

## The Next Phase

May 2024 / Essaouira, Morocco (Slightly revised 7 July 2025)

Writing as I believe any member of an Economics Section would, and mindful of the, let's say, under-performance of the Social Sciences Section, this essay is my attempt to find clear and certain ground after the 2024 AGM of the General Anthroposophical Society in Dornach, an event which to my mind showed – despite constant references to it – how unlike the Christmas Conference the situation has become. In my understanding, the Goetheanum Leadership variously referred to by Rudolf Steiner in GA 260<sup>1</sup> amounts to a conversation between the Vorstand (of the Society) and the leaders of the sections of the School, the Collegium (which originally included the Vorstand members, and maybe should return to doing so).<sup>2</sup> The 'logics' of the two leaderships, one the body, the other the soul, are not the same. The one is that of an earthly organisation; the other a supersensible school. In their right relationship, they allow the spirit to speak into earthly affairs via the activity of the School's members in their capacity as 'representants' of the 'anthroposophical cause' through their work done 'in', by or through the Sections.

To use a landscaping image, the secret of good garden design is that the paths, when set in their necessarily hard outlining, are wide enough so that when the plants beside and behind their edges reach their full habit, they can overflow freely onto the path but leave it wide enough for two people to pass side by side in peripatetic discourse like philosophers in ancient Greece.

The spirit of the Christmas Conference comes of itself, but it cannot do so – except with great difficulty – if it has to contend with today's double hindrance. Firstly, along with the working with the World Goetheanum Association, above both the Vorstand and the Collegium there is a layer of management (i.e. the currently-named Goetheanum Leadership's 'rules of procedure'<sup>3</sup>), where the conversation between body and soul is subject to, if not overridden by, paired mandate-holders whose ground is neither body nor soul, but a conflict resolution construct. While I recognise this may have been needed at the time of its creation, surely it was not meant to be permanent or to devise and implement its own *modus operandi*. More to the point, have the circumstances that brought it about not now been addressed?

Secondly, an ever-increasing use of online media and centralising technology which, whatever their merits, have three definite demerits: (i) devaluing and decreasing the possibility of in-person meetings at all levels and in all corners of the anthroposophical movement, (ii) marginalising the need for and role of Country Societies, and (iii) likewise taking awareness away from their own 'domestic' working via groups and branches.

-----

If one's image of the Anthroposophical Society is of a single worldwide entity with direct membership as the norm (not the exception), in which, with the one press of a button, every member can receive (but possibly not open, let alone read) its publications and appeals for money, then these concerns of mine will not be yours.

For me, however, I experience the presence of an increasingly ensconced and gloating inmate spirit, very aware that it is doing more damage to Rudolf Steiner's mission than could ever be accomplished by that mission's enemies from without. My question is how to 'firewall' the continuing life of the

---

<sup>1</sup> See my treatment in [http://www.hopespringseternal.world/fileadmin/HSE\\_Commentary\\_18\\_Leadership\\_in\\_the\\_Anthroposophical\\_Movement.pdf](http://www.hopespringseternal.world/fileadmin/HSE_Commentary_18_Leadership_in_the_Anthroposophical_Movement.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> The Vorstand, per Steiner, would also hold regular sessions of itself in enlarged moments, for example, when meeting with the General Secretaries or the Treasurers.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix 1. *Provisionally translated (for study purposes with close colleagues) by chb from the German and the version published at the Dornach AGM, April 2024. In key respects, some of the subtleties concerning the leadership of and at the Goetheanum are incorrect in the English translations of the Statutes.*

Christmas Conference from the presence and effects of this inmate development, so that the Deed of Rudolf Steiner might nevertheless find fresh wind via the Country Societies especially?

It was in this mood that, sitting in the back of the Hall during one of the AGM's overtly political (and therefore ill-placed) moments, that I found myself penning these words:

If the soul tells the body how to carry it (the soul), the body cannot serve the soul out of itself. Instead, the body, when dictated to, shrinks and has no true *telos*. And so, in the end serves itself.

The School should make its needs known, so that the Society can live by serving and carrying the School.<sup>4</sup>

For this, the Vorstand (of the Society) and the collegium (of the School) should stand free of one another and so enter into conversation.

And not be overarched by another instance, today's 'Goetheanum Leadership', which increasingly can only suffocate both the Society and the School. Replacing joy and spontaneous effectiveness with draining and stultification.

The Society's chart of accounts should reflect this – the Society, with its own needs met first, able to carry the School in such a way that neither does the School tyrannise its funding nor does funding dictate to the School.

The membership of both Society and School will then stabilise and even grow. The Society, as the School's funding vehicle is the protecting buffer for this. *But it can provide no protection from today's 'Goetheanum Leadership'.*

### Time to get strategic

Part of the ground I am seeking is the re-enlivening of the presence, identity and working of the Country Societies. For them to grow as groups of the Anthroposophical Society around the world, they need to be protected from, by not partaking in or replicating, the confusions at the Goetheanum consequent, in my view, on its current leadership construct.

*Inter alia*, important ways of doing this through finances include for example:

- 1) attending to the membership contributions
- 2) building funds in the Country Societies for the work of the Goetheanum not only in Dornach, but around the world
- 3) encouraging domestic financial discipline (paying fees, using budgets, etc.)
- 4) adopting a shared chart of accounts that reflects and facilitates the Society carrying the School (with the General Anthroposophical Society following suit)

and through approaching the finances strategically, i.e. with stated goals and time-frames.

In 2017,<sup>5</sup> in an article called *Rudolf Steiner. Financial Genius*, I wrote:

Statute 12 reads: 'Membership dues 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

---

<sup>4</sup> Echoed in the Treasurers's Guidelines 7 and 8, *Anthroposophy Worldwide*, 11/21.

<sup>5</sup> *Anthroposophy Worldwide*, No. 4/17.

at the Goetheanum.' This, Steiner said, should be enough for the budget of the General Society. Updated using information supplied by the Swiss National Bank, that amount today would be 90 CHF per member<sup>6</sup> – a factor of 6. Today, on the recently reported membership base of close on 45,000,<sup>7</sup> this would amount to 4,050,000 CHF (or, as I prefer to think, 4,050,000 HIB – for Hibernias, a notional world currency rated 1:1 with the Swiss Franc that befits the need to think of the worldwide movement as the fullest context for the Goetheanum<sup>8</sup>).

In 2016, the cost for the Society and School combined was 14,944,000, of which 4,191,000 (28%) was met from membership contributions and free donations, meaning that *overall*, we are actually already meeting the sum updated from 1923. We should know this and take heart from it. The problem is that it is not evenly, fairly or consciously carried by the membership at large... [Moreover,] such a sum as 4,050,000 Hibernias not only meets the day-to-day needs of the Society, it could also have a siphoning or leveraging effect on the monies needed to finance the work of the School – the latter understood in its largest sense as ranging from stage work to research of all kinds in the many fields reflected in its Sections.

Likened to modern business precepts, membership income could be seen as covering the risk implicit in the work we initiate as a movement – the 'equity' part of our liabilities, providing the ground that enables humanity at large to join us in financing the 'debt' part. Together, these two components finance ... what (in allusion to *Statute 2*) we do for the benefit of humanity as a whole on the ground of spiritual scientific insights into civilisation and practical life.

On 31 December 1923, when discussing how much money would be needed to finance the work of the School to the extent it merited, Steiner observed: "We should need nothing more than something like 50 to 75 million francs; [though] I present this not as a wish, nor as a possibility, only as an illusion, albeit a very real illusion. If we had 75 million francs, we should actually be able to do what absolutely must be done." Multiplied by the factor of 6, today this would be 300 to 450 million Hibernias.<sup>9</sup>

If every society did in fact seek support for the work of the School from society at large, not only would that work be strengthened and protected, because its relevance and merit would have been recognised by people generally, but the 450,000,000 Hibernias would also arise on a *worldwide* basis – that is to say, not in one place but wherever the inner Goetheanum was active. In 2016 terms, that would mean the current 10,750,000 for the Goetheanum at Dornach plus 439,250,000 for the Goetheanum beyond Dornach, with a large part of this probably coming from 'spend-out' foundations, where this money currently otherwise gets 'stocked' in financial markets.

The answer to these questions – questions of leverage and world relevance, rather than addition and self-referencing – cannot be known, however, until the 90 per member is achieved. Currently that amount averages a very uneven 75. Can we, therefore, find it in our hearts and will to increase this number, but also to carry it more widely? Surely the Good Spirits that accompanied the Christmas Conference would not let such an effort on our part go unnoticed or unreciprocated.

I stand by this earlier attempt, via finances, to give a fresh ground and fresh impetus to the Anthroposophical Society in the various countries around the world – independent and autonomous entities in regard to themselves and the General Anthroposophical Society, yet Country Groups of the Anthroposophical Society when understood as a worldwide affair. And not Country Societies as conduits of cash to Dornach, but as Groups together carrying the Anthroposophical Society

<sup>6</sup> Actually 94.

<sup>7</sup> All numbers from *Anthroposophy Worldwide*, No. 4/17.

<sup>8</sup> See *Anthroposophy Worldwide*, No. 3/17, p.16.

<sup>9</sup> Cast over the 10,000 institutions worldwide, this would be 45,000 per institution. As an economic calculation, but not as a policy proposal, it would be interesting to know what that would be as a percentage of their turnover; that is, as if they were charged an intellectual property levy. Conversely, and more interestingly, it would be valuable to know by what amount, if any, their income would need to increase (become true?) in order to contribute such a sum. (See also footnote 11.)

worldwide, both at the Goetheanum and especially at home, in the so-called periphery (though that is not a term I find useful.).

Since writing my article, the Circle of Treasurers has come into being, along with the Treasurers Guidelines, the very first of which stresses the importance of members paying viable contributions to and through their Groups, while No. 5 asks Country Groups to remit viable amounts annually to the General Anthroposophical Society.<sup>10</sup>

I have no doubt that, as a matter of conventional finance, let alone anything of a more overtly spiritual scientific or occult nature, if the members cover the costs of the Society, the costs of the School (which the Society exists to carry), will come from the world at large – including or led by those members of both School and Society with excess funds substantial enough to give away – but not in any way that conditions the School, or, more concretely, the work done in its name by its members.

Again, I stand by my earlier figures, meaning also that I do not necessarily accept the need for higher expenditure at the Goetheanum; certainly not as long as the  $40,000 \times 90$  is not achieved – or not even seriously attempted. If we expend despite the weak and uncoordinated will of the membership we will simply fall into the funding logic (and related habits) of foundations or those of our members who are privately wealthy.

If I were to change anything since 2017, it would be to argue that we set the world membership at 40,000 and assume it will not go below that, so that the Country Societies combined budgeted provision for the General Anthroposophical Society would be  $40,000 \times 90 = 3,600,000$  HIB. I do not see the declining membership as demographic or a permanent tendency, but as a moment in history and karma that reveals and reflects our weakened will. To stop that decline, therefore, we do not need to spend hours in analysis or place false expectations on young people; we simply need to steel our will and collaborate.

For this, however, the General Anthroposophical Society needs to stop, and reverse, going past the Country Societies and deliberately go *via* them instead. Likewise, members should not join the General Anthroposophical Society directly except, as initially envisaged, *in extremis*. Every member who joins direct is a member who has not sought, let alone found, his or her fellow travellers ‘locally’. While the related revenue resulting at the Goetheanum is illusory and unleveraged.

After all, what is 90 Hibernias per day? 25 ceadus (cents)! And who of us, truly, does not have such a small amount of money in our pockets? On the contrary, in one way or another, if we all steeled ourselves to pay 0.66 HIB per day to the Society,<sup>11</sup> i.e. 240 HIB per year,<sup>12</sup> the result would be not only  $90 \times 40,000 = 3,600,000$  for the Society at the Goetheanum, but 6,000,000 remaining in the Country Societies, to cover their own costs and those of the School they carry.<sup>13</sup> How different the Anthroposophical Society would then look, but also be perceived by the world at large!

-----

So, is it wealth or priorities that we lack? Riches or will power? And yet, where does such will come from other than by steeling the forces we already have? Allowing His will, not ours alone, to become operative. Christening our contributions.

---

<sup>10</sup> 90 HIB per member is the ideal. The option of 50% of membership revenue was an immediate compromise suggested, not on the basis of what members could be asked to do, but on what results from their current will habits.

<sup>11</sup> Using exchange rates: 1.00 HIB = 0.87 GBP, 01.02 EUR, 1.66 AUD, 1.05 USD, that equates to 0.58 GBP, 0.67 EUR, 1.10 AUD, 0.73 USD. For comparison, typical prices in USD are a banana 0.30, a cup of coffee 3.00, a croissant 3.75, a newspaper 1.50. Together, that could be a breakfast of 9.34, or  $12 \times 0.73$ !

<sup>12</sup> 209.00 GBP, 244.00 EUR, 398.00 AUD, 265.00 USD.

<sup>13</sup> This is not the 300-450 million mentioned in *Rudolf Steiner. Financial Genius*, but it is substantial enough given our current ability to match it with concrete and relevant spiritual scientific research. For this number cannot be an abstract sum; it has to reflect our competence and what our skills sets and available personnel on earth can accomplish.

From thoughts such as these, and at risk of repeating myself, a clear and simple enough overall strategy can be devised. For example, in an overall spirit of steeling our will by saying “Thank you” to Rudolf Steiner, especially with the forthcoming centennial of his death in mind, we could act in the following ways:

*1. Self-stabilise the membership*

Already discussed, we should set the number of members (40,000) that we wish to work with and not merely have it given to us by circumstance.

*2. An apple a day keeps Ahriman at bay*

Implement the Treasurers Guidelines with pro-activity, making it a priority (not an option) for every Country Society.<sup>14</sup>

*3. Welcome serious money*

By ‘serious’ I mean the ‘illusory’ 50-75, now 300-450 million Steiner referred to in 1923 (or as much of that amount as is *not* illusory today). For this, we need to design and create arrangements to receive monies destined for the work of the Goetheanum in the world as a whole, such that such monies are kept distinct and separate from the cost of administering the membership, especially when it is under-paying. (The Goetheanum Fund Worldwide is such an arrangement.)

*4. Goethe who?*

If ‘the Goetheanum’ is to mean anything worldwide, it is necessary to build an understanding of Goethe in cultures where he is not a reference. This may seem odd to those who live where Goethe is a known and uncontroversial cultural figure. But as a rule that does not include English-speaking countries, where in the main Goethe is a reference only for Germanophiles.

*5. Of root hairs and cotyledons*

Identify projects and activities that, through the insights of Rudolf Steiner and his colleague-collaborators (both on earth and not), enable Anthroposophy to take hold of the world at seminal places<sup>15</sup> until their first true leaves appear, as it were – at which point these undertakings can become in without becoming of the world; at which point, too, humanity at large, i.e. humanity beyond the membership of the Anthroposophical Society/School of Spiritual Science,<sup>16</sup> can join in the funding of both.

*6. Spend, lend and tend*

Create and use our current and future opportunities to avail ourselves of (and so also demonstrate and give fresh meaning to) the three conventional uses of money: spending, lending and tending (giving) by

- paying fees punctually via Country Societies to the General Anthroposophical Society (akin to purchase money)
- maximising the use of bonds and minimising the use of donations to finance real property (akin to loan money)
- reserving donations, grants and legacies for the work of the School in its many manifestations (akin to gift money)

---

<sup>14</sup> All this apart from the separate project to get 5,000 ‘anthroposophical institutions’ to displace the General Anthroposophical Society’s current dependence on Weleda by paying 1 HIB per day to the Goetheanum ( $1 \times 365 \times 5000 = 1825,000$ ). See also footnote 6.

<sup>15</sup> E.G: enabling longer trainings for teachers, funding remedies so that they do not need to go via the market, refinancing real estate with bonds and so freeing up the ‘gift money’ currently trapped in it.

<sup>16</sup> In my view, membership of the Society and School is always and only a matter of karma and past resolves, never a matter of outreach, membership drives or proselytizing.

## A Next Address<sup>17</sup>

Out of my concern about the displacement of direct human intercourse (the kind angels take part in) by facsimiles of it, I am seeking ways to use the internet against itself, as it were, by not expanding its use and substitution of direct human intercourse but ‘taming’ its use by, for example, creating and using websites that (a) bring clarity to what is now confused, and (b) provoke and serve as an aid to but not displacer of in-person working.<sup>18</sup>

It is in this mood, in the days directly after the AGM, that I thought of doing this by conceiving of a ‘next address’ as the inspiration behind branch websites (and possibly the revised site for the Economics Conference of the Goetheanum).

Although, of course, Rudolf Steiner did a great deal between when he ‘retired’ from public view (on 29 September 1924) and his death shortly after 4am on 30 March 1925,<sup>19</sup> the idea behind these websites is to pick up where he left off, as it were – at the end of his half-given last address – by imagining a next address. But not from him to us, or us to him – rather, from us standing beside him looking from Michaelmas 1924 forwards to, say, Michaelmas 2033. A time distant enough to give us a sense of aspired achievements or achievable aspirations by then, of timing and traction and thought-led action. After all, by now we have acquired plenty of potential motive forces; it’s time to put them to use by giving them focus, guidance and historical and spiritual efficacy.<sup>20</sup>

Addressed to today and all our tomorrows and mindful of all our yesterlives and journeys to date, these websites would endeavour to imagine and reiterate Rudolf Steiner’s mission. Conceived in the spirit of syllables rather than consonants, conception then birth, they are a call to intention in colleagueship with Rudolf Steiner. In their different ways, they would tell the story of Rudolf Steiner, his mission and legacy as humanity’s brother and Anthroposophy’s ‘midwife’; the Anthroposophical Society as the future family of humanity, having evolved beyond consanguinity to where the I is grounded in itself; the School of Spiritual Science, whose deep, widened and representative understanding of human existence enables us to overcome our limited knowledge; and coherent initiatives undertaken in collaborative gratitude to Rudolf Steiner on the basis of his work and insights.

### Yes, but...

Yes, but one should ask oneself what would such a ‘next address’ realistically entail? Referring to the content of *The Last Address*, twenty-five years into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, what is the mark of those who prepare the Michaelic Mood? What, today, characterises ‘letting the Michael Power and Will penetrate all life?’ And what did Steiner mean by ‘the leadership of [not at] the Goetheanum’?

‘The Last Address’ was only half-delivered, as Rudolf Steiner could not complete what he had to say. It left us, in Alfred Heidenreich’s closing introductory words, with ‘an esoteric riddle … [such] that we might grow by pondering it reverently and thus be led eventually to revelations which we should discover ourselves.’ The substance of this riddle – the inclusion of Lazarus-John the Evangelist in the sequence of incarnations from Elijah to Novalis, and so on – is the subject of the book, *Christianity as Mystical Fact*.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>17</sup> The allusion is to *The Last Address*. Rudolf Steiner Press, London 1967.

<sup>18</sup> For example, in my case, <https://sociedadantroposofica.ec/en/> and <http://www.hopespringseternal.world/>

<sup>19</sup> Source: Ita Wegman Nachrichtenblatt 1925 at <https://reverseritual.com/rudolf-steiners-deathday/>

<sup>20</sup> See *Anthroposophy Worldwide*, 3/4 2025.

<sup>21</sup> *Christianity as Mystical Fact* (1902) Steiner Books: New York 1997. Also, *John the Baptist and St John the Evangelist*, Maria von Nagy (1957), *The Raising of Lazarus*, John Cornish (1979) St Georges Publications: New York, and *The Gospel of St John and the Mind of Today*, John Cornish (1981) St Georges Publications: New York.

Can we claim or report any such revelations – or growth – now, one hundred years later? And how, if at all, does the story outlined above relate to any of this, especially when the Anthroposophical Society and the School of Spiritual Science within it are considered in their financial aspect? If our answers to these questions are in the negative, then where are we and what are we to do? And yet, lest or before we despair or deem ourselves unworthy, how can we have any hope of rising to that occasion if, in the way we conduct our own lives, we do not follow Rudolf Steiner's own 'logic' and examples in regard to that story's four main elements? Until we satisfy ourselves, and the gods who attend us, on that account, the jury has to be out. All the more reason, therefore, for putting all our focus on getting these four aspects of the anthroposophical movement rightly arranged, first in our own minds and conduct, and then making that the basis of the next phase. There is an idea currently being iterated of 100+1 years. I suggest we also think in terms of 100+10 years.

# Appendix 1: Rules of Procedure for the Goetheanum Management<sup>22</sup>

*Translated for study purposes with close colleagues by chb from the German and the version published at the Dornach AGM, April 2024. In key respects, some of the subtleties concerning the leadership of and at the Goetheanum are incorrect in the English translations of the Statutes.*

*Purple words in text = CHB additions to clarify and support the meaning. Purple footnotes 20 ff. CHB comments.*

## 1: Framework

Section 3 of the current statute of the General Anthroposophical Society states:

‘The General Anthroposophical Society is the legal entity (carrier, surely?) of the School of Spiritual Science in accordance with Articles 5, 7 and 9 of the (Christmas Conference) Founding Statutes.<sup>23</sup> The Goetheanum Leadership designated in the Founding Statutes includes the members of the Vorstand as well as the leaders of the individual Sections of the School of Spiritual Science, who regulate their own forms of working.<sup>24</sup>

In addition, the commercial register stipulates that any two (General Anthroposophical Society) Vorstand members, or one Vorstand member and one Section Leader can legally represent the General Anthroposophical Society.<sup>25</sup>

## 2: Tasks

From the perception and assessment of the social and spiritual events of the time and the developments and insights in the Sections and Country Societies, the Goetheanum Management develops a current picture of the tasks of anthroposophy in the world. From this it creates directional impulses and initiatives for the Goetheanum.<sup>26</sup>

The Goetheanum Management is responsible for

- the leadership of the School of Spiritual Science (as the Collegium of Section Leaders),
- the operating of the Goetheanum (through its delegated management team),
- and advises and supports the Vorstand with regard to all matters of the Anthroposophical Society (acting as an extended Vorstand).<sup>27</sup>

The Goetheanum Management wants to deepen and expand its understanding of humanity and its world context, to bring it to light in a variety of ways in art, science and religion, and to make it fruitful in social life. The Goetheanum as a place of life and activity of the School<sup>28</sup> is jointly responsible in all areas of work and managed through mandates.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Where the current construct is meant, I use Goetheanum Management, to keep it distinct from Goetheanum Leadership as mentioned in the Christmas Conference and its statutes. Though one can also use ‘Goetheanum Leadership’, I think ‘management’ better describes its ethos. Likewise, I have used Vorstand for the Vorstand (i.e. leadership) of the Society and Collegium for the leadership of the School, in order to know they refer to the usage at the Goetheanum, as distinct from in countries. It may in fact prove that in due course the Goetheanum as an institution becomes better identified and the term Goetheanum Leadership can migrate to there.

<sup>23</sup> In fact, in the English edition 5 refers to ‘leadership of the School at the Goetheanum’, 7 makes no mention of leadership but refers to Rudolf Steiner in his capacity as inaugurator of the School, and 9 makes no mention of leadership. Conversely, 3, 8 and 12 do refer to leadership but are not mentioned here. See Appendix 2.

<sup>24</sup> Understood, but surely the ‘form’ intended was a conversation between the two leaderships, not their amalgamation of subsuming in any other let alone higher instance?

<sup>25</sup> i.e. by proxy, provided that does not reversely link the School to earthly life.

<sup>26</sup> Meaning, presumably, GAS and the School.

<sup>27</sup> How does this compare to Rudolf Steiner’s image of an extended Vorstand?

<sup>28</sup> Of the School, or of the building, its grounds and everything that happens within it, including but not only the School; i.e. the Goetheanum and the School are not synonymous.

<sup>29</sup> Where, in all Rudolf Steiner’s ideas does one find ‘mandates’? This is surely from the NPI world, i.e. via Fritz Glasl as conflict management specialist.

### 3: Working methods

The working methods of the Goetheanum Management with regard to the leadership of the School and its sections, as well as the Anthroposophical Society, are carried out with transparency and mutual accountability and are evaluated annually.

- a. The appointment of new Vorstand members and section leaders is discussed in the Goetheanum Management and decided unanimously (3.d below notwithstanding). In the case of Vorstand members, a proposal initially comes from the Vorstand, which is then discussed by the Goetheanum Management and, after approval, goes to the Conference of Country Representatives (a.k.a. General Secretaries) and the General Assembly.

At the age of 70, regular appointments to the Goetheanum Management end regardless of other functions. They can be renewed as an appointment for one year at a time.

- b. The Vorstand at the Goetheanum brings its responsibility for operations and administration – including finances – to the Goetheanum Management. The Collegium of the School, consisting of its Section Leaders, fulfils its responsibility for the School within (!) the Goetheanum Management.

The Goetheanum Management is to be informed about all important processes in the Anthroposophical Society and the School and makes decisions on direction and goals concerning overarching questions of the individual areas of responsibility. With regard to individual Section and School matters, as well as administrative questions, the Goetheanum Management primarily makes decisions on competence rather than on substantive issues.

- c. It is therefore the task of the Goetheanum Management to assign individual members **of itself** temporary mandates or areas of responsibility. The aim is to link the professionally competent co-workers<sup>30</sup> in the house – working independently within their respective competences and tasks as well as within budgets – with the goals of the Goetheanum in terms of content or operations, and thereby ensure the cohesion of management and operations. The responsibilities are set out in an organizational chart (not included here).

The assigning of mandates or areas of responsibility as an act of formal transfer includes:

- that individual members of the Goetheanum Management are given decision-making authority for their mandates or areas of responsibility within the framework of the professional circumstances;
- that a period of three years is agreed for the assignments. For tasks that are project-like in nature, a period corresponding to the duration of the project is agreed; and
- that there is an annual accountability to the Goetheanum Management and that co-workers are also consulted on this; for projects defined for a limited period of time, appropriate dates for the presentation of accounts are agreed.

The Goetheanum Management has the option of reversing its decision regarding the allocation of mandates or areas of responsibility.

- d. The Goetheanum Management strives for unanimity in its decisions. If there is no unanimity, the decision in question can be made at a subsequent meeting with a 2/3 majority of the votes of the members of the Goetheanum Management present.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Originally coming from Camphill, but blurring the fact that they are employees of an organisation and not, as such, responsible for its management and conduct.

<sup>31</sup> Voting on matters of the School????!!!

- e. The transfer of decision-making authority and responsibility means that those in charge regularly inform the Goetheanum Management and consult with it regarding their fundamental decisions. If such a consultation takes place, those in charge are free to include the results of the consultation in their decision. They inform the Goetheanum Management about this.

Any member of the Goetheanum Management can request that the spokespersons ([see 4 below](#)) discuss matters relating to an area of responsibility that has been allocated to another member. The spokespersons decide on an appropriate form of handling.

#### **4: Spokespersons**

The spokespersons for the Goetheanum Management are two of its members, one Vorstand member and one Section Leader. The appointment is made in June for one year (September to August). The spokespersons set priorities for the joint work on the basic principles and tasks of anthroposophy. They chair the meeting of the Goetheanum Management with the corresponding preparation and follow-up work. They are the external contact and are responsible for communication from the Goetheanum Management.

Original resolution, Dornach, October 23, 2012 / This version February 18, 2020

– *Goetheanum Management*

## Appendix 2: Christmas Conference Statutes

5. The Anthroposophical Society sees the School of Spiritual Science in Dornach as a centre for its activity. The School will be composed of three classes. Members of the Society will be admitted to the School on their own application after a period of membership to be determined by **the leadership at of the Goetheanum** (*German*: die Leitung des Goetheanums) [*chb*: of the School]. They enter in this way the First Class of the School of Spiritual Science. Admission to the Second or Third Classes takes place when the person requesting this is deemed eligible by **the leadership at of the Goetheanum** (*German*: die Leitung des Goetheanums) [*chb*: of the School].
7. The organising of the School of Spiritual Science is, to begin with, the responsibility of Rudolf Steiner, who will appoint his collaborators and his possible successor.  
*No mention of leadership but RS was inaugurator of the School, and President of the Society.*
9. The purpose of the Anthroposophical Society will be the furtherance of spiritual research; that of the School of Spiritual Science will be this research itself. A dogmatic stand in any field whatsoever is to be excluded from the Anthroposophical Society.  
*No mention of leadership.*

-----

*These are not mentioned in the Rules of Procedure but all have leadership mentioned or implied.*

3. The persons gathered in Dornach as the nucleus of the Society recognise and endorse the view **of the leadership at of the Goetheanum** (*German*: der Goetheanum-Leitung) (represented by the **Vorstand** [Executive Council] formed at the Foundation Meeting...)
8. All publications of the Society shall be public, in the same sense as are those of other public societies. The publications of the School of Spiritual Science will form no exception as regards this public character; however, **the leadership of the School** (*German*: die Leitung der Schule) ...
12. Membership dues shall be fixed by the individual groups; each group shall, however, submit 15 Swiss Francs for each of its members to **the central leadership at** (*German*: die zentrale Leitung am Goetheanum) **of the Society** at the Goetheanum.