

**THE
GOLDEN
BLADE
2004**

56th ISSUE



**TOGETHER
AT THE
TABLE OF BROTHERHOOD**

RUDOLF STEINER LIBRARY



VYDZ023766

THE GOLDEN BLADE
*TOGETHER AT THE TABLE
OF BROTHERHOOD*

2004

56th ISSUE

Rudolf Steiner Library
65 Fern Hill Road
Ghent, NY 12075
(518) 672-7690
rsteinerlibrary@taconic.net

TOGETHER AT THE TABLE OF BROTHERHOOD

Edited by William Forward, Simon Blaxland-de Lange
and Jan Swann



The Golden Blade

Anthroposophy springs from the work and teaching of Rudolf Steiner. He described it as a path of knowledge, to guide the spiritual in the human being to the spiritual in the universe.

The aim of this annual journal is to bring the outlook of anthroposophy to bear on questions and activities relevant to the present, in a way which may have lasting value. It was founded in 1949 by Charles Davy and Arnold Freeman, who were its first editors.

The title derives from an old Persian legend, according to which King Jamshid received from his god, Ahura Mazda, a golden blade with which to fulfil his mission on earth. It carried the heavenly forces of light into the darkness of earthly substance, thus allowing its transformation. The legend points to the possibility that humanity, through wise and compassionate work with the earth, can one day regain on a new level what was lost when the Age of Gold was supplanted by those of Silver, Bronze and Iron. Technology could serve this aim; instead of endangering our planet's life, it could help to make the earth a new sun.

First published in 2003 by The Golden Blade
 © 2003 The Golden Blade
 All rights reserved. No part of this publication
 may be reproduced without prior permission of
 The Editors
 The Golden Blade
 Old Tile House
 Marsh Green
 East Sussex TN7 4ET
 England

ISBN 0-9531600-6-8
 ISSN 0967 6708

Typeset by DP Photosetting, Aylesbury, Bucks.
 Printed in Great Britain by Cromwell Press, Trowbridge, Wilts.

Contents

Editorial Notes	7
Brotherhood and the Struggle for Existence <i>Rudolf Steiner</i>	13
Three Laws <i>Michael Luxford</i>	25
Clash of Civilizations, Iron Necessity, 530 Billion Imaginary Workers: Current Events through the Lens of Rudolf Steiner's Spiritual-Scientific Discoveries <i>Stephen Usher</i>	43
The Iraqi War and the Threefold Nature of Human Society <i>Michael Spence</i>	57
The Karma of Money <i>Cornelius Pietzner</i>	69
Ethical Financialism: A Fast-Track to Changing the Way the World is Financed <i>Christopher Houghton Budd</i>	83
The Human Being between Globalisation and Genetic Engineering? <i>Nicanor Perlas</i>	93
Threefolding or Global Governance? <i>Christoph Strawe</i>	107
"Com-Panis", Economics and the Company <i>Lawrence Keen</i>	127

Delegation and Collegial Leadership, as exemplified in the Self-Regulation of Waldorf Schools <i>Udo Herrmannstorfer</i>	133
Solovyov's Vision of World Brotherhood <i>Elizabeth Carmack</i>	161
The Age of Consent: Manifesto for a New World Order (George Monbiot) <i>Christopher Houghton Budd</i>	173
The Party's Over (Richard Heinberg) <i>Simon Blaxland-de Lange</i>	177
Notes on the Contributors	181

Editorial Notes

While writing the Editorial Notes for last year's *Golden Blade*, "Stillness in the Storm", on the same biodynamic farm where these thoughts are being formulated, I met up with an Iraqi family, husband, wife and two young girls. For some years they have been living partly in Baghdad, partly in London, developing self-help survival techniques which – according to the husband – those Iraqis who have an interest not so much in the political or religious forces opposing one another in the currently prevailing social situation in their country but, rather, in building a new socio-cultural fabric out of the debris of the old have learnt over recent years to cultivate assiduously. He did not think they would have too much difficulty surviving another war, which he fully expected to happen, such was his view of the leading political figures in the countries most directly involved.

The last two issues of the *Golden Blade* have been prepared during periods when storm-clouds of war were gathering respectively over Afghanistan and Iraq. Now that my Iraqi friend's expectations have been proved right, we have – whether we like it or not – been plunged into the storm itself. Building on such stillness as we may have been able to create for ourselves, partly perhaps with the help of last year's articles, we are now required more clearly and more unambiguously than ever before to take, and act out of, a choice which as members of a social or national group we might previously have hoped that our elected representatives might themselves have resolved upon, albeit with persuasion. Our times demand that the call of the Old Man in Goethe's Fairy Tale, *The Green Snake and the Beautiful Lily* – "the time is at hand" – and the moment of cathartic awakening experienced by Coleridge's Ancient Mariner

O happy living things! no tongue
Their beauty might declare:
A spring of love gushed from my heart,
And I blessed them unaware:
Sure my kind saint took pity on me,
And I blessed them unaware

are no longer solely the initiatory inner experiences of individuals but the existential, exoteric motives also for all who are awake to what these times are asking of us.

What this means, in effect, is that the journey outwards into present-day global socio-economic realities promised for this issue – a promise which is being honoured to the best of our ability – is also a journey inwards to that place where alone an individual choice can be made, in the heart and mind of each human being. The title of the Steiner lecture chosen for this issue, “Brotherhood and the Struggle for Existence”, evokes the enormity of our present dilemma. The choice is ours; the age of spectator-consciousness – as reflected in the names of several of our British newspapers – is over. Not that there is much doubt about which choice we need to make. Our title this year is taken from some memorable words spoken just forty years ago by one of the greatest moral leaders of contemporary humanity, Martin Luther King, in the course of his speech at the Civil Rights March in Washington on 28th August 1963:

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave-owners will be able to sit down *together at the table of brotherhood*... I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the colour of their skin but by the content of their character.

That we have arrived at such a point of having in one way or another to take into our own hands matters hitherto left more or less for elected political representatives to deal with on our behalf is the message which one may well derive from a handful of recently published books. Radical critiques of the present Anglo-American-dominated socio-economic status quo may be found, for example, in three books, one written from an American standpoint, one from a British point of view and a third by a British Islamic researcher. Gore Vidal, in his *Dreaming War: Blood for Oil and the Cheney-Bush Junta* (2002, British edition published by Clairview 2003) expresses his anger and despair that America has betrayed its true republican character and has been gripped by a messianic imperialistic distortion, a tendency which began with its devious manufacturing of the Cold War and has in recent years plumbed ever more abysmal depths of destructive egotism and mendaciousness. But anyone who thinks that what is at issue is largely an American problem should read a book by Mark Curtis, a former Research Fellow

at the Royal Institute of International Affairs, most notably *The Great Deception: Anglo-American Power and World Order* (Pluto, London 1998) or his new book, *Web of Deceit: Britain's Real Role in the World* (Vintage 2003). What emerges from Mark Curtis's painstaking analysis of declassified government documents is a picture of the extent to which the image of British foreign policy as the expression of decency and good humanitarian intentions is a total sham, at which even the liberal press – with its considerable moral support of, for example, the present Blair Government – has largely connived. What also becomes clear is that, although Britain has outwardly played second fiddle to America since the end of the Second World War, the policies being enacted in so brutal a way remain essentially British ones, governed intellectually or spiritually from London. If, therefore, there is to be a genuine step forward in cultural terms as opposed to continuing in the same imperialistic vein, Anglo-America needs to be seen as a single cultural entity with potentially enormous global responsibilities for its actions. Finally, the picture painted by these two authors is confirmed by Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed, a young British researcher of Bangladeshi origin. Ahmed's book *Behind the War on Terror: Western Secret Strategy and the Struggle for Iraq* (Clairview 2003) presents a careful documentary analysis of the historical background to the recent Anglo-American war on Iraq. The sheer inhumanity of this story of bullying and manipulation of this Middle Eastern country by Britain and its American “side-kick” – now allowed to roam the world without the restraint of an ego-oriented global conscience – brings an ever greater urgency to the quest for a global socio-economic order of a very different kind.

In this regard, three options would seem to be available: tinkering with and making the best of the institutions that we have; opting for world government in one form or another; or a third alternative which is conceivable only if the assumptions and prejudices ingrained in what may loosely be called the Western mentality, that cast of thought which has shaped the entire mind-set of modern times especially since the spirit was officially abolished at the Eighth Oecumenical Council of 869, are swept away to reveal that same spirit, though now as the rightful heritage of every individual human soul. The first of these possibilities is well represented by a ground-breaking book by Joseph E. Stiglitz, who until January 2000 was Chief Economist at the World Bank. Entitled *Globalization and Its Discontents* (Penguin 2002), it strongly criticises the ideology of capital market liberalisation, especially as practised within the International Monetary Fund (IMF). This dogmatic approach has,

claims Stiglitz, led to the IMF largely failing to achieve the aim enshrined in its motto, "Our dream is a world without poverty". Stiglitz's remedy is to reform globalisation so that it works not only for the rich but also the poor countries, thus bringing a greater element of regulation to what we have at the moment – a global system of governance without global government. The second option is exemplified by George Monbiot, whose attacks on the tyranny of big corporations were chronicled in his earlier book *Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain* (Macmillan 2000). In his new book, *The Age of Consent: Manifesto for a New World Order* (Flamingo 2003), Monbiot presents a far more radical diagnosis and solution than Stiglitz, proposing ultimately a would-be democratic solution incorporating a world government. The third option for radical change is – to one degree or another – the theme of the articles assembled in this volume, all of which are informed or inspired by Rudolf Steiner's threefold conception of the social order, founded as it is upon a view of man as a being with a body, a soul and a spirit. For – as Christopher Houghton Budd (one of our contributors) points out in the July/August 2003 issue of his *Journal of Associative Economics* – "it is the narrowness of our view of humanity that is the issue. Exclude any higher motive or capacity than self-serving from the human being, and the result is bound to be the self-centred world of today. We may call it 'economic rationality' and claim it has economic causes, such as saving transaction costs, but its origin and expression are in reality cultural phenomena..."

The sequence of articles begins with an early (1905) Berlin lecture by Rudolf Steiner, which outlines in clear and simple terms the central conflicting issues involved in our modern dilemma. Michael Luxford, who has done some extensive research on Steiner's early socio-economic articles and lectures, develops this line of thought in his article on the three Laws described by Steiner which are of direct relevance to our theme. We then continue with two articles written out of the context of the March 2003 war in Iraq. Stephen Usher examines whether the dominant power in our modern world, the Anglo-American West, has been equal to the challenge directed towards it by Steiner in 1919 and finds it has hitherto failed. Michael Spence leads us from a consideration of present political realities to the crucial role that Steiner's threefold idea has to play as a transforming element within them. This then leads by way of Cornelius Pietzner's lecture at Rudolf Steiner House in May on "The Karma of Money" into Christopher Houghton Budd's article, which looks for ways of tackling the fundamental issue of transforming

how we individually think of, and use, money. The articles by Nicanor Perlas and Christoph Strawe, contributed by Carol Bergin, offer an opportunity to reflect further on the theme addressed by the entire volume, namely, how can we implement in a directly practical way Steiner's threefold idea in the context of today. The sequence of articles on this theme is completed by Lawrence Keen, who, while reminding us that there is nothing inherently evil or anti-human about conventional business practices, concludes that "global material contact without mutual understanding has the consequences we have seen in recent events in the USA and the Middle East".

It would, however, be a mistake to suppose from the overwhelming dominance of the economic sphere in modern times that the other spheres of society are not of equal importance as we search for ways of implementing the threefold principle. Few individuals have done more to emphasise this than Udo Herrmannstorfer; and we publish the transcript of a lecture where he focuses on the kind of attitude and conduct appropriate for a healthy functioning of the rights sphere, in a cultural-sphere context. Finally, Elizabeth Carmack enables us to take a step back from the narrow immediacy of modern times to the vantage-point of the 19th century Russian philosopher Vladimir Solovyov's passionate vision of world brotherhood. Two book reviews complete the volume.

We extend our gratitude to all our contributors, with a particular word of thanks to Anne Stockton for the cover.

S.B-de L, August – September 2003

Brotherhood and the Struggle for Existence¹

Rudolf Steiner

Today it is our task to speak about two impulses of the soul; one of them, brotherhood, is an ideal that has filled mankind ever since men have had the capacity to feel. The other one is the struggle for existence, which we meet with just at present wherever we look. Brotherhood and struggle for existence! Those of you who have occupied yourself even a little with the aims of our spiritual-scientific movement know our main principle: to create the heart, the kernel of a brotherhood based on all-embracing human love that transcends race, sex, profession, religion and so on. Thus, the Theosophical Society* has placed this principle of general brotherhood foremost, made it the most important of its ideals. Of all these cultural endeavours that we need most at present, the Society considers this great ethical striving towards brotherhood to be most closely connected with the ultimate aim of human development.

He who strives in the spiritual-scientific manner believes, and not only believes but knows quite clearly, that deep cognition, cognition of the spiritual world, when it really takes hold of man, must lead to brotherhood; this brotherhood is the noblest fruit of deep, inner cognition.

Spiritual philosophy appears to contradict in this matter much that has appeared in recent times. Certain circles point time and time again to struggle as a force for progress. How often do we hear today that man's forces grow strong through meeting resistance, that man grows strong in will and in intellectual initiative by matching his strength against an opponent. One philosophy that grew out of a spiritual foundation, that of Friedrich Nietzsche, contains, among many other sentences inspired by struggle, the following: I love the critic; I love the great critic more than the little one. We can find this sentiment ever and

¹ Translation reprinted, with permission, from the Mercury Press edition of 1980. The original lecture was given on 23rd November 1905 in Berlin. It appears in GA 54, in the volume entitled *Die Welträtsel und die Anthroposophie*.

again in Nietzsche's work, in many different formulations; it is something that belongs completely to his view of life. According also to certain long-established economic theories, the struggle of all against all, as this takes form in economic competition, is a powerful lever for progress. How often has it been said that mankind would progress best if each person asserted and benefitted himself, as much as he could. The word "individualism" has even become a catchword, mostly in connection with material life, to be sure, but also, and not without validity, in connection with the inner, spiritual life.

It is the belief of many economists and social theorists that man can serve his fellowmen best when he takes as much as possible from life, because if he becomes economically strong he can better serve the community. And we hear it asserted that a person should not fall into a routine, should live freely in self-expression, should unfold his inner being; and that by so doing, he can best serve his fellowmen. There are many among us who are downright feverish in the pursuit of this latter principle, who cannot have enough of "doing their thing".

Spirituality does not deny the necessity of this struggle for existence, especially in our time; but is also conscious that just today, when the struggle is producing such powerful effects, the principle of brotherhood, in all its depth, must be brought closer to our understanding again.

The most important question will be: is it actually true, as many believe, that man's forces grow best through encountering opposition, that above all it is struggle that makes man great and strong? Natural science has raised this idea of man's struggle for existence to a universal principle; and in the West particularly, it has been believed for some time that those creatures are fittest that have driven their opponents from the field, and so survived.

The scientist Huxley says: When we look at life, it looks like the combat of gladiators – the strongest is victorious, the others perish. If one would believe the scientists, one would have to assume that all creatures that now live in the world have driven out those who were here before them. There is even a school of social thought whose adherents want to make the principle of the struggle for existence into an actual doctrine of human development. In a book titled *From Darwin to Nietzsche*, Dean Alexander Tille tries to show that the happiness of mankind in the future will depend on man emblazoning this struggle for existence boldly and freely on the banners of his development, that we must see to it that the unfit perish, and that we must further only what is

strong and forceful. We need a social order that suppresses the weak, because they impede man's progress.

I ask you; who is strong? He who has ideal, spiritual strength, but a weak body, or he who has less spiritual force, but a robust body? As you can see, general rules do not help much in this matter. It is difficult to decide who really should survive the struggle for existence; and if we were to deal with practical measures, this question would have to be decided first. Now we ask ourselves: What do we observe in human life? Is it brotherhood, or the struggle for existence, that has accomplished great things in mankind's development – or have both impulses contributed something?

Natural science does not occupy the same ground today that it did even ten years ago. The Russian scientist Kessler gave a lecture in 1880, in which he showed that animal types most capable of development and truly progressive are not the ones that do the most fighting, but those that give mutual support to one another, that help each other. No one can maintain that struggle and combat do not exist in the animal kingdom. Certainly they are present, but the question is; what furthers development more – warfare or mutual assistance? And which types survive? Those whose members constantly fight with each other, or those that have mutual service? Scientific investigation has already shown that it is not struggle but the rendering of assistance that truly promotes progress. Prince Kropotkin, in his book *Mutual Help in the Animal Kingdom and Human Life*, provides many beautiful contributions to the questions that occupy us here.

What has brotherhood achieved for human development? We have only to look at our own ancestors. One could easily gain the impression that it was the hunt and warfare that advanced them, that primarily moulded their character. But when one delves deeper, it will be found that this first impression is not correct, that precisely those early Teutonic tribes prospered most that had developed the principle of brotherhood to an extraordinary degree. We find this principle of brotherhood expressed above all in the way property was managed, before and after the great migrations. Common ownership of land was the general rule. Each village owned common grounds, and – excepting those few possessions necessary for household use, and perhaps a garden – all other property was owned in common as well. From time to time the land was divided anew among the people. And it was these tribes, which practised brotherhood to this extraordinary degree with respect to material goods, that became strong.

A few centuries later we find this principle bearing remarkable fruit. When the principle of brotherhood had manifested in earlier times, people went so far as to burn what somebody possessed on his own piece of land, at the time of his death, because one did not want to own the personal property of another after his death. This practice was abandoned for a number of reasons, but chiefly because some people had acquired large landholdings, forcing others into serfdom and feudal services. The idea of brotherhood then asserted itself in another striking form. Those who were oppressed by their masters, by their owners, wanted to free themselves. There was a great movement towards freedom through Europe in the middle of the Middle Ages. This movement towards freedom grew out of a spirit of the brotherhood of man, and from it arose a general culture, the city culture of the middle Middle Ages. Those who could not endure servitude on the land fled their masters and sought their freedom in the growing cities. People came down from Scotland, France and Russia; from everywhere they came together to build the free cities. Thus, the principle of brotherhood developed and furthered culture to a high degree. Men of similar occupations joined in societies called oath-brotherhoods, which later grew into the guilds. These oath-brotherhoods were far more than mere societies of crafts or tradespeople. Born of the practical, everyday life, these associations developed to moral heights. Mutual aid was the fundamental concern of these brotherhoods and many aspects of life that are of nobody's concern today were occasions for such support. For example, members of such a brotherhood would help each other in case of illness. Two brothers were appointed to keep daily vigil at the bedside of a sick brother. Members who were ill received food, and the fraternal spirit prevailed even beyond death; the responsibility for burying a brother member in proper fashion was considered a special honour. Finally, the care of widows and orphans was a duty of the oath-brotherhood. You can see from these examples how there grew up an understanding of the moral life of the community that modern man can hardly imagine. Present conditions are not being criticised in any way. They have become necessary, just as it was necessary that the conditions of the Middle Ages came to expression in their own way. We must only understand that there have been other phases of development than the present one.

In the free cities of the Middle Ages people spoke of a "lawful" price, of a "lawful" market. What was meant? In the early days, when produce was brought into town from the surrounding countryside, it

was strictly prohibited during the first days to sell these goods, except in retail. Nobody was allowed to buy wholesale, and to become a dealer. Then there was no thought that price should be established according to supply and demand; people understood how to regulate both. Groups in the cities or in the guilds had to establish prices for the products of members, after the members had explained what was needed to produce the goods, to become a producer. Nobody was allowed to sell at a higher price. Even when we look at labour conditions, we see how profound was the understanding of man's needs at that time. When we consider the wages, taking into account the entirely different conditions, we must say that the labourer's wages could not compare with those of today. This fact has often been interpreted quite wrongly by researchers. These brotherhoods were organised out of practical considerations, and therefore they developed gradually along practical lines. They then spread from one city to another, because it was natural that those in several cities who had a common craft and common interests should unite and support each other.

At that time, men were not united under police-enforced law, but held together for practical reasons. This particular phase of the deepening of the principle of brotherhood in the cities of Europe can be seen vividly in its fruits. The immense artistic accomplishments of the 12th and 13th centuries would have not been possible without such deepening. Culturally, we can only understand Dante's stupendous work, *The Divine Comedy*, when we understand the impact of the principle of brotherhood. Also, the arts of printing, copper engraving, papermaking, and watch making, as well as the later inventions, came about through the principle of brotherhood. What we are accustomed to call the citizenry arises from the cultivation of this principle in the cities of the Middle Ages. Much that has been created through profound scientific and artistic activity would have been impossible without this principle. When a cathedral was to be built – the one in Cologne or any other – first a society was formed, a so-called building-guild, whose members joined in cooperative effort. One can see intuitively the expression of the cooperative principle even in the architectural style; one can see it expressed in almost every medieval town, whether you go to the north of Scotland or to Venice, whether you look at cities in Russia or Poland.

The thing we must stress is this: The principle of brotherhood arose under the influence of a current of the time that sought to enter decisively into the material culture. Therefore we see everywhere in the higher culture that arises, as well as in what remains to us as the fruit of

that time, the material, the physical. Material existence had for once to be cultivated, and in order to cultivate it rightly, and work it through thoroughly, this brotherhood principle was at that time necessary. From the living spirit of brotherhood of the earlier time, arose the abstraction, and through this abstraction, through this intellectualistic kind of thinking, our life has been split; so that now we do not rightly know, can no longer properly understand, just how the struggle for existence has become more and more separated, as by an abyss, from what people truly have felt as their idea. In the middle of the Middle Ages there was a harmony between one's ideal and what one actually did. If it has ever been shown that one can be an idealist and practical man at the same time, it was shown in the Middle Ages. Also, the relationship between Roman law and actual life was still harmonious. Today, however, considerations of justice float somewhere above the life of morals. Many will say: we know what is good, just and fair, but it is not practical. This divergence appears when thinking becomes separated from the highest principles of life. From the 16th century onwards, spiritual life develops more in accordance with the principles of the intellect. The guild-member who, together with the other twelve jurors, sat in judgement on an offence committed by a fellow member of the guild was a brother to the man being judged. Life was connected with life. Everyone knew the other's work, and everyone tried to understand why, for once, the accused might have deviated from the proper path. One looked, as it were, into the brother, and actually desired to do so.

Nowadays jurisprudence has developed in which both judge and lawyer are interested only in the law, so that both of them see only a "case" to which they have to apply the law. Every moral thought has been divorced from the science of justice. We have seen this situation develop ever more explicitly during the last century. Under the feeling for brotherhood in the Middle Ages, however, there evolved the principles necessary for healthy progress: confidence and competence, both of which are falling by the wayside today. The judgement of the competent expert has given way almost entirely to abstract jurisprudence, to an abstract parliamentarianism. The average, the common understanding, the voice of the majority, has become the yardstick today, not competence. This preference for the majority had to come. But just as one cannot vote in mathematics to get the right result - because 3 times 3 is always 9 and 3 times 9 is always 27 - so it is here. It would be impossible to carry through the principle of competence, or expertness, without the principle of brotherhood, or brotherly love.

In life the struggle for existence has its justification. Because man is an individuality who as a single being has to make his way through life, he is part of the struggle for existence. In a sense, the words of Rusckerts hold here: when the rose beautifies itself, it also beautifies the garden. If we do not make ourselves capable of helping our fellowmen, we shall be poor helpers. If we do not see to it that all our talents are developed, we shall have little success in helping our brothers. In order to develop these talents, a certain egoism is necessary, because egoism is connected with initiative. The person who understands how not to be led, how not to be influenced by everything in his surroundings, but who descends into his own, inner being where the sources of strength are to be found will develop into a strong and able person, and in him there will be a greater ability to serve others than in the one who conforms to all kinds of influences that come from his surroundings. Obviously, this principle which is necessary for man can be developed to an extreme. But this principle will bear the proper fruits only when it is combined with that of brotherly love.

The guilds in the free cities of the Middle Ages show how what is practical became strong precisely under the principle of the mutual, personal, and individual rendering of help. From where did the guilds draw this strength? They drew it from living in brotherhood with their fellowmen. It is correct to make oneself as strong as possible; But can we become strong at all without brotherly love? He who rises to a real knowledge of the soul must answer with a decisive NO.

In all of nature we see examples of the cooperation of single beings within a whole. Consider the human body. It consists of independent beings, millions and millions of, single, independent beings or cells. When one takes a part of this human body, he will find that it consists precisely of such individual beings. But how do they cooperate? How has that which in nature must form a whole, a totality, become selfless? None of our cells asserts its separateness in an egotistic manner. The miraculous tool of thinking, our brain, is also composed of millions of delicate cells, but each one operates in its place harmoniously with the others. What causes the cooperation of these small cells? What causes a higher being to express itself through these small living beings? Man's soul is the cause. But the human soul could never work on earth if these millions of small beings had not renounced their individualities, putting themselves at the service of this great being they have in common, which we describe as the soul. The soul sees with the cells of the eye, thinks by means of the cells of the brain, lives through the cells of the blood. There

we can see what union, what association means. Association means the possibility for a higher being to express itself through the members when they are united.

This principle is general for all life. Five people together, who think and feel harmoniously together, are more than 1 plus 1 plus 1 plus 1 plus 1; they are not just the sum of the five, just as our body is not just the sum of the five senses. Men's living together and within one another has the same significance as the living together of the cells within the human body. A new higher being is in the midst of the five – yes even among the two or three. "Where two or three are gathered in my name, I shall be in their midst." It is not the one, or the other, or the third, but something entirely new that springs from the union. This new entity arises only when the one lives in the other, when the single individual person draws strength not only from himself, but also from others. But that can happen only when each lives selflessly in the other. Thus, human associations are the secret places where higher spiritual beings descend in order to work through the single individuals, just as the soul works through the members of the body.

In our materialistic time, what I have said will not be easily believed, but for spiritual science it is real in the highest degree. Therefore, spiritual science does not talk in abstractions when it speaks of a folk-spirit, or folk-soul, or a family spirit, or the spirit of some other community. One cannot see the spirit who works through an association, but he is there; and he is there through the brotherly love of the people working within the association. Just as the body has a soul, so a guild or brotherhood has a soul; this is not just a figure of speech.

People who work together in a brotherhood are magicians, because they draw higher beings into their circle. One no longer has to call to witness the machinations of spiritualism when one works out of brotherly love in a community. Higher beings do manifest themselves there. When we give ourselves over to brotherhood, this giving, this merging into the totality, is a steeling, a strengthening of our organs. When we then act or speak as members of such a community, it is not the single soul that acts or speaks in us, but the spirit of the community. This will be the secret of the progress of mankind in the future: to work through communities. Just as one epoch takes the place of another, and each of them has its own task, so it is with the Middle Ages in relation to our own epoch, and with our epoch in relation to a future one. The brotherhoods of the Middle Ages worked within the immediately practical life, when they laid the foundations for the useful arts. These

organisations began to show a materialistic bias only after they had achieved their fruits. By then the foundations of their consciousness, namely brotherhood, had more or less vanished, as the abstract principle of the state, the abstract spiritual life, took the place of one person's entering into another with true feeling. The future will have the task of re-establishing brotherhoods, and of establishing them out of the spiritual, out of the highest ideals of the soul. The life of man has up to now given birth to a multitude of associations, it has called forth a terrible struggle for existence, which has just now reached its high point. Spiritual science, however aims to advance mankind's highest ideals in the spirit of the principle of brotherhood, and thus you see that the worldwide movement of spiritual science replaces in all fields the struggle for existence with the principle of brotherhood. We must learn how to conduct community life. We must not believe that this or that scheme resting in anything less or other than the true feeling for brotherhood will be able to accomplish anything lasting.

Everyone would like to know how one unites struggle for existence with brotherhood. That is very simple. We must learn to replace struggle with positive labour, to replace combat with the ideal. What that means is little understood today. People do not know which struggle they are talking about, because they talk about nothing else: the social struggle, the struggle for peace, the struggle for the emancipation of women, the struggle about the soil, and so on. Spiritual science strives to replace struggle with positive labour. He who has immersed himself in spiritual science knows that in any field of life struggle never leads to true results. Try, without fighting the opponent, to introduce into life, to assert, what you in your experience and through your cognition have found to be correct.

Of course, this can be only an ideal, but such an ideal must be there, so that it can be introduced into life as an axiom of spiritual science. The people who join with others and who put their strength at the disposal of all are those who will provide the foundation for healthy development in the future. The Theosophical Society* wants to be exemplary in this respect. In this organisation one works through the labour of each individual member. This idea must for once really be understood. He works best who does not want to push through his own opinion, but seeks to support what he observes in the eyes of his fellow brothers – who searches the thoughts and feelings of his fellowmen and makes himself their servant. Within this circle he works best who in practical life does not regard his own opinions as important. When we try

thus to understand that our most valuable forces arise out of our society with one another, and that this society is not only to be adhered to as abstract principle but has to operate in every act, in every moment of life, in a theosophical manner, then we shall progress. Only, we must not become impatient.

Spiritual science makes us conscious of a higher reality, and this consciousness will enable us to go forward in the application of the principle of brotherhood.

Today people still call theosophists unpractical idealists. It will not be long, however, before they will prove to be the most practical people, because they take the forces of life into account. Nobody doubts that somebody will be hurt when we hit him on the head with a stone. What is not considered is that it is much worse to send somebody a hateful feeling, that the soul of man is much more hurt than when the stone hurts the body. Everything depends on the spirit or disposition with which we face our fellowman. But our strength for fruitful work in the future will depend precisely on our comprehending this truth. When we exert ourselves to live in brotherhood in this way, then we are putting the principle of brotherhood into practice.

To be tolerant in a spiritual sense is different from what is commonly understood. It means also to respect the freedom of someone else's thought. To shove somebody from his seat is the act of a lout; when this action, however, is committed in thought, nobody registers it as an injustice. We do speak a good deal in general about the necessity of valuing other people's opinions, but we are not inclined to apply this good advice to ourselves.

A word has for us, as yet, almost no importance, it is heard, and yet, it is not heard. We must learn, however, to listen with the soul, we must understand how to grasp the most intimate things with the soul. What later becomes physical reality, always exists first in the spirit. Therefore we must suppress our own opinion in order to hear another's completely; not only the word, but also the feeling behind it, even when the conviction arises within us that what the other person says is wrong. There is more strength in being able to listen for as long as the other speaks than there is in interrupting him. Such listening produces an entirely different understanding. You will feel as if the other person's soul were filling with warmth, with light, when you face him in this way with absolute tolerance. We should guarantee not only freedom of the person but complete freedom; yes, we must value even the freedom of the different opinion. This is only one example, but it can stand for much

else. From the point of view of spiritual science, the person who interrupts someone else's speech does something similar to the person who would give him a kick. Once one understands that one commits a much more violent offence when interrupting someone's talk than if one were to kick him, only then can one really understand brotherhood with the soul, only then does it become a fact. Therein lies the greatness of the spiritual-scientific movement, that it brings us a new faith, a new conviction of those spiritual forces that flow from man to man. That is the higher, spiritual principle of brotherhood. Anyone can picture for himself how far mankind is removed from such a spiritual ideal. Everyone may develop himself to send his loved ones thoughts of love and friendship, if he can find the time. Generally, people consider such acts meaningless. But once you understand that thoughts are just as much a force as the electric current that flows from one apparatus to another; then you will also better understand the principle of brotherhood; then gradually our social consciousness will become clearer – and, finally, practical.

From this point of view it becomes clear how spiritual science considers the struggle for existence and brotherhood. We know quite well that many a person, having been placed in one or the other position in life, would simply perish if he did not howl with the wolves, so to speak; if he did not carry on his struggle for existence as cruelly as many others do. For the materialist, there is almost no way to escape this struggle for existence. We must, to be sure, do our duty at the spot where karma put us. To do the right thing, however, we must be aware that we would accomplish much more, if we were to renounce the desire to see results immediately. A materialist will perhaps think that you do nothing when you make yourself stand with a bleeding soul. But after the foregoing explanations, you will understand that this act must have its effect later, because, as we know, nothing is lost that is done spiritually.

In this way, we can take up the struggle for existence, disheartened in soul and with sadness in our hearts, and yet transform this struggle through our contribution. To work thus means to change the struggle for existence in a practical way. To accomplish this change from one day to another will not be possible, but that it will come is beyond all doubt. When we work on our own soul in the spirit of brotherhood, in serving ourselves we shall best serve mankind; for it is true that when we persist in our selfish separateness, our talents are uprooted like a plant that is torn from the soil. An eye is scarcely an eye when it has been torn

from its socket, and just so little is a human soul still a human soul when it separates itself from the community of man.

You will see that we develop our talents best when we live in a brotherly community, that we live most intensively when we take root in that totality. To be sure, we must wait till what has taken root in the totality ripens into fruitfulness, through silent inward meditation. And we must not lose ourselves in the world, because what the poet said is true in the highest spiritual sense: one has to be quiet within oneself that one's talents may unfold. Those talents, however, are rooted in the world. They strengthen us; but to improve our character, we have to live with and within a community. Therefore, if man lives in accordance with the real, true principle of brotherhood, he is strongest precisely within the struggle for existence, and he will find in the stillness of his heart his greatest powers, as he develops his entire personality, his entire individuality, in union with his other human brothers and sisters. It is true: a talent develops in tranquillity. But the following is also true: character, and with it the entire human being and all of mankind, develops within the currents of the world.

*Please note that where mention is made of Theosophy or of the Theosophical Society, there is the historical context to be considered, and that perhaps it is not incorrect to think that now these usages can be replaced with the terms Anthroposophy and Anthroposophical Society, insofar as a corrective updating only is intended and not any form of polemic.

Three Laws

Michael Luxford

Threefoldness

To those familiar with anthroposophy, which could be described as being the study of the wholeness of the world and human existence from both a spiritual as well as an earthly material point of view, it does become clear that for at least the last twenty-five years of his life and work, Rudolf Steiner had been occupied with the attempt to deepen his understanding of how the human being is constituted from a threefold point of view, in particular.

Already in 1899, in his essay on Goethe's Fairy Tale, he wrote about the characters of the Three Kings. He likened each of these to aspects of the human soul: the gold king to thinking, the silver king to feeling, and the bronze to the will. He also gave each king a further attribute: wisdom, beauty and strength respectively.

It took him a further seventeen years until 1916 until he saw the link between these three attributes of the soul and the human organism. In the essays *Riddles of the Soul* he points to the relationship of human thinking to the nerve-sense organisation, feeling to the rhythmic system and will activity to the limb and metabolic organisation. Through a process of spiritual research he was able to recognise and convey to others the way in which an archetypal threefold principle (the kings), and the bodily dimension (the human soul and its physical manifestation) are related.

This research process led him from the above consolidation of perception, to a new widening-out of perspective, as is manifest in the publication of *The Threefold Commonwealth*. This speaks of a threefoldness or tripartite configuration within the social organism. The ideals of the French Revolution: *liberté, égalité, fraternité* can be recognised as the social goals pointed to by the gold, silver and bronze kings, as mentioned previously. They also become the ideals towards which humanity as a whole can aspire in cultural life, in the area of rights

and agreements, and in economic activity. A bridge is built between social life, the human soul, the physical constitution, and ultimately the realm of the Trinity.

This process can be likened to the "opening of a door" to what had previously been unknown-territory, the realm of the mixed king in the imagery of the Fairy Tale. From this point of view *The Threefold Commonwealth* begins to unveil the mysteries of the social organism, just as much as *Riddles of the Soul* opens up to us mysteries of the human soul in relation to the physiological constitution. However, these two realms need no longer remain separate, un-bridgeable. The well-being of the individual becomes inextricably linked to the health of the social organism. For example, Steiner's preface to *The Threefold Commonwealth* is a powerful call for the separation of state influence from education, asking us see the ever-present figure of the mixed king cavorting through the corridors of power, leading to dissatisfied teachers and the stresses and strains experienced by even primary school children. And so it becomes ever more urgent to begin to see the way "threefoldness" is present as an underlying principle, in the forming of the world, of the human being, and of social life.

"In the human being who is on the way to free personality, three powers of the soul are mixed together: will (bronze), feeling (silver) and knowledge (gold). Experience in life provides through its revelation that the soul can acquire three powers: strength, through which virtue can work, is revealed to the will; beauty is revealed to the feeling; wisdom reveals itself to knowledge. What separates man from 'free personality' is that these three work in his soul as a mixture as represented by the figure of the mixed or fourth king in the Tale. The human being will only achieve 'free personality' in the measure to which he can receive in full consciousness the gifts of these three with their own special quality, each of them separately, and uniting them himself, in free and conscious activity within himself. Only then what has previously enslaved him collapses into itself, as a chaotic mixture of will, feeling and power of knowledge" (*The Character of Goethe's Spirit*, 1899).

Three Laws

The reader may be familiar with this "territory"; with the differentiation within the tripartite configuration of the human being and the social order. Here, however, we will look at a further threefold relationship, which was not configured in this way by Rudolf Steiner himself, but

which can be recognised within his research in the form of three inter-linked social laws. These particular laws were described over a seventeen year period. Each of these will be considered in turn, in the form of a commentary with key quotations from the original text. As an afterword the relevance of these to the world today, and to such areas of interest and activity as economic globalisation, state control of citizens, and the exercising of power over others, will be addressed. A link will also be made to what has already been said about the threefold configuration of human and social life.

A Fundamental Social Law

In the 1905/1906 editions of the journal *Lucifer-Gnosis* published in Berlin, three essays were written by Rudolf Steiner under the title *Anthroposophy and the Social Question* (GA 34).

The First Essay

This focuses mainly on the criticism which has at times been levelled at anthroposophy, in that the seeming preoccupation with supersensible matters leads to the essential social and personal needs of people being neglected.

It is not merely an inquisitive desire for new things which leads people to withdraw into an anthroposophical circle in order to obtain all sorts of interesting revelations about worlds beyond; they do so because there they learn to school their thought and feeling and will in the eternal laws of life, and to go forth into the thick of life with a clear, keen eye for the understanding of it. The teachings of anthroposophy are a means whereby one may arrive at a full-lived thinking, discerning and feeling. To have worked patiently and persistently through the conceptions gained from anthroposophy means to enhance faculties for effective work in a social context.

Steiner's main point is that everything depends on what thoughts are living in us when we are active in social life. Everything we do, and which has a considered basis, has its origin in a thought or a number of ideas, which, when put into practice, eventually show their effects on people's lives. Because of this it is necessary to discover what are truly helpful thoughts. Hence:

We must learn to know the forces by which favourable conditions are created.

It is the nature of thoughts that they take their effect slowly; and the effect of those born of anthroposophy and influencing large scale practical affairs is only slight on the large scale of issues, despite these thoughts having been with us for nearly one hundred years.

There is nothing to be done in this respect, save wait in patience, until what anthroposophists have to say has opened the minds of those who have the power to act.

Steiner is being realistic here, not arrogant, with regard to anthroposophy and its potential usefulness. He regards it as a source for the ideas which social life would need for its greater health, even though there would be a long way to go to achieve it.

Until the road of actual life can be trodden in the fullest sense of the word, those into whose minds anthroposophy has entered are but at the beginning of their work.

The Second Essay

Here Rudolf Steiner turns to the figure of Robert Owen (1771-1858) and comments on matters of human suffering and raising the question as to whether suffering can be ameliorated by the way institutions are formed, which was Owen's view. Or, if the tendency to want to exploit one another is inherent in human nature, is it not just this tendency which needs to be tackled?

The anthroposophical attitude of mind cannot rest content with a surface understanding; it must go into the depths. It cannot stop at demonstrating that such and such conditions produce social misery. It must go further, and know what it is that has created these conditions, and still continues to create them, as this, after all, is the only knowledge that can bear any fruit.

So long as our thinking only skims the surface of things we ascribe a quite fictitious power to circumstances, indeed to externals generally. These circumstances are simply the outer expression of an inner life. Just as a person only understands the human body when he knows that it is the outer expression of the soul, so also he alone can form a right judgement of the external institutions of life who sees that they are nothing but the creations

of human souls, who embody in them their sentiments, their habits of mind, and their thoughts. The conditions under which we live are made by our fellow-men and we ourselves shall never make better ones unless we set out from other thoughts, other habits of mind and other sentiments.

He continues with detailed examples which seek to show how we can "think our way through" to what is the actual situation we find ourselves in when face to face with injustice, inequality etc. in the areas of purchase, price and the work of others.

Whether I be poor or rich, I am equally an exploiter when I purchase things which are underpriced. As a matter of fact no one these days has the right to call anyone else an oppressor, for he has only to look at himself.

The final part of the second essay deals with the issue of self-interest, which is leading the so-called "practical person" to think he is acting out of what he considers to be "good intentions", when in fact he is merely suiting his own ends.

Whether I have too much or too little when gratifying my own self-interest, the one who supplies my needs will nonetheless be exploited. I may protect his labour, yet nothing is changed, save appearances. If I pay more for his work, then he will have to pay more for mine. Also, my aim to become better off may only lead to the result that the other ends up worse off than he was before.

If I purchase a factory in order to make as much as possible for myself out of it, I shall take care to get the necessary labour as cheaply as possible. Everything that is done will be done from the viewpoint of personal self-interest. If, on the other hand, I purchase the factory with the view of making the best possible provision for two hundred human beings, then everything I do will take on a different colouring. Practically, in the present day, there will probably be not much difference between the second case and the first; but that is solely because one single selfless person is powerless to accomplish very much inside a whole community built up on self-interest. Matters would stand very differently if non-self-interested labour were the general rule.

We see here how socially conscious Rudolf Steiner was as a spiritual-scientific researcher, and this answers the question posed in the first

essay. The answer being, that it is possible to place the spiritual next to the social in ways that lead toward practical ideas which, in the end, help the "man and woman in the street".

All interests, and therewith all the conditions of life, become different when a thing is procured not with an eye to oneself, but with an eye to other people. What is the person serving who looks only towards his own private welfare? To making as much as he can for himself, when all is said and done. How others are obliged to labour in order to satisfy his private needs is a matter which he does not take into consideration. He is compelled to expend all his powers in the fight for existence. I can start an undertaking which is there for the purpose of bringing in as much as possible for myself. I do not have to enquire how the labour power is set in motion that does the work. But if my point of view would be: how does my labour serve others, then the whole situation is changed. Nothing will then compel me to undertake anything which may be of detriment to someone else. I will place my powers not at the service of myself, but at the service of others. As a consequence of this, the powers and abilities of individuals will take quite a different form and expression.

The Third Essay

Rudolf Steiner begins by acknowledging Robert Owen as having been a "genius of practical life" whose efforts failed in the end due to his having the idea that the forming of good institutions would lead ipso facto to social harmony and the will of individuals to want to work for the common good. What happened instead was that the self-interest of individuals undermined his altruistic social endeavours. The realisation was made that a change in the experience of self-interest needs to arise within individuals, and egotism be transformed, if institutions are to be formed in ways which can create social well-being.

Robert Owen was forced to the conviction that any good institution is only maintainable to the extent that the human beings concerned are disposed by their own inner nature to its maintenance and are themselves warmly attached to it.

The question arises as to whether it is possible for individuals to develop the necessary perception for the presence of egotism in themselves, as

well as for what is needed if a beneficial way of living and working together is to be achieved.

People may learn to perceive ever so clearly that certain institutions are practical and would be of benefit to mankind; but the clearest possible perception may not suffice in the long run to carry them through to the goal proposed. Egotism is there, once for all, as a part of human nature; and consequently it begins to stir within the feeling of every human being, when he is called upon to live and work together with others in the social community. Thus, as a kind of inevitable sequence, most people will consider that those forms of social institutions are most desirable that best allow each individual to gratify his own wants. When that is the case, the social question – under the influence of these egoistic feelings – comes to assume the form: what particular social institutions must be devised in order that arising from each persons labour he may secure for himself the proceeds he requires for himself?

Such an approach has appeared forcefully in recent decades; Adam Smith-based Thatcherism for example. Almost 100 years ago Steiner described the doctrine as follows:

A human community will be most prosperous, when it also allows the individual to reap and garner to the full, or the largest possible extent, the proceeds of his own labour.

Anthroposophy, meaning in one definition the "consciousness of our humanity", can broaden the potential response to such a thought. Showing in fact:

That all human suffering is purely a consequence of egotism, and that at some time or another in every human community founded upon egotism, suffering, poverty, and want must of necessity arise.

Realising this opens a way to consider a fundamental social law:

In a community of human beings working together, the well-being of the community will be the greater, the less the individual claims for himself the proceeds of the work he has himself done; i.e. the more of these proceeds he makes over to his fellow workers, and the more his own requirements are satisfied, not out of his work, but out of work done by others.

The use of the term "fundamental" has nothing to do with fundamentalism. It is rather to do with recognising a basic principle whose truth can be demonstrated time and again, thus becoming a law which can be discovered to have quite definite effects, depending on whether we seek to institute it, or go against it.

Every institution in a community of human beings that is contrary to this law will, after a while and inevitably, engender in some part of it, suffering and want. It is a fundamental law, which holds good for all social life with the same absoluteness and necessity as the law of nature, within a particular field of natural causation. It must not be supposed, however, that it is sufficient to acknowledge this law as one for general moral conduct, or to try and make it into the sentiment that everyone should work for the good of his fellow-men. No, this law only finds its living, fitting expression in actual reality, when a community of human beings succeeds in creating institutions of such a kind that no one can ever claim the results of his own labour for himself, but that they all, to the last fraction, go wholly to the benefit of the community. Each individual must himself be supported in return by the labours of his fellow-men. The important point is, therefore, that working for one's fellow men, and the object of obtaining so much income, must be kept apart, as two separate things.

But how is this to be instituted?

How is one to translate this law into actual fact? What it says amounts to this: the well-being of a group of human beings is in inverse proportion to the degree of egotism which is present. Meaning, that for its practical translation into reality we need people who can find their way out of their own egotism. Practically, however, this is quite impossible if the individual's share of weal and woe is measured according to his labour. He who labours for himself cannot help but gradually fall a victim to egotism. Only one who labours solely and entirely for the rest can, little by little, grow to be a worker without egotism.

The crux of the matter is our willingness to become such workers without egotism. But there is a primary requirement which affects all who would try to build up a communal effort based in the goodwill of individuals.

There is one thing needed to begin with. If any man works for another, he must find in this other person the reason for his work; and if any man works for the community, he must perceive and feel the meaning and value of this community, and what it is as a living, organic whole. He can only do this, when the community is something other and quite different from a more or less indefinite totality of individuals. It must be informed by an actual spirit in which each single person has his part. It must be such that each single one says: The communal body is as it should be, and I will that it be as it is. The whole communal body must have a spiritual mission, and each individual member of it must have the will to contribute towards the fulfilling of this mission. All the vague progressive ideas, the abstract ideals, of which people talk so much, cannot present such a mission. If there be nothing but these as a guiding principle, then one individual here, or one group there, will be working without any clear comprehension of what use there is in their work, except its being to the advantage of their families, or of those particular interests to which they happen to be attached. In every single member, down to the least, this Spirit of the Community must be alive and active.

Thus the community will always remain alive, and in a process of change according to the realities of the moment and circumstances.

No one need try to discover a solution to the social question which will hold good for all time, but simply to find the right form for his social thoughts and actions, in view of the immediate needs of the times in which he is living. Indeed, there is today no theoretical scheme which could be devised or carried into effect by any one person, which in itself could solve the social question.

The underlying requirement is that each member of the community makes the effort of gaining within himself a "spiritual world conception" which can sustain his intentions and his goodwill in finding the reason for his work and seeing its value for the community and ultimately the Spirit of the Community.

There is only one thing which can be of any use; and that is a spiritual world-conception, which, of itself and, through what it has to offer, can make a living home in a person's thoughts, feelings and will, in short, in his whole soul.

With people who have no world-conception centered in the

spirit it is inevitable that just those institutions which promote material well-being will have the effect of also enhancing egotism, and therewith, little by little, will engender want, poverty and suffering. For it may truly be said in the simplest and most literal sense of the words: the individual human being you may help by simply supplying him with bread, a community on the other hand you can only supply with bread by assisting it to a world-conception. Nor indeed would it be of any use to try and supply each individual member of the community with bread; since, after a while, things would still take such a form that many would again be breadless.

There is a large-scale approach to this law of human co-operation, but it also finds its expression in the every day scene, in quite ordinary life.

Wherever this law finds outward expression, wherever anyone is at work along its lines – so far as is possible for him in that position in which he is placed within the human community – there good results will be attained, though it be but in the one single instance and in ever so small a measure. And it is only a number of individual results, attained in this way, that together combine to create a healthy collective progress throughout the whole body of society.

We can recognise this social law as being basic and fundamental to human social life and it can be discovered at work everywhere, either successfully or otherwise.

What can be done by everyone is to work on the lines of this law within his own sphere of action. There is no position in the world that a person can occupy where this is not possible, even though it may seem to be obscure or lacking in influence.

The final section of this third essay refers to the building of a world conception which can help anyone to acquire the ability to perceive the spiritual as well as the practical relevance of this law, and how to begin building healthy community between human beings. This section needs to be read and understood accordingly.

It could be said that the challenge of the final sentences encapsulates in mirror form the opening question of the first essay. These make clear that anthroposophy is not meant to create distance from life. Rather, it should help us to develop the impulse to transform self-

interest in pursuit of creating healthy community, not only as an idea, but also within practical life. The building blocks for this attempt are ourselves!

The world moves forward, only when men WILL that it shall. But, in order for them to will it, what is needed in each individual case is inner soul-work; and this can only be performed step by step.

A Fundamental Sociological Law

This is described a few years earlier than the Fundamental Social Law, in an article by Rudolf Steiner entitled "Freedom and Society" (GA 31), originally published in the *Deutsche Wochenschrift* between 1887–1901. It is placed here out of time-sequence, but the reason for this will become apparent later.

To begin with Rudolf Steiner points to the way Darwinian principles of evolution have been applied to the human social domain, in that the doctrines of natural selection and the survival of the fittest are seen to be operating in social structural developments, leading the "finest individuals" towards ultimate superiority.

Current assessments of social questions suffer through the way in which thinkers, experts and social scientists who employ their scientific capabilities in this field apply the results which Darwin and his successors obtained from their studies of the plant and animal kingdoms in an indiscriminate way to the social development of humanity.

It is then pointed out that in the early stages of social cultural development it is natural that the individual has to subjugate himself to the requirements of the community.

This factor can be characterised in the following way: institutions arise in the first instance in such a way that the interests of the individual recede into the background, while those of the community receive particular emphasis. As a result these institutions initially take on forms which in the further course of their development have to be counteracted. Marriage, property, the state, etc. could never have developed in the way they did if it had not been for the fact that the tendency of the individual to develop his powers and capacities in an all-round manner had been frustrated.

This situation has both a long standing history, as well as an understandable necessity.

This means that private property, which enables man to assert his individuality, did not exist at the beginning of human cultural development. What better illustration that there was once a time when it was experienced as right to sacrifice the individual to the interests of the community than that during a certain period of time the Spartans used to cast weak individuals out into the wilderness where they were left to die so that they would not be a burden to the community.

However, this stage gave way to what we would now recognise to be the emergence of justified individuation. A while ago the concept of the "me generation" appeared, for example, and everyone instinctively knew what this was to do with.

The forms of all social institutions during the beginning stages of cultural evolution were such that the interests of the individual were sacrificed for the sake of the community. However, it is equally true that in the further course of evolution the individual attempted to assert his needs over against those of the community. If we observe closely, a good deal of human history is encompassed in the self-assertion of the individual over against the communities which arose of necessity at the beginning of cultural evolution and which developed at the expense of the individual.

In the course of time this situation of the relationship between community and individual has changed and will continue to do so.

Common sense compels us to acknowledge that social institutions were necessary, and that they could only come about through priority being given to common interests. However, it is equally obvious that it is necessary for the individual to resist the sacrifice of his own particular interests. In this way a situation has come about, in which social institutions have taken on forms in which the interests of individuals are given more scope than was earlier the case. If one rightly understands the nature of our times one might well say that the most advanced members of our society endeavour to develop social forms in such a way that through the forms of human interaction any restrictions on the individual are

reduced to a minimum. The idea that a community could be an end in itself is gradually disappearing and it is seen more and more as providing for the development of the individual. The state, for example, should be constituted in ways that give the greatest scope to the unrestricted development of the individual. All general arrangements should be made in such away that they serve the individual rather than the state as such.

This leads towards a situation in which such a fundamental sociological law becomes recognisable and is seen to be present as a reality.

Having stated all this we can proceed to describe the fundamental sociological law governing the development of mankind, and which with logical necessity, is expressed as follows:

In the early stages of cultural evolution humanity tends towards the formation of social units where initially the interests of individuals are sacrificed to the interests of those associations. The further course of development leads to the emancipation of the individual from the interests of the associations, and to the unrestricted development of the needs and capacities of the individual.

This has its consequences for the state and society:

Any state or society which regards itself as an end in itself has to aim for control over the individual, regardless of the way in which such control is exercised, whether it be in an absolutist, constitutional or republican manner. As soon as the state no longer considers itself an end in itself, but as a means towards an end, the principle of state control will no longer be emphasised. All arrangements will be made in such a way that the individual receives the greatest scope. **The greatest ideal of the state will be to not control anything. It will be a community which wants nothing for itself, but everything for the individual.** If we want further developments in this direction we are bound to oppose everything which tends towards a "socialisation" of social institutions.

This law may seem to lead towards a kind of anarchy, but just as much as I might seek to be granted my own unrestricted development, so in turn I should also seek this for my neighbour.

Anyone who can read the development of mankind rightly can only support a social order which has as its aim the unrestricted

all-round development of individuals, and which abhors the domination of any one person by another. The question which then remains is how each individual is to cope with himself? Each individual will solve this problem for himself if all sorts of communities don't get in the way.

A Fundamental Spiritual Law

This fundamental spiritual law is described in the course of an address at the founding of the Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain in London, 2nd September 1923 (GA 259).

For the world at large, such a moment as this day in 1923 is to all intent and purposes completely "invisible"; yet it gave rise to the stating of this law, which says something significant about the relationship of any particular movement or association to the progress of humanity as a whole.

It makes the point that any movement must do what is necessary to fulfil its own aims, and to do this freely in the sense of its inherent spiritual freedom so to do; and to protect this freedom in face of criticism or adverse comment.

The inner laws of a spiritual movement, such as the anthroposophical movement, need not take account of things that come from outside, be they opposition and hostility or be they approval. Spiritual movements must be true to their own intrinsic nature and purpose, carrying out what they recognize, from their spiritual insight to be necessary for a particular age. On the one hand they must follow the inherent forces of their own momentum, and on the other they must do whatever is necessary to continue to exist in the world and not perish.

However, whilst seeing the necessity in the above, as far as its value for wider humanity is concerned, i.e. its spiritual value, any such movement or association also needs to relate itself to the generally human situation of the time in which it exists and is developing.

No spiritual movement in our time can flourish if its aims are specialized in any way. It is what you might call an occult law that every genuinely sound and fruitful spiritual movement must exist for the good of humanity in a general way. It must be generally human or, as we say in ordinary life, international. In our time, if something is

not generally human, if a number of individuals get together to form a kind of group ego to carry a spiritual movement, they damage the general progress of humanity; they do not serve humankind or help it to progress. There is no point in discussing this, any more than it is meaningful to discuss a law of nature. It is purely and simply a spiritual law: if a spiritual movement is to help humanity to progress it must be generally human in intention and character.

The way in which the spiritual law was described indicates that its working can be recognised both at the micro as well as the macrocosmic levels – that is, in smaller organisations or movements which experience themselves as having spiritual value, as well as in nations or folks.

The history of the twentieth century shows that this law is one, which if it had been realised and heeded, could have directed humanity away from the almost incomprehensible horrors which have stemmed from nationalistic and exclusive interests. Such traumas remain ongoing even now into the third millennium.

It is understandable that in the early stages of the development of a social spiritual impulse there is a natural tendency to create "one's own sphere of interest" but, as the law states, the value of any such impulse lies in the contribution it is to make to general human development. Going against this law – and this does not mean negating the specific aims of different impulses or ceasing to value different national characters – can only have deleterious effects.

Thoughts on these Laws

Despite appearing in different, and seemingly unrelated contexts in the active engagement of Rudolf Steiner with the social and spiritual issues of his time, these three laws, arranged in the above way, stand out as still being of value and worthy of consideration today, particularly so in relation to the opening remarks on the threefold social order. Naturally we view them almost a century further on in time, and in the light of the circumstances at the beginning of the third millennium.

These laws become apparent when:

Self-interest manifests in the activity of economic enterprises, and particularly in the case of globalisation. Social Law

States impose limitations and control over the free development of citizens beyond the justified application of agreed laws and settlements. Sociological Law

The intransigent presence of nationalism and exclusivity provide the basis for conflict and war. Spiritual Law

As has been said already, the purpose here has been to present these laws with a commentary, allowing them to stand before the reader on their own merits. Each in turn begs the question as to whether or not they are indeed laws, and if they are, how might we see the right or wrongfulness of social actions, in the light of their presence?

The Social Law

With regard to the social law it is fairly obvious that the need and want of peoples is pandemic across the world. Western Europe is a land of milk and honey compared to the living conditions which are found in much of Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, Russia, South America. We may think that North America represents a continent of wealth and prosperity, but even here we can find areas of dire poverty and social exclusion, in the countryside and in urban districts.

The communist-socialist experiment came to an end, and now the capitalist, market force economic ideology rules the day! Doesn't this indicate to us that the challenge of overcoming self-interest and egotism remains with us? Would not an awareness of the efficacy and unavoidable aspect of this fundamental social law be beneficial for the way in which economic life is arranged?

There is much more that could be said about this. However, we can focus on one major area: that of economic life which is increasingly globalised and marketed. The self-interest of companies and the requirement to achieve continuous growth in profits, works against the requirements of this law. Isn't the need and want that we see all around us globally a confirmation of the truth of this law?

The Sociological Law

The sociological law can be discovered at work alongside the social law. How often do we find "company people" and even "community people" manifesting new interests and personal agendas which seem to go against their previous dedication "to the cause"! They seem to be no longer satisfied with submerging themselves within the organisation or community. They want to break free and follow their own necessities, maybe even appearing to be egotistic and self-interested. The socio-

logical law is at work continuously on a micro level, and it certainly works within human biographies, if it gets the chance.

On the wider level there are numerous examples of states executing extreme control over citizens. Individual capacities and wishes are frustrated and the will of the state may become dominant, even repressive. Even in so-called democracies there is usually a ruling and an opposition party, who divide over the extent to which the individual should be allowed greater or lesser autonomy over their lives. It would be beneficial, both to the way states are constituted, as well as for individuals within society, to be aware that this law is at work and has its place. It offers a form of resistance against which politics is ever and again knocking its head, mostly without knowing why.

The Spiritual Law

Time and again organisations, communities, associations and other impulses emerge on the social scene, having their own and unique "spiritual impulse". The more these entities develop their own particular sphere of interest, the deeper they have to turn inwards. This is inevitable and necessary, but tends towards encroaching self-absorption. How often do we not hear of laudable organisations or communities, which sooner or later become wracked by internal conflict, navel gazing and debate over the minutiae of their own principles! We can say they have "lost the plot". They may have become irrelevant, or are entering a process of re-assessment of their relevance, though now it becomes a matter of their significance and usefulness to the wider society.

This law refers to the relationship of the spiritual and creative intentions of people, and the freedoms, which underpin their right to exist. Yet, at the same time, setting a measure against which a wider purpose in life is set.

Summary

It is this commentator's view that what is encompassed by these laws are spheres of reality in each of whose contexts can be found a principal ethic. So that where self-interest reigns globally or locally, and where suffering and want appear, we recognise the working of:

A Fundamental Social Law

Where states or controlling bodies work against the interests of individuals, and only work for the interests of the communal body, abuses of human rights and all forms of repression even within smaller organisations may ensue. Here operates:

A Fundamental Sociological Law

Every impulse amongst peoples who are working towards a common endeavour needs to consider its value, not only for itself, but for humanity as a whole. It can ask itself about its spiritual value to itself and nurture this, but at the same time must seek to overcome the tendency within itself towards exclusivity, which can on any level have disastrous results. We may become aware of:

A Fundamental Spiritual Law

These laws, each in their own realm, are expressions of fundamental insights. They are conditions for health within the social organism of the human community. They also relate to the social trinity with which we began:

In Economic life there operates:	A Fundamental Social Law
In the life of Rights we discover:	A Fundamental Sociological Law
In Cultural life there works:	A Fundamental Spiritual Law

It may be that we can see in these three laws a further widening of perspective of what was described at the outset as "threefoldness", which is present as an archetype, as well as a working principle, in everyday personal, communal and global experiences.

Clash of Civilizations, Iron Necessity, 530 Billion Imaginary Workers: Current Events Through The Lens Of Rudolf Steiner's Spiritual Scientific Discoveries

Stephen E. Usher

Dramatic events have gripped the world's attention since 9/11 when a significant part of the planetary population witnessed the images of the collapsing World Trade Center in New York. The American attack on the Al Qaeda infrastructure with the invasion of Afghanistan followed. Next came the slow build up to the Iraq invasion with a to-and-fro discussion about inspections. This ended with a cowboy-like high noon ultimatum for Saddam Hussein to get out of Iraq within 48 hours. The swift war followed and Iraq came under American control. As of this writing an enormous question mark stands after the issue of how post war Iraq will develop. Will it fall into total chaos? Will it emerge as a liberal democracy or at least something that resembles one? Will it become a Shiite fundamentalist state?

Endless discussion and commentary on these events has filled the airwaves and print media. Innumerable perspectives have been offered. Here I attempt to look at these events through the lens of Rudolf Steiner's forward-looking statements about humanity's development. In offering such a view I must assume a reader familiar with and sympathetic to Rudolf Steiner's spiritual science. In particular I assume the reader has studied Rudolf Steiner's claims about the possibility of a science of the spiritual world that enables human beings to investigate spiritual reality in a way analogous to the way natural science allows us to investigate the natural world. It was Steiner's claim that this was possible if human beings consciously developed themselves as spiritual scientists by pursuing a meticulously laid out series of inner exercises and discipline. The result of this development, which might require more than a single incarnation to carry out, is that the person develops and articulates within his soul and life body what Steiner termed supersensible organs of perception and other higher structures that exist only in germinal form in ordinary human beings. This process of esoteric

development brings to birth a "higher man" of soul and spirit. If this higher man is born healthy he is enabled to observe in higher worlds and to make of himself an instrument of spiritual research. An advanced spiritual scientist has the ability to observe in the astral and higher worlds forces that in the future will condense to physical manifestation. From such observation an idea of how the future will unfold becomes accessible.

In reviewing Steiner's many statements about the future the student of his works will often notice nodal or branch points. In other words Steiner often does not simply state what will happen. Rather he observes what forces are at work forming the future and then he observes what will develop if human beings use their freedom in a certain way and what will happen if they do not.

Pronouncements On the Future

An adequate understanding of the epistemological foundations of spiritual science allows one to grasp that it was possible for Steiner to make certain pronouncements about the future. Using one of these statements as a lens we shall try to form an understanding of present events. Speaking in Dornach, Switzerland, on December 14, 1919, directly after the First World War to an audience partly composed of British members of the Anthroposophical Society, Steiner made the following statement about the victors and vanquished of that war:

"[T]he actual victor is the being of the Anglo-American peoples, . . . , this being of the Anglo-American peoples is destined to dominate the world in the future. So what is the consequence for the German nation of being eliminated from experiencing the things that will in future dominate the external world? The responsibility of the nation as a whole – though not, of course, that of individuals – for the events of human evolution falls away. The responsibility – not of the individual, but of the nation – is lifted from those who are down-trodden as indeed they are. They will not be able to recover, and any talk in that vein is founded on shortsightedness. They are relieved of responsibility.

All the greater, though, will be the responsibility on the other side, where the real responsibility will lie. It will be easy to win external dominion, for this will be done with the help of forces for which the winners can claim no credit. The transfer of external

dominion will take place with the *relentlessness of a force of nature*¹. The resulting responsibility, however, will be deeply significant for those souls. Already inscribed in the book of human destiny is the question: Will there be a sufficient number among those impelled to assume external dominion, *as though by a force from outside*, who feel a responsibility for inserting into this entirely external, materialistic dominion – for that is what it will be, make no mistake – *an impetus for spiritual life*?

What is more, there is not much time in which this can be done. The middle of this century is a very important moment. Those who have been chosen to shoulder the dominion of materialism in the external world must feel the full weight of this responsibility. For the *dominion of materialism bears within it the seed of destruction*. To shoulder external dominion means to take on, and to live within, *the forces of destruction, the forces of sickness of mankind*. Out of the new seed of the spirit will come something that can bear mankind onwards into the future. This seed will have to be nurtured, and those to whom dominion has fallen will be especially responsible for this."²

In what follows I address the underlined passages. An obvious objection should be addressed here. History shows that Germany did attempt in the most evil manner to again participate in world dominion in the short-lived existence of the Third Reich. This attempt was met with crushing defeat after which Steiner's claim about Germany appears to ring true. Whether the rise and fall of the Third Reich contradicts Steiner's pronouncement depends on how one understands "the things" that will dominate the world in the future. What Steiner had in mind was evidently economic and commercial life.

Anglo-American Outer Dominion Will Proceed As A Force Of Nature: Clash of Civilizations

This brief passage contains many ideas. Let us focus, first, on the forward-looking statement that the victor – the "being" of the Anglo-American world – is destined to assume outer dominion of the Earth in

¹ All italicised statements are this writer's emphasis.

² *Idea for a New Europe*, Rudolf Steiner Press, 1992, pp. 36-37.

the future.³ On this Steiner surely was prophetic. The last serious contender for world dominion, the Soviet Union, crumbled with the Berlin Wall in 1989. Since then The United States has been the sole super-power.⁴

Of this world dominion Steiner states that it will be a purely outer dominion and that it would come about as if by a force of nature. When we picture forces of nature images of hurricanes and volcanoes come to mind. How is one to understand the force of nature analogy here?

Steiner also uses the analogy in the introductory lecture of his discussion of a spiritual scientific approach to history, *From Symptom to Reality in Modern History*.⁵ Here he compares two historical events explaining that one occurs through comprehensible motives while the other is like an event of nature. The first event from 1309 is the transference of the Pope to Avignon. This was an act of the French King and Steiner points to it as a symptom of the dawning of the era of the consciousness soul (1413–3573). Prior to that it would have been inconceivable that a king would so treat the Pope. But with the dawning age of the consciousness soul the individuality of the king no longer bows to the pope in the old way, and when circumstances warrant it and the king has the power, the power of the pope is quickly reduced. Of this chapter of history Steiner explains that it forms a single complex. “[I]n order to understand not the inward and spiritual, but the external and human tendencies and influences which were connected with the event of

³ In *Challenge of the Times* (Anthroposophic Press), lecture of December 8, 1918, Steiner further elaborates the nature of the English speaking peoples as follows: “[D]uring the fifth post-Atlantean epoch, the element of power is assigned to this English-speaking population. We call to memory the three figures in Goethe’s fairy tale: power; phenomenon of appearance; wisdom, knowledge. Of these three elements, power is assigned to the English-speaking people. What they accomplish politically in the world is possible by reason of the fact that one of their inherent, inborn characteristics is that they should work by way of power. To work by way of power will be accepted during the fifth Atlantean epoch as something not subject to discussion. . . . Of course, all the injurious effects, which, however, are always to be found in the reality belonging to the physical plane, may be sharply criticized. . . . It is inherent in the evolution of our times that they are accepted, and without any reflection, without any effort to find reasons for this.”

⁴ Steiner does not make clear in this passage how long this dominion will last. However, from his larger picture of the seven Post Atlantean ages it seems clear that it will not last beyond the 5th age, the age that commenced with the scientific revolution in 1413 and will end around 3500. After that the meristem of evolution will shift to Russia and totally different conditions will prevail.

⁵ *From Symptom to Reality in Modern History*, Rudolf Steiner Press, 1976, Lecture of October 18, 1918.

Avignon and prepare the ground for it, you need not look beyond a coherent complex of human acts and decisions.” The historian can grasp the players and their motives, and from an understanding of these, can make sense of what occurred.

The other historic event to which Steiner refers is the Mongol invasions. Briefly characterized, Ghengis Kahn (1167–1227) destroyed the powers of China and Islam and then advanced through Eastern Europe passing through Georgia, overrunning the Ukraine and Crimea, and destroyed three Russian armies in the process. A second invasion occurred starting in 1237 led by Ogoidei that captured Moscow and other cities of Russia before ending due to Ogoidei’s death. These invasions occurred according to Steiner as if by a force of nature. He states that “[Y]ou will find no such coherent pattern of events when you consider the time between the Mongol invasions and the later penetration of the Turks into Europe.” He goes on to explain that in this case, for the Europeans, it was like experiencing a phenomenon of nature, like seeing colors and hearing sounds that are external trappings behind which the elemental beings are active. In the historical analogy the psychic element behind history “does not manifest itself.”

In continuing his characterization Steiner states: “It is most important to bear in mind this strange intermediate zone, this no man’s land, where peoples or races *clash*, revealing to each other only their external aspect – this strange intermediate zone, which also must be reckoned among the symptoms, between actual universal experience of the human soul such as we see in the event of Avignon and the genuine impressions of nature.”

Of this last passage it is worth noting that a notion of “clash” of civilizations emerges about eighty years before Huntington became famous for conceiving the idea.⁶ Equally striking is the fact that in the long passage of December 14, 1919 it is the development of Anglo-American dominion that will occur as if a force of nature. Steiner is telling us that the development of Anglo-American world power will strike us as inexplicable, like a natural phenomenon, where the psychic element is hidden and we cannot make full sense of it.

Consider the main sequence of events in this light. First, comes 9/11. There follows the “axis of evil speech” and the invasion of Afghanistan. Then the idea of an invasion of Iraq emerges and the to-

⁶ Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*, 1998.

and-fro of diplomatic discussions. Finally comes the swift invasion and toppling of the Iraq regime. The 9/11 event was one of the long series of opportunities that opened the door to expansion because it put the public in the US in a mood supportive of the government's response. As with former events that precipitated the expansion of the Anglo-American dominion, e.g. World War II and the Cold War, the Anglo-American World is led to expansion by opposing aggressors who objectively can be characterized as the relatively "black hats."⁷

The hurricane like chaos can be seen in the strange emergence of the "axis of evil" idea. A speechwriter and not a government or think tank analyst conceived the "axis of evil" thought. Moreover, the speechwriter was fired when he took some credit his idea.

The motivation and decision to go to war with Iraq is quite impenetrable; as of the time the actual invasion began no evidence had been produced that implicated Iraq in the 9/11 disaster. Yet somehow, out of the emotion and fears of the moment, the instinctive decision for war was taken. In particular, that decision does not appear to have been informed by conscious comprehension of the Shiite fundamentalist social forces that had been repressed by the Saddam regime or by any thought of where uncapping that pressure might lead after the war.

Probably most revealing, as evidence of inscrutable behavior – force of nature like – is the behavior of the British Prime Minister. Unlike his American counterpart he did not enjoy popular support for dragging his country into the war. Indeed, he risked toppling his government to participate. Somehow an impulse drove him in that direction. His impulse was from that "no man's land" as Steiner described it. Remarkably, it was just this impulse that validates Steiner's concept that the dominion is "Anglo-American" and not just American.

The dominion of materialism bears within it the seed of destruction:

Iron Necessity

Why must the dominion of materialism be accompanied by destructiveness, which indeed it is as can be seen, for example, from a study of the innumerable wars of the 20th century and the millions killed and

⁷ American cowboy movies typically depict the forces of good in white hats and those of evil in black hats. At least as of the Second World War the Anglo-American's have opposed black hats.

maimed in the process? The overarching answer is that it is part and parcel of the type of consciousness human beings have today. Since the beginning of the era of the Consciousness Soul (5th Post Atlantean epoch, 1413–3573), which started with the scientific revolution, the human head has been dying and is only able to continue living because vital forces are sent upward from the rest of the organism. Within this process of dying our present form of consciousness lights up. This consciousness makes possible the sharply contoured ideas of natural science that allow scientists to formulate natural laws. But the natural laws actually only comprehend the dead world. While natural science does study living things, e.g. biology, zoology, etc., in reality it never actually grasps life. Rather it attempts to reduce life to a dynamic system of chemistry. The difficulty is even greater when natural science attempts to comprehend conscious life, ensouled beings.⁸

From the dawning understanding of natural laws there arose the technological revolution, the creation of machines based on our knowledge of the dead world. As this process developed, human beings more and more shaped their thoughts in accordance with the technology that surrounded them. In particular, they applied this type of thinking to the ordering of the social life. But these thoughts were only applicable to the dead world and consequently brought a destructive element into social arrangements. The fundamental reason why the dominion of materialism is destructive is that it is based on a mode of thought that is unable to grasp the nature of life, society, and civilization. It applies a false understanding to structuring these and in the process creates chaos and destruction. It is a bit like a person with no comprehension of dynamite charged with cleaning up a huge spill of dynamite in a dark cave. His first step is to light torches to get a better look!

There is a deeper, esoteric side to the destructiveness as well. Steiner explains that there exists a connection between the powers of destruction and decline in the universe on the one hand and human consciousness on the other. When people live in a materialistic state of consciousness they ignore the spiritual world and spiritual beings. It is a law of "Iron Necessity" that the spirits will take revenge if they are ignored. "A mysterious connection exists between human consciousness

⁸ Steiner explores these issues in his first book, *A Theory of Knowledge Based on Goethe's World Conception*, Anthroposophic Press, 1968. There he makes clear that contemporary consciousness is suited to the study of the dead world. A higher level of consciousness – which he later calls imaginative consciousness – is required to understand living things. An even higher level of consciousness is required to form an understanding of ensouled things.

and the destructive powers?"⁹ Steiner goes on to explain that had human beings in Europe put as much energy into pursuit of spiritual things in the last decades of the 19th century as they did in pursuit of material knowledge then the spirits of destruction would have been "paid off"¹⁰ and the First World War could have been avoided.

The war came because materialism prevailed. Souls who have died after spending a life focused only on material reality thirst and long for destructive powers in the physical world, for in the after life they live with these forces of destruction.¹¹ That is the Iron Necessity.

In a lecture of 1913¹² Steiner describes how souls who have inadequately developed sensitivity to spiritual aspects of reality become servants of spiritual beings of destruction after death. "It is a shattering experience to behold souls between death and rebirth who are forced to become the servants of evil spirits of disease and premature death..."

Souls that are completely absorbed in selfish materialism begin to fall out of the normal course of cosmic development, out of the progressive evolution of mankind. This is particularly so if they failed to make a conscious connection with the Christ forces during their earthly life. What happens is that the progressive hierarchies find them too dense and, consequently, these higher beings are unable to exert their healing influence on these souls in their after death existence.

A wise providence, however, has made provision to transform the destructiveness brought about by these souls, the deeds of destructiveness that these souls bring as servants of the spiritual beings of destruction, into a redeeming power. Each time a human being's life is cut short as a consequence of these evil forces that human being enters the spiritual world with forces that were not used up in earthly life. Suppose a man is killed in war, a man of 35. Had a bullet not cut his life short he would have had sufficient life forces to live and experience life for another 35 years. These forces are released in the cosmos and the wise guides of humanity make use of them to work on the dense souls and help these souls find their way back into the progressive course of evolution.¹³

⁹ *Fall of the Spirits of Darkness*, Rudolf Steiner Press, 1993, p 19.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p 20.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p 21.

¹² *Life Between Death and Rebirth*, Anthroposophic Press, New York, 1968, lecture of March 10, 1913.

¹³ *Ibid.*

There is also compensation for those souls who are lead to early death. "Condensed into one moment, he experiences things which would have been spread over long periods of time. What he could have experienced during the next 35 years he now experiences in one single moment. For the important experience in the hour of death is the following: the human being sees in truth his body from outside; he sees the transition it passes through; he sees that it relinquishes the control of the forces it possessed when the soul dwelt in the body, and that it now becomes a nature-being, given over to the nature forces. The tremendously significant experience at the moment of death is that the human being then beholds the relinquishing of his organism to the physical nature forces. If a human being suffers a violent death, he is suddenly delivered not only to the normal nature forces, but his organism is treated by the bullet as if it were an inorganic, lifeless body; it is completely relegated to the inorganic world. There is a great difference between a slow death through illness and a sudden death through the interference of the external world with the human organism, be it in the form of a bullet or in any other way. In this moment there is a sudden flaring up, a sudden flashing forth of a tremendous amount of spirituality. The flaming up of a spiritual aura takes place, and the one who has passed through the portal of death looks back upon this flaming up. This flaming up greatly resembles the event that takes place only when human beings devote themselves to spiritual concepts. These are values, my dear friends, which are interchangeable."¹⁴

The law of Iron Necessity dictates, in our time, that when humanity does not spend sufficient effort in developing spiritual ideas many souls fall into a completely materialistic frame of mind. When they enter the afterlife they become the servants of evil spirits of destruction and death, and they literally crave destruction and death on the earth and help in bringing about wars and other destructive events. At the same time these souls, being filled only with materialistic ideas and having ignored development of spiritual awareness, in particular having failed to find a conscious relation to the Christ event while on earth, become so dense that the progressive hierarchies are unable to help them keep up with the progressive pace of evolution. But the progressive hierarchies make use of the forces released by people who meet an

¹⁴ *The Mission of the Archangel Michael*, Anthroposophic Press, 1961, Lecture of February 17, 1918.

untimely death as a result of the destructiveness. A wise spiritual ecology directs the unspent forces to the aid of those souls at risk of falling out of the progressive evolution. The souls who face untimely death also are compensated in the form of a deep spiritual experience at the moment of death. But the key point is that all these difficult things can be ameliorated if human beings make strong efforts to awaken an understanding of spiritual reality by working strenuously at the development of spiritual ideas while on earth.

A counter impetus for spiritual life: 530 Billion Imaginary Workers

In the passage from December 14, 1919 Steiner states that "already inscribed in the book of human destiny" is the question of whether enough of those responsible for shouldering the burden of world dominion in the Anglo-American world will take the free initiative to develop an impetus for the spiritual life? He goes on to state, "Out of the new seed of the spirit will come something that can bear mankind onwards into the future. This seed will have to be nurtured, and those to whom dominion has fallen will be especially responsible for this." What did Steiner have in mind when he spoke of the "impetus for the spiritual life" and "the new seed of the spirit?"

We have seen that the destructiveness of the materialistic civilization has its roots in the nature of our head consciousness. That describes the dark side of this consciousness. But there is a very positive aspect to it as well. This head consciousness makes it possible for human beings to create thoughts with sharp outlines and this represents an advance over older states of consciousness. These are the thoughts developed in pursuit of natural science and technology. The new seed of the spirit arises from taking the capacity gained in pursuit of natural science and technology and applying it to understanding spiritual reality, in the creation of a science of the spirit. "Clear and sharp thinking trained in the modern, scientific ideas and then applied to the spiritual world as it reveals itself anew; such is the configuration, fundamentally speaking of Anthroposophical Spiritual Science."¹⁵ The spiritual science that humanity now has the capacity to develop holds the potential of creating ideas that truly comprehend social life and thereby to give guidance to the further development of human civilization.

¹⁵ December 20, 1918, "The Fundamental Demand of our Time", Typescript.

The new seed of the spirit is also connected with an evolutionary step taken by a class of spiritual beings known as the Spirits of Personality or Archai. This step began after the 4th century. At that time the Spirits of Form (also known as Elohim or Exousiai)¹⁶ started to transfer responsibility for the guidance of thought to the Spirits of Personality. "[T]he thoughts which are in things and which man draws out of the things, are no longer solely the possession of the Exousiai, the Elohim, but of the Archai."¹⁷ This transition did not proceed without difficulty. Certain Spirits of Form refused to give up their control of the thoughts. The result is that man's relation to thoughts is now regulated by backward Spirits of Form who did not keep pace with their evolution and the properly progressing Archai or Spirits of Personality. The consequence of this development is that human beings who interact in freedom with the Spirits of Personality gain the ability to produce thoughts out of themselves. "[M]an is confronted with the great choice in some one of his incarnations definitely to decide for freedom or, which is the same thing, to have the possibility of his freedom through turning to the legitimate Archai."¹⁸ This choice becomes acute in our 5th Post Atlantian age.

For the human experience there is a great difference between thoughts mediated by the now backward Spirits of Form and thoughts mediated by the progressive Archai. The Archai, like Angels and Archangels, are present between the human being and the sense world. The Spirits of Form work from behind the tapestry of the senses. When thoughts are mediated by the Spirits of Form the human being receives them in an automatic fashion just as he receives his sense impressions. In contrast, when the thoughts are mediated by the Archai the human being must exert personal effort and make the thoughts his own and this is just the condition of human freedom, "that man shall unfold his thoughts himself in inner activity, and that out of these self-evolved thoughts which in my book [*Philosophy of Spiritual Activity*] I have called 'pure thoughts,' he shall draw his moral impulses."¹⁹

¹⁶ For a discussion of these beings and their evolution see *Esoteric Science, An Outline* by Rudolf Steiner, Anthroposophic Press, New York, Chapter 4.

¹⁷ *The Driving Force of Spiritual Powers in World History*, Rudolf Steiner, Steiner Book Centre, 1972, lecture March 18, 1923.

¹⁸ *The Driving Force of Spiritual Powers in World History*, Steiner Book Centre, 1972, lecture March 18, 1923.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

Opposition to human beings finding their way to the progressive Archai does not arise from the backward spirits of Form alone. It also comes from certain ahrimanic demons and spirits of darkness. "[W]e see over against them [Spirits of Personality] certain Spirits of Darkness, . . . , Spirits whose interest it is not to allow that which is to come – the new revelation of the Spirits of Personality – to become active in mankind. These new Spirits of Darkness find an opportunity to realize their intentions in a certain phenomenon of modern life."²⁰ The phenomenon Steiner has in mind is the replacement of human labor by technology.

Specifically, Rudolf Steiner made the following observation on a number of occasions. The world population was about 1.5 billion. Unaided by machines this population was capable of a certain amount of work in the physical sense. Owing to technical innovation the actual amount of work was significantly higher. He cites one Reuleaux²¹ who calculated how many human workers – working 12 hour days – would be required to produce the same amount of work in the physical sense as was produced by all the coal burned in a year. By this calculation there were an additional 540 million imaginary workers. At that time almost all of these imaginary workers were located in Europe and Africa, as industrialization had hardly started in the rest of the world.²²

After presenting these figures Steiner states: "You see therefore that human labor on Earth has found, so to speak, a substitute. Something is here that works like human beings and yet does not consist of human beings in flesh and blood. This fact is extremely important for the evolution of mankind, and it is connected with other facts in the evolution of the present time. The five hundred million men who are really not there as men of flesh and blood – all this machine work gives

²⁰ "The Fundamental Social Demand of our Time", Rudolf Steiner, typescript, lecture of December 20, 1918.

²¹ Lecture of July 3, 1918, GA 181. Available in English as typescript from Rudolf Steiner Library, Ghent New York under the title "A Sound Outlook for Today and a Genuine Hope for the Future." It should be noted that Reuleaux appears to have written in the 1880s so the figures Steiner presented may be based on data from that period rather than 1918.

²² See previous footnote.

opportunity for the Spirits of Darkness²³ to realize themselves within our human evolution."

In the lectures where he mentions Reuleaux he explains that the imaginary workers are "crystallized human intellect," and "intellect detached from man." Ahrimanic forces take possession of these workers and thus Ahriman is connected with the purely external advance of our civilization. He goes on to observe that Luciferic forces necessarily appear as a polarity to these Ahrimanic beings. "For each machine a Luciferic spirit. . . . Invisible to this Ahrimanic civilization arises a Luciferic one, like a reflection. This means that to the same degree as machines are made, man on earth is saturated in his morality, his ethics, his social impulses, with Lucifer's mode of thought. One cannot arise without the other, that is the pattern of the world."

From these passages we see that Steiner relates the extent of the

²³ The exact nature of these Spirits of Darkness presents challenges to the understanding. Steiner uses this term, "Spirits of Darkness," on a number of occasions. In the 1917 lectures published in English under the title *Fall of the Spirits of Darkness* the term Spirits of Darkness primarily refers to ahrimanic beings of the rank of angel that were defeated by the Archangel Michael in 1879 and as a consequence were forced out of higher spiritual worlds into the earthly world. Of these beings Steiner states that they work directly into the human being, particularly his thinking. In these same lectures Steiner also tells of earlier times when other ahrimanic angles were driven out of heaven onto the earth. The activity of the different cohorts of ahrimanic angles differs from one another. One group who arrived on earth earlier than 1879, for example, is responsible for the creation of bacterial infections. In contrast the Spirits of Darkness referenced in some of the places where Steiner mentions the imaginary workers and the Reuleaux calculation are described as not entering human beings but rather embodying themselves in the subnatural forces that arise with the imaginary workers. In one lecture (August 19, 1918 not available in English, German GA183) he calls them ahrimanic demons. Hagemann (*World Ether, Elemental Beings, Kingdoms of Nature*, Mercury Press 1993) tells that Steiner describes demons as related to the human astral body and spirits as related to the ego. Generally speaking demons and spirits are created by the human sheathes or by the sheathes of higher beings. Sometimes, according to Hagemann, Steiner uses the term demon to refer to three entities: demons, specters and phantoms. When he does that demon is used in two senses. In the more specific sense it is a being related to the astral body while specters are related to the etheric and phantoms to the physical. In the more general sense demon includes specters and phantoms as well as the narrowly defined idea of demon. It is also interesting to note that there is a connection between the ahrimanic demons of the machines and the ahrimanic angels of 1879. Both are working in the same direction in connection with the future time in the sixth millennium when it will no longer be possible for human beings to reproduce as they now do. These two groups will work to enable some type of reproductive process to continue longer than would be possible for the progressive spirits, called in this context the Spirits of Light, working alone to achieve. (Compare August 19, 1918 of GA 183 to the lecture of October 28, 1917 from *Fall of the Spirits of Darkness*.)

activity in our civilization of the Ahrimanic spirits on the one hand and the polar opposite Lucifer spirits on the other with the number of imaginary workers and the number of machines respectively. We can attempt a similar calculation for our own time for the imaginary workers. World energy consumption is about 404 quadrillion BTUs. Based on a 12 hour day – to be consistent with the number Steiner presented – and the fact that human labor power is about 10% of horsepower and that a 250-day horse-year works out to about 7.6 million BTUs, we can calculate an imaginary work force at a staggering 530 billion in a world with population of about 6 billion.²⁴ This needs to be compared with Steiner's figure of 540 million imaginary workers when the world population was about 1.5 billion. At Steiner's time on a per capita basis every three people on the planet shared 1 ahrimanic demon of the sort discussed here. Today there are about 88 such demons for each person on the earth. For the US, which consumes about 25% of the world's energy, the figure is almost 450 demons per person!

Moreover, it should be evident that a calculation based simply on energy consumption hardly captures the extent of the "crystallized human intellect" at work all around us. The engineer years of labor that went into the creation of our information technology is staggering and the ubiquitous use of computers all over the globe represents a level of "intellect detached from man" that was hardly to be conceived at the time Steiner discussed the calculation of Reuleaux.

The new seed of the spirit, the impulse for spiritual life comes about to the extent that human beings make a link with the progressive Spirits of Personality and use their freedom to elaborate thoughts about spiritual reality. Steiner tells us on the one hand that this will require free deeds on the part of those who shoulder outer dominion and, on the other, that it is opposed by the Spirits of Darkness connected to an imaginary work force now estimated at 530 billion. It seems reasonable to state that the 530 billion imaginary workers represent a significant increase in the opposition since the time Steiner spoke. It also seems correct to state that those who actually shoulder responsibility for the outer dominion of the Anglo-American world have taken very limited interest in a real impetus for the spiritual life. The answer to the question inscribed into the book of destiny, about sufficient free initiative for spiritual life by those who carry outer dominion, is, thus far: no.

²⁴ 404 quadrillion BTUs / (7,632,000 BTU × 0.1 BTUs per human year) equals about 530 billion human years of work.

The Iraqi War and The Threefold Nature of Human Society

Michael Spence

We have just experienced the turmoil and tragedy of the Iraqi war. Many questions can and will be asked about it, and many different answers given. What lies behind it is immensely complex and different people will each see it in the light of their own understanding. To attempt to understand all the different facets of the war would be an impossible task, but having been asked by a student whether war has a place or purpose in human evolution and what that purpose might be I was prompted to consider what light might be thrown on this question if looked at from the perspective of what the threefold nature of social life calls for in the future.

For this purpose, from the very many possible questions and viewpoints that could form a starting point, I would like to pick just three: firstly, the growing awareness of the individual rights of each human being over and above his being a member of a particular family, tribe, religion or people; secondly, the place of the "nation state" as opposed to the individual human being on the one side and world humanity on the other, and lastly, the polarity that lies between those who initiate or support war and those who demand peace. All these point to the necessity of society in the future rightly structured according to its own inherent threefold nature.

Consciousness of the Individual and of Self

Never before has there manifested such a consciousness of every human being's right to life and never has this been given so much attention and been such a powerful influence on the conduct of a war. It placed enormous restraint on the coalition forces in their operations with regard to the civilian population. This has been a clear illustration of the change that is, and has been, taking place in human consciousness. Any

look at the attitude of the leaders of society towards the deaths of civilians and the ordinary soldiers during the wars of the last few centuries will confirm the progress of this change.

If we look back in time we will see more and more what can be called a group soul consciousness. People thought, felt and acted as members of a group rather than as distinct and individual human beings. This group consciousness held them firmly within the social group into which they were born and to which they were bound through blood and a common ancestry. The individual human being lived as a member of a particular family or tribe, he did not have an existence separate from it as he does increasingly so today.

The family, tribe or people based on blood ties and bearing the group soul common to all its members was at one time the primary social unit in humanity. There was not then the awareness that there is now growing ever stronger of, on the one side, the human being as a unique and separate individual and, on the other, world humanity. Where one tribe or people went to war with another it was quite within the order of things that some members of necessity be sacrificed for the benefit of the whole. This was possible because the individual was not separate from the whole—in that he experienced himself as living within the whole he felt that something of himself continued within the whole.

Group consciousness is still very prevalent today, but in the course of human evolution it must of necessity, give way on the one side, to consciousness of self, and on the other, to the consciousness of all people as individual human beings. It is now coming about that the individual is primary and the group is justified only in so far as it supports the individual. This in turn leads a person to the consciousness of being a member, not of one particular group separated from another group, but of one world humanity. Out of this has evolved the feeling for human rights as something to which all people all over the world are equally entitled with all others. In our time it can in truth be said that the consciousness of the individual human being and of one world humanity is slowly emerging to replace the older group consciousness.

Both forms of consciousness have been clearly visible in the conflict in Iraq. While there was world wide concern for every member of the Iraqi civilian population who suffered or died and, amongst the coalition forces, deep concern about the death or capture of each of their own soldiers, there was by no means anything like the same concern for the deaths of Iraqi soldiers. On each side the forces of nationalism have also been powerfully evident.

Nation State

In earlier times there were groups of people bound together by a common culture determined through their blood relationships or religious ties and having a framework and boundaries set by those ties. This is now giving way to the "nation state" based on a population within a certain geographical boundary and having a structure of law which is arrived at democratically. Instead of a people bound together as one people through a common culture and soul configuration, and by a shared ancestry or religious belief, there now arises a population of often unrelated and disparate individuals bound into one nation by legal categorisation.

In the Iraqi war we see one nation state, the USA, supported by others, mainly the UK, attacking another nation state, Iraq. The reason given for the war was that Iraq posed a threat to the USA and to others through its possession and therefore possible use of weapons of mass destruction. While it is generally accepted that one nation is entitled to defend itself against possible attack by another and that this defence might include pre-emptive attack, going to the aid of an oppressed and suffering people is not considered a justified reason for war. The question generally asked was, not whether the USA had a right to defend itself, that was assumed, but whether Iraq did actually pose a credible threat—did it actually have the weapons of mass destruction.

If it is acceptable that a nation go to war in order to defend its own safety and well being, has a nation state also a right to go to war on the basis of its concern for the well being of an oppressed and suffering people? This has not been put forward as a motive or a valid reason for the war in Iraq, though it was mentioned as a side benefit. There seems to be a general feeling that no nation state is justified in interfering with the internal affairs of another except on the authority of the United Nations.

This calls into question what appears to be the generally accepted concept of the "nation state". Is the right of the people and government of a country or nation state to decide and arrange its own affairs so inviolable that, even where a dictator seizes control, taking all power and wealth to himself and holding that power through suppression of sections of the population including the torture and murder of all those who threaten him, so sacrosanct that no other country or people may interfere or come to the assistance of those whose freedom and livelihood has been taken away, and whose very lives are threatened? Does

the leadership of the nation state, no matter how he or they obtained that position of leadership, have the same right of absolute power over the people as was held by the leadership of the theocracies of former times? Should the "nation state" take precedence over the rights of the individual – have the leaders a right to dictate to their people how they should think and what they should believe?

It is said that only the United Nations, under certain circumstances, has a right to interfere, or to authorise interference, in the internal affairs of a nation state. But the United Nations is formed of nation states, not of individual human beings, nor of humanity as a whole. Each of the nation states that makes up the United Nations acts and votes, in the main, according to its own interests, or even out of the interests of the leadership rather than that of the nation itself. Experience has too often shown that the leaders of some states will block any move to bring pressure on the leadership of another nation because they do not want their own activities looked at too closely, or their own economic interests to be adversely effected.

Does the nation state have a proper role in human affairs today, and if so where are the limits to its role? If it is not the nation state, what body is it that can represent and act for human beings both as individuals and as one human, and what are the limits to the rightful activity of such a body?

These are all questions that have been highlighted by the Iraqi war. But there is still a further question that has been pressed upon us.

War and Peace

There also appeared a marked division between people over the question as to whether the war on Iraq was justified and necessary, or whether war is never justified – between those who advocated war and those who demanded peace. It is not my intention to attempt here to go into all the possible arguments for or against peace or war but to look at it from one particular perspective.

All growth and development in the evolution of the individual human being, in any community or organisation, and in humanity as a whole, has come about through the working of contrasts, hindrances or polarities, that is, either in the working out of the conflicts they present us with, in the striving for balance or a way between opposites, in the rhythmic movements from one to the other, or in the overcoming of hindrances and obstacles. In nature we see the constant struggle between

life and death – without death there can be no new life. Time and again we see that through some serious illness or misfortune a person gains new qualities and strength of soul. I know from my many years of experience at Emerson College that it was only in those years when we met crisis and turmoil that the college was able to move forward in its development – or move backwards. In the years when there was no turmoil the college remained static, or consolidated what had been previously gained through crisis.

When we look into the deeper aspects of human spiritual development we see two forces that strive constantly to lead the human being away from his true path of development, one enticing him away from the earthly life into worlds of illusion and fantasy, the other in the opposite direction into materialism and cold calculation. The human being must strive always to keep the balance between these two, only in this striving can he move forward in his path of development.

Everywhere it is possible to see how evolution, growth and development are given through striving to overcome opposition and in the conflict between different or contrasting factors.

War, the conquest or overcoming of one people by another has been a fact of social life ever since the earliest times of recorded history, and probably existed long before that. There were times when one people, in order to further its own development or growth, would seek to conquer another. This could be for a number of reasons: that it was a vigorous people growing in numbers that needed more land, or more slaves to do the menial work. Or it might be that it was a people grown old and so no longer able within itself to develop new wisdom or skills in crafts. By conquering a more youthful people it was possible to renew these forces. So conflict between one people and another made possible development. But that was at the time of the group soul, when it was the group, the tribe or people that found possibility of development or growth through war that it could not do through peace. But those times are past, the human being has changed, he is no longer primarily a member of a group and war itself is no longer man against man, but highly sophisticated technology against the human being.

The Threefold Social Order

Would any of this be different, or find a healthy resolution, if the social life of humanity was structured according to its inherent threefold nature? How would tensions be made productive of human develop-

ment? How would the individual human being as individual come to be served by the community, and how would world humanity have a voice?

A society formed on the basis of its threefold nature will contain within it polarities that bring contrast and opposition in a balanced and harmonious way and at the same time bring to awareness both the central importance of the individuality of each human being and simultaneously an awareness of all humanity.

In the past, and still persisting today, the relationship between the individual and society has been one in which the individual was a member of one or another group, he stood inside the group. In the opposition between his group and another he would feel himself as part of the one group over against the other. This relationship becomes quite different in a threefold society. There the individual stands, as an individual, outside any one of the three sectors of society. He may work in one or in the other, but he has a relationship. He stands in a threefold relationship to that community. Where there is contrast or opposition between one sector and another he as an individual does not stand within the one sector over against the other, but can strive to bring the balancing forces needed from within himself.

It is very difficult to come to an imaginative picture of a society in which the three sectors really have been separated out, where the three individually self administering sectors work together to form a whole. Most people do not reach beyond imagining what is in fact one government, much as we know it today, but with three separate departments each administering one of the three sectors. But that is not what is needed. We must come to see a society in which there is no government as we know it, where there is no central authority, no prime minister, president or other such head, no one centre of authority. That is not easy to do in concrete terms. But so long as we do not achieve this we do not come even close to an idea of what the inherent nature of society itself strives towards if it is to be a true outer reflection of the threefold human being.

There is another misunderstanding that also too often arises. In any discussion of the threefold social order the term "economic" or the "economic sector" can only refer to all that human activity that goes towards the actual production and distribution of products, that is, products that have their origin in nature or sub nature and which we need due to the fact that we have a physical body. Money arises out of this activity, it facilitates it but is not itself part of the productive process. So too, all that which arises out of the buying and selling of what are in

reality "rights", such as the right to own or use land, or shares in businesses, are not part of the economic productive process.

Within a society structured according to its threefold nature there will always be two pairs of contrasts which will have constantly to be brought into balance, each fulfilling its own task. One contrast lies between the cultural and economic spheres of activity, and the other connected to the rights sector.

The cultural life of a community comprises all the activity of the community that, in one way or another, serves the soul spiritual nature of the human being. In this its focus of attention leads constantly to the single person, the unique and individual human being. In contrast the task of the economic sphere of activity is to provide for the physical bodily needs of all the community. Here we are constantly led, not to the single human being but to humanity as a whole.

All cultural activity starts from a form of egoism. Every human being has within him something that he has brought through birth from his life in spiritual worlds. He has certain impulses and intentions as well as potential capacities and abilities. In life there wells up within his soul a deep need to bring these to expression. This gives direction to his life – through their realization he finds life's fulfilment. What he brings of this is particular to him, it gives him individuality and makes him different from all others.

A person becomes a teacher because out of the depths of his soul comes the need to teach. In the same way a painter needs to paint, an architect to design buildings. All work in cultural life, is, at the beginning and in so far as he has found his rightful place, a fulfilling of needs that arise out of a person's own soul. Most people do not see this because they have been taught to think, according to the thought forms that dominate social life today, that they work for the money. If they looked deeply into their own motivation they would see that their lives would not be fulfilled in the same way if they did not do just what they are doing.

Every human being has a need to be recognised as, and given the freedom to be, who he is. He seeks to find a place in society where his work will, in the first place, satisfy the needs that arise in his own soul. He strives to do the work that he himself wants to do.

Every artistic creation is different and carries something of the soul of the artist, so in art we desire to know the identity of the individual artist. The teacher must, ultimately, carry into his work an awareness of the soul needs and potential abilities of each particular child. A person

can "know" something only when he himself has come to recognise it as true, or he can accept it from another because he recognises for himself the standing and wisdom of that other.

So we see how in cultural life we are led at every point to a perception and consciousness of the individual human being. We see the opposite of this in the economic sphere of activity.

In pure economic activity, that is, excluding such activities as craft work, a person plays his part in producing something not because he gains any inner fulfilment out of the activity of production itself, but because other people need the product. A person involved in some way in the manufacture of electric light bulbs may be motivated by his need for money, but the bulb itself is made because people of today need electric light bulbs. In the bulb we see nothing of the souls of the people who made it. We cannot even know the very many people who were involved in all the manifold processes that ended in the bulb.

No person, or even group of people, can produce even a small fraction of all that they need for themselves. If we look at all that we use or consume during even a part of our lives and consider all the activity that had to go into its production, including the obtaining of the raw materials, the making of all tools and machines needed and the manufacture of each of the different parts of each item, we will come to see that in all that we have, all humanity worked.

In the economic sphere of social life we are led to an understanding of all humanity, to the fact that no person can stand alone. Here we are led, not to egoism but to mutual interdependence or brotherhood. In our social life today this is hidden because money has come to be seen as having reality in itself, we do not look behind it to see all that went into the making of the product the money actually stands for.

In cultural life we see each person as a centre, each relates to the world from the point at which he in his soul stands. To understand and take hold of the economic sphere of activity we have to reach right out to the periphery and look inwards from there. The individual human being, as an individual, cannot do this. He as individual will always see it from his own particular perspective. The consumer will want to buy as cheaply and conveniently as possible. The entrepreneur will want to be successful and for people to buy his products, he will endeavour to obtain his raw materials and dispose of his waste as simply and cheaply as possible. The community will want to protect the environment even if it means that products will be more expensive.

So the individuals working in economic production will always view the economic sector from their own perspective. Only when the individuals come together can the group, from the various perspectives represented, view the whole from the periphery. Then too, the group can rise above the egoism of the individual and come to work out of mutuality.

At every point in the economic sphere of activity we are led away from the individual to the whole, to the mutual working of the whole and to viewing this whole from the periphery.

In a society where the three sectors of its being really are separated out and work independently of each other, each according to its own nature, the contrast or opposition between what is inherent in the very nature of economic productive activity and the necessary foundation of all cultural work will become apparent. It is already there, but because the egoism that has a rightful place in cultural life has spread into and become dominant in the economic sphere of activity where it causes immense damage, this is not seen.

In cultural life the human being must start from the foundation of what in ancient times was called for in the words "Man, know thyself". Though the human being has evolved and changed since those former times, that call is still the essential foundation for all inner work of the soul. What is called for in economic activity is quite different. There, out of the very nature of economic production based on division of labour, comes the demand – "man forget yourself and waken to the needs of others".

In cultural life, through education, through art and science what lies as potential in the human soul is awakened and brought to life. The imaginative capacities for discovery, creativity and invention, the ability of the entrepreneur and the manager all lead over into developing economic production, to the invention of new products and to making the productive process itself increasingly efficient. So cultural life of necessity extends into and fructifies economic production. But if the egoism which can be a starting point for creative work in cultural life is allowed to extend into economic activity it will there work destructively against the very nature of economic productive activity.

This contrast or opposition will always be there within social life, it is not something that can be removed or overcome but will constantly have to be worked with. Just as in cultural life there must be freedom for a person to bring to fruition that which arises as impulse or need out of

his own soul, out of his personal destiny, so in economic life all that arises as individual impulse and initiative must give way to the needs of others, to the needs of the being of humanity.

The scope and effects of egoism in the economic sector can be held in check by the proper working of the rights sphere of social life. Economic activity must not be allowed to extend beyond the actual productive process, that is, before human labour actually begins the process of transforming that which is provided by nature. Neither is human labour itself part of this process. The economic productive process is always the result of, but never includes, human labour.

When land and all that lies within land, when those rights such as shared ownership of businesses, and indeed labour itself, cease to be considered as properly belonging to economics and are made matters of the rights sphere where they properly belong, then society will have the means whereby the harmful effects of egoism in economic life can be held in check.

The rights sector of social life will always base its work and decisions on a sensing of what is felt to be fair, right and just by the community. In the forming of law every person's opinion is of equal value, everyone has an equal vote in the electing of representatives.

Here we come to a second opposition, that which in one form comes to expression in the conflict that often arises between the law of the state and conscience.

In the innermost sanctuary of the human soul there is that which is of the nature of the eternal, of the substance of the Divine. When a person can truly say "I am" or "I think" then it is out of this that he speaks. In this all people are equal, all are equal before God. It is an echo of this that we hear when we experience the voice of conscience within our own souls. For most of us it is as yet only in conscience that this is experienced during our lives between birth and death. It lies, for the vast majority of people, still within the world of Spirit and, except as conscience, has little power or effect on our ordinary conscious activities during our life between birth and death.

So human beings, to achieve what conscience cannot as yet do, have had to create law in all its different forms. Man made law, as opposed to conscience, is something that is entirely outside the human being and belongs solely to the life between birth and death. It is an ideal also of this law that before it all people are equal. But a person in any way caught up in the law will nearly always have the experience of something inhuman that denies him his individuality, his humanness. In

all this it can be said to be the opposite of the divine or moral law experienced as conscience.

Law is an essential ingredient of our social life, but due to its nature it is of fundamental importance that it is kept quite separate from, and has no influence whatsoever on, cultural life. Christ Jesus pointed to the importance of this when he said "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's". So too, it must have no part to play within the economic sphere of production.

So we see also here two opposites that have to be worked with in our human social life. The nation state belongs to this sphere of law and has a rightful place only so long as it does not usurp that which is the proper sphere of cultural or economic activities. Moreover, the nation state has a rightful task only so far as it deals with what is relevant to the one group of people. There must also be that which forms the law out of what is experienced as right and just by humanity as a whole. At a time in human evolution when humanity has progressed from the group soul consciousness to the single human being on the one side, and to humanity as a whole on the other, the role of the nation state becomes very much reduced.

If we look again at the Iraqi situation then we will see that if America and its supporters had gone to war, and had been seen to go to war, not to protect themselves and their own interests, but in order solely to relieve an oppressed and suffering people from that oppression, and if those countries that opposed the war had also been concerned solely with the suffering of people instead of their own interests, then the conduct and the outcome of the war and its effect on the Arab and Islamic world would have been vastly different. On all sides leading people looked only at the Iraqi nation state and at the Iraqis as Iraqis, or at the Moslems as Moslems. They failed to look beyond this and to see each individual human soul, each suffering soul that itself was neither Iraqi nor Moslem but human.

The Karma of Money*¹

Cornelius Pietzner

The theme of the “Karma of Money” is enormous. The deeper you enter into it the more dimensions, sides and aspects it has. I realised that if I was going to talk about it at all I would have to shrink the theme a bit. Issues of money and its effect are issues we all think about in one way or another and are concerned with almost every day of our lives. What I want to offer are thoughts that could be layered onto your own thoughts and considerations. I don’t wish to offer anything definitive and final.

When I was given the suggested theme for this presentation today, I did what I often do and turned to a number of people and asked them to comment. One said I should talk about the Knights Templar and the founding of a new banking impulse and share how this new credit system was developed centuries ago. I went to someone else and they said “you can immediately read the karma of an individual by seeing how they relate to money” and began to tell me about his children and how each one relates to money in very different ways. One daughter never has enough money, but she has quite a lot. The other is quite happy to do without anything. One can read their biography in their relationship to money – it was very clear that this should be my central theme. Another person I turned to, who administrates money, said to me “I think that money is sick. Money has sickness attached to it”. He was speaking out of his personal experience in regard to the administration of the assets for which he was responsible. So you can see there

* This audially transmitted text has been corrected and approved by Cornelius Pietzner. In editing the text, I have tried to convert the text from a spoken to a written one. To achieve this I have generally tried to improve the flow; the reader will have experienced when listening to a live speaker that it is not only what is said but the gesture and movement and the sense of meaning conveyed supersensibly that communicates. – Christian Thal-Jantzen, transcriber and editor.

¹ The occasion of this talk was the final morning of the Annual General Meeting of the Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain at Rudolf Steiner House, London Sunday 4th May 2003.

are many different sides and many different approaches that one can take to this theme. It is around us and everywhere. It's like electricity; it exists in potential. We can see its effects like electricity in light and heat. There are many different ways we experience the manifestation of money.

I want to start with two short stories which were important in my formative experiences in regard to money. Before I do so, I want to give a brief and sketchy description of what I would call the "dematerialisation" of money itself. When we begin to think about money we can look at four stages – a kind of spiritualization. This has very much to do with the material world, the dematerialisation of money itself. If we think back in time about how value was built up and how exchange was developed, we can imagine that this was done in a very local geographically fixed place, a place where the commodities of exchange had intrinsic worth in and of themselves, such as for example a cow or a horse. Broadly speaking this is a first stage that represented exchange of value. This was a sort of trade or barter system. As a second step, we can think of money having a representational character, where it still has intrinsic value through a substance such as gold or silver. But already here we have the earthly imprint of the sovereign, the king or queen on one side of a piece of gold and it begins to have more abstracted value in terms of its possibility for exchange and purchase. A third and further step of the dematerialisation or spiritualization of this very material element comes with the introduction of paper money. Here we have the literal flattening of the money and the thing in and of itself loses a further step of intrinsic and inherent value. It is a piece of paper that is backed by other substances that have value (such as gold). So we have paper that has images and numbers imprinted on it. It has images on it but in and of itself it is relatively meaningless. For instance, I have a note in my pocket that was given to me recently. It's from Cambodia and it says 500 with some designs that I imagine have meaning to some people, but I do not understand the letters. It won't buy me a cup of coffee here in London. In and of itself it does not have value. It can only be used as decoration if it had no representational force. This is the third stage where the thing itself, the exchange mechanism, is further abstracted from any inherent value. The fourth stage is the representation of vast amounts of value in binary sequences which show up in electronic transfer through computers. In industrialised countries over 90% of the exchange of value is simply done by the click of a button and shows up on a screen somewhere. Nothing is exchanged. Trillions of dollars are

traded and moved every day electronically. Money and electricity do actually have a lot to do with each other. This in itself, of course, is something to think about.

Let me come back to my two little stories. The first one has to do with my first year in university in America where I had a group of friends that were spread out around the country. Most of them were in university themselves and we had a youth group together and wanted to deepen our relationships. We wanted to deepen our work together and felt that a significant way to do this was to plunge into the realm of cooperative finance. With a great deal of idealism we set up a simple mechanism. There were six of us and we set up a pooled fund as a bank account. It had very few criteria. Each one of us had to make a start-up contribution. We had an administrator that would rotate every few months. The way this worked was that after we had made our contribution we were entirely free to withdraw any amount without any notice to anyone else, except to the administrator. The responsibility of the administrator was to let us know when we were getting low with our account balance. The idea behind this was that the six of us, spread out around a very big country, needed and wanted to develop an acute sense of trust in regard to the others. We wanted to have the trust that each of our fellow friends would be prudent and wise in their withdrawal of funds and would be equally prudent and wise in their contribution to the fund. That was the one side, extending ourselves into the social circle and unfolding this aspect of trust. The obvious second part of the mandate was to develop a sense of responsibility for our own usage without succumbing to all kinds of gremlins that would sneak in such as guilt in withdrawing any money or misuse of the funds for something frivolous. We quickly realised that this was not so easy to do. It was actually quite a burden. This experiment failed after about a year. It failed for two reasons. One is that we were all poor university students and we just didn't have enough money to make the project viable! There was an important lesson in this for me: you have to finance your ideals to really give them substance. The second reason was that we had undertaken to become our brothers' and sisters' keeper, so to speak, and with this, the intensity of the social fabric was key to the successful administration of finances. The social life and finances are intimately woven together. In our case they began to drift apart because we did not have the maturity or insight to deepen and foster our communal existence together at that young age. Other social aspects began to creep in and we abandoned the experiment after a little over a year.

The second story builds on this aspect of the necessity of the social community with money and each other. It is an intensification of collaboration and has to do with an early experience I had when I joined the work of Camphill in the USA. I was in a children's village and did not receive a wage or salary. We were obligated in our house communities to prepare personal budgets every semester. I lived in a large house of about 7 co-workers, and we went through the exquisite process of making personal budgets every semester. I was in my early twenties and of course when you come into such a situation there are social realities of seniority. But in the realm of making personal budgets and revealing to each other our personal needs there was no specific seniority in the normal sense. It was a very powerful experience for me, to sit with my colleagues, some of whom had been there for many years. Essentially my experience was, that we were trying to penetrate a membrane of privacy, of a personal domain, that was profoundly intimate and very, very challenging. If I were not incredibly careful, I realised, I would succumb to judgement and criticism of the other and their "needs" in what I felt to be sacred space. This I did on more than one occasion! It was important for me to learn that the expression of personal need is less a financial matter than a matter of education and personal development. But it was easy for me to criticise a need that one of my other co-workers might express such as a wish to join a health club for instance. I felt that to be pretty unimportant at the time. At the same time it was difficult to honestly explain my own needs. It always felt like a justification, and therefore uncomfortable. Distilling my experience: when we tried to enter this landscape of the other person's needs, we were treading on intimate spaces which I would call the holy ground of brotherhood or sisterhood in the economic realm. This is how I experienced it. It was a sacred space and one which needed careful preparation. Otherwise it could be profoundly divisive. In the right spirit it could also be profoundly supportive. I wanted to share these experiences with you, and I want to come back to them later on.

Let me come directly to the question of the "Karma of Money", which is a difficult title. I tried to think about this question and what I understood about karma all together. In thinking about the "Karma of Money", I would like to think about the qualities and essential characteristics of human karma itself. I am just going to point, in a sketchy way, to the formation of karma in the human being. There are different layers and elements to the formation of our karma that take place between death and rebirth. We have the stream of physical inheritance

that comes through the mother or the father. In this broad sweep of time between death and rebirth we begin to draw our etheric forces out of the substance of the cosmic ether, but already through the portal of death in the expansion and dissolution of our etheric body there have been aspects of our etheric structure that in a sense are indigestible and do not expand or dissolve but constitute a kind of "package" that carries on in the incarnating etheric structure drawn out of the cosmic etheric forces. That "package" reunites itself with the descending etheric formation force of the individual, slips in to it, and creates an etheric predisposition. This predisposition belongs from an etheric point of view to the past karma of an individual.

Another dimension belongs to the astral realm in terms of the karma we bring with us. This has to do with mutual human impact and meetings or encounters we have had with human beings in our present life and whether we have been able to provide love or joy, hatred or pain. How we have acted in these encounters is reflected back to us, as it were, from the periphery. Our experience in this present incarnation on earth is very much self-oriented; we move out from self towards the social periphery; to all the people around me. But as we traverse from death to rebirth again, it is as if we would walk through a room full of mirrors. These mirrors are reflecting back to us from the periphery the experiences of those souls of our encounters on earth, from their point of view. The experience of us working in them is reflected back to us as a mirror. This creates an astral experience that condenses as it reflects back to us and becomes part of our astral configuration that we bring with us when we incarnate on earth.

We have our own higher being, our ego, that carries forward from one incarnation to another. We have our own spiritual organism, an *entelechy*, that carries forward from one incarnation to another, building on itself and its capacity as an agent for transformation and change. This gathers substance and then incarnates on earth as one aspect of our karma. We bring it with us, so to speak, when we are reborn, from past lives, and it represents an aspect of untransformed karma. Thus we have the karma that lies in our physical body through inheritance, our etheric configuration with its "indigestible package" and the forces that are radiated back through the periphery towards the center of ourselves in the astral sphere based on human encounters. These are aspects that we carry with us and bring as karma that can be redeemed or transformed but are in a sense given to us. This is one aspect.

There is another aspect that has to do with the formation of karma. Rudolf Steiner speaks about this in a number of different places, but particularly strongly in 1923 where he describes, in a wonderful way, how our karma is woven not in the sphere of our day existence. Our karma is woven during the time of sleep. The material for our karma is gathered in the daytime, but when we enter into sleep, our astral body and ego separate from our etheric body and physical body. We engage with the archangels and the archai. He describes particularly the communion of our astral body in relationship to the archangels and the communion of our ego body with the archai. There, in relationship to the hierarchies and during sleep, our new karma is woven and plays itself out in our lives. We gather substance in daily intercourse; our karma is woven in the sphere of the night. So the formation of our karma both through the new and the old that we bring with us, is woven in the sphere where our ego and astral body expand, in the non-physical sphere. I wanted to mention these two aspects of the formation of karma because they are connected to the issue of the karma of money.

When we are here on earth, how do we work with these elements? There are a number of ways we work with our karma, or not. One has to do with the elements that we bring with us and that lie within the realm of our unconscious. This has to do with the experience of our double or our shadow or an aspect of our lesser guardian. This has many different aspects. Our double has sides that live within our physical body and certain dispositions combine with our physical body. It also has to do with our temperament and our etheric structure that provide a dispositional orientation to our temperament. Our double also has to do with our character and with our astral body. These are described quite extensively in Bernard Lievegood's book *Man on the Threshold*. The double also has to do with unredeemed elements that live within our surroundings, in our culture, in our upbringing and in what we experience externally. Another aspect has to do with a remnant that we bring with us from previous incarnations. These are three layers that have to do with our surroundings, what we take in, what we absorb through our culture and what we bring with us from previous incarnations. These are areas that belong to the double where we either do or do not work with our karma and our karmic disposition. That is one aspect that has to do with our own internal element.

There's another aspect that comes from outside, moving towards us out of the culture in which we live. This represents a movement not from within outwards, but one that comes towards us from the outside.

Rudolf Steiner describes this in the second lecture of the Curative Course, where he describes what he calls the education or pedagogical law. He describes how, if we want to provide support or help to the physical body of someone, we can influence the physical body from our etheric body. If we want to provide support or help to a distorted etheric body we have to work out of the forces of our astral body. And likewise if we want to support or work with the forces of the astral body of someone else we have to be able to work out of the forces of our own ego. He mentions the spirit self in relationship to the ego, saying that with this we are beginning to develop an esoteric instruction. The point is that it is not just my etheric body working on your physical body specifically, it is what lives around us in the whole realm of the ether that is working into our physical constitution and formation. What is living around us in the astral realm, with the people, our environment, is having an effect on the formation of our etheric structure itself. We experience a tremendous impact in our orientation or relationship towards money coming from what lives in the astral or even etheric structure of people in our surroundings, such as parents, family members, other adults or friends. The realities and relationships to money that they live with work into us through our next lower sheath. These influences come from etheric bodies around us and influence the forming of our physical bodies. Influences from astral bodies around us are having an impact on our etheric bodies. The next higher member in our environment is working on the lower member in us. This is going on all the time in social settings wherever we are together.

So we have the aspect of the double, which itself has a number of different dimensions and layers, but offers the potential and challenge for us to take hold and transform it and make it conscious. This is particularly so in relationship to the vast, confusing and exciting area of money. We experience the necessity of our own personal transformation. The other formative aspect comes to us from around us, from our surroundings, and influences us, especially in early years. Spending habits, compulsions with debt or acquisition, emotional trauma with money, inferiority feelings, fear, dominance and power that live in others around us filter towards us in our own forming relationships. These are two forces flowing in different directions, one towards us, one from out of us directly, that live within us in terms of our personal karma, particularly in terms of its expression in regard to money.

The question one can ask is "does money have karma?" One can think about this in relation to the elements I have tried to describe to

you. What are the activities within the formation of karma that would be relevant or essentially dissimilar in relation to money? One is that the formation of karma in the human being is not something woven only in the time between death and rebirth but in the time that we are sleeping when our astral body and our ego are in communion with the third hierarchy. The actual weaving and creation of karma takes place in a different realm. The question is; "does money touch that realm, and if yes in what way?" Money's sphere of activity belongs on the earth. Its sphere of activity is here on the earth. It clearly has a close relationship to the liberation or unfolding of karma. But as such, the building of the Karma of Money, and its implication for reincarnation, is not something that takes place in the spiritual world.

I want to make a little digression. It comes out of the Fifth Gospel where Rudolf Steiner speaks about the three temptations of Christ. Lucifer comes with the first temptation offering all the beauty and glories of the world which Christ is able to overcome. Lucifer and Ahriman come with a second temptation of overcoming gravity, the forces of the human body on earth. Christ is also able to push that away. Then Ahriman sends Lucifer away for the third temptation, and this third temptation has to do with money. I want to read you this paragraph; because Ahriman comes alone to Christ and says to him: "Turn mineral substance into bread, turn the stones into bread if thou wouldst boast of divine power. Then said the Christ Being: men do not live by bread alone but by the spiritual forces which come from the spiritual worlds. None knew this better than the Christ, for He had just descended from the spiritual worlds. Then Ahriman said, thou mayest indeed be right, but thou cannot prevent me from keeping a certain hold upon you. Thou knowest only how the spirit acts, the spirit who descends from the heights. Thou has not yet lived in the world of men. There below in the human world there are men who must make stones into bread, who cannot draw their nourishment from the spirit alone. That was the moment when Ahriman communicated to Christ something that could indeed be known on earth, but could not yet be known by the God who was here for the first time. He did not know that there below it was necessary to turn mineral substance, metal, into money, into bread. Ahriman said that men on earth have to nourish themselves by means of 'gold'".

A few pages later Steiner describes the final culmination of this earthly tragic force of money in relation to the life of Christ. "Because of the question that had remained unsolved, the question that Christ could not solve in the spiritual worlds, but only on earth, Ahriman had gained

sufficient power. As a result of the most terrible of all deeds, Christ had to experience what it means to turn stone into bread, for Ahriman made use of Judas Iscariot. On account of the way Christ worked, there would have been no spiritual means of discovering among the men who revered Him which was, in truth, the Christ; for wherever the spirit was working, wherever even the trace of convincing power was working, He could not be taken. Only where there was one who employed the means which Christ did not know, which He could learn only as the result of the most terrible deed wrought on earth, only where Judas was working could He be identified. The only means of recognising Him was through one who placed himself in the service of Ahriman, who in actual fact betrayed Him for the sake of money alone. Christ Jesus was connected with Judas because at the Temptation there remained something, which in a God, is incomprehensible: He did not know that only in the heavens is it true that stones are not needed for bread."²

Money is of the earth. It is not of the heavens even if we have the ironic paradox of the dematerialization of money, the abstraction of money from the world of material, from the world of substance and inherent value into something as invisible as the sphere of electricity. This is the one side. The second aspect to the question "does money have its own karma", has to do with the capacity of an inherent agent of transformation, such as the ego in the human being, to transform forces of the double that live in us unconsciously. Man has the capacity to build new karma through self-directed relationships and activity in communion with the hierarchies. Money as such does not have that aspect. It does not have an inherent internal aspect of transformation and change. I think it is quite clear that money does not meet the conditions for having its own karma. It is a releaser, or catalyser of human karma. It is of the earth and does not belong to the realm of the heavens. If we turn to a fairy story such as the *Green Snake and the Beautiful Lily* by Goethe, we will see this already in the first image where the two fine gentlemen come late at night and want to cross the river between the land of earthly reality and supersensible reality. They persuade the ferrymen to take them over the river and are frolicking about in the boat as two wondrous streams of light. As they come to the other side they jump up and down shaking gold coins into the boat, much to the horror of the ferryman, who stops and cries: "Don't do this, I can't take your money. If any gold falls into this river it will swallow the boat. The river cannot abide this gold."

² *The Fifth Gospel*, Rudolf Steiner Press, London, 1968, reprint 1985 pp 96 & 104.

This gold as a representation for value is not sufficient payment for the ferryman to take passengers across the river, and he says: "I have to be paid by the fruits of the earth, with three onions, three cabbages, and three artichokes". The gold in itself is not payment for the ferryman to cross this threshold. But actually we can see if we just continue for a moment with the images of this story that this aspect of the gold, of payment of money in its different forms, becomes like a yeast, or leaven or like a catalyst for the unfolding of the karma in the story. The ferryman takes the gold, puts it in his cap, very careful not to lose one gold coin. He drops the gold in the cleft in the cave where the clinking of the gold coins wakes up the green snake who is lying in the cave. She succumbs to a certain degree of vanity and eats the gold coins becoming wonderfully luminous and light and is rather pleased with herself in the beginning. She becomes a radiant beam of light. What conclusions we can draw from this I will leave to you. She eats the gold and becomes, in an unexpected and uncharacteristic way, a little bit vain. But perhaps more importantly these other two beams of light, the will-o-the-wisps, who had crossed in the boat, travel on and come to the house of the old woman. They flatter her to the point that she forgets all kinds of things. She makes lots of excuses when her husband, the old man with the lamp, comes home. She does not even notice that when they dropped their gold coins her dog ate a piece and dies. She does not notice until afterwards. She also succumbs to a certain amount of vanity that has to do with this gold and this light. And these two beings, who have not paid their debt to the ferryman, who have not been able to give him fruits of the earth, transfer their debt to this old woman. The old woman, flattered by the two beams of light, takes on their debt and even says that she will carry the fruits of the earth to the ferryman. She is true to her word and she does this. Then the story unfolds with the repayment of the debt that was precipitated by the gold coins that were not fruits of this earth and could not pay the passage from one side of the threshold to the other. She carries the three artichokes, onions and cabbages and almost steps on the shadow of the giant who takes one of each so she is unable to pay the ferryman in full. She is unable to repay the debt fully to the ferryman. He makes her swear to fulfil her promise to complete the debt by putting her hand in the river, which she does. She is very fond of her hands -indeed, although she's a simple woman her hands are the part of her she loves the most. She puts her hand in the river and it turns black. It shrivels, and so the story goes on. You can see just from these few little images what is unfolding. This first ineffective payment with the gold, the

payment which was refused in crossing from one side of the threshold to the other, is just one little aspect. There will be many stories that we could draw on to illustrate this yeast-like precipitating effect of money on human karma.

I want to turn to another dimension. This has to do with what I would consider the fundamental primary human dynamic that we in our human condition find ourselves in. It has to do with the experience of our self-identity, the experience of self and the experience of other. The experience of my individuality and the "otherness" of the world around me, the community in which I live, represent two polar and fundamental human experiences. This is an essential dynamic in that we can experience a movement between sympathy and antipathy within these poles. Rudolf Steiner approaches this question in many different ways. We experience the community, the "otherness" of the world, and constantly withdraw back into ourselves, into the isolation of ourselves and the experience of our own self-identity as distinct from the other. We continually oscillate between these two experiences of self and other, self and community. We have a sympathetic or "sleeping experience" of this on the one hand. This is an experience for which you could maybe use the word "altruism", when we flow out into the experience of the other person or community. Then there is the sharply awakening experience when we come back into self-experience. This has a necessary dimension of "egoism". This is an egoism that can be expressed in a negative way, but also has an essentially fundamental social purpose. It allows us to make sense of, and bring order to what we have experienced in the "sleeping into" of the other. It is awakening. We oscillate between the experience of egoism and altruism, of self and other, or sleeping and awakening into the other. This is a fundamental rhythm and movement that we constantly experience in the social dynamic in different ways. It is a rhythm that is modulated and moderated by the capacity of our ego to bring us into fruitful engagement with ourselves, and to bring us into self-awareness of the other.

We could describe this sociologically as having a three-fold structure. It is often referred to on a micro level, a meso level and a macro level. One could also say that it is an experience of the 'I' or yourself, an experience of the community, school, organism or corporation and the experience of humankind, of mankind, the fellowship of humanity. These are three existential aspects in the fundamental dynamic of "self and world". What we individually experience, what we bring out of ourselves and our work, how we are able to work with and

transform our double in the different aspects that I mentioned before; and the work that comes towards us from the outside, that presses in towards us through the forces that live in this threefold picture – these two elements have their influence in the experience of our own I, in the experience of our community, school, clinic or whatever it might be, and in our perception of larger humankind. In other words, the experience of this threefold picture, of self experience (micro-social), community (meso-social) and humanity (macro-social) is altered continuously through both the “old” karma, and the “new” karma – what comes with me, so to speak, and what I am able myself to transform. It is constantly developing. This effects our relationship to money and what it can precipitate as further karma in our lives. It also can lead to the impression that money has karma “per se”, which I believe is incorrect. Money does not have karma in the traditional sense. Human beings have karma.

However, another question is “Does money have ‘beingness’ to it?” Is there a “beingness” element to money? Does the beingness of money begin with a certain size or corpus of money? Is it a relative issue? How can we come closer to this question?

I am reminded of a humorous story I want to share with you. A friend of mine was responsible for the finances and fundraising of a community, and was meeting together with 3 or 4 colleagues. These other colleagues were not responsible for the finances or the practical aspects of the community. They were connected with the cultural life, the free spiritual life. This community had received a moderate sized donation of \$20,000. However, the group that was responsible for the cultural life and festival life was adamant that this money could not be accepted, because it had come from a source that was tainted. It came from a lottery, some sort of gambling system, and was being distributed as a grant to this community. One group insisted saying: “We can’t accept this money! This money is tainted!”. My friend thought for a moment, hearing that the money was “tainted”, and then said to his colleagues: “Yes, you’re right. . . . It t’ain’t enough!”. It’s a funny little story, yet it points to a difficult dilemma because one group was looking at the “origin” of the money and its intangible dimension, whereas the other person was looking at its future application, where and how it could be used. Money and its use and character has a specific time dimension. Its application in this case was going through the crucible of awakening of consciousness.

Let us come back to the question: “Does money have beingness?”

The question of what justifies its beingness opens questions for me. It is a discussion point for us. I have wondered if someone who is working with large sums of money, 5 million or maybe 30 million, has the feeling of an independent dimension of the money itself. What is the impact of that? Does it have a characteristic or power that is inherent, and that builds over time. Is it corrupting, or purifying? Although not karma does it bring an element of beingness? It certainly has shadow sides to it. This is a complex and difficult question.

When we talk about beingness of money you cannot escape the idea that Rudolf Steiner describes of the different qualities of money. He describes one quality of purchase money, or transaction money. This is money that is used in the exchange of goods, in the sphere of time. It comes out of the past and is the least interesting form of the three qualities of money. The second quality is loan money. Here we come into the realm of expectation, of commitment, of engagement. This has to do with the present. But it also has a definitive time limit expectation into the future. It also has a deepening aspect that can enable activities that otherwise would not be able to be created through purchase money. The third quality of money comes through gift money. This is the most productive form of money that exists. It liberates forces of creativity, love and the unexpected, with no sense of immediate return or pay-off. It also has the aspect of regeneration and rejuvenation by allowing aspects to develop without any connections to the past. In this sense it is freeing, and carries an aspect of risk.

I would like to make a distinction between gift money and the activity of giving. The activity of giving has a different name – “philanthropy”. This is a wonderful word and actually means “the love of humanity”. If you look at the history of philanthropy you will see that not so many centuries ago there were many aspects of philanthropy that had nothing to do with money. For example dolphins were considered “philanthropists” because they love the company of human beings and were known to save swimmers that were in trouble. Over time money has been conjoined with the idea of philanthropy, so that “the love of humanity” contained in the word philanthropy, has come to mean money. Money has become the currency of philanthropy. Money has become the currency of love. In the area of gift money through the wonderful, creative force of philanthropy, we have a high ideal that unites us with this freeing aspect of gift money. Through philanthropy – the act of giving, or the act of loving – the gap between the self and the world, between the I and the other, can begin to be unified and bridged. This is

a fundamentally positive aspect of money that can lead humanity forward into its next epoch. It ultimately has to do with the forces of Christ and particularly with the forces of Michael.

In the *Anthroposophical Leading Thoughts*³ you will see that Michael, as the messenger of Christ, enjoins us, in wanting to come to him, to practise love for the outer world. I want to read this to you by way of conclusion. Here Steiner writes a simple sentence "It's only when he loves the world that a man truly experiences himself". Michael is the guide to Christ, the one who attaches himself to Him and cultivates love in relation to the outer world. This love must be unfolded in relationship to the outer world; otherwise it becomes self-love and ultimately destructive. The love of humanity that we can see in philanthropy as a social-spiritual force is a love that can allow us to moderate in the most positive sense between self-love and world-love along the pathway that brings us into the realm of Michael and ultimately into the domain of Christ.

Please take these thoughts as a stimulus for your own additional considerations.

³ *Anthroposophical Leading Thoughts* – Rudolf Steiner Press, 1973, reprint 1985, "The World Thoughts in the Working of Michael and in the Working of Ahriman" (16.11.24) p 100.

Ethical Financialism **A Fast-track to Changing the Way the World is Financed**

Christopher Houghton Budd

There is a growing movement today that goes by the name of ethical or socially responsible investment. Put at its simplest, the idea is that much of modern finance is somehow unethical and that ethical forms of finance are therefore needed.¹ This critique has many facets. For some it is about a string of nots – not to invest in tobacco or in arms, for example. For others, it is about avoiding or minimising interest on the grounds that the charging of interest is anti-social or the result of "scamming" by the financial community.² Others take issue with such matters as the scale of corporate executive pay or the disproportionate power of transnational companies.

All these propositions derive from genuine and particular social concerns, part of a growing sense that we need to be responsible in our use of money and capital. And yet this approach gives rise to two important questions. The first, a matter of principle or ethics, is the no-doubt unintended but nonetheless implicit comment that modern finance is unethical, as, by extension, are those responsible for it – bankers, brokers, financiers, pension fund managers, and so on. The second is the practical problem that the hard and fast compartmentalisation possible in the physical world does not exist in the world of finance. Alluding to impregnable separation, one talks about "fire-walling" one project from another, but this relies on strong discipline; witness the ease with which pension funds have been plundered by companies desperate for cash or needing to support the value of their balance sheets.

¹ In this essay, finance means the provision and/or management of money and capital, money refers to coinage or its equivalent, and capital to investment.

² This argument is often extended to say that money should be issued without an interest charge. This would radically change the socio-economic world as we know it, but perhaps not quite as much for the better as its proponents imagine since a world without interest can also mean a world without the human spirit at work in economic life.

In finance, everything is in flux and money is fungible, meaning it can take various, substitutable forms. For this reason it is virtually impossible to insulate one's money or capital from the worldwide processes they belong to, and which, indeed, they represent. Most "ethical" banks, for example, along with most "ethical" investors, have some of their funds in "unethical" instruments or simply at the bank, where they become one with the generality of finance. Look at the year-end of most 'ethical' banks and you will see they hold reserves in the banking system, even if only because they are forced to do so for regulatory reasons.

Unless one functions entirely with cash, it is a practical impossibility to separate oneself from the wider financial system in which all economic activity is now embedded. Indeed, is it really ethical or responsible to try and do so? Can one change something by avoiding it or change the world by absenting oneself from it? If, as I believe, the challenge we face with regard to finance is to be in but not of this world, it is doubtful that an Essenic attitude will enable us to meet such a challenge.

I do not draw attention to these questions in order to be critical of those who seek a more moral basis for modern finance. Clearly, much of modern finance operates at the limits of what many people regard as social and moral, and any attempt to change this situation merits applause.

My concern is threefold. First of all, to speak of "ethical finance" can suggest that finance is not inherently ethical. Yet, it is precisely because it is ethical and does have inner meaning that we are able to perceive or judge when financial behaviour is aberrant. Secondly, the term can be offensive to finance people, many of whom are as concerned as anyone else about the moral status of modern finance. Moreover, their technical knowledge of the subject makes many criticisms seem ill-informed and counter-productive, since real change in the world of finance needs to go hand-in-hand with technical expertise. Thirdly, while the ethical investment movement may be booming, one can seriously ask whether it is a match for the speed and strength of impact of the fundamental mindset and macro-economic policies that govern modern life, which are the focus of this essay.

For example, today's burgeoning credit (or debt) is unaffected because the ethical movement scarcely touches credit issue or money supply, which are among the more important aspects of today's economic landscape. Similarly, if one considers but two of Rudolf

Steiner's³ own critiques, an ethical investment can as easily continue the practice of "damming capital into land" or of treating labour as a commodity, yet for many in the movement to raise such matters would simply draw blank looks. More critically, given the way the world is going, the ethical movement has had little if any impact on the most crucial of all considerations: the need to understand and organise economic life on the basis of an autonomously (because associatively) conducted single global economy, or the need to rest monetary policy on global bookkeeping, based in turn on the recognition that there are three kinds of money.⁴ Instead, the debate remains couched in terms of state-controlled or market-led approaches to economic life, both of which entail regulatory concepts that act externally on the human being, when what is called for is inherent regulation of the economy based on conscious financial behaviour.

Finally, ethical investment tends to leave untouched what is perhaps the deepest question of all: How is humanity to conduct its economic life to the benefit of all other than by recourse to the concepts of an invisible hand and market forces? Both of these ideas are central to orthodox and alternative economics alike and show the extent to which we are in thrall to economic materialism.

In short, how can the individual play his part, not only in breaking the spell of economic materialism, but in making a day-to-day contribution to problems that we otherwise believe should be left to bankers and politicians? I believe none of these things are possible unless we transform finance from inside by unearthing its inherently spiritual nature and the story this nature has to tell. Without this little will change in terms of world poverty, the militarization of the dollar, the neo-imperialism of Western interests, and a whole raft of related problems.

One can, of course, take the view that the individual is no match for such "big" events in history and that one can do no more than pay attention to one's immediate circumstances by, for example, switching to an "ethical" bank, becoming part of a community-supported agriculture scheme (CSA), or joining a local exchange trading system (LETS). These and any number of similar things are all important contributions, of course, but how realistic is it to think they are having a determining effect on macro-policy?

³ I am assuming Steiner is a "given" for GB readers.

⁴ In German, *Arten*. See Lecture 12, *Economics*, Rudolf Steiner. New Economy Publications: Canterbury, 1996.

Macro-economic policy is becoming more and more estranged from the "right" kind of economic life, meaning an economic life that is inclusive and inherently healthy and not dependent on manipulation or enforcement. Ecological treaties are being ignored, IMF and World Bank policies continue to cause havoc, and money continues to be subverted by governments. Such problems cannot really be addressed until the individual, far from being unable to affect history, wakes up to the fact that he has a historical responsibility in regard to both money and capital. More than that, I believe we need to open up a "fast-track" for changing modern finance, a path that is readily identified and leaves no-one without the opportunity to use it.

Fundamentally, responsibility for money will not be a match for events unless we consciously and directly participate in the historical responsibility we all have – and which only human beings can discharge – to overcome our belief that money is a thing in itself. For it is this idea, as it lives deeply in the human soul, that feeds the main financial feature of our times – the phenomenon of faithless global capital as it works through the world's financial markets. Financialism, or, as Rudolf Steiner put it, money doing business on its own account,⁵ results from the divorce of personality from finance. Overcoming it is not, therefore, about external regulation, and certainly not the creation of global governance.⁶ It is about reconnecting finance with the human being, not now out of his personality, but his deeper sense of and responsibility for macro-economic affairs. Unless we find a way truly to see through this notion of money having value in itself, we cannot begin to touch the problems that surround us. The fast-track is therefore about practical arrangements that require us to rethink our conceptions of money, capital and investment.

Throughout time, the process of becoming *au fait* with and able to represent the larger tasks of human evolution has always been asso-

⁵ *Economics*, op. cit., Lecture 9.

⁶ The idea of global governance to match global economic organisations is gaining ground today (e.g. George Monbiot's recent book, *The Age of Consent – A Manifesto for a New World Order*). This idea contrasts greatly, and even contradicts, Steiner's image of an associatively-conducted, single global economy operating alongside national polities in which the state confines itself to matters of rights (see his book, *The Threefold Commonwealth* (Rudolf Steiner Press, London) and his lectures on economics (*Economics*, New Economy Publications, Canterbury 1996). To anticipate where this argument will lead, one only needs to ask who will the president of the world be, and what will be the difference between that office and the "prince of this world"!

ciated with initiation. Whereas in the past this was a matter for only a few and took place in a hidden way, today every human being has this possibility. This is what being human really means today.

Moreover, initiation is now a public affair. And it is a central claim of this essay that modern finance is the very medium for so public an event. In the relationships we adopt to money and capital we find the means of self-initiation – that is to say, of cohering our individual will forces with the wider world without infringing human freedom. Indeed, human freedom relies on achieving this; otherwise it is but license or anarchy.

To accept the kind of ideas being put forward here it is necessary not only to see finance as inherently ethical, but to understand it also as an esoteric phenomenon. As I once put it, finance is but the "skin" of spirituality.⁷ I know of no other way to enter into the nature of finance in order to discover there, not only its inner significance, but the means by which its deeper purpose in human history can come to the fore. That is to say, the means by which we can see that it is not market forces that run the world, but the interplay of karmic relationships, and that it is not an invisible hand that ensures all individual acts sum to a social result, but the activation on the part of each individual of his ability to take the interests of others into account, his capacity for higher egoism.

If the content and tenor of my remarks appear brusque, I beg the reader's forbearance. This is but clumsiness in my attempt to wake us up to two facts that mark the gateway to the fast-track of which I speak. Firstly, it is the individual human being that at all times is the agent of financial processes today, not his appointees – his broker, banker, advisor or political representative; secondly, the individual needs a means or medium that will enable him at one and the same time to change both his conception of money and the way in which finance is conducted.

Furthermore, under today's conditions of abstract finance, the idea that money is a thing unto itself is not our only problem. It is related to the fact that thereby the human being absents himself from financial and monetary processes. Financial markets then *appear* to be abstract or remote, but this is not quite the truth. More accurately, they seem thus because they lack the 'presence' of the human being. If we would give modern finance a truly moral basis, therefore, we have to insert the human being at its every stage and moment.

⁷ *Financial Events are Soul Size – An essay prompted by the accounting "creativity" of Enron, Worldcom and many others*. New View, No. 25, October–December, 2002.

Using finance to place the human being at the centre of economic life is what I call "ethical financialism". The term refers to Rudolf Steiner's concept of "ethical individualism", meaning that "to allow the moral intuitive content of the human being to express itself is both the highest moral driving force and the highest motive a man can have..."⁸ and that "the individual is morally barren unless he has moral ideas of his own."⁹

I have invented the term to suggest that, properly understood, finance provides a concrete means to implement ethical individualism and to take us beyond financialism (money doing business on its own account).

If we would grasp both the inner and outer nature of finance in the way I believe Steiner had in mind, we need to understand that economic life has both ethical and practical dimensions. For Steiner, this means we must "enter the retort" and see ourselves as the agents of change. But this is code for taking hold of and transforming our will forces – the central task of our times and the reason we live in an "economic age".

Throughout the ages, this task has required strict inner discipline and guardianship. Today it takes the form of becoming precise in our understanding and use of finance, no more as something abstract, but as the revealer, guide and medium of human will forces, and of the way in which the individual freely finds his place in society.

By integrating ourselves – that is, by cohering our will forces – the world of finance will in turn lose its abstract quality. Not tomorrow, for it did not become abstract just yesterday, but as the start of a long process reaching as far into the future as the present level of abstraction leads us back into the past.

It is crucial to understand that we are at the crossover between the alpha and omega of financial evolution. At this juncture, all the processes of history, including the most sublime, disappear from the world around or outside us, only to reappear within – *if we could (or would) but uncover them*.

This is why it is so untrue to say the human being is not part of or able to have an effect on history. The opposite is true today: history has its source in the human being. Indeed, history today is the future making its presence known. The past has rapidly diminishing importance.

⁸ *The Philosophy of Freedom*. Rudolf Steiner Press, London 1970, p. 134.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

Today it is the ordinary citizen who is the agent of true history, not monarchs, presidents or leaders. What counts from now on is what human beings do, how they conduct themselves, and whether their *own* actions (rather than those of others) have moral content. This is a condition that has never before obtained and it is only intensified in regard to finance.

To be responsible in regard to money is to step into monetary history by giving modern abstract finance a new moral content both in regard to how we understand money and capital and how we organise and use them. For understanding and use are two sides of one coin. To this end, ethical financialism requires that there be no discrepancy between understanding and use, and that both have a historical dimension. Ethical finance is to be applauded in that it means no one can any longer say he has neither opportunity nor possibility to do something "ethical" with his money. But ethical finance needs to become ethical financialism if we are to get to grips with the background issues that, in my view, are the real drivers of modern finance and the "origin" of its amorality.

The difference between ethical finance and ethical financialism is that ethical finance still uses national money and is therefore part and parcel of debt-based and government-manipulated finance, where monetary policy is predicated on a unitary or undifferentiated concept of money and where financial processes are not thought to begin with the individual human being. It is also thereby linked to notions of abstract economic growth and merely external quantitative assessments of corporate performance, and subject to conditions in which inflation lurks at every corner and the cover of money remains uncertain. Moreover, because we persist in preferring national economic perspectives, the true nature of today's economic life (one-world economy) goes unrecognised, delivering us into the hands of financial markets – a world, as Thomas Friedman once described it, in which there is "no one at the end of the phone."¹⁰

To move from ethical finance to ethical financialism we need to find a fast-track means of giving expression to a quite different economic landscape. We need to give expression to the fact that globality now obtains and that this calls for autonomous and associative conduct of economic life and predicated on three kinds of money (not one). This is the sure sign of a world in which both money and capital are issued by

¹⁰ *Quit Whining! Globalisation isn't a Choice*. New York Times, September 1997.

those who undertake economic activity, which is potentially every human being, not banks or governments.

How can the individual make a direct link to such a world? By organising his own affairs as a microcosm of it! Moreover, he can do this by using the very medium that modern finance offers for this purpose – accounting. Not accounting in its dry and technical yet superficial aspect as used to report to shareholders or the tax man, but in the deeper sense in which accounting can order human experience out of its own logic. For example, why is it that a balance sheet has this name? Why should every debit have a credit? Why should assets and liabilities match? We accept these things as technical facts, but it is worth pondering why they are ineluctable “givens” that we cannot escape, the very means, indeed, by which we can recognise aberrant financial behaviour?

I do not mean to answer these questions; yet they are not merely rhetorical. My hope is to cause pause for thought. If we can enter into the inner meaning of accounting – and the only way is to organise our own actions in its terms – then we will find ourselves at the start of the fast-track to change. Fast, because the world we seek lies before us as an open book. We do not need to create it. We have only to give it credence and align our behaviour with its logic.

Just as the eye is made by the light for the light, so accounting – in the sense I am meaning it – serves as a medium by which we can enter into the nature of finance and thereby effect change. I know of no other way at one and the same time to overcome our thralldom to the idea that money is a thing in itself and to place the human being at the centre of financial processes.

Space does not allow me to rehearse in detail why I consider accounting to have this role. For the background to this, I would refer the reader to an article I recently wrote jointly with two Swiss colleagues.¹¹ The gist of that article was that accounting has three elements – income and expenditure accounts, balance sheet, and closing entries – and that this threesome is important for three main reasons discussed immediately, and a fourth which I will discuss later.

Firstly, the threefold structure of accounting, even in its simplest expression, gives the human being day-to-day access to the logic that lies behind it, provided, of course, he keeps his accounts and wants to

¹¹ *From Hibernia to Globalisation: Towards a spiritual scientific understanding of modern economic events*. Christopher Houghton Budd, Marc Desaulles and Anita Grandjean. New View, No. 13, Autumn 1999.

understand the why and wherefore of doing so. In other words, that he wants to use his accounts as an instrument for consciousness.

Secondly, the three elements of accounting can be linked to Steiner's idea of three *kinds* of money – purchase, loan and gift – but also, in my view, to the classic Anglo-Saxon concept of three *functions* of money – means of exchange, store of value and unit of account.

Thirdly, accounting therefore also provides three crucial bridges: from the individual to the deeper background of economic life, from Steiner's ideas to prevailing Anglo-Saxon orthodoxies, and from individual economic activity to macro-economic policy.

For there can be no doubt that to organise one's affairs in the light of the threefold nature of accounting will create a tension between all that stands behind such an approach and the current way of doing business and working with finance, which relies totally on an undifferentiated understanding of money and on rivalry,¹² meaning a struggle always between two elements (not three) – supply and demand, bonds and stocks, domestic and foreign inflation, and so on.

This tension is only heightened if one takes seriously the fact, just mentioned, that in reality it is the author of economic activity that issues money and capital. What, then, is one to make of concepts and arrangements that say, “No, this is the task of banks and governments”? This is just one example I could give to underline my argument that ethical financialism gives historical wings to the economic actions of individuals.

The fourth reason I wish to mention is that the threefold structure of finance, whether close-to in accounting or distant in the global financial architecture of trade, capital and central banks, is a reflection of the threefold being of man. If we would master thinking, feeling and willing, we need to become distinct from all three, so that they appear to disintegrate and operate anarchically. Reintegrating them is then a task of conscious ego hood. This is, of course, the quintessential nature of crossing the threshold, the condition that Rudolf Steiner clearly describes as the underlying reality of modern history.¹³

In that finance reflects this we have, therefore, a means to make this underlying reality conscious to ourselves and a means, moreover, whereby each individual can come abreast in the full light of day of this otherwise unconscious condition in which, as humanity, he finds himself.

¹² The word derives from the two banks of a river.

¹³ See *World History in the Light of Anthroposophy*, Rudolf Steiner Press, London.

By "fast track" I mean waking up as individuals to humanity's situation and becoming representative of it. It is because humanity has crossed the threshold that finance has become the force it has, that such non-perceptible notions as an invisible hand and market forces have such plausibility in a culture that professes to be rational, and that we feel our lives to be directed from outside. If we would that things were otherwise, we need to catch up with history, especially financial history, by ourselves crossing the threshold through the way we do business. I know of no other way, in social fact, whereby we can make ourselves the masters of finance and not its servants.

The Human Being between Globalisation and Genetic Engineering?

Nicanor Perlas

The human being is increasingly being treated as a commodity, as a sort of "product" between genetic engineering and globalisation. In that context we are going to take a look at how from these two aspects, in a sense, the human being is actually being reformed or transformed. This has very deep implications in terms of the nature of the human being, and the dignity of the human being.

In this connection there is a very interesting book, by Francis Fukuyama. He wrote a book about 12 years ago, and a second just a few months ago. In an interesting way the first book is connected with globalisation and the second, recent, book is connected with "genetic engineering" and its impact on the human being. The title of the first book is *The End of History* and the second book *Our Posthuman Future* has to do with the Biotechnological Revolution. In the first book, which appeared after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, Fukuyama was saying that actually humanity has reached the end of history. It was the end of history because the battle between capitalism and communism had ended with the victory of capitalism. And that process then unleashed a whole set of developments which spread throughout the world and we are now all having to deal with the results of this kind of "End of History". Because the "End of History" accepts the capitalistic system as the superior system around the world.

Then what happened is that the GATT agreement was actually transformed into the WTO agreement. GATT was the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It was first established in 1947 and there were several rounds where it was amended and then in 1994 the WTO agreement was concluded, approved and established in 1995. What is important here is the connection with the sense of the "End of History" and of the emergence of capitalism as the organising principle of the world economy. Because that is the direction in which the United States very strongly pushed (in co-operation with Europe, with Japan, and

Canada) the World Trade Organisation – the WTO. They were in the middle of a negotiation to actually change the GATT in the so-called Uruguay Round. And this Round was not going anywhere because at that time it was still being negotiated during the Cold War. Then at the end of the so-called Cold War, there was only one system, and the feeling was – now the process of negotiation can be accelerated to increase the hold of capitalism over all the world.

Inside the WTO this agreement is called the General Agreement on Trade in Services. The process of negotiation has now started, and they expect to come to a kind of preliminary agreement next year and hope to end the negotiations by 2005 or maybe even earlier. In terms of that agreement, it actually means the total take-over, basically of all forms of public services by corporate control, or turning public services into business. So what this means is that education will become a totally “for profit” operation; health will become a “for profit” operation; everything including child care, care of the elderly, handicapped; all such service will now become a “for profit” operation. You may be familiar with this so I don’t want to go into great detail, but just to say that practically all the services are now open to competition. For example they are eyeing education, as education is a 6 trillion-dollar industry from their perspective.

Some initial privatisation of services is now starting to occur, not only in Europe but also in other parts of the world. Maybe you have heard of the scandals of the HMO Health Management Organisation in the US, when they started to privatise their health services. What that means in the health-care process, is that the human being becomes basically a commodity. Because in the logistics of such operations the tendency is to put in place certain standards of efficiency, standardisation of procedures, which in health-care practice you cannot do if you want to make sure that you are understanding the individual sickness, and illnesses of human beings.

I have two brothers who are medical doctors and when I ask them, “Is it possible to treat according to an economic principle?” They say, “This is going to be a very big constraint, because the illnesses of people are not the same, even if you have the same diagnosis.”

If this is the human being (Blackboard Diagram) under this process of GATS, which is part of the whole of the trade agreements, we begin to see one part of this pressure. Now it’s interesting that on the other side, while this is going on, we have the phenomenon of genetic manipulation of all living things; plants, animals and human beings. So

in this genetic manipulation of human beings there are of course discussions about the cloning of human beings. In fact there was a major battle last year in the US about the cloning of stem cells, which appear in the early stages of human reproduction. Of course you have some scientists who are announcing that in a certain kind of laboratory they are going to do human cloning, despite the fact that it may still be prohibited. Anyone familiar with the history of agriculture and medicine will know that for a long time in their history the two were connected. Whatever technology they have been able to develop with animals, it is only a short time before the same technology could be applied to humans.

Being a biologist by background I have no doubt of the capacity, already today, to actually clone human beings. They have already succeeded in cloning many different kinds of mammals especially farm animals, pigs, cows, etc. Now in the book about the “biotechnological revolution”; written by the same author who wrote *The End of History* he is now saying that he made a mistake. He said, when he wrote the book *The End of History*, he underestimated the rapid development of technology. His first book was mainly concerned with political and economic history and the battle between two different economic and political systems, the capitalistic and communistic systems.

Because he was focussed on the economic and political, he was not seeing the rapid development of science and technology which basically are in the cultural realm of society. These are cultural activities that are being increasingly appropriated by economic powers. So he is saying his mistake was that we need to conceive of a different kind of end of history. The kind of end of history that we must consider is that of the end of the human being, as we know the human being to be. In other words what we know as the “normal” human being that we are familiar with; he has already seen the trends that in the future this human being that we know is going to become designed – it will be designed to be different. In this design process, with organ replacement, cloning and so on, piece by piece, the human being that we know today and the human being of the future will no longer be the same. And when that break occurs, that is actually the moment of the “End of History” – the history of the human being we know.

But this process that is going to redesign the human being, is actually part of a larger process. From the side – (Blackboard Diagram) which actually effects the physical structure of the human being, and through that the non-physical aspects of the human being – we can see

that there are two other developments which are going to combine with biotechnology to accelerate the development of a new form of human being. These two other technologies will combine with "genetic engineering" to actually create a new form of human being. One development is information technology, especially artificial intelligence. And the other is nanotechnology, the technology of engineering at the level of the molecule, that is, one billionth of a metre small. These three technologies are being fused today and the first applications will be in medicine. The coming together of what they call nano-, bio-, info- technology. Another name for it is Singularity. They are trying to achieve a science of singularity. They are attempting to create for example the fusion of the living and the non-living.

In this coming together of the living and the non-living they are starting to create the basis for computer chips that are made up of living and non-living matter. They are using the structure of DNA which can self-replicate. This will allow information to be stored like a silicon chip but it is now a protein molecule instead of a silicon chip, so it can start replicating itself. Out of this, as only one area of application, (they see many areas of application) but out of this area, they hope to seek in medicine the redesigning of the immune system of the human being by releasing what they call nano-robots into our blood stream.

Some of these so called "Nanobots" have applications in medicine, but also in computers. In the radical leap of miniaturising the computer, they predict in 8 years there will be no computer screens but that the iris of your eye will, like contact lenses, become the computer screen, so that through these methods of radical miniaturisation you can actually surf the Internet. And this is really weird, if you are able to inject this into your body; you will actually enter, in terms of virtual reality, into the Internet. I am not sure if they are creating this in Europe, but there are very rapid developments in the United States.

There is a very important article on this that has generated a lot of debate and a lot of concern. It appeared in *Wired* magazine, a kind of equivalent to *Time* magazine in the area of advances in the computer world. It is "The" magazine to read concerning emerging technologies and the debate surrounding them. In that magazine an article appeared which became the most controversial article in the life of this magazine, which reaches over a million people. Bill Joy, the chief scientist of Sun micro-systems, wrote. Before the new technologies, that fuelled the so-called new economy, collapsed in terms of speculative technologies, Sun micro-systems was emerging to be larger than Microsoft. Because the

scientists there understand the computer not as a personal computer or laptop: for them the computer is all the interconnections of all the computers of the world into one. And they were creating a system that one can say could become the emergence of a global brain.

One of the key people around that concept, making it a reality is, Bill Joy, and he wrote this article, I think 2 years ago – "Why the future does not need us", i.e. human beings. In that article he warned about this singularity, this coming together of three radical technologies, in which each one on its own, is equivalent to the industrial revolution. So this coming together will change the face of humanity. And he said that the development of these technologies today is equivalent to the discovery of the possibility of creating atomic power. He was comparing the two periods of history with the discovery of the Atom bomb. For those who know the history of the first fission, (the first bomb that was created and exploded) – the scientists at that time did not know whether that first bomb was actually going to explode the earth. They did not know whether the chain reaction would continue beyond the bomb itself.

Bill Joy's concern is that if you start releasing very small robots, sometimes smaller than a bacteria, then it is not clear, when they mutate, whether they can be contained and what new combinations they will actually create – not only in the environment but also inside the human system. In the new medicines of the future there will be new pills, and when you take a pill you will be ingesting millions of these nano-robots into your blood stream. So in terms of Fukuyama and the "End of History" following the logic of that "End of History" to this new time, we are now seeing a different "End of History" with the arrival of singularity.

We can call this movement a kind of "End of History – first revision". From the original political, economic conception of the end of history, into the end of history where we are going to be creating a new species of human beings half-machine half-human which may eventually take over the conscious process of human evolution.

One of the first applications, which we can always see with this radical kind of newness, one of the first applications will be medicine, because they will have to justify this kind of creation with the promise of better health for the future of human beings. It is a kind of bargain, in Europe maybe you could call it a "Faustian Bargain" where you don't know whether for your health you are actually exchanging your humanity. It has now reached that point – this is a very radical development in technology.

Where are the boundaries in our search for ever increasing health? We may have the health but we may no longer be human in the fullest sense of the word? This is the kind of slippery slope that humanity is on today. Incidentally what may seem to be two separate developments are interconnected. Under the same WTO, inventions are also protected by so-called TRIPS the Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights where you can patent that technology even if the patent includes cloning technologies.

There is a very interesting provision in GATS which will allow the further integration (of this side – Blackboard diagram) of the direct manipulation of the human form, with the social side, which allows profit to be made out of the degradation of the human being. What we have presently as the means of our social structure, allows some form of debate and regulation, for example on the applications of genetic technology. But under GATS that kind of oversight of technology, or any other kind of service that is privatised and placed in the corporate sector will be removed. There is a principle there that says once a country is inside of GATS, the government cannot do anything to favour any domestic process when it is faced with competition from corporations from the outside that are coming into the country.

One can say that a social condition is being created that facilitates the direct transfer of control of radical medical technology (and other forms of technologies) into the control – not of the people in that state – even that is already problematic – but into the direct control of corporations, of business interests who are going to create these new products.

Here we begin to encounter another version of the “End of History” that is way beyond what Fukuyama talks about but which is the complement of this slide towards technologically designing the human being. We need to understand that GATS and the WTO are just part of a larger process. For GATS and WTO are part of the process that we are calling “Elite Globalisation”. This is the kind of globalisation which is being practised whether you have GATS or not. It is already taking place in many areas around the world. I don’t know what the situation is in Germany, but colleagues in Scandinavia for example, are saying that in preparation for GATS for the eventual privatisation and commodification of services, they are starting to dismantle state support for education. Under GATS if there is any form of subsidy, for any educational system, for any health clinic, that subsidy is illegal, so it has to be dismantled. This kind of Elite Globalisation has either a direct

impact on the human being, or an indirect impact through GATS, and there is yet another side to this.

That is the concept of commodifying everything. We have here a situation where people’s thinking and consciousness are being prepared to accept commodification and at the same time you have a structural system that actually commodifies.

Now after September 11th, this process has intensified to a degree which is almost incredible. This elite globalisation process, and the developments in gene technology, have been joined by two more large-scale global processes, and these two other processes which join the kind of economic agreements that are being put into place can be called by two names.

One name, being used inside the US itself, is called US Unilateralism. What this basically means is that after the Cold War the tendency of the United States is to make decisions while ignoring what other people in other countries think. Take for example the recent European conflict with the US in the Kyoto Protocol on global warming. In that treaty, where the US was formally a founding negotiator in the Treaty, the Bush Presidency actually removed the US from the Kyoto Protocol and removed the signature.

Another key example, which is deeply connected to what we are discussing, is the Convention on Biological Diversity. It is very interesting that a Convention that is legal has a different definition of intellectual property than the WTO. In a certain sense this Convention actually weakens the WTO, but the US again did not sign this treaty because it said this is disadvantageous to the biotechnological industry of the US. What is interesting is that for almost 10 years the US sat negotiating this Convention even though it was not a member of the Convention itself. It is difficult to understand how that is possible, and how other ministers of other countries can accept that, but this is just one of dozens of examples of such things going on all the time and it is deeply affecting negotiations at the WTO.

One last example I cannot resist, as this just happened recently in Bali in preparation for the World Summit on Sustainable Development:

The WTO and the World Summit Agenda 21 Documents have two different concepts of scientific risk. According to Global Agenda 21, if there is a possibility of a risk, even though the probability is small, but the risk is great – for example global warming – then what is at-work is the so-called Precautionary Principle. This says do not do this thing which may cause great harm to humanity if you are unsure of the out-

come. That is the Agenda 21 Principle. But this principle clashes with the WTO principle of the pytho-sanitary standards, of harmonisation to the lowest level of scientific risk standards. In the WTO the country concerned about the health, or scientific impact will have to scientifically prove that risk is there. This is the opposite of the precautionary principle. Around two weeks ago, in Bali Indonesia, the US bracketed the Precautionary Principle that has already been operating for 10 years. They said, "We do not agree with this principle". Not only that, they were trying to align the Agenda 21 closer to the WTO regulations.

There is a third manifestation of what has been used to describe the world after the Cold War, and this goes by the name of the Clash of Civilisations. According to this concept there is going to be a battle for supremacy between the civilisations. Huntington who wrote the book *The Clash of Civilisations*, said that the way in which we identify ourselves is in relation to those whom we hate. He said that this was one of the characteristics of Western Civilisation. This is now operative, in terms of the whole turn to the right in some Governments and in connection with relationships between different ethnic groups around the world. Of course the biggest example of this is September 11th as this then "justified" a new expression of US Unilateralism.

This was the third element of a baleful convergence: on the one hand you have a singularity occurring in the realm of technology which is going to eradicate the human being we know. Then on the social side, elite globalisation is attacking the economic, political and cultural aspects of world affairs. Finally we have a kind of social singularity where this economic globalisation process, US unilateralism process in the political life, and the "clash of civilisations" produce a kind of world disorder that starts justifying the self-definition of the United States as an Empire. Incidentally the term is not coming from me, it's coming from the highest official levels in the US and England. There is a widespread debate going on in the United States, as to whether the US is a Republic, is going to remain a Republic or is going to become an Empire. There is also an echo of this discussion in Britain where the chief policy advisor to Blair is actually arguing for a new Imperialism, the necessity for a new "Humane Imperialism". It created quite a controversy because Blair endorsed this thinking. So interestingly, while this debate was going on there were 300,000 people in the streets of Washington DC last April and very few if any newspapers picked up on it although this was one of the largest demonstrations in the United States.

The question is, whether it truly emerges consciously in the policy debate that USA will become an empire. It is acting de facto as an empire with the policy of US Unilateralism. But here what you are seeing is unconscious behaviour – de facto – the other is conscious acceptance that it is acting as an empire. Thus we have a further revision of the concept of the End of History but now on a different plane. If the US decides consciously to act as, and to create its policies as empire, then it will mean the End of History, in terms of what we know of Empires of the past.

All empires of the past had limitations. If you look at the Roman empire although it was very large, it was limited in extent. And at the time of its existence it had a competing empire in China for example. The Mongolian empire was very large, had China, had Russia, had parts of Europe for a while, but it was still only in Euro-Asia. We can say the same of the European empires of the past. They were large, powerful, but limited and had competing empires. But what we're seeing in terms of the US empire, is one empire that actually encompasses the world, has no real competitors, that is historically unknown. So it is also not surprising that the programme called "Star Wars" has been accelerated. This is known. You can see it in the website of NASA: it is explicitly described there that by the year 2020 there will have been developed the capability to militarise outer space. If previous empires had intelligence and military systems that encompassed their Empire, the US empire will create a system of monitoring, reconnaissance and actual strikes, using laser and guns, nuclear weapons to maintain what would be their control around the world. Of course this is a certain kind of tendency, and while moving in that direction today, it is not yet established.

Before we take a look at the social forces that are actually resisting this whole development, I would like to look at this picture one more time but from a different point of view. We can see that as individual human beings we are in a sense being redesigned from two sides. From the health perspective we can only see an aspect of this. We can only see aspects of genetic manipulation taking place and aspects of the increasing commodification of medicine. What is important to know is that the GATS and genetic engineering are both embedded in larger technological processes. Scientific technological processes on the one hand, and on the other hand global societal processes. These aspects are interwoven, and threaten to suppress the human being from both sides. So what does that actually mean for those among us who would like to address this problem? It means that we need to find a response that is as

comprehensive and integrated as the kind of development that is taking place today. Some of these developments are co-ordinated – some not.

We may be addressing one aspect but we have to be sure, if we are a global movement, that the different problems are being addressed, otherwise we may stop this GATS, but may create new expressions of the same thing. A good example is MAI, (the Multi-lateral Agreement on Investment). This was defeated by global civil society, by social movements which resisted this. This was defeated. Even aspects of the WTO process were delayed in the Battle of Seattle and other battles around the world. But it is really interesting that shortly after those two defeats MAI 1998, then Seattle 1999, GATS was re-created and argued as another venue to achieve the same things as were previously attempted in MAI: they now find a new expression. So what is required of the different social movements who were very active? They are actually the only forces today that can really contend with this problem. They will now need to develop a more sophisticated strategy, and networking, to actually stop the whole area of concern – to actually stop this whole development. What I mean to say in saying stop means street demonstrations, or specifying alternatives like in the World Social Forum, or by whatever means. Those means need to see the totality and the threat the human being today is placed under. So what does this mean, the new approaches, as well as the integration of approaches, for civil society movements or the social movements who are active today in resisting this at the individual, local, national levels and global levels? What does it mean to really address this problem? What it means is that first one has to make sure that in the process of resistance, and of questioning, that we actually question all the facets that are laid out before us. It doesn't mean that we have to do everything as a social movement, what it does mean is that we need to create channels of communication, collaboration, alliances, whatever forms of coalition, to ensure that those active in the different areas of concern are meeting and speaking with each other. The individuals and institutions that are promoting these developments i.e. elite globalisation are in touch with each other. They talk; they meet in forums like the World Economic forum and all kinds of different forums to discuss together. In some of these forums, and I have attended some of these from the inside, are the people who like this "End of History" kind of world. They don't really like each other very much, they are in fact competitors in the market but they are sure about a few things, which perpetuate the system.

In the new kind of activism, that will address this question, one of

the first things necessary is a kind of integrated resistance. Integrated in terms of perspective, in seeing the whole and how this is moving and creating conditions that are really highly problematic for the future of this planet. Resistance is very valuable, it delays, it creates spaces for free movement, but it is only the first step. Many activists, individuals and social movements around the world recognise this and this is why they created the World Social Forum.

The resistance process has been successful to a large extent in terms of stopping but not really transforming. But now they are being asked, "what do you really want?" Do you really have alternatives? In the area of health, what is the alternative to materialistic medicine, or medicine that commodifies the human being? One has to speak, for example, about "What is your economic alternative to competitive neo-liberal economics?" In the World Social Forum there is the banner saying "We want an Economics of Solidarity". But the question is "What are the actual details of that?"

That is not a criticism, it only means we need to be able to demonstrate alternative modes of being, across a wide spectrum of human needs and for the future of humanity. There are thousands of alternatives out there and it is now a matter of intensifying these alternatives while at the same time defending social space from further control. We have to defend not only social space on the side of the economy, but social space in human consciousness from further control and erosion. These two strategies are related and actually help each other. But then these are also only aspects, or a part of a complete approach of addressing this problem.

One major question in connection with the US empire relates to Europe not having really found a strong answer yet. If one reads the documents that come out from the US side of the analysis, a major concern is that no competing empire to the US will come out in the region of what you call Eurasia. The geopolitical strategists in the US realise from the study of history that many of the empires of history have come from Eurasia. So their strategy is to contain the possible alliance of Russia and China or India and China – all possible combinations arising from Eurasia.

They want to create control points in the west of Eurasia; – i.e. Europe: in the east of Eurasia – i.e. Japan; and East Asia, and the south – i.e. India, Pakistan, that whole middle region as a containment process to a competing empire. What does this mean, for those who want a different world, and those who are active in the social movements? A

process is starting in the US, from the citizens, from civil society from the social movements; they are starting to ask what kind of America do we want? Do we want to retain a different and new conception of a republic? Or are we going to allow a small group of political and economic leaders to turn the US into the US Empire? This part of the discussion process has now started and is continuing in the US. Aside from that strategy of creating a lack of consensus within the United States by Civil Society, the next most important strategy as far as the US strategists are concerned, is preventing the emergence of a clear vision in Europe. Because if there is a clear vision of what Europe is and what it wants to do then that can create a counterbalance to what is emerging in the United States.

I understand historically that that is a very difficult question here in Europe, and it is precisely because of this difficulty that it is much easier for an aggressive US policy to start shaping Europe. Observe what is on the agenda of the Danish leadership of the EU (Denmark is going to be the president starting July.). What is the agenda of the EU under the Danish presidency? I understand from a recent visit from Denmark that the major agenda is to expand the European Union towards Eastern Europe to include more countries so that it becomes a counterbalance to the US. But there is a certain twist to this. Because if the voices of European citizens and social movements are not heard or effective in this process, you may see a more powerful Europe getting integrated but as a form of competing empire. Or it can be a kind of empire that relates to the United States where they try to find a kind of joint-leadership but without really addressing the fundamental problems that are created by both systems. The situation is urgent because GATS, if approved, will dismantle the Europe of the twentieth century.

If you study European history, the kind of social forms created in Europe were to a large extent responding to the excesses of capitalism. Of course in the present time in the globalised world this is creating its own internal problems. But there is a greater understanding in Europe of a kind of social economy versus a pure capitalist economy than there is in the United States. So a basic question for Europe is, will it be able to find its voice in the world? – A kind of voice that questions these types of (neo-liberal) economic developments in the world. This is really a key and burning question because at this point the expansion of the United States' power is dependent upon what happens inside the US, and upon what happens between the US and Europe. In that definition of this relationship, what the social movements of civil society in Europe and

around the world have to say, and how they organise themselves to say it, will also become critical.

What is at stake is not just a battle over GATS or over genetic engineering. What is at stake is the constitution of what kind of planet, or world we want in the twenty-first century. If we do not effectively answer the question, then humanity as a whole will be faced with two kinds of endings of history. The end of the history of human beings as we know them, and the end of the history of humanity, of civilisation, as we know it. The future is not determined; it depends on how we act today to change the situation. I hope that we are actually going to act.

¹ This article is based on a public lecture given by Nicanor Perlas at the University of Tuebingen, 19th June, 2002.

Threfolding or Global Governance?¹

Christoph Strawe

Translated by Ulrich Morgenthaler

Governance – a New Keyword // Dissolving the Old Community // Individualization = Egotism? On Mistrusting the Human Being // Individualisation and Cultural Power // Globalisation and Modern Economy // The New Role of the State // Archetypal Phenomena of Threfolding // Conditions for a Culture of Trust // What Kind of Governance Do We Need? // Threfolding – a Promising Governance Approach for the Future? // In Search of New Political Forms and Structures // The Threfolding Movement – Tasks and Opportunities

Governance – a New Keyword

How can we meet the challenge of globalisation? – Wherever this question is raised, again and again the concept of “global governance” comes up. Although it has hitherto hardly played any role in media dominated public opinion it is a key concept for the future. “Governance” according to dictionaries means: to govern, rule, power of government, sway, power, control, form of government – and thus one is easily led to think of a world-government, which takes the lawless space under its control that has been created by globalisation and which cannot be handled by the nation states. Thus an institution or institutional layer of administration that creates legal forms, meets international crime through a world domestic policy, confines the profit interests of the global players through a world social policy.

¹ The text is the elaboration of a lecture, held in a conference with Nicanor Perlas and Michael Baumann in the forum 3, Stuttgart, 11 March 2001. It was published in German in the circular Threfolding of the Social Organism, No.3 / 2001. The circular is published by the Initiative Network Threfolding, Haußmannstr. 44a, D-70188 Stuttgart, E-Mail BueroStrawe@t-online.de, Internet www.sozialimpulse.de // www.threfolding.net.

That there are powers or forces that dream the dream of world government is not questioned. However the point is, that governance is normally understood as a policy approach for problems on global or regional levels in the absence of a world government. Some quotations will make this clearer:

Under-Secretary Ischinger of the German State Department explained: "In a certain way the classical nation state has surely lost policy authority, i.e. power. Today no state in the world, however powerful it may be, not even the US, holds the monopoly of competence for the solution of global problems. However what is required is not a "renaissance" of the nation state's monopoly of power, nor even an utopian world government. What is much more needed is successful "global governance", that is the creation of a new kind of policy structure or structural framework among all stakeholders in globalisation. A clear example is the search for ways to structure the immensely large flows of money which are daily transferred around the globe in such a way as to avoid regional or even worldwide financial crises."²

German Secretary of State Fischer at the UN assembly: "[...] with the jump into the next millennium the principle of the nation state will continue to lose relevance. It will no longer be possible to find answers to the large global problems within the framework of the classical nation states but only within a strengthened international structure and through a power transfer to international organisations, at their head the UN, a transformation of classical power into justice, a balance of interests and a civilisation of the international political system together with an ever stronger integration of civil society stakeholders and businesses. [...] The United Nations have to become the core of an effective global governance."³ In the work programme of the Governance White Paper of the European Commission one can read: "For a number of years now the term 'governance' is has been used in various contexts. An important United Nations report on 'global governance' has emphasized the necessity of rules, by means of which *even without the existence of a world government* (emphasis added by the author) a consensus can be reached, which then can be globally and

² "Globalisation and German Foreign Policy". A contribution to a panel discussion at the EXPO on 17 October 2000. Published as pdf-file in the internet-archive of the German State Department (look under www.auswaertiges-amt.de).

³ Speech by German Secretary of State Joschka Fischer at the 54th general assembly of the United Nations on September 22nd 1999 in New York. Source: Internet-Archive of the German State Department (look under www.auswaertiges-amt.de).

effectively applied. [...] 'Governance on several levels' means that public stakeholders that are independent of each other cooperate on various geographical levels to realize common goals." "With 'governance' the emphasis also includes cooperation among subordinated and non-governmental stakeholders." These should be integrated into the decision-making processes of the community.⁴

In these three representative statements the term "governance" is used with a particular nuance of meaning, as in the concept of "good governance", meaning a state under the rule of law with a citizen-friendly kind of administration. The history of global governance encompasses thus not only the emergence of institutions like the UN and the IMF, but also the founding of the "Red Cross" in 1863, the World Postal Service Society in 1874 and the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in 1919.

It is important to have all this in mind in order to see clearly what is characteristic in the phenomena we have to deal with today. Certain critical remarks, which Rudolf Steiner as founder of the idea of social threefolding made about Wilson's League of Nations, his warnings against attempted global dominance, have to be understood and interpreted in their concrete historical context, and cannot be interpreted as a vote against any form of governance. In the same way it would of course be missing the mark, if without reflection we took today's concepts of governance as a contribution to the development of threefolding simply because the idea of tri-sectoral partnership – i.e. the integration of nongovernmental stakeholders coming from business and civil society – plays a role there. "Threefolding or global governance" – in this formulation the "OR" can mean an excluding alternative, but could also be the expression of a similarity.

To find a sound answer to the question of the relationship between governance and threefolding, the concept of threefolding should not simply be taken for granted. Because "what is known is not necessarily also understood⁵", and especially he who has become aware of threefolding will continuously have to try to deepen his/her understanding. Threefolding is not a finished product but the answer to a reality with whose further changes it also has to go through trans-

⁴ "To deepen Democracy in Europe", Commission of the European Community. A white paper or handbook on "governance" for the European Union. Work programmes. Work document of the departments of the commission. Brussels 11th October 2000, SEK (2000) 1547/7 endg. The document has been placed on the internet by the EU server.

⁵ Georg Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel, foreword to the second edition of *Science of Logic*.

formations. It is a working approach, not a doctrine. So what is the inner core of threefolding?

Dissolving the Old Community

The reality in which we live today bears the hallmarks of "individualization" and "globalisation". Humanity's past is characterized by hierarchical cultural and social relations, by the submission of the individual to the community. At the same time economic life was orientated to a large degree towards self-sufficiency. Subsequent developments have led to the reversal of this situation: just as everyone increasingly feels that he or she is "a human being for him/herself", different from all others, an economic and communicative network of dependencies between people – based on technology – has developed, covering the whole globe. Both are due to the development of consciousness, to the development of the individual spiritual potential of human beings: technological progress and the independent individual come from the same source.

Until the beginning of our time the large majority of human beings were in a state of relative immaturity. This meant that legitimated elite groups, irrespective of how that legitimation occurred, thought and acted for them in a way that guided communal life hierarchically from top to bottom. Although first attempts at independent thinking and preliminary forms of democracy had already developed in antiquity, only in modern times, and in the fullest sense only with the French Revolution, did human beings start "en masse" to shape their own history. In doing so they still had to face the old thinking wanting to guide them from the top down, which is still alive within society's institutions, but they also had to face the tendency in themselves to fall back into the state of immaturity out of inner weakness and laziness.

In former times communities had been relatively unified formations enclosed in themselves of which a last remnant of form has maintained itself until today in the uniformity of the nation state. Two impulses towards emancipation led to the dissolving of this old unified formation and to a quest for totally new social forms, to a need for reform "from the bottom up".

The individual emancipates from all old bonds, emerges in this respect from the (old) community, demands autonomy and freedom, and rejects top-down interference.

Parallel to that the economic life, based on modern technology, overcomes all territorial and nation state limitations.

From these tendencies results thirdly a necessity for the countries to adjust and reshape their legal structures.

These three movements, whose effects for the social structure are reflected in threefolding, will now be looked at more closely:

Individualization = Egotism? On Mistrusting the Human Being

The emancipation of the individual (individualization) is at first a negation of community, because one cannot become a self-reliant human being, if one does not free oneself from bonds and distance oneself. "I-Consciousness" emerges out of the rejection of the "Non-I". However with growing self-confidence, egotism also results, endangering human communal life and the natural conditions of life.

Thus comes about the first and basic question of how to shape society, which once having emerged will never disappear from human history again: the question of how to make freedom and society compatible.

Obviously the answer to this question depends upon the extent to which one trusts the human being and this again depends on the understanding one can attain about the human being per se.

Anyone who mistrusts the human being will see individualization – which for him can only be a synonym for the working of egoism – simply as a danger to community. He will therefore, in the interest of this community place limitations on the principle of the freedom of the individual and will want to limit it to the private sphere. In social life however he will want to channel that which is individual, or where this is not possible, will want to suppress it through regulations.

This attitude has however also resulted in phenomena such as weakness in judgement, reluctance to carry responsibility and ego-addiction in the western dominated culture of our time. From other cultures, for instance Asia, the reproach is raised that individualization in the West has gone too far, and one should not pursue this path further but should rather re-orientate to the still existent traditional community values in these cultures.

Understandable as this point of view is, one could equally argue that the development of individual freedom in the West has not yet gone far enough. This point of view can be taken up by those who have come to the experience that liberation from heteronomy is only the first step towards freedom and that freedom only finds its true form where it becomes "freedom to" (F. Nietzsche) – as opposed to mere "freedom from".

With this second level of freedom we are referring to the capacity within the human being – who has become independent – to set goals for himself, by means of which he becomes responsibly active in social life. The fulfilment of freedom doesn't lie in arbitrariness and lack of commitment but rather in self-commitment through freely accepted responsibility. It is easy to see that such an advanced development of freedom will not lead further away from community but into new constitutional forms of community: this happens where independent human beings out of their inner initiative, form task-orientated communities in the various fields of life – for instance in education, healthcare, agriculture etc. Seen in this way, freedom ceases to be a private concern and becomes a social issue; it becomes the prime source of cultural richness in society. At the same time it will become a requirement for society that its structure remain permeable for this source of initiative.

Individualisation and Cultural Power

We speak of culture whenever individual activity and work shape nature. This begins with agriculture and ends in science, art and religion, the core realms of culture. The source of culture is the creativity of the individual human being: "every human being an artist" (Joseph Beuys). This points to a potential in each human being, which will however be opened up to varying degrees and which, through inner or outer circumstances, can be hindered or supported in its unfolding. Each individual holds spiritual forces which as working capacities, as technical or artistic intelligence, flow out into society which would otherwise have to decay. In the core realm of culture these forces of creativity are acted out or nurtured as an end in themselves, whereas in other places they serve the necessities of outer life.

Today this core realm of culture is to a large extent externally governed through the state and the market. Naturally, particularly those people who have already awakened the "artist within themselves" suffer from this heteronomy. Together with Paul Ray one can speak of the "cultural creatives", a qualified minority of initiative-taking and innovative people. He/she who wants to become culturally creative needs autonomy. Autonomy in the sense of self-governance of cultural institutions or initiatives, is the structural condition for cultural creativity. Individuality and therefore pluralism is one of the essential requirements for culture today. In the age of the mature individual, the choice of

school, therapy institution, nutrition, can only be left to the judgement and decision of the individual – under the precondition, that at the same time the same freedom of judgement and action of all people, that is guaranteed under human rights, are observed. (That means at the same time that this freedom includes the solidary form of financing of health care or education).⁶

It should be a central item on civil society's agenda to work or strive for such autonomy of culture which has to be achieved step by step. This naturally does not mean that self-governed schools are forced on those who are satisfied with the state-run school system. It rather means that wherever the new option is wanted, opportunities for its realization should be provided. And here wanting does not mean merely wishing but the readiness and capacity to take on responsibility oneself.

An essential precondition for such processes consists in the fact that civil society actually works everywhere as an independent power and does not let itself be co-opted into the system of either the state or the market. It should not run into the trap that one could call "the majority trap". This majority means that in relations with the state one does not concentrate on demanding freedom for all people to realize good and creative ideas but instead tries to make all people happy with one's own good and creative ideas. This happens when one looks for majorities for these good ideas and thereby forgets the minority which must then experience these good ideas as being forced upon them. The best pedagogical insight cannot be forced through by the state in an top-down levelling out kind of way because being decreed, the decreed good will turn into its opposite.

Civil society has to unfold its force ("power") but not in order to establish a new centralized power or to be part of such, but to take down those elements of power that have become anachronistic. The three-folding of society is not dividing power amongst three groupings but making society receptive for the new things that are wanted. Civil society should use the new balance of societal powers, coming about through tri-sectoral partnerships, for such openness.

Globalisation and the Modern Economy

In modern times, parallel to individualisation, the economic life developed with its dynamics breaching all guild restrictions of the middle ages

⁶ See the authors article "GATS – Service to Whom?" (www.threefolding.net/GATS.htm)

and finally the limitations of the nation states. The great discoveries made the earth a globe in the consciousness of human beings. As a member of a world economy based on serving others, the individual gradually became dependent on the services of others for the maintenance of his own life. This also is a process which leads out of the old limited community. When one reflects on what comes into play between natural resources, work and know-how for the production of one single commodity in the modern economy, one enters just through this reflection process itself into the dimension of the whole of mankind. The original motive of the individual taking part in the economy to support himself, proves itself insufficient for the shaping of an economy in which working for others must be more than a unpleasant duty on the way to one's own income.

The classical doctrine of the market economy has answered the questions of motivation with the thesis of egoistic self-interest as the only possible drive for economical progress.⁷ Of necessity this had to result in a highly one-sided and exclusive emphasis on the principle of competition. Today's neo-liberalism has placed this principle as a guiding idea at the foundation of the "elite" form of globalisation, in which form it is in the hands of, and being driven by organisations such as the WTO. The dominant guiding principles are all penetrated by mistrust for all communication processes amongst partners in economy – for instance for the attainment of a fair price. Individual autonomy in undertaking microeconomic action is accepted, however the possibility of a non-egotistical comprehensive structuring of macroeconomics by the participants in economy is rejected. The credo of structural policy: the legal forms are there to enforce adherence to the framework of competition. One assumes correctly that a real *laissez-faire* would lead to a self-regulation of the economy through a network of agreements. And because the mistrust-approach assumes the impossibility of keeping to such agreements, other than by means of exploitative cartels, one fights not the cartel but the agreement in general as "hindering competition" – to the effect, that slowly the right to engage in competition comes to stand higher than contract law.

Paradoxically today's legislation takes care of maintaining a certain form of economy by enforcement but on the other hand this law-making itself is being marginalized or pushed aside by the very economy

⁷ By pointing to "moral sentiments" inherent in human beings this thesis is at least initially softened, however those sentiments play only a secondary role.

it i.e. designed to control. This form of economy has also affected the factors of production: land, labour, money and capital to the extent they themselves have become commodities traded in the market place. Because of this, the term "pseudo market economy" (*Scheinmarktwirtschaft*) has been introduced. The "pseudo markets" increasingly determine the global economy which is most of all shaped by unchecked financial streams that are roving all over the globe, separated from the real economy to a large extent but at the same time acting upon it in a harmful way. Not for nothing is the question of possible control of the financial markets a decisive question in civil society's discussion of governance.

That the state should not bureaucratically direct the economy is hardly to be questioned after the historical experiences of the last century. However the economy is not an extraterritorial agent in society but an integral part of society, which it should serve. An economy that knows human beings only as cost factors is perverse. Thus the legal communities have to escape the trap of globalisation by finding forms that allow the re-installment of societal supremacy over the economy. The creation of wealth is an economic question; the social structures for sharing this wealth are questions of justice. Where the progress of economic production leads to ever more elimination of human labour, thereby making more and more people dependent on redistribution and social welfare, the marginalisation of the legal communities is a catastrophe.

All these problems result solely from the paradigm of the *homo economicus* who is only interested in himself. To state this does not mean to deny the power and the importance of self-interest. But it has to be clearly stated that one-sided orientation towards self-interested motives will lead to the situation that self-interest cannot ever again be regulated by means of cooperation and negotiation. He who only recognizes egoists raises egoists!

Such a one-sided concept of the economy has to be challenged by a different approach: the economy is a societal operation serving the mutual support of human beings. To serve this task, forms of cooperation between the business partners have to be able to emerge accordingly. "World-economy" must not become an abstract world-market, in which the profit-motive rules, disregarding the living conditions of human beings and their natural resources. Rather these forms of cooperation have to supply the context in which the cooperation of all enables each single economical region to prosper. Economic regions

should be understood as life-areas, as "socio-topes", worthy of protection!

The New Role of the State

Everything is changing, only nation states act as if everything remains the same, remarked an observant journalist on current affairs a couple of years ago. Indeed states are rather a change-resistant element: the impulse for change comes from individualization and economic globalisation.

It should be the task of legal communities and of a global legal structure to bring about the permeability of society for initiatives and thus to facilitate the development of the principle of individualization towards the principle of responsibility which would bring with it new capacities for community building.

However, instead of consequently granting space for autonomy, society gets stuck within the framework of New Public Management which is at best only a partial autonomy, and which only too often consists of a division of control between state and market. One tries artificially to create market-like conditions in cultural life, which then however, result in a tendency towards standardization, because standards make it possible to compare competing offers. Behind this tendency again lies the already described problem of mistrust.

Although they do not grant culture really full freedom, nation states have moved increasingly into a defensive position in relation to the economy; which should clearly experience state limitations in social as well as in ecological terms.

Thus they miss the concept of the modern democratic human-rights-defending state, which of course should be a lean but in no way a weak state. Modern and post-modern development make it necessary to develop a new understanding of the role of the state, are set out in the two central ideas of modern political science: democracy and human rights. Human Rights put the individual into the centre of the government system. To respect and defend its full human potential becomes – as is stated in the German constitution – the highest duty of all state authority. After the emergence of the demand for democratic equality it had to be fought for, and later degenerated with its deformation into egalitarianism, while in truth it is a principle about the same freedom for all. With human rights the community recognizes that these basic rights are not given to the individual by the community, but belong to him as a

human being. The "guarantee of integrity in human rights is more than merely a legal idea, it enshrines the idea of the irrevocability of human rights. The democratic majority is not the new supremacy, to which the individual now would have to turn as a petitioner in the same way as to the aristocratic supremacy in former times. It is much more – at least idealistically understood – the community of the free who now tacitly accept to only arrive at agreements amongst themselves in a democratic way, while recognizing the general freedom for action of the individual as the basis for polity. Because the life of rights finds its concentrated expression in legislation but cannot be reduced to that alone, human rights remain more than a mere legal idea even if laws contradicting them are forced through. Clearly they have to be anchored as deeply and as solidly as possible in the legal awareness of the people and have to be made factually irreversible through the democratic participation of people in achieving constitutions. Human rights demand on the one side freedom of culture, on the other side – so that freedom and dignity are not just something on paper – a structure of the economy which enables people to mutually meet each others needs so that freedom is not just an empty word. And they demand democratic participation in all decisions that apply to all people in a polity.

The Archetypal Phenomena of Threefolding

Summing up we can say: The fact of individual autonomy leads to a reversal of the relationship between the individual and the community. In earlier times it had been the community around which everything revolved. Now the development of the individual and his/her capacities for responsibility become the focus and the task of the community. We find a certain analogy to this process in the history of mankind in the biography of the individual on the way towards legal maturity (which normally takes place at the age of eighteen). Everything which up to this point had been a precondition for the development of the young human being – care, guidance, integration into the community of the family – now becomes its opposite: a hindrance of development. It is a wise institution in the law to withhold the decision about legal maturity from the parents who, seeing that relevant capacities are still lacking, would be more inclined to assert continuing guardianship over the young human being. However the point is that with "coming of age", the development of responsibility becomes

a task for the individual who for that purpose needs self-determination over his own life.⁸

This self-determination has the factual consequence that a differentiation in social relationships takes place: the young person now seeks out for himself that cultural environment in which he or she wants to be. As a citizen of the state he now enters the life of polity as a bearer of the same democratic right to participate. And in carrying responsibility for his own life, sooner or later he has to integrate himself into the system of a globally networked economy based, on division on labour – that means that he has to embrace a work task in which he achieves something which not he himself but other people need. There we have before us an archetypal phenomenon of social threefolding: social maturity demands and creates threefolding.

Conditions for a Culture of Trust

From this it is not hard to see where one has to look for the way out of mistrusting the human being towards a culture of trust. The experience of history shows that it cannot be a matter of proposing the human being as such as good, or only made evil by his environment. Blind trust only leads to abuse which again provokes control from above and outside. But in the same way one should not view existing incapacities as non-changeable constants in the human being. One has to take the human being seriously as a developing being, which means allowing the possibility of development in oneself and also in others.

Development can only take place where room is made for it. If we would only allow the child to walk when it had already perfected the skill, it would never learn to walk upright. If we waited until the young person made perfect use of his freedom before we granted him maturity he would have no chance to become free. One learns responsibility where the conditions allow responsibility to be taken on. And he who does not grant parents the free choice of schools and then laments that they lack the judgement to make this choice, does not realize that he laments a situation which he himself has helped to bring about. Mistrust in maturity is a self-fulfilling prophecy, as Kant has already remarked.

The question of how freedom can be compatible with society can

⁸ This genesis of threefolding out of the emergence of the individual and its analogy in the biography of the individual has continually been emphasized by Udo Herrmannstorfer in his presentations on social renewal.

thus be rephrased: how can one bring about conditions that support responsible action? The answer to this question will be different in each case depending on which parts of social life are involved. Economic questions demand a different style of treatment than cultural questions and these again a different one from political questions.

But in each case it will be a matter of addressing people in their capacity for responsibility in a way that all solutions, to the furthest extent possible, have to be brought about through the direct participation of those involved: through their "communicative action" (Jürgen Habermas) or through "self-administration". Autonomous self-administration means in the end: those who are active are also those administering. In contrast to that the culture of mistrust leads to bureaucratic manipulation, and to anonymous conditions. It results in "systems" within which people should function without causing problems. A system however – even the most "complex" – remains a dead machine, cannot become a living – organic – network of relationships between individuals.

Self-administration – we could also call it self-governance – as a living responsibility relies on people. It leads to shaping of relationships where one meets as partners and thus draws its strength from the meeting itself. By shaping their relationships, those involved embark on a human-social path of development. In the cultural sector self-governance will grow out of the independent status of individual institutions and their networking. The economy will have to start with networking as a given fact at the outset resulting from division of labour. This means that organs for action have to be allowed to emerge in which the exchange of interests between the business partners – from production to consumption – can work out of economic considerations on holistic bottom-up solutions. Where the conditions themselves do not allow an alternative to binding regulative structures for a larger community – e.g. to have traffic moving on the left or right can not be a matter of individual choice – maturity means to have the same opportunity to introduce initiatives into the majority decision-making process and to participate directly from the grassroots (three-step legislation procedure by the citizens themselves as a complement to representative democracy). Without becoming an integral part of the state and without giving up its independence in relation to the state, Civil society will have to take up and realize this demand to produce freedom-orientated solutions – which is on its own agenda – and bring them to legally binding realization. Initiatives in this direction have been proposed for

example in relation to the development of the European Constitution by the IG EuroVision and the Initiative Network Threefolding.

What Kind of Governance Do We Need?⁹

Individualization and globalisation are driving the old societal uniformities apart. At the same time new tendencies towards uniformity of life are arising all over the globe by the way in which globalisation acts today. The economy is slipping out of human societal control and aspires to be an arbiter of human society. While layers of problems are increasingly being dealt with by global interdependencies they can less and less be worked upon by the old nation state forms. At the same time these are contradicting the essential requirements of culture.

All this leads to the question of new forms in which a society can live that is governed on the one hand by interdependencies and dependencies requiring solidarity, and which on the other hand has as its axis the freedom for every human being to participate in its ordering. These new forms can only arise in a healthy way when the self-organisation of culture, of political structures and of the economy by the people involved is not hindered by centralisation and concentrations of power.

The new paradigm is: self-organization in the sense that the people who are involved have the responsibility to organize themselves. Only this basic principle can lead to a future-orientated solution of the governance problem.

Without an idea which leads organically structured societal relationships one will finally be caught in the suction of a new uniformity mania. One will dream the dream of world government – and will only be satisfied with a structure below this level because one thinks of this world-government – for the time being – as utopian.

That instruments of a global rights-life have to be developed, that the United Nations have to play an important role in it, that it is progress within the rights-life that crimes against humanity can be brought to international courts, – non of this need be argued against. However it cannot be a question of transferring the principle of the nation-state – which, facing individualization and globalisation has proven to be a deeply problematic structure – to the level of world-regions or even onto the global level itself. Enlarging the dimension of the state would only

⁹ See my article on "Trisectoral Partnerships, Civil Society and Threefolding" in the *Rundbrief Dreigliederung des sozialen Organismus*, first edition/March 2001.

enlarge the dimension of the state problems already existing today! There are other possibilities of restoring societal supremacy over the economy. An important approach lies in tax-systems as the meeting point between the economy and the constitutional state.¹⁰

The new world situation demands a new understanding of individuality and thus of diversity, or globalisation will lead to cultural levelling-out, to the destruction of everything original, creative and spiritual. The wealth of a world we are heading towards consists exactly in this cultural diversity. Democratic equality, in relation for instance to an education system, does not consist in the uniformity of the pedagogical content but in allowing the same participation for everyone in a diverse educational system which lives by initiative-taking teachers, professors, parents etc... The mental image of a standardized curriculum which would globally guarantee that students of a certain age are dealing with would in this context be a nightmare. Such standardized solutions are also utopian because individualisation of necessity brings with it a diversity of educational ideas and approaches. It is not accidental that there has been controversy recently about the teaching content to be taught in schools resulting from fixed ideas of uniformity (in Germany for instance the discussion about whether a provincial government could pass a law that crucifixes had to be hung up in classrooms). There are similar examples in other areas of culture life.

Threefolding – a Promising Governance Approach for the Future?

What is the relationship between governance and threefolding? Rudolf Steiner's approach to a threefolding movement directly before and after the World War I can in fact also be understood as an attempt to deal with the governance problem, even as the formulation of a governance approach, at a time in which most people in responsible positions only understood in terms of categories of international relationships between states.

In the final chapter of his then well-received book "Towards social renewal"¹¹ Steiner deals with the "international relationships of social organisms". If one follows the argument of this chapter, a global

¹⁰ Compare the suggestions by U. Herrmannstorfer, H. Spehl and myself to refinance social systems by a consumer-orientated social transfer, amongst other places also published at www.sozialimpulse.de.

¹¹ Rudolf Steiner *Towards Social Renewal*, Rudolf Steiner Press, London 1977.

structure finally results from the fact, that each of "the three spheres" – culture, politics or rights-life, and the economy – of one social organism "would have its own independent relationship to the corresponding spheres of the other social organisms". In this way cultural, economic and inter-state networks could emerge and develop relatively independently of each other. Meaningful forms of co-operation could result where previously states were manipulated economic interests or cultural issues were distorted political intentions. Human rights would become the axis of international life and state supremacy would no longer have primacy in international relations.

As an example, the idea of a world-school-association was floated in the context of this approach. It then becomes clear which direction to take in creating global organs within the framework of future-oriented governance. It is not only a matter of having organs within which states co-operate; general self-governing organs have to emerge in which the shapers of education-systems and other areas of society co-operate responsibly in matters that are of their common concern.

Only cultural autonomy guarantees that each ethnic, religious or other grouping can foster its own culture without hindrance. On the other hand this principle of autonomy rules out one's own culture being imposed on others by means of state egalitarianism. Only in this way can the conditions slowly arise for peaceful co-existence and even active tolerance between cultures and their clash (the "clash of civilisations") can be avoided.

One can see how modern and capable of development this approach is. Steiner's sceptical and critical attitude towards Wilson's ideas of the League of Nations resulted from the insight that the "right to self-determination of nations", as propagated by Wilson, can only too easily become a "barbarian instrument" (as it was characterised in the 80's by Ralf Dahrendorf). There, after all, it is not the individual right of each human being to live within his or her polity in freedom, in equality and under humane material conditions of existence, that is the axis of international life, but rather the right of each nation to its own state. This has to lead to intractable conflicts, especially where different ethnic groups live on the same territory, as we have again just recently seen in the Balkans and in other places. By means of social threefolding – as Steiner put it – "diversified relations are established between peoples, states and economic bodies which ally all the parts of mankind so that each, in its own interest, is sensitive to the life of the others. A league of nations arises from impulses

corresponding to reality. It will not need to be 'installed' because of one-sided political considerations."¹²

Where societal areas of life develop in ever greater independence and the meaningful shaping of the whole depends on consideration of their inherent characteristics, the form of co-operation can not be one that is centrally mediated, but must reflected a "tri-sectoral partnership" of representatives of the three spheres – in which at the present time for the cultural realm, organised civil society can and must play the key role.

Today the necessity of "tri-sectoral partnership" is so obvious that even the representatives of uniformist thinking – whether from the economic or from the political perspective – find themselves bound to adopt this approach at least partially, – though not without trying to re-functionalise it. It is intended to achieve the same economic interests and political intentions as before only in a more flexible way by integrating and co-opting civil society. One can speak of an integrational approach. This however is, as shown above, not capable of future development.

The new constellation poses difficult questions for civil society. The now stronger integration of non-state stakeholders into "political networks" of various kinds, opens new possibilities, but they are also connected with the danger of losing one's original intentions. Civil society would also fall into a trap if it forgot that its power emerges from the grass roots: the movement for democracy, local agenda, the coalition for freedom in education, the consumer initiatives and initiatives for new forms of economy, etc. In the end one will not be able to avoid the question of whether the role of civil society activists at the round table of tri-sectoral partnerships only serves the representatives of the establishment as an early warning system of the neuralgic points for the realisation of their own goals, or whether conditions can be created in which those involved can engage themselves as carriers of responsibility in an open and constructive dialogue.

In Search of New Political Forms and Structures

Tri-sectoral partnership as such does not inherently solve the problem of how to create new political forms in the age of individualisation and

¹² *Towards Social Renewal* see above, page 129. However one has to say that already then the League of Nations did not always act in accordance to Wilson's basic ideas; for instance in 1921 when Finland's supremacy over the Swedish speaking Åland-Islands was confirmed in view of the far-reaching autonomy that Finland had granted them.

globalisation. We have looked at many important aspects of this problem. But these thoughts must be developed further in a variety of directions. For participatory democracy, it is the process by which a legislative form comes about that is decisive. This is why in the current debate so much attention focused on issues like the media presentation of initiatives as a precondition for a real public discourse. This public discourse lives by the fact that decisions are taken as close to the grass roots as possible. With the enlarged dimensions of democratic legitimacy arising through globalisation, new problems arise. All State authority comes from the people, but what matters is where it goes to, as already remarked by B. Brecht. The higher the level at which decisions are taken, the less the possibility to take into consideration the special characteristic of a certain region. From this point of view the idea of grassroot-democracy draws in the ideas of federalism and of subsidiarity.

At present a new concept is emerging in political-life, that of "soft law". "Soft law" comes about through agreements, through informal settlements etc. amongst societal stakeholders. A justification for this phenomenon is seen in the increasing ineffectiveness of the traditional way in arriving at structures and policies especially on the global level, where up until now this has been done by means of treaties between states. On the other hand the need to find new structures and policies is so urgent that it leads to the creation of "soft law". This development is truly dubious. Where well-founded and therefore also clear laws are missing, particular interest groups can try to fish in muddy waters. However, in the creation of "soft law", complementing traditional structural forms of international law, lies also a seed for future development, because those actually involved are at the centre of the process of shaping new political relations, meaning that, of their own free will, they create legal bonds by means of arrangements, agreements, contracts and commitments. Such agreements are one possible approach to shaping the legal side of global relationships in which the sovereignty of the groups involved and their specific interests and impulses can be maintained. By agreement between partners, laws can also be created within the framework of tri-sector partnerships – however with the precondition that the partners themselves are legitimised by their own, i.e. that state stakeholders for instance do have a democratic mandate.

If we accept general freedom of action for the individual as the basis for a modern understanding of rights and politics and if we also understand this freedom to act as freedom to unite on the one hand, and

freedom to make contracts on the other hand, then this will enlighten the central position of the principle of contract in the political sphere. Modern state philosophy sees supreme power as arising out of the original free contractual relationship amongst the members of a community (theory of social contract). The negotiation of contracts is indeed archetypal for the legal forms of the present.¹³

The political structures of the future will consist of a combination of various elements. Legal forms democratically legitimised by the citizens themselves will have to form a framework within which various elements of a new type of "soft law" can develop.

The Threefolding Movement – Tasks and Opportunities

The ongoing governance debate is a symptom of the need for social change having piled up. The present situation offers new opportunities for threefolding work but greater demands also come with them, which can only be met if we continually test and demonstrate the methodological fruitfulness of threefolding and find the right answers for each situation. Another of these demands is that more than ever before the capacity is needed to find solutions in dialogue with partners and in coalitions. The word "social" originates from "socius", which can be translated as companion. I would wish for many companions to join us in taking the necessary steps towards social renewal.

¹³That there are various so-called contracts in which formal equality and freedom hide factual inequality and unfreedom is a different matter.

"Com-Panis", Economics & the Company

Lawrence Keen

From the most ancient times there has been tension between those who wish to engage actively with the earth and mould it and those who, while willing to accept what the earth offers them, do not wish to engage with it in the same way. Or, to put it another way, between those who feel at home in the material world and those who are more comfortable with the realm of the mind. Thus in attempting to describe the methods of thought and the activities of the first group to an audience that is likely to be more in tune with the second group, one is aware that what may seem natural and harmless from one perspective may be instinctively objectionable from the other.

So let us talk about companies. In English the word "company" means a group of companions and has its roots in the Latin words "con" and "panis", or "with-bread". It therefore literally signifies a group that shares bread. As bread is the crux of our involvement with the earth it is appropriate that, from these beginnings, the word "company" has come to denote a group that is formed for commercial enterprise.

What is regarded as an appropriate way of doing business at a particular time has always depended on the attitudes and inclinations of contemporary society. In the 16th and 17th centuries, as Europeans turned to the exploration and conquest of the world, various companies were given royal charters to involve themselves in this activity. Some of these charters gave a company the powers of a state: the power to tax; the power to make its own laws; and the right to use force in its various forms to control a territory and its inhabitants. As result, these chartered companies tended over time to become effectively the governments of quasi-colonies. And although for a chartered company the objective of making money was explicit, rather than implicit as it was for many of the kings and queens of the day, the chartered companies of the 16th and 17th centuries bear little relation to the modern, purely economic, company.

The genesis of the modern company was a series of laws passed in

England in the 1840s and 1850s, which allowed the formation of joint stock companies and which culminated in the 1862 Companies Act. France enacted similar laws in 1863 and Germany did so in 1870.¹ Crucial features of the new type of company were that it was regarded as an independent entity in its own right for commercial disputes and that the investors' liability was limited to the money they put into the company. These two innovations proved hugely successful but they had three long-term effects. First, the owners' limited liability allowed them to give less attention to what was done with their money by the management of the company. This in turn was a major factor in the depersonalisation of money that we see today. Second, as a form in which to organise people's activity, joint stock companies have proved well suited to using, and in many cases developing, the complex technology that has allowed mankind to dominate the material world over the last 200 years. Third, and at least partially as a result of the first two, companies have been uniquely successful at generating economic wealth.

The 1862 Companies Act was a political innovation designed to encourage economic activity. However, the question that has remained ever since is where the balance of interest should lie: should the company be run primarily in the interests of the owners or in the interests of other stakeholders such as customers, suppliers, employees, national governments, or society in general? With so much wealth, and thus self-interest, involved the argument is unlikely to be resolved soon. But one obvious, though often forgotten, point is that if owners do not find it worthwhile to put up money to fund an enterprise then generally they will not do so. At the other extreme, if a company starts being run more in the interest of the other stakeholders then over time it tends to become economically inefficient and to need to be subsidised in one way or another by society.

What we call "economics" arises like a natural law out of the interplay of the material world and human will, and money is the form through which economics expresses itself. Just as learning to orientate ourselves in the earth's gravity involves falling over and skinning our knees as we start to walk, so learning what one can and cannot do with money frequently seems to progress via the painful collision of human desires with the laws of economics. This also happens inside companies.

A company offers its product to potential customers at a parti-

cular price and tries to persuade them to buy. It can let the potential customer know about the product via advertising, and even try and persuade them that it fulfils a customer need in a way that is not obvious (and not necessarily even relevant), but the customer makes the decision. The willingness of the outside world to buy the product, as manifested in the exchange of money for that product, is the indispensable basis of a company. The company must then use that money to pay its workforce, suppliers, taxes and so on, with the remainder going to the owners in various different ways. Nothing is left over. If the cost of the supplies and workforce exceeds the income from customers then the company is destroying wealth, of the owner and of the nation as a whole, and the company will swiftly collapse. In economics nothing is free; someone has to pay for everything in one way or another.

It is a common perception that the individual is powerless in the face of a large company. This is not true, especially in the case of companies that sell directly to the public. Most successful companies became successful by being responsive to their customers; for example, many provide special telephone numbers on which they invite customers to call them. Not only does a company have an economic incentive to maintain its external reputation, given that failure to do so will adversely affect sales, but when a company is accused of wrongdoing this also has an adverse effect in terms of the impact on the morale of the workforce. It is a management truism that a workforce that is happy and motivated is much more effective than one which is not. This is not to say, of course, that a decent working environment is always achieved. But a good manager tries to balance the needs of the workforce and the wider community with those of the owner, to the extent that this is possible in the economic context.

One significant constraint on the economic potential of a company is competition from other companies. Competition is greatly to the benefit of the customer since it tends to reduce the prices a company can charge. A company may try to make its products different from everyone else's, but over time the characteristics of products tend to converge on the most popular. Thereafter the only difference is price, so other things being equal the customer will buy the cheapest. As a result, in order to function, the company must make sure that it is as efficient as possible in economic terms. This means that it must take the cheapest options available. Those cheap options may have a bad impact on the environment, for example, for which the company may not have to pay. However in general, due to competition, the "saving" made by the

¹ For a history see *The Company, A Short History of a Revolutionary Idea* by John Micklethwait & Adrian Wooldridge, Modern Library, New York, 2003.

company in this way is passed on to the customer. So in our example, the managers of a company may grumble at being required to pay extra to avoid environmental damage, but provided all their competitors are required to do the same they are not too unhappy because they can pass on the extra cost to their customers. The real problem for the company is that it may sell fewer products due to the increased price. (Selling more is important to companies because producing most things is akin to making cups of tea: for the first cup you have to assemble the teapot, the tea leaves and boiling water whereas for the second cup you need very little more than you have already.) Companies operate as efficiently as possible within the parameters that are set from outside. In general it is much less important to a company precisely what the parameters are than that the parameters are the same for everyone.

In the western world competition is seen as a beneficial way of making sure that companies are pushed to be as efficient as possible. National governments try to foster that competition by preventing companies from merging when to do so would reduce the level of competition in that industry. They also maintain price competition by making it illegal for companies or an industry group to agree between themselves on the prices they will ask for their products. This has the effect of passing most of the benefit of a company's activities to their customers (i.e. all of us, in one way or another) and of increasing consumption by lowering the price.

Enthusiasm for competition between companies does not always extend to competition between nations. Economic theory says that everyone should specialise in what they do best relative to everyone else and then trade the results; though this theory is less helpful if you are not much good at anything. An example of the logic could go like this: First farm (climate good for apples) can grow 5 apples in the space needed for 1 orange. Second farm (climate better for oranges) can grow 5 oranges in the space needed for 5 apples. First farm values 1 orange as being worth 5 apples – because that is their choice in what to grow. Second farm values 1 orange as being worth 1 apple for the same reason. So if they agree to exchange 3 oranges for every 5 apples then both farms are better off than they would be by themselves, by 2 oranges. They have also developed a connection, albeit starting from mutual self-interest, which has the possibility to evolve further. Trade is a tie that binds the participants in mutual interdependence.

Now if these two farms are in different countries their national governments may also enter the situation. Let us say that the govern-

ment of the second farm decides to impose an import duty of 2 oranges per 5 apples on the importation of apples. The effective price of apples to the buyer from the second farm has gone up. He is no longer willing to pay the same price because he has to pay his government a further 2 oranges in duty, and if it costs him 5 oranges in total to import then he can grow the 5 apples himself at the same cost. So the seller from the first farm has to drop his price; perhaps he can now only get 2 oranges for 5 apples instead of 3. In this case he has effectively paid half of the foreign government's import duty. At this point the first farm's government may choose to step in with an import tax on oranges in retaliation against the second farm's government. It is to avoid escalating trade disputes of this kind that the international community set up various international trade bodies to arbitrate between countries.

One of the unusual characteristics of import tax, or import duty, is the way in which it effectively enables a country to tax the businesses and thus the citizens of another country. And these are very difficult and emotional issues because one of the main differences in the cost of production between countries is the level of the wages of the workers involved. If something needs one person to make it in the UK, but two people in India at one-third of the wage each, then either the UK must impose import duties to make up the difference or the production will shift to India. This process benefits the customers, who get a lower price, but it is very painful for those who lose their jobs. The company involved also gains in the short term, but in the long term competition normally removes most of the monetary benefit as other companies do the same. Meanwhile, the greatest benefit actually goes to those who gain the jobs, and by the nature of low wage economies these are likely to be greater in number than the jobs lost elsewhere. After all, it is not important to an individual whether they are being paid more or less than someone else in another country. What does matter for that individual is to have work that enables them to buy enough in the local environment for a reasonable standard of living. It is thus far more valuable to the people of a poor country to have jobs as a result of trade with a rich country than to receive charitable aid. But jobs are also much more painful for a country to give.

Economics is not kind to our illusions. It manifests much too clearly the truth of man's will because it accurately reflects what people actually value and do, not what they say they are going to do. It is possible to have morality in the economic sphere, but only if people deliberately put it there through their actions, for instance by paying more for "fair trade" goods. It will not come of itself.

Meanwhile companies, the visible face of economic laws, have always aroused suspicion and criticism. In an early example, Sir Edward Coke (1552–1634) objected that companies “cannot commit treason, nor be outlawed or excommunicated, for they have no souls”². This highlights one aspect of companies that arouses instinctive fear and distrust, for we tend to think of a company as we think of an individual human being and react accordingly. But a company is not an individual any more than a nation or any other group is an individual. It is composed of the activities of the individuals who come together to form it; if they disperse, it dissolves. It may be viewed as a material body, or a form, which reflects the strivings of the individuals within it and the culture that surrounds it.

Aside from the frequently unpalatable driving forces of economics, some individuals do behave badly within companies for their own ends. And to go further, a few companies have an ethos, or a spirit if you like, which seems to cause the employees as a group to exhibit a tendency to behave badly. But no company can survive for long without the support of its customers and, at least tacitly, of government and society. So while vigilance is necessary, once abuse is detected reform normally occurs.

However, there is a neglected problem with the activities of companies at another level. In 1912, when both trade and the number of companies operating in multiple countries were much smaller than they are today, Rudolf Steiner looked upon the global interconnection formed by companies, trade and technology and referred to it as “our world-body”³. He saw this as requiring a corresponding “world-soul”, to be created from the mutual spiritual understanding of peoples everywhere⁴. In our age the “world-body” is a reality, and we should welcome that reality as internationalism and cosmopolitanism are in accordance with the spirit of our age. But it remains unbalanced because we have not developed the necessary mutual understanding, the “world-soul”, called for by Steiner. Material contact without mutual understanding has the consequences we have seen in recent events in the USA and the Middle East.

² As quoted in *The Company*, page 33.

³ See GA 130, lecture given in Düsseldorf, 5th May 1912, as included in *Esoteric Christianity and the Mission of Christian Rosenkreutz*, Rudolf Steiner Press, 2000, page 261.

⁴ Ibid, page 262.

Delegation and Collegial Leadership as exemplified in the Self-Regulation of Waldorf Schools*

Udo Herrmannstorfer

The theme of “Self-regulation” is inexhaustible, particularly if looked at in a practical and not merely in a theoretical sense. The point of view taken here has to do with the way in which we work together.

School and Life

The function of a school is decidedly different from that of the home. The parental home presents, for the child, the practical basis in its life situation; from its parental home it enters ever more into its surroundings. The boundaries between the parental home and the child’s surroundings cannot always be precisely defined. We notice this in education: even if there is no TV at home, the child can go to Granny where there is a TV!

Then the moment approaches when this mere entering into its surroundings does not suffice and the child needs a school. School-education as a general responsibility of society occurs historically at the same moment at which the challenge of individuality emerges. One does not become an individual by simply becoming part of life as such – this will yield only an education suitable for everyman. Where the individuality shows itself, one can perceive that it has to be specially addressed, specially developed if it shall find itself. To this end we have to mute the immediacy of life a little, we must hold it back. This is exactly what we do when sending the child to school! For in school we

* An edited translation by Ulrike Brockman of the revised report by Christoph Straws of a lecture given by the author at a seminar in the “Studienhaus Rüsse” on 6.2.1999. Omissions have been made where indicated (...). This seminar was part of a series in further education called: “Individuality and Social Responsibility” and the theme of the seminar was: “Courage Towards Change: the Waldorf School within Social Evolution”. The original title of the lecture had been: “Beware, Danger of Suffocation! How to avert it through delegation and collegial leadership”.

create a kind of enclosed, artificial space. School and life are two distinct things, even though this artificial space of school naturally takes on a life of its own.

The question as to how to define the boundaries between home and school understandably gives rise to many difficulties. It is important to understand that we should keep our daily life with its demands away from the school in order that the individuality of the child may be nurtured. This is necessary if life is to be at all manageable! After school the young person has to leave the artificial space again to enter practical life, society, professional life. As children we enter into our surroundings within the protection of the family; later on we do so out of ourselves. In between lies the space of the school.

It is clear that this enclosed space of school is under pressure from two sides; firstly, from the sense of responsibility felt by parents, who approach the school with their wishes, demands, expectations and questions. "Is what you are doing with our children right? Will school really make of him what we are hoping for? Is he under or overstretched? Is he properly prepared for life?"

These and many other questions and conflicts arise from the fact of there being two distinct responsibilities, that of the parental home on the one hand and teachers on the other. The partitioning of responsibilities is one of the great questions confronting schools which is not easily clarified and has to be solved ever and again anew.

The other element of pressure is the vocational element which, from the standpoint of the children's future, wants to tell the school constantly: "If one is going to be able to cope with life, one must be able to do this or that." School is meant to prepare for life by teaching knowledge and capacities which are needed later. But does an ability to cope with life really arise in this way? Is there not a need for a space which is free from this pressure? This is not an unimportant question. To prepare children for the real world in today's understanding means to educate according to economic needs. "We have consequently to focus the school towards the economic demands of life!" This is the motto of state education planning today.

In a certain way, therefore, school – as this artificially created place – is exposed to this constant twofold demand; and it has to defend itself in both directions, its legitimacy is constantly being questioned.

On the other hand, the parents will also say they know best and will want to exercise their influence, claiming: "You, teacher, are only the educator of my children. Yet these are my children and not yours!"

The ideas which we as parents have exert a strongly authoritative power. This can cause violent debates and conflicts. Anyone who is the mother or father of a school-child knows this pressing feeling: "What are they doing there? I am sure it should be different. My child needs something else!" In this way a school gets constantly irritated from these two directions. For in the Upper School the question keeps coming up: "Is the Waldorf School still part of the real world? What was a healthy world has subsequently come to look quite different! Can this artificial space be maintained?" Is it not just an artificial life space?

In face of this double pressure on the school, the teacher has to ask himself repeatedly what is the indispensable and particular value of the school's pedagogy. Life tries to paralyse this inherent legitimacy again and again. How can one legitimately hold back this life which tries to force its way into schools so that a place for children's development is guaranteed without its becoming a sealed-off space? "What is the relationship between school and life?" This is an important question today in the discussion about Waldorf Schools, particularly in the problematical Upper School. How much of the vocational element should enter the school? How can we arrange a closer connection with practical tasks? Should we, for example, practise "economic life" in small artificial enterprises? What forms exist for this?

If we are speaking about questions of self-regulation, it is important to become aware of this twofold legitimacy problem of the school, which initially manifests itself in the question as to the respective responsibilities of teacher and parents. One can only delegate where one also has responsibility. Yet, who is responsible? Is the school a joint organisation of parents and teachers? Or is it a place for which the teacher alone is responsible? Moreover, there is the question of the pupils themselves. They grow up gradually and demand their own realm of responsibility. [.....]

In the past, a school was viewed mainly from the pedagogical standpoint. Nowadays we have a distinct change. This is triggered through the financial questions which confront both the state and society in general, although the causes may even lie deeper. "All that is far too expensive, we cannot afford all this educational and social services expenditure to the extent that we used to be able to". We have been hearing and reading this for years. "We have to economise" – this was the first conclusion. Subsequently, people realised that it does not help merely to make savings, we must become more efficient. Everything, schools included, must become more efficient. At first sight this does not

sound wrong, but if one listens more closely to what is really meant, it is the transformation of areas of society which had hitherto been regarded as non-profit making in the economic sense. At present it is the educational economists who lead rather than the educationalists. [.....]

Are Teachers Responsible Only for Pedagogy?

Under these circumstances the question of responsibility for the school becomes even more intricate. For a long time it was a relatively undisputed fact that teachers are responsible for the school. They teach the lessons and, in a Waldorf school, they also shape the curriculum. Nowadays this is no longer so clearly defined. A significant reason for this is economic pressure. One can hear it said: Well, these are good teachers but they know little about management and the economic running of the school. Moreover, they are, in effect, beneficiaries as they gain from the expenditures of the school. How can one expect them to deal responsibly with school finances? Therefore, one must not entrust the economic sphere to teachers who will only ruin it. If we were to ask assembled administrators or councils of Waldorf schools, I am convinced that the opinion of a majority would today still be: If we did not exist, the school would collapse. For the teachers can't manage. It is perfectly clear that a school must not be left to the teachers. They may get by in certain circumstances, but this is only an exception to the general rule. The administrator will not say this aloud in school but he will often think like that. Teachers are the professionals for the pedagogy, but they are not experts in administration, finance and related fields. Thus the tendency is to say: teachers are responsible for pedagogy and only for that, full stop. One does not even have a bad conscience in thinking this thought, for actually we do something good if we prevent teachers getting immersed in administration. Let teachers be teachers and do not load them up with other business which would only disturb them!

Perhaps this is nothing but the projection of a wish which we all carry in our soul. As a business advisor I would also wish that I had not to submit my salary details and that the business of remuneration would sort itself out. For I would spare myself much aggravation and many unpleasant situations. Yet can one keep everything unpleasant out of one's life? Someone has to regulate things for us. We would end up needing people who are responsible for all unpleasant jobs whilst we go for the pleasant ones.

The question of self-regulation is not dealt with by declaring teachers responsible only for pedagogy and not for anything else, or at least not fully responsible... But where does this point of view lead?

In the preface to the 1920 German edition of his book *The Threefold Social Order*, Rudolf Steiner formulated his position at the founding of the first Waldorf school in a classical way:

The educational and teacher system, out of which all spiritual life grows, must be entrusted to the management of those who educate and teach. Anyone active in the state or economic life must not interfere with this management. Every teacher shall spend on teaching only as much time as it allows him to also act as administrator in his field. In this way he will deal with the administration in the same way in which he deals with his lessons. Nobody gives instructions who does not himself work within the living teaching and educating process. No parliament, no individual who may have taught earlier but not any more may join in discussions. What is directly experienced in teaching will flow also into the administration. It belongs to its nature that in such an institution objectivity and professional efficiency in the highest possible degree are observed.

We see that the question is absolutely fundamental. One can certainly argue that administrative matters are much more complicated today than in 1919. Wage accounts, annual accounts etc. are extraordinarily complex and a science in their own right, as are the questions of how to run a school. How could teachers manage this at all? Unhealthy forms within our society, having to do, for example, with remuneration or employment conditions, are reflected in this complexity. Today we have professional groups who concern themselves only with questions of accountancy. This complexity of social life, which originates in its illnesses, is reflected in schools. But it is not adequate to demand that "professional answers" to problems are given. We must also ask ourselves if such a situation is acceptable. We must not passively tolerate inappropriate arrangements but must ask how we can alleviate the pressure of these conditions and ultimately arrive at sensible and healthier ones, starting on a small scale first.

To begin with, however, we are confronted with the complexity of bureaucracy in actual practical terms. Self-regulation is under the spell of this complexity. This again elicits the spontaneous counter-movement of those people who are submerged in bureaucracy and sigh: "If only I could

get rid of it". If many teachers want to be responsible for education alone, it is a kind of response to this whole bureaucratic tendency in schools.

Our choice then seems either to become submerged in bureaucracy or to dispense with all administration saying: we want to be purely educationalists. This, however, does not answer the question: what is my responsibility as a teacher? Because surely the administration should serve the education and, therefore, be uncomplicated and human. Who, if not educators themselves, would be able to handle the administration in such a way? This was how Rudolf Steiner initially thought about this problem. Pedagogy for itself alone does not exist, it belongs to life and life comprises also mundane and sometimes unpleasant aspects which are connected with the word administration.

This fact catches up with us in the end in the teachers' meetings of a Waldorf school. One may have unloaded many questions elsewhere – to the council or the administrator; but there will always be something to be administered, at least as long as one does not revert to having a headmaster.

Attention, Danger of Suffocation! The new Community and its Threats

The responsibility for this can be experienced either positively or negatively. We can find today many self-regulatory organs which in effect collapse because teachers belonging to them take the view which some might even express if asked: I do actually like the school, if only there were neither colleagues nor the teachers' meetings. One may ask them: why is this? The teachers' meetings should be the place of enthusiasm for the school, everything should be permeated by this enthusiasm! Then one hears: this may have been so earlier, with us it is the opposite. We leave teachers' meetings deeply depressed. The agendas become ever longer, one does not do justice to any item. A thousand points are listed, we are always asked to be brief. The motto is – Chase through, sit through, postpone. If one participates in this for a time, one does not get the feeling that the future is being prepared here. Then comes the heartfelt groan: this cannot be right!

It is evident that much depends on the question of how to work together properly. How must a modern form of co-operation look in order that it does not constantly lead to such frustrating experiences? Of course, life asks this question always anew and there is no theoretical answer to it. Yet we can work out points of view which help to find answers in concrete situations again and again.

Behind all questions of self-regulation lies the fundamental problem of communities in modern times. Looking into the past, we see that earlier the community dominated – this is a general phenomenon. The individual had no say, communities determined life. In coming of age in modern times, the individual becomes aware of himself and forms his own judgement. Every person who has his own opinion and judgement is not governed by other people's judgement but is more or less certain of his own. To the extent that one stands on one's own ground, one basically leaves the community. Modern man does this anew ever again. The place for the individual is not the community; the individual stands on his own.

What are the implications for social life? On the one hand it was the aim of the community to lead man to his coming of age. Yet once he has reached it he cannot remain within the old form of community, since it was just this which had determined what an individual should do. It would be a contradiction to lead towards the coming of age and when this status is claimed to say: sorry, we are a community. This is impossible. Therefore, a community has to be transformed, it cannot remain as it was before the age of majority. When this aspect of transformation, which enables people to act according to their own judgement and not primarily under the influence of a community, is viewed on a large scale we call it "The Threefold Social Order". This concept is none other than the answer to the question: what happens when people come of age? How then has society got to change?

This happens on a large scale, and the same happens on a small scale in individual social institutions and equally in our school system. We have schools which were set up by the community (the State), where we can send our children. But now we develop our own ideas and say: "If I look at it properly, I believe that my child needs something different". By taking this view we step out of the community and are open to the reproach: we have established all these expensive schools, why do you not send your children to them? Why do you always have special wishes? Anthroposophy is really an encouragement for special wishes which makes it suspect to communities. For people who still think in the old way about the primacy of the community, it is hard to accept if hundreds of schools want to go their own way.

Basically though, we must say: one cannot even discuss whether schools which are wanted by many people – be they Waldorf schools or other independent schools – are allowed to exist or not; because this would mean that we allow people who do not want something to forbid

others, who want it, to wish what they consider right. This would be grotesque. Nowadays an impulse does not need a justification from above or from outside. It only needs the assent of those who judge it to be right. It has to show merely that it rests on the basis of fundamental human rights. This is the new foundation for consensus in a society. This is the only limiting factor – that one can only ask for freedom where one acknowledges the freedom of others. Impulses and initiatives no longer need the permission of the community at large. This is precisely the credo of the free spiritual life. If I want to do something, others with a totally different conception must not judge whether I am allowed to want this. It would be absurd. It could lead to decisions being made by those who – because they are not interested in a subject – are not competent to do so. This ridiculous state of affairs has still not been overcome today. But we are moving away from a situation where general spiritual rules for all people are issued and we say: we want freedom for the school system. Thus we are bearers of a modern impulse: individuals leave the old community and form new, smaller communities: the individual school-community of a Waldorf school, for example.

The Teachers' (or College) Meeting – An Organ of Consciousness

However, this represents only a partial solution to the fundamental problem of modern social forms. For we now need to prevent the old problems, which we tried to get rid of when we left traditional community structures behind, from catching up with us again sooner or later. Because it may happen that the community – in the form of our new, smaller one – again says: "Now we shall decide what should happen". Yet we forsook state education for Waldorf education in order to free ourselves from being dictated to. We want a new community in reality, not only as a formality. We then arrive at the question: how does a new community of responsible adults actually function? We do not solve this question entirely by abandoning the large community, but take it with us as we search for ways of shaping the new community – in our present case, that of the school. The same also applies to other establishments; for every new initiative has to solve the problem of the relationship between the community and the individual. How can one build really modern communities in which the individual is treated differently to before, when he was only allowed to appear as part of a whole, part of a collective or a group? Much depends on the clarification

of this relationship between individual and community in the everyday life of institutions.

That is why firstly – if we want to understand the problems of collegial leadership – we have to ask how the life of a school manifests itself with regard to this polarity of individual and community. Every social life bears this polarity within it.

Here we can notice something apparently trivial which does not usually become clear to us. Whilst we are at teachers' meetings, no lessons take place. We have to stop the school to be able to sit together at all as a community of colleagues, and we realise: what does the community do? Each time we sit together we do nothing in the way of teaching. The life of the school has been halted. One cannot speak of life but of consciousness: in the College we try to gain consciousness about the problems of our school. This shows us that the modern community is not the pole of initiative but of consciousness. We experience this quite realistically. Life has to be muted, pushed back, stopped in order that we can meet. It must be acceptable that the College develops its own life but that is a different matter. Wherever consciousness arises, life processes are pushed back; and the same applies to the life of a school. If the spiritual within a community wants to become aware of itself, life has to be held back. With individuals it is the same: the soul and spirit nature of man depends on the breakdown of living forces and is not their continuing expression.

In actual fact, the modern community "does" nothing. On the other hand, what does the individual do? The individual "manages" the school. The community manages nothing but is governed by the work of each individual in the school. This is what the community wills to do. In the individual we have the will, or activity pole, in the community the consciousness pole. You can experience this as a reality when, as a teacher, you are told: we must talk about something, we have to meet. Therefore you have to leave your work or pause.

Because one experiences this so strongly, it gives rise to the initial feeling: another meeting, when we can't do anything! Depending on how one experiences the quality of these meetings one will feel: this is wasted time, because one is, in reality, responsible for the life in the school. Every hour of sitting together means, in fact, one hour of teaching is lost. How much one could have done in this time? Such is the more or less conscious impression.

Sitting together is a hindrance to life, for which I am responsible. Therefore it is an impertinence to be constantly saying that one should

meet, when I have so much to do. That is the frequent feeling. Self-observation shows us that we, as individuals, feel responsible for activity. So then what does the school achieve? As much as each individual brings to it. This, and not the alleged activity of the community, creates the achievement of the school. The community achieves nothing, it only becomes conscious of the achievements or the defects.

Individual Actions for the Community

Initially we can state: the community always has to do with consciousness and the individual with activity. It is most important to become really clear about this: the source for everything we need are individual people, not "the" school. This is exactly what Rudolf Steiner means when he speaks of all social development as the emancipation of the individual from the rulership of associations. The modern form of community should want nothing for itself but everything for the individual. It does not mean that the community should help us to privatise, but rather that we realise that the source for everything which we can achieve for the community is the individual. We must do all we can to answer the question: how can we tap into this source of individual initiative? You see how through such a view-point, the understanding for community changes. We cannot say any more: what are *we* doing? On the contrary the "we" has to be pushed as far as possible into the background. Then the question is rather: "What shall *I* do, every individual?"

This is the modern question, the source from which now everything has to flow. The more we ask, what *we* are doing, the more difficult it becomes. The impulses for actions today arise from within, no longer from outside. Yet the fact that the "we" element lies so close to us presents a difficulty; we naturally tend to think of ourselves as representing one school. If we make the "we" into the subject, we revert to the past, where the "we" as the old community told the "I" what it should do. Whereas there existed in that past a legitimate spiritual content for the "we", this is missing today. Thus the ego which today is determined by the "we" only looks like one; in reality it is only an executive organ, part of a collective. There are communities which, in the course of recent centuries and particularly in the 20th Century, have demonstrated what such a collective point of view entails. Ultimately, it leads to the demand for total self-abandonment, total obedience. I am at the disposal of the community, without my own will, like a corpse (as Ignatius of Loyola

once formulated it); I receive my tasks from the community, from above. This ends up in Leninism and Stalinism: the Party is always right, your place is where the Party puts you; you are nothing, your nation is everything, said the Nazis.

This is the consequence of holding on to the predominance of the "we" whilst living in an age which demands freedom for every individual. The new "we" is created by the contribution which every "I" makes towards the "we". Yet we must not understand the "we" as entirely inactive. Rather should we ask: how can the "we" enable the spring of the "I" to flow. The necessity of asking such a question arises out of actual experience. In the community we can always just say: "This needs doing" and then we depend on somebody saying, "I'll do it". We can really experience: the well-spring is the individual. Therefore we have to be vigilant that we do not organise the community in such a way that no real understanding for the individual arises and that individuality could even be regarded as a danger for the "we". In that case we would be imitating on a small scale what we deplored on a large scale when we said: "we need something of our own". Indeed, it is the case that people with initiative do not always have an easy time in a community because one reverts only too quickly to the old way of thinking: "here he comes again with something else when we have just arranged everything so nicely". We must be constantly vigilant to prevent the community becoming hostile to individuals. It will inevitably become so if one lets things run their own way. Ever and again one has consciously to create friendliness towards the individual. This means working against the tendency of the community to revert repeatedly to the old rut by taking over the dynamic role of activity, which would then inevitably lead to hardening.

But there is another danger for the new community. It arises when the individual claims the consciousness aspect for himself alone. Then we get, for example, individual autonomy. Power-structures arise if one or several persons assume the right to have consciousness for all in order to be able to tell the individual what to do.

So we have to pay attention to the right relationship between ego and community. Equally, we have always to maintain the right relationship between consciousness and life and have to prevent it breaking down. On the one hand, we should not reinforce the vegetative aspect, which encourages us to fall asleep and lose our consciousness. Nor should we strengthen our conscious pole one-sidedly, so that the life-processes effectively die. How do we bring life and consciousness

processes into a balanced relationship? This is our question, quite generally formulated. In social terms it points to the right relationship between two questions: *firstly*, how do we achieve an appropriate inner rhythm between individual and community? How do we bring it about that the individual can work as the focus of activity through which everything can be accomplished? *Secondly*, how do we gain a consciousness of events from the community aspect which allows us to state: this is a community?

If the latter is not achieved, the tendency of dissipation arises. Just as on the other hand the collective point of view with its hardening tendency develops, so as its opposite the opinion develops that we do not really need a community, as we all do our own thing anyway. So the idea of community as such is under question today: "why do we need a community at all? We get on quite well without it!" Such a tendency also exists among teachers, even to the point of doubting the significance of the College. We have had a similar tendency in the economic sphere: each person is a cost centre, and an entrepreneur in his own right. In thinking like this, community remains an abstract entity without real significance. This is the other danger.

Therefore we have to ask: how can we enable the community to collaborate in such a way that it in effect carries the individual within its consciousness? On the other hand, how can the individual experience the community in such a way that within the latter the opinions and outlooks of individuals can meet as a harmonious whole? A school is, after all, a group of people who have something in common and are not simply thrown together. These people have something to do with one another. That is why they initiate inter-human relationships amongst themselves which are relations of the rights sphere. Ultimately these legal relationships socially form a kind of skin against the outer world, establishing a distinction between inner and outer. It can be developed with greater or lesser strength, yet it begins earlier than is normally acknowledged and not only with the founding of the association. Wherever people work together, a "silent society" is effectively created, the simple society of civil rights. This does not need to be formalised in contractual terms. Where such relationships pertain, a delicate social skin will always be formed. We can observe how it is strengthened, becoming more distinct until a legal personage stands before us, in the truest sense of the word. So we have three elements: we have the individual, we have the community and we have in effect the skin, the legal form, the legal relationships which bring us

together and which have to regulate these relationships in a certain sense.

Questions of statutes are by no means unimportant, as they determine how the poles of "individual" and "community" relate to one another. Statutes and clauses are a kind of orientation for both. In this respect we also experience the relationship-forming influence of the legal sphere, bringing a rhythmical element into the social life of human beings. This is the task of the rights sphere – a task which it can only carry out if statutes describe and bring order to life processes, while not frustrating or impeding them. Which forms have to be developed so that the existing or proposed social life can be taken hold of and shaped? To create statutes which include all kinds of wishes, or in which detailed rules for all manner of contrived eventualities have been drawn up, is totally abstract and removed from real life. Whoever sets up statutes must have an ear for life, otherwise life itself would be overwhelmed by legal relationships – which would be counter-productive. We must not underestimate the extent to which legal forms develop their own dynamic and can effectively lead life in a certain direction.

Rudolf Steiner's point of departure in the social sphere was always the human side and the attempt to overcome the programmatic or collective element. He did not want, as is often wrongly asserted, to repress the rights aspect; rather did he seek to ensure that the law orientate itself again in accordance with life. Formal law must not overwhelm life, as is the case in many areas today.

We shall try to bring these two elements together and ask ourselves: how does this work in a community? We shall in the first instance consider the College of Teachers. Were we to widen the community by including the parents, other aspects would enter in. But first of all we shall consider the so-called "collegial leadership" of the school. Much of what we shall discover is of direct relevance to other areas – to collaboration within a parents/teacher circle, a school council and other communities. Much of what will be presented here as examples will be valid generally.

How the danger of suffocation can be averted by dynamic delegation and collegial leadership

What has been developed so far gives us the first answer to the question how a community has to inwardly oscillate, in order that the two poles referred to – which must not be mixed up – may both be taken into account. Whatever a community brings to its consciousness, what it sees

as its task and experiences as problems etc., is always inclined to be community-orientated. On the other hand, we can say: whenever something has to be done, we must find people who will do it.

A task confronts us – we want to solve it. The obvious path we take is to move from the community, which experiences a problem and has given itself a task, through the pole of the individual back to the community. Thus we leave the circle of the community and return to it, in a lemniscatory movement. The path of solving community tasks does not lie through the community; rather does it lead from the community towards one or several individuals and back again into the community – in which way we have still to discover. Were we to remain in the circle, no oscillation would occur, as we can see already now.

The question which will concern us now is about the steps of the process we have to take. If the problem exists at the point of departure and the solution at the end, there must be a point in the middle where the problem crosses over to the solution and that is the point of decision. Where a decision is taken, that is the point where everything which I may have previously been considering has now come to a focus, and I can say: now things must change.

The decision is the mid-point where a change becomes effectual. Ultimately, it is generally speaking a question of who in fact says what should happen. Who decides? It is marvellous that we master the tasks and want to solve problems; but meanwhile there is always the question: who does, in fact, say what should happen? Who is competent to do so? The question of competence in making decisions is a kind of centre. *Who* stands in this centre? Who does it? This is a central question around which much circulates. If one unravels problem-knots of self-regulation, one almost always eventually finds questions pertaining to decisions which had previously remained hidden.

Which are the steps leading from perceiving a problem to overcoming it? If we consider this question we have to become aware that, with such systematic observations, the angle from which we are looking needs to be sufficiently wide. . . . The point is to direct one's view towards certain qualities and elements in the process of finding a solution, which can last longer or shorter according to its content.

1. Awareness of the Problem

The first step towards mastering something consists in developing an awareness for the problem and the related tasks. Do we develop an exact

picture of a problem and the task involved? Much depends on that; for if my diagnosis is wrong, the therapy will be wrong. That is the overall foundation, and it has many sides to it. We know that if someone does not see a problem as such, he will see the solution not as a solution either but only as something different. He will then say: why should I do anything different anyway?

The forming of images with regard to problems signifies far more than just obtaining a picture of them: by being *our* picture, it awakens the urge for a solution. It is an old experience: where no urge for a solution, for overcoming a problem, exists, all efforts will come to a stop somewhere. Nobody will participate, people boycott, block and the like. This is not because we have anything against a change, but because, basically, we are not fired inwardly by the impulse: something must change! The change seems to us just one possibility amongst many others. There are, of course, opinions, someone wants this, the other that. The discussion about a task and a problem is more than a matter of the mere subject; it reaches into the innermost being of the person involved. A consciousness of the problem arising thus has repercussions on everybody involved.

So we can say: the forming of "an awareness of the problem" is a classical community task. What concerns us all as a College or committee should also become a matter of conscious knowledge to all of us, even – or especially – if I myself am not the person who will later be the one to put it into practice. Otherwise it will happen that anybody will do anything. Whether we need it or not has not been discussed. We let it happen, which often simply means that we are not interested. In this way the community is tacitly put out of action. We must, therefore, state: the first phase of forming an awareness of the problem must permeate the whole community, it is a specific process of community consciousness. The first phase of "dynamic delegation" is orientated towards the community. (The concept of "dynamic delegation" refers to the method through which the self-regulation of a community is practised in the sense of individual responsibility.)

However, one must not take these phases too schematically. Let us look at an example. A problem has been approaching schools in recent years, the computer. We see that this problem occurs everywhere. What shall we do? Someone says: "We must speak about computers". "Why?" "Who understands computers?" "Well, no one, or only a few". It is meaningless to hurry into a deep conversation on computers ad hoc now. Rather should we at first enable ourselves to talk about the problem in a reasonable and comprehensive way.

This means we have to go off on a digression: "Hold on, this is senseless. How do we become experts at all? Who can present the theme with the necessary depth?" Perhaps we only realise when thinking more thoroughly about the problem whether it is one for us at all. So we must not make a schematic formulation and say: "Well, we talked for one hour, so this is phase one". Rather should we approach the matter with common sense and in a living way. Then there are many possibilities, something comes towards us, we talk about it and realise: this does not apply to us at all, we put it aside. Or we observe: it does not apply to us yet, we put it on hold. Or else we say: it applies to us but we do not know anything. We have first got to get into the swing and learn about the subject.

The first phase comprises what is called today in the development of organisations "picture forming". This always demands a certain cautiousness. One must not rush precipitously towards the practical consequences, but has to learn first to look "in a scientifically-objective way" at the subject without projecting one's own wishes and feelings into it. What is the issue? Do we have a real picture of what we are dealing with? What, precisely, is coming towards us? How does the problem manifest itself?

2. Recognising the Forces of Transformation

To form pictures of problems is essential but does not suffice. We must not only view the phenomena associated with a problem together but learn to interpret these as symptoms which point to deeper causes. The picture-forming is empirical: What can I observe? What is there? What can I perceive? What has played a part hitherto? How does it appear within the context of the whole? What are the facts? All these are practical empirical questions about the phenomena. One question though is still missing: the one which views the nature, the essence, which appears and about which we have to gain clarity.

If we look at phenomena, we are looking at portions of a stream of development, which do not yet tell us where the stream comes from and where it is heading. So we have to reach beyond the simple phenomenon and enter into the forces of forming and shaping. These have made the phenomenon in question an experiential reality in the first place. One cannot find an answer merely by staring at isolated phenomena. This will only bring us to a superficial comparison: is the one better or the other? If we get stuck we begin to make check-lists to

state advantages and disadvantages. I am not saying that one should never do it, but mostly it does not lead far. Anyone who only looks for advantages and disadvantages will all too easily lose sight of the question as to what is right. We have to look more deeply and ask what wants to grow out of this, how we can help the process of transformation. [...] Today we tend to subject our whole lives to balance sheets; it is not for nothing that accountancy is so dominant. Balance sheet analysis is a poisoning problem of life if done in the wrong place. One overlooks the essentials. Those of you who have worked through the *Philosophy of Freedom* know how much emphasis Rudolf Steiner lays on this theme of weighing up the credit/debit balance of life – effort against advantage – to which he devotes a whole chapter. Climb for five hours to the summit, stand there for ten minutes. If you begin to weigh up things in this way, nothing is worth doing. There were philosophers who said: anyone who really masters the technique of weighing up pros and cons must become lazy, because every effort creates deficits. Rudolf Steiner's answer to this was: a person who does not wish to reach the summit will, of course, come to regard everything as being an unnecessary effort. Anyone who does not want anything will, of course, find everything too much. But if I really want to get to the summit, no obstacle is too big and I do not shy away from any trouble. Therefore, we have to ask: what are our intentions? What wants to develop? – instead of asking: does this bring advantages or disadvantages?

The suggestion often comes: show us alternatives. By the end, five different possibilities have emerged, and one is now clearly confronted with the problem. For how can one find the right solution from out of the five? We must not reduce the search for a solution which does justice to the situation to a choice between abstract alternatives. That freedom should not be understood in terms of freedom of choice is an insight that we find early on in the *Philosophy of Freedom*.

All the same, we are only too glad to revert to this comfortable state of picking and choosing between ready-made alternatives. We need to give an answer to a problem, but this is too complicated; so we would like two suggestions. Of those we focus not on the right one but on the more advantageous one. This is, of course, much simpler. Truly free actions need as a prerequisite an intuitive insight into the formative forces, an identification with what wants to develop and which we wish to help enter the world.

So we aim for a solution. If we accept the word "solution" itself as a picture, this means that a knot has been formed which we are disen-

tangling or else there is a hardening, a blockage, which is being dissolved. Something has fallen away from the stream which flows towards the future, and which has its direction determined by the future, by becoming condensed and hardened: it is this that we have to dissolve into that stream. Moreover, we have to recognise what it is that is flowing there; we must dive into this stream of forming and shaping forces, at the source of which we can find archetypal qualities. We have to seek what wells up as a phenomenon from the ever-moving archetype.

Pedagogical questions can only be answered if one takes the view of the growing child. It is not sufficient to look at the child as it stands before us at present and to ask: what does the child need now? Only if we connect ourselves with the growing individuality and put ourselves at the disposal of that which urges towards development in the child, can we progress. So we have to work constantly out of the future, otherwise we never know what has to happen educationally.

Since the task was firstly to form a picture of the circumstances and how they had grown out of the past and had become hardened into a problem, so we have to look in the second phase towards demands which approach us from the future. Only if we combine the two in our gaze, past and future, are we gradually able to give an answer to the question: how shall we set about our task? No real progress in this respect is possible without this.

We gain scope for action by treating both with equal importance: the perceiving of the phenomena, all-round consideration of the facts on the one hand; and looking towards what wants to develop, i.e. the archetypal element, on the other. In education we have to look at the child firstly in the way that we assess its general condition – how it behaves, its health, its capacity of perception – in short: a child review. Secondly, we get together and work on the study of man. We do not discuss this particular child but work on the archetype of man in general. Moreover, with regard to the individual child we go beyond merely assessing it and try to enter lovingly into its being. We try to read the various phenomena with regard to the development of its individuality and discern the possible help we can offer.

We find stimulation for everything we have to achieve educationally in the general study of man. Again and again one has to enter into the archetypal element to find one's way through the world of phenomena. That need not always be to the same degree; and indeed, one must not develop a rigid formula here either but ask in the actual situation what respective weight one should attach to the outer

appearances and the archetypal aspect in order to tackle each question appropriately.

This work with the archetypal element is a matter for the entire community of a self-regulating institute. It is most essential that everybody takes part in such conversations so that everybody really participates in the flowing development of the community. We often put the cart before the horse, in that a common consideration of problems and fundamentals does not take place or only unsatisfactorily. The arising feeling of discontent will then be expressed in the demand for more detailed "information". We wish, so to speak, to prevent anything happen that we don't already know about. But even if we were "informed" about everything, the fact is that information deals with something that has already happened, with established facts. We would still not be part of the stream of becoming in this way.

This is a crucial part of what carries the community. It is a mistake to believe that community originates in the concrete. Community comes into being through the formative forces of life, not through the individual element. Details are dealt with differently by everybody. There is no such thing as a definitive Class One curriculum. Each Class One teacher will teach differently. You cannot give recipes, you cannot give orders for actions to the Class One teacher but have to acknowledge: with regard to the concrete details every teacher will do things differently.

Yet we know the standpoint of Waldorf education regarding an age-appropriate curriculum for Class One, how writing or anything else is introduced. Although we know this in general, we would notice by walking through classrooms that there are hundreds of ways of translating this point of view into practice. It will depend on each individual how he does it; there is no generally agreed way. What keeps us together is an understanding of the role of Class One – that is the common element. It sounds unfamiliar because one always thinks: everything must be concrete.

At this point we notice: where things are still dynamic and living, a sense of togetherness arises and we can all find a way in. In this general sense we can all be Class One teachers. But we cannot discuss whether one does it this way or that. Each teacher in his situation with his children, out of his particular circumstances and possibilities, will have to answer it. To look there for a common approach is senseless. It would lead to uniformity. The element of commonality lies on the first two levels. Everybody should be able to share in that. On these levels people

should be allowed to join in the conversation even if they do not themselves teach the subject in question. Not everybody needs to understand particular problems in the English curriculum. But everybody should know something about the basic elements of what is aimed at with English lessons in a Waldorf school. Only in this way can there be an understanding for the work of others in the community, which is more than a general indifferent tolerance. This is most essential. Not everybody needs knowledge of specific details but certainly of the fundamentals. It is not permissible that things are done in a school of which the majority of people involved have no awareness and of which they could say: we have no idea why we are doing this and what they are doing there at all. This is the point: in our consciousness we have to comprehend the school as a whole. But the whole is initially made up of our understanding of the formative forces out of which we are working. The work with the archetypal element is a community-forming process.

3. The Search for Solutions Through Delegation

It is a great problem for schools that the two phases in the work of the College – in “collegial leadership” – that have been described hitherto are often inadequately dealt with. In particular, the second phase only very rarely receives the attention it needs. This arises when we rush immediately from acknowledging the problem to a practical solution and say: clearly we have a problem and it is obvious that not everyone can deal with it; who then will deal with it? We move immediately from the phase of picture-forming to the principle of delegation. Then we pull back as we face the consequences of giving mandates; because we cannot get rid of the uncomfortable feeling of not knowing exactly what we are aiming for with delegating and because we, as a community, have a gap in our consciousness.

Something needs to be dealt with and we ask: who will do it? This is a critical point, because we leave the communal whole as soon as we delegate. This is the turning-point where we search for the individual or the individuals who will investigate the problems in our stead. The first difficulty approaches us at once: how do we find the right person? Delegating is a delicate theme. For if one simply decides on somebody and tells him: you have to do it, one may have the feeling of infringing upon his freedom. But if we ask: who volunteers? we have often had the unpleasant experience that the wrong one comes forward. To ask him to go away would be a major problem. We are simply not used to talking

openly about such questions; although we naturally employ the necessary tact: “It is good of you to volunteer, but does this certain task not demand certain prerequisites? Maybe someone like XY would be more pre-destined for such a task. Your strength actually lies in other fields.”

Because all this is so difficult and because we wish to protect the freedom of offering one's help, we must finally close the door. If somebody volunteers who can perhaps not cope so well or of whose ability to do the job at all we feel unsure, and we know, moreover, that it is an important task, the result of which will have an effect on the whole establishment – for that case we have invented a universal remedy. Unfortunately, it has turned out to be the guillotine of every community. The universal remedy is to say: “make us a suggestion”. Nothing can go wrong. The person in question can now become as active as he likes but in the end it is not he but we who decide what shall happen. This is what we ultimately resort to in order to put a stop to things. We use this tactic regularly: we make suggestions to each other all the time. Naturally, this leads to a way of implementing a task in which not the individual but the community is the bearer of the initiative. The problem here is that, in effect, we draw the community into the sphere of concrete activity.

What does this lead to? One person or a group works enormously hard and tries to bring the fruits of this work to the community at some stage. This is not easy. The matter has to be put on the agenda, which is already too long. It has to be squeezed in somewhere and one hears: “Yes, bring it up but ten minutes at most, the shorter the better”.

Although one has worked on this subject for half a year, one is now forced to contract it into ten minutes. These minutes are inserted somewhere in a long list of day-to-day items and, because one cannot bring these to a conclusion, the subject is postponed three times. Once the great moment has arrived, all colleagues ask: what is next? Of course, half a year ago we had asked for a suggestion to be worked at. Everybody sits there unprepared whilst the presenter is moved by his theme, which he must now report in five to ten minutes. Already, while speaking, he notices the faces becoming longer and longer. Although admittedly unprepared, those present simply do not have a good feeling about this suggestion. Moreover, if he has spoken as briefly as had been demanded, it is likely that someone will say: “You know, this was far too quick for me. I am supposed to decide something, and it's all so helter-skelter. Ultimately I, too, am also responsible for the consequences. Tell me, how do you arrive at such a suggestion at all?” And if we add that unanimity is not regarded as an aim to be striven for but as a

methodological principle – if someone shakes his head it cannot be done – we have finally made everything just as impervious to initiative on a small scale as it was, to our great chagrin, on a large scale.

Naturally all this is a bit exaggerated – it is not quite as bad everywhere – but one can see the problem more clearly if it is stated in this way.

In such situations, we are totally unclear about what is going on. Indeed, anything could be happening. Since we have not spoken about the fundamentals, about the general direction of the solution, we have no idea whether we need to go to the right or the left, forwards or backwards. Distrust towards the person who had worked at the subject is justified; except that we do not realise that we ourselves were the cause of it. And from that distrust we keep something back. Maybe we pick to pieces the suggestion which had been presented to us, or even attempt to produce detailed changes ad hoc in the College meeting.

Why did we not talk about it beforehand? We had not found time for it or had not even thought of it at all. Now we find ourselves landed with the same problem, which we had only shifted; and it has become much more difficult to solve. The time which we could not find for phases one and two we have now to spend many times over. This is enormously frustrating, and would not have occurred if we had conversed about the essentials before. What should have taken place in the circle of the community in general has been sucked into the realm of concrete detail. There it is in the wrong place, it becomes an encroachment into the responsibility-sphere of the individual [...]

The core of the problem lies in the fact that an individual action has taken place, that it can live amongst us and I support it although it looks different from what it would be if I had carried it out. The supporting individual achievement of the *others* – this is the actual critical point in forming a modern community.

The hidden motif of the inclination towards a demand for unanimity is mostly that if I have unanimity, I have an absolute right of veto, i.e. I am the last resort for everything. This is basically a veiled claim for power. Against this we have to acknowledge the principle of individuality. We must be able to talk about the general points of view which, as a school, we have about a certain field of activity. But if a task has been conferred on someone it should, as a rule, be carried to its conclusion by the mandate-bearer who has responsibility for it; and if I am of the opinion that he is not suitable for the task, I have to say so in good time.

It is a bad habit that we draw elements which belong to the periphery – where we form pictures of general principles – into the centre. What should happen in the periphery is then jammed in the centre. That is when the danger of suffocation occurs. We then fail to see through the entanglement of discussions and problems. For if the agenda for daily arrangements becomes ever longer and we conduct such discussions, nothing will improve and dilettantism prevails.

Those who want to make everything that takes place in the College of Teachers dependent on majority rule will create a tyranny of the majority, in that there will always be a majority who lack expertise in a particular realm. Five have prepared a subject and twenty decide about it. If this is carried to an excess, it will, of course, in time create dilettantism. No original solutions come into being in this way. Something original is never patchwork, but comes into being as a unified whole. The best letter is not the one to which everybody adds his formulation, but the one where the most essential points of view from the conversation are made available to the author. Weighing it all up and living it through inwardly enables him to compose the letter as one whole. This – rather than patchwork – is what we aim for.

The real task which confronts us today is to put up with an action being carried out the way that the other person on whom we conferred the task wishes to do it. To put up with oneself is already a problem at times; but to put up with another person is much more difficult. If we do not learn to support the action of someone else as if it were our own, we shall not achieve community development. Otherwise we make our judgement the measure of everything. If the other person does what we would have done anyway and what we had imagined that he should do, we approve of it. If it differs from that, we find it wrong. To recognise the originality of everyone means that we say to ourselves: it has become what it is now because it carries the signature of that colleague and not anyone else's. Permeating the community with the principle of individuality in this way is an utterly central question.

4. Decision

However, this also means that the individual or the mandatory group is normally not only concerned with the search for solutions, but is also competent in taking decisions.

We have to include the word "normally", because in a single case there are, of course, also decisions of such consequence that one has to

say explicitly: the decision has to be taken in the large circle of the College meeting, perhaps even in the members' meeting of the school council. For that, however, a substantive reason must exist. In case of doubt, the individual or the mandatory group decides and only where this would not be permissible for reasons related to the particular subject, we deal with it differently. It will, for example, hardly be possible that two colleagues introduce a new salary arrangement. With such a question it is self-evident that the decision has to be taken by everybody and not only by a few.

But this has to be clarified beforehand. If there is no explicit reason, the principle holds: those who do something here, also decide upon it. In case of doubt, the decision is taken by those whom we delegate. This leads to our having to become fully conscious of the matter. We cannot afterwards suddenly put a veto upon it and say: "I think it should be different". This would inwardly suffocate the community. For here the consciousness-pole begins to lay claim to life itself. And with that it would kill life. The community must know where it has to hold itself back in order to protect its sources of vitality. It has to find the moment when a question is taken out of the community and an individual can concern himself with it responsibly. The community has done what it could concerning the level of general awareness. Now it has to continue solely through the agency of those persons who devote themselves specifically and intensively to this task.

The third phase was concerned with the search for solutions, i.e. everything that was necessary when dealing with the problem in detail before a decision could be taken. At the beginning of this phase stands the act of delegation itself. The fourth phase, the decision, stands in the centre. Now a decision must be made. I've come a long way, so let's get on with it!

5. Making it a Reality

The third and fourth phases are normally phases in which the individual acts. Of the fifth phase, which of necessity is the one of implementation, of changing the present reality, one must say: here it cannot be otherwise than that the individual acts. The College as a whole meets when nothing is being implemented but when consultation is taking place. The decision then needs to become a reality, and this reflects the third phase in the sense that what was developed as

solution in the third phase is now becoming outwardly manifest. The search for a solution, the decision and bringing it to realisation represent a natural succession.

However, one sees now that the transformation process has not thereby been completed. We must come back to the common whole.

6. Assessment

The next and penultimate phase mirrors the second. In the second phase we tried to approach the growth-forces, the forces of the future. What wants to, and what should, happen now? Where are things heading? Now we need to consider: where *has* it led to? This is the assessment. Assessment does not imply justifying oneself; it means: how did I deal with the need for a transforming impulse which we acknowledged together? What have I learnt from this? It is not important whether I liked it; what matters is how it harmonised with, and was related to, what had concerned us earlier. Again, whether the others like it or not is of no relevance. There are many things which are right without necessarily being liked by us. Today we have constantly to try, through self-education, to influence our soul life and our inclinations. We live in the age of the consciousness soul, which is devoted to what is recognised as being spiritually right, and not in the age of the intellectual soul when everything was placed in the service of the soul. So we have to learn many things which at present we dislike. The whole idea of self-regulation is one big exercise in self-education.

To assess means in a certain sense to make myself accountable for what I had recognised as being right and wanted to make the basis of my action. For this I have to confront the actions which I carried out. This is an important issue. Without reflection, without looking back retrospectively, there cannot be development. Even if we say throughout our life: it is going forwards, not backwards – if we never look back higher forces will intervene in the end and force us to look back over our actions. This we call dying. Death is basically a forced looking back. Assessment reports are of immense significance for the development of a community. Of course, one does not need to make a report about every trifling detail. One has to find the appropriate style, the right moment at which one can perhaps look back over a longer period of time.

Assessment has also a second effect in addition to reflection. Through it everyone can again participate in what is happening.

Meanwhile, the non-participating individuals had been excluded. Of course, they can always ask for information. Whether this is necessary depends on the dimension of the problem. Yet if we look at the basic gestures we may say: all are involved, everyone is informed in the first two steps. Then the problem is delegated, given away, a few colleagues have concerned themselves with the task. And now it comes back again into the community via the assessment. In between the problem had effectively disappeared and only manifested itself by its effects, but now it has been raised again into the consciousness of every participant. When this happens, we create the possibility for every person to orientate himself to the community and to what the community is living through. It can work at the same time as a way of fitting in with the community without the latter having to behave like the individual's guardian. It is most essential that everybody can suddenly perceive in this phase what has been accomplished by individuals within, and on behalf of, our establishment.

Assessment has yet another, psychological, side to it. Many of us do not feel rightly perceived; and many are, indeed, not adequately perceived. Those who can always get a hearing in the circle are known to everyone. But the quiet workers amongst us, who fulfil their tasks without ever making themselves obvious, must not be overlooked; for the community lives from their work just as much as from the more outgoing colleagues. Every co-worker of a community should have the possibility to give an account of his work at times, to give the others insight into it. One could call this a modern harvest festival. One can even arrange the event as such. One must stop viewing such reports as only an item on the daily agenda. There are already positive experiences in a number of institutions. They attempt to cultivate these assessment reports, to organise them like a festival, to which people from outside are invited. They can be shown where we stand, how we have dealt with our tasks and which perspectives we have opened up etc. Incredibly much depends on these moments. Nowadays such occasions are treated in a second class way, as a purely formal point in the life of an association. Thus whenever the school council sits together one hears: oh dear, we have another members' meeting, what shall we tell them? Whereas we should say to ourselves: again we have an opportunity to give an assessment and also present the fruits of our work – which is something quite different. To give an assessment does not make one unfree. On the contrary, it is a condition of freedom.

7. Approval

Our point of departure was the community. Then the community burdened individuals with its problem by delegating it to them. Now the community has got to take the consequences of the delegation again on to itself. This reiterated commitment of the community to the consequences of what individuals have done for it and on its behalf – even if the results were negative – this we call "approval". The word approval* (= Entlastung in German), means to take the "Last" (= burden) off the shoulders of those who had completed a task. We accept and say: what has happened through you, we carry it as if we had done it ourselves. Each one of us takes part of this burden onto himself. In everyday life we call this "loyalty". You know how this works. We are all enthusiastic for positive results and take credit for them. If something goes wrong, we always know someone whose fault it was. To be loyal to the community is the main task. With this we do not mean blind loyalty in which we shut our eyes to weaknesses and defects. Yet as long as I am a member of this community I must stand by it, i.e. I am prepared to put up with the consequences as if I had done the job. This applies especially if I do not agree with everything that happened.

Only this attitude makes a community again into a community. If its members distance themselves from everything it inwardly disintegrates, even if it still exists outwardly. Voting for approval does not mean to vote whether one approved of something or not. It is not a vote of for or against. It is an act of agreement with regard to standing by the consequences. Only in extreme cases where the community was intentionally harmed, where fraud or the like was involved, would one would make an exception and not vote. But this is the only exception. Otherwise one votes not because one agrees with facts, but because approval means: I help carry the new reality which has arisen in the name of the community.

The Rhythm of the Self-Regulation Process

We have been dealing with a kind of rhythmical oscillation within the field of tension between the individual and the community. Where the

*Translator's note: "Approval" is not the exact translation but seems the nearest to describe the process of unburdening the community and giving it relief (Entlasting) by approving its endeavours.

whole is brought into consciousness, there the community must stand in the centre. Once something wants to come into the world, however, when it must be accomplished, this has to happen through the individual. This creates the inner oscillation. The process starts in the community. In the delegation process – which is the turning point – it begins to separate itself from the community and works effectively through the individual and back again into the community. A modern community oscillates in this inner rhythm whilst constantly asking itself: how can I bring the process again into consciousness? How can I get again from consciousness back into action?

The critical points lie where we have to leave the community and again where we must come back to it. To arrange both in the right way – this separation and reunion – is a real art. The separation is only prevented from being a general dispersion if the consciousness-forming within the community had been achieved beforehand. But then the community has to let go or else everything becomes a matter for the community, in which case the tasks for people will multiply, it will become more complicated instead of simpler. Rudolf Steiner has always held that self-regulation makes life simpler and not more complicated. If we cannot achieve the separation, that which should be the task of a few will become a matter for everybody. But this already makes it inevitable that we cannot accomplish the task. Then we face the danger of suffocation! Now comes the second critical point: we lead what had necessarily had to go through an individualising process back into the community in order to prevent dispersal and, ultimately, loss of consciousness. Therefore, how do we find our way from the consciousness pole towards the action pole, and then how do we come back again from the action pole into the general consciousness? Working this through rhythmically is the key question for community life.

References:

1. *Die Kernpunkte der sozialen Frage in den Lebensnotwendigkeiten der Gegenwart und Zukunft* (1919), GA 23, Dornach 1976.
English Translation: *The Threefold Commonwealth*, Anthroposophical Publishing Company, London 1923.
2. "Freiheit und Gesellschaft", *Magazin für Literatur, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kultur- und Zeitgeschichte 1887–1901*, GA 31, Dornach.

Solovyov's Vision of World Brotherhood*

Elizabeth Carmack

The year 2003 commemorates the 150th anniversary of Vladimir Solovyov (1853–1900). Solovyov's most seminal work develops a unique philosophical concept on "all-unity". St Petersburg is where Solovyov's ideas on "Godmanhood" or "Divine Humanity" came to birth in a series of lectures delivered from 1878–1881. The term "Godmanhood" is derived from two Russian words: "Bog" meaning God and "chelovechestvo" humanity, resulting in "Bogochelovechestvo" for Divine Humanity. "Chelovek" being the Russian word for man in the sense of human being, "Bog" + "Chelovek" = "Bogochelovek" [$1 + 1 = 1$] is Solovyov's redefinition of Christ as the archetypal "God-man". After the first lecture on 26 January 1878 an announcement, probably composed in part by Solovyov himself, appeared in the *Orthodox Review*, *Pravoslavnoye Obozrenie*:

Beginning on 29 January the Master of Philosophy V.S. Solovyov will read lectures on the philosophy of religion at 8:30pm on Sundays and Fridays in the large auditorium of the Museum of Applied Sciences.

The aim of Solovyov's lectures will be to show the rational character of positive religion, to show that the truth of faith, in the whole fullness of its concrete content, is, at the same time, the truth of reason.

The central idea of the lectures is Divine Humanity as the living God. Of the twelve lectures the first six will represent a necessary transition from the natural content of human consciousness to that central idea that first received historical actuality in Christianity. Here, the main stages of this transition will be considered as they have been expressed in the intellectual history of pre-Christian humanity, i.e.

* First delivered in the form of a lecture at an "Art and Christianity Enquiry" conference in St Petersburg, Russia on 9 July 2003.

Buddhist, pessimism and nihilism, Plato's idealism, Old Testament monotheism.

The remaining six lectures will be concerned with the positive development of the religious idea itself. They will cover the actualization of Divine Humanity in eternity and in time, the divine world, the fall of spiritual beings into sin, the origin and meaning of the natural world, the earthly incarnation of Christ and redemption, the visible and invisible church, the end of the cosmic process, and the full revelation of Divine Humanity. (1)

Solovyov's opening lecture on divine humanity was a milestone in the development of Russian philosophy. Leading Russian intellectuals of the day including Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy attended the lectures, which were to make Solovyov famous at the age of 25. Vladimir Solovyov, one of the most remarkable figures of the 19th century and perhaps one of the most revolutionary speculative thinkers of his era, published on philosophy, religious thought and ethics. He was also a visionary poet, a literary critic and active politically, addressing current social, political and ecclesiastical questions.

On his mother's side of the family, Solovyov was related to the Ukrainian, Greek and Latin scholar, Grigory Skovoroda (1722-94). Although a philosopher, Skovoroda's unique reputation rested on his being a visionary. Having chosen a spiritual path of self-imposed "homelessness", Skovoroda was known as a "wanderer". On account of this distant relative of his mother's, Solovyov was encouraged to trust his latent intuitive nature. However, Solovyov was also the son of the eminent historian Sergei Solovyov, renowned for his authoritative work *History of Russia from Most Ancient Times*. From his father Solovyov received an example of intellectual excellence from an early age. As rector of Moscow University Solovyov's father in his position would have provided his son with academic zeal and scope. Although Solovyov's father had won his reputation documenting Russia's previously unrecorded past, by revealing what seemed "unknown mysteries", the historian seemed to be able to disclose secrets not consciously understood before. Here there is a parallel to be made between the art of the historian and the vision of the philosopher, who sought to bring the previously uncomprehended spirit of mankind to light. Both father and son worked with what effectively seemed a kind of magic, the former unearthing the cultural secrets of the Russian people and the latter the esoteric origins of humanity.

In his childhood Solovyov was steeped in an intensely intellectual

atmosphere, which was equally devout and pious. At the age of seven he was already an impassioned reader of the *Lives of the Saints*, for which his parents had to restrain his ardour. Despite this atmosphere of severe piety or perhaps because of it, by the age of 14 after reading Buechner's *Force and Matter* Solovyov abandoned Christianity for atheism, but returned to the church by the age of 20. By the time he was 21 he had become a junior professor at Moscow University. The originality of Solovyov's ideas, especially his advocacy of individual expression, dependent on political and religious freedom, ultimately exposed him to censorship at the university and he abandoned his lectureship in the hope of finding greater freedom elsewhere. He travelled to England, where in the British Library he sought to identify and contextualise his own spiritual experience. Although he sought personal definition within the sphere of Gnosticism, he found the work of many Gnostics quite inadequate and returned to religious philosophy for broader terms of self-analysis. Thus the structural basis for Solovyov's ideas on divine humanity is rooted in religious and philosophical terms. Solovyov "believed in the possibility of an adequate philosophical presentation of the Christian message, even that it was possible to prove its truth in terms of rationalist philosophy." (2) From 1838 to 1848 Russian thought became saturated with Hegel's philosophy, read by many initially in the original German. The influence of Hegel definitely accounts for Solovyov's rationalisation of religion. However, where Hegel creates a dialectic between faith and reason, in Solovyov, at moments of epiphany, reason becomes faith, and faith reason:

After this entire cosmogonic process, in which the divine principle, uniting ever more closely with the world soul, dominates chaotic matter more and more and finally gives to it the perfect form of the human organism, when the external receptacle for the divine idea is created in nature in this manner, a new process begins: the development of this idea as a principle of inner all-unity in the form of consciousness and free activity. In humanity the world soul is, for the first time, inwardly united with the divine Logos in consciousness as a pure form of all-unity. Although in reality being only one of the many entities in nature, the human being, having in consciousness the faculty of comprehending the reason, or the inner connection and meaning (logos), of all that exists, appears, in idea, as the all. In this sense, the human being is the second all-one, the image and likeness of God. (3)

Thus, human beings are not limited to a single principle. They have in themselves both the elements of material being that unite them

with the natural world, and an ideal consciousness of all-unity that unites them with God. (4)

In humanity, the world soul reached an inner union with the divine principle, transcended the limits of the external, natural being, and focused all nature in the ideal unity of the free human spirit. (5)

Spiritual consciousness, free activity and ideal unity transfigure the inner chaos and incoherence of the individual into divine substance, understood as God. Every individual is a "God-man", increasing in divine stature in direct proportion to personal consciousness, freedom and at-one-ment. Christ the ultimate "God-man" exists as an archetype for all time.

The Gnosticism at the heart of Solovyov's work may not be apparent, but it is in fact the essential mystical moments in Solovyov's life, which gave rise to his philosophy and not vice versa. Although the poem 'Three Meetings', written at the end of Solovyov's life, acknowledges the Divine Sophia as his source of wisdom and personal vision, Stephan Hoeller's prose rendering does justice to the vital impact of these three unique experiences.

Attending Ascension Day service while still a young boy, he saw the walls and dome of the church disappear and their place taken by a radiant female figure holding a heavenly flower in her hand. Deeply affected, Solovyov discussed his vision with his grandfather, a priest in the Orthodox church. Together, they reached the conclusion that the celestial visitor was Sophia, the Lady of Divine Wisdom, who is recognised by the Orthodox Church as a hypostasis or emanation of God. The mysterious vision of this Lady, whom he named his 'Eternal Friend', returned to Solovyov on several occasions. The next time was when he was studying in England [at the British Library]. He called upon her for guidance and she directed him to proceed to Egypt where he might meet her. Spending the night among the Pyramids in solitary vigil, Solovyov at last glimpsed the mystic vision of Sophia in all its transcendental splendour. (6)

Thinkers of any historical moment usually assess and organise their experience with the help of ideas, whereby the truly chaotic and enigmatic nature of life takes on a clarity that exists primarily in the mind. Thought can make life appear falsely predictable, because of the metaphysical certainty it projects. In this respect "Solovyov does not fit this model. Neither ideas, nor philosophical speculations not even theological dogmas were the foundation of Solovyov's life but rather a number of mysticalexperiences which began early in life and continued

intermittently until his death" (7) Thus Solovyov's experience of Divine Sophia accounts for and is the spiritual agency behind his philosophical and theological aspiration for "all-unity". "All-unity" in the sphere of religion, i.e. unity of all faiths and especially the re-unification of Russian Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches substantiate Solovyov's basic argument for a universal church. However, his aversion to anti-Semitism and acute awareness of the suffering of the Jewish people was also valid incentive to eliminate differences between religions. Since his mission to establish a universal church failed, at the end of his life Solovyov devoted hours to prayer in Hebrew in his own unique attempt to assuage the plight of the Jewish nation. Solovyov clearly believed that if a universal church was impossible, universal love was imperative.

Solovyov's work on the universal church *La Russie et l'église universelle* (8) was written in French and first published in France in 1889. Although the expression of the ecumenical movement today is the best contemporary example of Solovyov's belief in 'absolute faith' defying the differences that divide people of various religions, perhaps the reconciliation amongst believers, who are aspiring to greater harmony in a multi-faith society, especially since 11 September 2001, is the first real sign of Solovyov's wisdom.

In the early 1880's just after his lectures on Divine Humanity, in *God, Man and the Church: The Spiritual Foundations of Life* (9) written between 1882 and 1884, Solovyov advocates "prayer" as the only real activity of true religious union with the divine. He sees "prayer" as the only inner sincere manifestation of good-will possible, since the individual submits to the spirit out of complete freedom. Furthermore laying the foundations of faith in the activity of prayer, rather than any doctrinal belief supports Solovyov's premise that real religion is non-denominational. As a result faith and the foundations of the true church are comprised of humanity and are to be found in people, not in the expression of institutionalised religion. Within this context Solovyov upholds Christ as an example and guide to conscience beyond ecclesiastical doctrine. However, for the spirit of Christ to be an absolute, valid to all, despite religion, race or creed, the divine truth would require universal terms equally accessible to all. Perhaps "the great merit of Solovyov is that he preached with ardent zeal the Christian message in the language of modern philosophy" (10), whereby it was possible to affirm the true essence of Christ as "universal love".

The most accurate picture of Solovyov at the time he was expounding his ideas on "Godmanhood" is from Dostoyevsky (1821-

1881). In May 1878, four months after Solovyov had started to lecture on "Divine Humanity", Dostoyevsky's son Alyosha died of epilepsy a few months short of his third birthday. Alyosha was Dostoyevsky's second child to die in infancy; his eldest child and daughter Sophia had died just after birth, at the age of two weeks. The impact of Alyosha's death was all the more painful to Dostoyevsky, because he had died from epilepsy. Dostoyevsky felt directly responsible, because his son had inherited the disease from him. On account of this Dostoyevsky not only felt bereft, but burdened with guilt and was unable to work. Before this tragedy, Vsevolod Solovyov, Vladimir Solovyov's older brother, an historical novelist of the day, had been a long-standing friend of Dostoyevsky's. However, in an attempt to console Dostoyevsky and his family of their grief, Solovyov, the philosopher, made a personal gesture to the writer and started to visit him and his family at home. At this time Dostoyevsky's wife persuaded her husband to accompany Solovyov to Optina Hermitage after prevailing upon their new friend to include Dostoyevsky in his plans. Solovyov was intending to travel to Optina Hermitage that summer and a visit to this sacred place had long since been only a dream for Dostoyevsky. Optina Hermitage used to be a unique place of pilgrimage in Russia where the ailing, elderly and dying could take refuge. Mystical union with the dead was possible and many people, especially writers, made Optina Hermitage a place of pilgrimage to affirm a sense of immortality prior to death. Pilgrims to Optina Hermitage received an experience of the spirit, which created a foreknowledge of life after death. As a result the necessary inner courage was imparted to help the individual face death and to die reconciled, if not in peace. Accompanying Solovyov, Dostoyevsky left Moscow a month after the death of his son. "The journey to the Optina Hermitage took seven days, which were to prove of major significance to the way in which the project of the novel *The Brothers Karamazov* developed. In the course of the journey Dostoyevsky discussed with Solovyov his plans for the work he had begun, and Solovyov later asserted that 'the Church as a positive social ideal was to constitute the central idea of a new novel or new series of novels, of which only the first *The Brothers Karamazov* has been written.'" (11)

The Brothers Karamazov written at exactly the same time as Solovyov's lectures on divine humanity embodies an accurate portrayal of Solovyov in the character of Alyosha, Fyodor Karamazov's third and youngest legitimate son. Dostoyevsky even introduces his novel "as ... the life-chronicle of ... his hero, Aleksey Fyodorovich Kara-

mazov". (12) Aleksey's character mocked by his school mates best captures Solovyov's early orientation to women: "This feature of his was a savage, frenzied modesty and chastity. He could not abide certain words and certain kinds of stories about women." (13) The words of the young priest about his spiritual objective in life exemplify Solovyov's too: "I want to live for immortality, and I will accept no half-way compromise." (14) However, despite Aleksey's humble and modest beginnings as a novice, his religious devotion, mystical experience and spiritual aspiration to learn to heal as a "doctor of the soul", best reflect Dostoyevsky's experience of his friend Solovyov. Dostoyevsky's depiction of Solovyov in *The Brothers Karamazov* reveals the philosopher's zealous nature and religious mission. Although an unlikely character to associate with Solovyov, Ivan Karamazov is also often interpreted as the philosopher's rational double. The conflict between the two brothers Ivan and Aleksey Karamazov reflects an inner tension of the pagan sceptic and Christian believer in Solovyov. Dostoyevsky's concept of Christianity in *The Brothers Karamazov* is firmly rooted in Russian Orthodoxy, however, his personal vision of Christ and emphasis on individual faith create broader terms of Christian grace, which challenge ecclesiastical doctrine. The Law of God or the application of Christ as a moral imperative exemplified in Protestantism, but interpreted in *The Brothers Karamazov* as the seed of corruption in Roman Catholicism, Dostoyevsky rejects in "The Grand Inquisitor". Dostoyevsky denounces the Roman Catholic church, but testifies to the Resurrection as unqualified and unconditional new life in the form of a second Lazarus. In Russia the life of the spirit is purified by the earth, and the earth equated with the renewal of the spirit.

Although the church as a social ideal in *The Brothers Karamazov* is clearly inspired by Solovyov's concept of "all-unity", Dostoyevsky's renowned "Pushkin Speech" in Moscow on 8 June 1880 further testifies to the writer's conscious ecumenical mission. However, Dostoyevsky's anti-Semitism cannot be overlooked in his advocacy of an Aryan ideal, which excludes the Jewish people.

Yes, the vocation of the Russian man is doubtless universal-European and even ecumenical. To become a true Russian, entirely Russian, means perhaps only (in the last issue, please emphasise this) to be brother of everyman, to become an "All-man", if you wish. All our Slavophile and Western movement is but a great misunderstanding, even if historically necessary. The destiny of Europe and of the entire Aryan race is for a true Russian as dear as Russia itself and the destiny is

ecumenical, but one that has been conquered not by the sword, but by strength of brotherhood and our brotherly longing for the spiritual union of all... To become then truly Russian means to provide the solution of European contradictions... to receive with brotherly love all brothers into his Russian soul, and perhaps even finally to be able to utter the word of universal great harmony, of final brotherly concord between nations, according to Christ's commandments. (15)

The novel *The Brothers Karamazov* espouses the Russian cultural ideal of "brotherhood". Individual responsibility for all and everyone within the broad terms of a social collective means shared guilt for the whole community, a concept expounded in the teachings of Father Zosima. These ideas, although not directly identical with Solovyov's, derive from a common source which strongly influenced both writer and philosopher. Dostoyevsky and Solovyov were profoundly influenced by Aleksei Khomyakov (1804–1860) whose basic understanding of "sobornost" endorsed the idea of Christian fellowship as "organic collectivity". Khomyakov understood the church to be the "free" unity of the faithful, a unity, which emerged from a common understanding of truth, and a common love of Christ. Real religion could not be attained through coercion. Only out of complete inner freedom could Christian truth develop, which Khomyakov experienced as fellowship, i.e. the "sobornost" at the heart of the Russian Orthodox Church. Khomyakov was a leading exponent of the Slavophile movement, a group of half a dozen individuals challenging the authority of the fast growing pro-Western stance catalysed by Pyotr Chaadaev (1794–1856) at the beginning of the 19th century.

Chaadaev's *Philosophical Letters* published in 1829 were harshly criticised and suppressed by the authorities, and as result he was placed under immediate house arrest and declared insane. Chaadaev's explicit condemnation of the Orthodox Church for its spiritual separation from the West, meant Russia had caused her own cultural isolation. Unity, universality and conciliarity at the heart of Roman Catholicism, Chaadaev explained, had accomplished everything in Europe. Attributing history with ontological status, Chaadaev saw a Christian truth and plan, at the centre of Western European development, absent in Russia. For Chaadaev the seed of wisdom in Western consciousness had been shaped by the impact and influence of the Roman Catholic Church. Although past cultural developments in Western Europe were fast being duplicated in Russia, to Chaadaev's way of thinking, the fruits of inner transformation within the European psyche revealed how

Russia had suffered an irreversible spiritual loss by being excluded from Western Christianity. Nothing could compensate for the impact of fragmentation and resulting egoism caused by the Orthodox Church; nothing could repair the inner loss to the Russian people. Accusing the Russian Orthodox Church of complete responsibility for this spiritual deficit, Chaadaev was met with fierce political opposition. However, Chaadaev's proof of Russia's lack of consciousness and backward thought, which was symptomatic of her "self-centred wilfulness, was the fact that, whereas in Europe Christianity had brought about the abolition of slavery and serfdom, in Russia serfdom had been introduced several centuries after the coming of Christianity." (16)

St Petersburg, founded in 1703 by Peter the Great (1672–1725), was built as an icon to the West, and as a result the city flourished during the Enlightenment, especially from 1762 to 1796 under the reign of Catherine II, Catherine the Great (1729–1796). The impact of Western thought-forms in literature, philosophy and art quickly alienated the indigenous culture's trust in their own Russian heritage and identity. The Slavophile movement dared to attack the very foundations of Western culture for its corrosive impact on Russia. Not just Chaadaev's advocacy of the Roman church, but a self-conscious sense of inadequacy in the Russian Westerners arose from the absence of a Russian Renaissance within their own cultural and historical development. As a result the Slavophiles sought to redeem Russia's predicament of identity by arguing that Western rationalism and an intellectual relationship to the spirit would be the cause of Western Christianity's ultimate doom. Slavophilism set out to remedy Russia's historical loss of being outside Western European development by arguing that Europe's Christian future would depend on synthesis and inclusion within the true faith and religious nature of the Russian people, a belief even Dostoyevsky testified to. Western Europe's intellectual relation to God would ultimately lead to fragmentation and alienation of the spirit. Thus the future of Western Christianity as understood by the Slavophiles was dependent on Russia's capacity to transform and redeem it. Moscow had already been identified as the 'Third Rome', the next great Christian centre after Constantinople.

Just as the Westerners' school of thought gained momentum in St Petersburg, the Slavophile movement developed in Moscow in proximity to Sergei Posad, the centre of the Russian Orthodox Church. Owned in the mid 19th century by Sergei Aksakov (1791–1859), a theatre critic in Moscow, the Abramsova Estate became a centre for the

Slavophiles to meet and define their anti-Western ideology. Aksakov's sons Ivan Aksakov (1823–1886) and Konstantin Aksakov (1817–1860) advocated Pan-Slavism and communal life. Although the visit of the two Kireevsky brothers to Berlin was responsible for transmitting German idealism and reintroducing its sources within a philosophical context, Ivan Kireevsky (1806–1856) alone affirmed that the supremacy of the Russian soul was based on two key factors: 1) the Orthodox Patristic Foundations of the Church and 2) the historic communal nature of the peasantry, the Russian folk. Despite Ivan Kireevsky's strong affinity with Western European developments in romantic literature and philosophical idealism, the supremacy of personal faith rooted in subjectivity always dispelled the authority of reason: "He who has not understood an idea by feeling it, has not understood it as well as he who has understood only through the medium of feeling". (17)

Dostoyevsky's concept of "brotherhood" and Solovyov's ideal of "all-unity" cannot be completely understood without acknowledging their indebtedness to Khomyakov's religious thought. Despite how ardently both writer and philosopher defend themselves against any affiliation with the Slavophile movement, Khomyakov's understanding of "sobornost" inspired an idea of Christian fellowship, which appears celebrated, although transformed in both Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* and Solovyov's *Lectures on Divine Humanity*. However, where Dostoyevsky embraces the universal significance of the Orthodox Church, Solovyov contests this Russian authority by positing the idea of "all-unity". The unprejudiced nature and unlimited scope of Solovyov's philosophical mind develop a sense of unity, which is often dismissed in Russia, because misinterpreted as an off-shoot of Chaadaev's religious allegiance to Western Christianity. However, the universal fellowship at the heart of Solovyov's vision, which inspired Dostoyevsky's concept of Christianity in "The Brothers Karamazov", far surpasses Chaadaev's concept of Rome. With the life of the individual devoted to the spirit, creating an ideal community comprised of all religions, divine humanity becomes the unacknowledged and invisible church, which Solovyov realises early in life through personal revelation and complete faith in the Divine Sophia.

Notes

1. *Lectures on Divine Humanity*, Vladimir Solovyov, Edited by Boris Jakim, Lindisfarne Press, New York, 1995, page ix

2. *Holy Moscow*, Nicholas Arseniev, London, 1940, page 111
3. *Lectures on Divine Humanity*, Vladimir Solovyov, Edited by Boris Jakim, Lindisfarne Press, New York, 1995, page 141
4. *Ibid* page 142
5. *Ibid* page 143
6. *War, Progress and the End of History*, Vladimir Solovyov, Introduction by Czeslaw Milosz, Afterword by Stephan Hoeller, Lindisfarne Press, New York, 1990, page 198–199
7. *Ibid* page 198
8. *La Russie et l'église universelle*, trans. *Russia and the Universal Church*, Vladimir Solovyov, G. Bles, London, 1948
9. *God, Man and the Church: The Spiritual Foundations of Life*, Vladimir Solovyov, translated by Donald Attwater, Cambridge, 1974: Part I, Chapter I: "Prayer", pages 35–64
10. *Holy Moscow*, Nicholas Arseniev, London, 1940, page 111
11. *The Brothers Karamazov*, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, translated by David McDuff, Penguin Books, London, 1993, page xiii
12. *Ibid* page 1
13. *Ibid* pages 18–19
14. *Ibid* page 26
15. *Holy Moscow*, Nicholas Arseniev, London, 1940, page 109
16. *Handbook of Russian Literature*, edited by Victor Terras, Yale University Press, New York, 1985, page 76
17. *Holy Moscow*, Nicholas Arseniev, London, 1940, page 80

The Age of Consent – A manifesto for a new world order

George Monbiot, Flamingo, London, 2003

Monbiot's book is at once a critique of the status quo and of the anti-globalisation movement. Its argument is that if the "dictatorship of the rich" is to be overcome the anti-globalisation movement needs to get its act together, converting a medley of disparate agendas into something with serious political clout – a world parliament, no less. Nothing short of this will match the usurpation of democracy and national sovereignty consequent on the globalisation of economic life.

Monbiot does not spell out what such a world parliament would look like, however, although he has done so in media interviews, or how it would come into being. In fact, his book ends in a series of limp exhortations "to exchange security for liberty, comfort for elation." But the aim is clear: "to develop a strategic and systematic means of curbing the Age of Coercion", meaning the manner in which the rich use all means at their disposal to impoverish the rest of humanity.

Though *The Age of Consent* goes out like a lamb, it comes in as a lion, with great fighting talk about a "planetary class interest" needing to grab power from the dictating rich. Power must out-power power because "power is as intrinsic to human society as greed or fear; a world without power is a world without people. The question is not how we rid the world of power, but how the weak first reclaim that power and then hold it to account."

Monbiot's analysis proceeds by way of a tour of Marxism and anarchism, with both of which he has a certain empathy but in neither of which does he see a way forward such as democracy, with all its faults, offers. Provided it remains representative of the people and does not begin to lead a life of its own, the state provides humanity with the only means to constrain the abuse of power.

The main problem Monbiot identifies is that "national self-interest reduces our appreciation of our common humanity" and that power has migrated to the economic sphere. To match this situation, he outlines a manifesto designed to "democratise globalisation". Although

it ends with the rather vague notion of a world parliament, other key aspects of his critique amount not so much to the democratising of globalisation as the constraining of economic forces – an important distinction, though not one made by Monbiot. The first is to revamp the UN Security Council so that it is truly representative of all the nations. The second is to return to Keynes's pre-Bretton Woods concept of an International Clearing Union to balance out world indebtedness. The third is to establish a World Fair Trade Organisation.

All these are dangerous propositions that challenge US hegemony head-on. According to Monbiot, however, this is an event waiting to happen, and we are called on by history to envisage constructive ways to catch a collapsing world.

As an anthroposophical reader, my experience of reading *The Age of Consent* was a mixture of a sinking heart buoyed by moments of hope. My heart did not sink because of the dire picture of the world Monbiot painted or because of the class-based approach of his response, though neither were cheering. It sank because the threefold social order is so conspicuously absent from public discussion.

Theoretically, at least, it would not take much for Monbiot to recast his arguments as the need to separate economic and rights matters, and for the state to become the protector of rights rather than the manager of the economy. He would then go on to argue for true democracy as a matter of rights, not as a discipline on economics.

But where is the threefold image in today's debates? Where, indeed, is it the active principle of our own social arrangements? In the sad world Monbiot depicts – of increasing wealth disparities, political suppression and endemic economic ill-health – we see the result of refusing the threefold idea in 1917. But to remedy the resulting chaos without recourse to Rudolf Steiner's penetrating – and still relevant – analysis will only compound matters.

My heart sank most of all because it is not clear if this refusal is the end of the matter, or even the true problem. It could equally, though more tragically, be due to its abandonment by Steiner's followers or, worse, the karmic non-appearance of those whose task it is.

To give my sinking heart buoyancy some hope was offered firstly by the potential proximity of Monbiot's analysis to that of the threefold social order, provided this could be given current-day credibility. But secondly, though strangely, to an out-of-character remark that comes towards the end of Monbiot's book, where he describes his aim of finding the political equivalent to "the exultation, which Christians call

'joy', but which in the dry discourse of secular politics has no recognised equivalent. It is the drug for which, once sampled, you will pay the price."

Whether such joy is compatible with a "contemplation of revolution" such as would "rattle the cages of power" is a moot point. On the other hand, joy is every bit a human attribute as greed or fear. If we could but find its political equivalent maybe it is here that new socio-economic habits could begin to form.

Christopher Houghton Budd

**The Party's Over:
Oil, War and the Fate of Industrial Societies**

Clairview Books, Forest Row, Sussex 2003
(first published in Canada by New Society Publishers,
Gabriola Island, 2003)

Richard Heinberg

Much of the substance of the present *Golden Blade* is concerned with the desirability of radical social transformation on a global scale. This book addresses this same challenge, but more from the standpoint of necessity. It is, of course, not difficult to see that probably the most significant sleight of hand on which the modern "Western" life-style is based is that the dimensions of time and space have already been transcended, that as contemporary human beings we can move more or less at will from one physical or temporal situation to another. In a sense this is already a perfectly valid insight, at any rate as a potential; but for as long as this mobility depends, in real terms, on our *being moved* (whether physically or mentally) by external sources of energy, it remains appropriate and, also, necessary to view the human aspiration for social transformation with which we have been preoccupied within the context of the extraordinary precariousness of our present utter dependence on sources of energy – and, in particular, oil – which are not merely finite but, as Heinberg goes to considerable lengths to chronicle, will shortly become significantly more scarce than they are now.

The core of Heinberg's treatise is some research undertaken over several decades by a number of petroleum geologists, people who by and large have no particular political or corporate axe to grind and are certainly not prone to environmental sensationalism. The doyen of these was Marion King Hubbert (1903–81), a Texan geophysicist who was a leading academic authority advising at various times both Shell and the American Government. Among his other areas of research, Hubbert did some pioneering work on the likely world reserves of oil. He estimated that the peak in global oil production would come between 1990 and 2000. This is not so different from the peak in global oil extraction

estimated overall by Heinberg from the work of other more recent petroleum geologists. For the period which some of the people best placed to estimate such things have given for the culmination of the global energy party is 2006–2015. After this time, the growing exploitation of the accumulated energy resources of the world will go into reverse, and it will not be possible to replenish these reservoirs from renewable sources within such a time-scale. Electricity production – and with it the electronic communications industry and information technology – would of course also be directly affected. Statistics such as these are presented by the author in a lucid, matter-of-fact way, not because he has some kind of metaphysical agenda but because he believes it is important that as many people as possible are aware that “the party is over”. For then, he affirms – and he makes a number of intelligent, constructive and non-partisan suggestions – we can still do something about the situation.

“The party is over” is not, of course, an original phrase. These precise words were used by Fritz Schumacher as the title of an article written for *Resurgence* in 1975 (vol. 6 no. 4, September–October). In this brief article, Schumacher speaks of “three illusionary entertainers” who have in recent years been holding humanity under their spell, seeking to perpetuate the illusions of the “inexhaustible supply of cheap fuels and raw materials”, of an equally endless “supply of workers willing to do boring, repetitive and soul-destroying work for very modest rewards” and of a science and technology which have an infinite capacity to make everyone so rich that the only remaining problem would be what to do with it all. Schumacher goes on to point out that the only reason why these “entertainers” have (even in 1975) been getting away with it is that there has been what he calls a “refusal of consciousness”, which allows totally outdated philosophies and moral attitudes to be defended on wholly vacuous grounds.

Schumacher’s three entertainers were conspicuously on view at a one-day conference on 3rd September 2003 at the Regent’s College Conference Centre, London. This conference, “Is Small Beautiful?”, had been organised by the Intermediate Technology Development Group to mark the 30th anniversary of the publication of Schumacher’s famous book, *Small is Beautiful*. But this particular participant, at any rate, had the sense that their proffered bounties were falling largely on deaf ears, and that – at least as regards life’s practicalities – the West has more to learn from the so-called developing world than the other way round. Conspicuous amongst the non-entertainer speakers was Tewolde

Egziabher, a wise, dignified statesman from the Environment Protection Agency, Ethiopia. Speaking on behalf of smallholder farmers, Mr. Egziabher voiced in an eloquently personal way the general direction of the moral and practical recommendations expressed by Richard Heinberg. To him, the way that the world is coming together is an experience of considerable pain, with the dominant industrial culture of the North behaving as loners, gratifying their selfish interests. This has left the South at a definite disadvantage. Greed still dominates, coupled with conscience-driven humanitarianism. There is a prevalent sense of helplessness to change a situation where fair play is so lacking. And yet the North needs to listen to the South. Having outlined the present context of the work of the smallholder farmer, Mr. Egziabher went on to present a twofold approach to the problem. First, local farmers’ rights and their technologies should be recognised, intellectual property rights should not extend to privatising what is communal and international law should be based on fairness. Second, he described a “modular” system of maximising the resources of the local community, which should aim to produce all its own vegetables and at least 10% of all its food, with communal access to seeds (which should not be privatised); all its animal food requirements; after five years all its wood biomass needs and organic fertiliser requirements; to have its own water supply system and traditional medicinal arrangements; to be in charge of elementary schooling, with government support but *not* with the government running the schools; and to be self-sufficient in oil crop and textile production. He closed his contribution with a plea that people should not be herded into cities.

The present writer heard these words before reading Richard Heinberg’s carefully researched and quietly reasonable book. They make all the more sense now than they did at the time.

Simon Blaxland-de Lange

Notes on the Contributors

Michael Luxford has lived and worked in the Camphill Movement since 1971. He co-founded the Fundamental Social Law Research Group in 1993 and is active as an independent social researcher.

Stephen Usher is a Ph.D economist who received his degree from the University of Michigan. After several years as a staff economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of New York he took on the management of the Anthroposophic Press, a responsibility he held for 8 years. Following that he joined an internationally recognised firm of consulting economists where he was busy with a number of projects for over a decade. In 1999 he established his own economic consulting practice. In addition to economic consulting Stephen Usher is a trustee to several not-for-profit organisations involved with Anthroposophy. He is also a devoted student of the works of Rudolf Steiner about which he speaks and writes regularly.

Michael Spence was for many years the Bursar of Emerson College, Forest Row. Since his retirement he has been actively engaged in research on the application of Steiner's picture of the threefold nature of social life.

Cornelius Pietzner, born into the Glencraig Camphill Community, Northern Ireland, has spent much of his life working in the Camphill Movement in the United States. He was recently appointed as the Treasurer of the General Anthroposophical Society based at the Goetheanum, Dornach, Switzerland.

Christopher Houghton Budd, an economic historian, has long been a student of Rudolf Steiner's contribution to economics, whose works he publishes in English. He lives in England but travels the world extensively giving lectures and workshops. He has a doctorate in banking and international finance from John Cass City Business School, London.

Nicanor Perlas is President of the Centre for Alternative Development

Initiatives (CADI), a civil society organisation based in Metro Manila, Philippines. He is involved in advocacy and action on issues surrounding globalisation, sustainable national development, the threefolding of Philippine society in line with Philippine Agenda 21, and sustainable integrated area development in rural areas. He is involved in a range of activities, including leadership in several national and global networks, all connected with sustainable development and threefolding. In recognition of the national and international impact of his work, Mr. Perlas was awarded the UN Environment Programme Global 500 Award for Sustainable Agriculture and The Outstanding Filipino Award.

Christoph Strawe has researched, lectured and written about the Threefold Social Order for many years and is currently in Stuttgart with the Threefolding Network Initiative.

Lawrence Keen is based in London and has first-hand experience of working in multi-national corporations over many years.

Udo Herrmannstorfer, born in Breslau in 1941, is a graduate in business management and an economist, with several years' experience in industry. Since 1972 he has worked as a management consultant, principally as leader of the Institute for Contemporary Economics and Social Development, Dornach, Switzerland. From 1995 onwards his endeavours have been focussed on building up the quality-development initiative, *Wege zur Qualität* ("Ways to Quality"), which arose as a result of a collaboration between his Dornach Institute and the Rudolf Steiner Seminar for Curative Education and Social Therapy.

Elizabeth Carmack, after having lectured at Moscow State University for three years in English Literature, conceived of the Cambridge Music Conference as a three-year initiative on "Music and the Word". "Music and Healing" (2001), "Music and Oral Tradition" (2002) and "Music and Philosophy" (2003) were developed under the epitaph: "Every illness is a musical problem – its cure a musical solution!" (Novalis, 1772–1801). Dialogue and social renewal have been at the heart of the Cambridge Music Conference, which has consciously worked with "music as a source of regeneration". As a result music has been commissioned and premiered each year by such celebrated

composers as Howard Skempton, Judith Weir and Nigel Osborne, whose works have artistically inspired the metaphysical ideals of each conference. Elizabeth is currently completing her Ph.D on "Music as a World Conception of Moral Regeneration in Shakespeare's Late Plays/Romances"

Copy #1

DATE DUE

MAY 20 2004

OCT 03 2004

APR 20 2008

DEC 28 2011

Rudolf Steiner Library
65 Fern Hill Road
Ghent, NY 12075
(518) 672-7690
rsteinerlibrary@taconic.net

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

TOGETHER AT THE TABLE OF BROTHERHOOD

The emergence of an increasingly global economy presents challenges to the rights of individuals and social groups within nation states. Commercial interests in cultural sectors like education, health provision etc. raise fundamental issues about entitlement, distribution and indeed the freedom of the human being. This issue of *The Golden Blade* draws contributions together on the question of how to reconcile the freedom of the individual with social responsibility.

Brotherhood and the Struggle for Existence

Rudolf Steiner

Three Laws

Michael Luxford

Clash of Civilisations, Iron Necessity, 530 Billion Imaginary Workers: Current Events through the Lens of Rudolf Steiner's Spiritual-Scientific Discoveries

Stephen Usher

The Iraqi War and the Threefold Nature of Human Society

Michael Spence

The Karma of Money

Cornelius Pietzner

Ethical Financialism: A Fast-Track to Changing the Way the World is Financed

Christopher Houghton Budd

The Human Being between Globalisation and Genetic Engineering?

Nicanor Perlas

Threefolding or Global Governance?

Christoph Strawe

"Com-Panis", Economics and the Company

Lawrence Keen

Delegation and Collegial Leadership, as exemplified in the Self-Regulation of Waldorf Schools

Udo Herrmannstorfer

Solovyov's Vision of World Brotherhood

Elizabeth Carmack

Book Reviews: Two Recent Publications

Christopher Houghton Budd

Simon Blaxland-de Lange

Cover Design:

Anne Stockton

ISBN 0-9531600-6-8

ISSN 0967-6708