
What *else* is happening at the Goetheanum!

No. 70 / 22 August 2023

COVID and official Anthroposophic Medicine What should we learn from the pandemic?

"... nor do I wish to take sides with the modern superstition that bacilli (viruses) and bacteria move in and out of man and cause disease." (GA 314, 7 April 1920)

"He who says that diseases come from small creatures; for example, that influenza comes from the influenza bacteria and so on, is of course just as clever as one who says that rain comes from frogs croaking." (GA 348, P. 141)

Abstract

In view of the increasingly obvious inconsistencies and untruths, especially about the gene-based "vaccinations" with which about $\frac{3}{4}$ of humanity has been "vaccinated" at least once ¹, the question arises whether this alleged pandemic and these "vaccinations" have not committed an unprecedented crime against humanity, the consequences of which we cannot yet even fully comprehend. A reappraisal of what happened has long been underway, even if this is ignored by politics and the mainstream media and the corresponding agendas of supranational organisations continue to be pushed forward, with which the freedom of the population can be massively restricted in future in the face of alleged threats, and not only from diseases.

In this context, a review of the conduct of our anthroposophical institutions - here in particular the Medical Section and the leadership of the General Anthroposophical Society - is essential. The following is a summary of the essential points:

- Independent of COVID, it has been observed for some time that the leadership of our institutions is increasingly submitting to the alleged scientific consensus - which is merely produced by the media and politics - and not only accepts the "prohibitions on thinking" that have arisen as a result, but also believes that it can cooperate with the corresponding institutions, researching together within the prescribed "framework of thinking", and at the same time also protecting Anthroposophy from attacks ².

- This has led to a situation where scientific debate in the sense of a free intellectual life has not been allowed within the Society either, and dissenters have increasingly been ignored or even discredited as conspiracy theorists.
- Although members of the Goetheanum leadership did not necessarily share the views of the Medical Section leadership, they apparently did not speak out or did not do so audibly enough for reasons of solidarity.
- With the theory of the virus as a pathogen, mono-causal thinking (actually a belief) has been followed, although there is no scientific evidence for it and Rudolf Steiner described this approach as a *modern superstition*.
- Thus, Rudolf Steiner's statements contradicting these theories were either not reproduced at all or only in a distorted way.
- Regarding his smallpox vaccination, a representation was made that was contrary to the facts and the truth, with which its own positive attitude towards gene-based "vaccinations" was supported and literally instrumentalised Rudolf Steiner as an alleged advocate of vaccination.
- The question of the essence of vaccination was not addressed, although Rudolf Steiner, referring to the smallpox vaccination of the time, already spoke of the vaccinated being "*clothed with a phantom*", whereby the human being would become "*constitutionally materialistic*" ³.
- We assume that many thousands of decisions in favour of "vaccination" were made in reliance on the pronouncements of the Medical Section.

¹ <https://rumble.com/v2djfco-mwgf-d-pressekonferenz-vom-15.03.23-genbasierte-impfstoffe-das-pharmaverbre.html>

² Newsletter 61, see www.wtg-99.com in the archive.

³ GA 314, p. 278.

The responsibility for this is also shared by all those who did have the opportunity to oppose the one-sided and unscientific approach of the Medical Section and failed to do so.

- The considerable research deficits regarding both the processes of infection and the effect of vaccinations on the higher members of the human being - by no means only concerning COVID - are also becoming apparent.

In light of the questions that have arisen from the attitude of anthroposophical medicine and in particular, the Medical Section during the so-called COVID pandemic, an open and unbiased reappraisal is essential. Ideally, this process should take place from within, in a neutrally moderated process, between those responsible from the Society's leadership and those who are committed to and engaged in this coming to terms with the situation.

The Society and the School of Spiritual Science would thus show that they are capable of a self-critical reappraisal with scientific standards. This would be associated with a considerable gain in authenticity, both internally and externally and in several fields at the same time: *scientific, medical and social* - in the sense of a positive role model for necessary reappraisal processes in the rest of the world.

Furthermore, consequences must be drawn, because this unprecedented event makes it clear once again that the Goetheanum leadership in particular, as the essential and central governing body, must also be accountable to the membership for its actions and work. A demand that has already been formulated in the past (at the AGM 2019 as a request ⁴ and in "Ein Nachrichtenblatt" 18/2022 as a proposal for revision of the Statutes).

Further notes and information, references, sources and details of Rudolf Steiner's statements: www.wtg-99.com/aufarbeitung.

Detailed Version

Preliminary remark

Regardless of what one thinks of the behaviour of official anthroposophical medicine and the anthroposophical institutions; an unbiased, open and honest examination is essential for the General Anthroposophical Society and the School of Spiritual Science for reasons of truthfulness and authenticity, since the behaviour described below with regard to COVID has down-right blindsided spiritually oriented people who are awake to current events. The following statements are to be understood in this sense. It is in the nature of things that critical attitudes are taken as a starting point - with the aim of verifying or contradicting them - partially or completely.

⁴ AWW 3/19, literally: <https://wtg-99.com/Statuten-2019>

Note on this issue

In addition to the current content, nine "*Questions to the current leadership of the Medical Section and to the Goetheanum leadership*" by Ilona Metz were originally to appear. Matthias Girke had been informed about both contributions in advance with a request for a written statement. Georg Soldner responded to the article "Corona and official Anthroposophical Medicine" (see "A necessary supplement", page 5) and it was possible to facilitate a discussion of about half an hour on the nine questions with M. Girke, Ilona Metz, Roland Tüscher and Thomas Heck. M. Girke stated that he would be happy to enter into a dialogue - in a fraternal sense and with a mutual approach - about the questions posed. In view of the short time available, Ilona Metz put the fourth of her questions up for discussion. Unfortunately, the quality of discussion described by M. Girke did not materialise, as most of the time was taken up by him explaining in detail the positions we had known for a long time. Unfortunately, he hardly responded to the concrete questions and points of view of I. Metz. We hope that these initial difficulties can be overcome.

The fundamental question remains why the dialogue desired by M. Girke, which we also want, had not been possible beforehand. This would have been possible at several member forums on this topic (e.g. 12 June and 23 Nov. 2022 and 15 May 2023) - but was prevented by the structure and the behaviour of the leaders.

M. Girke expressed concern that a publication could lead to factionalism, which is in no way our intention. However, the question arises whether these have not already arisen due to the restrictive behaviour of the management. He also pointed out that in his experience open letters have never had any positive effect. Our experience is quite different, because it was precisely the corresponding publications from the membership that played a significant role in the fact that, for example, the members' forums came into being in the first place and that the pending issues can now be dealt with openly and without restrictions.

M. Girke had promised to continue the discussion at short notice – maybe next week? In the hope that mutual understanding will be possible in this human encounter, it was decided to postpone the publication of the nine questions here for the time being.

Thomas Heck

Moreover, we owe it to anthroposophy and Rudolf Steiner at least trying to provide clean evidence for the incompatible views in a scientific sense, and ideally to resolve opposites. We owe it especially to the large number of people who have made a decision based on the widespread views - whether for or against these so-called vaccinations. Another essential aspect is that clarification will also make it possible to deal better with any pandemics or other threats that may occur in the future - real or alleged.

In the following, the focus will be primarily on the Medical Section, the School of Spiritual Science and the General Anthroposophical Society, since a tangible social framework is given here. In view of the fact that the official or officially disseminated and recognisable way of dealing with these questions has led to many member resignations and has significantly influenced the attitudes of other anthroposophical institutions, this process of reappraisal should also be open to supporters and contributors who are not members of the General Anthroposophical Society.

Corona / COVID – Gene-based “vaccinations” An unprecedented crime against humanity?

Anyone who does not inform themselves exclusively via the mainstream media and takes note of the increasingly obvious discrepancies and the spreading untruths about the gene-based so-called 'vaccinations', with which approx. ¾ of humanity has been 'vaccinated' at least once⁵, must ask themselves whether with this alleged pandemic and these 'vaccinations' an unprecedented crime has been committed against humanity, the consequences of which we cannot even yet comprehend. The increasingly publicised vaccine damage and the excess mortality that has become apparent in the meantime, the decline in birth rates, fertility problems, cardiovascular diseases, unexpected deaths and much more are alarming. Some of the things that were discredited as “conspiracy theories” months ago have long since turned out to be reality, and above all the assurances that these “vaccinations” are safe have turned out to be empty promises. Not even infections are prevented by these “vaccinations” and if there are any benefits at all, it is questionable whether the negative consequences do not far outweigh them. It is time for a reappraisal, which has already begun⁶, even if this is still suppressed in the mainstream media. The extent to which this suppression also affects our anthroposophical community will become clear below.

⁵ <https://rumble.com/v2djfco-mwgfd-pressekonferenz-vom-15.03.23-genbasierte-impfstoffe-das-pharmaverbrec.html>

⁶ E.g.: <https://www.mwgfd.org/>

On the history of the GAS

Focus on “Constitution”

Lectures and talk - online

Next dates:

Thursdays 8pm:

31 August 2023

- A decisive period: Completion and dissolution of the Constitution, 8 February to 29 December 1925

14 September 2023

- Presentation, evaluation and discussion of the diverse, partly contradictory views and traditions. Historical and topical.

Registration and further Information

www.wtg-99.com/anmeldung.

The contributions build on each other, continuous participation is advantageous. Participation is free of charge, voluntary contributions are welcome (see last but one page for bank details).

Previous contributions are available as recordings:

www.wtg-99.com/videos

Topic overview

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, partly contradictory views and traditions. Historical and topical.

- The importance of the legal form.
- Causes of confusion.
- Developments from 1925 to 2000.

The 9/11 of the AAG: The reconstitution attempt in 2002. Further developments until today.

Post-scientific conditions

Media consensus instead of evidence

Scientific evidence is increasingly being replaced by an alleged scientific consensus, which, however, does not exist in most cases, but is merely asserted in the media. The funding of scientific enterprise is largely dependent on political decisions, private donors (foundations) and very large and influential business enterprises - with the result that, as far as possible, only projects and studies are funded that correspond to the alleged consensus or the interests of the donors and decision-makers.

This also applies to the large institutions such as the WHO, which depend to a considerable extent on private - usually earmarked and thus influential - donations. Today's scientific enterprises are thus predominantly interest-driven - as are politics and, to a particular extent, the mainstream or system media. A truly scientific "discourse" with public effectiveness is almost non-existent and anyone who dares to even question the "consensus dogmas" must reckon with defamation and discrimination - even the loss of livelihood.

Anthroposophy and free spiritual life?

It has been observed for years that institutionalised anthroposophy is largely adapting to this development, or even more: subordinating itself to it. One need only recall, for example, the cooperation with the Steiner Studies, the courting of opponents such as H. Zander and others, the acceptance or toleration of Jost Schieren's assertions (e.g., the scientific nature of anthroposophy is opposed to esotericism'), the acceptance of the claim that Rudolf Steiner made racist remarks, the unrestricted recognition of orthodox allopathic medicine, the striving for (public and governmental) recognition (e.g. state-recognised eurhythmy therapy, eurhythmy bachelor's degrees, master's degrees and professorships, public recognition of certifications, the degradation of anthroposophical medicine to an integrative medicine that merely expands today's fully recognised orthodox medicine and now the recognition of training standards for anthroposophical medicine by the WHO). Constructive debate is often replaced by personal criticism, there is talk of conspiracy theories and some people are placed in the 'new right' corner.

Anthroposophy, free spiritual life and the School of Spiritual Science leadership?

As will become apparent in the following, at least initially, there are considerable deficits in knowledge and communication both at the level of the natural sciences and the humanities. Particularly with regard to the significance of pathogens, viral diseases, causes and consequences of diseases, vaccinations, natural science and humanities cognitive methodology etc., one might have expected that at least a differentiated and open-minded attitude would have become visible with regard to the entire COVID problem.

- 7 It is absolutely understandable and comprehensible if, for reasons of securing one's livelihood, there is often a desire for these recognitions or if they are seen as positive. However just as understandable are the concerns about the compromises, adjustments and dependencies that are some-times necessary. Whether these tendencies of official recognition [popularization and academisation of anthroposophic medicine (Michaela Glöckler 2008)] are in reality rather detrimental to anthroposophic substance should at least need to be discussed.
- 8 There are publications that indicate these different views, which can be discussed in more detail if necessary. However, these were not available for decision making for or against the "vaccination".
- 9 Version 2019 (see Annual Report). Emphasis and addition TH.

This is especially true since the interdisciplinary composition of the School of Spiritual Science and the Goetheanum leadership would have led one to expect a broadening of views. In addition, indeed it is evident that there were and are very different views and there is also said to have been - sometimes heated - controversial discussions. However, almost nothing of this has become perceptible and thus relevant.¹ So far, only the one-sided pronouncements of the Medical Section have become publicly effective. In addition, important statements by Rudolf Steiner remained unmentioned or, according to them, were turned into their opposite and could not be discussed despite personal and public references. This has led to Rudolf Steiner being instrumentalised as an advocate of vaccination based on the fact that he had (had to have!) been vaccinated against smallpox (see below interview with ZDF and the websites of the Medical Section and the various associations). This is a process that actually demands Rudolf Steiner's rehabilitation!

This makes it clear that a free spiritual life is at most practised only internally within the Goetheanum leadership. Externally, what the Section responsible in each case considers to be right is represented, and only that is communicated. This procedure is even anchored in the Rules of Procedure!

In §3 on the working methods of the Goetheanum and School of Spiritual Science leadership it says in 3e:

"The transfer of decision-making authority and responsibility is connected with the fact that the persons in charge regularly inform the Goetheanum leadership and consult with them regarding their decisions. *If such consultation takes place, the leaders are free to include the results of the consultation in their decision [or not].* They shall inform the Goetheanum leadership accordingly."⁹

This procedure with regard to the Section leadership clearly results from the phenomena and was confirmed to me directly and indirectly in personal conversations. It corresponds to solidarity behaviour in spiritual life when, despite one's own contradictory knowledge, no publicly visible objections are raised - because one does not want to (or should not) interfere in the affairs of another Section. Apart from the fact that this behaviour can (or must?) also be regarded as morally questionable: Is this a way to avoid one's own responsibility? (Is it not even necessary to speak of organised irresponsibility?) Thus, we are dealing with solidarity or brotherhood in spiritual life and outwardly with equality. For even within Anthroposophical Medicine a publicly perceptible discourse has not taken place, dissenters have not had their say.

Newsletter 28 and 29 translated:

www.wtg-99.com/Newsletter_28

www.wtg-99.com/Newsletter_29

Accountability is indispensable

In view of the circumstances described above and the refusal of those responsible to be accountable - by invoking free spiritual life - it should be clear that accountability to the membership as part of the sponsorship of the School of Spiritual Science is indispensable and must be demanded by the membership - in the context of co-responsibility for what is happening.

Anthroposophic Medicine or anthroposophic medicine?

In the following, 'Anthroposophic Medicine' (with a capital A) means institutionalised anthroposophic medicine as it is officially represented, i.e. in particular the Medical Section, the medical associations of the individual countries, the umbrella organisation Anthroposophic Medicine in Germany (DAMID), the International Federation of Anthroposophic Medical Associations (IVAA), the clinics and the training courses (insofar as they belong to or depend on institutionalised anthroposophic medicine) and have largely uncritically subscribed to or followed the views represented by the leaders of these organisations with regard to Corona, Covid and the gene-based 'vaccinations'.

Natural science as a basis?

In principle, there is nothing to object to natural science and especially its (originally virtuous) methods and principles, as long as one takes into account that these are only applicable to the purely material world and one sticks to the required process of cognition. Thus, there is also nothing to object to theories being set up about processes for which perception does not (yet) exist. However, one must not forget that these are theories. However, there is an increasing tendency to deviate methodically from theories in order to (supposedly) verify them by citing questionable indirect methods as evidence instead of direct observation of nature. Rudolf Steiner already clearly pointed out this tendency, for example in the cycle "Limits to the Knowledge of Nature and Overcoming Them" (GA 322). But these questionable methods are also questioned from within established natural science itself (e.g. Engelbrecht and Köhnlein, Stefan Lanka, Harald Wallach).

Imperceptible pathogens?

With regard to the cause of the disease Covid, official Anthroposophical Medicine has followed the narratives of the materialistic-scientific views. According to this, the essential cause of the disease Covid is an imperceptibly small material in-organic particle. The fact that the disposition of the human being is also taken into consideration does not change anything. And this virus is the enemy to be fought by all means, with masks and above all with experimental genetically engineered pharmaceuticals.

A necessary addendum

Due to a reaction of Georg Soldner in the run-up to the publication of these remarks, in which he did not address our remarks and accused us of agitation, the following is pointed out:

No one has claimed that the leaders of the Medical Section and Anthroposophical Medicine did everything wrong, which is not the case. In particular, the treatment of the sick was certainly exemplary, as was the demand to the German government for a vaccination register.

On 12 Jan. 2021, the Medical Section had determined that the side effects of the "vaccinations" had not yet been clarified - a determination that did not require any particular foresight at that time.

It is noteworthy that as early as 4 Jan. 2021, a scientific publication (unknown to me) in connection with the "vaccinations" **had already warned of possible deaths from the vaccinations** and also that these "vaccinations" **would probably not prevent any infections**. However, how was it morally justifiable, against this background, to publish the pronouncements on the "vaccinations" of a recommendatory nature listed below?

Furthermore, the complaint was raised that one had by no means submitted to a mono-causal way of thinking by referring to Rudolf Steiner's remarks from the lecture of 7 April 1920 (GA 312) in a publication of 12 Oct. 2020. This lecture, however, was not only about planetary constellations, but it was also made unmistakably clear that it was a mistake to regard viruses (then called bacilli) as the primary cause of disease. But it is precisely this error that has been upheld, as witnessed by subsequent pronouncements. This, and nothing else, is what the accusation of mono-causal thinking refers to.

"The IVAA and the Medical Section at the Goetheanum welcome the development of tolerable and effective vaccines against Sars-CoV-2 in the hope that they will play a central role in overcoming the Covid-19 pandemic." ¹

"Anthroposophic medicine has internationally welcomed SARS-CoV-2 vaccinations from the beginning as an essential aid to overcome the pandemic and especially to protect at-risk groups." ²

¹ https://medsektion-goetheanum.org/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Stellungnahme_zur_Impfung_gegen_SARS-CoV-2_2020-Jan-12_final.pdf

² <https://damid.de/presse/pressmitteilungen/1011-impfen-solidarisch-entscheiden.html>

Reminder:

It is a theory, because a virus as a pathogen has not yet been scientifically proven. A distinction must be made between the existence of the virus as such (necessary isolation of the virus) and the pathogenic effect (proof of infection). Georg Soldner was unable to prove the virus evidence he claimed in 2021. ¹¹

It is unclear whether the "material" in which the viruses are supposed to be contained is the cause or the consequence of the disease, whereby Rudolf Steiner's explanations clearly point to the latter, which, however, has been concealed or not dealt with.

Even the contagion as such has not been scientifically proven. According to German politicians, even in autumn 2021 it was unknown how more than 80 % of the infections had occurred. The fact that some kind of transmission through proximity to ill persons can be observed is not disputed and also corresponds to Rudolf Steiner's indications (see on this: "Rudolf Steiner on contagion among other things in viral diseases" with an excerpt from "Hygiene as a social question", Newsletter 28 ¹²). However, this is no proof that it is a virus and that this is the primary cause of the disease.

Note: It is not ultimately claimed by me or by others who question these virus theories that there are no viruses. Such a claim would not be serious and should not be taken seriously unless it is clear from the context that it is merely a questioning. What is really unscientific, however, is to be called a virus denier simply for pointing out the lack of evidence, which unfortunately can happen to you in our circles as well. There are, however, also milder variants, with which the study of this question is rejected altogether, for example because of the title of a book ("Virus Mania" ¹³), or because there are too many spelling mistakes in the explanations. The rejection was also justified by the fact that one's own scientific view of the world could be shaken if one even allowed these questions to be asked.

¹¹ See Newsletter 29.

¹² www.wtg-99.com/rundbrief-archiv

"The theory of contagious diseases is very practical because it offers what any simplistic view of a problem seeks above all else: a culprit, an invisible hare for the hounds to chase in their elaborate laboratories, universities, hospitals and pharmaceutical centres. The fact that this hare can never be caught is the perfect guarantee that their hunt will never end, their demand for capital will never be met, and their ability to generate profits for the pharmaceutical and chemical industries will continue to grow." (Montague R. Levenson, 1911 from -The Blood and its third Anatomical Element° by Antoine Béchamp.)

Silence, not responding at all, is the most elegant and frequent method: I had sent Matthias Girke and Georg Soldner each a copy of the book mentioned. I received a confirmation of receipt only upon request - no comment on the content. This book existed long before Corona and can only be recommended to everyone, as it also questions many other established, supposedly proven views in an absolutely serious manner, e.g. on HIV, polio, BSE, etc., also on the Spanish flu, to which reference is made again and again. Is it not urgent to pursue these questions, especially in view of Rudolf Steiner's (suppressed) hints?

"These medieval ghosts were at least decent ghosts, but the present-day germ ghosts are too creepy-crawly, too indecent ghosts, to justify the fear which, moreover, is only just beginning, and which makes people fall into a faith in authority, especially here, in the field of health, which is terrible." Rudolf Steiner (GA 127, 5 January 1911)

"... nor do I wish to take sides with the modern superstition that bacilli (viruses) and bacteria move in and out of man and cause disease." (GA 314, 7 April 1920)

"These observations are not intended to deny the fruitfulness of official medicine. But there is a shadow side to this progress. Think what would befall humanity if it had to live according to the will of those who would exploit the fear of germs to make social institutions! Take, for example, the stiff neck. It is stimulated by a germ which does not need the sick person himself to be its carrier, only the person who comes into contact with the sick person. Let us now imagine that everyone who has come into contact with a person suffering from stiff neck is controlled. Think what a tyranny that would lead to! Certainly, all these things are true, but it is impossible to base anything in social life on them." (6 March 1909)

¹³ Köhnlein und Engelbrecht: «Virus-Wahn», Norderstedt 2021.

Further statements from Rudolf Steiner in the Newsletters mentioned earlier and at www.wtg-99.com/Aufarbeitung.

A major research failure?

"He who says that diseases come from the little creatures, who says, for example, that influenza comes from the influenza bacillus (virus) and so on, is of course just as clever as one who says that rain comes from frogs croaking." ¹⁴

*"One can say that the danger of infection is extraordinarily high with smallpox. **But one should not be so careless as to always think of physical mediation in the transmission of smallpox;** in fact, the psychological predispositions are particularly strong in smallpox. Proof of this could be that one can protect oneself very well if one is able to close oneself off in the right way. I may speak about this because I once taught a pupil when I was twenty-two years old ... whose mother was lying with black pox right next to him, separated only by a Spanish wall from the room in which I was giving my lessons. I didn't do anything about it, continued teaching the whole time until the mother got well again. But I was quite happy to do this, especially to see how one can protect oneself if one takes the smallpox patient, i.e. the black pox patient, quite objectively, like another object, like a stone or a bush, towards which one has no further feelings of fear or other psychological impulses, but takes it as an objective fact. There, indeed, the danger of infection can be countered to a great extent. Therefore, the psychological factor can also play a major role in the contagion. ¹⁵*

How is it possible that even now, after 100 years of Anthroposophical Medicine, these statements by Rudolf Steiner are not addressed or taken up? Has he ever been refuted? Or is there a considerable failure of research in Anthroposophical Medicine here? As shown already, scientific aspects also point very clearly to the latter. **It is urgently recommended - especially to medical practitioners, but also to other responsible persons - to read up on Rudolf Steiner's corresponding explanations themselves and not to adopt something second-hand in confidence or on good faith!**

The so-called "vaccinations"

It is remarkable that genetically modified food is rejected by the majority and that corresponding bans exist. Anthroposophical Medicine, however, welcomed the gene-based 'vaccinations' that were supposed to prevent infections ("herd immunity is now only achievable with vaccinations", according to the WHO) even *before* they were available.

Trusting the manufacturers' statements alone, the Medical Section made vaccination recommendations. These were definitely statements of a recommendatory nature for these novel, experimental and genetically engineered pharmaceuticals, which had never been used on humans; and had been approved only by emergency decree. The recommendatory character is in no way negated by the fact that a free individual vaccination decision was also propagated. In addition, many other anthroposophical institutions adopted these positive recommendations.

"I have told you that the spirits of darkness will inspire their hosts, the people in whom they will dwell, to find even a vaccine to drive out the inclination to spirituality from the souls' earliest youth by the circuitous route through corporeality. Just as today bodies are inoculated against this and that, so in the future children will be inoculated with a substance that can certainly be manufactured, so that through this inoculation people will be immune from developing the 'follies' of spiritual life out of themselves, follies of course spoken of in the materialistic sense." (GA 177, P. 237)

Undoubtedly, tens of thousands have opted for this genetically engineered "vaccine" solely because of the one-sided positive attitude of official Anthroposophical Medicine and anthroposophical organisations (Federation of Waldorf Schools, Demeterbund, Weleda ...). A vaccination centre had been set up in the anthroposophical hospital "Havelhöhe" in Berlin - more than 150,000 of these gene-based "vaccinations" were administered there! ¹⁶ This has created a responsibility that affects not only the leaders of the Medical Section and Anthroposophical Medicine, but especially those who have not made themselves sufficiently knowledgeable and/or have not spoken out publicly despite opposing convictions, and thus have not opposed the Medical Section's one-sidedness for reasons of solidarity or otherwise. This certainly applies to all those who, because of their position, would have had the opportunity to speak out publicly.

Was Rudolf Steiner a supporter of vaccination?

Rudolf Steiner was instrumentalised for the one-sided vaccination recommendations. Here is an excerpt from an interview: ¹⁷

«ZDFheute»: How do you counter accusations that the low vaccination rate in German-speaking countries is related to Rudolf Steiner's anthroposophical ideas?

¹⁶ Harald Matthes in an interview mit Gerald Häfner on Goetheanum.tv.

¹⁷ <https://www.zdf.de/nachrichten/panorama/corona-anthroposophie-steiner-100.html>

¹⁴ GA 348, p. 141.

¹⁵ GA 314, p. 286f.

Stefan Schmidt-Troschke: As a scientifically trained doctor, I am less interested in conjecture, but rather in what we can prove with certainty. I have to be clear: we are not aware of any empirical data showing that anthroposophists have above-average reservations about vaccination. And about Steiner's attitude itself:

He was not against vaccinations - at the time it was about the smallpox vaccination - and also had himself vaccinated.

In a lecture he said: ***'You just have to vaccinate. You can't do anything else. Because fanatically opposing these things is something I would not recommend at all, not for medical reasons, but for general anthroposophical reasons'.***

ZDFheute: Do you have any understanding for people who do not want to be vaccinated and justify this, for example, by saying that vaccination prevents the body from growing on its own and mobilising its natural strengths?

Schmidt-Troschke: Basically, we encourage people to learn to regulate themselves and to contribute to increasing their resilience through a healthy lifestyle. These aspects have a rather long-term impact.

In the context of a pandemic, it is about short-term measures. We would not link these two aspects, especially with regard to the Covid vaccination.

With the pandemic, we are in a dangerous situation, so we are very happy to have the vaccination.

ZDFheute: What is your opinion on the Corona vaccination? Would you advise people to get vaccinated?

Schmidt-Troschke: From the very ***beginning, we as anthroposophical doctors have made it clear that we expressly welcome vaccination to combat the pandemic.*** However, we also pointed out that priority should be given to vaccinating the groups that are particularly in need of protection, i.e. the elderly and other risk groups.

This also applies to boosting now: the risk groups should get the boosters first, because we now see that the effectiveness of the vaccination decreases after a few months. Of course, this is also how we advise our patients.

With the reference that *Rudolf Steiner had himself vaccinated against smallpox*, which was spread in this form, the following impression is created:

- He got himself vaccinated voluntarily and
- Out of his conviction that it makes medical sense.

However, this is tantamount to *deception*. Edda Hummel has handed down the story: ¹⁸

"As is well known, the Society had set up a nursery at that time. In Berlin, smallpox had broken out on one corner. As far as I remember, the children were vaccinated in the schools and nurseries. Dr Steiner ordered that the children in our nursery should also be vaccinated and also the people who went in and out of the nursery. Dr. Steiner himself also had himself vaccinated, as did Mrs. Dr. Steiner and all of us, or almost all of us, who went in and out of the house. Dr. Steiner himself got a bad arm, the smallpox struck, as they say. There was a joke going around at the time that Dr Steiner was part of the women's movement - which consisted of all of us, mostly women, often rubbing our sick arm."

This only becomes truly comprehensible when one considers that there had been a legal mandate to vaccinate against smallpox in the German Reich since 1874 and that this obligation to *vaccinate* was enforced in particular *"in the case of frequent occurrence"*, if necessary also with police intervention, and that *"all persons exposed to infection ... had to be vaccinated"*. This is clear from the rigid regulations in force for Berlin at the time ("Anweisungen zur Bekämpfung der Pocken", Berlin 1906, a compilation of laws, implementing regulations and announcements by the Reich Chancellor and the military and police authorities). In view of Rudolf Steiner's very critical statements about smallpox vaccination, it is completely absurd and basically dishonest to present the fact of vaccination as if he had been vaccinated voluntarily and out of conviction of a positive effect. Even the statements taken out of context *"then you just have to vaccinate"* and *that he had spoken out against fanaticism with regard to vaccination*, take on a completely different meaning in the actual context and in consideration of compulsory vaccination. Thus, here too, his statements in favour of Covid 'vaccinations' have been instrumentalised in an untrue manner - regardless of whether this was done consciously or accidentally.¹⁹

The nature of the disease and vaccination was not addressed

"Sir, I do not share your opinion, but I would stake my life that you should be allowed to express it." (Voltaire)

The question of the nature of the illness or the effect of the so-called vaccinations on the higher members of the being has not been raised or discussed publicly, although there are enough indications from Rudolf Steiner to justify this question - and anthroposophical doctors and therapists have also reported on corresponding effects, e.g. in the GAÄD doctors' forum in which Georg Soldner participates.

¹⁸ Newsletter 29.

¹⁹ More details in Newsletters 28 und 29.

The book "Corona Vaccinations from a Spiritual Perspective" contains reports and experiences of people who, according to their own statements, have corresponding cognitive abilities and systematically research on this level. One may take whatever view one likes of these reports from supersensible perception and cognition, but it is completely inappropriate when official representatives of Anthroposophical Medicine (Tido von Schoen-Angerer, Thomas Breitzkreuz, Matthias Girke and Georg Soldner) accused the author and publisher of the book, Thomas Mayer, in a review that the book was dogmatic, "unscientific and manipulative".²⁰ In fact, the reviewers themselves behaved dogmatically, unscientifically and manipulatively - and above all unseriously: the criticism was exclusively personal, free of any factual rebuttal and flawed, making it clear that they had not read the book thoroughly. And doesn't the accusation of a claim to absoluteness apply to the reviewers themselves? Aren't they the ones who dogmatically allow only their positions to apply - even today?

Thomas Mayer has by no means described the experiences and perceptions as absolutely true and unquestionable. As already indicated above, one can only state that research was rightly carried out into the corresponding effects of the elements; this was already obvious on the basis of Rudolf Steiner's references to smallpox vaccination alone. It would have been the task of the Medical Section - within the framework of the School of Spiritual Science - to initiate such research. But how does one come to describe the experiences described in the book a priori as aberrant? Rudolf Steiner:

*"It [smallpox vaccination] only harms those who grow up with predominantly materialistic thoughts. Vaccination becomes a kind of Ahrimanic force; man can no longer rise from a certain materialistic feeling. And that is actually the alarming thing about the smallpox vaccination, that people are virtually clothed with a phantom. Man has a phantom, which prevents him from detaching the spiritual entities from the physical organism as much as in normal consciousness. He becomes constitutionally materialistic, he can no longer rise to the spiritual. That is the worrying thing about vaccination. Of course, the topic of statistics is always brought up in this field. The question is whether so much importance should be attached to statistics in these matters."*²¹

²⁰ «Unwissenschaftlich und manipulativ» in «Das Goetheanum», 20. Jan. 2021.

Thus, the accusation that Thomas Mayer has harmed anthroposophical medicine is also a projection. This inappropriate slating, above all their *own omission of appropriate research* and much of what is described here: It is *precisely through these collective failures of leading circles in our institutions that immense damage has been done not only to anthroposophic medicine but also to anthroposophy itself, to the Society and also to Rudolf Steiner!*

Reappraisal and consequences?

In view of the questions that have arisen from the attitude of Anthroposophical Medicine and in particular the Medical Section during the so-called Covid pandemic, an open and unbiased reappraisal is essential. Ideally, this reappraisal process should take place from within, in a neutrally moderated way, between those responsible from the Society's leadership and those who are committed to and engaged in this coming to terms with the situation.

All relevant medical, natural and spiritual scientific and societal aspects must be included in this reappraisal, in particular also communication within the Society and communication with the outside world. Thematically, the reappraisal must be oriented towards the subject areas dealt with here. The Society and the School of Spiritual Science would thus show that they are capable of a self-critical reappraisal with a scientific claim. This would be associated with a considerable gain in authenticity, in several fields at the same time: scientific, medical and social - in the sense of a positive role model for necessary reappraisal processes in the rest of the world.

Further consequences must be drawn, because this unprecedented event makes it clear once again that the Goetheanum leadership in particular, as the essential and central governing body of the Society and the School of Spiritual Science, must also be accountable to the membership for its actions and work. A demand that has already been formulated in the past (at the AGM 2019 as a request²² and in "Ein Nachrichtenblatt" 18/2022 as a proposal for revision of the Statutes).

Thomas Heck

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

Account owner: Thomas Heck

We would like to thank all supporters of our work.

²¹ GA 314, 287f.

²² AWW 3/19, literally: <https://wtg-99.com/Statuten-2019>

Imprint

What *else* is happening at the Goetheanum!

Publisher: *Thomas Heck und Eva Lohmann-Heck*,
Dorneckstr. 60, 4143 Dornach / Schweiz

Email: thomas.heck@posteo.ch / www.wtg-99.com
Newsletter (de)registration on the Internet-Page.

Translated by DeepL.com

Proofread and formatted by Dezsö Pallagi

*

The Constitution of the GAS

Its significance – a question of its future?



Compilation und publishing: Thomas Heck

The book contains a collection of articles and longer explanations that were created in particular in connection with the two-year constitutional work. Above all, the topics that are always controversial are addressed, such as: Form of the Christmas Conference Society, commercial register entry, name of the Society, implied merger, etc.

In addition, the chronology created during the colloquium work is included.

Ca. 170 pages, large A4 format,

25 € / Fr. plus shipment (from ca. 16. June 2023).

Orders: thomas.heck@posteo.ch

Was in unserer Gesellschaft *noch* vorgeht!

3 x 33 Jahre Weihnachtstagung und die Krise der AAG



Thomas Heck

3 x 33 Years Christmas Conference and the crisis of the GAS

A collection of materials

Thomas Heck

- Crisis aspects of the General Anthroposophical Society and the School of Spiritual Science.
- The 33-year rhythm based on the duration of the life of Christ-Jesus, especially in connection with the founding of the Societies by Rudolf Steiner and the resulting time series (e.g. 1923 - 1956 - 1989 - 2022).
- A detailed examination of the years 2001 and 2011 (3 x 33 years after the founding of 1902 and 1912 respectively), in which essential renewal impulses became visible, which could not be realized and instead prevailed authoritatively in the 100th year.
- Other topics include COVID-19 and the 'official anthroposophic medicine', the future development direction of Weleda, the relationship between members and Management of the Society, the identity question of the General Anthroposophical Society (constitution question) and an initiative to revise the Society's constitution.

256 pages, 18 € / CHF (Shipment in DE

und CH 4 € / CHF) Orders:

thomas.heck@posteo.ch

In bookstores: Books on Demand

ISBN 9-783-7431-3371-6