Delegation and Collegial Leadership as exemplified in the self-regulation of Waldorf Schools.
Udo Herrmannstorfer

(An edited translation by Ulrike Brockman of the revised report by Christoph Strawe of a lecture given by the author at a seminar in the "Studienhaus Rüspe" 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").

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 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 sighj "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 <u>we</u> doing? On the contrary the "we" has to be pushed as far as possible into the background. Then the question is rather, "What shall <u>I</u> do, every individual?"

This is the modern question, the source from which now everything has to flow. The more we ask, what <u>we</u> 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 right 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 disentangling 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 <u>others</u> - 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 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.

* 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.

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 furLiteratur,
Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kultur-und Zeitgeschichte 1887-1901, GA31, Dornach.