

CONTENTS

Introduction by Wolfgang Zumdick ix

PART I

Spiritual Science, Natural Science, and Technology

STUTTGART, JUNE 17, 1920

Characteristic forms of spiritual-scientific research methods. Experiencing the spiritual in its concrete form through perceiving consciousness. Transformation of the configuration of the soul of the human being in the course of the development of humanity. Transition from mere observation of nature to the grasping of nature through experimentation. The desire for knowledge of natural science connected with the desire to copy nature. The soul's understanding of the world of technology. The developing of a one-sided technical consciousness in the pragmatism of American philosophy. The new technological experience as preparation for pure experience of spirituality.

pages 1–23

Discussion

pages 24–43

Anthroposophy: Its Essence and Its Philosophical Foundations

BERN, JULY 8, 1920

Anthroposophy and the question of the conscience of our time. Transformation of the entire human soul life as a requirement for researching the world. The boundaries of the knowledge of nature as the first point of connection. The attempt of conventional philosophy to go beyond these boundaries through intellectual methods. The fundamentally different approach of anthroposophical spiritual science. Meditation and concentration as one aspect of spiritual-scientific research. About the characteristic of the meditation exercises and their results. The illusory nature of the usual mysticism as the second point of connection. Individual training as the other side of this spiritual-scientific method of research. Knowledge of nature and self-knowledge as both pillars of human knowledge. Considering the soul-spiritual as the essential aspect of the scientific. The grasping of human nature through the development of an understanding for the spiritual, soul, and bodily nature of the human being. Rudolf Steiner's years-

long fight against Kant's system. The transitory nature of matter and force. The necessary birth of a new spiritual life. The appeal to the will of each individual. The task of today's youth.

pages 43–67

PART II

Natural Science and Anthroposophy

ZÜRICH, JUNE 4, 1921

The natural-scientific method as starting point for anthroposophy. Fundamental elements of a natural-scientific worldview. Insufficient prerequisites for the understanding of human freedom. The example of Franz Brentano and his psychology. Pure thinking as prerequisite for experiencing freedom. The experience of a non-reality from the example of "I think, therefore I am not." The extent to which the opposite statement from René Descartes is based on an error. Meditation based on the view of the anthroposophical method of research. Imaginative insight as conscious creating of pictures or images. The attempt to attain the reality of the spiritual world. From imaginative on through inspirational to intuitive consciousness. The extent to which an optimistic view of the world is justified. The difference between imaginative ideas or pictures and hallucinations. Mystical experiences as a reflection of bodily processes. The knowledge of the inner nature of matter through anthroposophy. The agnosticism of modern spiritual life as a hindrance to research; the intentions of anthroposophy.

pages 71–94

Disputation Evening: On Natural-Scientific Questions

ZÜRICH, JUNE 4, 1921

Without pain, no knowledge. Development of free thinking as necessity for avoiding social decline. The flight from real life. The threefold suffering of Friedrich Nietzsche in relation to the development modern times. The inaccessibility of the pantheistic talk of spirit. Demand for the transformation of spiritual knowledge into the concrete. Finding a practical way into the artistic and the social through anthroposophy. On Expressionism and Futurism. The inability of Goethe to break through entirely into the spiritual. The personal life as starting point. Basis for the emphasis on human preexistence through anthroposophy. On the issue of vaccination. The principal of good or proper comprehension as prerequisite for the success of a meditation. A radical error of the present time: the view of the prerequisite of brain activity for all spirituality. The human being as a member of the cosmos.

pages 95–123

PART III

Anthroposophy and Science

BASEL, NOVEMBER 2, 1921

The special methods of knowledge of anthroposophy. Imaginative consciousness as the first stage of higher knowledge. Inner pictorial thinking in contrast to ordinary abstract thinking. The unsatisfactory state of today's psychology. On the relationship of thinking, feeling, and willing. The arbitrariness of subjective willing in the thought-life. Its replacement by the objective willing that lives in sense perception. The objective character of imaginative thinking. The document by Heinrich Schramm as an example characteristic of a mathematical worldview. The pessimism of Edouard von Hartmann and the fight against it by Rudolf Steiner in *The Philosophy of Freedom*. The "thinking in forms" by Goethe. The legitimacy of abstract thinking for the inorganic world. For the organic world thinking in forms is necessary. The image of one's own life from birth to the present time as a result of imaginative perception. The second stage of suprasensory knowledge: the inspirational consciousness. Insight into one's own spiritual nature. The third stage of suprasensory knowledge: intuitive consciousness. Seeing the working of the spiritual world. Bringing world knowledge out of true knowledge of the human being as a central desire of anthroposophy. Concerning the objection to autosuggestion in the document by Albert Sichler. The principle of the wrong polemics against anthroposophy. Agreement between science and anthroposophy. The usual views on the origin or beginning of the Earth and on the end of the Earth. The brain as foundation of thinking and not its cause. Continuous death processes in the human being. Moral values as real seed of the future.

pages 127–156

Agnosticism in Science

LEIPZIG, MAY 11, 1922

First Part: concerning agnosticism in scientific thinking. Comments on Kant's statement that in science there is only as much science to be found as there is mathematics in it. Phenomenalism as scientific method of research and how natural science undermines its own *a priori*. Agnosticism as logical consequence of phenomenalism. The catharsis of Greek tragedy as healing and health process for the soul. In the Middle Ages, human beings did not see the mathematical in nature but rather the moral. *The Philosophy of Freedom* as the effort to bring the moral law out of the suprasensory world, just as natural science brings it out of nature.

Second Part: thinking as starting point for inner development. On body-free thinking and the perception of the body as object. Body-free, imaginative thinking as pictorial metamorphosing thinking. The human life and space-and-time

organism. The past as the present. Imaginative knowledge grasps the “Urbild” (primal image) of the plants. What anthroposophy adds to natural-scientific agnosticism. Inspirational knowledge. Thinking as destructive process. Pathology and therapy. Overcoming medical agnosticism. Inner transformation through the conscious willing and enlivening of the soul-spiritual existence through intuitive knowledge. Overcoming social agnosticism.

pages 157–186

Discussion

pages 187–200

APPENDIX

Documents 201

Editorial and Reference Notes 214

Rudolf Steiner’s Collected Works 247

Significant Events in the Life of Rudolf Steiner 262

Name Index 276

INTRODUCTION

WOLFGANG ZUMDICK

FROM 1920 TO 1922, RUDOLF STEINER gave a series of public lectures in various locations—largely for audiences with an academic background—not least of all because, at the time, serious voices had already been raised trying to deny Steiner’s scientific credibility and to vilify his spiritual science as a psychopathological phenomenon. Critics such as the Berlin psychologist Max Dessoir alleged that the results of Steiner’s spiritual-scientific research were nothing more than psychic projections that “have a tinge of the pathological” (lecture in Basel, November 2, 1921).

After the 1911 Philosophers’ Congress in Bologna, where Steiner introduced the “epistemological position of anthroposophy” for the first time to a larger academic audience, he was deeply concerned with the scientific recognition of his research.[†] From the outset, Steiner saw himself as a scientist, and his scientific research—regardless of how strange its results may have seemed to the academic professors of that time—has proven itself on closer examination to have consistently been at the same level as the research of his time; indeed, Steiner defined his research by the standard of contemporary science. Thus, the misunderstandings that prevailed in many sectors of the scientific community about him and his work, as well as the prejudices he encountered again and again, must have been a source of disappointment and pain for him.

But there was another difficulty Steiner had to confront, especially in the years following World War I. More and more people felt drawn to his ideas, which rapidly accelerated the growth of the Anthroposophical Society. Particularly the defeat in the war, the failed October

Revolution, and the growing destabilization of the economy caused many people in deeply devastated Germany to long for a complete redesigning of the social sphere and for a more profound understanding of humanity and of existence.

The growing popularity of anthroposophy, much as Steiner must have welcomed it, also held risks. On the one hand, there was a growing number of people who wanted to represent anthroposophy to the outside world, or at least to profess it publicly, but who were intellectually not entirely up to the task; on the other hand, a certain personality cult sprouted up again and again, something that was anything but welcome to the founder of anthroposophy. Rudolf Steiner's letters to his wife Marie von Sivers (see GA 262) attest to the fact that he was very much concerned about these problems.

The lectures gathered in this volume were held in front of academic audiences in Switzerland and in Leipzig; they show the high level of objectivity and empathy with which Steiner responded to skepticism on the part of the sciences. Step by step, he presented to his listeners the fundamentals of the anthroposophical path of knowledge. Steiner was less concerned with presenting results from his spiritual-scientific research than with leading his academic audience to an objective understanding of spiritual science in a propaedeutic, conceptually transparent way. The central questions of his approach were: What are the tools and instruments required to orient oneself in the world of the soul and the spirit? How can we know that the spiritual world is an objective world and not merely a psychic projection? What authorizes the spiritual researcher to acknowledge what he has experienced "on the other side" as a reality that is independent of him?

Steiner addresses these and other questions in the lectures collected here in such a structured and readily comprehensible way that the lectures are well-suited as solid introductory texts, independent of the specific conditions under which they originated. To characterize the purpose of these lectures in one sentence, one could say that Rudolf Steiner was concerned here with nothing less than the establishment of anthroposophical spiritual science as a recognized scientific research method and practice.

Regarding some of the lectures included here, we have had the good fortune that not only Steiner's lecture but also the subsequent discussion was taken down in shorthand. Thus, for example, in the case of the Leipzig Anthroposophical Academic Course, which included a particularly long, intense, and controversial discussion, we can still feel the atmosphere, which probably also prevailed at many other similar public lectures and in which the entire spectrum of reactions is reflected—a spectrum that fluctuated between emphatic response and radical rejection. For instance, in Leipzig, Steiner faced an audience of professors who knew how to formulate their criticism of his research methods in a clear and unequivocal way.

Rudolf Steiner, thanks to the experience of many similar events, responded with enthusiasm but still always objectively and, above all, in a conciliatory tone: “Please do not take what I said with some severity in my reply as though it were meant in a hostile way. On the whole, I am pleased with everything that is objected to here because only if we can clear away these hurdles of objections can we actually enter into anthroposophy” (Leipzig, May 11, 1922). This is based on the conviction that there is a bridge leading from traditional, academic research to spiritual science, from the established natural sciences and humanities to anthroposophically inspired spiritual science, and that mutual understanding is as necessary as it is possible.