will be said about her in a future issue of *Anthroposophy Worldwide*.

For the Goetheanum Executive Council

*Heinz Zimmermann*

## The Goetheanum and Finances

### Interview with Rolf Kerler regarding this year's Appeal

*An appeal for donations will be sent this year as usual. Is this routine, a call for help, or an expression of a particular idea?*

This appeal is a genuine call for help, but with the emphasis on intensifying the main task of the Anthroposophical Society, which is to support spiritual research.

*To what extent can the Goetheanum do justice to this task of research?*

The funds available to the General Anthroposophical Society have always been so scarce that no major institutional research has been able to develop at the Goetheanum. Anthroposophical research tends to be done more locally, together with the concrete professional work – in agriculture, medicine, education, etc. From a financial point of view, the General Anthroposophical Society has great difficulty even just meeting the administrative costs of the Sections. The Society would like to support active researchers more, but far too little is possible financially.

*What would the hoped-for donations be used for?*

The appeal mentions the areas where funds are particularly scarce right now: the support of the Sections of the School of Spiritual Science, and the Goetheanum stage.

Our 1999 budget includes approximately CHF 4.5 million in free donations and legacies, and approximately CHF 800,000 in earmarked donations. Problematic for me is not this proportion, but the fact that we have to rely on so many donations just to cover our operating expenses.

*What income should be used for the various budget areas?*

Besides the general area of administration and services offered by the Anthroposophical Society, which can be covered by regular members' contributions, we have three major areas that cannot support themselves:

1. The work of the Sections should be financed by the activity of the Sections themselves (e.g., research commissions, ear-marked donations, conference and course income), and by regular donations by as many institutions as possible. All of these income sources combined are currently insufficient to cover the expenses. We have a yearly deficit of approximately CHF 1.5 to 2 million.

2. The expenses of the Goetheanum stage should be covered as far as

possible by income from performances and conferences. The entire cost cannot be covered by this income, of course (at the Goetheanum, 50% of the cost is covered, which is extremely good compared with other stages). This creates a deficit of approximately CHF 2.5 to 3 million. The stage is currently looking into the possibility of forming a group of sponsors who would contribute regularly.

3. The Goetheanum building and its nearby auxiliary buildings can only be supported by building donations and legacies. This currently succeeds only partially. We have to keep postponing badly needed repairs. Recently we published an appeal for the renovation of Rudolf Steiner House.

*Do you think it would make sense to have a Goetheanum Foundation?*

It would be very good to receive larger or many smaller funds that we would not use directly to pay for necessities, but would invest sensibly. Our operating expenses could then be partially supported by the proceeds. This would replace our current intolerable state of having to reckon with extra donations and legacies to cover our operating expenses.

*What is the involvement of the General Anthroposophical Society in anthroposophical businesses?*

A striking example is Weleda AG. The General Anthroposophical Society (together with the Ita Wegman Clinic) is Weleda's main shareholder. There are also several businesses that have agreed to pay the General Anthroposophical Society a specific sum each year as a contribution to research (e.g., the independent banks in Basel, Switzerland and Bochum, Germany). It would be very helpful to expand this kind of involvement.

*The will to be a true worldwide Society requires the cultivation of many contacts. To what extent is this a financial challenge?*

In recent years there has been a considerable increase in international conferences at the Goetheanum, creating a considerable rise in travel expenses. The new translation system was costly, and it already needs to be expanded to meet current needs. We have also seen more international conferences in other parts of the world (U.S.A., Asia), which request financial assistance from the Goetheanum. Not least, we also have *Anthroposophy*

*Worldwide* as an expression of our will to become a worldwide Society, with its additional costs.

*Money from all over the world flows to the Goetheanum. What flows from the Goetheanum to the world?*

It is primarily not something financial; it is not easy to describe. I believe that many people do return home enriched by their visit to the Goetheanum, through experiences that they do not find elsewhere – whether they participated in a professional conference, saw *Faust*, or did something else.

Also, many Goetheanum colleagues travel around the world, offering lectures and courses, private conversations, consultations, suggestions, and gathering impressions of the local work, which they need if they are to fulfill their task of mediation.

Regarding the financial side, there is a modest source of funds available, administered by the Evidenz Society, enabling money to flow to initiatives in the world that Goetheanum representatives consider important.

*What if the flow of donations turns out to be less than we need? How much can the Goetheanum still cut back without losing its functionality?*

Since we do not expect the financial situation at the Goetheanum to improve significantly through members' contributions, institutions' contributions, performance income, or other regular income, we are currently making a list of ways to cut costs to what we can afford in the budget for 2000. All of these measures will reduce the capacity of the Goetheanum to function. We have practically no cushion.

*What would you wish for under these circumstances?*

Long-term, that we as a Society concentrate more (in collaboration with one another and with others in the world) on doing things that will create new values in the world – spiritual values above all – that will sooner or later also have an economic effect for the Goetheanum.

Short-term, that all who read this interview may discover the Goetheanum in their hearts and think about how they can contribute to its thriving.

*Rolf Kerler was interviewed by  
Sebastian Jüngel and  
Ursula Remund*

*Donations:* General Anthroposophical Society, Raiffeisenbank, CH-9001 St. Gallen, acct. no. AA10886200, or Postscheck acct. no. 90-970-5, Clearing 80000, Swiftcode RAIFCH22