
What *else* is going on in our Society!

Issue No. 68 / 13 July 2023

On the history of the General Anthroposophical Society (GAS) Focus on “Constitution”

What is the real background of the constitutional problem? Lectures and talk - online

“The year of the death of idealism proper”.

Rudolf Steiner refers to a centenary event only once in the Complete Edition: the year 1859, the centenary of Friedrich Schiller’s birth. According to Rudolf Steiner, this was the “*year of the death of idealism proper*”¹. And elsewhere, in reference to the turn of the millennium: “*In the decimal system, the Ahrimanic impulses are now very strongly at work.*”² Is not this alone reason enough to give serious thought to these 100-year commemorations and to consider that 3 x 33 years just add up to 99 and that the 100 years cannot be meant by the *cyclical periods of historical events*?³ Could something similar happen in relation to the 100-year **anniversary** of the Christmas Conference as in the Schiller Year 1859? Especially if this year should also be celebrated in an obviously untruthful way as “100 years of the *General Anthroposophical Society*”?

“The year of the death of ...”?

But how does it look in *retrospect* - 100 years of Threefolding, Waldorf education, anthroposophical medicine and Weleda? In retrospect, will the cooperation with “One Health”, the WHO (“training standards”), which were entered into **in order** to protect anthroposophy, among other things, be assessed in the same way as Rudolf Steiner assessed this 100-year Schiller Year? “The year of the death of ...”? Should this not be a justified concern? (For details on this question see Footnote 3). However, it must be taken into account that something similar already occurred for the Society in 2002: In the 100th year after the founding of the Society within the framework of the Theosophical Society, the unspeakable reconstitution attempt of the Christmas Conference Society was undertaken - with devastating social, financial and also spiritual consequences - a 9/11 of our Society. More on this in the online events and in a note on Page 4 at the end of the article.

1 GA 222, 1989, p. 18, 11 March 1923.

2 GA 286, 1982, p. 109: “In the system of ten the Ahrimanic impulses now work very strongly.”

3 The extent of the Society’s and the university’s refusal to recognise this issue is documented in the following book: “3 x 33 Jahre Weihnachtstagung und die Krise der AAG”, Thomas Heck, Dornach 2022, available in bookshops or from the author.

On the history of the GAS

Focus on “Constitution”

Lectures and discussion - online (German only)

Thursdays, 20, 27 July, 3 and 10 August 2023 (and possibly other dates), 8pm each. Registration and further information: <https://wtg-99.com/anmeldung>

The sessions build upon each other, continuous participation is advantageous. Recordings of the contributions may be made available on the Internet.

Participation is free of charge, voluntary contributions are welcome (see box on Page 4 for bank details).

Topic Overview

- Basis of understanding for today’s world events - with special reference to our Society - historical and current. (Reality of the work of spiritual powers, reflection of our time with the Egyptian cultural epoch, occult backgrounds for influencing masses, age of untruthfulness).
- What the so-called constitutional question is really about!
- Prehistory of Rudolf Steiner’s work - at the same time a prehistory of the threefolding of the social organism. Focus: 18th and 19th century.
- Developments before the Christmas Conference (ca. 1912 - 1923).
- The constitutional events from Rudolf Steiner’s point of view (Christmas Conference up to the General Assembly 1925).
- Presentation, evaluation and discussion of the diverse, partially contradictory views and traditions - both historical and current.
- Causes of confusion.
- Developments from 1925 to the end of the millennium.
- The “9/11 of the AAG”: The reconstitution attempt in 2002. Further developments until today.

What might matter now

“Wisdom is found only in truth”

(Motto of the Anthroposophical Society of 1912, which by no means became obsolete in 1923).

In order to regain or maintain the credibility and authenticity of our Society, an unbiased and open *insight-oriented discussion* of the following topics is necessary now, or in the remaining time until Christmas:

- What were the circumstances, conditions and intentions connected with the re-founding of the Society and the Christmas Conference in 1923 - including the associated questions of the constitutional problem? In this context it can currently be observed that the associated untruthfulness, on which the self-image of today's General Anthroposophical Society is largely based, is experiencing a veritable renaissance.
- The way Anthroposophical Medicine dealt with the so-called Corona (COVID) pandemic - especially concerning the Medical Section and the Goetheanum leadership - needs to be examined in every respect: scientifically, medically and historically (here especially the downright instrumentalisation of Rudolf Steiner to support their own views on the vaccination recommendations)⁴ and the associated interaction of unscientific and untruthfulness - a genuflection before materialistically oriented natural science. One could also say: We *urgently* need to return to scientificity at least in these important aspects!
- The cooperation with institutions and organisations to research questionable connections – however, without engaging in the theming of the occult backgrounds and the obvious politically and hegemonically oriented intentions and also discussing these publicly. Would this not be precisely the task of anthroposophy and an anthroposophical Society? How can a spiritualisation of civilisation take place if there is no clarification about these backgrounds? This also includes a critical examination of the WHO pandemic treaty currently under discussion and the International Health Regulations.
- The one-sided affinities of various Sections to “One Health”, a movement that is by no means primarily scientific, but likewise predominantly politically related to the WHO, the WEF, Agenda 2030 and other organisations. Increasingly, attempts are being made to establish these supposedly scientific findings (health threats from zoonosis and climate change from anthropogenic CO2 emissions) as the basis for a global instrument of domination.

Is it not obvious that all these current developments are precisely such as those predicted by Rudolf Steiner?

“And it is an important task, an important magical task, to spread the untruth in the world in such a way that it appears true, because in this effect of the untruth as

⁴ See in particular my newsletters 28, 29 and 42.

[seemingly] true lies a tremendous power of evil. And this power of evil is quite properly exploited from the most diverse sides.”⁵

“It is in the general character of evolution that in this fifth post-Atlantean period certain relations of power, certain strong relations of influence, must pass to small groups of people who will have a strong power over other, great masses.”⁶

It must be left open at this point who will take up which one of these topics and when. At the moment, the questions surrounding the events of that time and their significance for us today should be addressed here:

- in the announcement of an online lecture and discussion series,
- and in a next issue about an initiative to bring the unfulfilled and open tasks from the colloquium work on the Constitution to an appropriate end after all.

What is the real background of the constitutional question?

But what really lies behind this constitutional question? What kind of problem is concealed by it? ***It is the conflict between life and form:*** From the *living* social realities, according to Rudolf Steiner, a form for society was created at the Christmas Conference in which he could take the lead to save Society from imminent disintegration. This form was created from the *concrete life of the time*, nothing was codified⁷, the statutes were not to be statutes, but tell what was real **at the time**. Nothing was to be shaped according to principles, nothing according to dogmas. But this is exactly what happened after Rudolf Steiner's death: what he had formed out of the living, what could only have permanence and validity through him and with him, was dogmatised, codified, declared to be eternally valid principles. It was the exact opposite of how Rudolf Steiner had proceeded: the form was conserved (or even mummified?) and life henceforth had to orient itself to the form.

This conflict between life and form was already clear from Rudolf Steiner's references to the distinction between Society and Association (see quote above and Footnote 14). This conflict became apparent in all its sharpness immediately after Rudolf Steiner's death: Marie Steiner was probably the only one to realise that it was not possible to continue in this constellation: *The Board had been orphaned in its childhood stage, it became a nothing.*⁸ She saw the need for change.⁹ But those around her were of a different opinion and insisted that nothing should be changed, and so the news bulletin on 3 May 1925 stated:

⁵ GA 173c, p. 143.

⁶ GA 178, 2015, P. 81.

⁷ Codification means the collection and inclusion of norms in a referenceable, written set of rules, for example in the field of social or linguistic norms.

⁸ Letter to Eugen Kolisko, 4 April 1925, in: Lili Kolisko, „Eugen Kolisko, ein Lebensbild“, private print, 1963.

“Since the final arrangement of the regrouping of the institutions connected with this Conference was still possible a short time before his death (see Newsletter 22 March 1925), but there are no later indications which give rise to a change in this state of affairs, the Executive Committee appointed by him regards it as its duty to remain in its functions and to continue to work in the spirit of Rudolf Steiner, whom it knows to be a leader in its midst.⁹

Especially with Albert Steffen, who together with Guenther Wachsmuth shaped the Society over four decades, the idea of form was clearly in the foreground, “*the Society is a work of Rudolf Steiner like other works ...*”.¹⁰ And, of course, one does not change works!

But are there any statements by Rudolf Steiner at all that suggest such a conclusion? Why does one not take seriously what he said? Some people seem to think that *Rudolf Steiner did not want what he said - and did not say what he wanted!*

No, he was (and is?) not taken seriously. Neither from the form as such nor from what he said about it can it be concluded that the form at that time was to be understood as a kind of archetype which it was only necessary to imitate. “***For of course the Anthroposophical Society must be something quite different when it is led by me or when it is led by someone else.***” No, this was not (and is not) understood, not even the fact that he did not name a successor either for the Society or for the Hochschule - not even when asked directly by Ita Wegman shortly before his death.

The Christmas Conference Society - an association under Swiss law?

To some, this question may seem absurd - but it is precisely in this that the conflict between “life and form” manifests itself quite obviously: With an association, a form is created that is to exist in perpetuity, independent of the concrete members and board members. Life then has to conform to the form - rules, principles and dogmas emerge, and in addition, the corresponding association laws have to be taken into account, some of which are binding - e.g. the strictly grassroots democratic orientation of the association according to Swiss law. Thus would have come into being what Rudolf Steiner described already in 1912 as inappropriate: “*Membership does not imply anything association-like.*”¹¹ And Rudolf Steiner emphasised several times that the Christmas Conference Society (Weihnachtstagungs-Gesellschaft) should have nothing to do with the association-like, that it should break with everything that is association-like.¹² He expressed himself in this sense as early as 1916:

⁹ Newsletter 18/1925.

¹⁰ Newsletter 16.

¹¹ e.g. in GA 259, p. 890f.

¹² In this context, it is repeatedly asserted that the term “association” refers to some kind of immorality or association formality. However, there are no statements by Rudolf Steiner in this regard, so this is an unproven assertion.

*“It will not be possible to continue working if there is no awareness that this society is something living, something true and not a club that you can leave if you don't like something.”*¹³

The desire to be a member of the Christmas Conference Society ...

As understandable as this desire may initially be to want to be a member of the very Society founded by Rudolf Steiner, the question must be asked as to why the *form* should matter. Every individual and every group can connect spiritually with Rudolf Steiner and the Christmas Conference - by no means only the members of the General Anthroposophical Society. Or is one seriously of the opinion that a kind of holy and solely-blessed institution came into being at that time and that everything depends on its continued existence and that one belongs to it?

Thus it is also recognisable here that the conflict between life and form manifests itself in this question, even if the respective advocates of one or the other position may not be aware of this. In the history and conflicts of the Society, however, the belief in the importance of form has prevailed and become an integral part of the body of habit. So it is understandable if some people find it difficult to even admit the thought of anything else. This becomes clear when one considers the way in which attempts are made to justify this theory of association.¹⁴

The actual question can be characterised as follows:

- Was the formation of the Society at that time one that took place out of reality, out of the real living, in a completely independent free form, without having to take into account any legal guidelines (but of course on the constitutional legal ground of Switzerland), i.e. a free association of people who freely formed their relationship? A form that could only come into being and exist through and with Rudolf Steiner?
- Or did Rudolf Steiner make use of a given legal form, which could only come into being and exist through and within the framework of state sovereignty on the basis of legal requirements¹⁵ - in order, however, to subsequently take the liberty of not adhering to the associated regulations and necessities (expecting this also from his successors), without, however, expressing this both to the founding membership and to the public, concealing the legal form?

What implicit insinuations against Rudolf Steiner are connected with the acceptance of the theory of association cannot be elaborated here, see references in Footnote 14.

¹³ GA 174a, p. 124.

¹⁴ See footnote 3 and circulars 14 and 42 as well as “*On the Constitution of the General Anthroposophical Society Its Significance - a Question for the Future?*”. 2023, <https://wtg-99.com/buch-konstitution/>. On the website insight into further remarks by Rudolf Steiner on the distinction between society and association.

¹⁵ It is in the nature of the legal person, a legal construct, that it can only be created and exist by law!

Further confusion instead of clarification

The current situation regarding the constitution of the Society - and thus what Rudolf Steiner wanted at the time - is characterised by decades of denial of knowledge and imprinted (false) images, ambiguities and confusion - which is currently increasing. Here are a few examples:

- In the work in the colloquia on the Constitution, no clarification could be achieved because at the end of the work, at the instigation of the leadership, the controversial views were removed from the chronology, despite agreements to the contrary. The detailed elaborations that emerged at the end were simply no longer discussed.¹⁴
- Even the conference “What was wanted” of the Social Sciences Section from 16 to 18 June 2023 could not bring any clarification - on the contrary: the different views remained side by side and a deepening did not take place. How the incompatible views are to be dealt with in November is currently completely open.
- Michaela Glöckler introduces a view that has now truly been refuted and has been completely outdated since 2002 at the latest. Without even mentioning the findings of the colloquium paper, she claims that a constitutional problem does not exist at all (in 2002, however, she had approved the reconstitution process, which was based on a completely opposite view!) In her view, on 8 February 1925 the Building Association (Bauverein) had completely merged into the Christmas Conference Society (Weihnachtstagungs-Gesellschaft). This had happened entirely according to Rudolf Steiner’s will. That in this case Rudolf Steiner would at least have accepted a - probably punishable - hidden transfer of assets - should be clear to her because of her decades of occupation.
- Jürgen Erdmenger¹⁶ is one of the lawyers who were the architects of the reconstitution attempt in 2002 and who subsequently acted as legal representatives for the accused board members. It is remarkable that he, of all people, argues that a merger had taken place, because the reconstitution plan at that time was based on the fact that a merger *could not have taken place*: This had been repeatedly proven in an excellent and clear manner. In a final statement after the judgement, the two lawyers reiterated their view and made it clear that they considered the court’s conclusions that a merger could have taken place to be incorrect. *However, in complete contradiction to this and their own conviction and findings, they welcomed the Board’s decision to recognise the judgements and from here on to assume that a merger had taken place. Because this is “a solid basis for shaping the future.”*¹⁷ In the end, it was only a decision of will

¹⁶ Anthroposophy Worldwide 7-8/23.

¹⁷ Statement on behalf of the Executive Council at the Goetheanum on the two judgements of the Solothurn High Court of 12 January 2005, Zurich and Brussels in March 2005. Date of publication in the News Bulletin unknown.

which interpretation one wanted to follow! Really? A solid basis for a knowledge society? We will have to come back to that.

One can have the impression that now of all times, 100 years after the events of that time, ambiguities are to arise to a particular degree.

To counter this, I propose two initiatives:

First: Starting on 20 July, on Thursdays at 8pm until further notice, I will be offering online sessions on these questions for guidance (in German only)

Second: Another - now *public* - attempt to bring the open questions from the colloquium work to an acceptable and orderly conclusion - more on this in the next issue.

Thomas Heck

*

About this English edition

As we are often asked for an English translation, we would like to try to share our information in English, especially at this important time 99/100 years after the Christmas Conference. Please distribute and forward this newsletter.

If you are interested in receiving it regularly, you may subscribe here: <https://wtg-99.com/nl>.

The subscription is free of charge - the production is a lot of work. We would be pleased if you could support our work. For bank transfers see box below. For Paypal you can use this link: <https://wtg-99.com/Paypal>

*

If you would like to support our work:

Postfinance Schweiz (CHF):

IBAN: CH 07 0900 0000 4048 8190 0 | BIC: POFICHBEXXX

Volksbank Lörrach (EUR):

IBAN DE 65 6839 0000 0001 4064 85 | BIC: VOLODE66

Accountholder [Kontoinhaber]: Thomas Heck

We would like to sincerely thank all supporters of our work.

*

Imprint

What else is going on in our Society!

Translation: Deepl.com

Many thanks to Dezső Pallagi for proofreading

Published by: *Thomas Heck und Eva Lohmann-Heck*,
Dorneckstr. 60, 4143 Dornach / Switzerland