

HOW THE ANTHROPOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN GERMANY DEFAMES THE ARCHIATI-VERLAG

Below you will read the following:

1. Defamatory Statements

in the Article by the Director of the Rudolf Steiner Archive – published in the Quarterly *Anthroposophie*, IV/2008 (pp373-376), the publisher of which is the Anthroposophical Society in Germany.

2. The Letter of Rejection by the Editors of *Anthroposophie*,

of the Rectifying Article written by Bärbel von Pokrzywnicki (a member of the Anthroposophical Society).

3. The Full Text of the Rectifying Article by Bärbel von Pokrzywnicki,

on the basis of her request to have the Article published unchanged and in its entirety.

What's it all about?

The Director of the Rudolf Steiner Archive has written an article with **defamatory statements** about the Archiati Verlag. *Anthroposophie* published this in its Christmas 2008 Edition. (1)

A member of the Anthroposophical Society submitted a *Rectification* of the statements made in the above-mentioned article, which the *Anthroposophie* Editors do not wish to publish at this stage. (2)

Ms Von Pokrzywnicki has asked us to publish her article. We have checked the statements therein. Her representation of the facts is correct. (3)

We gladly publish her Rectification, because she wishes to oppose the slandering of the work of our Publishing House.

Monika Grimm
Archiati Verlag

1. Defamatory Statements by Walter Kugler

In his Essay "Rudolf Steiner – Close-up? On the Problematic of the Editing of the Archiati Verlag", Walter Kugler states that the Archiati Verlag had only 'uncontrolled copies of copies' of lectures by Steiner at its disposal. He fails to mention, however, the numerous Text Comparisons already published by the Archiati Verlag.

A further statement by Mr Kugler is that the Archiati Verlag was not informing the reader of its sources. Ms Pokrzywnicki takes up this issue in her article.

Mr Kugler finds the Archiati Verlag particularly unscientific because it does not possess the shorthand notes. The reader of the works of Rudolf Steiner, as published in the GA (the complete works of Rudolf Steiner in German, published by The Rudolf Steiner Verlag), which are represented as being scientific, must assume that everything that can be gained from the shorthand scripts is already contained in the GA. The alternative is that the GA as it is today is not scientific.

The defamatory statements by the director of the Rudolf Steiner Archives against Pietro Archiati himself, are here not discussed.

2. Rejection of the Article by the Editors

Email of 19 February 2009

"Dear Ms Von Pokrzywnicki,

We have decided in today's Editor's Meeting that we will not publish, for the time being, your countering of Mr Kugler's contribution, in its current form. It seems to us that it is necessary to confirm the validity of your claims before we can make them, in their present form, public. Such an investigation would take some time. We ask therefore for your understanding that we may return to this matter at a later date.

With friendly greetings,

Jost Schieren"

3. The Text of Ms von Pokrzywnicki's Article

Rudolf Steiner – Close-up?

On the Problematic of the Editing of the Rudolf Steiner Verlag

Shortly before Christmas a long-standing member of the Anthroposophical Society bid me farewell with the following comment: "Read this article and then you will know what's wrong with the Archiati Verlag." She was referring to the article by Walter Kugler "Rudolf Steiner – hautnah?" in *Anthroposophie* IV/2008. I read the article, and I was deeply disturbed by the number of false statements and defamatory remarks.

The Archiati Verlag does not possess, according to Walter Kugler in his main argument, the most important sources – namely the shorthand notes – for a scientific publication of the lectures of Rudolf Steiner. To this one must immediately say that in many lecture-series of the GA we read quite clearly that no shorthand scripts are available. Wouldn't these publications also have to be considered unscientific?

As an example of the importance of the shorthand notes, he uses the word 'successive' (from the lecture of 11 December 1916) in the transcript of her own shorthand by Helene Finckh. The recent re-examination of the shorthand has now convinced Mr Kugler that this should read 'subversive'. Until now GA 173 read 'systematic'. But the only sensible version can be 'sezessiv' (striving towards secession), as it appears in the Archiati Verlag publication. Kugler does not mention the statement by the Archiati Verlag in their publication "Between East and West" (*Zwischen Ost und West*) by Steiner (2007, p 429), where we read: 'In case that the stenographer is not familiar with the word 'secede/secession', then 'successive' is the word, which both acoustically as well as stenographically comes closest.' Why has this spot of the shorthand script never been shown to the public? Why are we compelled to believe in Kugler's deciphering?

Walter Kugler does not provide one single example to show that the wording used in the GA is better or more faithful to Steiner than the Archiati Verlag's wording. In contrast to the GA, the Archiati Verlag offers its readers, in numerous lecture series, comparative texts, which allows the reader a chance to form his own judgement. Kugler does not spend a single word on these comparative texts, which should be of great interest to any reader.

Something unbelievable has happened over the past decades. Many scientifically relevant original transcripts of lectures of Rudolf Steiner – among them many hand-written by well-known people such as Matilde Scholl and Fritz Mitscher – have, through conditions caused by the long battle between the Anthroposophical Society and the Nachlassverwaltung, been bequeathed to the Society and not to the Nachlassverwaltung. This still does not own them. Many of them were compiled before the first 'manuscript printing' (the official version), and are virtually unedited, therefore they are as true to Steiner as possible. In many first manuscript printings, on which GA is based, the wording of Rudolf Steiner is heavily edited and expanded. The text-comparisons in the Archiati Verlag deliver, in this respect, for the unbiased reader irrefutable evidence.

Why has the Nachlassverwaltung, up to now, not concerned itself with the valuable documents which only the Archive of the Anthroposophical Society possess? In Rudolf Steiner's *Wahrheit und Irrtum* (Truth and Error, Archiati Verlag) (pp141-142), is shown, for example, that the Archiati Verlag is in possess of documents, which the Nachlassverwaltung, in GA 69a pp328-329, says it does not have. There are two obvious reasons for this lack of consideration: firstly, one would have needed the courage to question the unjustifiably acquired reputation that the GA as being true to Steiner's spoken word. Secondly, there would have had to be people with the necessary competence and dedication in order to work with a more complex source material. Should not the Anthroposophists be grateful to Pietro Archiati and the Archiati Verlag, for the plain and authentic way in which the work of Rudolf Steiner is made available to people?

A particularly clear example is GA 114: 'The Gospel of Luke', which first appeared in 1917, and essentially remained unchanged in all following editions in 1923, 1931, 1955, 1968, 1977, 1985, 2001, and in 2004 on HDD. The publishers, according to their own statements, have used only one single source, namely the edition of the actor Walter Vegelahn, whose shorthand notes are no longer in existence. There are, however, very definitely other sources, for example that of Fritz Mitscher. In the explanatory volume 'Text-Sources 1', to Rudolf Steiner's *Buddha and Christ* (corresponding to GA 114), the transcript of Fritz Mitscher is exactly compared with the text of GA 114. In this way the reader can form his own judgement on both versions. 'Text-sources 2' contains the copies of the transcripts of Mathilde Scholl and Clara Michels.

What follows is an example of two comparative texts right from the first lecture given on 15 September 1909:

F. Mitscher Version

When we see before us a world filled with such playing colour-forms, which change continually, form and transform themselves, and we have our gaze not limited to the dead colour, but we rather think of all that as an expression of soul and spirit, so that we can say, for example, when a green colour-picture appears, it is the expression of something lighting up, which reveals itself to us through the green colour, when we think of colours interplaying, always accompanied by smell and taste experiences, when we think of all this as an expression of spiritual beings, then we have what we call the Imaginative World. This is a real world, and the Imaginative Knowledge is another way of grasping compared to that of the

W. Vegelahn Version

Now think about a world filled in such a manifold way with mirroring colour-forms, which eternally change and transform; where our view is not limited to colour as in a painting of shimmering colour-reflexes; but rather think of all that as an expression of soul-spiritual beings, so that you can say: when a green colour-picture lights up here, it is then for me the expression of a being with understanding which is behind it; or, when a light reddish colour-picture lights up, then this is for me an expression of something, which is a feeling being. Think now about this whole sea of colours playing in each other – I could just as well use another example and say: a sea of tone-, or smell-, or taste-experiences playing in each other; because these are all expressions of spirit-soul beings standing behind –

senses.
(*'Buddha and Christ'*: Text-Sources 1; p13).

then you have that which one calls the Imaginative World. It is not something for which, as in usual speech the word imagination is used, a fancy picture, but rather a real world. It is another way of perceiving, as opposed to that of the senses.
(GA 114, p12).

Here each reader has the possibility to decide which version, according to his or her opinion, corresponds better to the spirit of Rudolf Steiner. Why should there be only one sanctioned version? It is indeed shattering that we had to wait for the Archiati Verlag to make us at all aware that there is a second version.

Is it not so, that Mr Kugler wants to sweep away the financial ground from under the feet of an undesired rival, in that he defames his publications, claiming them to lack integrity? Are here both the generally affordable prices, as well as the interventions on language of the Archiati Verlag being devalued? Yet the reader is made aware of, as is explained in the addendum, why, in some cases specific terms are used, replacing other terms; for example when the word 'race' is exchanged with the word 'body-type'. For me, this is a successful attempt to meet the accusation of racism against Rudolf Steiner's work. The reader can find the reasons for this in Pietro Archiati's preface to Rudolf Steiner's '*Angels of Peoples*' (*Volkseengel*, corresponding to GA 121, the much-attacked '*Folksoul*' Cycle of lectures).

Under the heading 'Title-Confusion, Monopolisation and Mistrust', Mr Kugler adds particularly nasty attacks, which, under closer scrutiny, do not hold their ground:

The first accusation states that the Archiati Verlag did not inform its readers honestly with respect to the sources used by them. The truth is the opposite, as already shown. A further proof is as follows: In the addendas A and B of Rudolf Steiner's '*In the Beginning was the Word*' – 2007 (*Im Urbeginn war das Wort*, corresponding to GA 103 – *The Gospel of John*), there are many text comparisons for the reader's examination. Here one can truly see 'close-up' editing – not a fake, as Kugler would have it, but really practised. Every reader can convince himself that in GA 103 there are many inconsistencies regarding content, which cannot be attributed to Steiner.

A further example of a scientific way of working, is the recent publication of the Archiati Verlag's '*Understanding Karma*' (*Karma verstehen*, 2008) by Rudolf Steiner. These are five lectures from 23 January to 5 March 1912, with accurate source information on pp 111-112; and an eleven-page addendum with three- or alternatively, two-column text-comparisons from different sources, and which are compared to GA 135 '*Reincarnation and Karma*'. Two versions of a whole lecture – one hand-written – can be perused in original form in www.archiati-verlag.de. Why is it only now, through the Archiati Verlag, that these important documents are being made known to interested people?

Lastly, a quick look at the legal aspects: In 2005 the R. S. Nachlassverwaltung sued the Archiati Verlag. They claimed that they had sole rights to the texts of Rudolf Steiner. The Nachlassverwaltung lost their case. The Judgement of the High Court in Munich of 16 December 2005 states: *The texts of Rudolf Steiner belong 'as such' to all mankind. Every person has the right to have access to them, and to publish them.* Is it not scandalous that the Archives in Dornach have not yet, through digital means, made all existing transcripts, note-book entries, and shorthand scripts of the texts of Rudolf Steiner, available to everybody, to whom they belong? The Archiati Verlag has shown in numerous of their books that the wording in many volumes of the GA is way off the spoken word of Rudolf Steiner 'as such'.

What remains now of the slanderous claims and defamations by Dr Walter Kugler? Where does 'the truly scandalous' behaviour and 'fake competence' really lie, if not with him? Can one be striving more honestly to inform the reader, and therefore making him more able to form a judgement, than the Archiati Verlag does? To establish an answer to these questions, one must certainly become acquainted with the books oneself, and not allow oneself to be influenced by prejudices of all kinds, as I showed at the beginning. Much mischief has occurred in our Society through such prejudices. It has been my intention to counter these decisively and clearly.

Bärbel von Pokrzywnicki
Grünberger Street 9, 33605 Bielefeld

Please help us to counter the Defamation by distributing this pamphlet which attempts to portray the true state of affairs. (The Archiati Verlag does not have a Press Organ of its own).