

## Fingertip Finances

Rudolf Steiner

An anthology of extracts concerning the financing of the Anthroposophical Society. Compiled with commentary by Christopher Houghton Budd, 16 March 2026. Italics per CHB. Source: *The Christmas Conference / 1923-4*. Anthroposophic Press, New York 1990. CW 260.

*The idea of this anthology is to draw attention to the basis of financing outlined by Rudolf Steiner at the Christmas Conference. The anthology begins with the four statutes that concern finances, followed by extracts from various meetings at the Christmas Conference where Steiner speaks about financing. This is the basis (the primary literature if you will) for what colleagues and I refer to as Steiner's ideas on financing the Society. Assuming the English is true to the German (something I have not yet verified, but the late Johanna Collis was one of the best translators), it shows Steiner thinking on his feet, fully aware of how financing takes place in the normal world and not given to suggesting it should be any different in the Society. Apart from clearly indicated comments and some italicising on my part, the texts are uninterpreted. To me it is evident that Steiner's sense of finance was both acute and undated. His ideas are as perceptive and relevant now as they were in 1924.*

– Christopher Houghton Budd

### CHRISTMAS CONFERENCE STATUTES

- 10: The Anthroposophical Society shall hold a regular General Meeting at the Goetheanum each year, at which time the Vorstand<sup>1</sup> shall present a full report with accounting...
- 11: Members may join together in smaller or larger groups on any basis of locality or subject matter (German: *sachlichen Felde*). The headquarters of the Anthroposophical Society is at the Goetheanum. From there the Vorstand shall bring to the attention of the members or groups of members what it considers to be the task of the Society. The Vorstand communicates with officials elected or appointed by the various groups. Admission of members will be the concern of the individual groups; the certificate of membership shall, however, be placed before the Vorstand in Dornach, and shall be signed by them out of their confidence in the officials of the groups. In general, every member should join a group. Only those for whom it is quite impossible to find entry to a group should apply directly to Dornach for membership.
- 12: Membership dues shall be fixed by the individual groups; each group shall, however, submit 15 Swiss Francs<sup>2</sup> for each of its members to the central leadership of the Society at the Goetheanum.

---

<sup>1</sup> Vorstand is German for board or council. In English this is often translated as Executive Council, but Steiner described it as an Initiative Council. The two terms are not synonymous. Executive Councils typically run not-for-profit organisations, but on behalf of trustees – i.e. they are not their own agents, but agents to principals, so the subtext is that principal-agency theory applies, instead of Rudolf Steiner's image of ethical individualism in Ch.9 of *The Philosophy of Freedom* (and as he understood that term; in essence that one's actions are neither impelled from within or without.). Put another way, an initiative-taking council is its own executive, but without this clarification Executive Council implies the Vorstand does someone else's bidding, which is not (supposed to be) the case.

<sup>2</sup> Reset in 1990 at 125 CHF per member from a Country Society, 300 CHF per direct member. Reimagined in 2019 via Treasurers Guideline No. 5, currently under review to revise from: 'The councils aim to transfer to the General Society a yearly minimum of CHF 90 per member or a minimum 50% of the membership dues income in their country' to 'The councils aim to transfer to the General Society a yearly minimum of 50% of the membership dues income in their country, with a target of CHF 90 by end 2026.'

13: Each working group formulates its own statutes, but these must not be incompatible with the Statutes of the Anthroposophical Society.

---

## 1: MEMBERSHIP FINANCE

**08.30 / 29 December 1923**

Rudolf Steiner: You have to have at your fingertips a sense for what might be necessary. I am altogether of the opinion that in the management<sup>3</sup> of a society not much can be achieved by a pedantic head. It may have its place elsewhere, certainly, but in the management of a society such as the one to be founded here a pedantic head is quite harmful. What we need are sensitive fingertips. The more we can manage the Society through our sensitive fingertips the better will things be...

Emil Leinhas: ...the matter of the contribution to be paid to the General Anthroposophical Society.<sup>4</sup>

RS: Perhaps I could ask Dr Guenther Wachsmuth to report on this.

Dr. Wachsmuth reports.<sup>5</sup>

RS: It will not help us much, my dear friends, if we discuss whether every country should participate in paying membership contributions. It will only help us if they all do pay. There is very little point in knowing now whether they will pay or not. The only fruitful thing to do is to take the general picture as the basis and to endeavour from this general picture to state a figure which promises to be sufficient for the General Anthroposophical Society to achieve what it has to achieve. I would therefore be in favour of stating a standard figure and then leaving open, of course, what the [country] groups ... can agree to in practice. Of course the figure can be exceeded by an unlimited amount, approaching, though never achieving, the lavish scale on which [Andrew] Carnegie acted. And less can also be contributed, for instance by the countries with very weak currencies, down to what in mathematics is termed the vanishing point. In practice we shall see what can be done. I do not know how closely it will be possible to approach the scale of Carnegie, but I am quite certain that the vanishing point ... will have a definite part to play.

Therefore, having regard to all that we can know today, I do believe that a standard figure should be fixed and that deviations from this can be arranged in individual discussions. So I think it would be right to lay down that each group should pay 12 Schillings for each of its members, i.e. 1 Schilling per month. I can assure you that even if this Schilling is really contributed we shall have the greatest difficulty in carrying out the things we intend to do here. This must not be allowed to weigh on people.

For those who cannot pay, *the amount will have to be reduced, and we shall have to reduce our plans accordingly*. But I do believe that we could agree on a standard contribution, *from the groups*, of 12 Schillings per member. Any other arrangement would lead to the Anthroposophical Society being able neither to live nor die...

---

<sup>3</sup> This term deserves special attention. Members of an initiative council are not managers, and in English there is a difference between managing an organisation and leading it, and again between management and managing in the sense of 'I managed to arrive on time.'

<sup>4</sup> i.e. the Anthroposophical Society at the Goetheanum.

<sup>5</sup> If available in German it would be good to have this in English.

So this is not intended to be an absolute demand. It is a general standard. If it turns out to be impossible, it nevertheless expresses what we would need; and we shall then simply have to reduce it. This is perfectly possible. But I do think that it is necessary to make a statement of where one stands.

Mr. Collison asks about a joining fee.

RS: The joining fee would not be included in this. It is something that goes into the general fund. But the calculation can be made on the basis of the subsequent contributions. I am simply reckoning with a monthly amount for every member of 1 Schilling, or annually 12 Schillings. This is what I am reckoning with. Perhaps I may be allowed to disclose that the Vorstand did consider this but only spoke in pictures regarding how these matters might be settled. *My suggestion is what has come to me personally*<sup>6</sup> as a result of those pictures.

Mademoiselle Sauerwein explains her point of view.

Baroness de Renzis: That would amount to 50 Lire. It would be utterly impossible for Italy!

Mademoiselle Sauerwein replies.

RS: Of course this may be so. It would simply mean that the standard contribution for individual groups would have to be set at a sufficiently low level. But I do not see that this means we cannot set the standard at the level that seems to us necessary *after making some very exact calculations*. What will happen in reality? Try to imagine it! I can say that under the conditions pertaining at present there will definitely be payments from not more than at most three to four thousand members, or rather payments will not be made for more than three to four thousand members. If you picture this to yourselves you will also have a picture of the amount we shall have at our disposal here each year.

So you see the only sensible thing to do is to set the level of membership contributions like a budget. To set the level without regard to the future is pointless. If we want to make calculations we have to make them with figures. We have to be able to count on a certain income. If this income fails to appear we are then obliged to replace the shortfall from other sources in another way, perhaps from voluntary contributions and so on. Simply to fix an amount which bears no relationship to what we need here seems to me impossible. If we are to fix an amount – otherwise we might as well go straight to voluntary contributions – then it must be on the basis of what we need here. No other basis can be fruitful.

Does anyone wish to speak to the question of the membership contribution?

Mr. Kaufmann explains that a little while ago Dr. Wachsmuth had mentioned an amount of 7 Schillings for the contribution and that the English delegates had come with the mandate to agree to 7 Schillings.

RS: *If the method I have suggested is chosen, then it will encompass every other method*. But I merely maintain that it is impossible to mention a sum from the start in the knowledge that it will be no good for anything. Whether or not something is obligatory is not so much the point. The point is that the amount can be counted on under all circumstances. In the picture that has emerged we have certainly

---

<sup>6</sup> This is the origin of my claim that Rudolf Steiner is a financial genius. See [https://economics.goetheanum.org/fileadmin/economics/Articles\\_and\\_Papers/EC\\_Paper\\_2021\\_CHB\\_Hibernia\\_Currency.pdf](https://economics.goetheanum.org/fileadmin/economics/Articles_and_Papers/EC_Paper_2021_CHB_Hibernia_Currency.pdf)

counted – *or I have certainly counted* – on the countries with strong currencies treating the amount more or less as though it were obligatory. *To go below the nominated sum would require individual negotiations.* But if we want to go below it now, it would have been better if we had started by negotiating the amount in the first place. We could have started the discussion by considering the amount – I know this would have gone against our moral sense – and once the discussion had revealed that the General Anthroposophical Society could not be maintained we could have decided not to found it in the first place.

There is no other way but to think realistically. We cannot found a Society which is incapable of surviving. *But now I have said that it will be possible to give less than the stated amount and then the centre here will have the task of raising the difference.* This statement makes the payment of the membership contribution no hardship at all, for it is simply a statement of what is actually needed. I should be sorry if the matter of the membership contribution were to create a mood of dissatisfaction. But it is not necessary for this to happen, my dear friends. However, it is on the other hand necessary that the general enthusiasm for our cause which rightly exists, and which has been expressed over the last few days, should not come to grief over the bagatelle of the membership contribution. That would be ‘ahrimanic’, my dear friends, as people are so quick to say in other settings!

Dr. Büchenbacher recounts that the Free Anthroposophical Society in Stuttgart made it possible for a colleague to exist by paying him 2, 5 or 10 percent of the weekly payments. He says that though conditions in Germany are very difficult, nevertheless if everybody pulls his or her weight things can be managed.

RS: I should merely like to point out that discussion leading to such matters cannot really belong in our present agenda. I am convinced that if we were to listen to all the pros and cons of paying or not paying the contribution we should of course hear as many justified reasons as there are people in this room, and later, in the meeting with all the members, that would mean eight hundred justified reasons. Surely we cannot make this the content of our discussion. If we are to continue, we must discuss how else we are to manage. We must discuss from the point of view of the General Anthroposophical Society how else we are to manage. I can see no possibility of managing in any other way. It seems likely that we shall not get what we need, but I see no way of managing with less.

However, I do see a possibility that the special wishes might be taken into account. Assume that not a single group can pay the required amount. So instead of 36,000 Schillings we should receive 5,000 Schillings, and then we shall have to see how to replace the 31,000 Schillings with something else. Above all it will be an uncomplicated and obvious situation. But it will be different from situations elsewhere; we cannot proceed by fixing budgets. Imagine a national budget being based on every citizen being allowed to pay whatever he likes! You cannot fix a national budget in this way! Or can you, Duke of Cesaro? Can you ask each citizen what he wants to pay per year or do you have to fix a sum and tell him what he must pay?

The Duke of Cesaro: You can, but you can't force him!

RS: This is just it; we shall not be able to enforce anything! And this can be the very reason why it might be much more easy to agree than if it were a matter of being forced. We have taken into account the matter of not being forced.

Mr. Collison asks whether this might not be a bit of an obstacle as regards acquiring new members.

RS: Suppose a group was in a position in which it could only expect a yearly sum of 4 Schillings or 4 Francs from each member. If this were the case it would of course not be able to pay 12 Schillings or 12 Francs to us. Perhaps it could pay only 2 Schillings or even nothing. The question of how to deal with new members is a matter that is left entirely to the groups, who will then say to us: We cannot pay more than so much for each member. Under these circumstances it will always be possible to manage.

Mr. Ingerö declares on behalf of Norway that about 3,000 Schillings per year could be paid.

Dr. Zeylmans van Emmichoven declares that taking Holland as a whole, the sum will be met.

RS: This is how the matter was always handled during the time when we were still the German Section of the Theosophical Society. Individual members were not forced to pay, but the groups were able to pay the full sum to the German Section by making up any shortfall out of larger payments by some members. In those days, though, the contributions were far smaller. This is no longer possible today. I have often described to you the conditions under which it was possible to manage with the old, modest contributions. I have described to you how *Luzifer-Gnosis* was produced and sent out in the early days. These are conditions which cannot be brought back today. So all in all, so far as I can see, there can be no other picture than that of needing 12 Schillings in the future for each member of the General Anthroposophical Society. Is there any member of the Vorstand who thinks differently?

Marie Steiner: No indeed. While I was closing down the publishing company and our flat in Berlin recently I was so interested to find the endless envelopes again, all addressed by hand by Dr. Steiner, while each entry in the post book had been checked by me. We saw to every little detail ourselves and then carried the whole mailing to the post office in a laundry basket. These memories came back to me in Berlin. Nobody likes doing things like this these days. But it was most interesting to look back and experience once again how every detail was attended to by Dr. Steiner and myself in those days.

RS: These are things which simply come about and there is no point in arguing about them. You didn't argue about them; you didn't even talk about them. These things are simply there, to be done out of the necessity of the moment. But once something comes under discussion you simply have to state how much you need. It is only possible to discuss something if you have a proper basis. Does anyone else wish to speak about this?

Ms. Professor Bürgi: I wish to commit myself to paying the contribution on behalf of the Bern branch.

Mr. Hahn: I wish to agree to what has been said.

RS: My dear friends, we must adjourn the meeting now so that we can go to the lecture. I shall announce when and where we shall continue.

### **1 January 1924, in the morning**

RS: Does anyone else wish to speak?

Mademoiselle Sauerwein asks whether the 12 Schillings are for the Society or the Goetheanum.

RS: In order to clarify the question Mademoiselle Sauerwein has brought to our agenda, I should report to you on the meeting in committee the other day of the General Secretaries of many different

countries with the Vorstand and with representatives of the Swiss groups. I must tell you what conclusions were reached. It was a matter of completing the only point of the Statutes which could not be finalized before they were printed. We have adopted the Statutes, but one small point remained open because I said that it would be better to discuss it in a smaller circle first; and that was the matter of the annual contribution to be made by the groups for each member.

I brought the following points of view to that smaller circle. You see, an anthroposophist – let me say this, though of course it will be easily questioned – an anthroposophist does not entertain illusions but must think realistically, for the future too. To think realistically is to say that one will need this much money for a particular project, that is, to make a preliminary annual budget which is likely to be sufficient. For the founding of the Anthroposophical Society there is no sense financially in talking a great deal about what each individual thinks should be paid annually for each member. The only sensible thing to do is to say how much we need and then to calculate how much this is likely to come to when it is divided by the number of paying members. I have concerned myself very fundamentally with this question ever since I decided – with the agreement of the members of the Vorstand whom I considered to be the right ones – to take the Presidency of the Anthroposophical Society into my own hands.

All I can do is to tell you the conclusion given to me as a result of my considerations: If we really want to run the Society which you yourselves have decided shall exist, the only thing we can do is ourselves lay down the amount which we need from every group for each member. All we can do is enter at this point in the Statutes the membership contribution to be made by every group for each of its members: 12 Schillings annually. That is only 1 Schilling monthly. You can work out what a minute amount that is per day! But we cannot manage without these 12 Schillings annually for each member. We could, of course, have started off the other way round, though I don't know whether this would have been more dignified. We could first have said: We need 12 Schillings from every member and then we shall found the Anthroposophical Society. Perhaps that would have been more practical. However that may be, the Society will only be realistically founded when we have these 12 Schillings annually.

Now, my dear friends, there are sure to be many groups who will say that they cannot raise this amount. There are groups whose membership fees would not even cover this, and they all want to keep at least half of the membership fee for themselves! So in the cases where this is so it will be a matter of negotiating with them how much they can reduce their contribution. And the missing amount will have to be raised in another way. We still need this missing amount. But this minimum sum which we need will have to be the standard, and then groups can go below it, which is bound to happen, as we well know from experience, down even to the vanishing point. The vanishing point is often reached. But I hope that there will also be instances of the opposite, right up to the level of Carnegie, though of course never quite reaching the infinite!

Anyway, this is the suggestion that I wanted to make in a smaller circle. And this smaller circle did not by any means agree immediately. But I do believe that most have meanwhile come to see that there is no other way. Countries also do it like this. You cannot set up a budget and then ask every single citizen: How much can you pay? This is not how it is done. We admittedly have no means of enforcing collection, and of course we want no such thing, for there must be freedom amongst us, including that of saying how much we need. So if you like, please do say what you think, or at least vote on whether you agree in general, in principle, to the payment of 12 Schillings per member, always remembering that everyone can negotiate how much below this it is necessary to go. I had to say this if this matter was to be discussed. (Applause)

Mademoiselle Sauerwein says that these 12 Schillings will be contributed by France because they are needed and she would like to know the date by which payment is required.

RS: The date will be a matter of administration. In the very near future – since time is too short to do so at the Conference – we shall issue By-Laws<sup>7</sup> to the various groups and in these we shall say when the contributions can be paid. They do not all have to come in at the same time. The method will gradually emerge, and agreements can be made with the different groups as to when it suits them to pay. Certainly we shall not shirk. Does anyone want to speak to this question of the membership contribution?

Mr Pyle suggests that agreement be expressed immediately on the point that the 12 Schillings per year would be raised somehow, since they were absolutely necessary.

RS: It has been suggested that we vote straight away on this question of the membership contribution. Does anyone want to speak about this suggestion, which is actually a matter for the By-Laws? Only on the suggestion, not on the question. If that is not the case, then I now call for a vote on this suggestion. Will those friends who are in favour of the standard membership contribution being set at 12 Schillings with the given proviso please raise their hands. (They do.) Will those member-friends not in favour now also please raise their hands. There seems to be cordial agreement on this point.

---

## 2: RESEARCH FUNDING

### 10:00 / 31 December 1923

Now you might say that the progress of mankind has always gone forward at a slow pace and that there is not likely to be any difference in this field. However, with civilization in its present brittle and easily destructible state, it could very well happen that in fifty or seventy-five years' time the chance will have been missed for achieving what so urgently needs to be achieved. In the face of the speed at which we are working and having to work, because we can only work if there are such devoted colleagues as Ms. Dr. Kolisko – a speed which might lead to results in fifty, or perhaps seventy-five years – in the face of this speed, let me therefore express not a wish, not even a possibility, but merely, perhaps, an illusion, which is that it would be possible to achieve the necessary results in five or ten years. I am convinced that if it were possible for us to create the necessary equipment and the necessary institutes and to have the necessary colleagues, as many as possible to work out of this spirit, then we could succeed in achieving in five or ten years what will now take us fifty or seventy-five years. The only thing we would need for this work would be 50 to 75 million Francs. Then we would probably be able to do the work in a tenth of the time. As I said, I am not expressing this as a wish nor even as a possibility, but merely as an illusion, though a very realistic illusion. If we had 75 million Francs we could achieve what has to be achieved. This is something that we should at least think about.

### In the morning / 1 January 1924

Mr. Koschützki touches on the question of finance. He considers that work at research institutes is the most suitable for obtaining money for the Goetheanum from non-anthroposophists.

---

<sup>7</sup> Often groups refer to constitutions, but in English a more modest and more accurate word is by-laws in that a by-law has the unspoken background of the general law, which it tailors to its case, but cannot undo. Since 2019, there have also been the Treasurers Guidelines. See: [https://www.hopespringseternal.world/fileadmin/COT\\_Treasurers\\_Guidelines\\_en\\_.pdf](https://www.hopespringseternal.world/fileadmin/COT_Treasurers_Guidelines_en_.pdf)

RS: So long as these things are in future always shown to be intimately bound up with Anthroposophy. It would be wrong to give the impression of merely wanting to do some research through ordinary science. In future we want to put things before the world simply as they emerge from the central core of Anthroposophy. Of course there is a good deal which does have to be presented in public in a way that is not possible through pictures, since pictures at best bring something super-sensible into the realm of the sense-perceptible. But we are supposed to present the super-sensible to the world. This is of course difficult, more difficult than presenting something sense-perceptible, but we must succeed. And we shall succeed. But please have the courage to present the super-sensible and not something that appears as though through a mask. This has brought us enough harm.

---

### 3: GOETHEANUM AS SUCH FINANCES (The Bauverein Story)

**08.30 / 29 December 1923**

Fräulein Schwarz asks some questions.

RS: The Verein des Goetheanum can only receive contributions towards the rebuilding of the Goetheanum. And the rebuilding of the Goetheanum has nothing to do with the administration of the Anthroposophical Society. These are two quite separate things. I presume you are referring to the membership fee for the Verein des Goetheanum? The relationship of the Anthroposophical Society to the Verein des Goetheanum is something that can still be discussed during this conference. With regard to the membership of the Verein I think some kind of method will have to be found if those gathered here in any way wish it. You have to consider that with regard to the rebuilding of the Goetheanum the membership fees for the Verein are so minimal as to be almost negligible. The membership contributions are almost negligible! And in future they will be negligible; in the past they were at least used for the most part for the payment of interest on loans. But for the building of the Goetheanum in future it will not be possible to get involved with loans. A sinking fund will be the only option. So then the membership contributions to the Verein des Goetheanum will have to be put to a use other than that of paying interest. We shall be speaking about the building of the Goetheanum. In future perhaps it will be possible to bring about an agreement with the General Anthroposophical Society. This is a question that would go too far for the moment, since we have not yet got beyond the matter of the membership contribution.

**In the morning / 31 December 1923**

RS: I have often stressed amongst ourselves that if you want to live in reality and not in ideas, then the realities of the time must be given particular recognition. The time in which one lives is a reality. But it is difficult to generate an understanding for this time as being something real. There are still people today who represent the threefolding of the social organism with the very sentences I used to use with regard to the conditions prevailing at the time, in 1919. History is indeed advancing so rapidly just now that if someone describes things in the way they were described in 1919 this seems to be hundreds of years out of date. Thus, since things have after all been happening in the Anthroposophical Movement, you cannot build in 1924 as you did in 1913 and 1914. In 1913 and 1914 the idea of the Goetheanum arose simply out of the realization that an artistic space would have to be created for the Mystery Dramas. At that time we really only thought of the Mystery Dramas and the lectures. But much has happened since those days and I only wish that even more had happened,

but I hope that quite soon a good deal more will happen even without the 75 million Francs I spoke about earlier. This must certainly be taken into consideration.

The thing that has happened since 1919 is that eurythmy has been developed. In 1913 it did not yet exist, it has only developed since. Therefore it cannot be maintained that what was good enough then can be good enough now. Furthermore, although I was assured at the time that the building could be executed at a cost of much less than one million German Reichs-marks, nevertheless, as you know, the cost in the end was at least seven or eight times as much. So we do not want to do our sums in the abstract this time. We want to reckon with certain quite definite figures.

Mr. Donner speaks about the financial situation.

---

GOETHEANUM FUND WORLDWIDE (Van Leer's 'World Goetheanum Association')

### **In the morning / 1 January 1924**

RS: I would now like to call on Mr. van Leer, who has asked to speak on this matter.

Mr. van Leer wants to found a World Goetheanum Association,<sup>8</sup> resembling a World School Association for the running of the Goetheanum.

RS: Yes, my dear friends, I cannot see any objection to the creation of a body of people who are members of a Goetheanum Association or something similar *even if they are not members of the Anthroposophical Society*.<sup>9</sup> The question will be, though, as to what the members of such an organization can be called upon to do. It will be very difficult to win members merely by saying that they should pay money for the Goetheanum or for any other of our ventures. But perhaps in future Anthroposophy as such, as represented now here in Dornach, will become more and more known in the world. Perhaps people who are not in the first instance courageous enough to become anthroposophists will see that fruitful work can be done out of Anthroposophy and with Anthroposophy. Then it might be possible to say to people: Look, this is a spiritual movement; maybe you are not interested now; but help it to mature, do something so that the people involved can get going and show what they can do. It is quite likely, if we carry out into the world what has been discussed here during this Conference, that an Association such as that envisaged by our dear friend van Leer might indeed become a possibility.

Do not forget that a good deal of what is now included in the Statutes is of necessity bound up with the complete openness of the Society. You will see that much will change in practice. And once there is an understanding everywhere of what is connected with this openness of the Society, then it could very well be that a form such as that suggested just now by van Leer will be found. This openness will have to be taken very, very seriously by us. And on the other hand we here at the Goetheanum, this Vorstand, will have to take very seriously the fact that in future there can be no more working under cover. It will no longer be possible to say: if we approach people about a threefold social order or about Anthroposophy, they don't want to know about this, but they are interested in the things themselves. This is something that has done us the most damage of all over the last few years, or

---

<sup>8</sup> Not to be confused with the current World Goetheanum Association, which is a cooperation among anthroposophical institutions within the anthroposophical movement.

<sup>9</sup> The basis of the Goetheanum Fund's fund raising activities since the mid 2000s.

indeed over a longer period too, because it has brought us inwardly into a sphere of untruthfulness. The work going out from Dornach in future in all realms of life will be uprightly and honestly declared in full openness as being for Anthroposophy. Then people will know for what they are giving their money. And if we work from this angle then I do believe that a form such as you have suggested will become possible. It will never be possible if people have to ask what they are supposed to give money for.

This is what I believed I ought to say. If this is done, then the prospects are quite good. Would anybody else like to speak on the question of the rebuilding?

Miss X. believes that eurythmy can show the public a great deal of what Anthroposophy is about. She asks for pictures, pictures of eurythmy and the picture of Ms. Dr. Steiner for publication in South America.

Mr. Monges hopes to arouse interest in America. 'Americans have to see before they will give.'

RS: Does anyone else wish to speak?