



Hope. Spring. Eternal. Concerning the Crisis in the Anthroposophical Society

with Christopher Houghton Budd*

30 March 2022

Transcribed by Kim Chotzen

Adapted from the original flier:

Invited to address this topic by Dottie Zold, this presentation was aimed mainly at a younger generation than my own – 73 and under! It considers the challenges facing the Anthroposophical Society when understood as a part of, not apart from, current history. Meaning the Anthroposophical Society as a shared space in which its members, if they are so minded, have the opportunity not to feed their own souls directly, but by playing a part in fashioning the Anthroposophical Society as an exemplar of a wider social life worthy of every human being. I addressed this theme in three ways:

- *Whither or wither: Does the Anthroposophical Society matter anymore?*
- *The Christmas Conference as threefolding secured.*
- *The Anthroposophical Society, economic materialism and the role of America.*

The need to overcome economic materialism is the particular task of the West. Unless spiritual science engages directly with this task, there is a real and present risk that neither will economic materialism be overcome, nor will spiritual science be anything more than a sideshow in wider human affairs (which may, of course, be its tragic destiny). I refer to spiritual science, rather than anthroposophy, because anthroposophy is often more a body of received thoughts than insights developed by oneself. Indeed, in outer life it is often better simply to stay with Rudolf Steiner's ideas as one's reference.

The background to what I shared can be found in my published works, especially in *The Deed of Rudolf Steiner*,¹ (search (aeBookstore.com), and the 2008 recordings *Inner and Outer Aspects of Associative Economics (Money: The Old and New Mysteries, and Rudolf Steiner's Unfinished Deed)* – available from steinereconomics.com.



* I have been a member of the Anthroposophical Society since 1972 and of the School of Spiritual Science since 1979. I am convenor of the Economics Conference of the Goetheanum, begun in 2002. Throughout this time, I have studied the 1923 Christmas Conference and am currently engaged with Society treasurers in giving that better effect. Professionally, as an economic and monetary historian specialising in finance, I am active both as an academic and entrepreneur and have always sought ways whereby Rudolf Steiner's socio-economic ideas can be woven into current mainstream debates and policies.

¹ Originally published in 1979 as *Rudolf Steiner, the Anthroposophical Society and the School of Spiritual Science*. Revised in 1996 as *An Economic Testament*. Revised again in 2013 as *The Deed of Rudolf Steiner*, incorporating *Tasks, Seeds and Qualities*, concerning the three classes by Jurgen Smit.

Welcome by Dottie Zold

So, here's the book I encountered that was on my shelf for I don't know how many years by Christopher.² I was deeply inspired by what I found inside and then I reached out to him to see if it might be a presentation he could offer on the death day of Rudolf Steiner. He said yes after a period of getting to know one another – who we are, what we're about. That was really incredible and lovely for me and I experienced it as very future oriented. So, thank you, Christopher. And thank you all for being here today on the day of Rudolf Steiner crossing the threshold. I had asked if we could read a verse and Christopher offered one that is his prayer, read now by Kim Chotzen:

Christ John of Rose Cross, Protect us
Guide us on our path
In the hope that it is your path too.
Help us be attentive
but nonetheless decisive.

To centre the economy
Is to resolve the chaos in karma
Facing us with the astral life.
In touching a task perhaps not his
Of keeping true the economic structure of the world.

Grant us the courage
To pursue our objectives
And the forces of spirit
To remain conscious of you.

² Dottie is referring to Rudolf Steiner, the Anthroposophical Society and the School of Spiritual Science, an essay originally written and published in 1979, then extended and updated in 1996 under the title *An Economic Testament*. In 2014, it was further extended as *The Deed of Rudolf Steiner – Sociological Masterpiece / Economic Testament* (search aeBookstore.com.) to include a section on the ideas of Sergei Prokovieff and Marc Desaulles and the details of talks given to the Youth Section in England in 1979 by Jurgen Smit₂

Introduction by Mary Adams

Thank you, Dottie. Thank you, Kim. And thank you for the invitation to be here on this day. I think that we all received the information from Dottie and from Christopher which includes some wonderful information about his biography, so I'm going to take the liberty of speaking about my relationship with Christopher over the years. And the many times that we've spent pondering the mysteries together – primarily for me, the mysteries of the stars and my appreciating how the really practical application of thought that Christopher has toward his subject matter not only brings information to me about that, but also about my own work. And I think for me this is the true gift of anthroposophy – when we can be in the light of clear thinking and how it can illuminate for us our task.

We first met back in, I think it was 1998 in Viroqua and then over the years I've had opportunity to travel to Fair Oaks, to Canterbury, to Vancouver and always out of a question for myself about how does a working with the stars and a striving to understand something that others might not have access to, how is this illuminated by what I experience in Christopher's work as an economic historian in relationship to the things that he places attention on. And it has been interesting to see how certain events that we have both attended have coincided with specific celestial phenomena, not the least of which was the astronomical first full moon of Spring that happened in 2019, when we were gathered in Vancouver and there was a great question about whether or not the Easter Mystery was actually occurring on the first Sunday after the Vernal Equinox or whether it was, as the Church was describing it, one month later. And I think it gave an opportunity to really look at the esoteric and exoteric or inner and outer experience.

But today there's also something interesting happening celestially or we could say phenomenologically, because the Moon has, it's just a few hours away from coming to new phase and so it's in this place that's called its dark phase where we don't see it. And it's passing by, almost right now, as we're speaking. It's passing by the planet Jupiter, in the same degree of the zodiac and later this evening it will pass by Neptune. And this is significant because Jupiter and Neptune, on the 12th of April, are going to come to a meeting that they have not had in this degree of the zodiac or this region since the 1850s.

So there's something about this day. In addition to it being the anniversary of the death day of Rudolf Steiner, there is this interesting relationship between Moon, Jupiter and Neptune that seems to hold a clue about what the conjunction that's going to happen a couple of weeks from now might be.

I can't think of a better way to spend time today than with Christopher and with all of you addressing the question that Dottie had for Christopher – to really try to bring this clarity of thought on the issues, however they're manifesting themselves. And also I think that it's significant that in March of 1856 when Jupiter and Neptune came together, one of the things that happened at that time was that surveyors and scientists were able to determine that Mount Everest was actually the tallest peak on the earth. And this, I think, bears the mood of what Jupiter and Neptune are about. We can come to a certain practical application of human thinking and at the same time, attempt to measure something that is beyond reach. And so I like to think today is about that – looking at mysteries that allows really applied practical thinking so we can make our way forward in the best possible light.

I'm very happy to have had the opportunity to share this little picture of my experience of Christopher and I just want to say thank you to Christopher for being here on 'zoom', and for sharing what you have to bring today. Thank you.

Hope. Spring. Eternal.

The Crisis in the Anthroposophical Society

Ok, thank you. Hello everyone. I can't see everybody but I do have a list of who is looking at me and I'd just like to say hello to anybody I already know. There's quite some old timers out there and maybe I'll see you on the screen later.

My thought was to make a very precise and even scripted presentation, hopefully no more than thirty minutes. I have quite a lot of complex things I want to talk about, but first I need to make an apology for my voice. Two days ago I was in bed with covid. Yesterday I was up with covid. Today I'm up without covid hopefully. But as you can hear, it's not quite gone yet so I apologize for that.

I want to start with a warning. I'm not sure, concerning this topic that we're going to talk about, whether one's allowed to talk about it this way, with this medium and in these times, and so it's a kind of health warning: this may be an act of hubris on our part. I mean that seriously. Somehow we need to be alert to the fact that maybe what we're considering is not to be considered in this way. You don't know that until you've done your deed, of course; only then do you find out. But I have reasons for saying what I've just said.

That said, I made the title for the talk 'Hope. Spring. Eternal.' because I wanted to lighten the mood of the original question that Dottie asked me, concerning the crisis³ in the Anthroposophical Society. I think that's a very serious question and it's a very sombre topic. It's also quite complex. So I wanted to lift it a little bit so that we get a distance from it and avoid getting trapped too much in our melancholia and the tragedies of the last more or less hundred years.

I also asked Dottie which particular crisis she was referring to because there's probably quite a number that people have in mind and I'm not sure which one she meant. Next week, many of us will be meeting at the Goetheanum AGM. That might well be another crisis, or maybe Dottie already has some inside information. I don't know.

So I'm being serious and slightly jokey also. But what I wanted to say is, I think the crisis of the Anthroposophical Society is a permanent one and it will accompany the Society as long as it's on the earth. That's the crisis I want to talk about. It's the crisis of not having a *telos*, not having a clear purpose beyond itself, and it's compounded by the fact that we have maybe one hundred years or so of catch-up to do. That's my view – we have wasted, well maybe we haven't wasted, that's for the gods to decide – but you can look back at the last hundred years and you can really wonder whether we've done what we should have done, whether we've missed the boat, whether humanity has sailed without us – there are many ways one could describe this. But I'm fairly sure one way or another there's a serious amount of catch-up to do. And maybe part of this event and these hundred years, those moments going up to the Christmas Conference centenary, are also about that – catching up on lost time.

But for a *telos*, the kind of thing I have in mind has to be something way outside one's comfort zone. And you'll see what I mean when I start talking about it. If we have a purpose which is so close to us, or too close to us, then it's not really a purpose at all. It becomes a purpose of our own private lives, not, in my view, the purpose of the Anthroposophical Society. So we need something that is really world-historical and also central to events – nothing less than that. It may sound pompous and over-egging it, but I think unless we set the bar somewhere at that point, then we will not, as a collective community, achieve what we're supposed to be doing. Our horizon will be too short and we will end up mainly squabbling and disagreeing, blaming our conduct on streams and all sorts of things when often it's because our horizons are too close. And that's why I want to make this idea of a destination, of a purpose, a very distant one, distant from our normal understanding of things.

I think it also important that we lift ourselves up to where Rudolf Steiner is. We need to join him in colleagueship, as it were, those of us, that is, who are members of the School of Spiritual Science. For we are

³ From the Greek, *krisis*, meaning a turning point or moment when an important change takes place, indicating either recovery or death. As in, perhaps, at "the Turning Point of Time..."

indeed *members* of the School of Spiritual Science; we are not pupils. This is a very important distinction. We're not in that sense pupils of Rudolf Steiner, we may also be that, but we are members of the School which he founded and in that sense we can also say we're colleagues, colleagues who I think should be sitting in circles all the time with Rudolf Steiner on one of the chairs of the circle, and not in the centre, so to speak. But also not creating an egg shape out of the circle, which often people do when they move from hierarchic leadership into circles. The circle gets egg-shaped and they sit at the top of the circle. But this is not Rudolf Steiner's way; he's one in the circle. If you look along the circle, you'll be able to see where he is.

I think we need to do this, as I say, to stop squabbling, to get beyond our petty or parochial interests and understandings. But also because, for me, there's always been an image – I take it from Theodor Schwenk,⁴ though I've never proved it. It's just been very beautiful as an image. When I was a Youth Section member, there was a whole crowd of us and we used this image quite often. It's the image of a flight of birds. A flight of birds, when you see them flying through the sky, looks like a unity. They're all flapping, going in one direction, but if you look more closely, that's the idea anyway, not every bird is flapping its wings, some birds are having their wings flapped by others. And this is the basic idea of the flight of birds – the whole thing moves forward because some of them are resting while others are carrying. It's a kind of division of labour taking place. And I've always thought this is a most important image for our work in the Anthroposophical Society – that, for example, when we see a shortcoming in somebody or what we perceive to be a shortcoming, we should supply what we think is absent. We shouldn't point it out, trapping one another in our shortcomings and making them even worse. This idea of division of labour – that we have a shared endeavour – for me is quite critical. And I want to set that out at the beginning as a way of understanding the way we should work.⁵

A Safe and Valid Space

And then, before going any further, I want to make a safe and valid space. So, a safe space for discussing this topic, 'the crisis in the Anthroposophical Society'. By that I mean, I have no idea who's actually watching me or what your relationship is to the Anthroposophical Society, so my concern is – and it's a kind of expectation that I'm making of you as a viewer or a conversation partner – that, whatever your relationship is to the Anthroposophical Society, you hold its well-being in your hearts. And I think this is the place I'd like to start, as a community of researchers, if you like, concerned about the well-being of the Anthroposophical Society. That is our starting point, that is our common denominator.

Now I want to use another image of the Christmas Conference, which is at the centre of the Anthroposophical Society. And it's a double image. On the one hand, I think it's like a lighthouse against which every karmic wave will crash and disintegrate. So that we are drawn to this lighthouse by our relationship to Rudolf Steiner primarily and what he is doing. But our private karma, as it were, is going to be splintered on this rock, on this lighthouse. That's one image. And it's not for us, so to speak, to keep alive or insist on our private karma. We must all expect our private karma to fall away from us on this lighthouse rock of the Christmas Conference. And when we do that, we will see that the Christmas Conference entails another image. It's the calm waters in the harbour after one has made safe harbour. I live in Folkestone, as some of you know, and so for me, this is a very easy metaphor to use because I can look out my window and I can see this going on most days of the week.

So, the idea of the Christmas Conference of the Anthroposophical Society as a place where we all – possibly even the whole of humanity – meet, but where we lose our private karma into chaos, as it were, and then out of this find ourselves in still waters. This for me is another important image, it's a kind of safe-guarding image for the well-being of the Anthroposophical Society. It's an image of nobody squabbling. And nobody claiming their stream is the cause of their problems or that one person's stream is more important than another's.

⁴ *Sensitive Chaos*, Theodor Schwenk, Rudolf Steiner Press, London 2014.

⁵ At the major 1979 regathering of School members at the Goetheanum, we in fact made a pact. If any one of us (we were five) went to the podium to speak, the rest had to follow and stand for whatever that person (guess who it was) said. The question was "Can the anthroposophy live in a bourgeois culture?" The full hall fell silent in non-response, and then came the coffee break. Directly after the pause, Jurgen Smit stood up to answer emphatically in the negative. His reason, as also the reason why the question was posed, is explained in the section 'Tasks, Seeds and Qualities', in *The Deed of Rudolf Steiner*, op.cit.

Next, I want to add something which I've always thought was very strange. When there was all the discussion of 'rehabilitating' Ita Wegman, I thought that's a very strange term to use. I thought it strange for two reasons. In my understanding of the Christmas Conference, there is no provision for exclusion. And therefore, nobody was excluded *except those who did the excluding*. And so I also want to state that again publicly: if anyone was excluded from the Anthroposophical Society at any point, the only person excluded was the one who did the excluding.

And the other thing about the idea of rehabilitation was, normally this is what you say about prisoners, criminals. So, I find it a strange notion that we talk about the rehabilitation of members of the Anthroposophical Society. Really, I don't think we should be using that term. We should be using something else like – I don't know – embracing someone we didn't really understand the first time round. Anything but 'rehabilitation'.

Rudolf Steiner, the Social Sciences and Finance

I want to place those images at the starting point in order to create a safe space. To create what I call a valid space, this is going to get more challenging or more problematical. The first thing I want to say is linked to my biography. When I met the work of Rudolf Steiner, I was already 16 and I was already on my way to becoming a social scientist. So it was me the social scientist that met Rudolf Steiner the social scientist. And I want to start with this idea that Rudolf Steiner was a very skilled social scientist. I'm not talking about spiritual science. I'm talking about social science. And he has (or ought to have) considerable stature in that world. If you look at his *Economics Course*⁶, for example, or if you look at his so-called *Threefold Social Order* book⁷, through the eyes of a social scientist, not through the eyes of an anthroposophist, they are remarkable pieces of work. And I think we need to start with recognition of this.

Secondly, the social sciences in those days were already completely captured by materialist thinking, but Rudolf Steiner as a social scientist was not subject to this problem. I want to get that clearly on the table so that we don't start with any lesser understanding of what he was doing when he re-founded the Anthroposophical Society. I've often called it a sociological masterpiece and I mean that in the sense that one day, I think, serious social scientists will see what he accomplished in what we call the re-founding of the Anthroposophical Society.

To use any lesser images than Rudolf Steiner himself used in the Christmas Conference to understand what he did and why he did it and what he expected is to put cataracts in our eyes, meaning we will not see what he was talking about. I say this because part of the problem or part of the crisis in the Anthroposophical Society is the way we look at it and try and understand it or sort it out on premises other than the ones Rudolf Steiner used. It's as if we don't accept his terms of reference and this is almost certain to be a problem in our joint endeavour.

I want to mention very specifically six examples of where I feel we have a problem in this regard. I'm talking about Rudolf Steiner's work as what I call a financial genius,⁸ because I think that's what he was and I think we have to give serious thought to the possibility that, if Rudolf Steiner was the initiate that most of us think he was – I've often called him 'the last initiate'⁹ – if he has this stature in the history of humanity, there's no way one can have the thought that he didn't understand finance. So when I look at the Christmas Conference, I've always been very clear – we have to look very, very carefully at what Rudolf Steiner himself says about finance. It's very subtle, it's very understated, but it's very specific. It's very short and to the point. That's the nature of finance.

But the way we look at the Anthroposophical Society is often *not* through Rudolf Steiner's eyes; it's through six other sets of eyes. And I want to name them because we need to park these sets of eyes, if that's a

⁶ *Economics – The world as one economy*. Rudolf Steiner, 2014 [1996/1922]. (GA 340) (Search aeBookstoe.com.)

⁷ 'Die Kernpunkte der sozialen Frage.' In English, *Towards Social Renewal*. Rudolf Steiner. Rudolf Steiner Press, London 1977 [1919].

⁸ See relevant section here:

https://economics.goetheanum.org/fileadmin/economics/Articles_and_Papers/EC_Paper_2021_CHB_Hibernia_Currency.pdf

⁹ *The Deed of Rudolf Steiner*, op. cit., p. 27.

possible image, or these glasses that we have on, in order that we can understand what Rudolf Steiner himself was seeing and describe it.

The first set are the glasses of church finance, used by the Christian Community. This is not a negative comment, but the Christian Community is a church and its finances are those of a church. The Anthroposophical Society is not a church nor are its finances.

The second set are those used in Camphill, from Karl Koenig. Brilliant work, very important; but in financial terms Camphill is a monastic order. By any other name, that's what it would be called. And with the finances of those of a monastic order. Again, this is not a criticism, it's just a description. You leave your assets outside when you join Camphill and the organization gets rich but not the people in it. Yet the Anthroposophical Society is not Camphill.

And then we have the problem of so-called 'ethical' banking which did not exist in Rudolf Steiner's time and if you read what Rudolf Steiner said about banking, it's a wonder it exists today. I'm not critiquing it in particular because banking generally is under criticism in our times. And yet, the Anthroposophical Society is not a bank. There's no point trying to conceive it as a bank or use it as a bank.

The fourth one in our movement is the role of management consultancy or organizational development, which I'm sure is wonderful in its own terms but it's not the field of finance. I do not know any managerial consultancy organization that really understands modern finance. So we also need to be mindful, because this is often the way we look at our organizations, and increasingly it's the way the Anthroposophical Society is perceived – as an organization. I think this is an error.

And then we have two earthly or outer arrangements, especially in the United States, but farther afield also. I know the Anthroposophical Society in America is a 501(c)(3), a not-for-profit with tax-exempt status. But we must not use tax-exempt modality to understand the Christmas Conference. That's not the way Rudolf Steiner conceived it. The Christmas Conference was not even on the earth, so to speak, until the first of January, after which all the problems began to happen because how do you give this entity, this being, this arrangement, some legal or rights existence? Throughout the Conference, throughout the unfolding of the Statutes, everything to do with them, there was no thought in Rudolf Steiner's mind about tax exemption. So we have to be very careful when we come into the world, that we don't take on its clothes in a way that we then behave like the world would like us to behave, least of all the world of taxation.

And the last one, we are not an NGO. The Anthroposophical Society is absolutely not a non-governmental organization. It has nothing to do with what's called the 'third sector'. It's a wholly different organization, the like of which no one has seen before, whereby an earthly society is the host of an esoteric school.

None of the six things I've mentioned have that in their mind in the way they're organized. So again, I am being critical, obviously, but I'm being descriptive. Those particular approaches to finance are not the ones Rudolf Steiner used and therefore if we continue looking at his work through those lenses, we will not see what he saw.

and the West...

We need to go to a meta place. We need to lift ourselves out of the Anthroposophical Society as we understand it as an earthly entity full of its problems all over the world and begin in what I call the primary literature, by studying very carefully the Christmas Conference proceedings.¹⁰ I mean everything that happened in those nine days – the meditations, the Statutes, the World History Course, the discussions, every single page, every single word merits consideration if you want to enter into the live experience of what was going on in those nine days, those important nine days of Rudolf Steiner's biography.

¹⁰ *The Christmas Conference for the Foundation of the General Anthroposophical Society, 1923/1924*. Rudolf Steiner, author; Marie Steiner, editor. Anthroposophic Press, New York 1990. The key passages in finance occur in the meeting 29 December 1923 8.30 am (pp. 170-182) and 10 am on 30 December, p. 209.

The last thing I want to mention in this validity discussion or statement is that I'm quite certain that if you listen carefully to Rudolf Steiner as he approaches the Christmas Conference over many years in fact, he has his eye on the West. Something quite clearly happened when he came to England and to Wales in particular in 1922 and 1923, also, of course in 1924, and you can find this world described in Frank Teichmann's book.¹¹ Rudolf Steiner discovered something about the West that he hadn't quite anticipated. There's a quite different colouring to his expectations after 1922/23 than there was before.

It's with this in mind, partly, that I thought, "Ok, let's explore this invitation to talk about this problem" – which I thought was going to be in America. I know it's not only in America, but in my mind I'm talking primarily to people in the United States of America, in the area we call the United States of America, but really that area needs to be conceived in terms of spiritual geography. I don't even want to say North America, because what we call North America needs to be conceived in terms of spiritual geography, as the area currently occupied by the United States, if you see what I'm meaning. And generally, when I say America in this discussion, that's what I'm meaning. So I'm even not needing to get into the discussion whether it's South America or Central America – I'm meaning, the way that European humanity came across the Atlantic, came across the wide prairies, the 'Ah' became a wide A and then it met the Rockies – all these experiences. This is what I mean by spiritual geography. This is the West that I am referring to when I say 'America'.

The Materialist Conception of History

And now, if I come to my topic: What gives the measure, what gives the task, how do we understand the significance of the Anthroposophical Society in modern history? I think we have to begin by realizing that its role is to give the lie to the materialist conception of history. This is not a Marxist story, although it has a lot to do with Karl Marx. The materialist conception of history came about in the mid-nineteenth century at a particular point in time, namely in 1848, through the Communist Manifesto – through many things but particularly through the Communist Manifesto if you experience that as 52 paragraphs – at one point, I felt it was like the Christmas Conference – a 'download' of 52 statements made by Karl Marx to bring to earth a particular conception of the world, the materialist conception. And it comes about in 1848, a very important time in the middle of the 19th century. We can go into that if we need to, many things were happening at that point in time in the history of humanity. And one of the things that was happening, in fact the main thing, was the culmination of the Council of 869 when the spirit was subsumed into the soul. This, Steiner says, propelled us on a path until the mid-19th century, when the spirit/soul is further subsumed into the body through the materialist conception of history. This all happens in the middle of the 19th century.

Now the point about the materialist conception of history is very straightforward, at least it should be for an anthroposophist. As an anthroposophist, one understands that human beings have to come to earth if they are to be partners with the gods. We can put that in all sorts of language, but I'll just leave it like that. We cannot become partners with the gods unless we incarnate on earth. That is the reason we are on the earth. And therefore, for an anthroposophist or anyone with a similar sense, human beings come like Wordsworth said, they come 'trailing clouds of glory from God who is our home' and they hope they achieve their tasks before the prison bars close around them.¹² This is 19th century stuff. And this image of the human being coming to earth in order to be a partner with the gods, if you don't have this image, you have no other choice but to experience the human being as just appearing on earth so to speak, born of the earth, born of nature, and subject to the strictures of the material world. This is the materialist conception of history. It's inevitable and don't think we're immune from it. If you don't have an *active* experience of what it means to be on earth in order to become a partner with the gods, you *will* be thinking you are born out of the material world and are subject to its constraints. This is the power of the materialist conception of history. It is so unless spiritual science prevails.

In this sense, I mean this is an absolutely central modern historical problem. It brings with it a particular challenge: How do you come to be in but not of this world? This is a challenge that every human being knows but I think it's also a challenge for the Anthroposophical Society. And Rudolf Steiner was well aware,

¹¹ *The Origins of the Anthroposophical Society in the Light of the Ancient Mysteries*, Frank Teichmann. Temple Lodge, Forest Row, England (2020).

¹² "...trailing clouds of glory do we come, from God, who is our home: Heaven lies about us in our infancy! [Ere] shades of the prison-house begin to close..." from Wordsworth's *Ode to Immortality*.

as he would have had to have been, that to bring about the Anthroposophical Society in the way that he did, he was running the risk all the time that it would be brought into the world and the world would take it over. That is the fundamental crisis. You cannot come to earth, you cannot bring something to earth, you cannot enter into the affairs of humanity except that the world can invade your space – it is very possible to become ‘of’ the world and not just in it.

I want to make this really clear: the materialist conception of history is our challenge. We have to demonstrate that it is not valid. Marxists or people who know about the materialist conception of history, they at least are historically ‘honest’ in knowing about it. There are many non-Marxists who believe they have nothing to do with the materialist conception of history – they just talk about ‘the forces of production’. But this expression means that nature is governing one’s behaviour. In standard economics, we talk about ‘forces of the market.’ Well, from my point of view, there’s no difference. There’s a word difference but the concept is the same. So all those, anthroposophists included, whose economic conduct is market driven, who are self-interested, they are subject to the materialist conception of history, whether they know it or not.

This conception of history has a derived but easier version that most people know as the causation whereby economic life, i.e. the forces of production, create and determine human relationships which in turn give rise to ideology or culture. In that simple line of causation, you see how the materialist conception of history operates. If you are a student of Rudolf Steiner’s sociology, you would say economic life begets rights life begets spiritual life.

Three Themes. Three Mottos. Three Steps.

It’s then easy to see what our task is. And when Dottie first posed the question, about the crisis of the Anthroposophical Society, I thought I would cast it into three different themes:

- Whither or wither? Does the Anthroposophical Society matter?
- Threefolding secured through the Christmas Conference 1923/24.
- Overcoming economic materialism and the role of America.

These are strange themes and I’m not going to go into them one at a time. I’m just going to repeat them in a metamorphosing way. Because these three themes are linked to what I regard as three mottos.

- The first motto is that the spirit comes of itself.
- The second is, the spirit comes of itself through individual initiatives, but the freely taken initiatives need to be affirmed by those affected by them.
- The third motto is that those who take such initiatives are resourced by others, but until they are they have to carry the responsibility for their initiatives into their balance sheets. Namely, their assets are at stake for whatever they do until the world discharges them.

This is becoming quite complex and quite technical but I’m just reiterating the reversal of the materialist conception of history. The causation needs to be, the spiritual life begins, the rights life follows and the economic life comes next. The spirit comes of itself – people take initiatives. They need to be received into the ‘public’ space – affirmed, is the way that Rudolf Steiner put it in the Christmas Conference statutes – not just imposed on people. And then they have to be resourced.

That’s a very simple thing to do at the end. There are very few things that Rudolf Steiner says about the resources of the Anthroposophical Society in the Christmas Conference. Most of it is the spirit unfolding itself and then, as he listens to the space in which he is speaking, he modifies, for example, the Foundation Stone Meditation. And when you read the Statutes three times over, he’s constantly listening into the space in which he’s speaking, and they become modified so that at the end the verse and the Statutes have a kind of ‘final version’ where he’s listening on the one hand to the gods speaking behind him and, on the other hand, he’s looking at the members as they listen to him. The whole thing is in that sense an artistic spirit coming of itself, affirmed by the members, not imposed. Nor do the members give him permission to take initiative.

And at the end of that process, it's simply a question, "Ok, we've agreed to do that, how are we going to fund it?" I say, it's simply that question because if we've decided to do something, that's all we have left to do. And about that there need not be a lot of discussion.

If I then take these three mottos or these three steps a bit further, I have something even more technical in mind. The spirit comes of itself through the initiative of I-beings who act in solitude but in concert. They do not act as groups. Indeed, for me, group sociology has no place in our movement. What does have a place is individuals taking initiative in their own solitude but in concert with others. This is what I mean by working in a circle. And then the rights life part of our movement or our Society, and therefore of the world as a whole, is that we use our collective agency to embrace these initiatives. I won't go into that in detail but that for me is very important – that if someone steps into a circle, for example, to take on a known task or recognized task, don't tell him or her how to do that or that it could be done differently or whatever. Accept that person's initiative and help facilitate it.

The last part is very simple also. No initiative can take place unless the person undertaking it has the capital with which to carry it out. Therefore, economic resourcing basically comes down to, in our day, providing capital that the initiative requires or the person requires to take the initiative. I would also add that capitalizing initiative needs to be done via the idea of money as bookkeeping and not money as a thing. We can discuss that later if we need to, but it's very important that in the capitalizing of an individual human being we're not thinking in terms of money as a thing or of capital in a physical sense as something that needs to be preserved. We're primarily thinking of bookkeeping and flowing capital which will disappear into some initiative and the sooner it disappears, the better. I say this knowing that many Groups of the Anthroposophical Society have very nice balance sheets, but I don't get why they have funds sitting in the bank. Why it isn't all spent on financing people's initiatives?

I've taken these three things down into a fairly technical area quite deliberately because unless spiritual science as I understand it permeates economic life quite practically in the ways I'm describing, it's on a hiding to nothing. It's that which will have the consequence that the boat will sail without us.

An Exemplar Financial Community

So my image of the Anthroposophical Society is that it's a kind of exemplar of a community of human beings all over the world who recognize and resource the initiatives of others. It's a community which serves humanity, never itself, and technically it cannot be a society which serves its members. That's what tennis clubs do. And that for me is a huge problem in the Anthroposophical Society. Whenever I hear people, and there are many, who think or argue or act as if the Anthroposophical Society is there in order to serve them, its members, I've never understood this. I think it's technically untrue and I think it's perhaps even illegal. We join the Anthroposophical Society to serve its purposes, not ours. For me this is stating the obvious. But the reason it's like that is because it's not a tennis club. We're not getting together to do sports together. The Anthroposophical Society exists fundamentally to provide a home on earth for the School of Spiritual Science, not for the members of the Anthroposophical Society. This is a subtle point. It may seem that I'm splitting hairs for some people but, for me, the only reason for joining the Anthroposophical Society is to do what the Statutes say, to help the Society enable the work of the School to flourish in the world without becoming of the world.

This is also a very technical task. It means the School of Spiritual Science must be protected from being sued, for example. It cannot have a bank account. It cannot have any earthly existence. So that is the main role of the Anthroposophical Society – to allow the School to be in but not of the world.

Because I think in this way, I also think we have another problem in the Anthroposophical Society which is that as a rule we don't think entrepreneurially about money and scarcely ever in that way about the finances of the Anthroposophical Society. Yet I think we should. Because by definition, being a human being, at least a human being that's come to earth to be a partner with the gods, has quite definite economic consequences. There is no cost in coming to the earth, but the benefits created by becoming a partner with the gods are colossal. We need to have an understanding that an entrepreneur is a human being that comes to the earth to achieve things that are not otherwise possible. And therefore there must always be a constant cause or source of surplus in every human activity if it's successful.

Most activities are successful if they're capitalized. If we live in a world of not a lot of success this is because not a lot of initiative is capitalized in our modern world, not in the way I would understand it. And therefore we don't have a clear image or experience that we are sources of surplus. We don't see that we are generating money flows which are in surplus and that these should be directed via the Anthroposophical Society to the work of the School. And by work of the School I mean anything a member of the School of Spiritual Science does which in his or her view is research. It has to be conducted in a modern way, meaning, in my terms, according to a budget and with the minimum of financial literacy that Michael would expect one third into His Regency. It has to be totally legitimate in tax terms and so on. But it's still work done by individual members of the School of Spiritual Science; they still need revenue coming into their bank accounts for them to do this. I don't understand the research of the School of Spiritual Science as a private weekend affair, done out of charity. I think, if you go back to the Christmas Conference, the 75 million that Rudolf Steiner had in mind that could have been given to the Anthroposophical Society for research by the School was *not* for the members of the School to sit at home on weekends and think about themselves. It was to create Bidor, to design bridges, to create monetary policy, to do things which the world would recognize when they had big effects in the world to the level of 75 million francs, 100 years ago.

And so for me, this is the main problem – I don't say it's a crisis. The more the Anthroposophical Society behaves the way I'm trying to illustrate, the less critical will its existence be. Its crises, of which there are many, they begin when it loses its long term objective, this huge, modern historical purpose which I believe it to have. Because in what I'm trying to describe, albeit in outline, this is the way I perceive one would overcome economic materialism. It's a great image to have – we need to overcome economic materialism – but what does it mean? I think it doesn't mean anything more complicated than when young people come to earth, for example, with tasks to carry out, they are facilitated in doing this, their initiatives are capitalized. They are given or lent whatever capital they need according to what it is they are going to do, almost without limit. This would be a game changer in the lives of many, many young people. For me, that is what the overcoming of economic materialism would look like.

The Double

But to come to the close then, we now run into a problem. I am not a psychologist. I am entering into a realm now which I don't claim any expertise in. But when I made the third theme 'overcoming economic materialism, the role of America', I had in mind this area that is covered by the Rockies, at least in that part of that world. And this is where part of the crisis comes from, the crisis in the Anthroposophical Society, the permanent crisis. You cannot come to the earth without inviting your double and I think the Anthroposophical Society also has this problem. It cannot come about, exist on earth, unless its double joins it. This is not a problem which I want to go into in detail but it's different from the idea of streams and squabbling anthroposophists and all this stuff we're used to. It's just a concrete problem that we as individual human beings, we as Anthroposophical Society members and the Anthroposophical Society itself have to deal with – the fact that on earth, our double is going to trouble us. Every time we try to do something it will try and make it come out backwards, it will try and make our behaviour look the opposite of what we're talking about, it will give me a frog in my throat because I've got covid, it will do whatever it can so that what we're trying to say or what we're trying to express is not heard or understood. And it doesn't matter whether the deeds we're doing are large or small, world historical or simply unnoticed, this problem is a problem we have to deal with. I don't think it can be dealt with on one's own. This is a collective flight of birds problem.

Often when I've given workshops or organized workshops, my rule of thumb has always been: there are two chairs for every person in the room but you take one of the chairs away and then they all sit down. The simple reason is, though I have no idea if this is true, the simple reason is, especially when you look at finances, the double will be in immediate attendance and it will come out and sit on the chair next to you, on which someone is already sitting. So it's really important in spaces when you meet physically, that there's literally a chair space between me and the next person. So that when my double comes, it will sit on the floor and not on the lap of my neighbour. I say it sort of jokily, but I know from my architectural experience in rooms that this has a big effect, especially when you're dealing with finance. If you're dealing with finance and people don't have two chairs each, you will have a problem in the room.

So we have to deal with this double. One thing the double cannot abide is death in any form. And the main

form of death for the double in the world I'm talking about is clear, correct finances. So the clearer we are about what finance means, the clearer we are about how we conduct finances, the clearer our finances actually are, for the double this is anathema; it cannot bear this culture. But it cannot stop this culture either. It's just (!) a matter of managing the double. And it means things like, you do not take an initiative at other people's expense. This is a complete no-no in financial history. It's actually illegal and it generates such bad feeling and such bad karma – literally, bad karma; so, the more we *don't* do this, the sooner we will sort out the problem that the double entails.

If, when someone needs capital to take an initiative and we shrink from this task, saying, “Ah, there's not enough money,” or “Are you sure you're a real anthroposophist?” – all this stuff we start saying – this is food for the double. For this I have no evidence, but I also have no doubt. The double loves that kind of argument.

Behind all the misunderstandings and all the misuse, even, of Rudolf Steiner's very precise concept of 'gift money' in economics you will find the double at work. By and large, Steiner's understanding of gift money has not been understood in the anthroposophical movement. It's a very precise term intended for use in economics and even in economics it hasn't really been understood.

So the double loves all this unclear finances, all this incorrect economics, because it feeds, I was going to say, it feeds its soul, but let's not say that.

And then the other thing I would say about the double is very simple. It has a purpose in life, a larger purpose. Its role is to steel me in my own I-being, to strengthen my own will to come to earth to become a partner of the gods. If I didn't have my double, nagging me, bothering me, pointing out what I am not, inhabiting my words to try and make me say the opposite of what I'm meaning, I wouldn't know that I had an I-being that I had to steel and keep focused and stay conscious on this side of the threshold. Without that, I would become subject to the materialist conception of history. I would just be what life on the material plane required or made of me.

So I think we have a lot to thank the double for. And I hope, in closing now, it's a valid thing to say that the crisis of the Anthroposophical Society is and will be permanent, as long as it's on earth, because it has a double. You can't get rid of the double, but you can learn how to manage it.

And the very last thing I want to say, just a hint, concerning why I think we haven't understood almost the first thing Rudolf Steiner had in mind in terms of finances, why we have very little idea or experience or image of what these things mean in esoteric terms. Of how finance, for example, is a form of the Guardian. If we study finance, if our finances are correct, are properly organized, are clear and transparent, this is how we keep and protect ourselves. This is how we live and steady ourselves at the threshold. Without modern clear finances, it's almost impossible to live at the threshold without falling over or ending in fights and squabbling and so on.

A Second Chance

And so the double is just another part of what I call esoteric finance. Clear finance allows us to see, not see maybe, but experience the spiritual world in a very real way while we're on earth trying to be partners with the gods. And without it, I don't think we, well, I'm pretty sure we would just miss the boat.

So I'm going to close there. I think it's not for nothing that we're a hundred years on from the *Economics Course*, for example. We're a hundred years on from the founding of the Soviet Union also. We're a hundred years on from many things which could have been a huge turning point in human history, a hundred years ago. And as some of you will know, I'm a great proponent of the idea, meaning I believe in it, that a hundred years later we have a second chance.¹³ That, despite the list of problems we've created over a long period of time and despite a lack, in my opinion, of clear finances in our movement, both in terms of understanding and conduct, just waking up at the last minute will enable a huge catch-up on a hundred years of potentially wasted time. With that thought, I'd like to close and hand back to Dottie.

¹³ *A Second Chance for the World A Deed in Becoming*. Documentation of meetings held during 2019 in Vancouver, Canada and Folkestone, England. (Search aeBookstore.com.)

Questions and Answers

Dottie Zold: I'm a little speechless... Thank you, Christopher. That was very beautiful. I think I would just say there's two things that come to me. Or three maybe in, what I really appreciate hearing the Christmas Conference Foundation Meeting – that was strongly present and the question of the nine days. And really looking at the book¹⁴ page by page to really understand what was trying to come through. And I think the language of Rudolf Steiner as a social scientist and also as a financial genius are two things that would normally not come to the fore in our conversations in communities so I really appreciated hearing that. Thank you. And I thought I would ask Mary really quick just to share a thought to bring it all together and then will go to the Q&A.

Mary Stewart Adams: Thank you, Christopher. I hope that I speak for all of us in saying that that was really wonderful. I just would like to say that I appreciate the message that you've been giving about this second chance after 100 years. For me, that's a really significant starting point for the conversations I hope that we can have now. So thank you very much.

Leon Davies: Gosh, good to see everybody on this. First of all, I'd like to remind Christopher and let you all know what happened in the Philippines in the late 1990s. There was a big conference on threefolding and Christopher pivoted that conference wonderfully. He stood up and separated himself from the prepared agenda, made a critique, and the next day we shifted from a windowless square room with lectures by white guys from America and Europe to a round space in which the Philippina women were part of the conversation. I really appreciated that conversation so much. It was such a great act and it created a lot of upset for some of those white guys. Paul Mackay and I tried to mediate but to no avail.¹⁵

I want to put the idea to you that the issue of finance and the clarity of finance is part of a larger issue – namely, integrity. Steiner begins by saying, in anything, we need to begin by developing a reverence for the truth. And so often in our work as a Society we put that aside. We may have, for instance, a higher purpose in mind which enables us to think we can sacrifice the means for the ends and do away with integrity. One of the things that you emphasized in your talk, Chris, is the individual and supporting the individual. And the opposite of that is the present 'cancel culture' where people are censored and this has happened with us. It's happened with me personally and you, I imagine. It plays no part in our society. I come at these things through an academic background in biology and psychology and the big shift in those fields started in the decade 1848 – 1858, with Darwin and Wallace, particularly Darwin. But anyway, I've always felt that you have such a clarity with economics and a lot of the issues in our social work, that I really appreciate what you've done today. Thank you.

Charles Burkham: Hi, Christopher, we've reconnected several times – only electronically, so I'm hoping we'll get past that in the near future. And I just want to make a 'yes' and comment. And also look at the question within the Society that you brought up – very much about the question of rehabilitation and how it's really an inversion of reality. I also applaud Leon's thing about truthfulness is what can redeem everything. And so the 'and' I'd like to add is this: if what looks like mistakes that were made in the last one hundred years are faced with honest and truthful reflections and turned into lessons learned rather than mistakes left unattended, they will no longer be mistakes. And if we can do that in some small part, that would be a form of maybe not redemption yet, but rehabilitation of the first hundred years, acknowledging that people weren't ready to do what was necessary to take things forward. But I do agree that this is the time – the next hundred years is the time that it is possible to do what may not have been possible even with the best will, in that first one hundred years, given the changes in society. Thank you again for your thoughts and that's all I have to offer at the moment.

¹⁴ *The Deed of Rudolf Steiner*, see earlier footnote.

¹⁵ Ah, yes, Manila. Versions vary, but mine is of a pre-scripted event with me positioned midway, "where we thought you would cause a problem," and much fuss was made of pink and blue ribbons to distinguish members of the Society and the school, though with little authentication of their allocation. I knew two people for sure who were not members of either but happily wore their appointed ribbons. I questioned the written statement that Rudolf Steiner had failed, and that 'crashed' the conference. Challenging for me, yes. As Vorstand member, Rolf Kerler, said to me as we changed rooms, "Here comes San Sebastian." In the night, I asked to be relieved of my task, only to find more rocks in my backpack the next morning!

Maureen with Deborah: This is Maureen with Deborah and I'm sure that you must have enumerated them but I wonder if you could just clarify for me, you talked about the six lenses with which we view finance erroneously and could you spell out for me the correct vision of finance as set down in the Christmas Conference?

Waldemar Setzer: Thank you very much for the nice talk, Chris. I don't know if you remember me. I was translating a series of lectures that you were giving in Sao Paulo, Brazil where I am.

CHB: Yes, hello.

WS: I had a heart attack, so somebody else had to get in and continue the translations. It was a result of your enthusiasm. Since then I have had two others! What I wanted to say is that I completely agree that the main purpose of the Anthroposophical Society members is to help the work to overcome materialism. I think this is the most important and urgent task. Steiner said that materialism was a sickness and I think we are in a better way than in those times than Rudolf Steiner was alive because science itself has shown that it cannot understand matter. Probably most of you think that an electron is a tiny ball revolving around the nucleus or the atom nucleus, but the the atom is not a tiny ball and it's not revolving around the nucleus. We don't know what an electron is, so it's very easy in these terms to show what materialism is. I have a saying that a materialist is a person working and living in a building without the ground floor. Because we don't know what matter is from a physical point of view. We know very well what matter is when we grab it, we see it. But physics has destroyed matter, so it's very easy nowadays to show that materialism has no basis anymore. This was not the case in Rudolf Steiner's time and I think we should work also along those lines, using what science itself has given us as knowledge, to show that it's not complete, it will never be able to understand what matter is. Thank you, Chris and all the others.

Ted Petrenko: Thank you, Mr. Budd, for your presentation. I heard you say that when Rudolf Steiner went to Britain, he seemed to have a new perspective and you mentioned a book. I thought you said it was by Frank Biden, could you at least tell me the name of the book? I'd be interested in finding out more about it.¹⁶

Anne-Marie Fryer: Thank you so much for this beautiful presentation and for awakening the thought about a second chance. And also, thank you for all your wonderful books that are fleshing out these images that you have brought forth today. My question is, as a member of the Society and as a member of the School, what are the most important actions, thoughts or feelings, what are the most important things we can do now before it's too late? As members?

Jonathan Townsend: I haven't really got my question properly configured but it's something to do with what happens to an entrepreneur when he or she stops becoming an entrepreneur? Does one as a member of the School of Spiritual Science subsist on gift one's whole life? What happens if, say, someone stops there? The entrepreneur is very important, but not everybody is an entrepreneur or will be an entrepreneur all the time.

Wilfried Bohm: Maybe this relates to the earlier question about the six forms of finance. Could you say some more on the flow of resources. I don't want to necessarily say finance, but the flow of resources towards those that undertake research as a sort of definition of what the finances of the Society should be, rather than anything else? That's what I heard, could you elaborate on that a bit more if you have the time? Thanks.

Joan Jaekel: Thank you. Hello, Christopher, I don't know if you remember, you did a conference at my house.

CHB: Definitely!¹⁷

¹⁶ *The Origins of the Anthroposophical Society in the Light of the Ancient Mysteries.* See earlier footnote.

¹⁷ If I recall, the conference was about *Freeing the Circling Stars – Pre-funded Education.* (Search aeBookstore.com.)

JJ: Back in the days of dinosaurs! My question is the resourcing of the care of infants; babies until they're old enough to go to school. How do we resource the work of mothers, fathers and caregivers?

CHB: I think that shifts the focus from what we've been hearing so far, so I've made a second list with that one on top of it. The first few questions, for me, they're a story without changing to a different topic. So I'd like to stay with what we have so far. Otherwise it will become too complicated.

The first number of suggestions and questions were what an economist would call a bundle – they belong together, believe it or not. That's how economists work. You just have to trust me – they are all related. But I would like to reply on two levels. Firstly, to the person who said finance and integrity go together – was that Leon? – (“Yeah.”) – I would just share a simple thought, finance *is* integrity; integrity *is* finance. In our modern world, which is primarily a financial world, even resources begin with the need for a sum of money to go and get them. You can give me the resources if you want, but in a modern economy you have to give me capital and I then go and get the resources myself. Everything is filtered through finance in the modern world but in true terms historically the realm of finance, until our egotism infects it, is simply spiritual integrity on earth. That's all finance is. I think it's a very simple concept. So I wouldn't say ‘finance *and* integrity’, finance *is* integrity. And this is a clue, you can meet anyone in the realm of finance. You can soon find out if they have integrity or not, you just look at their understanding of finance. So that's a little clue. We should also avoid the idea that finance is in a world other than normal behaviour.

And then I want to give another hint at how one can understand finance more fundamentally or more spiritually, if you like. It's just one example. One could give many. When Charles was talking about we made mistakes; we have to make mistakes, you have to do things and your deeds cannot be perfect so you have to do something in order to see the error of your ways, so to speak. The important thing is that people don't trap you in the error of your ways. If we're going to behave like that, no one's going to do anything because we're not going to arrive with perfect deeds. That's to state the obvious. In order to become partners with the gods, we have to come to earth and we are bound to get it wrong, I would say. The default is we will make a mistake, it will not be what we intended it to be. The default will not be that we hit the ground running with a perfect deed. This is nonsense. The default will be that we will get it wrong. But now we see what we did and we can see the effect on others – that's what I was saying earlier – and by seeing the effect on others, we have the chance to review whether we did what we intended to do or not. I think it's fairly basic human existence. But the example I want to give you from finance is double-entry bookkeeping. I'm not going to give you a lecture on that, but double-entry bookkeeping has a very, very specific moral purpose or effect. I don't know that anyone gave it this purpose, it just has it. When you do your double-entry in bookkeeping, it shows up whether you made a mistake – whether you confused 7s and 9s; there's lots a little things people do in their normal arithmetic. And that gives you an opportunity to say, “Ah,” and then correct the entry where you made the mistake – you wrote a 7 instead of a 9, or whatever it may be. It could be your addition is not good. So the first thing double-entry shows you is where you made a mistake. And it gives you the opportunity, so to speak, to correct that.

But there are some mistakes you make which you intended to make. You put things off balance sheet for specific reasons, like you didn't want to pay tax or I don't know what the reason is. And so these mistakes are of a different order. You now have to confirm your mistake. I think double-entry is just an example of how in finance you will find a moral training without anyone saying it's there. You will then see, “Ah, I can differentiate between mistakes that were innocent and mistakes that I intended and that I intend to continue making”. I just give that as an example because if we have the idea that finance is spiritual integrity, we will no longer have the idea there's finance in one world and human behaviour in another. They are the same thing. And all ancient finance, all non-egotistical finance, will tell you this story. In anthroposophical terms, you could say it's a ‘Guardian-like’ phenomenon – you are just faced with yourself with every single transaction you put in your books. That's before we get into the question whether it's true price we're recording, whether you wrecked the environment with your purchase, or whatever else might be behind the transactions. All this is just you facing yourself at the threshold.

So that gives a hint of the true nature of finance. If I then go to the practical side of the questions that were asked, the six ways of finance which I mentioned which are not the ways of Rudolf Steiner, were those of a church, like the Christian Community, where you have a living if you're a priest in a church. You don't own the church, you're part of the organization. The church gets rich but the individual priest doesn't.

The second one is Camphill, which in my view has the economics of a monastic order. This is not a church, it's a monastic order. There's nothing wrong with that. But you need to be clear that you're entering into a monastic order if you enter into Camphill as originally conceived. Now it's been wrecked by events, you might say. But the original idea was of a monastic order and it's perfectly understandable.

Then I mentioned ethical banking or banking at all. In the history of finance, banking is yesterday's story and has been for a long time. And the primary thing we need to understand about banks is that, by law, to use the name 'bank' you have to be a licenced deposit taker and your purpose is to preserve capital. If you don't do this, you're not a bank. And in my understanding, what I've been trying to describe, the preservation of capital, this has nothing to do with the Christmas Conference.

And the fourth one was social development work or managerial consultancy, which is fine but it's not finance. I don't know any managerial approach which claims to understand finance or be a surrogate for finance. And what I mean by that also is that there are many problems caused in organizations by their lack of clear finance. And a lot of managerial advice relies on this unclear finance staying in place. I'm putting that very crudely. It has a lot of relevance but it's not there to solve financial problems. It is not a surrogate for finance.

The fifth one was the not-for-profit modality, like in the United States. I get where it's come from, I understand why it's there, but if you understand Rudolf Steiner's image of taxation and the threefold social order and if you understand the Christmas Conference, before he had to go down and register it, have it notarised, the Christmas Conference was a meta event which was not in any tax jurisdiction. So it was not driven by a need to get tax exemption or any of these things. I understand the role of tax exempt organizations, but they were not in Rudolf Steiner's mind when he created the Christmas Conference.

And the sixth one was NGOs – non-governmental organizations are organizations used to channel official funds of governments into humanitarian causes. We are not one of those and nor do we want all the dynamics that go with NGO funding – the prostitution on the media in order to get any funds, all this disgusting behaviour that are put through. None of this belongs to the Anthroposophical Society.

To give an image of what I understand Steiner to mean and to come to Anne-Marie's point, in the Christmas Conference you have all the discussions and then you get to Statute 12.¹⁸ There are meetings that take place linked to this statute and, in recorded highlight terms, there are some important numbers mentioned. If every member, this is very precise in Steiner's way of working: if you are on the council of a Group of the Anthroposophical Society, you are obliged to send 15 Swiss francs per member of the Group to the Goetheanum. This is not an obligation of the members, this is an obligation of the board of the Group. This is very specific. Rudolf Steiner says that a board of the Group of the Anthroposophical Society, say, in America is obliged to send to the Goetheanum 15 Swiss francs per member of the Society in the American Group. It's not a comment on the membership. That's one thought.

Another thought he says, and these go together, is that if we cover our own costs, although he says it's "a very realistic illusion"¹⁹ but he says we will be able to get the 75 million Swiss francs which then would put a true value on our research. So, when someone was asking what does research look like, it looks like whatever you have to do to get the world to give you 75 million Swiss francs a hundred years ago. That isn't having a meeting in an anthroposophical house on the weekend. That is discovering something like Bidor, something that the world merits and can understand and that can only be accomplished out of spiritual science. That's what I understand by spiritual scientific research. It can take all sorts of forms but the number is important. One hundred years ago it would have been able to attract 75 million dollars, let's say, on 1:1 to the Swiss franc.

This is what I mean by his genius, He has a number 15. If you multiply that – if you follow that on the central bank index, that number today is 90 Swiss francs per member. Then it becomes interesting. If you ask yourself how much does that bring to the Goetheanum today, the fact is on 40,000 members more or less, the

12. Membership dues (*German: Mitgliedsbeitrag*) shall be fixed by the individual groups; each group shall, however, submit 15 Swiss francs for each of its members to the central leadership of the Society at the Goetheanum.

¹⁹ *The Christmas Conference for the Foundation of the General Anthroposophical Society*, op. cit., p. 209.

Goetheanum has a revenue from all over the world of 3.6 million dollars which is all it needs as a Society at the Goetheanum. Beyond that is for its non-Society work. So this is really important. We still have the 15 francs, now brought forward as 90 and we actually get 3.6 million at the Goetheanum – it doesn't come evenly from all over the world but on total we as a Society cover our costs. And this is terribly important in social financial terms. What you must never do if you start an enterprise, you must never start it with someone else's capital without their agreement. You cover the risk that you're incurring so that people can come in at a wider level. This is leverage. Rudolf Steiner can talk about 75 million coming for the work of the School because the members of the Society had covered at the rate of 15 the costs they were incurring as members. I can't do the math now but if you bring that forward, 15 became 90 and still is 90. We do cover that but on an unequal distribution basis, so Germany bails out everybody, you might say. But the number is still there. The factor is 6, so if you took 75 million by 6, we should be able to command 450 million. Although we do cover this magic number of 3.6 million but in an uneven distribution, because of that we should be able to get 450 million from outside the anthroposophical movement, from the world saying "thank you" to Rudolf Steiner. And if we can't get that from the world, there's something wrong with what we're doing in my view. So that gives you an idea that it's not the numbers that are important, it's the ratios – this little idea that if we cover the costs of the Anthroposophical Society as the home of the School, then we can ask the world to cover the cost of the School.²⁰

It won't do that, if the world thinks it's paying our fees; there's no reason why it should. So for me, it's quite critical. If we cover the costs that we are incurring – if we need a newsletter, we pay for the newsletter, right? If we cover our costs, then it's possible for the Society to ask for this huge amount of money for the work of the School and it will come. This is such a simple notion that I'm surprised it has to be explained. It's such a powerful notion of leverage that any financial person would get it in 5 seconds.

Now, if I come to Anne-Marie's particular point, I would then say, first understand what I've tried to describe here and then play your part. And that means, for me, study carefully the Treasurers' Guidelines which you all would have seen in the 11/2021 issue of *Anthroposophy Worldwide* and then check with your Council to make sure that they are fulfilling their commitment to the Goetheanum. This may have a consequence for your check book but that's not the starting point. You should be standing ready to say we will then fund what we have to fund so that you can make a commitment to the Goetheanum so that this leverage can then happen. The concept is clear; it just needs funding to the level of one's ability to fund it.

Does that clarify any of the earlier unclarities?

Frank Agrama: It might come in the language of leverage, I guess, if you could speak a little to the relationship of the members of the School as a research community of initiative, and the social aspect of capital.

Elijah: Hello, I haven't been face to face with you since 1998 in Berkeley, California.²¹ And I want to thank you for the talk. I took it in, very vigorously because it kind of runs parallel with all my work on money. The two are intimately connected and so I had a question for you: in relationship to the funding of an individual, I think it is a question about Rudolf Steiner saying one's highest relationship to destiny is when your personal destiny becomes the destiny of the times. And I know yours is finance. And mine is the anthroposophical history of money and it took me a long time to come to that because I had to be a numismatist for 40 years and at the same time I studied anthroposophy and I was able to finally merge the two. So I think that my destiny became the destiny of the times when I could find the anthroposophical relationship to money. I don't know if there's a question there but I did want to say hello and thank you for the great talk.

CHB: It sounded like a statement.

E: Well the question was kind of in there about personal destiny. I could say again as a statement – if a person got financed for what they wanted to do, there must be a lot of people out there looking for finance to fulfil their will forces that would then become the destiny of the times.

²⁰ Of course, such a ratio (15 x 12,000 : 75M) may not exist, but the central idea is that if we cover our costs *as a Society*, the world will fund what we do *as a School* for humanity as perceived by the world, not conceived by us only.

²¹ At a *Colours of Money Seminar* (see <http://www.ae-mark.com/colours-of-money/>)

CHB: I don't have it here but I was reading something the other day that Steiner said many years ago, which is obvious when you read it, that if we – I'll put it in certain language – if we were to finance all those who needed capital to fulfil their destiny, if they were capitalized, there would be no pools of capital. And so, whether one's destiny is important or noticed or where it is on the scale of famousness is not the issue. It is where it is according to your karma. But I think the idea is fairly simple. If everyone was capitalized to the extent needed to fulfil his or her destiny on earth, so to speak, to do what they think they've come to do, there would be no pools of capital. And often when I make an image of the evolution of finance over the years, I end up with this huge yellow cloud up in the sky – the so-called financial markets – and I have no question, you don't have to calculate it, that huge accumulation of capital equals the amount of capital that everyone on the earth doesn't have. So for me, it's a very simple, true idea. It doesn't have any glory attached to it, but I'm quite sure that all that capital is just a way of measuring the degree to which humanity is not meeting its destiny. In academia there's an expression, autoethnographic, which means when your destiny is the destiny of the times. This could be a big story for someone but I think it's just a simple little fact of life. Then you're on your own Michaelic path, you might say. Someone may not notice what you did in life because it wasn't a destiny to be noticed, but it's true of everybody – if you're able to achieve what you came to earth to do, then you're in alignment with Michael. You can't do more than that.

Again, the crucial thing I found from Steiner is there will be no pools of capital. And if you look at the biggest problem we have in the world today it is not only that there are pools of capital, it's the size of the pools and the influence of the people who control them. A Bill Gates will decide whether malaria is a thing to wipe out or not, in India or not. This is absolutely obscene in our times. But if we could all do what we came on the earth to do, for example, malaria would still be wiped out, so to speak, but not necessarily in India only and not through Bill Gates only. We can talk for hours about this but the idea that there would be no pools of capital in the world is central to Rudolf Steiner's thinking. Check that out. Look at your own balance sheet. Look at the balance sheets of Anthroposophical Societies, check that they haven't got any pools of capital hidden behind their numbers or if they have, that the initiatives of everybody in that Society are covered, so to speak, so they can do what they're trying to do.

Gordon Edwards: Thank you, Christopher. A request, I guess, for an amplification or maybe just a kind of review because you did cover this. It relates to the role or place of the individual in the re-founding and in our proceeding to act in society at large, including the economy. Just a review of that. And also the fact that, my understanding is that Rudolf Steiner was not calling into incarnation another monolith, that the term Anthroposophical Society and the word 'society' are not referring to a monolith.

Laura Iturralde: Yes, thank you, Christopher, for all of this excellent conversation. I would like to know about the double aspect and the 'know thyself' at the same time and the numbers, where in this case you don't have a person telling you whether what you are doing is right or wrong but you see your mistakes and maybe able to correct them, even see the part that you don't want to correct or do it again. So is this a way of knowing thyself or knowing about one's lower self and being able to transform it. This is fascinating. Thank you.

CHB: How are we doing, Frank. What's the process?

FA: Ok, looks like the question chamber is clear. And by our timing there are 7 minutes left.

DZ: I wonder, Christopher, do you want to end exactly on time or would you like to finish the questions here or what are your thoughts?

CHB: Well, now I'm on zoom, I can stay here forever!

DZ: So a lot of people would like to join you as well. Wonderful conversation.

CHB: But we have to be hygienic about that and end on time. So what I suggest is in 7 minutes, we all pause, and then we have a 15 minute echo for those who stayed in the room. But first I'd like to comment – there was quite a range of things. I'm not sure, Joan, how to start with care for infants because, for me, that would mean that it's part of someone's biography and what anything would mean is everyone has a biography – to care for infants, teach kids or whatever it might be. Therefore, my basic image is that

everyone comes to earth as a kind of entrepreneur in the sense of coming to do something. Whatever it is one needs to do, you end up, you have to make a choice in life, normally. You can either do that by being employed by somebody or you can do it by being employed by yourself. And if I'm more precise than that, we all do what we've come to the earth to do on a self-employed basis, meaning, we all are responsible for the income we generate and the tax we have to pay or pension fund contributions, and so on. Some of us make a contract with our employer that he or she worries about that and all I get is what's left over at the end of the week to go and spend. But technically, everybody is self-employed. Self-employed people have all the hassle of tracking their liabilities, their taxation and all the rest of it. Employees have made a deal with their employer – you worry about all that and give me whatever is leftover. They're like drunk men trusting to their wives. All employees have literally made a contract with their employer to worry on their behalf about their social security costs and their taxation. All they want is whatever's left over so they can go and spend it. This is a very immature level of behaviour. It's very useful for governments to have this notion of employment and ability to take your tax the minute you incur it rather than wait for the self-employed people to report it. But if one thinks about it, we are all self-employed, responsible for our own conduct, our own finances, we're the ones who know what we want to do, what we want in terms of capital and so on. That would include someone caring for infants.

The problems are generic all the time. You're going to have to create a financial plan, you're going to have to figure out the capital you need and the world's going to have to supply it. It will want some financial literacy, some pure accounting and all the rest of it. So that's where I would start. Whether it's care for infants or teaching in a Waldorf school or building skyscrapers, we're all in this same place. It would be transformational if we all took direct responsibility for our finances as if we were self-employed. I know there are technical problems with this, but conceptually there's no reason not to do this. Do you want to come back on that?

JJ: So are you suggesting a mother would basically start a go-fund me campaign?

CHB: I'm not going to suggest a *mother* did, a person who wants to take on the care of infants would probably do that, yes. Because there are issues when you say a mother, now we're getting into complicated territory. I don't think we need to do that. So, not a mother using the father's wealth because she's got time on her hands, but someone who's made that her life work. And therefore will have to do it like every other entrepreneur – put a plan together, work out the finances needed for what you want to do. That's true for every human being.

I want to go from there straight to another thing because I can give a concrete answer to this. This includes researchers. I'll give an example. In the Economics Conference of the Goetheanum, we have this fund and it's located in different Groups of the Society around the world. Part of it is to fund research into economics. But what does that mean? It means two things, by and large. In our case, put together a proposal which clearly cites what part of Rudolf Steiner's work you are wanting to elaborate. Name the part of Steiner's work you want to take further, organize it in a way that economics is organized. There's going to have to be some kind of experiment, some kind of published results. It's going to have to get out in the public domain as a comprehensible document that the world will then say, "Ok, we read it, we still don't agree with it, but we read it and the document is cogent." So in the field of economics, we have protocols.²² Then, when you need your funding, you still have to send an invoice for this funding. You don't get a grant. Even if money is provided as a grant, it's revenue for your income stream if you're self-employed. Even as a researcher you are going to have to be self-employed. Because we can't be giving money to private people. Even from a grant-making body, that will come in as revenue to the person receiving the grant, to be declared to the Internal Revenue Service. So a researcher is also a self-employed person, whose 'product' will not be a nice pair of shoes but a comprehensible piece of scholarly work, that proves the point or disproves the point. This for me is perfectly normal, as opposed to spiritual scientific work meaning I've got some hair-brained scheme called an 'impulse' – the clue's in the word – which I'm not going to accompany to the end of the earth. It's going to last about a week till I have another impulse. That's the nature of impulses. I'm not actually going to carry it on my balance sheet because I'm going to leave the invoices on the side of the road. This is not what entrepreneurs do, in my opinion, nor is it what researchers do. So I'm putting two things together there. The idea of an entrepreneur all the way from, let's say, a very practical work someone's doing

²² <https://economics.goetheanum.org/research/research/research-protocols>

which is their biography in life to a serious economic dissertation, the money flows will be revenue coming in to an individual who has a tax liability, a tax number and this is not to be hidden. If you have that as a generic, nobody escapes that situation. But nobody.

I'll give you an example of what it would mean. In England, we have a thing called The Arts Council and many years ago I was sent there by a eurythmy group to raise money for their work. I went there with a lot of other arts people and the guy running the course said this won't take long, we just want to check your eligibility. Do all your artist friends have tax numbers? If not leave the room. The weird stuff you want to do, is it going to take place in a publicly accessible space using taxpayers' money? If not, leave the room. We do not care what it is you want the money for. It's not our interest. We care that you will get taxpayers' money and you will not pay your tax on it and you will do your funny thing in a way that nobody can get to it. That's what we care about. That was very powerful, and we came away with no money because none of the eurythmists had tax numbers. That's how they funded their operation – by not paying tax. This is pretty endemic, maybe less so now, but thirty years ago, I include myself, this was how you did things. This is not modern finance and, for me, it's not the way you do things in the School. So anyone who's doing spiritual scientific research, whatever that means I don't mind, but it should show up in their money flows. They will be receiving a taxable income and in America, I think, if I receive that from the Anthroposophical Society, I have to have a 1099. You know, there is a broken tally stick and I get a bit of it and the tax office gets a bit of it and it waits till the two bits come back together again on the 15th of April. Only then does the Anthroposophical Society maintain its tax-exempt status. Because if one bit of my broken stick doesn't come back on the 15th of April, the whole lot can lose its tax exemption.

I'm being very concrete. It doesn't matter whether you're looking after kids or writing complicated papers or doing some eurythmic form upside down... it doesn't really matter. What matters is that your revenue will be taxable. And your outcome, what it is you're offering the world, will have to have relevance in the world. Otherwise you won't get revenue. Not because it's not right, it's probably that you're doing the wrong thing. So those are my kind of very pragmatic responses to a whole range of issues. For example, we've worked very carefully with Kim, who's up on the screen somewhere, to make sure that with the friends in Ann Arbor who might be on four other screens that I can't see at the moment, this is kept very healthy. Because we can make a lot of complicated stories about what research is and how it's financed. But from a grant-making point of view, there's no complication. We need your invoice and your tax number. But then you're going to be an entrepreneur. You're going to have to put together a plan and then comes the fun bit. How much capital do you need? What form is it? Do you need a gift or a loan? What is it you need? Short term liquidity? You tell me, it's your initiative. All this for me is as if I am giving a 101 in basic financial management. What I mean by that is that you don't need Rudolf Steiner to explain what I'm now describing. It's just how the world works outside the Anthroposophical Movement!

That seems to me like a pause point, Dottie, so for those who want to leave, this is your chance.

DZ: It seems like finance as an initiatic path. Like, to awaken to necessity, looking at finances in a new way. I know for me that's what I'm gaining here in a very direct way. And I imagine many of us are who are looking at these things. And also responsibility to the Goetheanum.

Pause

Liam (from YIP): Thank you, Christopher. Apologies, I joined late. I hope this isn't an obvious thing that you spoke on earlier... I studied economics in university and one of my professors commented or taught us a lot about the phenomenon of money creation. I'm curious, it seems like you're talking about the financial system as a reality that we need to kind of check in with to some extent. If your impulse is not met by the financial system then it's not a good impulse, is that correct? And I'm curious, because I'd like to push back against that. The financial system, or money itself, to speak more broadly, I've studied a bit and have done empirical studies on banks, for example, and showed that banks are the ones creating the money and the banks are also the ones destroying the money. To me it seems a bit of a rigged system. I wonder if I could push back a bit against you, whether we don't need to reform money itself before your kinds of visions can be realized. Again, apologies if I misunderstand what you're saying but I only came for a little bit.

CHB: I'd like to speak to that directly because it could get complicated very quickly. When you look at the banking system, you need to look at the whole. Not right now, we can't do it, but you need to make a whole image, where it's come from, where it's going to, otherwise you will not get its context. In that process, in the background, also one has to have the image of the evolution of humanity as we become more and more down to earth, so to speak, more and more capable and individuated and the democratic people we are today. This brings about the so-called banking system because if we weren't trying to do that, there wouldn't be a banking system. But of course once we've accomplished that, the banking system becomes passé. That's the main problem with the banking system, it does not belong to our times. It belongs to the times when we were becoming Michaelic, conscious people who were born into the 21st century, such as yourself. So it's important to have a sense of history and then to understand what is going on in the evolution of the financial system, not so much the banking system.

The financial system in my way of describing it would only ever be a particular mirroring of the human condition. So if you have people who need capital, there will be in the world a kind of capital that they need. I'll just give you one example. We live in a monetized society. To understand that, you need to demonetize your existence and understand how it was and how people were when you didn't buy things with money, you traded. And similarly, we live in a financialized society and we need to accept that and stand in that and then we will start to see that everything in finance, especially bookkeeping, is simply a mirror image of yourself as you are related to yourself, it shows up the universe and everyone around you. That's all it is; it's your ability or not to do your maths, to book things on time or not. Everything in your accounts is just a reflection of your competence or otherwise. And the only thing that will get your books together is you getting yourself together, to use that kind of language. So the financial system in that sense is far more reality than you're thinking. It will reflect whatever our behaviour is.

And the main thing I wanted to say, why I wanted to interrupt, was, don't go there with this money creation nonsense. I get it on one level and I'm a kind of expert in it so I could tell you a lot about what I have in mind. But Rudolf Steiner had this very simple concept – I don't think he's quite alone in it but pretty much – and I'll put it in my terms not his – money has only ever been bookkeeping, it can only ever be bookkeeping and it will forever be bookkeeping. There is nothing else – money is bookkeeping, bookkeeping is money. And if you take that very seriously and you follow that out in the modern financial system, it means there will be no banks. There will be you doing your accounts, sharing them with Frank doing his accounts, completing transactions without any cash in your hands whatsoever, all through your accounts. This is how the financial system works. All these bank statements we get depict how the whole financial system is a constant flow of transactions back-to-back throughout the universe, no ending. And once one understands that, the way you see that, you just start doing bookkeeping and then you see bookkeeping is money, money is bookkeeping.

The brilliance of Steiner's concept is that all this modern stuff about banks and central banks just drops out of the universe. It's an anachronistic situation. It's fake in its maintenance of itself. It has no justification in theory, never did have. It just suits circumstance and it suits especially the circumstance of transferring wealth to elites and all this other stuff we have to talk about. But if you want to cut straight past that, just do your books, understanding your books are money. And then go looking for someone else who's doing his or hers, understanding books are money. And you will start looking for your trading partners, so to speak. Because once your payables equal your receivables, you won't be paying any money. Nor will you receive any money. I haven't got time to go into it, but if you look at the LETS system, for example, this is a multiple accounting system and you can just see in accounting terms, once everything I owe the world equals everything the world owes to me, my books are covered. There's no money that's going to move. You have to do this to get what I'm talking about, but the notion that money has only ever been bookkeeping just removes banking from the universe. And all the credit creation nonsense people talk about, how they think it's done and how it's done, it's not. You will create credit when you say, I need 10,000 bucks to do what I've come here to do and I can demonstrate to you why I need 10,000 and how I'm going to pay you back. The bank will just give you 10,000. *You* create the credit. The banks never create anything. This needs a whole seminar, obviously, but I'm saying to you as a young person, don't get caught up in this credit creation story, chasing the Fed and all this other stuff that people are enamoured of. Just understand money as bookkeeping and therefore do your books.

Liam: Hmm. I don't want to take more time but I'd love to hear more detail from you. I haven't read your books but this is an introduction to you.

CHB: Maybe I should make a plug for aeBookstore.com? You'll find so much material there – not by me, only, by any means – about all this in huge detail. There are probably 50 titles and 250+ journals. A lot of dissertations by fellow anthroposophists, doctoral dissertations, masters theses on finance, high scoring in serious institutions around the world. So this is my little plug. Just look up aeBookstore.com and go check all the titles and all the themes in the books.

Christine Burke: I had a question that popped up earlier for me. And I wrote it in the chat. It says, I'm interested in knowing if you are suggesting that each Society or the Goetheanum itself would be the funders of initiatives within the membership, or are you saying that each individual should go to their governments or other individuals to get financial support from the government or other individuals. And I ask this because well, that's a good enough question, I think. That's a clear enough question without getting too muddy.²³

CHB: Maybe a straight answer? If you're a member of the Anthroposophical Society, in your role as a member of that Society, so to speak, you only have one thing you have to do, which is pay your subscription or whatever you call it. That's all you have to do. You're not responsible for that Society, that's the responsibility of the people on the Council. Your responsibility is to pay whatever the rate is that's asked of you and that's very different depending on how it's understood and how it's computed around the world because each Group has a different way of looking at this. In my view, that's your only responsibility as a member. If you have to pay 100 bucks, you pay 100 bucks and you're clean. But the reality is that many of us are what some people call 'active members', so we do things out of anthroposophy. Here I think, we have to be really careful. For me, Rudolf Steiner's concept of the Christmas Conference is very simple. There's the Anthroposophical Society, of which we've become a member, and there's the School of Spiritual Science which we can also become a member of. What's the difference? The people who join the Anthroposophical Society simply want to meet and join in its task of furthering the work of the School. The people who join the School want to carry out that work. So they take a next step, you might say, which is to become members of the School of Spiritual Science in order to carry out research. But, then, as a member of the Anthroposophical Society you need to, so to speak, take that hat off and come back to the question I was looking at earlier: What am I doing as a member of the School of Spiritual Science? What am I doing that amounts to research that warrants me being funded? What is it I'm doing? You have to put a name to that and get funded for doing it. And how does that happen? That has to be a grant or whatever it has to be. But this is not you as a member of the Anthroposophical Society, it's not you as an ordinary citizen, it's you pretending – in the scholarly sense of that word – that you have something to bring to the table of research for humanity. You know whether you're developing a new plant seed or whatever it might be, it could be whole range of things, and for this you would then be a self-employed researcher able to put together a grant application and be funded for this, pay your tax on it and there will be a result to share with the world. Maybe your experiment failed – that's also a result to share with the world.

So for me, it's as simple as that, yet we make such a chaos of our notions of spiritual science, what research is, and we make such a chaos within our own Society of how we fund that. If you look at most Anthroposophical Societies, they don't make this sharp distinction, they have a lot of funding for a lot of stuff. Like your own American website, it's like all the restaurants in the United States! You have a map and all these little Google location pointers all over the United States. I don't understand it. They can't be all serious researchers. They're probably anthroposophists doing important things or interesting stuff, and I'm not being critical of that, but if I was to look at all those little pointers around the United States, I'd want to know, what is being pointed to? Is this someone just being nice, is this someone meditating, is this someone doing serious research who is going to come up with a new plant no one has seen before? This needs to be organized. And we need to have the sense, I think, that when we're contributing to this serious type of research, we are doing this as members of the School of Spiritual Science, whether we formally say so or not. Substantially we must be researching something that the world cannot otherwise research. Otherwise what's the point of being in a spiritual scientific school? If it's just an anthroposophist as a member flapping

²³ CHB afterthought: It is one thing to imagine us all going to the Goetheanum asking for funds for our work, requiring it to have a pool of capital, and quite another to imagine the world has funded us (without any loss of sovereignty) because then we will be going to the Goetheanum to compare notes, fine-tune and deepen our collective research on behalf of humanity.

around, any old thing, and muddling it up with all sorts of other stuff, unable to remember what Steiner said and when he said it, this is not spiritual scientific research and it should not get a single penny through the Anthroposophical Society. The Society is not there for that. It's there for the serious stuff that could command 75 million or today 450 million dollars – and I mean from outside the Anthroposophical Movement, not from people who've got buy-in because they're not your best judge. If you're a researcher you don't want your mum and dad to buy your research. Where's the rigour in that? You want your enemy to say, "My god, you're right and I'm going to pay for you."

CB: Hmm, beautiful. I see that, thanks.

CHB: I'm serious; we make such a mess out of a very simple circumstance.

CB: It seems that that is what the work that Dottie and Frank and Elderberries have been doing and it's a really beautiful picture. Thank you so much. I really appreciate that.

CHB: Can I give another plug because I did say I don't know how Dottie's projects work financially.

DZ: As many plugs as you like, dear Christopher, please!

CHB: My circumstance is that I don't need funding for this event – it's not because I'm rich, it's because I have funding from somewhere else. But before I agreed to do this, we had a lot of back and forth because I thought, "Oh no, I'm not going to hook up with *that* lady, this will further trash my already trashed reputation (though really I'm beyond that)." So we had a lot of back and forth about what Dottie's doing. And what I understood is, whatever Dottie is doing, she's hanging out with the kids, you know, she's hanging out with the drug addicts, she's hanging out with those who get born in the 21st century and there's nowhere to go. That needs funding.

You know, if Dottie came to me, she wouldn't survive it because I want cash flow statements and all sorts of things that she doesn't do because she doesn't do that sort of thing. But if she did, she'd get a whole chunk of money. Because in every drug-affected young person, there's someone who's come to earth to be a partner of the gods. And what didn't they get? They didn't get capital. They got peanuts or whatever they got. But they were not given the capital they needed to do what they said they were going to do. I'm very serious about this. There needs to be a lot of financial literacy, and they need to be taught how to do this, but at the end of the day, when someone says I need a thousand dollars, you give them a thousand dollars. You don't say, there's only so much money in the world and what if you lose it and anyway, who are you, you didn't go to a Waldorf School?! "No. I've been on drugs for many years and I'm coming off. It's not for you to gainsay why I'm on the earth." I can get very impassioned about this. And so I would like to say, if you've got any spare money, please give it, not to Dottie, but to Elderberries so she can do her good work.

DZ: Thank you. I remember something from Dennis Klocek, if you're going to work with Michael, you better strap in. It's definitely been a slog and I am so thankful to meet Christopher's work in a way that can inspire us to be more together so people can see the value of our work so that we can do that work further. So I'm inspired by that. But we're at our edge now. I don't know if, Christopher, you have a final thought before we close. And Christine is here to share the verse as the ending, that would be good.

CHB: I'd like to thank you for asking me to make this presentation and for everyone still being here on the screen or in the room or wherever we are. I think we need to wrap. As I said, thanks again and I'll leave it to you, Dottie. And thanks, Frank, for doing the techy stuff, wherever you are. I'm looking on the screen. Oh, there you are, thanks Frank. And send all your prayers to the US Immigration Office, please. I have an interview on the 6th of June to get a return visa to the United States, and I might need some support there.

DZ: Thank you Christopher. I'll hand over to Christine...

Christ John of Rose Cross, Protect us
Guide us on our path
In the hope that it is your path too.
Help us be attentive
but nonetheless decisive.

To centre the economy
Is to resolve the chaos in karma
Facing us with the astral life.
In touching a task perhaps not his
Of keeping true the economic structure of the world.

Grant us the courage
To pursue our objectives
And the forces of spirit
To remain conscious of you.