

MEMORANDUM OF THE YEARS 1925 – 1935

1. FOREWORD

In these pages the reader will find a description of events which were of vital importance for the course of events in the General Anthroposophical Society. Difficult problems, which have come to the fore ever since 1925, have been solved for the time being, for since the Annual General Meeting of 1934 it has been acknowledged that all decisions reached by the three members of the Vorstand together, Herr Steffen, Frau Dr. Steiner and Dr. Wachsmuth, are binding for the Society. Many preceding events justify this measure, and a retrospective examination of the antecedents should be welcomed by all who wish to understand these things. For this reason it is comprehensible that many who are unacquainted or only partially acquainted with the more distant facts, should have expressed the wish to have a clear account of the events which took place in the Society since Rudolf Steiner's death.

Already last summer, several co-workers at the Goetheanum felt this need and decided to attempt such an account, in order to throw more light on the present situation. Dr. Poppelbaum joined them, as a similar account had been asked from him again and again¹. This is the origin of the contents of these pages. To begin with, some of the co-workers drew up the main lines in writing, and then in the course of further deliberations they were extended until they assumed the present shape.

It was no easy task to work through the existing material. The course of events had also brought with it that not everything was recorded in

5

writing. In many cases the state of mind caused by divergent opinions of some of the members rendered the situation more acute and such things are of course difficult to explain to those who were not present.

Reluctantly we must describe facts which are still painful today and are, in more than one case, disgraceful. And this duty, which is indeed no cheerful task, is rendered more difficult through the fact that there are groups of members who not only refuse to discuss the past, because they consider this unnecessary, but who look with suspicion in advance on anyone who dares to mention past events as being the cause of events which are taking place now.

Characteristic for the present situation is the fact that the question has already been raised as to whether or not the history of the past ten years should be discussed at all. If - as some members declare - it is so unimportant for the present situation to go back to earlier events, it

¹ He already brought out a short and provisional report. Besides, he also helped in this Memorandum.

might at least be left to the members to decide whether or not they wish to adopt this view. However, a sufficient knowledge of the true course of events is indispensable in order to reach the conclusion that the past has been buried and it is undoubtedly lacking in all quarters. Why should this knowledge not be made accessible? How much trouble has already arisen through the fact that the members were left in the dark, some even wishing to be left in the dark, ostensibly because they did not wish to disturb the "positive" work! Yet they took part in decisions which they were unable to judge, and therefore blindly relied on the authority of others.

Facts can be stated and opinions can be formed about them. Different opinions arise out of the same facts, and no one questions everyone's right to his own honest opinion. But opinions which deserve recognition must be based on actual facts. It is a serious matter when facts are distorted and then opinions are based on such a distorted picture. This can of course stir up feelings, but makes it impossible to come to an understanding with those who think otherwise. The so-called "Willenserklärung" (Declaration of Intentions) has shown this.

"I can promise to be truthful, but I cannot promise to be impartial". These words of Goethe can be applied to an account of the past ten years. This account owes its origin to the

6

present situation, in which everything depends upon the will to realise what is recognised as right. What people are accustomed to exact as impartiality, will become a reality if the promise of truthfulness be kept. Should anyone designate this account as polemical writing, no objection can be raised, for it is more than a description of a dead past - it deals with events and consequences of events which are, even to-day, damaging to the life of our Society.

It must also be borne in mind that this memorandum cannot claim in the least to be a "History of the Anthroposophical Society". Unfortunately it can only deal with the most unpleasant chapters of this history. But its shadows need not alarm anyone, nor can the situation be looked upon as hopeless. On the contrary, in spite of the terrible difficulties, the work continued and the activities have not been paralysed. The Goetheanum does not only stand in its place, but during the great Conferences which are held in an unbroken succession, it is filled to the last place. Inasmuch as the future depends on inner conditions, it will never be jeopardised as long as the foundation of truth is not abandoned. To work for this, lies in the free will of each.

2. THE YEAR 1925

The immeasurable loss which the Anthroposophical Society had suffered through Rudolf Steiner's death, necessarily gave rise to the question of how the Society should be guided in future. It would have been strange if this fundamental question had not acquired a decisive importance for future developments and it is easy to understand, on the other hand, that fundamentally different answers to this very question should have led to opposite opinions, the result of which grew more and more alarming. If it can be shown that these conflicts arose again and again out of this very point of issue, and that the personalities involved were the same ones on every occasion, then it will be possible to link up the many confusing events of the past ten years. In most cases these events were but the visible expression of antagonism which always led to the same conflicts on every new occasion, these events must be studied from the moment of Rudolf Steiner's death, and this first year therefore requires a more detailed description than the following ones.

At the beginning, most of the members felt no particular anxiety about the guidance of the Anthroposophical Society. It was a hard blow for them that Rudolf Steiner was no longer President, an activity which he had been able to carry out since the Christmas Meeting of 1923, and that now there was no one capable of continuing his immense life work. But they felt sure that the members of the Vorstand, whom Dr. Steiner had elected as his co-workers, would guide the Society in his spirit and would do all that was still possible. Their confidence in the esoteric Vorstand excluded all fear of future dangers. The ideas concerning the esoteric character of the Vorstand, although not always clear, helped to strengthen the confidence that the right thing would be done for the future. It was expected that the united Vorstand would lead the work from the Goetheanum, and it was hoped that the enthusiasm, awakened more than ever during Rudolf Steiner's last years of work, would be transformed into strength for the work which was growing so much more difficult. It never occurred to any that one day the members of the Vorstand would find it impossible to work together. Many bitter experiences brought the realisation that the right of claiming such a united work no longer existed.

Only members who were completely in the dark could, in later years, claim this with a clean conscience.

Rudolf Steiner's death was felt as deeply and painfully in other circles of members, who had other and indeed quite precise views concerning the future guidance of the Society. They also

recognised the Vorstand, now consisting of five members, as the leaders of the Society and they emphasized its esoteric character. But they made a distinction between the leadership of the Society and that of the "Hochschule" (the School). Rudolf Steiner himself had been the President of the Society and the leader of the School, and after his death the Vorstand took over the leadership of the Society, and - in the opinion of most of the members - anthroposophical work and particularly esotericism, was also to be led by the Vorstand. This point of view was opposed by this other group of members, who demanded that Dr. Wegman should be recognised as the leader of the School. Apparently their acknowledgement implied that Dr. Wegman was for them also the true leader of the Society, even though she was not the nominal President. This privileged position conceded to Dr. Wegman, was also supposed to give her the right to decide important questions independently, and the other members of the Vorstand were expected to subordinate themselves to this personality who was looked upon as Rudolf Steiner's successor, and to help her in realising the aims which she would indicate. The further course of events will show that certain members hoped that in this way they would determine the tasks and aims of the Society.

Consequently, a harmonious and united activity of the Vorstand was taken for granted also by these members, for its esoteric character led to the deduction that, for instance, it was the duty of the Vorstand to reach unanimous decisions in all matters that might be placed before the entire Vorstand. In other questions, however, one felt entitled to consult only the supposed leader of the School. When, very soon afterwards, this attitude was opposed by some members of the Vorstand, and by rapidly growing circles within the Society, this was looked upon as esoteric immaturity, lack of judgment, and even as malice on the part of the members concerned.

But the true reasons why Dr. Wegman was to be placed in such a commanding position, did not lie in this somewhat theoretical view of the relationship between the Society and the School, nor in the interpretation of certain expressions used by Dr. Steiner which were supposed to prove that he himself wished that Dr. Wegman should have this special position, and least of all did they lie in the positive results of her work. They were to be found in an entirely different direction. Some of the members had come to a conviction which was based partly on their study of Dr. Steiner's lectures, and partly - as they alleged - on their own investigations of Karma, which made a deep impression in certain quarters. This conviction was that the individuality of Alexander the Great, which Rudolf Steiner had described on several occasions, and particularly during the Christmas Meeting of 1923, had reincarnated among the members of the Society. Not only this event had taken place, but also the whole court of Alexander had reappeared, namely in the very members who had made these Karma-investigations. All these great people gathered around Dr. Wegman herself. For this circle of members, the question of the future leadership of the Society

was thus settled - as they alleged - on the basis of the deepest kind of esotericism. As Dr. Steiner had also characterised the spiritual significance of this historical individuality, these members felt that they were justified in adopting the comforting thought that even after the death of Rudolf Steiner, a second leader of the Anthroposophical Movement was now active on earth. These alleged reincarnations of so many military leaders, as well as the so-called "esoteric investitures" which were supposed to have taken place during the Christmas Meeting of 1923, gave rise to a mental attitude² which claimed for Dr. Wegman and some of her co-workers the infallibility of all their words

10

and actions, and on the other hand demanded from the members obedience and submission, rather than judgment based on their own sound reason. Thus the highly praised spiritual activity, deepened through esotericism, which was interpreted in this manner, became more and more belief in authority and dogmatism. This sectarian mentality gave rise to the opinion that esoteric leaders need not account for their words and actions, and that exoteric members should only be told what they were allowed to know and able to understand. "More important things can only be discussed in a restricted circle." As a result of this, the hardest struggles had often to be fought in the Society in order to establish the mere actual facts. But the full truth could very seldom be known, for as a rule someone - for instance, Dr. Kolisko - jumped up and said: "This is no court of justice! We protest against such questions!" Mysteriousness and conscious veiling of facts have contributed a great deal to render any kind of understanding impossible. Facts that were kept secret, partially or wholly distorted, have caused the greatest confusion.

When looking for the origin of the conflicts of these past years, the following question should be asked: How could it have been possible that no mutual consultations were held in the Society, and that no united effort was made to understand this decisive change brought about by Rudolf Steiner's death? The above-mentioned attitude of the members shows that one part believed that things would be settled as a matter of course, whereas another part set up a dogmatism which could not be discussed and for which adherents were sought. Of decisive significance, however, was the following circumstance - that before any consultation could take place or any understanding could be reached, facts were created which destroyed every possibility of an agreement, and led instead to endless conflicts. Through these facts the thoughts and aims of the single members of the Vorstand were also evinced.

An attempt within the Vorstand to discuss the future guidance of the Society, revealed entirely divergent points of view. Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede energetically upheld the opinion that a new President was not needed, because Dr. Steiner would continue to be the President and

2 Concrete examples will be found particularly in the description of the events during 1930 .

everything would remain as it had been. Frau Dr. Steiner was of the opinion that Dr. Steiner would undoubtedly continue to be the leader of esotericism, but the requirements of the physical plane, which the President has to meet constantly - in many cases as tasks of the most unpleasant kind - could hardly be settled by Dr. Steiner, and that it was natural that the Vice-President, whom Dr. Steiner had designated as "the best anthroposophist", should now take over the difficult duties of a

11

President. As Herr Steffen preserved a most reserved attitude, Frau Dr. Steiner had to give way, and she could only add that she felt convinced that the necessity of refilling the Presidency would come from outside.

The course of this first meeting, showed radically different opinions. In spite of this, however, Dr. Wegman wrote in the "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 17 of April 26, 1925:

"We, whom he elected as Vorstand, realised that we could not abandon the posts which he had assigned to us. We realised that if we wished to take seriously what the Master transmitted to us from the spiritual world, it was our sacred duty to remain grouped around him, so that he may still work among us and in us, in spite of the fact that he is no longer with us physically. This was our spiritual attitude. Thus we still look upon Rudolf Steiner as President in our Vorstand, and all the members of the Vorstand maintain the functions with which Rudolf Steiner has invested them."

Who could doubt that the words "we" and "us" in these sentences applied to the Vorstand, and that the Vorstand agreed in these matters? Frau Dr. Steiner and Herr Steffen were, however, amazed to read the views which were ascribed to them, namely that there should be no President in a Society which had undoubtedly to work on the physical plane, and could not deny the reality of their great loss. The following "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 18 of May 3, 1925, at least contained a declaration signed by all the members of the Vorstand, stating in general terms only, that the Vorstand considered it "as its duty to maintain its functions and to continue the work of Rudolf Steiner, whom they know to be continually in their midst." For a long time the Presidency was not discussed.

From May 1925 onward, letters "To the Members" written by Dr. Wegman, appeared in the "Mitteilungsblatt". They seemed to be the continuation of Dr. Steiner's letters. "Leading Thoughts" were also added, apparently as a continuation of Dr. Steiner's "Leading Thoughts". Quite a number of members believed, or were convinced, that it was not necessary to consider that spiritual investigation had suddenly ceased, and they took it as a matter of course that Dr. Wegman possessed the capacity to substitute Rudolf Steiner in this activity, and she was therefore to be considered as his true successor. Dr. Wegman, on her part, behaved in such a way that these

members felt strengthened in their convictions.

12

The other members of the Vorstand only learned to know these publications through the "Mitteilungsblatt", and one day they also read in the "Mitteilungsblatt" that Dr. Wegman had gone to Paris at the end of May, and had there taken up, for the first time after Rudolf Steiner's death, the esoteric lessons; they also read that Dr. Vreede had been in Paris and had lectured there, and that Dr. Kolisko had explained "the new leading thoughts". In her report, Dr. Wegman tried to imitate, even in details, the style of Rudolf Steiner's reports of his journeys ("Mitteilungsblatt" No. 24, June 14, 1925). Dr. Wegman writes in this report:

"When our Master, Rudolf Steiner, left the physical plane, one of the chief problems of the Vorstand was the continuation of that esotericism which had been placed with so much force in the foreground of anthroposophical life immediately after the Christmas Meeting. We realised that the first thing which had to be done was to safeguard the already existing esotericism and to repeat its content, in order to call forth in the members the living forces contained in this esotericism."

However, the other members of the Vorstand were of the opinion that at that time there was no one capable of giving a new esoteric impulse. Since a repetition was the only thing which could be contemplated, it would have been absurd to claim rights that were not required at all for a mere repetition. Nevertheless the attempt was made to recognise Dr. Wegman as the only leader of the School. She also claimed this. In the above-mentioned report she wrote:

"When Dr. Steiner founded this First Class of the "Freie Hochschule für Geisteswissenschaft" (School for Spiritual Science) he invested me as his co-worker. The new students who were admitted at that time, and who had not yet received any esotericism, promised to be faithful members of the School. For this reason I felt that after the death of our teacher, Dr Steiner, I was not freed from these obligations. On the contrary, I felt them more than ever before, because I must consider Dr. Steiner's institutions as realities of the spiritual world. Thus it was my task to take up the repetition of the esoteric lessons given by Dr. Steiner for the "Freie Hochschule für Geisteswissenschaft". To my great satisfaction, the first step could be made in Paris."

These sentences show, in spite of the confused style, the standpoint adopted by Dr. Wegman, then and since. But when the First Class was founded, Dr. Wegman was in no other sense appointed Rudolf Steiner's co-worker than the other members of the Vorstand. However, as Recorder, she had to transmit the applications which were made when one member of the Class wished to communicate the content of the Class-lessons to another member who had been unable to be present. (In Classes held

outside Dornach, and at which the Recorder was not present, Dr. Steiner also entrusted other members of the Vorstand with this task.) An "investiture" had never been mentioned. This continual citing of "investitures" and "missions" became characteristic for the attitude of Dr. Wegman and many of her co-workers, and also for Dr. Vreede's attitude. Herr Steffen, Frau Dr. Steiner and Dr. Wachsmuth always denied energetically that they were in any way "invested" by Dr. Steiner, or entrusted with any kind of "mission". Dr. Steiner had always spoken of tasks, duties and responsibilities. The opinion, that in accordance with Dr. Wegman's own interpretation of this collaboration, she was to be looked upon as the surviving leader of the two original leaders of the School, has often been mentioned by her, and then denied³. The events which followed, will show the great difficulties caused by this attitude. As far as the promise of faithfulness is concerned, only the following is true:- In a few cases, Dr. Steiner actually did ask that the promise should be confirmed by the newly admitted member of the Class, who was asked to give his hand to Dr. Steiner and to Dr. Wegman standing beside him. However, it was not possible to deduce special rights owing to this circumstance, because Dr. Steiner had admitted the overwhelming majority of members to the School at Dornach in an entirely different way. These members had never come into touch with Dr. Wegman by having to make such a promise.

After the journey to Paris, came a journey to Prague in June 1925. As the majority of the members in Prague refused to recognise the clearly expressed demands to acknowledge Dr. Wegman as the leader and guide of esotericism, conflicts arose among the members. These conflicts also assumed a regrettable character through the circumstance that the Czech members who sided with Dr. Wegman separated themselves from the others. These national questions had been avoided during Dr. Steiner's lifetime. Dr. Wegman, however, asked whether the Czech members had no complaints to make, as Czechs, against the Germans. At the same time she wrote enthusiastic articles in the "Mitteilungsblatt" on the cosmopolitan Michael-impulse.

If realities had been taken as a foundation in those summer months of 1925, and if one had waited until all reasonable members would have recognised qualities and achievements, as they would undoubtedly have done, then all these difficulties need never have arisen. Outwardly too, the conditions for a sound continuation were re-established, when Herr Steffen enabled Dr. Wegman to begin her readings of the Class-lectures also at Dornach. He himself introduced her, stating that the Vorstand had agreed to this, and pointing out that Dr. Wegman, would carry out the activity which she had already started as the Recorder of the Vorstand. But this solution was rejected. Besides this, further difficulties arose.

³ Denied, apparently at least, in February 1926 (see page 36) and passionately claimed in November 1930 (see page 94).

These facts gave rise to a growing unrest among the members. The publications in the "Mitteilungsblatt" continued, and the style of these new leading thoughts was considered amateurish. It seemed almost incredible that the Vorstand was giving out these leading thoughts to the Society as some members assured. Soon afterwards it was clear that these could hardly be looked upon as a new revelation; particularly Dr. Wegman's letters and essays were objected to because they contained things which were brought forward with insufficient indications as to their source, and which were to a great extent nothing but diluted and erroneous repetitions from unpublished lectures of Rudolf Steiner's last period of life. Should this be recognised as spiritual investigation? Yet many members did and demanded it from others.

In the "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 26 of June 28, 1925, Dr. Wegman characterised the members who had dared to criticise her, as a group *"who had begun abusing, lewdly abusing and insulting personalities (!), and forgetting the lofty personality of Rudolf Steiner, who knew very well what he was doing when he invested the members of the Vorstand with their various functions. They were attacking him because they questioned his insight."* This way of referring to "investitures" and of using Rudolf Steiner's name as a shield against every criticism directed against one's own shortcomings, did not help to increase Dr. Wegman's prestige. Moreover, her words gave the impression as if the whole Vorstand had been attacked, and as if the Vorstand were responsible for the new leading thoughts. Although she wrote in the following "Mitteilungsblatt" - *"the negative attitude of a few members*

15

has proved them to be so much in the minority, that it need not be taken into consideration" - Dr. Wegman nevertheless continued to justify herself, and wrote in "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 30 of Jul 26, 1925:

"The continuity of the work could not be maintained by repeating the Leading Thoughts which had been given to us. These classical Leading Thoughts, containing all the teachings of Anthroposophy in such a wonderful form, must exist as a whole, and are accessible to everyone as a most wonderful material for study. Continuity meant that the living word from man to man should resound again through the 'Mitteilungsblatt'. Not words to any one's liking should be spoken, but words drawn out of Rudolf Steiner's rich source of wisdom, in order to emphasize and throw light on this or on that, which is important for the changed situation of our times. The changed situation consists in this - that the rich store of wisdom which our leader used to bring down regularly and in such fullness from the spiritual world, is closed for the time being. A continuation of the work is only possible, if certain important facts applicable to the moment, are taken out of this rich

store of wisdom. Many things lie hidden in the lectures and essays, many things which were spoken long ago, but could only be understood rightly and could only enter human consciousness, in given circumstances which arose later on."

Apart from the vagueness and contradictions which are contained in these sentences, the question must nevertheless be raised, as to what these important things really were, which the Society had to learn after Steiner's death, in order to maintain the continuity of the work. The same article containing the above sentences, gives the answer: Alexander and his expeditions, Alexander and Ephesus, Alexander and Michael! This was also the principal content of many other essays and articles.

What members could not endure, was the fact that they felt that a pressure was being put upon them, which was to lead them to the point of submitting to an impenetrable authority. No one questioned Dr. Wegman's right to impart her knowledge and views, but opposition was offered to an acceptance of this as a revelation or as a dogma. Leading members in the Society began to demand that the new 'leading thoughts' should be studied and elaborated in the Groups, like those of Dr. Steiner. Dr. Kolisko proclaimed everywhere that these leading thoughts came from the Vorstand. He knew very well that this was not the case. On a later occasion he was asked by Frau Dr. Steiner how it had occurred to him to stand for things which he knew were not true. He believed that he had answered this question satisfactorily by stating that he could not consider it as his task to "*spread the quarrels of the Vorstand among the members*". This is the first marked instance for the fact that Dr. Kolisko feels entitled,

16

for tactical reasons, to report things as he wishes them to be, not as they really are.

*

What was Frau Dr. Steiner's attitude during that time - Frau Dr. Steiner who had worked at Rudolf Steiner's side for 23 years as his intimate helper, who bore his name and had herself led the Anthroposophical Society for so long?

After a terrible shock caused by the diplomatic manoeuvres and systematic intimidations directed against her, instead of the sincere and straightforward attitude which she had expected⁴ it appeared right to her to withdraw to her own Section, and not to be in the way of those who had given her to understand so plainly that her interference was undesirable, and that she had not understood the Christmas Meeting unless she submitted passively. As the new drift of events began to be in striking contrast with what had been considered as right by Dr. Steiner, conscience impelled her to sever her connection with those who only wished to preserve the outward

4 Chapter 4 gives a few examples which are so painful that they cannot be described in detail.

appearance of what ought to have been an inner truth. She had an entirely different idea of the Christmas Meeting than those who now had the firmest intention of holding the reins, and in whose way she was standing. She therefore considered it more advisable for someone else to fill her place, who would tackle such things better than she. She thought of Dr. Kolisko who had already liked to make his influence felt in the German Executive, and wrote to him in this sense. Also Dr. Röschl could be taken into consideration as the leader of the Youth Section. Both were undoubtedly people who were always willing to lead and were already in leading positions. At that time she had no idea that these personalities were working quite purposely for the realisation of this new direction in the Society, and that this was a carefully considered and fully discussed plan. She also thought that Dr. Kolisko would judge without prejudice and be tactful. A subsequent discussion in the Vorstand showed, however, that this step was not approved by anyone. Also the group that still stood hidden behind the events of that time, considered

17

the resignation of a member of the Vorstand as imperilling the whole. The realisation of their mystic intentions required that the outward appearance of the "investitures" effected through Dr. Steiner should be maintained.

The extensive task which awaited Frau Dr. Steiner in the administration of the writings left by Dr. Steiner, as well as the many duties which otherwise fell to her share, made it impossible for her to fulfil the wish of many older members, to take part conspicuously in the leadership of the Society. She wrote on May 19, 1925, a "Private Communication" to this effect which she also published in the "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 22 of May 31 :

This states:

"It is not my intention for the present to participate in a direct and active way in the guidance of the Society. Younger forces are there for this. If I meet this wish of many friends, I should be obliged to neglect what I consider to be my most immediate task - the work within my Section and the immense work connected with the writings left by Dr. Steiner. This is enough for the strength and the number of years which are still left to me. I could not accept more work. Let me thank those who think that a particularly intensive work on my part within the leadership of the Society would be desirable. And let me express the hope that, after surmounting certain difficulties which are unavoidable in such a tremendous change, the powerful life-forces of Dr. Steiner's work will make all our imperfections and weaknesses appear like spots in the sun. The sun does not shine less bright for this, nor does it call forth less life."

It became more evident, however, that the attitude of whole groups of members had produced a growing confusion. Herr Steffen had, indeed, pointed out clearly at the beginning of

the Class lessons at Dornach, how the Vorstand had settled the question of the School with Dr. Wegman, but this had been in vain, because several members now insisted on claiming a special position for Dr. Wegman. Added to this was the way in which the "new leading thoughts" were accepted. Even at Dornach the members had finally to listen to a lecture by Dr. Röschl on Dr. Steiner's Leading Thoughts, in which she told them that his teachings had been supplemented, and even "extended beyond this ", by Dr. Wegman's "leading thoughts".

Soon after the appearance of Dr. Wegman's first "leading thoughts", Frau Dr. Steiner was one day surprised at nine o'clock in the morning by Dr. Stein, Dr. Kolisko and Frau Dr. Kolisko, who had arrived from Stuttgart and behaved like inquisitors. Dr. Stein began by reproaching her

18

bitterly that only at the last moment he had been able to prevent an action whereby Frau Dr. Steiner would have become the honorary President of the Anthroposophical Society in Germany. This initiative had gone out from Count Keyserlingk. Although Frau Dr. Steiner had not the faintest notion of this and could say with a clear conscience that she would not have accepted the honorary Presidency, Dr. Stein felt that it was necessary to torment her for a long time with the persistence of a judge. Then Dr. Kolisko found it appropriate to voice his indignation that Dr. Unger had not discussed the leading thoughts of Dr. Wegman on his evening in the Group, whereas Dr. Kolisko had spoken enthusiastically about them for two hours. Dr. Kolisko now demanded a declaration that the whole Vorstand stood united behind these new leading thoughts. When Frau Dr. Steiner replied that this was impossible for her, because she had only gained knowledge of these things through the "Mitteilungsblatt ", Dr. Stein tried to put a strong pressure on her, in order to force her to acknowledge the authority of Dr. Wegman, by pointing out her important incarnation. This systematic terrorisation lasted until 2 p.m.

The most painful thing for Frau Dr. Steiner was the circumstance that the confidence of the members had been badly misused through the publications of Dr. Wegman. The members could not do otherwise than think that such a matter had been discussed and carefully considered within the Vorstand. This abuse of the members' confidence produced something which was bound to have fatal consequences.

Gradually several things which took place soon afterwards showed that energetic attempts were being made from a particular quarter to eliminate Frau Dr. Steiner's influence in the Society, and to deprive her, beyond this, not only of all the things to which she had a claim, but to which she had unquestionably the right. By combining one thing with the other, it was hoped to contest her rights by undermining her personal prestige in the Society. This was considered to be the best way of working against the opinion of Herr Steffen and of many older members who wished that she should become President. Above all it was said of her that she had remained behind in

esoteric development, had come from the dark age, the Kalijuga, and that consequently she could not be expected to understand the meaning of the Christmas Meeting.

19

Indeed, the great confidence which she enjoyed, particularly on the part of the older members, gave cause for anxiety, but it was held that this could be opposed by deliberately ignoring her presence and by filling especially the younger members with suspicion against her. They referred constantly to the Christmas Meeting, which was supposed - at least, they thought so - to have abolished everything that had been justified before. The members from whom such things went out, were the same who had evinced such strange views concerning the meaning of the Christmas Meeting and had wished to establish, on other occasions, the autocratic rule of Dr. Wegman.

Frau Dr. Steiner felt the painfulness of all this not only for herself, but for the disgrace it brought on the Society, that after Dr. Steiner's death it was simply alleged that he had made no arrangements in case of his death. Before making such statements, no one had thought of asking her about this, although the Studio was carefully searched and new, arbitrary arrangements were made.

A Will of Rudolf Steiner existed, which contained his special wishes with regard to his writings. This will was fully valid also from a legal point of view. It had been deposited at the Lower Court of Justice in Berlin, and several copies existed in Dornach. In this Will, Dr. Steiner conferred upon Frau Dr. Steiner the copyright of all his books, as well as the property and right to dispose of all that he had left behind in the form of manuscripts, documents, letters, shorthand notes of lectures, and so forth. These rights were conferred upon her in order that she might

“decide alone, according to her own judgment, and in accordance with my own intentions, which are known to her, what is to be done with the effects described above.”

Although this Will was incontestable, it was nevertheless attacked passionately for years by the group of members who have already been mentioned repeatedly, because this will was drawn up before the Christmas Meeting of 1923. They were of the opinion that the inheritance should be handed over to Dr. Wegman, or to the Vorstand, but in no case to Frau Dr. Steiner. Dr. Wegman also shared this view.

One of the matters which came up for discussion immediately after Dr. Steiner's death, was how to keep up the Studio, where he had

20

worked so long and lived during his illness until he had closed his eyes. At first Frau Dr. Steiner intended to go through all the papers and manuscripts in the Studio with the Vorstand. When Dr. Wegman bluntly refused to do this, Frau Dr. Steiner declared that she would enter the Studio only

in a week's time, so that Dr. Wegman could meanwhile set things in order as she wished. Later on it was discovered that nearly all the manuscripts and notebooks of Dr. Steiner had been taken away. After a great deal of trouble, Frau Dr. Steiner succeeded in getting back from Dr. Wegman at least those things which she knew to have been there, and which she was able to describe. This fact was known only to a few intimate friends of Frau Dr. Steiner. But in some groups of members, meetings were already being held to discuss the question of the manuscripts and of the Philosophic-Anthroposophical Publishing House. These two matters were treated as one and the same thing, and this fact only added to the confusion. Soon afterwards, even the names of people were mentioned, who were to take over the management of the Publishing House, with Dr. Wegman's approval.

Dr. Steiner had given precise instructions about this, and there was no reason why these should not be observed after his death. Just as it would have been impossible to deny Dr. Wegman the right of conducting the Clinical Therapeutic Institute - although this had also become a part of the General Anthroposophical Society - so it was also impossible to deny Frau Dr. Steiner the unquestionable right to dispose independently of the Philosophic-Anthroposophical Publishing House in every sense. The decision to incorporate the Publishing House into the Society goes back to the Christmas Meeting of 1923. But also after this period, Dr. Steiner had repeatedly emphasized that this should in no way affect the existing rights and arrangements, and that "everything should remain as of old" - to use his own words⁵. The Publishing House founded by Frau Dr. Steiner herself had always been her property; it had never been bought from her, nor had she ever asked any financial assistance for it; it was not burdened with debts or mortgages and represented an object of a con-

-stantly increasing value. And this was to be simply taken away from her, although she had ensured the Publishing House for the Society, by incorporating it into the Society and thus prevent personal claims by relatives after her death. Dr. Steiner had always and also after the Christmas Meeting of 1923 referred to the Publishing House as exemplary for a sound enterprise, and in his lectures he had emphasized and praised the fact that Frau Dr. Steiner and Frl. Mücke had proved that they knew how to conduct this institution in a highly efficient manner.

In spite of all this, it was thought that all these facts could be simply ignored. A crass example of how Frau Dr. Steiner was treated can be seen in the events which took place during the summer of 1925. When the book "Fundamentals for an Extension of the Art of Healing" was to be published, Frau Dr. Steiner and Frl. Mücke heard of this publication only through an

⁵ The official inclusion of the Clinic and of the Publishing House into the General Anthroposophical Society only took place in March 1925. Frau Dr. Steiner remained proprietor of the Publishing House, as stated in the Minutes.

announcement in the "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 37 of September 13, 1925. But this announcement of a new publication issued by the Philosophic-Anthroposophical Publishing House did not come from the Publishing House, but from Dr. Wegman. As it was a book written by Dr. Steiner, no protest could be raised. The Publishing House paid the bills made out in its name for this book which was printed and bound without its knowledge, and also the fees claimed by Dr. Wegman as coauthor. After its appearance, large groups of members were indignant at the way in which it was received by Dr. Wegman's co-workers; Dr. Kolisko and Dr. Zeylmans acquired the habit of speaking of "Dr. Wegman's medical book", and it was mentioned in this way even in public lectures. Yet those who used this term, knew better than anyone else that as co-author of this book Dr. Wegman had played no important part.

A mentality predominating in a part of the Society showed that many members had tried to deceive themselves in far too light a way over the loss of Dr. Steiner, and now the consequences threatened to become fatal. In reviewing these first months, Frau Dr. Steiner wrote as follows in the "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 41 of October 11, 1925:

"The Jubilate' which broke over us so strongly out of the bereavement of the first months, and which sounded like the jubilation of children, meant to dispel the fear of creeping up shadows-has now given way to an earnest heart-searching. These are indeed signs showing that we, as true members of the Society, dare to be fully aware of what we have lost. No mystical, hopeful dreams can deceive us in this, no matter

22

how temptingly they may unfold their deceptive wings. With him, whose voice died out for the Society on the evening of September 28, 1924, we lost the admonisher who warned us whenever we were in danger of stumbling, whose penetrating look sufficed to dispel the bubbles of our fancy, who called to us again and again: "He who is willing to make one step on the path of esoteric development, must first make three steps along the path towards perfection." These, his words, should be our shield against all attacks of the Tempter, who seeks to blind and deceive us - this, and the constantly repeated warning to strive after the strictest truthfulness. This apparently easy and yet so distant goal, this basic need, shall we always bear it in mind?"

Frau Dr. Steiner further warned against more dangers which she felt were approaching, and which did come later on, namely a false esotericism and a lust for power as its consequence.

During the first months, before the foundation of the World School Union, Herr Steffen was not yet aware how great the difficulties were to become. At first he took up a waiting attitude

toward the things which aroused his doubts, because he wished to interfere with no one's freedom, and hoped that in the long run serious work and real achievement would constitute the standard according to which individual members in the Society would be judged. He also held that difficulties were unavoidable at the beginning, but that they would be overcome.

These were the reasons why he had not protested against the letters and "leading thoughts" of Dr. Wegman, although quite at the beginning there had been a meeting of the Vorstand in which he had rejected Dr. Wegman's proposal to continue the "leading thoughts" because he thought that to the extent in which Dr. Steiner had given them, they were an inexhaustible source and that no one could presume to compete with the spiritual work which Rudolf Steiner had created in spite of his illness in highest perfection and final maturity. But the new "leading thoughts" and the rest appeared in spite of all. Herr Steffen did not even protest when Dr. Wegman simply sent her manuscript to the printers without sending it through him, as editor of the "Mitteilungsblatt". But he silently resigned the editorship upon receipt of a letter from Stuttgart written by Dr. Schickler, who demanded from him that Dr. Wegman's "leading thoughts" should be printed under the title, "Leading Thoughts, which are given out by the Goetheanum for the Anthroposophical Society", as had been the case for Dr. Steiner's Leading Thoughts.

Herr Steffen also did not complain when Dr. Wegman deemed it unnecessary to inform him even of her intention to reopen the Class lessons in Paris. He himself opened the Class-lessons which Dr. Wegman began later on at Dornach, and introduced her as Recorder of the Vorstand. He took for granted that this would eliminate all misunderstandings because his words had proved that the other members of the Vorstand, who in view of the regrettable circumstances had recoiled from taking up this activity, had now recognised Dr. Wegman's right to read the Class-lectures. The actual circumstances seemed to exclude that other claims could be raised, beside the one to repeat Rudolf Steiner's Class lectures by reading them out to the members. Herr Steffen tried hard, not only then, but during the following years, to maintain the unity of the Vorstand. He did this irrespective of cases where one might have wished for oneself a different treatment. Very severe attacks imperilled the unity of the Vorstand, when Dr. Kolisko and Dr. Stein called on Herr Steffen and reproached him bitterly, for having introduced Dr. Wegman to the members as Recorder, and not as "leader of the School". These actions of certain members, and also the claims raised by Dr. Wegman herself, made the situation quite untenable in the course of time.

The necessity to fill the Presidency by electing a new President, only arose when the official authorities intervened, by pointing out the legal requirements.

There was a strong opposition in the Society against the election of a new President. Many shared the above-mentioned opinion of Dr. Wegman. From a theoretical point of view it may be said that the desire to leave the functions in the Vorstand as they had been in Dr. Steiner's days, although not showing a great sense of reality, was in any case the expression of a certain veneration for him. This may have been a genuine feeling in the case of some members. However, the following question may be raised. Would a President, even if his activity had been limited to the most restricted sphere, have interfered with any of the members or imperilled an autocratic rule of Dr. Wegman? - The facts themselves have answered this question.

Let us examine the actual events during the winter of 1925. Herr Steffen was Vice-President, consequently the most immediate thing to be

24

done, was to entrust him with the Presidency. As for Frau Dr. Steiner, she had stated clearly in the above-mentioned letter of May 19 to what extent she would be active in the Society, but there were members who bore in mind that she had guided the Society for years. For this reason they thought that she at any rate was eligible for the Presidency. And this possibility aroused the greatest fear in other quarters.

At the Annual General Meeting of December 29, 1925, after some unpleasant preliminary discussions⁶, the Presidency was conferred upon Herr Steffen, who accepted this office with reserve. In certain groups one hoped to get the better of the "poet". Only a few days later, the conflict was unavoidable,

We have to look back to this time in order to understand why Herr Steffen was unable, throughout the years which followed, to obtain an answer to the following question: - What do you consider are the rights of a President? - It is difficult to reply to this question, if it implies nothing whatever, and if the "nothing" is represented by a President who is only there to confirm what has been done by others without his knowledge and against his will. The first great conflict arose in January 1926, because certain groups of members had expected this attitude on the part of the President from the very beginning.

Frau Dr. Steiner had not become President, yet there were members who felt a threatening danger that she might accept the Vice-Presidency. Therefore they planned that this office should be cancelled, and for this a change in the Statutes was necessary. On one occasion a change in the Statutes had been mentioned in the presence of Frau Dr. Steiner, without stating, however, that it meant to cancel the office of Vice-President. When she learnt quite unexpectedly at a meeting of

6 See later.

the functionaries of the Society that this was the purpose behind the planned change, she saw herself placed in a diplomatic way before an accomplished fact, and found that this was unworthy. She protested against this way of procedure. She never dreamt of claiming this office, and a year later, when it was offered to her, she refused it; but she did not wish to be taken by surprise in this way, and was therefore unable to agree with the pretended reasons brought forward, because she felt that

25

they were not straightforward. Now the storm broke out more violently than ever, and the most malicious things were spread abroad by a General Secretary like Dr. Zeylmans, by teachers of the Waldorf School like Dr. Stein, Dr. Kolisko, and by other members who took as sole evidence the fact that the word "change in the Statutes" had been mentioned. They gladly overlooked that the expression "change in the Statutes" did not explain what had to be changed.

At this point Herr Steffen was obliged to interfere, and also for another reason.

26

3. THE CRISIS IN JANUARY AND FEBRUARY 1926.

On Sunday, January 24, 1926, Herr Steffen informed the members who were present at the reading of a lecture held at the "Schreinerei" (a large wooden annexe of the Goetheanum), that two facts compelled him to appeal to all the members of the Anthroposophical Society. One of these facts was that the campaign against Frau Dr. Steiner was spreading more and more. The other fact was the foundation of the so-called World School Union, against the will and without the knowledge of the Vorstand, who were not even subsequently informed of what had taken place. Yet the founders asserted that the World School Union had been founded by the Vorstand, represented by Dr. Vreede. At first, Frau Dr. Steiner decided to resign from the Vorstand and Herr Steffen intended to lay down the Presidency. But he decided instead, that it would be better to bring forward a positive proposal, a healing impulse. So he proposed to the members that they should dedicate themselves to an earnest work in a "Rudolf Steiner Association " for which he would ask Frau Dr. Steiner to take over the protectorate. He hoped that in this way Rudolf Steiner's life work, and truth and freedom within the Society, could be safeguarded. On the following day the "Rudolf Steiner Association" was recognised by all the members of the Vorstand as a legal association within the Anthroposophical Society.

On January 27, Herr Steffen again discussed the two above mentioned facts with the members. Several things showed that the founders of the World School Union, who openly ignored the Vorstand, had met with no opposition even in the Faculty of the Waldorf School, where Dr. Stein and Dr. Kolisko had the greatest influence and where the malicious talk against Frau Dr. Steiner had assumed its worst aspects. To justify himself, Dr. Stein then read the wording of a letter of apology to Frau Dr. Steiner, with which he thought to have settled the whole matter. But Frau Dr. Steiner rejected his thinly-clad apologies, and characterised Dr. Stein and Dr. Kolisko as wilfully spreading objective untruths on several occasions. She could say this, because in more than one instance Dr. Stein had to admit that this was true. It was also a well known fact that Dr. Stein had not ceased his campaign against Frau Dr. Steiner, although

27

he had acknowledged - after a talk with Dr. Unger - that in the question of the planned change in the Statutes insufficient information had been given to Frau Dr. Steiner. After he had sent in his letter of apology to Frau Dr. Steiner, Dr. Stein proclaimed at Stuttgart that he had not meant it seriously, and had only written the letter for the sake of dear peace. After the foundation of the World School Union, Dr. Kolisko purposely spread the false statement that the Vorstand had helped in this, just as he had led the members astray on previous occasions by wilfully spreading false information concerning the attitude of the Vorstand to Dr. Wegman's "leading thoughts".

Herr Günther Schubert then came forward and pointed out that it was the duty of the members to take Herr Steffen's appeal seriously, and themselves consider how they could fight the dangers which had arisen. He also spoke, but only in general terms, of his conversations with Dutch members, which showed that these members were agitating against Frau Dr. Steiner, and had curious views concerning the management of the Society; which might explain their strange attitude at the founding of the World School Union.

It was decided to await the arrival of Dr. Zeylmans, who was expected on the following day. He was the chief founder of the World School Union; he had travelled to London for a short visit, in order to advise with some of the members there on the difficulties which had now arisen in connection with the World School Union. Dr. Zeylmans arrived at Dornach on January 28, but refused to speak before the members; he wished to speak only to a few members who were to be invited by the Vorstand on that same evening for a discussion. But Dr. Zeylmans made the condition that the invitation which had already been sent out to Herr Schubert should be withdrawn. The latter was indeed his good friend, but Herr Schubert - so they had told Dr. Zeylmans - had insulted the absent General Secretary and therefore also the Dutch Society. Dr.

Zeylmans refused to have a personal talk with Herr Schubert. Herr Steffen reprimanded Dr. Zeylman's attitude and left the decision to Herr Schubert, who then withdrew voluntarily. As Herr Steffen himself had appealed to the members for their opinion, Dr. Zeylman's

28

attitude also constituted an attack upon Herr Steffen, who had - as always - exposed himself quite openly to all criticism.

In the discussion held among the restricted number of members, Dr. Zeylmans stated that he could not submit to accusations directed against his person on the part of members, because he was a General Secretary appointed by Dr. Steiner, and could therefore only be criticised by the Vorstand or by another General Secretary. Frau Dr. Steiner observed that she had not refused to sit together even with Dr. Stein and Dr. Kolisko, although she considered herself attacked by them in quite another way.

On January 12, Dr. Zeylmans had compiled a report on the foundation of the World School Union, but had never sent it to the Vorstand, so that Herr Steffen only received it on January 25, and that indirectly. This report described matters so that readers gained the impression that the Vorstand itself had helped to found the World School Union. Dr. Zeylmans now explained his standpoint, by referring expressly to the fact that Dr. Vreede had not objected to his founding the World School Union, and had consequently agreed to it. Dr. Zeylmans also declared that the Vorstand had left the responsibility to him, as being his own private initiative. It came to light, however, that this had not by any means gone out from the Vorstand. Dr. Zeylmans' statement was merely based on preliminary discussions with individual members of the Vorstand. The Vorstand as such, had, on the contrary, appointed Dr. Vreede, at the express wish of Dr. Zeylmans, as "intermediary" of the Vorstand, during a meeting held on January 3. She was to be present at the preliminary discussions which would take place in connection with this World School Union planned by Dr. Zeylmans and by others, on the condition, however, that the World School Union could on no account be founded without renewed and direct instructions from the Vorstand. Nevertheless, Dr. Zeylmans did found the World School Union on the following day, January 4. The Vorstand wished to wait before founding a World School Union, because on January 1, Dr. Zeylmans had read out a list of names in which certain personalities were proposed as founders, but this list contained no regular representatives from the Waldorf School or from the Waldorf School Union. The official represen-

29

tatives of the Waldorf School Union were Herr Molt and Herr Leinhas, and moreover Herr Steffen himself was the President of this Union. On the evening of January 3, Dr. Zeylmans discussed matters with Herr Molt and Herr Leinhas, in the presence of Dr. Kolisko and other teachers of the Waldorf School. As no understanding could be reached, Dr. Zeylmans said that he would in that case found the World School Union without the Waldorf School or the Waldorf School Union, and that he would not leave Dornach without having founded the Union. Whereupon Dr. Kolisko came forward with the idea to simply proceed with the foundation right away, and then ask who wished to join. Herr Leinhas had realised from the very beginning that binding arrangements had been made long before in Holland and in England, and that the list of proposed founders was no proposal at all, but the names of the actual Committee which had already been elected, and that Dornach should simply confirm it afterwards. Herr Leinhas was also aware of the originally planned connection between the future World School Union and the Waldorf School, and feared that greatest dangers would arise out of this for the Waldorf School. It was evident that a certain group of members wished to realise their own particular aims. This group seemed to have already carried out a "first foundation".

At the meeting on January 28, Herr Leinhas described this dark background, as "ambition for power on the part of certain members ". Dr. Zeylmans had meanwhile insulted Herr Leinhas; but although he withdrew his expressions immediately, this occurrence did not help to dispel the general distrust in his own intentions.

At this same meeting, the statement of a Dutch member (Herr Stibbe) was brought forward, namely that Holland was to be looked upon as the reincarnation of Macedonia, whence Alexander now led his expeditions to the West instead of the East. This statement showed who was really behind the planned World School Union, and also explained why the initiative had gone out from Holland and England. Dr. Zeylmans apparently shook off "the young man ", but he was unable to deny that this same young man was one of the members on the foundation Committee, and besides, one of the most intimate friends of Dr. Zeylmans.

For Herr Steffen the last possibility of an understanding was lost, when the Faculty of the Waldorf School, who had been warned by Frau Fels that the Vorstand knew nothing of the foundation, nevertheless decided to discuss matters with Dr. Zeylmans, who accepted their invitation to come to Stuttgart on January 22, without informing the Vorstand of these plans. During these discussions it was even decided to ask the Vorstand to confirm the foundation of the World School Union in the form of a celebration on February 27, the birthday of Rudolf Steiner

It has already been described how Herr Steffen appealed to the members. The Society was

to form its own opinion at a Members' Meeting convoked for February 6. Herr Steffen also entrusted two people who held opposite views on the matter, Dr. Unger and Dr. Stein, to study the course of events carefully and to prepare a report which would be submitted to the members.

The members' meeting took place on February 6, and Dr. Unger read a written report containing an exact description of the facts (The present account is based mainly on his report. In part, Dr. Unger's own words are used).

Dr. Stein, on the other hand, found a way out of this uncomfortable situation, by declining even to allude to the facts and preferred to play the rôle of quite a naive person - a very strange one for him.

Dr. Vreede's attitude was now discussed fully. Her unclear situation consisted in the fact that she had indeed been the "intermediary" of the Vorstand, but at the same time had approved Dr. Zeylmans' private initiative. Hence, she had not protested at the foundation meeting of January 4. At this meeting, she had described herself emphatically as being nothing but the intermediary of the Vorstand, and when she received Dr. Zeylmans' report of January 12, she protested by wire and by letter against the incorrect formulations which it contained. Why she transmitted no information whatever to the Vorstand, remained an open question. It should be noted that Herr Steffen never reproached her in any way, and when someone asked Dr. Vreede to resign from the Vorstand, he replied that this was an absurd demand.

Dr. Wegman had known of the foundation, but not - as she herself stated - in her quality of member of the Vorstand, but only as a private person. What was really implied by this could be seen only in 1930, when the strange financial scheme for the World School Union came to light. (See later)

The consequences of an ideology that considered a President unnecessary for the Society, had now become evident. When the upholders of this view had spared no effort that at least Herr Steffen and not someone else should take over the Presidency, they had not failed to point out that in filling this vacancy, the Society was merely carrying out a formality required by the official authorities. Herr Steffen had taken up the Presidency on December 29. Six days afterwards, on January 4, a worldwide pedagogical movement, based upon Anthroposophy, was founded without the consent of the President and of the Vorstand, but with the pretence that this consent had been given. Herr Steffen was also the President of the Waldorf School Union, and was ignored also as such, together with Herr Molt, the Vice President, and Herr Leinhas, the Treasurer. The circumstance must be added, that at that time the Waldorf School Union was the only real representative of anthroposophical pedagogy before the public. The Waldorf School was also

excluded. For the first time it was plainly evident that attempts were made to deviate important currents of anthroposophical life coming from Dornach and from other places where Herr Steffen and Frau Dr. Steiner could have an influence, in order to lead them into the sphere of certain cliques.

Who were the founders of the World School Union and their helpers? They proved to be those leading members who had so energetically upheld their views concerning the true meaning of the Christmas Meeting of 1923, according to which Dr. Wegman should be accorded a preeminent position in the guidance of the Anthroposophical Society. These members had caused all the difficulties in the past year, and the foundation of the World School Union showed clearly and visibly for the first time, what their views, aims and methods really were. And these are essentially the same members who in 1934 took up the initiative of

32

the so-called "Declaration of Intention" and founded the so-called "Vereinigten Freien Anthroposophischen Gruppen" (United Free Anthroposophical Groups). During the years which preceded 1934, these very personalities, and none others, tried to influence the life of the Society in such a way that they were called - the name of course, does not come from them - ever since 1926, the "super-Vorstand ". The gentlemen in question were Dr. Kolisko, von Grone, Dunlop, Kaufmann, Dr. Zeylmans, de Haan, a few doctors, and during the first decisive years, particularly Dr. Walter Johannes Stein, who was not moving in the background at that time. As these members played an important, and in part a decisive role in the Executives of the German, English and Dutch Societies, and in the faculty of the Waldorf School, and as they also exercised a strong authority particularly in the "Freie Gesellschaft " ("Free Society ") led by Dr. Lehrs. It need not surprise us that this influence went a long way. The description of the events which followed, will show how these leading members tried again and again to realise their own particular aims, with the aid of Dr. Wegman or of Dr. Vreede. On the other hand, these two members of the Vorstand repeatedly availed themselves of this "super-Vorstand " in order to carry out their own private intentions, even against the wish of the other members of the Vorstand. In the first years, this group of members collaborated more with Dr. Wegman, and later on, more with Dr. Vreede. At first, the battle was waged particularly against Frau Dr. Steiner, and in later years particularly against Herr Steffen. The relationship between Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede varied very much in the course of time. The names of these two personalities will only be mentioned together, in the further course of this description, when the facts justify this.

The gentlemen of the "super-Vorstand " tried above all to subject the Anthroposophical Society to their own will, and later on, when this had proved impossible, they tried to claim a

special position for themselves in the Society. Not only the events showed this - they themselves made no secret of their aims. Many members still remember to this very day Dr. Stein's words —"We tried to get the Society into our hands, but we did not succeed", and also—" we must break our way through".

33

When Herr Steffen showed them that he was not simply willing to confirm impossible facts in the matter of the World School Union, his antagonists took up an attitude which they also adopted in future, when similar circumstances arose, namely, that the members concerned explained what had happened as a harmless misunderstanding, and said that they had acted out of a praiseworthy excess of zeal which could never have led to severe difficulties if all the members would be so faithful to the esoteric Vorstand as they, who had grasped so deeply the true meaning of the Christmas Meeting. At the meeting of February 6, 1926, Dr. Kolisko protested against the unkind efforts to establish facts which were now settled. The meeting was not a court trial, and he had to object to questions which could only be placed out of a lack of confidence. He did not accuse his friends and their ambition for power, but rather their critics, for calling up the danger of a split in the Society.

Dr. Zeylmans had already demanded at the beginning of the discussion that the freedom of speech should be limited, and Herr Steffen had to defend repeatedly the right of each member to say what he wished to say. Herr Schubert had already once been deprived of the chance of speaking when he was excluded, at Dr. Zeylman's request, from the meeting of the more restricted group of members. Since then, Dr. Zeylmans had induced the Dutch members to draw up a protest against the alleged insults to the Anthroposophical Society in Holland. Yet Dr. Zeylmans had omitted to ask Herr Schubert to repeat to him what he had said. Shorthand notes were also available. Dr. Zeylmans read out this protest to the meeting, but it only made a slight impression, since most of the members present could remember that the Dutch Society had in no way been insulted. Herr Schubert rejected the protest with a few words, and expressed the hope that the Dutch members would not again be induced to senseless actions on the ground of insufficient information given by Dr. Zeylmans. He also said that the two facts which had compelled Herr Steffen to interfere—namely the campaign against Frau Dr. Steiner and the actual ignoring of the Vorstand, even apart from the case of the World School Union - would remain unchanged, as long as the attitude of the leading members who had now exposed themselves in such an unmistakeable way, remained unchanged. He pointed out in this connec-

34

tion the results of the alleged Karma-investigations, as being the cause of the difficulties which had arisen, and openly spoke of the rôle which had been assigned to Dr. Wegman. He also mentioned the foolish views on Macedonia, which he himself had heard proclaimed loudly by the member in question.

In looking back on all the confusions which had stirred up the members for months, Herr Schubert placed several questions before Herr Steffen, so that he might indicate a true course of action for the future development of the Anthroposophical Society. The questions referred to Rudolf Steiner's succession, to the leadership of the School, to the financial question, to the false informations of Dr. Wegman which had appeared in the " Mitteilungsblatt ", and to the danger of sectarianism.

Herr Steffen replied by explaining, that in his opinion there was no personal successor of Rudolf Steiner, and that the Vorstand should lead the Society as well as the School. Further details concerning the School would be discussed on the following day, at a meeting for the members of the First Class which had already been announced.

Herr Steffen left the answer to financial questions to the Administrators of the Goetheanum. Dr. Grosheintz submitted a report some time later. These financial matters dealt with large extensions, a part of which had already been carried out; with mortgages which had been taken up, and with guarantees which had been given. - All these things went out from the Clinical Therapeutic Institute, without having been mentioned to the Vorstand, although the Anthroposophical Society was legally responsible for the obligations arising therefrom. A few items were cancelled, but all the more was started later in other countries.

Concerning the articles in question, Herr Steffen did not wish to say anything and left this answer to Dr. Wegman, who later on declared that she could not enter upon such matters.

Concerning the danger of sectarianism, Herr Steffen said that this could only go out from members who did not take spiritual science seriously. Instead of realising that the real consequences of Karma work into the actual present life-situation and in existing capacities, these members yield themselves up to illusions which are quite alien to life, when they refuse to observe the real working of Karma, and indulge in dreams of

past karmic causes. In connection with the Alexander legend, Herr Steffen said that in his opinion one who recognises views on reincarnation brought forward in such a way - no matter whether they are based on truth or not - is either an authority-loving dogmatist, or indulges in idle talk. Dr.

Steiner had emphasized clearly enough that everyone who is really able to learn to know his preceding incarnations, must also know that he has to be silent about this, because in revealing such truths about human beings who are still alive, their possibilities of work are destroyed.

The further course of discussion did not contribute much toward an understanding, and after all that had taken place, Dr. Kolisko became indignant once more and compared Herr Schubert's behaviour to the deed of Herostratus who had burnt down the Temple of Ephesus at the hour of Alexander's birth!

Enormous excitement was occasioned at the end, when Herr Steffen closed the meeting with the request that the reasons should be given why Frl. Hoffmann had left the Faculty of the Waldorf School.

On the following day, February 7, 1926, the meeting for the members of the School took place. It was decided to authorise a report of the meeting for all members of the Society, and to regard this as a duty.

At the commencement of this meeting, Dr. Wegman read out a written declaration. Its main points were, that she did not consider herself in any way as Rudolf Steiner's successor and in no way claimed to be the leader of the School; she wished instead that Herr Steffen should take over this leadership. Moreover she held that the other members of the Vorstand should also read the Class-lectures, a matter which had already been mentioned in the Vorstand.

Herr Steffen replied that he was not willing to take up the leadership of the School and that, as President, he would take up the responsibility for the single Sections only then, if proofs could be supplied, that the conditions in the Society would really have improved. For the Class lessons it was agreed that in future Herr Steffen and Frau Dr. Steiner would hold these, while Dr. Wegman would continue to hold them with those who wished to have this spiritual treasure transmitted by her.

Herr Steffen pointed out once more that the misunderstandings which had up till now arisen through the manner in which Dr. Wegman had

represented herself to the members outside Switzerland, could now be looked upon as having been overcome.

Frau Dr. Steiner said that the chief thing to bear in mind was the development of an unerring sense for the truth and to distinguish whether truth stood behind words which anyone could use for his own purposes. She explained that, in her opinion, the cause of the evil which had gradually led to an untenable situation lay in the fact that younger members wished to judge and decide on

esoteric matters without possessing the required maturity to do so. In accordance with the laws of human nature, this can be the case only after the 35th year of age.

When also the questions relating to Rudolf Steiner's bequests and the Philosophic-Anthroposophical Publishing House arose, Frau Dr. Steiner had for the first time an opportunity to speak about these things to the members. As she wished to read out the actual documents, she had to leave the meeting in order to fetch them from her house. While the assembled members were awaiting her return, a strange feeling of anxious expectation took hold of them, mingled with shame at the fact that Rudolf Steiner's Will should be read out to the Society only now and under such distressing circumstances. However a part of the members did take up a negative attitude. Frau Dr. Steiner then read out the various documents, the contents of which is already known to the reader through the description of the events which took place in 1925. Frau Dr. Steiner did not bring these facts to the knowledge of the members in order to defend herself, but in view of the statement that the Christmas Meeting of 1923 had annulled Dr. Steiner's Will. This statement was not only meant to mislead the Society, but it had also given rise to the illusion that Dr. Steiner, who had kept his full, clearest consciousness to the very end, did not know why he had not annulled these documents. Moreover, as the leadership of the Society in the form desired by certain members, was based upon the opinion that Frau Dr. Steiner had not understood what Rudolf Steiner meant with the Christmas Meeting of 1923, she also read out some passages from a letter which Dr. Steiner had written to her on February 27, 1925: " After all you are the only one with whom I can think and feel together in matters of judgment and opinion." and—"As far I am concerned, I can attribute an inner competence to your judgment alone".

37

An earlier document of Dr. Steiner contains the words that Frau Dr. Steiner "had always understood me in such a way, that what is done by her after my death, shall be looked upon as having been done in my name ".

Also the reasons why Frl. Hoffmann had withdrawn from the Faculty of the Waldorf School, consisted in the fact that she could no longer stand the animosities against Frau Dr. Steiner prevailing there; she also censured the binding arrangements which had been made by a part of the "inner circle" of the youth movement as a preparation for the World School Union. This was all the more astonishing, as this "inner circle" had been formed and had continued to develop after an interview with Dr. Steiner, in which he finally agreed to give to the few people present a verse in common. Frau Dr. Steiner was also present at that interview and she had also received that verse from Dr. Steiner, which the others looked upon as an indissoluble link. In general, the attitude of the leaders of youth during those years was in direct opposition to the wish which Dr.

Steiner had repeatedly mentioned, namely, that he considered Frau Dr. Steiner as the most suitable person for dealing with the young members and he expected on the other hand (written proofs exist to this effect) that the leaders of youth would turn first to Frau Dr. Steiner with their questions. The circumstance that Frau Dr. Steiner has achieved for years such excellent results in her work with the numerous young people of her section, also belongs to the facts which certain groups of younger members willingly ignored.

From a historical point of view it is interesting to remember that at the conclusion of the meeting held on February 7, 1926, Herr Münch could characterise the situation by reading out the final words of Rudolf Steiner's Autobiography. The important thing however is that when Herr Englert repeated these words in 1934, they could be applied to exactly the same people as in 1926: *"Most of them however placed the chief emphasis upon the absurdities which in the course of time have grown up in the Theosophical Society and which have led to endless quarrelling."*

4 SOME NECESSARY EXPLANATIONS

The "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 16 of April 19, 1925, contains an article by Dr. Wegman, entitled: "Dr. Steiner's Illness, His Last Days and Hours", in which she wrote:

"At 4 p.m. the pains returned and my inner anxiety would not leave me. I insisted that Frau Dr. Steiner, who was in Stuttgart, should be informed of his condition."⁷

As everyone knew very well that at 8 p.m. Frau Dr. Steiner had attended the Recitation-Evening of Dr. Piper's poems⁸ and had only travelled back to Dornach on the following morning, the above words of Dr. Wegman could therefore only be interpreted - and were interpreted by many members in the following way: Frau Dr. Steiner had been informed of Dr. Steiner's condition at 4 p.m. but the Recitation-Evening was apparently more important to her, and so she remained in Stuttgart, postponing her departure to the next morning.

Another quotation must be added: *"The truth is that Frau Dr. Steiner was first communicated with after 10.30 p.m. Then she was told that Dr. Steiner's condition had grown worse, but that there was no need for her leave at once and that she would receive further news in the morning. This news came shortly before 6 a.m. and Frau Dr. Steiner left immediately."*

These words come from Herr Leinhas, who arranged Frau Dr. Steiner's departure and accompanied her to Dornach. He dictated these words to Herr Günther Schubert, in the presence of Frau Dr. Steiner and Dr. Unger. Herr Schubert included them in the manuscript which he intended to use at the Member's Meeting on February 6, 1926. Dr. Unger had also the intention of bringing up this matter.

Why was it not brought forward? Because Frau Dr Steiner did not wish it. Quarter of an hour before the meeting, Herr Schubert was informed of her wish through Herr Leinhas. He crossed through this passage in his manuscript with a pencil, and the above words are still on file to-day. Later on, Frau Dr. Steiner repeated that she did not wish these things to be brought forward, if it be only to protect her own person against the campaigns of calumnies. Besides this, she nursed the hope that the fanaticism of certain members would in time die out and that it would soon be possible to reckon with more humane feelings. But still in 1934, the fact could be stated that co-

⁷ Although Dr. Wegman did not telephone herself, it was done by her order and the account in the "Mitteilungsblatt", with its dire results, is written by her.

⁸ Dr. Steiner himself had wished that this Recitation-Evening should take place. because he was glad of any support given to Dr. Piper.

workers at the Goetheanum thought that Frau Dr. Steiner's attitude in March 1925 had been strange and inexplicable. As former members of the "Free Society ", in which such things were spread abroad, they unsuspectingly considered as a historical fact, what was really a calumny. Frau Dr. Steiner was supposed to have had the " karma " of arriving too late at Dr. Steiner's death-bed.

Herr Steffen, who never suspected that lies would be told him about these most sacred things, repeated the information which it had been considered right to impart to him. His "In Memoriam of Rudolf Steiner ", which he wrote immediately after Dr. Steiner's death, contains the information that Frau Dr. Steiner "was informed at 11 p.m. of the change for the worse" and that "an automobile could only be obtained between six and seven in the morning."

Thus Frau Dr. Steiner's enemies had not only succeeded in keeping her away from Rudolf Steiner when he was dying, but the fact of her absence was looked upon as a deliberate deed on her part, and was used for years as an accusation against her, or else it was interpreted as a sign of destiny showing that she did not belong entirely to Rudolf Steiner and to Anthroposophy. She herself kept silent and forbade her friend speak on her behalf.

But to-day the silence must be broken in order that the Society may through strictest conscientiousness place itself entirely on the ground of truth.

Another malicious invention concerning the events of those days is the statement that Frau Dr. Steiner had claimed the urn containing Steiner's ashes for herself, and that Dr. Wegman was obliged to intervene,

40

in order to "rescue " the urn "for the Society ". Dr. Wegman thereby achieved such a great merit, that in its light, her attitude on other occasions - even if it had been unjust - played no rôle whatever.

The characteristic trait of these absurd statements is the way of judging things, which also became evident in the question of Dr. Steiner's inheritance and on other occasions. This mental attitude takes for granted that everything which was entrusted to Frau Dr. Steiner would entail a loss to the Society; Dr. Wegman, on the other hand, had no personal motives, but always stood up for the welfare of the whole Society. As personal motives could never be evinced in Frau Dr. Steiner's case, these were constructed and then represented as things which had to be prevented.

This fact struck Frau Dr. Steiner in a surprising and painful way when the urn was being transported from Basle to Dornach, owing to the extremely offending attitude of Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede, who wished to ascribe motives to her which she did not have in this case, that she wished to prevent the urn from being placed in the Studio. But Frau Dr. Steiner had renounced

from the very beginning to keep the urn at Haus Hansi until there would be a worthy room for this purpose at the new Goetheanum. But at that time the obvious thing would have been to consider that Dr. Steiner kept the urns of several members at his house, among these the one containing the ashes of Christian Morgenstern. Herr Steffen and Dr. Noll also thought that Dr. Steiner's urn could be placed beside the others. Although it would have been natural for Frau Dr. Steiner to express her wishes in this direction, she nevertheless renounced, because this renunciation seemed necessary to her in view of the general situation.

When Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede now wished to ascribe the above-mentioned motives to her, the bitter remark escaped her, that it was indeed unnecessary to use diplomatic means in order to prevent her from taking the urn into Dr. Steiner's room, for this had never been her intention. The two others replied with a violent and abusive flow of words.

Many things which could still be said in connection with the events of those days, must obviously remain unsaid. The examples which have just been mentioned, sufficiently show that every humane feeling was callously pushed aside in the battle against Frau Dr. Steiner.

41

Silence must be broken, where malicious misrepresentations can be exposed through truth. Where the uttering of the truth can no longer change anything in the irrevocable injustice which has been caused, may truth be left to work also there where it remains unuttered.

If cause should ever arise to speak of these things, there are several members who are undoubtedly in the position to supply authentic information about them.

42

5. THE YEARS 1926 AND 1927.

At the conclusion of the meetings held in February 1926, Herr Steffen had expressed the hope that the difficulties were now at an end and that through a conscientious reporting of the proceedings, peace and confidence would be re-established in the whole Society. There certainly did follow an apparent peace on the stormy days of February, but in reality the opinions and mental attitude had not changed at all. It became evident at once that the assurances and promises made by Dr. Wegman were the very opposite of her true convictions and intentions, and were merely a pretence in order to gain time and gradually lay better foundations for her position.

The way in which the more recent events had been reported, sufficed to increase the conflicts among the members. Besides the open confession that the "super-Vorstand " pursued a policy of opportunism, many spoke of the martyrdom of those who, for the sake of preserving peace, had renounced the right to defend themselves. The convenient view that all the difficulties could be explained simply through the jealousy of Frau Dr. Steiner, who could not tolerate the special position of Dr. Wegman, was adopted not only by Dr. Zeylmans and the other enemies of Frau Dr. Steiner, but also by members who had to follow the events from afar and were not sufficiently well acquainted with the personalities in question.

Many people acted as if nothing had happened. But a difference did make itself felt in that more discretion was used. Further propaganda for the Alexander legend was made, not so loudly and obtrusively as before, but quietly and where "reliability" was assured. This had the advantage of producing a still more "esoteric" effect and at the same time one could denounce these things as rumours and misrepresentations on the part of malicious members. The crass examples of this during the General Meeting of December 1930 will show to what impossible situations this attitude led.

For the time being one lived in the expectation of further difficulties. Dr. Wegman soon travelled again to Paris and London, where she was still looked upon as the leader of the School and as Dr. Steiner's successor.

A new occasion to try to solve problems by stirring up feelings, arose in October 1926. The tragic aspect of the whole excitement which lasted until the Spring of 1927, was that it was called forth from the very beginning, not by facts, but by hallucinations.

Before Christmas 1925, Dr. Wegman had approached Frau Dr. Steiner with the request to renew the so-called "old esotericism". Frau Dr. Steiner refused. Dr. Wegman then asked Herr

Steffen some time afterwards to approach Frau Dr. Steiner once more with this request. Frau Dr. Steiner again refused.

At the same time, a public periodical, the "Oesterreichische Blätter für freies Geistesleben" published by anthroposophists, had brought out the false statement that Rudolf Steiner "had established an objective path of training for esotericism" only since the new foundation of the Anthroposophical Society in 1923, by introducing Classes of the School. Before that time he was supposed to have given only personal instruction and advice.

After ten months, during which this error was not set right by anyone, Herr Arenson wrote a circular in October 1926, disproving this false assertion, by referring to chapter 36 of Rudolf Steiner's Autobiography, where the esoteric institution of the years 1904—1914 is clearly described. Since this question had been brought up, Herr Arenson seized the opportunity to say something else in this connection, which he thought could not be withheld any longer. He wrote:

"Here an experience may be alluded to - I think it is my duty to mention it in view of my advanced age, for today but a few people are living, who witnessed this scene." He was therefore relating something he remembered. Rudolf Steiner had once mentioned during a festal occasion that the esoteric collaboration of Frau Dr. Steiner (at that time still Frl. von Sivers) could be looked upon as fully justified in every sense and not merely as symbolical, as had been the case with all the other participants at that time. Herr Arenson moreover drew a comparison between the study of the "Leading Thoughts", which should be studied with the help of the lecture cycles - as Dr. Steiner himself had said in "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 31, of the year 1924 - with the esoteric work which is not the result of repetition

44

but only of deepening and concentrating. Herr Arenson expressed himself as follows:

"Read through carefully the above mentioned address in No. 31 of the "Mitteilungsblatt". It will not be possible to ignore the fact that the "Leading Thoughts" can only be fully exhausted with the help of the spiritual riches which preceded them. Could not something similar be found in the domain of esotericism?"

That is all - a question. No denial of the extant esotericism, but an impulse for a deeper understanding.

Herr von Grone, however, heard in these words "the alarm-bell announcing a storm". In order that his prophecy should be fulfilled, he himself unchained the storm. Suddenly there sounded from all sides calls of senseless indignation: Frau Dr. Steiner intends to introduce once

more the old esotericism! This flagrant breach of the Christmas Meeting must be prevented! Now letters began to pour in and a feverish activity began-journeys, circulars, etc., which finally led to a written "Manifestation" which was presented to the Dornach Vorstand at the beginning of December 1926.

What was so incomprehensible in the entire situation, was that Dr. Wegman never said one word about her proposal to Frau Dr. Steiner. This would have silenced the storm. Frau Dr. Steiner and Herr Steffen could not speak without increasing the storm and turning it against Dr. Wegman. Yet Frau Dr. Steiner was allowed to be attacked for months! Only after a certain amount of quiet had been regained in February 1927, did Frau Dr. Steiner touch upon these things in a circular of which hardly a person took notice. Once again a case of "nothing has happened". Frau Dr. Steiner wrote on February 25, 1927 under the title:

Seeing ghosts.

The round of circulars connected with Herr Arenson's article has now perhaps closed. I consider it right at this juncture to add a few remarks. They can be formulated in the shortest way as questions.

1. How does it happen that so many meanings were attributed to Herr Arenson's letter, while the true reason which gave rise to it is quite overlooked? How does it come about that such slight attention is paid to this true reason, that it is constantly overlooked as if it did not even exist? Is it not a duty in our Society to rectify erroneous statements, which are published through insufficient knowledge of the facts? And is it not astounding that such a long time should elapse before there was any possibility of letting the members know that an Anthroposophical monthly had erroneously published something as fact, which was really

45

something quite different? Namely, that Rudolf Steiner had only given us personal esoteric introductions until the Christmas Meeting. When false statements are not contradicted they form opinions and have an influence on the future, but because they are not true this influence is a destructive one and burdens destiny. How does it come about that no one noticed that a service is rendered to the Society when truth is established? Or is there feeling left for the truth?

2. Do those whose imagination ran riot in ascribing all kinds of intentions to Herr Arenson's letter, realise to what an extent they deluded themselves? The fears which they tried to rouse culminated in the fact that the old esotericism was to be introduced again,

and through me. Is the fact sufficiently well known that I was personally requested by Dr. Wegman to take up again "the old esotericism." - even before Christmas 1925 and that also Herr Steffen was asked by Dr. Wegman to approach me with the same request? And that I replied in the negative? That it was with a firm "No" that I replied? After all that has happened, it will perhaps be seen that I had good grounds for this. But with some good will it is also possible to see that, had I wished to reach this end, I should not have needed to adopt the subterfuges suggested by Herr von Grone and his inspirers, when they began to peel the alarm bell - subterfuges which were so readily believed, but that as a matter of fact an official sanctioning for it existed, which I have left unregarded.

Herr von Grone who opened the campaign of errors with his extraordinarily phantastic letter, which was sent round in many copies and was followed up by journeys undertaken for the sake of influencing members, achieved strong results; as a proof, I possess a letter coming from circles of the Christian Community priests - a letter which seems like a romance in the midst of Herr von Grone's construction of hypotheses. Herr von Grone closes his *circulus vitiosus* with a great gesture. He tries to justify his excessive zeal through the fact that he represented the point of view that:

"Has Dr. Steiner not since and by the founding of the School - since the renewed founding of the Society - reserved in the strictest sense of the word to the leadership of the School in the Dornach Vorstand, the right to take any kind of initiative or even to give mere suggestions in esoteric matters to the members." But he forgets something very important. He forgets that two gentlemen of the German Executive have with great energy tried to influence Herr Steffen in esoteric matters and have also tried to work in a very stimulating way within the Society to this same end. He forgets that a circular was sent out containing the proposal to exclude those members from the First Class who did not adopt the attitude desired by certain circles towards the "leading thoughts" published from May to August 1925. Therefore his gesture lacks a real foundation. He could forget so easily, because among the members who for the sake of convenience are called "the other party" (although this expression is also in its source not based on truth), no effort was made to forge weapons of attack out of such things. - But he interprets Herr Arenson's letter as "an incitement to initiative connected with most which an alarm must be raised important esoteric matters", as a "Society-question of the most central importance", against

He overlooks the fact that an error is set right which, had it not been corrected, would have laid the blame of a sin of omission on the esoteric Vorstand. The course of events has shown what arises when such a deed is undertaken. It would not be at all bad if such a matter were to be well thought over. Herr Arenson writes something about his own

views concerning the continuation of the work in Dr. Steiner's spirit; it is in the highest degree political and objectively untrue to call this "*an initiative towards a reorganisation in the character of the School*". One who is 72 years old and thinks only of how he can best fulfil his responsibilities on earth before returning to the spiritual world and facing his Teacher and

46

Leader, may well deem it necessary to express an opinion in the face of the childish nonsense and the errors of many younger and unexperienced members... This is his right and even his duty, particularly when there has been a great deal of damaging gossip and much mischief caused. This mischief induced him to yield up a remembrance which meant a great deal to him, because he sees in it the continuity of the old into the new. He placed it opposite the politically coloured gossip which had been spread so diligently and considered it even as his duty, in view of a possible approaching death and in view of that responsibility which he owes to Rudolf Steiner. Even this is no "reorganisation of the character of the School". The best answer is supplied by the fact which I have already mentioned, that I, from whom such things were feared (proofs exist for this statement), had been requested by the President and by the Recorder of the esoteric Vorstand, to take up once more the old esotericism, and that in view of the great immaturity which offered itself all round, I took great care not to do this.

But Herr von Grone writes: "*This affair (the Arenson letter) acted upon me like an alarm bell announcing the approaching storm. This is the first beginning of an attempt to circumvent the Dornach Vorstand...*" O sancta simplicitas! Did not the events in February happen just because of the continued attempts to circumvent the Dornach Vorstand? And that with energy and force.

One cannot do otherwise than turn to sarcasm when dealing with such things. Pathos does not suit them; it sounds untrue and hypocritical like the bombastic "honest-fellow" tone of conviction of the last "Explanation" (title of a circular) with which one can water things in order to bring in confusion and mask them at pleasure. Epigrams and satyres alone can characterise such things. The "Manifestation" is contestable because it seeks to make an appearance, which is not based on the facts that stand behind it. It awakens false ideas and is produced by ghosts, by things which have no reality. The explanations and admonitions used, try to turn many things round into another direction by using a flood of words; they insinuate and tempt; they even dare to touch Dr. Steiner, which cannot be called in the best of taste. They have been written out of an infatuation, and their only

excuse might be that someone who does not know the facts as they are and their source, is easily influenced in certain things and being willing to help, turns to those who complain loudest.

Because this untruth, that Herr Arenson had veiled intentions in his letter in the way mentioned above, is still spreading I have been forced to give this explanation. The Christian Community priests should above all consider whether it pertains to their office to spread views based on hypotheses which become condensed to untruths and to show no understanding for what Herr Arenson considered to be his duty: to correct untrue statements. I conclude by placing a question before the members: Would it have been possible to leave the above unsaid ?”

These were the words Frau Dr. Steiner wrote at that time, with no special emphasis on the "Manifestation". This "Manifestation" is still of interest today because it constitutes, as it were, the first and comparatively harmless edition of the "Declaration of Intentions" (Willenserklärung) of 1934, and the way in which it arose could almost constitute the first chapter of a psychological study of this "Declaration of Intentions".

47

The details concerning the origin of the "Manifestation" have been fully cleared because a cloud was spread over it, greatly resembling that cloud which enveloped first the founding of the World School Union and later on the origin of the "Declaration of Intentions". Yet one fact could not be denied, namely that a part of the German Executive of that time was responsible for the drawing up and distribution of this "Manifestation". Herr von Grone, Dr. Rittelmeyer and Dr. Stein admitted this, in statements which were at variance from one another in some points but agreed fundamentally. Dr. Kolisko was the only one who reported during a Group-evening that the "Manifestation" had gone out from a few "members" and had an international character. Herr Leinhas who had very weighty reasons - as will be seen - to investigate these things carefully, wrote in a circular dealing with this:

"I acknowledge a justification for each one of these forms of expression, with the exception of the one given in public by Dr. Kolisko; in this I must see an attempt not to speak out the truth before the anthroposophical public."

This fact that something was decidedly wrong in the whole matter, became evident at once when it was seen that the " Manifestation" which was the initiative of five members of the German Executive was carefully kept secret from the four other members of the German Executive. These heard nothing of the active propaganda made in many countries for this "Manifestation"; of the 98 signatures that had been collected; of the transmission of the

Manifestation to the Dornach Vorstand. And when they nevertheless were informed quite by chance of the whole matter shortly before the "Manifestation" reached Dornach, even the word "treachery" was used. Moreover Dr. Rittelmeyer was again not aware of the circumstance that Dr. Unger and the other three members of the Executive were meant to know nothing about this.

The four members of the German Executive who had been ignored, were Dr. Unger, Herr Leinhas, Dr. Palmer and Frl. Mücke⁹. They were left out by their colleagues, because very likely they would not have

48

signed the "Manifestation" and if their refusal had become known, it would have been like a danger-signal. Many members would then have examined the document which seemed so harmless, on the score of its true tendency and the whole thing would have failed. As a result of this secrecy, certain names were conspicuously absent on a manifestation of faithfulness and of good will to come to an understanding. The bearers of these names had now to defend themselves and further conflicts were the result.

This example shows very clearly that the earlier history of some events are even more important than the final form in which they appear. The content of the "Manifestation" was an assurance of faithfulness to the Dornach Vorstand; yet it was thought right to admonish them to keep together, as only the united work of its five members could enable Rudolf Steiner's spirit to continue his work in the Society. This was to be set up as a high-sounding dogma, in order enforce a certain direction on the Dornach Vorstand. The Arenson letter was alluded to as endangering this unity; this allusion appeared in the very first sentence in the mendacious statement worded in general terms that opinions had been advanced therein concerning Dr. Steiner's continued life and activity, whereas such statements had only been made among the writers of the Manifestation. The whole thing assumed in this way the form of an accusation against Frau Dr. Steiner's ambition for power and against Herr Steffen who tolerated it. Led astray by the veiled sentences, even Michael Bauer had signed the "Manifestation" and later on, sorrowfully realised that he had supported a campaign against personalities whom he so highly revered. The document had the following text:

Manifestation.

Recently opinions have been advanced within the Society concerning Dr. Steiner's

⁹ Frl. Mücke was invited in Dornach at the last moment by Herr von Grone to sign the "Manifestation". She declined especially as the signatures of a part of the German Executive were missing. Herr von Grone replied that Dr. Unger had declined to sign. In another case, Herr von Grone had obtained a signature after having replied "yes" to the question as to whether Dr. Unger had agreed.

continued life and activity. These opinions could not be shared by many members of the Society. In order to throw light on the situation we should like to express our own views concerning Dr. Steiner's continued activity in the Society.

1. When Dr. Steiner departed from us, he left us a Vorstand which he had repeatedly and emphatically described, in its united work with him, as an esoteric Vorstand. We are convinced that Dr. Steiner will be enabled to continue his living activity within the Society, if the Vorstand as a whole leads the Society. We are also of the opinion that in their collab-

49

oration with Dr Steiner. the Vorstand must even today be considered as an esoteric vorstand, even if the greatest contrasts may be united in this Vorstand. We cannot imagine that Dr. Steiner's living work would be furthered, if anything resembling party-spirit were to disturb the harmonious collaboration of the Vorstand. We affirm the Vorstand as a whole and adhere to it with all the competences bestowed upon it by Dr. Steiner. Even if we ourselves have done things which go against the standpoint now brought to expression, we must condemn them. We beg all members of the Society, in full consciousness of the serious situation existing in the Anthroposophical Society and of our day, to be clear about the very first conditions needed for the effective continuation of Dr. Steiner's work and to avoid everything that might destroy it.

2. Dr. Rudolf Steiner left us an organism constituting the life of the Society and he hoped it would become the bearer of the living spirit. We feel convinced that the Society faces the future in the best way and that Dr. Steiner's living and continuous activity will be opened to us if the Society maintains these institutions in freedom, and strives to receive within them the further guidance of Dr. Steiner. We do not shut ourselves to the fact that progressive life may need changes, but only a truly convincing refutation of the now existing situation through a continued progress in life and the will of the Vorstand as a whole, could give us a good conscience in the matter of such changes.

3. We consider the situation of the Anthroposophical Society after Dr. Steiner's departure from the physical plane, as extremely serious, surrounded as it is by an overwhelming number of determined enemies. Only the greatest sense of responsibility of all the members, particularly in the sense that party-feeling should be avoided, personal mistrust overcome and the uniting element sought everywhere, can - in our opinion - preserve the Society, offer Dr. Steiner's spiritual work an organ formed by human beings and thus create for him the possibility of leading us forcefully forward.

But we are also aware of the fact that words like these can be fully valid and real, only as Dr. Steiner once said - "if after my death even two seek the welfare of the movement quite selflessly and purely, then I shall have the possibility of working within it."

"Even if we ourselves have done things which go against the standpoint now brought to expression, we must condemn them." This sentence is particularly impressive if we remember that the "Manifestation" itself constitutes a deed which deserves to be condemned, both as regards its content based on false grounds, and as regards the very questionable way in which it arose. It is also striking that it should say that the Vorstand must lead the Society, but should say nothing about the leadership of the School, in spite of the fact that the entire "Manifestation" was the outcome of an "esoteric" indignation and was meant to give Frau Dr. Steiner a shock, in order to keep her away from esotericism. But all this is not so surprising when we consider that the names of those who signed, and

50

knew what they were signing, were: Dr. Kolisko, Herr von Grone, Dr. Zeylmans, Mr. Kaufmann, etc. It was a manifestation of a purely alexandrian mentality.

Yet these excitements which lasted for months, were devoid of any real foundation! In this pitch and toss game between Dr. Wegman and the "super-Vorstand", Frau Dr. Steiner was to be damaged. Esotericism was misused as a weapon in this conflict, with the pretext of defending the Christmas Meeting. Had Frau Dr. Steiner agreed to Dr. Wegman's proposal, they would have said :- Look, those are the people who had to keep the old because they cannot understand the new! Now they foisted on Frau Dr. Steiner an intention which she did not have, and called out:- Look, those are the people who strive backwards, so that the new may not flourish!

At the end of this winter full of misery, the annual General Meeting took place on March 6, 1927. Only business matters were dealt with. Nevertheless the question did arise, why Dr. Wegman had not prevented all the senseless excitements of the past months. A few words from her would have sufficed. Dr. Wegman answered:

"This was, of course, unexpected for me. But this request to speak to you, is really good. - It was never, never my intention to attack Frau Dr. Steiner in any way. This would be impossible, because Dr. Steiner would never have worked with me as he did, had I not shown toward her who stood so near to him, the feelings which I really had.

"This fact, at least, can be assumed – never - and this must also be assumed as far as Dr. Steiner (!) was concerned - never, would it have been possible for the work between us

to proceed in such a fruitful and beautiful way, if I had anything in my heart against Frau Dr. Steiner."

After a few general remarks, she continued as follows, concerning recent events :

"I should like to know what things of an esoteric nature have been done by me against Frau Dr. Steiner, or against other members of the Vorstand. I would not know what they are. As to the affairs of the Class, we have surely talked enough about them, and I believe that complete clearness has now been reached on this subject. Also, what Frau Dr. Steiner said concerning the fact that it was I who requested her to give to all of us, or at least to those who were capable of receiving it - what she had known from earlier years, that is, the esoteric knowledge this is also a truth, and is based upon the fact that I have the highest reverence for Dr. Steiner's knowledge in that direction. I have also the greatest respect for the Section of Art, Eurythmy and Speech, and surely, I belong to those who rejoice immensely over what is now being given to the world in such a wonderful way."

The same attitude adopted by Dr. Wegman before, when defending her "leading thoughts ", became apparent in this case, and was to come

51

more and more clearly to expression in the future. For this attitude there are no facts, no reality, no faults, no responsibility - only the memory of Rudolf Steiner and the trust which he had in Dr. Wegman were to guarantee once and for all that - whatever might happen and whatever results might ensue through her - this would be in Rudolf Steiner's spirit; so that anyone who judged Dr. Wegman according to her deeds, was supposed to attack Dr. Steiner by so doing. In the case just described Dr. Wegman considered it necessary to confirm that Frau Dr. Steiner had spoken the truth! And then Eurythmy is praised, in case perhaps Dr. Steiner might be somewhat displeased. Also that the affairs of the Class were far from being settled, need not be entered into here.

*

The Anthroposophical Society in Germany passed through a serious crisis. A special General Meeting which took place in Stuttgart on April 6, 1927, was preceded by countless other meetings. Dr. Unger said, in regard to the " Manifestation":-*"I felt myself betrayed, as never before in my life."*

Herr Leinhas had already closed his above mentioned circular (see page 48) with the words:

"Let us rather see to it that we can answer for our actions before Rudolf Steiner Let us put an end to all this gossiping at every street corner about things which should be too holy to touch with even our thoughts. Let us rather see to it that freedom of thought, not

quarrelling over beliefs, should rule in our Society - hearty, indeed heartfelt openness, and not an atmosphere of stuffy "diplomacy" - earnest objectivity in matters of inner experience, not a great trumpeting of our own 'results of investigation' the we need have no fears for the stability of the Anthroposophical Society."

Society --hearty, indeed heartfelt -earnest objectivity in matters of

< and the entirely neutral

had entrusted in 1924

with the business management of the Anths as a special responsibility and as an obligation expressly refused ever to claim that he had Dr. Steiner. After the crisis of February 1926, definite stand that the German Executive

The guarantee of freedom for spiritual work and the entirely neutral management and organisation on the part of Dr. Unger, overcame the crisis once more. Dr. Unger, whom Dr. Steiner had entrusted in 1924 with the management of the Anthroposophical Society in German as a special responsibility and as an obligation entailing initiative, expressly refused ever to claim that he had been "appointed by Dr Steiner. Ater the crisis of February 1926, Dr. Unger took the definite stand that the German executive should not fall apart. In response

52

to this his enemies on the Executive declared that the business management had only fallen to him "because no one else had time enough for this at his disposal". Whereupon Dr. Unger refused to take further responsibility for anything going out from the business management, without his personal signature. In April 1927 this was limited still further to an "entirely neutral" management. Dr. Unger's task, not to interfere with the further efforts of those who had betrayed him, points to the demands which were to be made later on, in a similar way and more and more persistently, on Herr Steffen.

53

6 THE YEARS 1928 AND 1929.

The discrepancies which led to such great conflicts in the of the leadership of the Society, were in reality so closely connected with the entire attitude of life of the individual members, that the to expression in every action and appeared in every sphere of anthroposophical work. From various sides sharp criticism was applied, and a mutual rejection extended to almost everything that was said or done. Herr Steffen then decided to make a new attempt to maintain unity and freedom for the future work. At the General Meeting on February 25, 1928, he told the members that he had decided to take over, as President, the responsibility for everything which would in future be done in the name of the Society and through the different Sections. He reminded them that Rudolf Steiner had also declared himself responsible, as President, for everything which should happen in connection with the representation of Anthroposophy, and had carried this out to such a degree that in the case of a summons to court concerning an anthroposophical publication, he would not allow the author of the book to be called to judgment, but he himself submitted to the verdict.

In the "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 11 of March 11, 1928 Herr Steffen gave an account of the step which he had taken, and wrote:

"Conditions within the Society, which have been sufficiently discussed both verbally and in writing at meetings and in resolutions, brought about the result that during the first Christmas Meeting after Rudolf Steiner's death. when I was elected President after having been Vice-President, I made a declaration to the effect that the Sections of the individual members of the Vorstand must in future be responsible themselves for everything they do. In accordance with the present situation, the President could only assume the responsibility for his own actions. This declaration was demanded by me facts themselves. It corresponded to the reality, as proved by the conflicts which broke out in February 1926. I tried at that time to protect the unity of the Vorstand at all costs, by stating in spite of the fact that the Sections themselves were responsible for their actions – I considered the Vorstand a unity, and that the resignation of one member of the Vorstand would entail my own resignation as President.

This declaration, that the single Sections are themselves responsible for what had to be observed most strictly, so that I had to remain quite neutral when the actions of the leaders were attacked. It soon became evident. however that the work became more and more difficult. Members accustomed accustomed to think clearly felt that the independence of the Sections required documentary confirmation in the outer world. But in my opinion this would have increased the danger of a breaking up of the Society, which was precisely

what I wished to avoid through that declaration. A more or less established division would

54

gradually have brought evil consequences to the anthroposophical work in general, both here at the Goetheanum and in the Society, particularly as far as the lecturing activity was concerned.

During the last weeks, I have therefore taken the decision to declare myself responsible in future, as President of the Anthroposophical Society, for everything proceeding from the Goetheanum at Dornach. I declared this first of all in the Vorstand and then before all the members assembled at the General Meeting. This declaration annuls the previous declarations briefly mentioned here and occasioned by the Christmas Meeting of 1925 and by the events in February.

This does not mean at all that I shall always agree with everything for which I shall be obliged to be responsible in future. The many-sided activities at the Goetheanum would make this impossible. The work which is being done cannot always be surveyed, still less examined. But criticisms will thus be turned in one direction, so that the work which is now being handicapped from all sides, can continue undisturbed. Productive work is impossible without a certain amount of quiet. And without productive work no progress can be made. Thus we may perhaps hope that self-recollection and inner work of the active members may lead this decision, which has become unavoidable, toward a deepening and strengthening of the Society."

Herr Steffen felt that his decision implied a "jump meaning life or death." The members were grateful that he had created new possibilities and hopes through his deed. Particularly Dr. Unger expected the most favourable results from Herr Steffen's action. Only those who had the greatest reason to be grateful, spoke of interference and presumption. At that time it was clear to everyone that Herr Steffen hoped that in future, attacks like those of Dr. Zbinden against Dr. Wegman's medical work - quite to the point as regards content but vehement in their form - could be prevented or turned upon himself. As a result of Dr. Zbinden's criticism Dr. Wegman, on her side, had expelled him from the medical Section in the autumn of 1927, and this was considered by many as an illegal act. Thus, all kinds of untenable situations had arisen.

It became evident how Herr Steffen meant to carry out his decision, during that same General Meeting, when the "World-Conference " was discussed, which was planned to take place in London in the coming summer. Serious doubts were expressed against the "World Conference". Many members felt a certain amount of mistrust because the organisers and their helpers were

the same persons who had already caused so much harm as founders of the World School Union, as the upholders of the "Manifestation" and as "super-Vorstand ". They dreaded a new attempt to lead the anthroposophical movement away from the Goetheanum. Herr Steffen had certainly been informed officially this time, and a printed

55

advance-programme had been submitted to him, yet the Vorstand was not consulted when the plans were worked out, in spite of it being a "world-wide" undertaking, to be carried out on a large scale and with tremendous expenses. The actual discussions were carried on with Dr. Wegman alone, whom the organisers considered as the only personality that counted after Dr. Steiner's death. Apart from this, great dissatisfaction was felt because the World Conference was to take place about six weeks before the celebration of the inauguration of the Goetheanum, and the question had to be raised whether time, money and energy would not be better spent for the Goetheanum. The English organisers justified their action by referring to a wish expressed by Dr. Steiner during his last visit to England in the summer of 1924. He had, as a matter of fact, expressed the wish for a Conference on a larger scale. Nevertheless, it remained a question as to whether Dr. Steiner would have welcomed the fact that the Conference was to take place at a time when preparations were afoot for the opening of the Goetheanum. Dr. Steiner's words also acquired another meaning when one remembered - and many could remember this - that he had demanded a Conference on a larger scale, and above all a better organised Conference, declaring that he would not return to England if future Conferences would again be arranged so badly, and would have such a scarce attendance and such a poor reception as the Summer Course at Torquay in August 1924.

Owing to the cares connected with the difficult preparations for the opening of the Goetheanum, Herr Steffen could not be all too happy about the World Conference. However, he acknowledged the initiative and promised the official cooperation of the Goetheanum. The General Meeting at least induced the organisers to make some changes in their programme, so that it acquired a less partisan note.

The World Conference took place from July 20 to August 1, 1940 Herr Steffen sent an official letter of welcome which was read at the opening. Frau Dr. Steiner sent the Eurythmy-group, who contributed with performances, and Dr. Wachsmuth held a lecture. Also Dr. Unger, in view of Herr Steffen's attitude, had not refused, and had even extended the invitation to the German members in the name of the German Executive.

56

The chief lecturers were Dr. Stein - who was still waging his campaign against Dr. Steiner's Will - Dr. Kolisko and Dr. Zeylmans.

The "World Conference" was held in London at the Friends' House, a medium sized hall. Out of 1000 seats, about 600 were occupied, most of them by members, of whom many had come from other countries. It was hardly possible to speak of a public success, and the deficit was of course considerable.

Dr. Wegman, who had taken an interest in this World Conference as if it were her own affair, also wrote the official report which can be read in the "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 34 of August 19, 1928.

Subsequently the attitude of Herr Steffen and of Frau Dr. Steiner was of course strongly criticised, but the occasion was also used to make the statement that the Vorstand had known all the details of the programme from the very beginning and had helped in the arrangements. Even after two years it gave rise to the following words at a Meeting of the General Secretaries in April 1930:

Mr. Kaufmann: "Mrs. Merry (the Secretary of the World Conference) submitted her plans to the entire Vorstand.

Frau Dr Steiner: I, for one, had never seen such plans beforehand. This statement is pure nonsense. I returned from a journey and afterwards heard that the decision to hold the World Conference that same year was an accomplished fact. - You are at liberty to speak on any subject you like, but it were better to leave out your moral indignation."

When taking over the responsibility for the Sections, Herr Steffen also took over once more the editorship of the "Mitteilungsblatt". He now published his report on the General Meeting, and also gave a detailed report on the activity of all the Sections and wrote a few articles on the way in which a Society should be built up. He stimulated the members to a more intensive spiritual work, gave directions for an earnest artistic and scientific activity and also gave advice on how to cultivate a good style when writing. He asked the members to think over the following three problems: 1. How can the work within a Group acquire importance for modern civilised life? - 2. Effects resulting from propaganda campaigns. 3. Esotericism in art and science and esoteric dilettantism ("Mitteilungsblatt", No. 12, March 18, 1928).

On July 15, 1928, Herr Steffen published in the "Mitteilungsblatt" an invitation to all lecturers in the Society which he had already mentioned at the General Meeting, asking them to apply as lecturers for the opening Conference of the Goetheanum.

The wording of this invitation is important:

"During the annual General Meeting of the General Anthroposophical Society on February 25, 1928, the declaration could be made that in the autumn of this year, at Michaelmas, the Goetheanum would be given over to its work. Artistic performances (Mystery Plays, Chorus, Eurythmy, etc.) and lectures were announced for the Conference which is to last nine days. As President of the Anthroposophical Society, I believed that I was entitled to say that for the lectures, only such co-workers would be taken into consideration who have worked out in inner activity, from out of the encompassing sphere of Anthroposophy, something new which has not yet been expressed anywhere else. In giving these directives I have borne in mind the words of Rudolf Steiner, that the Goetheanum wishes to hear something new.

"This is an appeal to inner activity and to creative work.

"Our co-workers are therefore invited to make known the content of their lectures in a short exposition, so that the programme of the Conference may be compiled as soon as possible. This will be done from the standpoint that all lectures together should form a whole.

"It is foreseen that the Vorstand will not be able to consider all applications, for the number of our co-workers is fortunately large and the duration of the Conference unfortunately short." (In case of too many applications the lectures were to be reserved for subsequent Conferences.)

Moreover, Herr Steffen prepared a scheme entailing many weeks of work, for the organisation of lectures at the Goetheanum, the training of lecturers, etc. He wished to submit his scheme to the Vorstand, for their advice.

But Dr. Vreede protested immediately against all such things, because she held that every initiative had to go out from the Vorstand and that the President ought not to make independent proposals. Her attacks upon Herr Steffen as President had already begun early in the summer. She also protested against his having taken over the responsibility for the Sections - not so much because she was against it on principle, but because of the way in which Herr Steffen had done this.

Herr Steffen withdrew his invitation and substituted it with one from the Vorstand of a formal nature and in more general terms. Already before the Conference he felt convinced that it was impossible any longer to carry responsibility for the whole under such conditions and in view of the mistrust against his intentions.

Thus the opening Conference-although outwardly it went off so well-became somewhat different from what Herr Steffen could have attained, had his proposals been recognised. But it showed, nevertheless, that through Herr Steffen's broad-mindedness the lecturing at the Goetheanum could have been organised even when the lecturers adopted quite extreme standpoints in Society matters. The opening Conference, at least, clearly proved this.

But at the end of the Conference, during a meeting of the General Secretaries held on October 8, 1928, Herr Steffen - induced by the unabated attacks of Dr. Vreede - laid down officially the responsibility which he had taken up with such deep earnestness. In a letter, Dr. Vreede had recapitulated her accusations against Herr Steffen in the following three points :- 1. Suspension of the Vorstand. 2. Denial of the Christmas Meeting. 3. Suppression of spiritual activity.

In order to throw some light on the actual facts and their connections, a declaration given by Dr. Vreede as late as November 29, 1930, as an explanation for her attitude, must be reported here.

In the above quoted passages Herr Steffen had written how he had decided to assume the responsibility, and that he had "*mentioned it first in the Vorstand and then before the plenum of the General Assembly*". Dr. Vreede held that this was not the case and that Herr Steffen had not mentioned his decision in the Vorstand. She felt that she had been "suspended" as member of the Vorstand. Yet for two and a half years, during which time she had continued to be a member of the Vorstand, she had never attempted to ask Herr Steffen or another member of the Vorstand for an explanation of this passage in the "Mitteilungsblatt". Only on November 29, 1930, she read it out to the General Secretaries¹⁰, in order to forge a weapon against Herr Steffen out of her own mistake. during a most critical situation of the Society which will be described later on. She turned particularly to Dr. Wegman, who did not fail to support her by declaring suddenly that she also was not aware that Herr Steffen had discussed this decision of his within the Vorstand. Moreover she

declared that Herr Steffen was in any case incapable of taking up this responsibility. For the moment Herr Steffen was unable to defend himself by proof, because he could not always carry about with him in his pocket all the minutes of meetings. He only said that it was not his habit to write untruths which naturally made little impression on the "super-Vorstand." But a few days later, Herr Steffen read out to the members assembled in the wooden annexe of the Goetheanum,

¹⁰"Hence, this document, with which Herr Steffen took over the responsibility, states that I do not belong to the Vorstand." Thus she explained her standpoint to the General Secretaries.

a detailed report on the meeting of the Vorstand held on February 18, 1928, in which Dr. Wegman's presence was expressly noted, at which Dr. Unger had also been present and during which the whole question had been discussed. It turned out, however, that Dr. Vreede had not appeared at this meeting. It is indeed a riddle why she did not ask for an explanation at the General Meeting, or at the Meeting of the General Secretaries which preceded it, but had waited instead for two and a half years, during which time her unjustified protests made a harmonious work at the Goetheanum impossible. Dr. Vreede preferred to place the Goetheanum in a most difficult situation, because she felt more sure that Herr Steffen was likely to have told a lie, than that she was likely to have made a mistake.

In April 1930, Herr Steffen said in an address reviewing the year 1928 (the much more serious reproaches of Dr. Vreede of the autumn of 1930 had not yet been made)

"If I had insisted upon carrying out my own will, the Society would have been divided. I was standing quite alone. It was my intention to gather together the creative people, those who create in freedom - this was my appeal - to submit my plans to the Vorstand, and then not to decide this question alone. Although I had told them this at that time, I did not possess the full confidence of Dr. Vreede and many members shared her feelings. Well in spite of my being a poet, I am also a man who is perhaps more practical than one may think. And I am also a man who has always listened to the voice of destiny. I realised very soon that Dr. Vreede's objection was precisely such a sign of destiny, which led me back to my true work as a writer. You know that in the meantime I have been able to write two novels and several other things - all of which had not done for nearly ten years."

Even at the General Meeting of 1928, Rudolf Steiner's Will was again discussed. The French General Secretary, Mlle Sauerwein, raised claims for the sole and exclusive rights of translating Rudolf Steiner's work into French. This matter which continually brought new excitement for the next three years, will now be dealt with right to the end.

Mlle Sauerwein possessed an authorisation in Dr. Steiner's own handwriting conceding her the right to translate works of his. She declared that this conceded her the exclusive rights, but at first refused to show this document. She appealed to the French courts. During a performance of Eurythmy, the police authorities appeared at her instigation and claimed a fine for breach of copyright, because the programme included a translation of some verses by Rudolf Steiner. Mlle Rihouet, who had obtained the permission from Frau Dr. Steiner to translate and publish a book of Dr. Steiner, had to appear in court. Frau Dr. Steiner had to submit written testimonies and negotiations with lawyers and attorneys lasted for months. The verdict of the experts led to the

decision that Mlle Sauerwein could in no way claim exclusive rights, but that Frau Dr. Steiner, as the heiress in accordance with Rudolf Steiner's Will, had the right to allow others, besides Mlle Sauerwein, to translate books of Dr. Steiner. Moreover, Dr. Steiner had personally given his permission to Mlle Rihouet to translate works of his, because he was glad to support her periodical "La Science Spirituelle".

Throughout all these years, Mlle Sauerwein was supported by Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede in this battle against Mlle Rihouet and Frau Dr. Steiner. Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede paid her visits and gave her ostentatious signs of friendship.

Also the organisers of the World Conference fêted the French General Secretary who was present at the Conference, with the evident intention of supporting her in the campaign against Frau Dr. Steiner. This led to violent discussions in the above-mentioned meeting of the General Secretaries of October 8, 1928.

In Germany also, the fight against Rudolf Steiner's Will had continued. Particularly Dr. W. J. Stein earned new laurels as rescuer of the Christmas Meeting, by trying to prove with his infallible dialectic that the Will was incompatible with Dr. Steiner's intentions after the Christmas Meeting. For the less sharp-witted of the young people grouped about Dr. Lehrs, a legend was invented which was readily believed, namely, that during

61

his illness Dr. Steiner wished to go from his Studio to his to destroy the Will, and was only hindered from doing this through his weakness. It did not occur to those who believed this, that a provision, written in his own hand, would fully have sufficed from a legal point of view, to annul an earlier Will and to substitute it with later provision. Dr. Steiner had written up to the very last moment, and he knew you well how to make new arrangements, if he had wished to do so. Moreover, a written message would have sufficed for all papers to be brought to him from his house. Messages were sent nearly every day, and in the most important matters. The best proof for the mendacity of this invention is the circumstance that Dr. Steiner himself deposited a copy of the Will with the authorities in Berlin, and this Will could only have been annulled by a subsequent Will.

Through the Meeting of October 8, 1928, Dr. Stein felt obliged for the time being to leave the German Executive, but the question of the Will was again submitted to the Vorstand through letters of Herr von Grone. At a meeting which was then held at Dornach on January 1, 1929, Dr. Unger brought forward this question once more, on principle. He requested from the German Executive a clear statement to the effect that Dr. Stein and anyone who shared his views concerning Rudolf Steiner's Will were unfit to fill the office of a member in the Executive of the German Society and should be asked to resign definitely from the Executive.

When Dr. Unger failed to uphold his claim during the Meeting of January 1, 1929, he not only left the German Executive, but also the Anthroposophical Society in Germany, and became a member at Dornach. On the following day, Dr. Stein made a communication through Herr von Grone that he now withdrew definitely from the German Executive.

On January 4, 1929, Dr. Unger was to hold a lecture on the subject What is Anthroposophy? On entering the hall at Nuremberg, he was shot by a demented person.

The consternation over the sudden and tragic death of Carl was very great, and many realised his great merits and all he had done for the anthroposophical movement. Yet others still continued in their

62

hatred against the man who, for instance, had written the following words in his report on the World School Union:

"I wish to protect the Anthroposophical Society from the danger that the present difficulties should be imputed to the Karma-lectures of Rudolf Steiner. Both sides, characterised by the reporters of this evening (Dr. Unger and Dr. Stein. See page 31.) undoubtedly reveal the two currents which Dr. Steiner had in mind. But if it is to be a question of two directions of will, expressed in these differences, then it can at the most be a direction of free thought and of unfree thought. Protest had to be lodged precisely against these constantly repeated attempts to fetter thought by imposing certain ideas. Also the continual attempts to prevent speech belong to this direction." Dr. Unger also had the following conviction: "I shall never be able to win more influence than what my anthroposophical work is worth."

Statements like the following were tolerated in the Stuttgart circles of the "Free Society" (Freie Gesellschaft)—that Dr. Unger had been prevented by death as if by a merciful destiny, to become an antagonist of Anthroposophy, signs of which were already visible in the last period of his life. Or the rumour which was spread in another place - that Dr. Unger, by claiming that Rudolf Steiner's Will should be recognised, had caused Dr. Stein's resignation and that the spiritual world would not tolerate this.

In reply to these attacks made against Dr. Unger after his death, Frau Dr. Steiner published in the "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 14, of March 31, 1929, some of the very last letters of Rudolf Steiner, in which he bitterly complains of the enmity against Dr. Unger. This enmity, that cast a shadow over Dr. Steiner's last days, bore the name of Dr. W. J. Stein and his friends. A few passages of these letters may be reprinted here.

On March 13, 1925, Dr. Steiner wrote to Frau Dr. Steiner:

"At Stuttgart there seems to be again something going on against Unger. You will come across this but you will find the right attitude toward it. It is natural that now, during my illness, groups like the Waldorf School, for instance, must try to be independent in their work. This is already the case in the arrangements for the Conference. Now Unger was supposed to hold a lecture during that Conference. This is prevented by the Board of Management of the Waldorf School. Unger shall not hold a lecture (for the Anthroposophical Society, not for the Conference) during the Conference of the Waldorf School. At this stage, the Committee at Stuttgart writes to the Vorstand at Dornach, asking what they are to do. But we, here at Dornach, cannot possibly interfere in a matter which has advanced to such a late stage and belongs to the fatal things of Stuttgart. Hence I can only send word to the Stuttgart Committee that we cannot interfere. This, of course, does not prevent that you should do in Stuttgart what you consider right to do, if this matter approaches you."

63

On March 20, 1925, Dr. Steiner wrote:

"... Unger should in future be supported within the Anthroposophical Society. But what is to be done, if there is the continual tendency to make him impossible in the Society?"

The last letter of all written by Rudolf Steiner on March 23, contains the request:

"If you should still find time to speak with the enemies of Unger, this would certainly be a good thing. I have already written how matters stand..."

Even in 1934 Herr von Grone distributes a circular, "*confiding in the force able to build up a community which is contained in this circular*", containing the most foolish nonsense concerning Dr. Unger. The circular comes from Dr. Lehrs and no word need be wasted upon it.

An official communication of the German Executive appeared after Dr. Unger's death, in the "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 6 of February 3, 1929. It is dated January 20, 1929 and signed by Herr Leinhas. It begins as follows:

"Dr. Walter Johannes Stein has definitely left the German Executive on January 2, 1929. The Stuttgart Committee entrusted with the conduct of affairs (Dr. Kolisko, Leinhas, Dr. Palmer, Dr. Rittelmeyer) held a meeting on January 13, in order to discuss the change in the German Executive rendered necessary through Dr. Unger's death. Out of the existing circumstances, there arose the necessity that the undersigned should take over the

conduct of affairs. He himself considers this office as provisional. Dr. Kolisko, Dr. Palmer and Dr. Rittelmeyer declared that they were willing to continue cooperating as active members of the Executive. It was decided to request a new authorization on the part of the Vorstand in Dornach (the members of the German Executive are, in accordance with the "Principles ", functionaries of the Dornach Vorstand) and then to ask for the approval of the members of the Anthroposophical Society in Germany. The authorization of the Dornach Vorstand was given at the meeting held on January 18, 1929."

What significance had Dr. Unger's death for the constitution of the German Executive, since Dr. Unger had even left the Anthroposophical Society in Germany? It was a fact that Dr. Unger's resignation, which was such a disgrace to the German Executive, had scarcely become known at first, and through the consternation caused by Dr. Unger's death, it was overlooked as the less important of the two events. Moreover, Dr. Unger had agreed that his definite resignation should date from January 15 onward, as some business matters had still to be settled, and as above all, the lectures planned by him, had already been announced

64

publicly on posters in the name of the Anthroposophical Society in Germany. But he had provisionally handed over the conduct of affairs to Herr Leinhas on January 1. Yet his sudden death could be used as a formal pretext for the reconstitution of the German Executive.

First this reorganisation only consisted therein, that it was now no longer necessary to take into consideration the attitude represented by Dr. Unger, and on the other hand, Dr. Kolisko could impose his influence undisturbed. The fact that Herr Leinhas, in contrast to his former attitude, no longer opposed this influence, was considered by many members as an inexplicable and a most regrettable change. However, as Herr Leinhas on his part never ceased to show the continuity of his attitude, no reasons can be adduced for this change, but the actual consequences can be stated. Soon after the above-mentioned manifest, the direction of later events became evident.

Herr Leinhas, who warned by the World School Union and the "Manifestation " had preferred to keep a certain distance between himself and Dr. Kolisko, now gradually began to approach him, so that more and more points of contact arose, even though Dr. Kolisko did not cease the "*attempt not to say the truth before the anthroposophical public*". Herr Leinhas gradually became more and more enveloped by the , "atmosphere of stuffy diplomacy " which he detested so much. After barely two years, he was to emerge from it as the liquidator of the small remnant of the former Anthroposophical Society in Germany.

65

7. THE YEAR 1930.

The events in 1930 deserve a detailed report. They were of decisive importance, because through them, the last hope for an understanding was lost. The extraordinary General Meeting convoked in December showed that the situation in the Society called forth the decisions of the next few years out of an inner necessity.

The General Meeting of April 26, 1930 was not so important as the preceding one of the General Secretaries. This is now described below on the basis of the stenogram of the Minutes.

Herr Steffen read out a letter of five co-workers at the Goetheanum in Dornach, who asked to be allowed to attend the meeting. Herr Steffen wished that the decision should be made by the meeting and not by him, and after a discussion of one and a half hours he proceeded to the voting. There were 24 votes for the proposal and 11 against, and 12 members had refrained from voting because they were against a discussion of the matter. When the Dornach members who were waiting near by, were informed of the result of the voting, they decided not to avail themselves of this permission burdened with mistrust.

This event, looked upon as a symptom, throws a sharp light on the way in which an understanding was consciously frustrated in all important matters. Now, what was the question dealt with? The so-called meetings of the General Secretaries were foreseen by Dr. Steiner for the discussion of Society questions with the leading members. He spoke of an "extended Vorstand " in this sense. Nothing more precise had been said about the constitution, rights and duties of this institution, and it played no important role in the short time before Dr. Steiner's death. In later years, however, the conduct of the Society's affairs was influenced in such a way by these meetings, as to call forth the indignant protest of the members. The way in which this body was constituted could in no way be attacked formally, but in reality it was arbitrary and unjust. Naturally every part of the General Anthroposophical Society had the right to elect a Committee with as many members as they wished. But the consequence of this was that the Anthroposophical Societies in England and Holland, which consisted each of about 600 members sent just as many

representatives to Dornach as the Anthroposophical Society in Germany with its 8000 members. The Anthroposophical Society in England had doubled the number of its Executive in the course of time. This, and other wants of proportion, brought about that the followers of Dr. Wegman were in the majority at these meetings of the General Secretaries, and this was to be kept up. It was particularly striking that the members in Dornach were not represented. Dr. Wegman herself

protested against their admission with the words: *"Of course, if now five more people are admitted, and then the majority gets fewer votes, this is of course impossible. In this case five people can give quite another turn to events than it ought to take. We cannot go on in this way."*

Herr Steffen said: "For me it is quite obvious that Dornach also should have some representatives at this Meeting. For, if I look around, I do not see many Dornach people here." When Dr. Wegman spoke disparagingly of "some people ", he replied: "It is not a question of 'some people'! I mean Herr Aisenpreis, who as architect built the Goetheanum", and so forth, and he pointed out that they were members who had participated actively in the life of the Society for decades. (They were Herr Aisenpreis, Mrs. Waller-Pyle, Herr Stuten, Frau de Jaager, Herr Günther Schubert). Dr. Wachsmuth pointed out that some of those who were present, had become members only a short time ago.

The strange sense of justice which prevailed, could also be seen during the following meeting of that same year, when Mlle Sauerwein, who was prevented by illness, suddenly sent four members to represent her and no one objected. The Vorstand of course was not consulted.

The repeated statements, that it was possible to agree on principle, but that a refusal had to be given owing to the way in which things were done, are characteristic for the attempts to veil an actual sabotage by adopting a moralizing way of speaking. In a similar way, Dr. Vreede had already hindered Herr Steffen to take over the responsibility for the Sections. But the Society was sooner to "perish on principle", rather than that something should be done which did not exactly correspond to the way in which Dr. Vreede or others had thought it out. Dr. Vreede again took up this attitude, and Mrs. Merry stated in the name of the English

67

representatives who were present,"*that on principle they had nothing against the admission of the Dornach members, but they had nevertheless voted against it because they could not agree with the way in which they were to be admitted."*

The way in which some spoke of the "extended Vorstand " showed that they were not disinclined to extend the "esoteric investiture" of the Vorstand also to themselves, as "extended Vorstand ". Dr. Zeylmans and others proposed, as truly practical people, to form a fourth juridical body, besides the already existing bodies of the Vorstand, the General Secretaries and the General Meeting. Had it been formed, it would have been neither " esoteric" nor "exoteric" but merely senseless. Fortunately it never came to that point.

Also the following is an important symptom: Dr. Kolisko had heard that Herr Steffen, Frau Dr. Steiner and Dr. Wachsmuth were for the admission of the Dornach members, while Dr. Wegman

and Dr. Vreede were against it. In spite of this fact, he demanded that this matter should not be discussed at the meeting, but decreed by a unanimous decision of the Vorstand. *"The Vorstand has not decided this. And this is precisely what constitutes one of the greatest difficulties."*

When also other members demanded a unanimous decision for esoteric reasons, Dr. Wachsmuth said: "Would you consider it as esoteric, if I were to say: Very well, I will change my mind, just in order that one opinion may arise? It would not be esoteric at all to give up one's opinion! This is a problem that has troubled and tormented us for years! As long as the Vorstand is expected to agree in such matters, we may just as well decide at once that there should be no Vorstand at all for the Anthroposophical Society. Such a thing is quite out of question. You will never find such a unanimous Vorstand. Moreover, I cannot believe that Dr. Steiner was so unworldly as to think that live people whom he had called together would always be of the same opinion. We do not come any further as long as matters are interpreted in this way." And before, when a discussion on this question at the meeting had been refused, he had said: "Are we supposed here to work together, or must the Vorstand always decree what is to take place? If we decide everything beforehand and then bring forward our decision

68

there is hardly any sense in holding meetings. If the Vorstand is expected to declare their unanimous agreement in all matters well, I should like to ask, whether in that case there would not still be someone unwilling to admit such a decision? I think that this is indeed a question of truthfulness, and that it is worth while discussing it."

The second point which came up for discussion was the so-called "Scandinavian Proposal". As a decision in this matter was only reached in December, it will be dealt with later on.

The last point, however, must be discussed in detail, because it gives the reason why meetings of the Vorstand could no longer be held as before.

This is how matters stood:

At the beginning of 1930 the Vorstand had received several letters asking why Frau Kolisko had now for two years read no Class-lessons at Stuttgart and if it was to be expected that she would take them up again in the near future. As Dr. Wegman had strongly opposed this at a meeting of the Vorstand, and wished that the right of reading the Classes should be reserved to the three members of the Vorstand whereas Herr Steffen, Frau Dr. Steiner and Dr. Wachsmuth were for leaving this right also to certain members entrusted with it - Dr. Wachsmuth was charged by the Vorstand to answer the enquiry which had just arrived from a Stuttgart member, to the effect that for the present, the existing situation could not be changed, and that the members

should be patient until a final decision would be reached. This seemed to settle the question for the moment.

During a subsequent meeting of the Vorstand, Herr Steffen had to read out another letter, signed by 90 members of Stuttgart, asking that Herr Arenson might be allowed to read the Class-lessons to them. In this connection, they reminded the Vorstand that Dr. Steiner himself had stated that Herr Arenson was suited for such a task. Before discussing this matter, Frau Dr. Steiner mentioned that recently on her journey she had heard that Frau Kolisko had announced that on February 27 she would resume her Class-lessons. All the members of the Vorstand, including Dr. Wegman, expressed their surprise that Frau Kolisko thus placed the Vorstand before an accomplished fact without consulting or

69

advising them beforehand. As Dr. Wegman insisted that in future Classes should only be read by three members of the Vorstand it was agreed that Frau Kolisko and a few others should be told that until further notice - these words were specially emphasized - only the three members of the Vorstand would read the Classes. When she heard this decision of the Vorstand Frau Kolisko protested in a letter very energetically but not quite comprehensibly. She declared that she could not accept the decision of the Vorstand and that she would come to Dornach to defend her standpoint. A meeting of the Vorstand was then held at Dornach, in the presence of Frau Kolisko, but matters were not cleared entirely. But what did come to light, was quite unexpected. It appeared that Frau Kolisko herself had informed Dr. Wegman of her intention; first, orally—already during the Agricultural Conference in January; the second time, by letter - so that she "believed to have acted with Dr. Wegman's consent."

These questions were discussed at the meeting of the General Secretaries of April 25, 1930, and it was proved that Dr. Wegman had received Frau Kolisko's letter even some days before that meeting of the Vorstand at which she had pretended to be so surprised. It also appeared that at Dr. Wegman's instigation, the words "until further notice" had been omitted in the letter of the Vorstand sent to Frau Kolisko and to the other personalities, so that the letter acquired an entirely different meaning. It had, to be sure, been left to Dr. Wegman to add a few kind words to Frau Kolisko's letter, because the Vorstand knew how closely Frau Kolisko felt herself connected with Dr. Wegman. The other members of the Vorstand signed the letters together with the other mail, without re-reading them, because they felt sure that the content was in order.

In reply to the question why she had not mentioned Frau Kolisko's letter during the meeting of the Vorstand, Dr. Wegman replied: (Darüber wurde gar nicht gesprochen! Darin liegt ein Missverständnis. Es tut mir furchtbar leid. Hätte ich gewusst, dass da eine Katastrophe daraus

entstehen könnte, dann hätte ich vielleicht noch andere Dinge gesagt. Ich weiss es nicht.) "This matter was not brought up at all!

70

There must be some misunderstanding. I am terribly sorry. Had I known that a catastrophe would arise, perhaps I might then have mentioned quite other things too. I do not know." She also claimed that Frau Kolisko's letter had not been addressed to her in her capacity of member of the Vorstand and Recorder. ("Dieser Brief hatte für mich keine Realität".) "This letter had no reality for me." Not the announcement, but the accomplished fact, mattered most to her. ("Ich war ganz erstaunt von dieser fertigen Tatsache. Es ist gar nicht die Ankündigung, es ist die fertige Tatsache, von der ich überrascht war.") "I was quite surprised at this accomplished fact. It was not in the least the announcement, but the accomplished fact which surprised me."- But the accomplished fact consisted precisely in the announcement. This contraction was just as incomprehensible as the opinion which she also expressed on that occasion, namely "that Frau Kolisko had unquestionably the right to hold Class-lessons ", in spite of her having annulled that right by omitting the words "until further notice". She justified the cancellation of these words by saying: („Es war bei mir die ganze Sache eigentlich die, dass ich nicht gern einging auf die Erweiterungen der Klasse. Ich wollte eigentlich die Klasse wieder einschränken für den Vorstand. Und so war auch meine Meinung, dass die Briefe, die an die verschiedenen gingen, die Klassenstunden hielten, also an Kolisko, Graf Polzer und Collison, so gefasst werden, dass das tatsächlich zum Ausdruck kam, und dass man eigentlich, weil man (!) gegen die Erweiterung war, die Menschen also bitten möchte, die Klasse nicht mehr zu halten und die Klasse wieder zurückzugeben an die Vorstandsmitglieder. Und das wollte ich zum Ausdruck gebracht haben".) "The whole question amounted to this - I did not gladly consent to the extension of the Classes. I really meant to limit the Classes again to the Vorstand. And so I was of the opinion that the letters sent out to those who held Class lessons, namely to Kolisko, Count Polzer and Collison, were to be worded so as to express that, because one objected to the extension, one (!) thought it desirable to ask these people not to hold the Classes any more and to return the Classes to the members of the Vorstand. And this is what I wanted to bring to expression." Finally she said: („Jetzt liegt die Tatsache so, dass man denkt von mir, das wäre

71

böse Absicht von mir ...") "Now things have this appearance, that it was bad intention on my part....."

Herr Steffen: "I have not reproached you with this."

Frau Dr. Steiner: "It may have been an oversight. In any case it is fatal."

Matters remained at this, and Herr Steffen went so far as to simply break off the next General Meeting, when he was asked to explain Dr. Wegman's attitude in this connection.

These things had to be explained more fully, because they contain the reason why the meetings of the Vorstand now became so impossible and devoid of sense. Frau Dr. Steiner said at the meeting of the General Secretaries: "And this is just exactly where our misfortune lies--that we have no firm ground under our feet when we discuss important matters, for the facts lie somewhere else, and we only get to know them afterwards. This is our problem and our tragedy and enough to make us despair."

A way out was found for the time being. Dr. Wachsmuth discussed the current business at several meetings with Herr Steffen, with Frau Dr. Steiner, with Dr. Wegman and with Dr. Vreede. This arrangement was reluctantly made, and after Frau Dr. Steiner - who did not wish to burden Herr Steffen with single interviews - had declared in a letter that she would again take part at meetings of the Vorstand, provided an honest basis for an understanding would be reached. But as this understanding could not be reached, these numerous single meetings were tried¹¹. When several members of the Vorstand were often absent simultaneously on journeys and when the summer months came along with their increased work connected with the Summer Conferences, this arrangement could hardly be maintained, and then matters were settled either by letter or by telephone. Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede were not the only two members in the Vorstand who were consulted in this way. On every occasion - and we shall return to this matter - members of the Vorstand were consulted, and it is really out of the question that someone had been "ignored in important matters."

72

These facts brought about a situation which could only have been improved by an honest straightforward judgment. There was little inclination, however, for this. Everything was to be hushed up and kept secret from the members as far as possible. Particularly Dr. Vreede and Dr. Zeylmans protested against things which they had provoked, but for which they made Herr Steffen responsible. Such things were above all the Conferences at Dornach and in Holland.

In the summer 1930 a great Youth Conference, the so-called "Kamp de Stakenberg", took place in Holland. It had been planned from the very beginning as an international, "world-wide" enterprise, and lectures were held in German, English and Dutch. The Anthroposophical Society in Holland, i. e. its Executive, had organised it, and Dr. Zeylmans was the "Camp-leader". At the

¹¹ This induced Dr. Vreede to accuse Herr Steffen of causing a "clique" within the Vorstand. (This letter is published below.)

beginning of the year, Herr Steffen had been informed of these plans, but he had left everything to Dr. Zeylmans. A great discontent arose, however, when the propaganda material, which had already been printed and circulated widely, became known also in the Society. The loud way in which propaganda was made for Anthroposophy in a Camp Journal, was felt by many members as an offence against the dignity of the Anthroposophical Society. The course of the Conference confirmed the fears which had arisen. Dr. Stein was the chief lecturer; Dr. Zeylmans, Dr. Kolisko, Mr. Kaufmann, represented Anthroposophy in their own way. From the very beginning the whole thing had decidedly a party-character. It all seemed like a repetition of the World School Union and of the World Conference.

Dr. Wachsmuth's presence prevented the worst. Besides polemical questions due to the strange lectures of Dr. W. J. Stein, the following chief difficulty arose: The Camp Journal was to be transformed into a great international periodical for young people. When Dr. Wachsmuth requested that this should not be done without first consulting the Vorstand in Dornach, and asking its permission, Dr. Stein replied: "We already have our paper and it already has its name." Once again one was to be placed before an accomplished fact.

All these facts and their background, so well known to Dr. Zeylmans, were nevertheless completely ignored by him when soon afterwards he began to complain about the situation of the Society. At the

73

same time, Dr. Vreede protested against a new attempt made by Herr Steffen to improve the Conferences at Dornach. All this gave rise to exchange of correspondence, which clearly characterises the various standpoints. Although these letters were already published once, in 1920 they are again reproduced below. (The reader can, without losing the connection of the whole, study the letters later on.)

74

LETTER FROM DR. VREEDE TO THE GENERAL SECRETARIES AND EXECUTIVES.

Dornach, October 29, 1930.

To the General Secretaries and Executives of the Anthroposophical Societies in various countries:

I regret to say, it is my duty to bring to your knowledge the following matter which is in connection with the approaching Christmas-Conference. In doing so, I must first go back for a moment to the last Michaelmas-Conference.

Already this Michaelmas-Conference - not to mention others which preceded it - came about under unusual circumstances, some of which may be surmised by reading the programme printed in the "Mitteilungsblatt " of September 7. Further particulars may be derived from the following correspondence.

On the afternoon of August 28, I received a letter from the Secretariat, as follows. On the envelope was added: "Very urgent":

August 28, 1930.

Dear Dr. Wegman, Dear Dr. Vreede,

Since the programme of the Michaelmas-Conference must not fail to appear in this Sunday's "Mitteilungsblatt ", and since - owing to the absence of Frau Dr. Steiner and the continuous lectures and performances now going on it will be impossible to hold another meeting of the Vorstand before next week, we should like to request that you inform us immediately concerning any suggestions you may wish to make as to lectures for the Michaelmas-Conference, in order that we may arrange the programme accordingly.

Frau Dr. Steiner has informed us that she will give two of the Mystery-Plays; and in addition to these there will be the usual two Eurythmy-programmes and the Saturday evening performances, as well as the Class-Lessons. Furthermore, the following persons have decided, out of their work in common to arrange for the treatment of one theme from several points of view. More exact details are given with the enclosed plan for the programme; as you will note, the free hours available for lectures are marked with a cross. Thus, there are still two free days offering 4 to 5 hours for lectures, and we should therefore like to ask you to specify at once-because of our limited time-the 4 or 5 lecturers which you may like to propose.

I should be most grateful if you could possibly let me have these names by this evening, since I shall probably have to telegraph the speakers in question what their exact subjects are to be, in order to receive a definite answer from them, and thus have the necessary information for the "Mitteilungsblatt" before the end of the week.

On behalf of the Vorstand at the Goetheanum, with cordial greetings,

signed: Dr. Guenther Wachsmuth.

The plan for the programme referred to above was, for the most part, identical with the one which has been printed in the "Mitteilungsblatt" of September 7; but, of course, it included as yet no mention of either my own lecture, nor of those assigned for October 4. Moreover, there still appeared on this schedule - for October 5 - a lecture by Prof. Dr. Eymann, which was later replaced on the printed programme by the "Reading of a lecture from Rudolf Steiner". Prof. Eymann's name, however, is still included in the "Mitteilungsblatt" of September 7, among the signatures of those gentlemen who - as stated in the fore

75

going letter - "have decided " at the coming Michaelmas-Conference to arrange for the treatment of one theme from several points of view". Prof. Dr. Eymann, a personality who deserves to be highly valued for his support of the cause of Anthroposophy, is still - as far as I know - not a member of the Anthroposophical Society.

In response to the above letter, I replied as follows on the following day-after having been asked twice by the Secretariat when my reply might be expected :

August 29, 1930.

Herr Albert Steffen,

President of the General Anthroposophical Society.

Dear Herr Steffen:

Yesterday I received, with "Very urgent" on the envelope, a letter from the Secretariat, the content of which I assume - is already known to you. This letter is addressed to Dr. Wegman and myself, although its content is a matter which concerns the whole Vorstand. I have often, of late, expressed my determination not to agree to any division of the Vorstand and I am, therefore, unable to accept a letter drawn up in the style of this one, since - if I did so it would practically amount to my approval of such a division. Were I to agree to the carrying out of what is asked of me in this letter, I should have had to hold a special meeting together with Dr. Wegman, in order that we might divide between us the four or five speakers allotted to us. I decline to agree to such a procedure, since my agreement would mean the supporting-against my will- of a "clique-formation" within the Vorstand¹².

12 This refers to the above-mentioned difficulties. See page 72.

The concept of a programme for the Michaelmas-Conference, enclosed in Dr. Wachsmuth's letter, indicates clearly that thorough preparations for the programme have already been made. There is, at the same time, no justification to be found for such discussions between the eight gentlemen in question, together with yourself and Dr. Wachsmuth, which would not also include the other members of the Vorstand. As far as I myself am concerned, I can always find the time to attend Vorstand-Meetings including those in which others of our members might take part. I believe that much good would result, especially for the Conferences, from the cooperation of a group of lecturers united on a strictly neutral basis; and that, if such a Group or Groups were then to come together for discussions with the Vorstand, this could have only a beneficial effect. It is precisely because of this conviction that I regret so much the fact that the rough draft of the programme now under consideration was not worked out in this way.

In this connection, I must once again remind you that, as far as the meetings of the Vorstand are concerned, our rules of procedure¹³ are unfortunately not being observed. The absence of one, or even of two members of the Vorstand offers no sufficient ground for not holding its usual meetings. As far as the Michaelmas-Conference is concerned, it will be necessary, in spite of everything, to hold such a meeting and I herewith request that you either call one yourself, or see to it that this is done.

Respectfully yours,

signed: E. Vreede, Ph. D.

P.S. A carbon copy of this letter is being sent to each member of the Vorstand.

76

To the above, Herr Steffen replied as follows:-

Dear Fräulein Vreede:

I have once more read through the letter addressed to yourself and Dr. Wegman, a copy of which was sent to me by Dr. Wachsmuth, and still find it - as I did at the first reading - in complete agreement with our rules.

The programme itself must be ready for the "Mitteilungsblatt " by Sunday evening. A meeting of the Vorstand was out of the question during these days. Frau Dr. Steiner left on a

¹³ Accepted by the Vorstand in January 1930. They contemplated: "Meetings of the Vorstand take place once a fortnight ". At the General Meeting 1934, Dr. Vreede declared that she had never accepted these rules. But Dr. Wachsmuth then mentioned that the rules already contemplated that in decisions three votes sufficed. In reality, not these rules, but the situation itself mattered most. Dr. Vreede alone referred to these rules, and only if they suited her, and again, when they did not suit her, she denied them.

journey and Dr. Wachsmuth is even more than usually burdened with the duties accompanying the daily schedule of the Conference still going on. Also for me such a meeting would have been very difficult to attend. I can readily believe that you yourself, as you say, would always find the time for this; but in any case, the other three persons referred to did not.

You state in your letter that Dr. Wachsmuth's rough draft of the Conference-programme "*indicates clearly that thorough preparations for the programme have already been made*". This is not the truth. I have discussed the matter neither with Frau Dr. Steiner, nor with Dr. Wachsmuth. Shortly before her departure, Frau Dr. Steiner was asked by telephone concerning the artistic performances. The rough draft of the programme was then forwarded to her. She had known nothing whatever about the decision of the gentlemen in question "*to arrange for the treatment of one theme from several points of view*". This decision was made, for the first time, on the evening of August 27, after a performance at which Goethe's "Märchen" was recited. It is an excellent decision and the way in which the members of the Vorstand have been informed of it is in every way correct. One should really be grateful for it.

Our attempt to arrange for a united plan of work gives you the occasion to speak of a division of the Vorstand. With us, there has been no mention of such a thing. This problem does not belong here at all. And I must call your attention to the fact that with such expressions you are making use of a weapon that is not permissible.

It almost seems as if you wished, once more, to try to shipwreck a necessary piece of work. This surprises me all the more, because I hoped that you had come to see how disastrous your attempt had already proved two years ago when you attempted to destroy my efforts to bring new life into the lecture-activities of the Goetheanum.

Let us hope that in the future, your critical sense will be directed against what is harmful within the Society, and not against what is good!

With anthroposophical greetings,

signed: Albert Steffen.

August 30, 1930.

On the following day, Dr. Wachsmuth asked me whom I wished to propose in the way of speakers at the Conference. I replied that I had no suggestions to make, except that I myself wished to give a lecture. How Dr. Wachsmuth would place this lecture in the programme, I left to him, as I always do. When the "Mitteilungsblatt" appeared, I noted that my lecture and those which had been arranged at Dr. Wegman's suggestion were separated conspicuously from the frame-work of the other lectures.

On the definite Michaelmas-programme, provision was made for an open discussion-hour on

Thursday, October 2, to follow the series of lectures indicated with a cross.

77

This hour began with a rather long introductory speech by Herr Steffen- the which, I regret to say, I do not possess. It was so worded as to make the distinct impression that the Conference in reality included only those lectures held by the newly formed "Group of Workers ", and the artistic performances of which he also made special mention. The other lectures - my own, held on Saturday, September 17, which was of a purely anthroposophical nature and which I continued with a second one on Sunday, and the medical lectures of October 4 - were all passed over in complete silence. A similar echo of the Conference may be found in the "Mitteilungsblatt" of October 12. On October 9, I myself left first for Stuttgart, and then for Munich, whence I wrote, on October 16, the following letter:

Munich, October 16, 1930.

Dear Herr Steffen:

May I ask you to please print the enclosed announcement for the MathematicalAstronomical Section in the "Mitteilungsblatt".

Since I now expect to be away until about October 27 - it is my intention to attend the Conference on Nutrition in Berlin and probably also the opening of the new Headquarters in Hamburg - I should like at this early date to request that you make no decisions in advance in connection with the Christmas-Conference, in order that the situation which arose at Michaelmas may not repeat itself.

Respectfully yours,

signed: E. Vreede, Ph. D.

In Hamburg, I learned from Dr. Poppelbaum that he had been requested, as he said by the "Vorstand" - in a letter dated October 11 - to deliver a lecture at the Christmas Conference, that the general subject for this Conference had already been given by Herr Steffen, and that the idea was to extend this "Group of Workers" at the Goetheanum - the formation of which had been so warmly welcomed by the members, etc. The letter here referred to was from the Secretariat at the Goetheanum, signed by Dr. Wachsmuth, without the customary addition, "for the Vorstand at the Goetheanum". (I have given the substance of this letter from memory - the letter itself, I have not with me.)

Now I must assume that similar requests to lecture at the Christmas-Conference have been

sent to other members of the Society and that these other persons are likewise under the impression, perhaps, that the invitation has come to them from the Vorstand. From the foregoing, it is clear that this is not the case. The situation, therefore, is this: that the approaching Christmas-Conference - which signifies the first seven-year anniversary of the 1923 Christmas-Meeting conducted by Dr. Steiner - is being arranged by a part of the Vorstand, in conjunction with certain other members who represent, moreover, only one part of the Sections and of the membership that lectures at the Goetheanum.

Hence, no other way now remains open to me - since things have come to this stage - than to turn to the General Secretaries and the Executives of the affiliated Societies (including the Executive of the "Free Anthroposophical Society") who, as Functionaries of the General Anthroposophical Society, have been designated by Dr. Steiner himself, in a certain sense as an "extended Vorstand ". I trust that these same Functionaries will express to the Vorstand their opinion concerning these matters, at the first possible opportunity.

With anthroposophical greetings,

signed : E. Vreede, Ph. D.

78

LETTER FROM HERR DR. WACHSMUTH TO THE GENERAL SECRETARIES AND THE VORSTAND.

Dornach, October 30, 1930.

To the General Secretaries and the Committees of the affiliated Societies:

The letter of October 29, addressed by Dr. Vreede to the General Secretaries and the Committees of the affiliated Societies, gives in certain important points an incorrect picture of the facts therein described, and therefore needs rectification. In this connection, it must be pointed out that members of the Vorstand, as well as other members of the Society have for a long time past, felt a certain dissatisfaction because, up till now, the programmes of the Conferences could be planned only as follows: each member of the Vorstand proposed certain speakers acceptable to himself and the programme was then worked out - leading inevitably to a more or less disconnected "mosaic" as the final product. Consequently, the value of many of the Conferences in Dornach - which, nevertheless, were very beautiful - lay in single performances and lectures, and a unified continuity of theme was often lacking. As already known to many, Herr Steffen attempted some time ago to give a more unified form to our lecture-activities, through an appeal to the speakers and giving a certain theme to be worked out, which plan failed, as is well known, because of Dr. Vreede's opposition. Certain persons among those most active as lecturers at the Conference, and representing the most varied spheres of work-who felt deeply the need for an

improvement of this situation, and at the same time preferred, instead of constantly complaining about things, to find some way to positive and profitable work-these came together in August 1930, in a free, unconstrained manner, and in consideration of the approaching Michaelmas-Conference, to discuss this whole matter. The persons who did this acted in complete freedom from any sort of subaltern or "cliquy " " taking of sides ", or the like-simply as free people, active in their most varied lines of work and living permanently in Dornach. As we have stated above, their deepest concern was for a better way of working out the Conference programmes; and they were convinced that such a problem could be solved neither by lamentation nor negotiation, nor through petty formalities, but only by positive work-and that a concrete beginning should be made.

It was therefore resolved:

1. To ask Herr Steffen for a general theme for the lectures. The speakers should then mutually inform one another, in free discussion, as to how each wished to approach the subject for himself - so that in this way they could supplement and help one another as much as possible, and enable the members and visitors at the Conference to realise the benefits of such work.

2. The greatest care was taken to avoid everything that could in any way interfere with the freedom of other persons, or that was in any way negative, or that might tend to leave out other members. The members of the Vorstand were requested, as usual, to propose speakers and at once the names and themes of the lecturers of this group were sent to all the members of the Vorstand. Thus, on all sides, there was complete freedom to propose speakers, to suggest subjects for lectures, etc. In the name of all the members of the Vorstand this plan was given out and announced; thus the entire Conference including the lecturers of the group in question, and all other lecturers was convened and accepted by the whole Vorstand. In this way, every detail was carried out correctly and objectively. The rights and the duties of both the Vorstand and the lecturers -

79

and above all, in each case, personal freedom and the possibility for accomplishment - were absolutely respected. On the part of this particular group, there was not one thing done during the entire Conference that was negative, exclusive, polemical, or in any way a hindrance to the freedom of others. Any one who attributes other motives to us does this out of his own "thought-world", not out of ours.

Why should not some of the speakers arrange to talk on a common theme, at the Conference of a School? And others together, on another one? By which plan there could always be changes made in the grouping of the lecturers. Must all the speakers in each case, treat of

many different subjects; or, on the contrary, must all of them follow the same theme? Is it really possible to expect this of them? Is it not a great step forward, if we can have an arrangement of several working groups and their themes, instead of subjects strung together without plan or system? The group which made a beginning of this - a beginning which, after all, one might well recognise and which did receive the recognition of a large number of those who attended the lectures was happy in the consciousness that such an impulse as this had no limit in its variability and its possibilities of development. This initiatory group had planned to suggest for the coming Christmas-Conference, the cooperation of speakers from other places, who would be ready, of their own free will, to have Herr Steffen give them their subjects. (See letter to Dr. Poppelbaum, etc.) It was intended that this plan should then be put before the Vorstand in the customary way and finally be incorporated in the Conference programme. Herr Steffen-at the meeting of the Vorstand called to decide the matter-proposed a beautiful theme directly connected with the subject of the Christmas Meeting of seven years ago; indeed, he expressly emphasized that this suggestion was offered to all the speakers recommended by the Vorstand for the ChristmasConference. Thus it comes about that certain people are asked if they perhaps would be in a position, and willing, to speak on a certain subject. This plan is laid before the Vorstand, whereby each of its members is free to add other suggestions, etc., and the final decision rests in its own hands. Is this not permissible? Could one possibly act in a more correct and neutral way? Is there anywhere in the world a responsible person or group of persons who would not have both the right and the duty - if called upon to make concrete suggestions for the planning of a concrete piece of work-to first call together those who are to take part in the work, for informal discussion and deliberation? Are the members of the Vorstand, and leaders of Sections, as well as the General Secretaries and members of the Executives of the affiliated Societies, etc.- i.e. all those who are responsible persons in their own particular spheres-never again to have the right, before they attend a meeting called to discuss certain concrete questions, to converse beforehand with those whose cooperation they have asked, and to inform them? These are, indeed, important questions! Is not the initiative which leads to thorough preparation for such discussions something that we may welcome, if we are really objective in our judgment? Especially, if all possibilities for development, for changes, and for decisions, are at the same time left absolutely open? If the simple fact that a group of free persons comes together to do a common work for the good of the cause is to be represented as negative and exclusive, then every working-group in our Society, to which all the approximately 17,000 members cannot in each case belong, would have to be included under this characterisation-a situation which, of course, would be perfectly absurd, and would render entirely impossible all useful and specialised work. The same objection could also, in that case, be raised against all those occasions when-already at earlier Conferences-certain days were devoted to the specialised lectures of the individual Sections.

Negation, exclusion, and violation of freedom were, indeed, not to be found in the efforts of this group-whose work was beneficial to the Conference but rather in those

80

quarters where it was desired that the helpful work of this group should be hindered. This group - which has never looked upon itself as something final or unchangeable, but desired only through its initiative to give a much-needed impulse has permitted everyone, throughout, all possible freedom of speech. It has the right to expect, therefore, that its own freedom shall be respected in like manner.

Still another point mentioned by Dr. Vreede in her letter, is the brief period of time allowed for the working-out of the Conference programme. Any such reproach, in this connection, can really be directed only to those persons who either had not occupied themselves at all with this task, or at least had not done so ahead of time and who were not themselves, therefore, the ones to have come forward with positive suggestions. In this case, as in many others, the letter from Dr. Wachsmuth, which Dr. Vreede quotes, signifies nothing more nor less than an urgent warning that it is high time that these matters should be regulated. It would be strange, indeed, if those same persons who missed the right moment to exercise a certain initiative were then to turn round and protest against others who took advantage of it. And this, moreover, even when consideration was everywhere shown for all persons who made their wishes known and their wishes in each case were carried out.

Dr. Vreede, in her whole manner of procedure, shows that she has fallen prey to a fundamental misunderstanding. She acts as if she thought it possible to achieve cooperative work between given persons by means of formal measures, negation, or statutory regulations. To attempt this would be hopeless and would mean the failure to understand spiritual and human realities and most certainly it would not be in accordance with the Christmas Meeting so often referred to. There are those, moreover, who perhaps consider another road than Dr. Vreede's as the better one. These persons also love and revere the memory of the Christmas Meeting, with its spiritual impulses; they believe, for example, that the position and profitable work carried on by this group of lecturers is at least as true to the spirit of the Christmas Meeting 1923, as many a formal exposition and storm of documents. Nothing lay further from our intentions - nor does it do so now - than to rob Dr. Vreede of her full freedom in her own sphere of work. Indeed, such freedom never was in any way disturbed - this can be proved, if necessary. Let us hope that Dr. Vreede, in her turn, will leave untouched - in accordance with the principles of Rudolf Steiner and our Society - our freedom for positive work, even when sometimes the "how" of her interpretation may differ from ours. It surely ought to be possible to carry on whatever work is for the good of

our movement, in an impersonal way, without nervousness, and with mutual respect for every truly good achievement - whose ever it may be. It would thus be possible, in the future, in spite of all these apparently necessary birth-pains, to achieve much that is worthy and beautiful and to do it better and better.

With anthroposophical greetings,

signed: Dr. Guenther Wachsmuth.

LETTER FROM DR. ZEYLMANS TO THE DORNACH VORSTAND.

The Hague, October 22, 1930.

To the Vorstand:

After long consideration and with a heavy heart, I find myself compelled to address certain questions to you. The answer to these questions will be of decisive importance for my own further activity within the Society.

81

Many things that have happened - especially just recently - make it impossible for me to understand clearly in which direction or according to which principles the General Anthroposophical Society is being led. It has therefore also been impossible for me to understand how certain things done by the Vorstand in Dornach relate themselves to what was founded and planned by Dr. Rudolf Steiner with the Christmas Meeting of 1923/24. As you all know, I have a very special twofold connection with that Meeting. First, as General Secretary of the Society in Holland and secondly, as a physician who stands in close connection with the Medical Section. On repeated occasions, of late, I have been unable to understand the relation of the Dornach Vorstand - and especially that of the President - either to the affiliated Societies or to the Sections.

I know that I am not alone as regards these problems. A number of leading personalities in the different affiliated Societies are likewise most seriously concerned because of this lack of clarity.

I shall endeavour to make clear, by way of certain examples, just what I mean by this. In this connection, however, I must expressly emphasize the fact that, to me, it is not the examples as such that are of importance, but only what I am compelled, as I believe, to gather from them.

The first example has to do with the relation to the Anthroposophical Society in Holland. In this connection, certain things have happened - particularly those which had to do with the de Stakenberg Camp - which must give me the impression, when I try to interpret them as correctly

as possible, that the Executive of the Anthroposophical Society in Holland and especially I myself as General Secretary, have not been taken with due seriousness in all matters.

I hope that I am mistaken in this. But if I am mistaken, it should also then be possible to explain to me the following matters.

Somewhere about February, 1930, I wrote to the Vorstand in Dornach (through Dr. Wachsmuth) that the Committee in Holland had decided to take advantage of the initiative of Herr Grelinger. The Committee itself, it was decided, should organize and conduct the Camp. I was to function as Camp-Leader. An invitation to all the members of the Vorstand in Dornach, to attend the Camp, was also sent out. I received no reply to this letter of information and invitation, although one question included in that same letter was, in fact, replied to by Dr. Wachsmuth.

At the General Meeting which took place shortly thereafter, it came out that this letter had never been really discussed in the Vorstand - or, at least, only very hurriedly. Herr Steffen and Frau Dr. Steiner knew nothing about the letter; Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede remembered it only in a vague way.

This detail alone would have afforded me no reason to continue the correspondence further, had not Herr Steffen stated - at that same General Meeting - in speaking about the Camp, that the fact that Dr. Wachsmuth was to attend it, was for him at least a guarantee for its "niveau". And, since there was a rather lengthy discussion on this point of the "niveau", Herr Steffen's statement had an important bearing on it. Thus, I was obliged to hear stated by Herr Steffen, that the fact that the Dutch Executive, and I as general leader, were backing the Camp, would offer to Herr Steffen no guarantee, or in any case too slight a guarantee, for the "niveau" of this Camp. (If I mention this here, I do so only because I have since overcome whatever pain was caused by the offence contained in such a statement. I am not induced to do this because of any personal feelings whatsoever.)

When I myself then reported to Herr Steffen in August on how the Camp had fared, he said approximately: "*he had received a favourable report from Dr. Wachsmuth also*"; and he added: "*one need have no concern as to the Camp*".

In spite of this fact, not one of the five reports, nor the various newspaper-notices (with the heading: "Occurrences in the Anthroposophical Society ") concerning a great public Youth-Conference arranged and organized by the Committee of the Anthroposophical Society in Holland, was accepted for publication.

Now there will probably be all kinds of explanations to meet what I have cited here. These

explanations will, however, have to be very substantial indeed before they can eradicate the impression that the Leadership of the Anthroposophical Society in Holland was treated in this case in a way that it cannot possibly put up with any longer.

Furthermore, it will also be my duty - in case I receive an unsatisfactory reply - to draw my own conclusions.

I certainly hope with my whole heart that it will be possible so to explain the facts here mentioned, that I shall be able to understand and acknowledge the motives which guided them.

For after all it is more a question of motives. Not of any single details. I could go on and cite a number of other similar examples from earlier years. I do not see any use in doing this, however. I think it quite possible, for instance, that when he determines things our President follows a point of view which would be difficult for me to understand. In that case I must really ask for help.

The second example concerns the meetings of the General Secretaries and the different Executives.

It was once arranged that these should take place four times a year. Our last meeting of this kind was held last Easter; the one before that, at the preceding Michaelmas. Why this? And why is no announcement made beforehand, when these Meetings cannot take place? Why does one hear about this only by chance? Perhaps the members of the Vorstand at Dornach are of the opinion that such meetings are superfluous. Or perhaps that still other persons in greater number should be present.

Herr Steffen, in fact, proposed the names of certain members at our last meeting, offering the argument that there was too small a representation from Dornach. There were several who spoke against this argument, since they believed that, if the whole character of this assembly was to be changed, the matter should first be thoroughly discussed. I for my part am still of this opinion.

It is quite possible that these Meetings will have to be radically changed. Perhaps it is necessary that quite other persons should be added to the number. Indeed I myself have often thought about this. In that case, however, the question would first have to come up for some kind of a discussion. One surely cannot, after supposing that one belonged to a certain given group, be called upon suddenly to face the fact that, after all, one belongs to an entirely different group. Either it must be a meeting of the General Secretaries and Executives of the affiliated Societies, together with the Vorstand at Dornach in the sense of an "extended Vorstand" as Dr. Steiner once said - or it is something else. I shall gladly welcome this "something else"; only, I must first be in a position to know just what it is¹⁴.

14 See page 66 and 68.

The third example refers to the relation of the President and the Sections, as evident during the last Michaelmas Conference at Dornach.

You will remember how zealous I was at the meeting of the General Secretaries, at Michaelmas 1920, to help to bring about a different method for planning the Conference, and how very strongly I expressed myself at that time against "mosaic-like" programmes. For this very reason I must necessarily be among those who welcome with the greatest pleasure Conferences which have a more uniform character.

83

The programme of that Michaelmas Conference left nevertheless a very painful impression upon me. And this impression became still worse through the manner in which Herr Steffen spoke to us in the evening. On that occasion, he explained at length what the newly-formed Working-Group intended to do and had done; yet he did not say one word about what had just gone before (Dr. Vreede's lecture), nor about what was to follow (from the Medical Section).

For the very reason that Herr Steffen is the President of the Society, such a thing coming from him amounted to the exclusion of the others from what was looked upon as the real Michaelmas Conference.

I delivered my own lecture only because I considered myself under an obligation to the members who composed my audience to do so.

Here, again, I must leave open the possibility that I simply do not understand Herr Steffen's guiding views. He spoke, for instance, of the fact that it was a striving after freedom which led to the formation of this group of speakers. If this is so, it seems very strange that one who has tried for years to be truly free within the Society, should be compelled, because of this, to feel himself excluded.

There must be something wrong somewhere in regard to freedom. As far as the arrangement for this Conference was concerned, the really prominent group of speakers was represented by one of the Sections (Dr. Wachsmuth with his colleagues) and two WorkingGroups. In view of the fact that the President connected himself only with this group of speakers, two of the Sections (Dr. Vreede's and Dr. Wegman's) were left out altogether. Even if the intention is - as I have been informed unofficially to extend this group (certain physicians I understand, are to be added to it), this does not in any way alter these facts. I must still hope most earnestly, that the programme for the Christmas Conference of 1930 will be differently organized. Many members are looking forward to this Christmas 1930 with eager expectation, as a very significant moment. It would be unspeakably sad, were a Conference to take place then, in which a number of the

members would be compelled to consider themselves as excluded. Let us hope that this will not be the case.

In conclusion, I must once more request that you will please not misunderstand this letter. It really is not my intention, to increase still further the difficulties already existing everywhere, but on the contrary, to help to clear them.

There are many in our Society who feel themselves passing through a crisis-many others have a feeling of despair. Not even the most wonderful Conferences, nor the most important positive work, can cover up these facts. But the main thing is that there are a great many members who are extremely unclear as to the Leadership of our Society. Perhaps after all it will not be without significance if the effort is made, just at this particular time, to help the members out of their unclear state of mind.

With the urgent request for a reply to this letter,

I remain

Respectfully yours,

signed: Dr. W. Zeylmans v. Emmichoven.

84

REPLY FROM HERR ALBERT STEFFEN TO DR. ZEYLMANS.

Dornach, October 29, 1930.

Dear Dr. Zeylmans v. Emmichoven:

Your letter to the Vorstand of the General Anthroposophical Society was forwarded to me to Hamburg. Since this letter is addressed - as the letter-heading shows - not to me personally, but to the whole Vorstand, it is not my duty alone, but rather that of all the members of the Vorstand, to reply to it. I shall, accordingly, request that they do so as soon as possible. Since some of them are away on journeys or are about to travel, this will perhaps not be so easy. For this very reason, I should like-as far as possible, to write what I have to say. But the answer from the other members of the Vorstand will none the less be necessary. Indeed, for my part, I must request such answers most urgently. What they say will be of great importance, not only for yourself, but also for me.

Allow me to say first, as a more general reply to your questions, that it has always been my unceasing endeavour to conduct the Society in accordance with the Principles of the Christmas Meeting 1923. As you know, however, this Leadership is not in my hands alone, but belongs to the other members of the Vorstand as well, and that the circumstances which rule the present conditions are extraordinarily complicated. Your questions force me to remind you that they have become so complicated, because immediately after the death of Rudolf Steiner, many things took

place within the Society without my knowledge and against my will and that I was not supported- indeed I was hindered -in carrying out what I was compelled to consider as right (and what I have several times expressed in the clearest terms). I would refer you in this connection to the minutes of the various General Meetings, as also to those of the meetings of the General Secretaries and of the Vorstand-Meeting.

You say, in your letter:- "*On repeated occasions, of late, I have been unable to understand the relation of the Dornach Vorstand--and especially that of the President-to either the affiliated Societies or the sections. I know that I am not alone as regards these problems. A number of leading personalities in the different Societies are likewise most seriously concerned, because of this lack of clarity*".

Although it is the duty of the Vorstand as a whole - to whom your letter is addressed - to instruct you concerning the circumstances you refer to, I must nevertheless call your attention to the fact that I myself have already given expression to this. I would remind you of the time (in the spring of 1928) when I took over the general responsibility, in order to bring a united direction into the leadership of the Society; then at Michaelmas 1928 when I was preparing in this sense for the opening of the new Goetheanum and wished to arrange the Conference, I was prevented from doing so by Dr. Vreede, and consequently was compelled, to my very great sorrow, to lay down again such responsibility, and to hand it over to the separate Sections.

" The relationship of the Dornach Vorstand - and especially that of the President - to the affiliated Societies", has never been questioned by me. I should like, however, to know what the reproaches are which have been raised against me in this connection and I must request you therefore, to name these "*leading personalities in the different Societies*", so that I may know with whom I have to deal. Perhaps I can bring forward something which, in the behaviour of such personalities toward the Dornach Vorstand and especially toward the President, seems to me to need an explanation.

The first example cited by you, refers to the Stakenberg Camp. Here I can reply as editor of the "Mitteilungsblatt", independently of the Vorstand. When Herr Grelinger came to see me last Christmas about this matter, I asked him at once whether he was already

in touch with the Dutch Society and with yourself. He answered "yes" and with this matter was settled for me. Nor did I raise any objection whatever to holding the Camp I had no cause for apprehension until those reproaches met me, which were candidly on the appearance of the Camp-Journal. I myself had not yet read the Journal, when I was requested from all sides - by letter as well as by word - to explain how it could ever be possible that an anthroposophical publication

could be written and propagated in such a way. Its content appeared to some members of the Society to be both superficial and agitative. Now I had known nothing about the starting of this Journal, not to mention the articles printed in it. My attention was called to the fact that as President of the Society I ought at least to be informed of such undertakings. The question was then raised as to whether the Journal would be continued after the close of the Camp. The particular circumstance that you yourself, as Leader of the Camp, had no influence on the compilation of the number in question, would seem to justify a certain caution. Dr. Wachsmuth, as member of the Vorstand of the Anthroposophical Society, was in a position to keep an eye on other Groups which did not belong to the Society in Holland.

It is true that when you reported to me on the arrangements for the Camp, I said to the effect that, '*one need have no concern as to the Camp*'. That is to say, now that it was over. I must admit to you, however, that afterwards I heard many things about it, which I should have been glad to have heard from you in person: for instance, that it was true that the continuation of the Camp-Journal had been proposed and planned - once more, without my knowledge and that Dr. Wachsmuth had opposed the step.

I should like to place the question before you, as to whether or not you feel that such a proposal was an interference in the sphere of work of the President?

As a result of all this, the affair of the Camp has become an affair of the Vorstand. It is to be taken for granted that I submitted the reports about it to the Vorstand - with the exception of certain naive accounts and letters, the publication of which was left entirely to my discretion, and which would have only caused the reader to smile. Later Dr. Röschl withdrew, of her own accord, the reports which she had sent in to me¹⁵. The newspaper notices, although they told of great success, were in fact without substance.

I regretted very much that you yourself, as Camp-Leader, had not sent me an official report - i.e. one written by yourself - which I could have accepted for the "Mitteilungsblatt", without first having to refer it to the Vorstand. (Which I could not do with the reports from Dr. Röschl, Pache, Marti, etc. As I said, I had to submit them to the Vorstand).

The second example you mention concerns the meeting with the General Secretaries and Executives. To this point I would answer that at the last of these meetings the dignity of the President was far too seriously offended to permit me once more to take the initiative of convoking the General Secretaries and the Executives. I am quite ready, of course, to submit the question to the Vorstand at Dornach, as to whether such a meeting should take place at all; and I should also be ready to take part at the meeting. Moreover, I am quite willing that the proposal should come from a member who has attended these up till now. I myself however cannot do it

¹⁵ As turned out later, quite by herself, without waiting for a verdict from the Vorstand.

anymore, for I am convinced that if I did, I should have to reckon with new insults.

At the last meeting I made a certain proposal. This is surely within the rights of the President. My proposal met with opposition and I let it drop. This concluded the matter. I shall not take it up again. So that I proposed something which was subjected to the free decision of the meeting. Each one had the right to express himself. I acted with absolute correctness. For this reason a sentence in your letter such as the following, is completely

86

incomprehensible to me:- "*Surely, after belonging to a certain group, one cannot suddenly face the fact that one belongs to an entirely different group.*"

My suggestion was offered for free discussion, in the presence of all the members of the Vorstand of the General Anthroposophical Society, all the General Secretaries, or their representatives, and the Executives. Indeed, my proposition was accepted by the majority of those present; nevertheless, when I saw that dissension would be the result, I withdrew it again, with the consent of the artists who had been waiting outside for more than an hour. Obviously, it must seem very strange to me when at this late date you censure the President, addressing it to the Vorstand as a whole.

But instead, how appropriate would such censure be when proposals are made in the absence of the President of the General Anthroposophical Society!

The third example: the relation between the President and the Sections, as evident during the Michaelmas Conference at Dornach. I shall be able to give my answer to this only after the other members of the Vorstand of the General Anthroposophical Society have expressed themselves and when I myself have read their statements. This whole matter has its precedents, which must be taken into account. When Dr. Vreede's conduct made it impossible for me to arrange a certain uniformity in the Conferences, I gave over this task - it was the only thing I could do - to the Vorstand as a whole. The Conferences took on, as you yourself say, a mosaic-like character. And they would have kept it, too, had not a group of members - I mean that very group which was active for the first time at Michaelmas 1930 - come together to undertake a joint task. If this had not happened, once more nothing would have been done to work out a unified programme. Three groups - the Natural Scientific, the Cultural-Scientific, and the Social Scientific groups - asked me for a theme. I gave it to them full of a happy confidence, and I found that my hopes had not deceived me. A confident atmosphere ruled for the first time in a long while.

Instead of thanks, follows blame - in spite of the fact that not one single thing was done that was incorrect. No one was interfered with in his freedom. And this, as far as I am concerned, will

not happen in the future. At the same time I shall also know how to preserve my own freedom.

As I said above, as far as this third example is concerned, I have not yet given my final answer.

Very respectfully yours,

signed: Albert Steffen.

A Meeting of the General Secretaries took place on November 29. Various reports were given out from amongst those who were present. The one made by Herr Joseph Geith gives such a good picture of what took place, that it will be repeated. After a most careful comparison with the Minutes, it has proved to be perfectly reliable, as well as sufficiently complete, and is given below, with only a few slight changes and additions.

87

REPORT OF THE MEETING HELD ON NOVEMBER 29. 1930.

by Herr Geith.

10 a. m. Herr Steffen greets the friends present, a hearty welcome to Dornach. He emphasises the fact was called at the request of Dr. Vreede. He mentions that the day fore--that is on November 28, 1930-a preliminary discussion of the General Secretaries took place upon invitation of the German Executive dated November 17, 1930, and issued without his knowledge. On November 25, 1930, five copies of this document containing the information that such a preliminary discussion is to take place, came to the hands of the members of the Vorstand at Dornach, with the request that the Vorstand itself should not take part at this meeting, but should see to it that one of the halls was placed at their disposal. This was the first time that a discussion had taken place at the Goetheanum, to which the Vorstand had not been invited. Furthermore, Herr Steffen himself had received no invitation, in spite of the fact that he is General Secretary for Switzerland. To be sure, a request had been sent to Dr. Grosheintz on November 20, asking him to attend as the representative for Switzerland; but this gentleman had declined the invitation with the statement that not he, but Herr Steffen, was General Secretary for Switzerland.

Herr Steffen protests both as General Secretary for Switzerland and as a man. He asks whether he should conduct this meeting at all-in view of the fact that he no longer receives the proper recognition as President.

Herr Leinhas states that the Vorstand could quite well have been present at this preparatory discussion-nothing was brought up, it could not have heard. The persons who had called the

meeting had wished only to avoid inviting those many other people who usually attended, even though they were not themselves General Secretaries.

Dr Wachsmuth brings out the fact that in any case this was the first time a Meeting had taken place at the Goetheanum, in connection with which his only functions was to see to cleansing of the hall and the placing of the chairs.

88

Herr Leinhas moves that the minutes of this present meeting should remain in the hands of the Vorstand alone. Dr. Kolisko, Dr. Zeylmans, and Dr. Wegman disapprove the fact that the minutes of the last Meeting of the General Secretaries were given out to members, since they had assumed that what was said there would remain within the circle of those present.

Dr. Wachsmuth protests against the characterisation by Dr. Kolisko, of his passing on of the minutes as a "grotesque" act - which has led to "mischief". Dr. Wachsmuth has merely carried out instructions to make the minutes accessible to certain members.

Various ones among the friends present explain that they cannot speak at the meeting as they should like to do, unless they are assured that the minutes of this meeting will not circulate further. Herr Steffen states that he himself claims the right to say to any one else exactly what he says here. Rector Bartsch agrees with this standpoint and proposes that the deciding of this question be postponed till the close of the meeting. His motion is accepted by the majority.

3 p. m. Dr. Lauer states that Dr. Vreede's demand for a definite stand to be taken in connection with recent occurrences, is a symptom of the fact that the Vorstand is no longer able to fulfil its tasks alone, but has to ask the help of the General Secretaries. He proposes a complete reorganisation of the Vorstand.

Herr Steffen protests against this idea that the Vorstand is no longer able to fulfil its tasks, and that, for this reason, it has called together the General Secretaries. It was not he who had turned to the General Secretaries, but Dr. Vreede; she had called them without consulting him. Neither Frau Dr. Steiner nor Dr. Wachsmuth has called them, any more than he. He asks that the subject of the discussion-namely, the letters from Dr. Vreede and Dr. Zeylmans, shall at last be dealt with, since he was attacked in these letters. He emphasises the fact that the letter from Dr. Zeylmans was addressed to the Vorstand, and not to the President. Hence he expects Dr. Wegman also to give her answer - the other members of the Vorstand had already informed him of their replies.

89

Dr. Zeylmans explains that he did not mean to attack Herr Steffen in his letter, but had only asked for explanations, since he himself could not understand various things that had happened.

At the request of Herr Steffen, he read out his own letter. He then states once more that he did not wish to bring any charges against Herr Steffen; he was only thinking of things that were a source of anxiety to the members.

Herr Steffen replies that even if Herr Zeylmans did not consciously wish to attack him, his letter nevertheless actually constitutes such an attack.

Dr. Wegman sees no attack in the letter, but only a statement. She refuses to express herself concerning either the Camp or the Michaelmas Conference.

Herr Geith takes the standpoint that the letter from Dr. Zeylmans assumed the form of an attack, especially because later on he had sent a copy to all the General Secretaries.

Herr Steffen requests that a definite stand be taken as regards his own procedure at Michaelmas.

Herr Geith states that a large part of the German members entirely approved Herr Steffen's procedure and could only welcome joyfully the fact that he had taken up an initiative.

Several of the speakers regret the position taken by Herr Steffen with regard to the Camp-question and also the preparation of the Michaelmas Conference.

Dr. Boos speaks of the thousands of members in Germany who have complete confidence in Herr Steffen.

Dr. Zeylmans replies that there are also thousands who are watching with the greatest concern the way in which Herr Steffen leads the Society.

Herr Gentilli says that the Italian friends look with admiration upon the way in which Herr Steffen lives Anthroposophy. This is what gives them such great confidence in him. He considers it a violation of human honour to encroach upon the freedom of action of such a personality.

The Scandinavian delegates wish unconditioned freedom and independence for Herr Steffen-he should be permitted to choose his own co-workers.

Dr. Vreede states that the President has not only rights, but also duties. The Society has a history. Dr. Steiner himself showed clearly in which way he wished to have things managed. At the present time, entire Societies are being ignored.

Dr. Wegman asserts that Herr Steffen, as President, ought of course to consult the other members of the Vorstand. Can anyone wish to deny two members of the Vorstand the position

which is their due?

Mr. Dunlop compares the Vorstand with the human hand which has precisely five fingers. The President, however, should not be more prominent than the others.

Herr Steffen is of the opinion that the President did, as a matter of fact, hold a prominent position; otherwise there would be no need whatever for a President.

Herr Steffen and Dr. Wachsmuth call upon those taking part at the Meeting to express themselves as to their idea of the position of the President.

Dr. Wegman protests against the eventuality that Herr Steffen should ever be permitted to take over responsibility for the Sections.

Herr Leinhas takes the standpoint that the President ought to take the initiative; but that it is his duty to include the other Vorstand-members in this initiative.

Herr Steffen states that at the time of the opening of the Goetheanum in 1928, he had wished to take the initiative and to organise the lectures, Dr. Vreede had charged him with denial of the Christmas Meeting, violation of free spiritual life, deposition of the Vorstand. These are three objective untruths. At the present time, Dr. Vreede is again attacking him. The Christmas Conference is approaching and nothing yet has been prepared. The consequence of Dr. Vreede's attack is that he cannot speak at Christmas because he has had no time for preparation.

Dr. Wachsmuth proposes that for once at least Herr Steffen should be allowed complete freedom for a certain period of time for six months, perhaps. The more freedom Herr Steffen himself has, the more he will be able to respect the rights of the other members of the Vorstand, and to bestow freedom on others.

91

Rector Bartsch eagerly supports this proposition.

Dr. Kolisko is in favour of unity in the Vorstand. He adopts the view that if the suggestion of the Scandinavian friends is accepted schism would appear in the Society.

Dr. Vreede once more mentions the way in which the Michaelmas Conference has been arranged, and complained that she had been called upon so late to make suggestions for it. When she was questioned about it the programme had been practically arranged.

Dr. Wachsmuth states that he cannot understand why Dr. Vreede had not expressed her wishes before, for she knew perfectly well that for years past, the Michaelmas Conference took place at the end of September. He added that the group of speakers which came forward to take part as a group at this Conference, first came together of its own accord, and only afterwards went

to Herr Steffen with the request that he should give them a subject in common.

As a practical example, Herr Steffen read out the minutes of the Vorstand-Meeting in which the coming Christmas Conference was to be discussed. From the contents of these minutes, it was evident that Herr Steffen made certain suggestions and then asked the other Vorstand members to make their wishes known. Dr. Vreede refused to discuss these suggestions, basing her action on the letter written by her on October 29, 1930. Consequently, Herr Steffen was forced to withdraw his suggestion.

Dr. Boos accuses Dr. Zeylmans that his assertion to the effect that no changes in the structure of the Vorstand were justified, but that the seed sown by Rudolf Steiner at the Christmas Meeting must first be allowed to grow-is a smooth "mask" with hidden motives ("eine glatte Fassade mit Hintergedanken "). Dr. Boos calls Dr. Kolisko an extortioner and deserter, if he keeps on threatening with a cleavage in the Society. For instance, when the course on Curative Eurythmy was published, Dr. Kolisko stated that this was the beginning of such a cleavage. fundamental trouble at the bottom of all the difficulties in the Vorstand has been the robbery of Esotericism committed by Dr. Wegman This too is Anthroposophy, but a negative Anthroposophy which works

92

itself out as destiny and which has now to be transformed through common endeavour into something positive.

Dr. Zeylmans protests against Dr. Boos for his impossible manner of speech. Were he himself leading the Meeting, he would censure Dr. Boos for his expressions.

Dr. Wachsmuth who has taken over the chairmanship at the wish of Herr Steffen censures the manner of speech of Dr. Boos.

Herr Leinhas asks Herr Steffen if he is going to tolerate that persons taking part at this meeting be called "extortioners" and "deserters".

Herr Steffen regrets that he is asked to reprove someone elsewhere as no one has offered a reproof when he himself was attacked and when the honour of the President was violated several times. He declines to accept the form and the expressions used by Dr. Boos, but he cannot reject the content of his words.

Dr. Wegman immediately protests and requests an explanation from Herr Steffen.

Dr. Boos is unwilling to place Herr Steffen in a position of having to call him to order; he therefore withdraws the expressions he used, and uses other expressions.

Also in view of continued urging, Herr Steffen at this point states that after the death of Dr.

Steiner, the "leading thoughts" of Dr. Wegman appeared without his consent. Indeed, in one case, one of the so called "Letters to Members" was sent direct to the printer in Basle, without his having seen it beforehand, although he was the Editor. He added that Dr. Schickler blamed him severely for not having added to Dr. Wegman's "leading thoughts" the words "given out by the Goetheanum"- as was done with the Leading Thoughts of Dr. Steiner.

Dr. Wegman replies that at the Vorstand-Meeting which followed the death of Dr. Steiner, Herr Steffen answered her inquiry as to what he was intending to do, with the words that '*he did not intend to do anything*'. Because of this she felt it to be her duty to try to do something. She only wishes to call attention to some important matters.

Herr Steffen states that one only needs to read his articles written at that time, to know the absurdity of the statement that he did not intend to do anything. But he was of the opinion that the Leading Thoughts of

Dr. Steiner which contain such an immeasurable fulness of spirit more than sufficient. It was his wish to continue editing the "Mitteilungenblatt" in the same form which he had given to it in the first number published after Dr. Steiner's death. He states, moreover, that Dr. Wegman had no right to hold a Class-lesson in Paris at that time. He prefers to give no further reason for this assertion, since - if he did so he could no longer remain in the Vorstand. As he does not wish to give offence to anyone, he prefers to resign. From this time on, he will deliver no more lectures at the Goetheanum, except when he is invited to do so. He will retain the leadership of his own Section and the editorship of the "Goetheanum". And he will be able, even then, to work with all his strength for the Society.

At this point, Herr Steffen is urged by many of the members present - and especially by Dr. Wegman - to express himself more clearly. He declines to do so, since he has withdrawn from the Vorstand precisely in order that he might not be compelled to speak. He assures his friends that they need have no anxiety concerning the Society - he will work for it with all his strength. In spite of this, Herr Steffen is urged more and more to speak - till finally he is compelled to state that Dr. Wegman has failed as an esotericist - that she has not reached a certain stage. She has had no other competence than that of Recorder - whereas in Paris she introduced herself in a different capacity. Dr. Stein and Dr. Kolisko had uttered the worst kind of reproaches against him (Herr Steffen) because he had introduced Dr. Wegman as Recorder and not as Leader of the School. Even when Herr Steffen insists that, if he were to say more, it might oblige him to leave the Society, he is urged to continue his statements. Dr. Wegman now claims that she felt herself to have been invested by Dr. Steiner, as co-leader of the School.

Finally, Herr Steffen states that of course he acknowledges every that Dr. Steiner said about Dr. Wegman - as also the fact to which Dr. Wegman has so often made reference. Since the death of Dr. Steiner, however, the spiritual succession has been lacking, and this is the only succession which he can recognise. This is his personal opinion; he is not forcing it upon anyone else, and he regrets that he has been under pressure to speak. It had not been his wish to do this. Where-

94

upon Herr Steffen is asked by many of the friends present to resume his office as President. He abides nevertheless by his resignation.

Dr. Wachsmuth states that he cannot remain in a Vorstand of which Herr Steffen is not a member. He expresses his fear that Frau Dr. Steiner, who could not be present at this meeting, would probably also wish to withdraw. Out of a deep apprehension he asks Herr Steffen to think about all that might become of the Goetheanum if the Society goes to pieces. He refers especially to the difficult situation in which the Society will be placed in its relation to the public if he maintains his decision to resign.

Herr Leinhas makes Herr Steffen responsible for whatever may happen to the Society if he does not resume the Presidency.

Herr Steffen says that in view of the fact that Herr Leinhas has "*held a pistol to his breast*", he is ready to take over the Presidency again in its official character, in relation to the outside world and the authorities - but only under the condition that he will not be obliged to attend meetings of the Vorstand, nor to organise Conferences, nor conduct meetings.

He adds that it would have been better if he had not again been forced in this way, but unfortunately he sees that once more his assurance that things will go well, even if he is not on the Vorstand, has not met with trust.

Dr. Wachsmuth asks Herr Steffen if he, through anything he has said, has robbed him (Herr Steffen) of his freedom. Herr Steffen replies that this is not the case - that had he been in Dr. Wachsmuth's place he would have said exactly what Dr. Wachsmuth has said. He thanks Dr. Wachsmuth.

At which the meeting is closed.-It is 3 a.m.

*

95

As an example which is in contrast with this report of Mr. Geith we print below the Report of the Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain signed by Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Kaufmann and six others:

REPORT:

The following report is issued for the information of the Members of the Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain by the Executive Council. It is signed by those who attended the meeting on November 29th.

On November 29th, as previously announced in the Weekly News Sheet, the Vorstand met the General Secretaries and Members of the Councils of National Societies and groups of the Anthroposophical Society. The occasion of the meeting was a letter which had been circulated to the Executives of the National Societies by Dr. Vreede, together with Dr. Wachsmuth's reply, and a letter from Dr. Zeylmans as General Secretary of the Dutch National Society to the Vorstand. Dr. Vreede complained in her letter that Herr Steffen and Dr. Wachsmuth had made arrangements for the Michaelmas Conference at the Goetheanum after insufficient consultation with the other Members of the Vorstand. Nor could she approve of the way in which they had begun to arrange the Christmas Conference, which she regarded as of especial importance since it marked the seventh Christmas since the Foundation Meeting. In his reply Dr. Wachsmuth urged that Dr. Vreede was as free as Herr Steffen to make any proposals she wished. Dr. Zeylmans in his letter asked for an explanation of the one sided way in which the Michaelmas Conference had been carried through and expressed his difficulty in understanding the attitude of the President to activities of the Dutch society, particularly in connection with the Stakenberg Camp, of which no report had appeared in the Weekly News of the Society.

A preliminary meeting of the various General Secretaries and Executives, without the Vorstand, was convened for the previous day by Herr Leinhas on behalf of the Executive of the German Society. To this meeting, Herr Steffen, who besides being President of the General Society is Secretary General of the Swiss Anthroposophical Society had not been invited but the invitations had been sent to another leading Member of the who had, however, declined to forward them. The Swiss Society therefore was not represented at this preliminary meeting.

At the meeting with the Vorstand on Saturday, November 29th, it became evident that the issues to be raised were wider than those defined in the letters circulated. The representative of the Societies in Norway, Sweden and Denmark proposed that Herr Steffen should be President of the Society with the fullest powers, the members of the Vorstand remaining merely as heads of their Sections; and it transpired that the main division of the opinion was between those who supported this proposal and those who wished the Vorstand as such to remain the leader of the

Society as indicated by Dr Steiner at the Foundation Meeting at Christmas 1923. The difference of opinion became critical when Dr Roman Boos, in a violent and abusive speech (for which, at the he was called to order by the President) accused Dr. Wegman of having been the principle cause of the dissensions in the Society. In calling Dr Boos's to order, however, the President indicated that he agreed to the substance of Dr Boos remarks and a few minutes later he resigned the Presidency, saying that, if he retained that position, he would be obliged to reveal matters concerning Dr. Wegman about which he would much prefer to keep silence. Herr Steffen was thereupon pressed (especially by the Scandinavian represen-

96

tatives) to accept the leadership of the Society without the Vorstand which they declared was no longer in existence. But he replied repeatedly that the Vorstand would continue to exist in spite of his absence from its meetings.

On being pressed by Dr. Wegman herself and others to reveal the precise nature of his complaints against her, Herr Steffen referred to her continuing the 'Leading Thoughts' after Dr. Steiner's death and to her conduct in regard to the First Class of the School for Spiritual Science in 1925. To this Dr. Wegman replied that she had been entrusted with a special responsibility by Dr. Steiner and moreover that she had shared this responsibility with the Vorstand as a whole.

In the exchange of opinions which ensued, Herr Leinhas and Dr. Wachsmuth warned the members present that it must be disastrous for the Society if no way were found of preventing the division which now seemed imminent. With great earnestness Dr. Wachsmuth placed before the members the picture that has never been absent from the minds of many - the Goetheanum - the needs of the Goetheanum on the physical plane and the liability of the Society for its maintenance. Finally the President said that he would withdraw his resignation but that in future he did not wish to take an active part in the arrangement of Conferences, nor would he attend the Vorstand meetings.

The meeting then concluded with the decision to call a Special General Meeting for all Members of the Society on December 27, 1930.

(In a statement delivered a few days later at a meeting attended by two of the signatories to this Report, Herr Steffen briefly confirmed the decision as to his own future activities which he had taken at the meeting on November 29th.)

Signed by Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Kaufmann and by six others.

Today it is hardly worth while to contradict this report word by word. Nevertheless it is a highly important document, for it proves how responsible leaders can lead astray members who are dependent for information upon such reports, without telling them any direct untruths. One could almost feel ashamed for the English-speaking members, for not being considered sufficiently grown up by these leaders to hear the truth concerning a serious struggle, in which not only important matters were at stake for the Society, but in which human beings went through some of the most shattering experiences of their life. The English members were told instead a nursery tale.

Even two printed pages might contain the essential points; but if more than half of the report is wasted on very correct but long-winded terminologies and formalities, very little room remains for the rest, although the writers might very well have added a few pages had they wished it. What did the English members learn? Dr. Vreede's com-

97

plaints and an incidental remark of Dr. Wachsmuth, which even sounds ridiculous as rendered in the report. Then come Dr Zeylman's complaints, which the English report considers so very justified that it does not even mention the fact that Herr Steffen above all others rejected them. Then comes a curious description - that because Dr. Grosheintz declined, "therefore" the Swiss Society was not represented. A disproportionate importance is given to the attitude adopted by Dr. Boos so courageously opposed - so it is stated - by Mr. Dunlop. (Incidentally: Dr. Boos was called to order "at the instance" of Herr Leinhas. Mr. Dunlop was only one of those who later on protested.) Then comes Herr Steffen's resignation, followed by a description that gives the impression as if the renewal of the "Scandinavian Proposal" was the only important question left to be discussed. But the worst still comes-instead of describing a real earthquake, the report merely states that Herr Steffen resigned because he wished to make a few remarks that sound quite puerile in the way in which they are repeated, and are easily contested by Dr. Wegman, whose reply appears to establish evident and unquestionable facts. - Yet Dr. Wegman had not only spoken of "responsibility", but had claimed for herself a high esoteric rank, and her statement that this responsibility would have been shared with the whole Vorstand, could have been at the most her own personal view. What she claimed were precisely exclusive rights, and her additional remark that she had always advised the Vorstand beforehand, was firmly denied by Herr Steffen. In the English report Herr Leinhas appears without a "pistol", and he appears to share Dr. Wachsmuth's point of view. Then comes a peculiar example of Mr. Kaufmann's sentimental style. Finally Herr Steffen wishes to be left in peace, as if he had expressed wishes but no condition. Two days later, two Englishmen - one of them Mr. Kaufmann - heard Herr Steffen speak at least of a

“decision”. But what they do not hear - curiously enough - is that Herr Steffen read out the minutes of a meeting, proving that Dr Wegman had taken part after all at the important Vorstand-meeting of February 18, although she had stated on November 29, 1930, that this had not been the case. The minutes of this Vorstand meeting also show that the grave accusations of Dr. Vreede, with their disastrous consequences for the Society, were at

98

least due to - if not directly caused by - a mistake made by her. (See page 59 and 60.)

Moreover Herr Steffen read out his answer to Dr. Zeylmans' letter, and said that he merely wished to establish the fact that Dr. Zeylmans had sent out a letter to the General Secretaries without taking into consideration the weighty objections raised in Herr Steffen's reply to this letter, and that Dr. Zeylmans' letter had been used as a foundation for the preliminary meeting on November 28, without even mentioning the existence of Herr Steffen's reply. Then, at the meeting of November 29, Dr. Zeylmans had behaved in such a way that Herr Steffen was obliged to ask him whether he had received his answer at all. And finally Herr Steffen repeated the communication which he had already made to the General Secretaries, which is not devoid of interest in view of later reproaches. Herr Steffen had namely said that during the weeks preceding the General Meeting he would neither speak nor write to anyone concerning Society matters.

It is of course Mr. Kaufmann's own business to have not the slightest interest in Herr Steffen's words or in Herr Steffen's sufferings. May the English members judge themselves whether Herr Kaufmann was right in withholding from them more precise information concerning Herr Steffen's situation, just because he felt that this information was unnecessary. No one could pretend, for instance, that Mr. Kaufmann should report unessential details like the following one:-

The English representatives had succeeded in obtaining that the negotiations at the meeting on November 29 should be translated for them and Mr. Kaufmann was named official translator. He translated excellently. Now Herr Gentilli held his speech, in which he characterised Herr Steffen as a free spirit who also left others free; the Society could not afford to do without him because he was a creative man and also stimulated others to be creative. Mr. Kaufmann refused to translate this speech. Herr Steffen declared that the translation did not matter to him, but that the refusal was nevertheless very strange for an anthroposophist. Then Mr. Kaufmann stated that he would translate after all. Herr Steffen said, however, that perhaps Herr Gentilli's speech had given the impression as if Herr Steffen alone was a free and creative man. Herr

99

Gentilli replied that this was not what he had meant. Herr Steffen insisted, however, that no translation should be made, because the English members were likely to misunderstand after all. Mr. Kaufman was now more eager than ever to translate. Herr Steffen thought it over for a moment, thanked Herr Gentilli for his understanding and then stated that even many of those who were now present had elected him President in December 1926 only "*to meet the requirements of the authorities*", but that he had nevertheless given himself entirely to this office. In spite of this fact, not a single member of the Vorstand had ever been hindered by him in any way. "*If the truth of this statement can be disproved by examples, please mention them.*" Herr Steffen emphasized that he had never wished to be the first, and he reminded the members of the words that "*the first shall be last*". This speech of Herr Steffen was then translated.

When after a while Dr. Vreede began a long accusation against Herr Steffen, Mr. Kaufmann asked if he might translate at once. Later on he spoke again, this time as a speaker, and stated that it was not right to speak of Herr Steffen as being a free and creative man, because this was insulting for Dr. Vreede and the many creative members who could be found everywhere in the Society.

Let the reader bear in mind that all this took place in the autumn of 1930. The same General Secretaries who had taken part at the meeting in April, with the whole tragedy connected with the Class-lessons held by Frau Kolisko and Dr. Vreede who was not too pleased with Dr. Wegman's attitude at that time - all of them were well informed and had perhaps even contributed to the difficulties in connection with the camp. Yet they came back in the autumn as if nothing had happened and of "*insufficient discussion in the Vorstand*", of "*entire Societies which had been ignored*", and similar things. Reality nevertheless broke through this crust of illusions, and a clear situation arose - the con between two irreconcilable mentalities - and this situation grew more and more real in the following years, in spite of all attempts to white wash facts.

How did Herr Steffen judge his situation? His speeches 9 following picture:-

100

First of all letters circulated in the Society, with unjust and partly untrue statements against him. Dr. Vreede appealed to the General Secretaries without even taking into consideration the Vorstand. The functionaries met in the Goetheanum without Herr Steffen and the Vorstand. He was left out although he was the General Secretary of Switzerland, and had no chance of sending his representative. Dr. Zeylmans who was the plaintiff, was even proposed as chairman. Dr. Zeylmans' letter was used as a foundation for the discussion, and the functionaries were not even told that Herr Steffen had raised very serious objections to this letter long before. Then came the

meeting on November 29. Herr Steffen asked in vain, during the whole morning, that the letters and the forthcoming Christmas Conference should be discussed. When this happened at last, new accusations rained in. It was particularly painful for him that it was again emphasized so sharply that the leadership of the Society was not the leadership of the School. Particularly Dr. Kolisko kept on repeating that so many members mistrusted Herr Steffen for this very reason. Herr Steffen's previous attempts to assume the responsibility for everything and to organise the lecture-activity, were characterised as an interference on his part, and were rejected for the future. Herr Steffen read out the minutes of a Vorstand meeting in which Dr. Vreede rejected even the discussion on the forthcoming Christmas Conference. The minutes also stated that the dignity of the President had been attacked. Young people like Pache, Stibbe and Lehrs rebuked him conceitedly. Yet noone ever protested. Finally Herr Steffen himself had to tell Herr Stibbe:

" It is not possible, Herr Stibbe, to hold superficial moral lectures as you do, to men who are - I will mention my age - 45 or 46 years old, and have done something in life, and also have a name. This is not right. This is something which really makes one feel ashamed for you, downright ashamed. Think how matters stood all these years. Have we not given some of our heart's blood, a piece of our own heart? This matter must be dealt with earnestly, not superficially or rudely - even though you have spoken so finely."

Then Mr. Kaufmann refused to translate Herr Gentilli's speech. Then came Dr. Zeylmans and spoke of the anxiety concerning Herr Steffen's conduct of the Society, which he had already expressed in his letter, and he complained that the Dutch Society could not find any real contact

101

with the "whole Vorstand "; for this reason it was also possible that Dutch members who came to Dornach full of enthusiasm, were "poisoned" by certain people - he could state numerous cases - because they received information concerning Society matters which "*made them think that he (Dr. Zeylmans) had always given them an entirely false picture.*" Also Dr. Vreede spoke of Societies that were being ignored, particularly the Dutch Society. Just as if the Dutch members - although they themselves cannot be blamed, but their representatives, Dr. Zeylmans, Herr de Haan and Herr Stibbe - had never ignored the President! As if there had never been a World School Union, never any malicious gossip against Frau Dr. Steiner, no Alexander legend, and no Macedonia on the North Sea !¹⁶ Then Dr. Vreede read out to Herr Steffen a passage in the "Mitteilungsblatt", in order to show that he had written a lie. After renewed attacks on the part of Dr. Zeylmans and Dr. Kolisko who threatened with a split in the Society if Herr Steffen would take into consideration the

16 Herr Stibbe is a co-founder of the World School Union, and was at the same time an vowed by Dr. Zeylmans. See page 30.

"Scandinavian Proposal ", Dr. Boos got up and at first rejected many things very objectively, but gradually he assumed an offensive way of speaking. The meeting would not tolerate this. Dr. Zeylmans, Dr. Kolisko and Dr. Wegman were not to be insulted. Dr. Zeylmans was the first to protest and dared to say: "*The fact remains that many, many things have happened, which again imply that one has been unjust toward Herr Steffen, and perhaps it is a good thing that this matter has come up for discussion. Not all will be pleased at this, but it was perhaps necessary.*" Then came the other protest and Herr Steffen resigned because he did not wish to discuss certain things connected with Dr. Vreede's Bodhisattva-lectures and with the foundation of a Dutch shareholder's company for the Einsingen Factory¹⁷ to which he alluded. His words were twisted round and the situation was turned upside down. He resigned just in order that he need not discuss certain things. Yet this was interpreted as follows: Since he had resigned, he must speak. He defended himself in vain¹⁸ against Dr. Wegman who imputes to him

102

of having spoken of her "guilt " and of having "suspected " her. He did not wish to speak and even said that he would leave the Society. No - Dr. Wegman insisted. Then Herr Steffen spoke about the "leading thoughts" and explained that Dr. Wegman had been accorded the right to read the Class as Recorder of the Vorstand. He could not recognise any other right. Only when Dr. Wegman herself referred to a cross which Dr. Steiner had given to her, and to documents which were supposed to prove her high esoteric position and when she claimed to be recognised as the leader of the School and as Dr. Steiner's successor on the score of such things, then Herr Steffen stated - but not as President, for he had already resigned - that in his opinion there was only a spiritual succession which must be based on deeds. Whatever Dr. Steiner may have said or done with full justification, could be jeopardized if a certain stage was not reached, and Dr. Wegman had failed.

Dr. Wegman replied that no one could judge this - only Dr. Steiner.

The irreconcilable standpoints now became evident: free judgment based upon actual deeds, or upon authority - even at the cost of renouncing self-judgment. Instead of this she bases her claims upon a golden cross, which soon afterwards appears in the light of a reward which Dr. Steiner had not limited to her alone, and upon documents from which the other members of the Vorstand were unable to gather the truth of her statements. But in this case it was not at all a question of documents, but of deeds.

*

17 This will be discussed below

18 He finally asked, as a last means of defence, that this should be expressly entered in the Minutes.

The Extraordinary General Meeting began on December 27, 1930 and lasted for three whole days. In the centre of discussion stood the so called "Scandinavian Proposal", which existed in various forms and was always formulated anew, in the hope that Herr Steffen might agree with it. But he rejected it definitely, after having already rejected the earlier wordings which were submitted at the meetings held in April and November. The scope of the "Scandinavian Proposal" was to hand over to Herr Steffen the decision for the future leadership of the Society, because those who had advanced this proposal felt sure that he would not misuse freedom and would not encroach on the freedom and rights

103

of others. The details of carrying this out were left to Herr Steffen, or all kinds of proposals were advanced, always in the hope that he accept them. This plan was also supported by Dr. Wachsmuth and he had been charged by Frau Dr. Steiner - who was unable to be present owing to illness - to support it also on her behalf.

Herr Steffen refused because he did not think it possible to make changes in the Vorstand, but also because it had been proved that the mistrust of some important members had robbed him even of the slightest trace of freedom. Unless the conditions in the Society changed, this would remain so. Herr Steffen found himself facing a Society in which the overwhelming majority of the members had trust in him, but who were in part represented by functionaries who did not trust him and had unmercifully wounded him for years already, both as President and as man. Herr Steffen drew different conclusions from the "Scandinavian Proposal" quite different than those expected by several members who supported it—he did not touch the freedom and the rights of his adversaries. This decision rendered possible a sound continuation of the work. At first, most of the members were very disappointed when Herr Steffen kept to his decision to remain President only under the three conditions which have already been stated (not to arrange Conferences at his own initiative was not withdrawn by him even after Easter 1934). This attitude of Herr Steffen, however, enabled the members to make use of their own freedom and to arrange their connections with Dornach by eliminating the tutorship of certain functionaries. When these functionaries would not withdraw in spite of the clearly expressed lack of confidence of the members and continued to appeal to "investitures" and "missions": the members did the only thing which was still left to them—they broke through the dividing wall, severed their connection with these representatives and found their way to Dornach. Shortly before the General Meeting, the "Stuttgart Group I" had already left the Anthroposophical Society in Germany and had become attached directly to Dornach. details will be related further down.

What it means to be attacked three days in succession with a wish brought forward in the

name of thousands of members, and no way in spite of all - while a word would have sufficed to gain the fullest

104

freedom and also power for himself - let this be judged by those members who later on felt that it was necessary to speak with an earnest mien of a "dictatorship" aimed at by Herr Steffen.

For the first time the co-workers at the Goetheanum took up a united stand during this General Meeting, and handed in a statement in which they declared, that on the ground of events during the past years, they had come to the conclusion that in their work and in the preparation for Conferences they would follow the guidance of Herr Steffen, Frau Dr. Steiner and Dr. Wachsmuth, and take no notice of the unavoidable protests on the part of Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede. At that time the opinion of the co-workers did not meet with general approbation but they stated what lay in the direction of future development and what was recognised by the Society on a wider scale at the General Meeting of 1934.

During the General Meeting held in December 1930, all those things came up for discussion which for months had caused new trouble and had already yielded the dark background to the last meetings; they acquire an even worse aspect when the hypocritical speeches are compared with the real, but consciously veiled facts.

For some time an inexplicable interest in the Bodhisattvas had awakened. Again it was those around Dr. Wegman who had spread the most impossible statements—in this case, concerning a Bodhisattva who was expected to appear in the near future. In order to contest absurd and phantastic statements which he himself had to hear over and over again, Herr Arenson collected the various passages from Dr. Steiner's works on the nature of the Bodhisattvas, showing as a particular instance that even a spiritual investigator had no possibility of recognising a reincarnated Bodhisattva before the human being in question had reached at least the age of 33. Herr Arenson held a detailed lecture on this question and afterwards published the manuscript of this lecture. Against these explanations of Herr Arenson Dr. Vreede took up an attitude which appeared in her lectures, in which she at least left open the possibility of the expected coming of the Bodhisattva in the near future, but at the same time felt entitled to make very singular and scarcely comprehensible statements to the effect that Dr. Steiner had been obliged by special circumstances to overstep certain spiritual laws.

105

In any case it could be established with horror that the same circles in which the Karma-investigations had assumed such grotesque proportions, now took up another theme. Who exactly

was responsible for the fact that this subject could be brought up at all, cannot be established clearly. Dr. Wegman did not prevent the mischief in her nearest circles. During the General Meeting she stated that she herself had only spoken of the "forces" of the Bodhisattva.

Connected with these things was another personality, who had not been long member of the Society. Apart from the fact that this Frl. Benthien could indicate all kinds of wonderful incarnations for herself and others, she had also discovered where the Bodhisattva was now living. During the General Meeting even names of members were mentioned in this connection, who had nothing to do with the whole matter. One of these members received a letter from Frl. Benthien a few days later, in which she stated that she had never mentioned his name in this connection:

"I have always denied this strongly, for since about 1922, I already knew that the Bodhisattva at that time was still young and not a member of the Anthroposophical Society." Then she mentions the time when she was staying at Arlesheim, and writes:-"At that time the Bodhisattva was being searched for eagerly at the Clinic, but it never entered my mind to take you for the Bodhisattva, for I knew otherwise."

The sad part of it was that Frl. Benthien had gained a considerable influence, and precisely among members who were the most extreme followers of Dr. Wegman and obeyed her slightest gesture. Although leading members considered Frl. Benthien as an initiate, and her messages from the spiritual world were even supposed to come from Dr. Steiner himself and were looked upon as guiding lines for the Society, so that the whole matter soon became a very serious problem for the Society, Dr. Wegman had not considered it her duty, either as member of the Vorstand, or as a leader of esotericism which she claimed to be, to do something against this. When questions were asked at the Geneva Meeting she treated the whole matter as something which she did not wish to discuss, because Frl. Benthien was for her nothing but one of her former patients. The important point, however, was the danger to Society, as particularly the heads of younger members had been turned. Although attempts were made at this General Meeting to deny everything and to awaken the appearance as if everything was a malicious in-

vention, it became evident very soon that the fears of the other members were fully justified. Frl. Benthien did not only write the above-mentioned letter but a whole packet of her letters had been deposited on the table of the Vorstand. In these letters she advanced the most phantastic statements about incarnations investigated by her and other sensational things.

As soon as Frl. Benthien heard of the discussions at the General Meeting, she left the Anthroposophical Society¹⁹ and some prominent members followed her. Among them were not
19S till today, in the winter of 1934, so-called "lessons" in letter-form circulate among the members; they can be

only some well known members of the "Free Society", but even one of its two leaders, Herr Wilhelm Rath. They wholly supported Frl. Benthien. Herr Rath was also said to have stated that the Goetheanum was merely a lump of concrete on which no money should be wasted. This statement, which also expressed the opinion of Frl. Benthien, was discussed at the General Meeting in the presence of this gentleman, and was not denied by him. But also among other circles of this kind, "mystical" rumours had gone round for some time to the effect that the "spiritual Goetheanum" was no longer at Dornach.

It was a desperate state of things that continually the opinion arose that such things could not be judged, discussed or criticised. The worst example of this kind was given by Dr. Wegman herself. She described how Frl. Benthien had formerly been her patient for a longer time and had told her many things which she had to consider as a medical secret. But this was not in the least the point; what mattered that was all Frl. Benthien had said already, and particularly what she had said already at that time and later on when she was no longer her patient - what she had said not to doctors, but to members who readily responded. But in Dr. Wegman's opinion even things like these must not be judged, for she herself had refrained from doing so. She said literally: "What else has been said concerning Frl. Benthien? That she has a pathological clairvoyance. Well, what does that mean? I cannot be expected judge right away whether something is pathological or not." And then once again: "A person cannot be judged right away on this point." So

107

that Dr. Wegman, a medical woman, who a few weeks ago had also claimed to be recognised, together with Dr. Steiner, as the leader of the School, cannot judge "right away" whether a clairvoyance is pathological or not in the case of a person whom she has known well and for a long time. This in addition to the fact that the "results of spiritual investigation" of the person concerned were known and discussed everywhere. What Dr. Steiner had for so many years described in detail as the criterions of a pathological clairvoyance, because he wished that every member should learn to judge it; what is contained in his books and lectures, and what he himself had openly characterised before all the members as something pathological and unhealthy by giving concrete examples (for instance, what came to expression in the paintings of some members) - all this should not be applied and the members were expected lovingly not to judge. What every serious student of Dr. Steiner's books cannot only do, but is expected to do, this Dr. Wegman declared that she could not and would not do.

But worse things were still to follow. Frl. Benthien had also told Dr. Wegman all kinds of reincarnation-tales: -

"Nun, ich bin niemals darauf eingegangen, überhaupt auf Inkarnationsfragen, das kann

traced particularly in Holland, where they are taken seriously.

man überhaupt nicht. Und was man auch über mich sagt, Fragen stellt z. B. Sind Sie diese oder eine andere Individualität gewesen', darauf kann ich auch nicht antworten. Das müssen Sie doch verstehen, dass es unmöglich ist. Das sind doch tiefe Geheimnisse, die wir selber in uns bewahren. Ja, ich kann aber auch nicht dafür, dass andere Menschen es aussprechen; die haben doch die Freiheit bis zu einem gewissen Grade. Ich bin nicht der Hüter dieser Menschen, die nun dies oder jenes sagen. Schliesslich habe ich damit auch nichts zu tun."

"Well, I have never discussed reincarnation questions at all. This is impossible. And what others say about me, or when they ask for instance - were you this individuality or some one else 'to this I cannot reply. You must understand that this is impossible. These are deep mysteries which we keep within us. It is not my fault if others speak about them. They are free up to a certain extent. I am not the guardian of these people who say this or that, and finally I have nothing to do with all this."

As to the question mentioned by Dr. Wegman, it was asked by a Berlin member at the General Meeting of April 1930 in a very tactless way. Herr Englert had placed this same question at an earlier General Meeting, in order to make an end to this unbearable talk on reincarnations within the Society. His question of so personal a nature was at that time objected to as such by Frau Dr. Steiner, who even placed herself protectively before Dr. Wegman and rejected the question on her

108

behalf. "The deep secrets which we keep within us" had, however, been discussed for years, as far as Dr. Wegman was concerned, by the very members whose guardian she did not wish to be. Yet they saw in her the leader of the "Michael School" and she had many ties with "these people", who wished to conquer the world for her with World School Unions, World Conferences and Youth Camps, and who came together for years at Arlesheim as "super-Vorstand", to determine the aims of the Society.

The people who according to Dr. Wegman's own words, had spoken about things which are better kept in the depths of the soul and had said "this or that", did not give up hope of saving the situation. They began to deny everything and even declared that they had never heard or said anything about Alexander. In order to draw the Assembly out of this swamp of untruthfulness, a member of the Norwegian Society stood up, and turning toward Dr. Zeylmans, she recounted minutely where, when and how Dr. Zeylmans had spoken to her at Oslo about the reincarnation of Alexander, of Alexander's court and of the direction which the Society had to follow as a result of

this and in keeping with the true meaning of the Christmas Meeting of 1923. The Norwegian member emphasized that she had spoken only from a sense of duty toward truth, not out of any hostile feeling, because she was a friend of Dr. Zeylmans and had worked with him very well indeed for some time in Holland, at the Hague. Herr Englert then told of another case, and described how he had heard the same tales in Vienna from members who were afterwards known everywhere as the most devoted friends of Dr. Wegman. He reminded Dr. Wegman that he had immediately called on her when he returned to Dornach and had asked her opinion about this kind of talk that was going round. She had answered that it was all an invention on the part of her enemies in order to ridicule her followers. Her followers evidently tried to imitate her attitude at the General Meeting described above, and might have succeeded in their aim had not a few honest members taken upon themselves to say the truth even when it is inconvenient. That in this connection it could be proved too, that also Dr. Wegman herself had not always kept silence, may be mentioned here incidentally.

109

An exceedingly weighty question remained to be discussed at this General Meeting. Through the bankruptcy of a factory at Einsingen some members of the Anthroposophical Society had suffered severe losses. As the Anthroposophical Society itself had no connection whatsoever with this enterprise, the fact that single members had invested large sums of money in it, had to be traced to the circumstance that the investors were given to understand in an entirely misleading way that they were furthering anthroposophical interests by supporting this factory. Even a first examination proved that the name of the Goetheanum and of Dr. Steiner had been misused grossly by some members in Germany and in Holland. The names of the members in question gave rise to the supposition that they had tried, together with Dr. Wegman, to create a financial basis for certain particular aims. If this were to be really true, then Dr. Wegman must have neglected her duties as a member of the Vorstand of the Anthroposophical Society in an incomprehensible way. Unfortunately this supposition turned out to be right. When, however, Dr. Wegman was asked at the General Meeting what connections she had with the Einsingen factory, she answered that all her connections with Einsingen consisted in having once given advice, or a recommendation. She had given this advice to the owner of the factory, when he applied to her.

“Und ich sagte ihm: Nun ja, vielleicht gibt es in Holland noch wohl Menschen, die sich dafür interessieren können, - sagte aber auch sehr deutlich zu ihm: Sie müssen auch versuchen, nicht bei Anthroposophen um Geld zu bitten, sondern Sie müssen versuchen ganz andere Leute zu bekommen. Es kam dann dazu, dass von holländischer Seite aus Freunde kamen, z. B. Herr T. zu Herr V. L., der sich dann bereit erklärte, sich mit Fabrik zu verbinden, und es dann auch auf sich nahm, nicht bei Anthroposophen e für diese Fabrik zu

erwerben, sondern Menschen zu finden, die für solche Dinge interessieren konnten, die aber mit Anthroposophie überhaupt keine Beziehung hatten. Ich das sagte, und die Freunde. Und das war sehr stark auf meine Veranlassung hin, weil ich das sagte, und dahe, eigenuich das Geld nicht bei Anthroposophen zusammenzubringen, sondern ganz bei anderen Leuten. Es war wirklich als Rat, als guter Rat. Die Freunde dazu gebracht, und auch getan. Wir haben sehr viele nicht anthroposophische Freunde dazu gestaluen weiter gar nicht darum gekümmert." - „Als ich aber hörte, dass nicht gut ging, da habe ich mich energisch gewehrt."

And I said to him - well, yes, perhaps there may after all be some people in Holland who might be interested in this. But I also said very clearly to him: you must try not to obtain money from Anthroposophists – but you must try to get quite different people. Then it happened, that from Dutch quarters friends came forward, for instance Herr T went to Herr V L who then declared that he would connect himself with this

110

factory, and then he also undertook not to raise money for this factory from Anthroposophists, but to find people who might be interested in such things, but who had no connection whatever with Anthroposophy. And this happened very much at my instigation, because I had said it, and because I had convinced the friends not to collect money from Anthroposophists, but from entirely different people. This was meant as an advice, as good advice, and they followed it. We have interested very many non-anthroposophical friends, and I have not bothered myself more about it. But when I heard that things were not going well, I protested strongly."

In order that no misunderstanding may arise from the description which will now follow, it must be stated clearly that Dr. Wegman cannot be made responsible for the business mistakes of the factory management. What one can reproach her with, lies in an entirely different sphere - in her attitude as member of the Vorstand, both toward the Society and toward single members.

During the General Meeting she declared, however, that in this matter she had always acted only as a private person, and in no way as a member of the Vorstand. She was also asked whether she had succeeded in making clear the private character of her connections, so that the institutes which she guided independently of the Anthroposophical Society were also not connected in any way with the Einsingen factory, for instance as receivers of the expected profits.

Dr. Wegman replied:

“Das will ich auch gerne beantworten: Keinerlei Beziehungen bestehen zwischen der Klinik und Einsingen, keinerlei finanzielle Beziehungen, auch nicht geistige Beziehungen. Keinerlei Beziehungen bestehen zwischen den Instituten, den heil-pädagogischen Instituten und Einsingen. Und keinerlei Beziehungen bestehen zwischen Weleda und Einsingen. Alles ist vollständig in Ordnung. Nie sind da Beziehungen gewesen, von der Klinik auf keinen Fall. Immer habe ich das streng – ja, sie kamen gar nicht in Betracht. Sie kamen gar nicht in Betracht! Und ich habe gar keine Neigung gehabt, irgend jemals mich finanziell mit Einsingen zu beschäftigen. Ich habe nur einen Rat gegeben, einen Rat, von dem ich dachte, dass man es richtig ausführen könnte. Was die Menschen daraus gemacht haben, ja, dafür kann ich nichts.”

"I shall willingly reply to this also. There are no connections whatever between the Clinic and Einsingen, no financial connections of any kind and no spiritual connections whatever. There are no connections whatever between the Institutes, the Institutes for curative pedagogy, and Einsingen. Everything is perfectly in order. There have never been any connections; on the part of the Clinic, in no case. I have always strictly - indeed, they do not come into consideration at all - they do not come into consideration at all! I have never felt inclined to take any financial interest in Einsingen, I only gave advice, an advice which I thought could be carried out rightly. What they made out of it, that is not my fault."

111

The General Meeting decided to appoint a commission of experts who were to examine how the circumstances, which were still so obscure, could have arisen.

The report which this Commission²⁰ submitted later on showed once more that the Anthroposophical Society was in no way connected with the Einsingen factory and its bankruptcy. But it had to be ascertained however that the private connections of Dr. Wegman had not been considered as such by others, and that her name had sufficed to call forth in the investors the conviction that anthroposophical interests were connected with this enterprise. The statements made by Dr. Wegman at the General Meeting proved to be misleading, and contradicted entirely the actual facts which the Commission, after a very careful examination, could concretely substantiate. The following passages will be quoted from this report, with the omission of all technical details, because they throw light on the essential point - namely, the phantastic way of

20 It consisted of six members: Dr. Grosheintz, Chairman (Dornach); Dr. Kreutzer, Industrialist (Nuremberg); Dr. Fränkl, Doctor-in-Law (Dornach); Dr. A. Im Obersteg (Basel); Herr Knopfli, Banker (St. Gallen); Herr Aisenpreis (for the Administration of the Goetheanum Building), Dornach.

thinking of those members who so frivolously had misused the name of the Goetheanum for entirely personal ambition for power.

In the report is stated :

"Dr. Wegman takes up the standpoint which she already adopted at the General Meeting when she declared "I do not speak as a member of the Vorstand, but as a private person". She therefore adopts the standpoint that all her efforts on behalf of Einsingen, both advice and financial assistance, were her own private concern. On the other hand she alleges Dr. Steiner's interest in Einsingen as a justification for her own participation.

For this reason alone, the Commission cannot share Dr. Wegman's point of view, namely, that a member of the Vorstand can participate actively in an enterprise in which Dr Steiner was interested²¹, not as a member of the Vorstand, but as a private and moreover without informing the Vorstand of this fact.

Moreover, the Commission also considers such a distinction between member of the Vorstand and private individual as something which can at least produce untold misunderstandings, because no one will make such a distinction, and because the authority of a member of the Vorstand will always be seen behind the private person."

112

" The Dutch investors were to be approached more easily through the fact that Dr. Wegman declared that she would write to her Dutch friends, and ask whether they could do anything in this matter. Mr. K. the chief administrative accountant of the Clinic travelled to Holland on this matter. It proved to be successful. "

"Once more the way was found to Holland, and use was made of the intervention of functionaries of the Anthroposophical Society in Holland. In this connection, the dream of one of the functionaries (Dr. Zeylmans) played a rôle which those concerned in this matter interpreted to the effect that to support Einsingen meant following Dr. Steiner's aims. Please note that we are in January 1926. These events can only be rightly valued by placing them against the background of happenings, opinions, feelings and controversies which were ruling in the Anthroposophical Society at that time - that is, at the end of 1925 until the beginning of 1926."

"The name of Dr. Steiner and of the Goetheanum have been misused in the grossest way." ...

21 He had given special instructions for the manufacture of the raw materials. But these were hardly tested in the laboratory and had no real influence on the factory. Yet they were misused as propaganda to get investors.

" Finally Herr K. was delegated to Einsingen. Although he had formally left the Clinic when he went to Einsingen, he maintained his influence in the finances of the Clinic. He drew up the balance-sheets of the Clinic, and when the Clinic needed money, the employee in question was told to apply to Herr K. at Einsingen, who would then dispose. Herr K. returned to the Clinic shortly before the crash, but even then he was negotiating with the man who was directly connected with the bankruptcy."

"The Weleda became connected with Einsingen through Herr V. L. who had a leading position in both enterprises...."

" The following institutions were to be financed: Waldorf School, viz. School Union (we are now at the time of the foundation of the World School Union) - Arlesheim: the Clinics and Laboratories...."

"As Herr V. L. did not feel entitled to dispose all alone, of the amounts which would eventually be available, he asked Dr. Wegman and Gr. K. to give their names as well, so that these three personalities should together decide how the money should be distributed in accordance with Rudolf Steiner's(!) intentions ". -

"How the expected profits were to be used, was already discussed at meetings held in 1926, and the arrangements were so definite, that in the summer of that same year a very distinguished personality in the business world travelled expressly to Dornach in order to warn and inform Herr Steffen and Frau Dr. Steiner that great efforts were being made to develop a centre of power on a financial basis, but that on the other hand, this financial basis appeared to be very shaky to a critical eye."

"In spite of this neither the President of the Society, nor Frau Dr. Steiner, nor Dr. Wachsmuth were able to obtain from those who were connected with Einsingen reliable information that could enable them to judge the situation and no notice was taken of their warnings and wishes. Herr Steffen described this situation very clearly at Christmas 1930, and mentioned particularly how he warned "most decidedly and clearly ", but in vain, against the founding of a limited liability Company."

The entire report shows that the same members who wished to create a special position for Dr. Wegman within the leadership of the Anthroposophical Society, at the same time tried to attain this end by using external means of gaining power, although in so doing they

damaged themselves more than anyone else. For this the Goetheanum was misused, the Dornach

Vorstand deceived and all this happened with the full knowledge of functionaries of the Society who loudly claimed on other occasions that they had been entrusted with unique responsibilities by Dr. Steiner. A characteristic circumstance mentioned in the report is the fact that there were even some functionaries who turned away from clear knowledge and allowed dreams to be used as an impulse for free action.

The Commission emphasized above all that the greatest wrong consisted in the fact that Dr. Steiner's name had been misused. Instead of quoting words by Rudolf Steiner, which were misunderstood and in part not even authentic, it would have been better to keep to what he himself had written in the "Mitteilungsblatt" of July 15, 1924:

"What I mean is that in future I shall have to see to it as strictly as possible that no monies of Anthroposophists flow into economic enterprises which have no direct connection with the Anthroposophical Society as such. In this connection we have given way once in the past, but now it is urgently necessary that in future no economic enterprises are fed with the money of Anthroposophists."

*

It may still be mentioned briefly that also the lawsuits of Mle Sauerwein were discussed, and the General Meeting passed a resolution expressing the disapproval of the attitude adopted by the French General Secretary. When the resolution was passed unanimously, Dr. Kolisko was the the only one who protested, and he declared in an insulting way the whole assembly - with the exception of himself, of course - was anyway unable to make decisions, in view of its condition at the moment. When Dr Wachsmuth called Dr. Kolisko to order in the name of the assembly, Dr. Kolisko used a milder language by pointing that it was already late. Dr. Wachsmuth stated the fact that it was only 7:10pm and the assembly proved that it was still capable of making decisions for many hours longer.

8. THE YEAR 1931—1933.

At the General Meeting of March 31, 1931, the Commission submitted to the members their report on the Einsingen Factory. In connection therewith, the incorporation of the Clinical Therapeutic Institute into the Anthroposophical Society, which took place in the year 1925, was annulled.

In the meantime more and more members had found their way back to the Goetheanum, the way to which had been closed to them for so long by certain functionaries of the Society.

This came to expression not only in the movement seeking direct connection with Dornach in an outer form, but also in the fact that the members also decided to adopt the way of representing Anthroposophy as Herr Steffen has always practised it. Many members were also stirred up by the alarming cases which had shown into what an abyss the Society would be plunged, if through that small group the anthroposophical movement continued to remain at the mercy of all manner of occult mischief, coupled with financial adventures.

The essential question was to clear one's own standpoint toward Anthroposophy; what inner struggles were connected with this, could be seen in the storm of applause called forth at the General Meeting by a speech of Dr. von Baravalle :

Dr. von Baravalle said:

"I have asked to speak in order that a member who was also an independent member in the past, i.e. not a member of a group belonging to the German Anthroposophical Society, but one who afterward entered the group which sought direct contact with the Goetheanum-in order that also such a member may contribute something to the motives which gave rise in a real and true way to 'a movement of joining Dornach'. I must protest above all against the sort of ideas that are going around-namely, that there are such people who do not get on with one another and have had quarrels due to all kinds of complications. Now that a favourable opportunity has arisen, we have seized it and have become independent. This reminds me of the "niveau" which pained one so much, when the conflicts in Dornach were ascribed

115

to the quarrels of two ladies²² and when one hears such smooth re as those given by the German Executive, then one asks :- What hay you done to come as far as this? Things are described there as if everything had been as smooth as oil, and one must ask: Have I slept?

22 See page 43

Was everything which I have struggled through, a dream? Indeed. I must say that I owe a great deal to the fact that throughout these years I have been connected with the personalities of the Waldorf School, have worked with them and have experienced these things with suffering and pain. But it was a most magnificent spiritual battle, a spiritual battle in which one who is obliged to take part in it still as a young man, could almost go to pieces, and was often on the verge of collapse. Thus the things which influenced one were not subjective, they constituted an objective and great battle. This could show that the spiritual currents which also exist otherwise in the world, lead into absurdities have indeed led entirely into absurdities - and this is visible from afar to those who take part in these difficult hours. Everything possible can be found here in the shape of an unhealthy spiritual life which has exercised an influence even to the very end. I wish to speak particularly, because I wish to say just a few words to some of the younger members, for the older members who were connected with Dr. Steiner's work in all these things, have gone through so many experiences in their own life in view of this collaboration, that now things are much easier for them. But the younger people on hearing such speeches must say:- What do they really want, these quarrellers, these individualists, who do not wish to have a community, etc., etc., as they talk about in their speeches? In truth, they have not left because they were unable to agree with the others--in my case no one can declare that I have not been able to get on with the others—they have really left when a moment arose in which the holiest things in us were once more at stake. For I must say that the ways of thinking which are used to a great extent on that side, are quite impossible--this "community and all the things that have been said--that one must keep together and costs —this method of "equal for equal", this talk of:-- You are made

116

in this way and you in that way, you are both bickering, hence we all have the same rights! A discussion on such things is impossible.

"If this way of thinking--and this constituted for me the objective experience—were to get hold of me entirely, then from that moment onward I should no longer be an anthroposophist. I came across this way of thinking as a primal phenomenon most clearly of all in my collaboration of many years with Dr. Kolisko--this way of thinking which he constantly evinced in all discussions which we have had for the last ten years. Each time when I carried out an action--a decisive action, where I felt—now that was a free action that is perhaps justified to be called an anthroposophical action--then I experienced each time

that it was always Dr. Kolisko who actually went into a rage over it. I need no confirmation for this, for I experience it in the Waldorf School. I felt each time when I became inwardly more free, when I carried out an action—this can be felt afterwards—that then Kolisko infallibly came into conflict with this way of thinking. And on the following day, after the most terrible strife which had preceded it, when the things were then accepted, one heard—why, this is just what we all wanted, this has always been our own opinion etc., etc. Then one asked:- And yesterday? All that took place yesterday, has it taken place or not? When one could experience all this, then one advanced little by little to become an Anthroposophist. And then one asked:- Where are the people who also experience such things, yet speak against them quite systematically and even get furious when they are discussed?

Then, when I returned to Stuttgart, where I met those who had joined the Goetheanum, I experienced this: We discussed many things together and I knew—now something has dawned in them, a deed had been enacted and now the light will spread by uniting with this deed; we improve to some extent by uniting with this deed! You may take it as you like yet I could feel that the whole air in Stuttgart, even as far as the School, became clearer. One could feel that now a channel had been opened up for spiritual life and spiritual happiness, and one could really share in this joy which Herr Steffen again expressed today-- that daylight is breaking. The old forms of thinking have run out today, whereas a few years ago, one still stood quite alone and was crushed.

117

I often asked myself:- Do I still have sound common sense ? AUL " learned " people are against my opinion. Often I was on the verge doubting my own common sense. And had I not persevered ... perhaps I too would have held the same lectures, spoken the same words, but then I should not have been an Anthroposophist any longer. It was very bitter for me that people said: If you want to be an Anthroposophist you must be so and so. This went so far that I had to make an inner decision. All that was prescribed to me in order to be an Anthroposophist - I tore it to shreds one day and said: I will return to my own sound common sense. Indeed, I have stood before this. I said to myself:- Perhaps I am leaving Anthroposophy through this. Yet I have risked it and I have instead found Anthroposophy. One who has experienced this, knows that this is no idle talk - for the human being himself and his deepest forces are at stake. Out of these forces we have worked. They become filled with light. We experience them here at the Goetheanum. It is something so beautiful

this feeling of happiness, that I can now feel:- A new light has dawned, through the way in which Herr Steffen builds up things; the entirely different way of thinking has brought about entirely different things, and I believe that the spiritual world comes a little nearer to us in the near future. I have taken part in this movement of joining Dornach, and I have shared in the experience of some of that happiness which has shone over into Germany from out of this deed."

*

All the difficulties of the Anthroposophical Society in Germany were discussed in Dornach at Easter, 1931. The destiny of the Anthroposophical Society in Germany developed throughout the years in close relationship with that of the General Anthroposophical Society, because the attitude of certain members of the German Executive were responsible – as has often been mentioned - to a great extent for the difficulties in the Dornach Vorstand. Dr. Stein and Dr. Kolisko have positively contributed to bring about the conflicts. Dr. Wegman would hardly have maintained her position in the face of the other members of

118

the Dornach Vorstand, if she had not been sure of the constant support of influential German members, and if at that time she had not been backed by a considerable part of the German membership. In the German Executive Dr. Unger was at first and for years, almost the only one who stood up against these intrigues and opposed the claims of Dr. Wegman and her partisans. His antagonists in the German Executive were of course Dr. Stein and Dr. Kolisko who succeeded through their ability in intrigues and artful dodges, in drawing a varying number of the remaining members of the Executive on their side. Or when they did not succeed in this, they at least checkmated the effects of their opposition. During the Extraordinary General Meeting of the Society in Germany held on April 6, 1927, Dr. Unger succeeded in calming the growing discontent among the German members by guaranteeing freedom for anthroposophical work with his own person, and by guaranteeing also an entirely neutral conduct of affairs in the Society. In the course of 1928, it was seen that this attempt had failed because the continual one sided efforts of Dr. Stein and Dr. Kolisko did not cease. The fact, for instance, that Dr. Stein did not acknowledge Dr. Steiner's Will, revealed the untenableness of the situation.

After Dr. Unger's death, the opposition against the German Executive naturally grew, although it tried to create a wider basis of confidence by co-opting further members. Many German members said with right that the influence of Frau Dr. Steiner's and Herr Steffen's enemies in the German Executive had not ceased through this extension, but had merely become

less evident. Hence it did not last long before this Executive was broken up. In December 1930 and January 1931, Frl. Mücke, Herr Stegemann and Dr. Piper resigned in order to show their protest at least in this manner and to bring about a reorganisation. During the same months many German Groups (as the first one the Rudolf Steiner Group of Study in Stuttgart, on December 7, 1930) made the weighty decision to leave the Anthroposophical Society in Germany and attach themselves directly to Dornach as an independent Group of the General Anthroposophical Society. In the letter addressed to all the German Groups, the members of this Group informed them that they "could not agree with the way in which the leading personalities of the German Executive had

119

behaved in April 1930 at the Meeting of the General Secretaries at the General Meeting at Dornach. The way in which these personalities had then behaved toward Herr Steffen on November 28 and 29 1930, is in contradiction to everything that we ourselves would have done in this position and leaves us no other alternative than that of connecting ourselves directly with Dornach." Further groups then shared the view that it was impossible to proceed further through negotiations and that a positive action was needed. The reduced German Executive made a last attempt to hold their own against the growing "exit" of the Groups, by calling an extraordinary meeting of the Society in Germany, on January 30 and February 1, 1931. They proposed to the Groups which had left, the formation of a separate Society. But the evident dwindling away of every basis of confidence induced further members of the German Executive (Rector Bartsch, Dr. Poppelbaum, Dr. Rittelmeyer) to resign. This enhanced still more the growth of the "exit-movement". Until the General Meeting at Easter 1931, already 76 German Groups had left the hitherto existing Anthroposophical Society in Germany and had joined the General Anthroposophical Society directly. At first the Goetheanum could do nothing further in this situation than to "accept this current of will" (as Dr. Wachsmuth expressed it). Yet it was clear that the great work of administrating and consulting with so many German Groups and single members could not be carried on permanently from Dornach. Rudolf Steiner had in fact created the affiliated Societies in various countries also for the purpose of diminishing the work of the Goetheanum. Herr Steffen was asked for advice as to how the conditions in Germany might again be ordered. Herr Steffen gave this advice during the General Meeting, Easter 1931. But in so doing he expressly asked each member of the Vorstand of the General Anthroposophical Society separately for their agreement, which he obtained, and moreover he let the Meeting itself express its agreement. Only with the approval of both these organs he proposed six active German members who were in his opinion suited begin the reorganisation of the united Anthroposophical Society in Germany. These six members (Initiative Group) accepted the task and began to bring

together the German Groups and members on the basis

120

of the principles indicated by Herr Steffen for the work in the whole Society, namely, the overcoming of all sectarianism in the Society through methodical conscientiousness in the scientific work, the furthering of artistic performances and the continuation of the Goetheanum Building. Otherwise the Groups should organise their work quite independently as had been the case so far.

The great majority of the German groups and single members recognised that this form of conscientiousness which bore in mind the necessities of the entire movement, also constituted the sane basis for the Anthroposophical Society in Germany, and they came together into the re-organised Anthroposophical Society in Germany. The former Executive retired at the end of April 1931, liquidated the small remnant of the old Society in Germany, and thus compelled the groups and single members to decide whether or not they were willing to take into account the new Anthroposophical Society which was about to be formed. (The "Free Anthroposophical Society" in Germany was also dissolved in the spring of 1931, after having dwindled down at the end to quite a small membership.)

No sooner had the "Initiative-Group" begun their work, than already at the end of April 1931-a number of German study-groups formed a separate Society on German territory. This took place without taking into consideration the fact that concrete proposals had been made by the Initiative-Group for a united German Society, and the groups who did not wish to put their trust in the Initiative Group had even been assured repeatedly of independent administration of the membership fees, a separate money-order account managed by someone whom they themselves could designate, etc. Also the obvious guarantee for the independent work of all the groups was useless. An "Anthroposophische Arbeitsgemeinschaft in Deutschland" (Anthroposophical Working Community in Germany) was founded, without informing the President of the Society, Herr Steffen. As in other cases, he was placed before an accomplished fact and was expected to acknowledge it. All these groups took no notice whatever of the advice given by Herr Steffen which was meant to overcome the fatal influences of the last six years; they acted as if the Society had developed in an undisturbed way

121

after Rudolf Steiner's death. Many members who joined this "Anthroposophical Working Community in Germany" in fact did not know what preceded it, or else they believed that these

were merely personal quarrels. But the leaders of this Working Community must have known the facts, for they were in part the same personalities who had given rise to the difficulties of the past years. But they preferred to hide their intentions against the leadership of the Goetheanum behind words like "neutrality" and "mutual understanding". To the members who had followed up the events of the past years, it was evident that the purpose of founding the Working Community was to check the urgently necessary elucidation and to try to protect all the evils which the other members were so anxious to eliminate.

The General Anthroposophical Society, however, was placed in an entirely impossible situation when Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede supported this Working Community, after they themselves had acknowledged the Initiative-Group and its task to found anew a united Society in Germany. Through this attitude of these two members of the Vorstand, not only the Vorstand as such, but also the Society represented by the General Meeting, were ignored and placed in an absurd position. Also the attitude of the Working Community was impossible from the very start, because its representative, Herr von Grone, had indeed voiced his concern immediately after the General Meeting, and this had induced Dr. Wachsmuth who heard about it, to exhort Herr von Grone not to make any arbitrary decisions, but to await negotiations. In spite of this, the foundation was undertaken immediately.

When this separate group then turned to the Goetheanum, in order to be recognised as "Anthroposophical Working Community in Germany" the President of the General Anthroposophical Society was obliged to refuse this recognition, because this would have meant legalising a second Society in Germany, whereas before he had upheld the realisation of a united Anthroposophical Society in Germany, and he had pledged himself through the approval both of the Dornach Vorstand and of the General Meeting. He could not possibly betray this attempt solution which had just been started. Hence, there was no getting away

from the fact that from now onward he would refuse all membership cards with the designation "Anthroposophical Working Community in Germany", and would only countersign those made out by a local group, for instance—"Anthroposophical Working Community in Stuttgart," "Anthroposophical Working Community in Munich", etc. Never has Herr Steffen refused to recognise these local groups and their functionaries. But there were, as in the past, only three forms of membership also for the German members to be a member either of the Anthroposophical Society in Germany, or of a single local group recognised by the Goetheanum, or (in exceptional cases) to be attached direct to Dornach. Herr von Grone, however, without the knowledge or approval of the responsible leadership, and in an entirely illegal way, took the liberty

of transferring the membership cards of the General Society to the Working Community. A special form of misleading members arose through an able juggling with the words "Working Community" and "Working Communities". In spite of all, the "Working Community in Germany" which had not been recognised by the President, was also supported by the circles around Mr. Dunlop in England, and Dr. Zeylmans in Holland, which were connected with Dr. Wegman.

"The Working Communities undoubtedly represented the support and backbone of Dr. Wegman in single places in Germany. Consciously or unknowingly, they ignored the fact that the Society had run the danger of becoming a doubtful sect and that it had been a question of overcoming this pathological tendency. Where the safeguarding of the very substance of Anthroposophy is at stake, it is not possible to cover up the errors of single personalities with alleged Christian charity. If such personalities were severely attacked during discussions, the inexorable necessity due to the facts themselves must be borne in mind. (Also Rudolf Steiner, when he founded the Anthroposophical Society in 1913, had to fight against sentimental and hypocritical "pacifists" who loved similar, i.e. theosophical absurdities).

The Initiative Group spared no efforts to reach a common basis, by discussing matters with the leading personalities of this Working Community. These efforts, however, were wrecked because negotiations were repeatedly refused, or the decisive personalities (for instance,

123

Dr. Kolisko, Dr. Lehms) did not appear. In a discussion which took place still in October 1931 at the house of Herr Stockmeyer among 30 responsible German members, Rector Bartsch made an attempt to unite the contrasting elements—an attempt which could hardly be surpassed in broad-mindedness. He asked the representatives of the Working Community who were present: "What do you wish that we should do, in order to be just toward your claims; what do you expect from us?" To this Dr. Kolisko replied with a single word: "Nothing".

For three years, until Easter 1934, a sifting took place among the German groups which became more and more evident: the great majority, with more than 7000 members, are now working in the Anthroposophical Society in Germany, and thus placed itself on the basis of the proposals for a reorganisation of the Society which went out from the Goetheanum; the rest, comprising less than 1000 members (in 25 groups) joined the so-called "Working Communities" who ignored the events of the past years, and out of whose midst a silent or loud opposition to the intentions of the leadership of the Goetheanum became more and more evident. The proportions in various countries outside Germany, and thus also within the General Anthroposophical Society, are similar. Only in Holland and in England there are for the present

minorities supporting the Goetheanum, which had therefore to emancipate themselves from the leadership of Mr. Dunlop and of Dr. Zeylmans. In England this took place already in the winter of 1929—1930; in Holland, later. As regards the Anthroposophical Society in England, it must be reported that, as an only exception, the membership cards submitted by Mr. Dunlop were no longer signed by the President only when Mr. Dunlop refused to submit to the President the addresses of the applicants. Thus the President was denied the information as to the residence of people whom he was supposed to admit into the Society. In support of this refusal, a former communication of the Secretariat in Dornach was referred to; in a letter the Secretariat had mentioned that they would be satisfied to have at least indications as to what group the new members belonged to, seeing that before, it had asked in vain for the exact addresses. In refusing the addresses, the London Executive simply ignored the fact that both in Dr. Steiner's days, as well as later, the sending of the addresses had

124

been requested even in the "Mitteilungsblatt". So that the rule given by Dr. Steiner himself²³ was in no way observed. Besides this official refusal, Mr. Dunlop emphasized during a discussion in London that he could not admit that eventually information might be sent to members direct from Dornach, and that he refused the addresses for this reason. For the same reason the London Executive protested so strongly against the translation of the "Mitteilungsblatt" ("Anthroposophic News Sheet") arranged as an initiative of the Dornach Vorstand at the express wish of English-speaking members. This translation was not only meant for England, but also for America, Australia, New Zealand, etc., and was therefore no internal concern of the Society in England. This Society brings out its own News Sheet ("Anthroposophical Movement"), which is a decided party-paper, and for a long time already, refrained out of party-feeling from publishing important articles of the Goetheanum "Mitteilungsblatt" and on the other hand opposes quite openly everything which does not go out from Dr. Wegman or Dr. Vreede, so that the members in England are informed only in a one-sided manner.

*

At the General Meeting of March 31, 1932, Herr Steffen pointed out with special emphasis the necessity for a deeper anthroposophical activity, and in connection with this he appealed to all members to bear in mind the right method. Herr Steffen referred the members to Rudolf Steiner's work and clearly stated that nothing "new" was needed but that it was that method which Dr. Steiner had designated again and again as something quite indispensable. Herr Steffen's

23 Printed below. Also the regulations concerning the "Mitteilungsblatt".

explanations were immediately attacked by Dr. Vreede and others, and they were interpreted as if Herr Steffen wished to claim for himself and his co-workers a method which was the only infallible one, whilst stigmatizing all other methods which were also possible and equally justified. This "not wishing-to-understand" called itself later on "tolerance which comprehended everything", able to embrace the limited standpoints of others, and it realised with great regret that these others were not in a position

125

to raise themselves to an "all-encompassing tolerance". This standpoint had to be opposed on later occasions again and again with the question as to whether, through this lofty tolerance, every difference between truth and untruth, justice and injustice, were to be considered as eliminated.

Herr Steffen appealed to the ability of being able to distinguish between truth and untruth, between method and lack of method in general. During another General Meeting he comprised his views in the words: "My method is to seek the truth."

In the course of time, the Anthroposophical Society was obliged to cover with its own name many things which were quite incompatible with Anthroposophy. A touchiness which decried each reference to methodical mistakes as a personal attack or as inquisitorial procedure, always appeared in those who did not wish to expose themselves to free and open criticism and wished to continue undisturbed, also in the time which followed, in fostering all that which had already led the Society repeatedly to the very brink of the abyss.

Although it was difficult to criticise without being brand marked as a partisan, there have occasionally been discussions on single scientific achievements. The members of the medical Section had ample opportunity to think over methodical questions. Still to-day everyone can find a material for such a study in the periodical "Natura". Here, it will merely be reported how Dr. Wegman behaved when confronted by justified criticism. At a meeting of the medical Section in the spring of 1932, particularly some articles by Dr. König were subjected to severe criticism by other physicians. In fact, they constituted evident examples of an unrestrained combinatory thinking, which gradually rose to an exalted mysticism--all superficially based on indications of Dr. Steiner. Dr. König himself, later on designated many of these articles as "juvenile errors". At that time, however, the principal question was whether the Editor of "Natura" was willing to publish rectifications and objections to such things. Dr. Wegman's reply was a decided "No". Dr. Kolisko added that the reputation of the periodical would suffer through such a criticism. Dr. Wegman, however, did admit that she herself could not agree with many of the things written by Dr. König,

126

and she would advise him not to come forward, for the time being, as a writer or as a lecturer. But this did not happen. At that meeting Dr. Husemann declared that the "Natura" no longer interested him under these circumstances, and that he had to renounce collaborating in a quarter where scientific criticism was not admitted.

The picture completes itself through a study of the periodical itself, which has contributed to a great extent in discrediting Anthroposophy in seriously striving medical circles. To-day this periodical is rejected by the numerous physicians in the Anthroposophical Society who keep away from this pseudo-scientific formation of "cliques".

These things, however, were not limited to the medical circles, but Dr. König had published an article on "Birth-Control as a Problem of Birth" in "Der Pfad" (September Number 1930), a periodical for young people which was then appearing, and he had said the queerest things. In January 1931 Dr. König arranged together with the Christian Community at Hannover a Conference dealing exclusively with such subjects as sexual life, crime, dopes, etc. The programme of this Conference was made known everywhere in the Society. As a protest against it, serious warnings and vetoes of Dr. Steiner were published in the "Mitteilungsblatt" of the Goetheanum, No. 4 of January 25, 1931. It is characteristic also in this case that the people in question severely censured, not the error, but the criticism, which was moreover based on Dr. Steiner's own words. They even went as far as designating Dr. Steiner's words as "antiquated ". Whereupon Frau Dr. Steiner was compelled to intervene, and she wrote in "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 7 of February 15, 1931.

MY REPLY.

"The September Number of the periodical "Der Pfad" which is addressed particularly to young people, contains an article by Dr. med. König, "Birth-Control as a Problem of Birth ". After an interpretation-most painful to an artistic sense-of Raphael's Sixtine Madonna and Michelangelo's Pietà, the article closes with the following somewhat sensational picture:

"The spiritual world is silent. It begins to speak only when the individual personality turns toward it in complete freedom.

But then also the unborn begin to speak and tell of their unspeakable sufferings. But suffering always becomes a deed. We do not want to wait until the unborn become active out of deepest despair. Can we not even if we are but a few who hear their voice--show them the way to the earth?

Not only the dead, also the unborn collect to-day into hosts. Who will prevent invasion of the earthly sphere, if this is willed by the spirit?

The problem of birth-control can only be solved when birth is grasped in its full truth. This means:

Know the secret of birth!

Hear at last the call of the unborn."

The imaginative experience described above may be overwhelming for the one who experiences it. But he should try to get the better of it alone. It is not possible to place it before others with a certain authoritative gesture and to supply it with a verse which is meant to exercise a psychological influence.

In a lecture which I myself heard by the writer of the article in question, not only the Gospel of St. John, but also Rudolf Steiner's lectures on the Fifth Gospel (which he has not set free for reference in lectures and books) were connected to a great extent with embryological studies. We had to hear that the calling of one pair of apostles was comparable with the allantois, that of another pair with the vitellus, etc.

These revelations were brought forward in a certain solemn way, with the claim to occult inspiration; for this reason they acted suggestively and were accepted by many listeners with respectful awe, but were of course rejected indignantly by others.

They have inaugurated a kind of current in our Society. For this reason it is a good thing that members should know Rudolf Steiner's attitude as regards such themes.

Above all, he deemed it necessary that if someone wished to act as an occult teacher, he must have reached, not only the age of 35, but of 42 years. Only then it is possible to be fully conscious of the responsibility needed when speaking about occult facts.

The truths which Rudolf Steiner uttered on facts connected with mankind, and not with the situation of a fleeting moment, do not lose their validity, for in their wisdom and experience they are a thousand years in advance of our age. For this reason, the expression "antiquated" applied to his words - and the expression has been used - can only be considered as immature wisdom of youth.

The Anthroposophical Society may reject Rudolf Steiner's words as antiquated, but it must be given the opportunity at least to know his words.

When the world asks questions, Anthroposophy still gives the purest answer through Rudolf Steiner. When our young people are so urgently requested "not to wait until the

unborn become active out of deepest despair", it should be realised that it is our duty to place by its side the words of Rudolf Steiner: "It is the most dangerous sphere that can be touched, for this reason--because the thoughts, when they are turned toward this sphere, are always darkened in a certain sense.

Also this lecture mentioned by Frau Dr. Steiner was designated later on by Dr. König himself as a "juvenile sin ". But at that time, and whenever someone dared to criticise or to place questions in the face of such facts, he was brand marked either as malicious or as dogmatic. (Dr. Rittelmeyer, however, admitted that the criticism of the Hannover Conference was justified.)

To protect oneself against such unhealthy tendencies also became more difficult in view of the fact that personalities like Dr. Kolisko and Dr. Zeylmans, and other physicians belonging to the medical Section,

128

played an important rôle and had a great influence also as functionaries of the Society. This rendered it possible, on the one hand, to claim that the Society should approve everything that went out from the medical Section, and on the other hand to expect that the medical co-workers should support Dr. Wegman's aims in Society-matters. If this was not the case, they were kept away from the work in the medical Section. Thus this sect which had formed itself in one part of the Society was centred in the group which officially constituted the medical Section.

In the course of time, however, an increasing number of members came into conflict with these sectarian tendencies, which were the opposite of a free life of the spirit. In the medical Section itself, Dr. Steiner had gathered about him in 1924 a more restricted circle of co-workers; in addition to Dr. Wegman, a certain number of physicians named by Dr. Steiner belonged to it. Dr. Steiner had mentioned these names to the assembled Section. After Dr. Steiner's death, however, the position of this circle to the Section became entirely different, particularly owing to the way in which Dr. Wegman, very soon afterwards, undertook to enlarge it. Several new candidates were invited to a meeting, telling them beforehand what was planned. Without any notice, they found themselves taking part at a kind of ceremony, at the end of which they were immediately dismissed. Now they had been admitted without any preparation to the inner circle. No free decision was left to them as to whether or not they wished to belong to the circle of their own accord, just as they had no possibility to realise beforehand the meaning of this step. Thus an entirely alien spirit was introduced into an institution founded by Dr. Steiner. This could also be seen in the fact-and it became evident at once—that it was taken for granted that this extension

was to be kept secret from the remaining Section—in contrast to the way in which Dr. Steiner had chosen his co-workers. When one of the newly-admitted doctors thought it quite natural to tell other members of the Section of this accomplished fact, this was at once designated as treachery²⁴. Another fact must also be added, which Dr. Palmer, the former leader of the Clinical-Therapeutic Institute at Stuttgart, felt obliged to bring forward at a later General Meeting. Shortly before the extension

129

described above, Dr. Wegman had declared to him that an end of the circle was out of the question. She meant that it was out of the question for him and others.

Even these few cases are a proof for the mentality which did not shun such means as the denial of actual intentions and mysteriousness in order to keep away people whose attitude towards Dr. Wegman's claims, particularly in Society matters, was inconvenient. This brought about that already at an early stage a certain number of doctors was excluded, if not formally, at least practically, from the work of the Section, But also those who still trusted for a while that the medical Section would continue in Dr. Steiner's spirit, were largely convinced in the course of time by the facts themselves that a real collaboration was impossible, so that gradually more and more co-workers withdrew. Thus on a small scale the same process took place as in the whole body of the Anthroposophical Society

As there was no possibility for objective discussion in the medical Section, it was necessary on more than one occasion to discuss medical questions somewhere else. But those who had given rise to these conditions were then the very ones who grew more indignant than anyone else over the alleged indiscretions told at General Meetings. Yet this indignation was out of place, for these were undoubtedly things which showed that the medical section had damaged the reputation of the Anthroposophical Society in extensive circles. In fact, it was a duty to bring such things to the knowledge of the members.

*

Another example dealing with the question of "method", but on an entirely different sphere of work, came to light during the General Meeting of 1932. From lesson-books of school children it could be proved Dr. W. J. Stein had taken the liberty of bringing forward the teaching the spiritual hierarchies in the school-instruction of the Waldorf-School Stuttgart, by working out in a grotesque way the comparison between hierarchies and military ranks. Rudolf Steiner's strict veto against introducing Anthroposophy - even when rightly interpreted-in the instruction, had not

²⁴ Later on Dr. Wegman declared that this circle had been dissolved.

sufficed. And what had always been proclaimed

130

that a pedagogy in an anthroposophical direction does not permit the inclusion of anthroposophical subjects in the instruction--threatened to become an empty phrase, particularly as this was only one case out of many. In spite of all, the English Executive declared their solidarity with Dr. Stein, and this declaration was submitted to the Dornach Vorstand as a special form of insult.

The same mentality also appeared when in 1934 Dr. Kolisko brought out his booklet "On First Instruction in Chemistry", which was wanting from a scientific aspect and fully incompatible with anthroposophical pedagogy. Dr. von Baravalle dealt with this writing from these two aspects, in a detailed criticism which he submitted to the assembled faculty of the Waldorf-School teachers, and later on, to the General Meeting. Although Dr. Kolisko had withdrawn the booklet from sale, he let it nevertheless be used in the schools as internal material for study. The meeting of the representatives of the Rudolf Steiner Schools in Germany, held on April 22, 1934, protested against the latter, and their protest appeared in the form of a declaration in the "Mitteilungsblatt".

Since 1930, when Dr. Vreede's attitude to methodical questions as well as to questions dealing with the leadership of the Society, had brought about that no lectures could be held for the celebration of the seventh anniversary of the Christmas Meeting, difficulties of this kind arose continually. In 1933, the tenth anniversary of the Christmas Meeting, Dr. Vreede again interfered. On that occasion Rudolf Steiner and his work, both in the form of artistic performances and the reading of one of his loftiest courses of lectures, was to stand unalloyed by itself. This was in keeping with a general and genuine need. This would also prevent the mutual discontent as regards lectures. Dr. Vreede, however, made known in a letter to Herr Steffen, that she herself and some others - among them Dr. Zeylmans and Mr. Kaufmann-had decided to hold a series of lectures at Christmas under the general title "Old and New Mysteries ". Shortly afterwards she requested that her programme should be printed in the "Mitteilungsblatt" No. 48 of November 26, 1933, and this "counter-Conference " actually took place in a smaller hall of the Goetheanum, but the lectures were attended by about 40 people, whereas the simultaneous Conference in the large hall of the Goetheanum was attended by more than 1000 people.

131

10 . THE YEAR 1934.

All the difficulties which had—for so long a period of time and always for the same reasons - led to hopeless discussions, came to a temporary conclusion through the important decision of the General Meeting of March 27 and 28, 1934. By a vote of 774 in the affirmative to 94 in the negative (with 23 who refrained from voting), it was resolved that any decisions made by Herr Steffen, Frau Dr. Steiner and Dr. Wachsmuth would be binding for the Society.

This resolution was the answer to a question put to the meeting by Herr Steffen, in the following statement:-

"The President of the General Anthroposophical Society felt obliged to lay down the Presidency during the General Meeting, owing to unjustified reproaches made by Mr. Kaufmann and in view of many things that had gone before. He handed over the Presidency to Frau Marie Steiner and left the Meeting. Frau Marie Steiner declared, however, that she would only continue to be in the Vorstand if Herr Steffen remained President, and also left the Assembly.

Dr. Wachsmuth was then entrusted by the General Meeting to hand over to Herr Steffen and Frau Marie Steiner the decision of the General Meeting, carried by an overwhelming majority of votes, namely: that the Society should be reconstituted by these three persons, Frau Marie Steiner, Herr Steffen and Dr. Wachsmuth. The constitution of the Society is contained in the 'Weihnachtstagung' (Christmas Meeting of 1923). For those entrusted with this task, who have the work of Rudolf Steiner at heart, there results accordingly the following question which they submit to the General Meeting:

"Is the Anthroposophical Society willing to allow these three persons to continue the work in the spirit of the 'Weihnachtstagung' and to consider the decisions to which they come, as binding for the Society?"

A report of this General Meeting appeared in the "Mitteilungsblatt" and in the English translation of this, the " Anthroposophic News Sheet" No. 16/17 of April 29, 1934. Some of the items which are not even now sufficiently clear to all the members will be emphasized below.

Before the General Meeting, the so-called "Declaration of Intentions" ("Willenserklärung ") was handed in to the Vorstand in Dornach, accompanied by a notification of the three speakers who wished to advocate it at the General Meeting, namely Dr. Kolisko, Dr. Zeylmans and Mr. Kaufmann. During the long discussion caused by this Declaration of Intentions, it could be proved that gross untruths and conscious falsification of facts form the essence of its content. The text reads as follows:

WILLENSERKLÄRUNG.

(DECLARATION OF INTENTIONS.)

“During the last 8 years, the undersigned Groups and Members have been compelled to realise that various directions of will have developed in an increasing measure within the Anthroposophical Society. This has caused a cleft in the organism of the Society, which is growing deeper and deeper.

Now it has come to our knowledge that motions for a change in the Statutes will be proposed at this year's General Meeting, which would change in the most drastic way the fundamental constitution of the Anthroposophical Society. Against this, we must say that we cannot recognise such a change, which would empower the President to distribute anew the offices in the Vorstand, to alter the rights of signature or to have the exclusive right of signing membership cards alone.

We consider this motion an attempt to alter the constitution of the Society, given by Rudolf Steiner in the "Principles " that were accepted at the Foundation Meeting of the Christmas Conference in 1923-to alter it indirectly by means of the "Statutes" that were set up solely for communication with the Authorities. This procedure would imply the legalisation of the situation that has developed in the Society during the last few years.

But independently of these proposals for a change in the Statutes, we find ourselves compelled to bring the following " Willenserklärung" to the knowledge of the Vorstand and of the members, in view of the general situation characterised above:

We uphold the constitution of the General Anthroposophical Society, created at Christmas 1923.

Decisive measures, proceeding from three members of the Vorstand alone, as has been the case recently, cannot be recognised by us as binding for the whole Anthroposophical Society.

The same applies to the majority-decisions in the General Meetings during the last 8 years, whereby the most important decisions in Society-matters were carried out, without previous consultation in the Vorstand, and with the functionaries and the leading members of the Society.

The situation has arisen that two members of the Vorstand do not share in the responsibility of guiding the Society, and that a great number of leading members in various countries have no possibility of helping in the shaping of the Society and of carrying out anthroposophical work at the Goetheanum. Since the time in which three members of the Vorstand have had the exclusive conduct of affairs, a great deal of valuable work done by existing

Groups, has been ignored. From Dornach, the organisation of affiliated Societies has been changed (literal translation: "one has changed from Dornach the organisation of affiliated Societies) and attempts have been made to transform the whole Society in the intention of this part of the Vorstand.

We do not fail to see that, under certain circumstances, a change in the constitution of the Society may be needed, provided that conditions require such a change. Such changes, however, can come only from the entire body responsible for the Society's organisation.

In contrast to the above-mentioned encroachments, we uphold the principle of the Autonomy of Groups, as being one of the chief fundamentals of the Society anthroposophical life. This includes particularly the right that members may have the free choice of their collaborators.

133

We reject most energetically the judgment that only those members are faithful to the Goetheanum who agree with - and are therefore willing to follow - the special direction in leadership of the three members of the Vorstand, who have now the exclusive guidance.

The Goetheanum is active spiritually wherever anthroposophical work is carried out. We know that we stand in the midst of this work with our best forces, and we have contributed our best - each one according to his capacities - to the various spheres of work. We wish to develop this work also at the Goetheanum in Dornach. For the Goetheanum exists for all members.

We consider it our duty to show to the people who are in contact with us, the way to the full spiritual life at the Goetheanum.

The history of the Society clearly shows that people wish to be active in it, who seek indeed the same Anthroposophy, but who wish to cultivate it in different ways. Rudolf Steiner always recognised this, and considered this also when he composed the "Principles" and called together the Vorstand. Consequently we are convinced that the Society can fulfil its task only if a differentiating element is opposed to the centralising tendency which has now taken root in the management of affairs. We find this necessity expressed in Rudolf Steiner's words:

"On a spiritually-scientific basis, we become united if we differentiate and individualise, not if we centralise."

In these words, spoken in 1923, Rudolf Steiner expressed - apart from the occasion which gave rise to them - a guiding sentence for the formation of anthroposophical social life. Such a living differentiation must be preferred to a formal uniformity.

This differentiation is above all a uniting link and an element of life for a great part of the members. Consequently, an organic structure full of meaning, should be created within the

Anthroposophical Society. We are also convinced that a great part of present day humanity will find a real life-soil in the Society through the realization of these principles.

We shall continue our work as free, independent Groups and Members in the General Anthroposophical Society by taking these principles as our foundation. As free, independent Groups and Members we shall also be equipped in the best way to face the demands of the present age. To-day the world demands more than ever the spiritual insight, the will for social co-operation and an open heart for the requirements of humanity."

The very first sentence of the text is characteristic of the authors. It reads thus: "*During the last 8 years, the undersigned Groups and members have been compelled to realise that various directions of will have developed in an increasing measure within the Anthroposophical Society.*" It is strange indeed to speak about having been "*compelled to realise*", when these persons have themselves been striving for years past to force their own will on the Society. And equally strange to refer to 8 instead of 9 years, a necessary evasion, of course, if the purpose be to blot out the year 1925 which is so indispensable for any true judgment of all that has happened.

134

Further on we read that the proposed change in the Statutes" would empower the President to distribute anew the offices in the Vorstand " and "to alter the rights of signature".

When Dr. Kolisko was requested to account for this falsification in the text regarding a change in the Statutes, he knew no other answer than to say that he "perceives" in the text of the proposed change what the content of the Declaration of Intentions expresses.

The motion for a change in the Statutes which had been handed in, in correct order 4 weeks previously, reads as follows:

Dornach, 19th February 1934.

To the Vorstand of the General Anthroposophical Society, to be delivered to the President, Herr Albert Steffen, Dornach.

The undersigned will bring forward the motion at the forthcoming General Meeting, to change the wording of paragraphs 6 and 13 of the legally registered Statutes, as follows:

Par. 6.

Membership is acquired when the written application for membership has been accepted by the Vorstand and the membership card has been signed by the President.

The Vorstand represents the Society to the external world. The legal right of signature in the name of the Society is held by:

The President, signing alone; the Recorder (Schriftführer) and the Secretary-Treasurer, signing collectively with the President. The President can give to members of the Vorstand a general power of attorney or one for special spheres of work, entitling them to sign alone.

Sgd. Paul Bühler, Dr. E. O. Eckstein Dr. Otto Frankl, Ehrenfried Pfeiffer, Paul Eugen Schiller, Günther Schubert, Dr. Richard Schubert.

Thus Dr. Kolisko, Dr. Zeylmans and Mr. Kaufmann, as responsible functionaries of the Society, had misled for weeks beforehand the members of the German Groups and of the Anthroposophical Societies in Holland and in Great Britain, by systematic mis-statement of the wording of an important text.

There was no ground for speaking about a "*drastic change in the constitution*". And it was equally unjustifiable to talk about a breach of the "Principles". As regards the important item in connection with the signing of the membership-cards, Dr. Steiner himself made the following arrangement:

Respecting the administration of the Anthroposophical Society: The Vorstand wishes to cite the following in connection with the Statutes:

1. A person becomes a member from the moment that the leader of the Anthroposophical Society has signed the Membership card submitted by the functionaries of the Groups.
2. The functionaries of Groups are requested to keep an up-to-date list of the names and addresses of the members belonging to their Groups, and to send a copy of this list to the Secretariat at Dornach²⁵
3. ... The communications to members will be made as a rule through the "Mitteilungsblatt". In special cases the functionaries of the Groups will receive the communications with the request to transmit them to the individual members.²⁶

The Vorstand of the Anthroposophical Society.

From the "Nachrichtenblatt" of the 20th January, 1924.

Further on we find stated: "This procedure would imply the legalisation of the situation that has

25 This is the passage to which reference was made previously, in connection was Mr. Dunlop's refusal to submit the addresses of new members.

26 This also has been carried out by Mr. Dunlop, only when he believed that interests of his faction would not be prejudiced thereby.

developed in the Society during the last few years."

Not only is the assertion that the situation of the recent years was illegal, an absurdity, but even Dr. Kolisko himself, who spoke on behalf of the authors of the Declaration of Intentions, was unable to cite examples, no matter how urgently he was requested by the members to do so.

And then follow the sentences in which majority-decisions of the Vorstand and of the General Meeting are rejected.

Two points are to be noted in this connection. Firstly :- How can resolutions for the Society be made otherwise than through the usual legitimate appeal to the Vorstand and to the General Meeting? And now could anyone expect such resolutions to be unanimous? This whole assertion becomes specially grotesque when we realise that the appoint-

136

ment of the German Initiative-Group was concluded by unanimous decision of the Vorstand, and that-in spite of this—the carrying out of its task was then hindered in every possible way by the two Vorstand members, Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede.

Secondly: The assertion regarding resolutions formed during recent years does not in any way harmonise with the facts - and especially when it is once again made in connection with the last "8 years". The entire statement signifies nothing else than the expression of the desire to make all further leadership of the Society impossible. Under the guise of formal grievances, certain matters are brought up in the hope that an impression may thus be made on unsuspecting members. The real reasons why consultations in the Vorstand as well as with the functionaries had become impossible, have already been sufficiently dealt with in the present memorandum. Likewise the other fact-in spite of all denial of this - that each of the members of the Vorstand has always been questioned concerning all important affairs, such as the Conferences at the Goetheanum, the new organisation of the German National Society, etc.

The sentence (literal translation): "*one has changed from Dornach the organisation of affiliated Societies* " and: "*attempts have been made to transform the whole Society in the intention of this part of the Vorstand*", disclosed itself in all its falsity when Dr. Kolisko explained its wording and cited again the example of the new organisation of the Society in Germany, characterising this procedure as interference on the part of Herr Steffen. These procedures have already been sufficiently explained and in reality they must be traced back to the fact that more than 7000 - out of a membership of over 8000 in Germany - abandoned Dr. Kolisko and all who shared his opinions.

And again further on it is stated: "We do not fail to see that, under certain circumstances, a

change in the Constitution of the Society may be needed, provided that conditions require such a change. Such changes, however, can come only from the entire body responsible for the Society's organisation." This maze of words takes on a certain significance, to be sure, when we look into this "insight" here referred to ("we do not fail to see ", etc.) and see what effects it has had in the Society for years past. Radical changes were striven for, without

137

consideration for the General Meeting or the Vorstand, and the "entire body responsible for the Society's organisation" was accordingly taken by that loyal court of Alexander which had so often already, through useful undertakings, singled itself out as the "super-Vorstand ".

The demand that all five members of the Vorstand - after all that has happened-be nevertheless recognised as having equal rights, expresses exactly the attitude which has called forth our very worst difficulties of recent years. "Investitures" and "higher points of view" were to serve the purpose of diverting attention from uncomfortable facts, as well as of making untruths acceptable.

The Declaration of Intentions was the worthy successor to the "Manifestation" of the year 1926. Both of them originated within the same circles and pursued the same ends, namely, to create by means of agitation among poorly-informed and unsuspecting members, an atmosphere which would be advantageous to the ambition for power of a small clique of leaders. Through discreet silence or through misstated or freely-invented facts, attention was to be diverted from the true state of things, and any foundation for a true judgment taken away from the members so that they would not be properly informed, but on the contrary misled. They would thus have no possibility of finding out for themselves, but would "render manifest" or "declare as their intention" whatever Dr. Kolisko, Dr. Zeylmans, Mr. Kaufmann and certain others prescribed.

A number of co-workers at the Goetheanum, together with the German Initiative-Group, asked the following questions to the authors of the "Declaration of Intentions":

1. How can you assert that a motion has been brought forward, which changes in a drastic way the constitution of the Anthroposophical Society?
2. How can you declare that a motion has been brought forward, which empowers the President to distribute the offices in the Vorstand anew and to change the right of signature?
3. Whence do you take the right to mislead by such false statements, members in Germany, England and Holland?
4. How can you insinuate that the situation in the Society has been illegal for the last few years? Give examples of this.

138

5. Please give examples of valuable work which has supposed to have been ignored.
6. Who has ever prevented Groups from choosing their collaborators freely?
7. Who has changed the organisation of affiliated Societies from Dornach?

After receiving no proper answer to these questions—they were obscured rather, by all sorts of generalities—those persons who had put the questions gave the answer themselves in the form of the following Motion accompanied by a "Justification" formulated in writing:-

MOTION

"The General Meeting of the 27th March 1934 rejects the so-called "Declaration of Intentions" of Dr. Kolisko, Dr. Zeylmans, Mr. Dunlop and Mr. Kaufmann as a demonstration which through untruth, misrepresentation of historical facts, and calumnies, endeavours to bring about a compulsory situation that would paralyse every activity in the Anthroposophical Society. The General Meeting begs those members who have supported this without realising what it implied, to inform themselves independently concerning the true facts."

Justification.

"We establish that the motion for a change in the Statutes mentions nowhere a "change empowering the President to distribute anew the offices in the Vorstand" and "to change the right of signature". This is an untrue statement of facts.

We establish that according to the wording of the Principles and of the Mitteilungsblatt No. 2 of 1924 there is no infringement of the Principles or of the Christmas Meeting 1923. On the contrary, the authors of the so-called "Declaration of Intentions" do not know, after ten years, Rudolf Steiner's explanations on these questions. Again, there is an untrue statement of facts in the so-called "Declaration of Intentions".

We establish that the actual Motion was submitted in due order four weeks ago and was accessible to everybody. Instead, in England, Holland and Germany people talked of a Motion which never existed. We call this a misrepresentation of facts.

The sentence "one has changed, from Dornach, the organisation of affiliated Societies, etc." is a calumny, which has not the slightest foundation, and in support of which not a single concrete example could be mentioned. The anonymously worded reproach was hurled at Herr Steffen in the course of the discussion. Thus a Vorstand is desired, the President of which is insulted again and again in the most insolent way.

The chief example at the General Meeting of work that is being ignored at the Goetheanum, is Herr Steffen's work, planned on such a large scale, which has not only been ignored again and again by FrI. Dr. Vreede, but rendered impossible, and thus actually lost to the Society.

The demand that the five members of the Vorstand should work together, is felt by us as untruthful, when it is advanced by members who have done all they could, since Rudolf Steiner's death, to bring about the present situation, which itself renders such a demand impossible. Its enforcement would mean the paralysing of all the work in the Society, especially if neither the decisions of the General Meeting nor those of the majority of the Vorstand are recognised as valid."

The Motion with the written Justification was sent in by the:-

| | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| Collaborators at the Goetheanum: | | and the Members of the German Initiative- Group: |
| Dr. Roman Boos | Ehrenfried Pfeiffer | Dr. Hermann Poppelbaum |
| Paul Bühler | Paul Eugen Schiller | Dr. Hans Büchenbacher |
| Dr. E.O. Eckstein | Dr. W. Schornstein | Ernst Stegemann |
| Curt Englert-Faye | Günther Schubert | Martin Münch |
| Dr. Otto Frankl | Dr. Richard Schubert | Dr. Hermann v. Baravalle. |
| Wilhelm Lewerenz | Jan Stuten | |

Even had there been a last possible chance for an understanding, this was also forfeited because of the stand taken by Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede, who officially endorsed the content of the "Declaration of Intentions ". Dr. Vreede's attitude was once more characterised by attempts to take the Meeting by surprise, as it were, through false statements of facts. She asserted, for example, that the last part of her letter concerning the Christmas Conference of 1933 had been purposely left out of the News Sheet. The number of the News Sheet in question had to be placed before her before she was willing to give up this effort to mislead. She then insisted that she had been set aside as lecturer, but when she could offer no proofs, she had to withdraw this assertion, also much against her will. On the contrary-although she had for years past systematically hindered Herr Steffen in his efforts as President, to arrange any sort of Conference or special programme-she herself was not hindered in her own plan to hold a parallel or "CounterConference" together with others of her friends during the Christmas Conference of 1933. Finally her whole bearing became such that the Meeting did not wish to listen to her any more.

Dr. Zeylmans was characterized by similar tactics, when he endeavoured to put Herr Steffen in a false light before the Meeting through the assertion that by mentioning Society affairs in a letter to the Group at Bandung, Java he-Herr Steffen-had disturbed an unsuspecting cilCIE members in their peaceable work. Not till after the conclusion of General Meeting did the fact come to light that it was Dr. Zeymans himself who had informed this Group quite a long time before and too, in the way he had wished to do it. Thus, apart from the fact that it

is quite incomprehensible why the President of the Society should not have the right to express himself concerning any and all of the Society's affairs, we see here even then the enormous difference between the way in which Herr Steffen speaks to the members in such cases, and the decidedly questionable manner of reporting of the General Secretary from Holland-by means of which, for years past, the Dutch members have been alienated from the Goetheanum.

Dr. Wegman gave her support to the "Declaration of Intentions " in the form of a letter to Herr Steffen, which was read at her request before the Meeting. The letter reads as follows:

Arlesheim, 24th March, 1934.

Dear Herr Steffen,

Again a General Meeting approaches, again the emotions of members will be whipped up and inflamed, and again will decent people, whom Dr. Steiner loved and appreciated, be attacked through these inflamed emotions; the prestige of these men will be undermined, and they will be systematically ruined. And you, as President of the Anthroposophical Society, allow this. You think that it is good that people correct each other. But you do not consider what is thrown down in ruins through this.

A Group of seven people now brings forward a motion. With this motion they wish to give you, Herr Steffen, other rights besides those of a President, - rights that go well beyond this sphere. I do not see anything good in this. It means going still further away from Dr. Steiner's principles, and exhibits a tendency to make the Goetheanum accessible only to a particular group of people. The others are excluded. This has been more or less the case already for several years, and as a member of the Vorstand I cannot agree that this situation, which has been carried through consistently by three members of the Vorstand, should be legalised.

I second the "Declaration of Intentions of the Groups belonging to the "Working Community, and to the Societies in Holland and in England, because they protest with justice against the one-sided leadership of the Goetheanum.

As regards my own work at the Goetheanum, which is connected especially with the art of healing. I inform the Vorstand and the Members herewith that I am not willing to accept alterations which might be undertaken with the Sections. I will devote myself to the task entrusted to the Sections by Rudolf Steiner, with the help of all those who wish to work with me and who feel awakened within them the healer's will. We shall find possibilities of devoting ourselves to this calling of healers under the protection of the spirit of Rudolf Steiner, and far away from the quarrels and disharmonies that are now raging in the Society. Through this Healer-Will we now raise ourselves consciously at all quarrels, and we shall remain consciously in the Goetheanum - the place created by Rudolf Steiner not only for a privileged small group of people but for us all. Aided by those who have an understanding for this kind of work, we will strive to deepen

141

elaborate and spread the knowledge given us so unstintingly by Rudolf Steiner - in perfect harmony and mindful of Christian charity, untouched by the turmoils in the Anthroposophical Society.

Sgd. Dr. I. Wegman.

P.S. I meant to say this personally at the General Meeting, but since I have been in bed with fever for the last fortnight, I must use this means.

Even this fact alone, that the Anthroposophical Society must include this letter among its documents, is humiliating enough. Such a letter can only be looked upon as a self-characterisation, and the last possible illusions are destroyed through the unmasking which it brings about. For it is in this way that Dr. Wegman now writes-Dr. Wegman who herself has done nothing whatever, during the winters of 1926 and 1927, to prevent the alarm-raising authors of the "Manifestation " from giving vent to their emotions, and who had tolerated all sorts of malicious assertions regarding Frau Dr. Steiner and Herr Steffen, and indeed was herself guilty of some of the worst of these. She now ventures to speak about being set aside as a member of the Vorstand and to make the President responsible for the criticism passed on her work-after she herself, at the Meeting of November 29, 1930, had pronounced as impossible and had rejected the taking over of responsibility by Herr Steffen either for the past or the future. She approves the absurdities contained in the "Declaration of Intentions ", although it was she, through her own behaviour, who made the meetings of the Vorstand impossible and misled members at General Meetings. It was she who in February 1926 deluded the Society through promises and solemn affirmations, in the hope of gaining time and thus gradually establishing her autocracy. And it was she, moreover, who—in the spring of 1930-treated the Vorstand in so strange a manner-that is, when through her own statements, she allowed false suppositions to be created as to decisions in the Vorstand, in matters concerning the First Class, and afterwards made matters even worse by changing the text of a letter from the Vorstand. In addition to the untrue statement made by her on November 29, 1930, according to which she claimed not to have heard in the Vorstand, in 1928, anything about Herr Steffen's taking over of responsibility, she de gave expression to a whole series of traceably objective untruths when she appeared before the General Meeting of December 1930.

142

Hence it has a most peculiar effect when this same person-who in reality turns away from the wounds that she herself has inflicted-now speaks about a "Healer-Will " and seems to believe that by doing this "she can raise herself consciously above all quarrels". Anyone who thus claims to be "mindful of Christian charity" and thereby pleads Rudolf Steiner's Cause ... let him examine himself as to whether he is entitled to do this. Furthermore, if the Goetheanum is there "for us all", then all of us must all the more take care that both this name and the name of Dr. Steiner shall not be misused as they have been misused by Dr. Wegman-not only in connection with the Einsingen affair, but also each time she has taken a stand contradictory to the truth, both as a

member of the Vorstand and in the position she has craved as a leader of the esoteric School.

Let it suffice here to mention briefly the fact, that as a result of the unjustified accusations made against Herr Steffen by Mr. Kaufmann, a turning point was brought about at the General Meeting which rendered a change in the leadership of the Society unavoidable. Even then, however, Mr. Kaufmann only repeated what was in Dr. Wegman's letter, and while appealing once more to Christian charity, he placed upon Herr Steffen the responsibility for everything. Through the opposition of those among whom Mr. Kaufmann himself was never absent, Herr Steffen was prevented from taking up a responsibility which he had once readily taken upon himself ²⁷.

*

The "self-exclusion" of the "super-Vorstand" and of the two Vorstand members, brought about through their "Declaration of Intentions", took on its final form when the so-called "United Free Anthroposophical Groups" were founded during the summer of 1934. These Groups are in such flagrant contradiction with the constitution of the Society and arose out of such obvious hostility to its authoritative leadership, that it is no longer possible to even think about an understanding with their

143

founders. Disregarding the fact that such a foundation cannot be acknowledged by the Vorstand, the founders claim for themselves the right to receive into their midst persons who are not recognised as members of the General Anthroposophical Society, but who are nevertheless looked upon by the founders as anthroposophists having the same rights usually belonging only to members who are accepted according to the rules. Dr. Vreede, in spite of these facts, had a share in founding the Groups, and functions since that time as their medium of correspondence, a fact which has been made known by Mr. Kaufmann in a circular letter. Also Dr. Wegman recognises and supports this unlawful organisation. Hence Dr. Wegman and Dr. Vreede have in reality put themselves out of the Vorstand of the Anthroposophical Society.

144

²⁷ In view of these occurrences, the letter from Dr. König which came to hand while these pages went to press, is also comprehensible. It is only amazing that what seemed to be a last extreme can still be exceeded.

10. CONCLUSION.

If, on perusing this survey of the past ten years, the reader feels oppressed by the many unpleasant events which had to be told, he will be best able to gauge what self-conquest it implied for the writers of this Memorandum to deal again, for whole months at a stretch, with all those events which had been painful enough when they experienced them. This is one of the reasons why the publication of this Memorandum, which was planned for the autumn, has been delayed till to-day. But another reason is more important still it was extremely difficult to decide whether it should be published or not. The decision to bring such a report was by no means made either lightly or willingly.

To begin with, Dr. Poppelbaum found himself compelled last summer to reply in some way to attacks and agitations and wrote an account for such occasions; this he afterwards published and propagated as a provisional report on the history of the past years. Considerations based more on principle arose and the necessity for a detailed description became more and more evident. Above all, the fact had to be considered that for years the difficult conditions in the Society were essentially increased by the members not being sufficiently informed. In accordance with the intentions of some functionaries, in certain circles the members had been given explanations only to a limited extent and with certain reservations.

But many things remained unsaid on the part of others as well. This happened, however, because they were always willing to reckon with the possibility that the situation might improve even without the mention of all too unpleasant facts and that the members would come to a realisation of what was right. Expectations in this direction have partly been fulfilled, but at least to the extent practised for so long the reserve lost some of its justification because no improvements could any longer be reached through it, whereas the attacks carried on with false statements would continue undisturbed. The "Declaration of Intentions" and the circulars which followed it can only be opposed by a description of the true facts, although this will hardly be effective where people prefer to reckon, not with the facts themselves, but with what they wish to see.

Readers who are unacquainted or only partially acquainted with the facts, will probably be horrified by many things in this Memorandum. But others who have taken part in these happenings will be surprised at the indulgent terms and the reserve which they will find in many cases. There will be very divergent and very personal judgments.

Apart from such judgments based on personal taste which are only connected indirectly with the matter, the apparently justified question can nevertheless be raised as to whether indulgence and reserve in action have always been the right way or whether this has not enabled the unhealthy conditions to continue for a longer time than was perhaps necessary? This may be the case from an abstract point of view. But how little such a judgment really applies to the true course of events can be seen by bearing in mind that at the beginning about one third or even half of the whole membership supported the claims and aims of Dr. Wegman and that finally this became a minority which hardly comprises one tenth of the membership. This shows the healing consequences of a process which could only take place through a free judgment of the realities of life. Only in this way could belief in authority and toying with esotericism be rejected and this was the essential point. Nothing good could have arisen if, for instance, the Anthroposophical Society in Germany had been re-organised through an authoritative command and if the thousands of members had not freed themselves of their own accord from that small but tyrannising group of leaders. It is strange enough to see that these rigid dogmatists above all, were the very people who grew indignant at this process and who misused whatever authority was still left to them in order to spread the most malicious and impossible descriptions concerning Herr Steffen's attitude in this connection. Herr Steffen can only be understood or not understood. It is not possible to convince wanton people!

Untrue statements, however, do not remain ineffective, particularly when they are spread so strongly and wilfully as has been the case with the circulars of Mr. Kaufmann and of Dr. Lehrs. Herr von Grone sends round these articles and advocates them by "trusting in the force offered in their contents which is able to build up communities". But they merely render in a new edition those items in the "Declaration

of Intentions " which have been proved to be untrue and they wish to prevent that the events of the past years should be known in their true light. Uninformed and unsuspecting members can thus be given distorted views and be led unawares along a path which they would never tread of their own accord. That the past is past, is a simple and-above all convenient truth. That causes precede effects and must therefore lie in the past-this too is a simple truth, but it is not a convenient one. It is inconvenient for anyone who wishes to conceal the past and for anyone who knows nothing about a particular past, but would have to know it if he wished to judge soundly its consequences in the present. Such an easy-going attitude, however, is one of the dangers which cannot be taken too seriously, because it is so easy to appeal successfully to this kind of human

weakness.

By bearing this danger in mind, the writers of this Memorandum decided to bring at least some of the important things to the knowledge of wider circles. They also believed that this was their duty, as otherwise the reproach might be made to them at some future time that through their silence they too were responsible for things, the evil consequences of which they must have foreseen.

If the history of the Anthroposophical Society would, in general, be taken more seriously, then it would be possible to realise the absurdity of the opinion which was ruling in many circles-- that the life in the Society must and could take its course peacefully and harmoniously, for this had always been the case before, and only after Dr. Steiner's death the terrible Meetings began, because certain people enjoyed creating disturbances. Let the facts alone—they said—and let the members "come to an understanding in a human kind of way"!

But there still exist the voluminous printed reports published as official "Communications" about the Meetings of earlier years. One can read in them how Dr. Steiner, who himself led the Meetings, had repeatedly taken a stand most strongly against sentimental peace-making and alleged tolerance. Even after decisions had already been reached to break off the debate on unpleasant subjects, he insisted that everything should be discussed until full light be thrown on the matter. These subjects were sometimes even more unpleasant than those of the past

147

years. And anyone who can still remember the Delegates' Meet 1923 (held first at Stuttgart and then at Dornach) knows to what extent Dr. Steiner admitted the justification of "tolerance" or shy understanding" if this was meant to cover up inconvenient facts and untruths.

The situation of the immediate present cannot be better characterised than through words which Dr. Steiner himself spoke at the end of his lectures on "Cosmic Being and Egoity":-

"Sides are taken for the one who is in the wrong. And letters are written to the effect that those who are attacked should be the ones to do something to maintain the friendship and to settle things. One should develop love! When someone commits a downright loveless action against another, then one writes—not to the one who committed the action, but to the one who suffered under it: Develop love! It is so loveless of you not to do something in order to straighten out matters - It never enters one's head to require this from the other one who is in the wrong! These are some of the peculiarities to be found precisely here, among us—things which happen just exactly among us!"

Has the Anthroposophical Society not emerged in 1913 out of a tremendous conflict? And what things had to be fought against in those days? The mischief that was carried on in connection with reincarnations, "investitures ", " missions ", false esotericism, etc.-in a few words, ambition for power.

As a defence against similar tendencies, decisions had to be made in 1934, giving rise-in addition to the negative which they contain above all to this positive result: that the members see in the guidance of the Society through the three members of the Vorstand who are now leading it, a guarantee for a sound further development and for earnest work.