

Why?

Why does the Executive Council spare no pains to try to make us believe that our General Anthroposophical Society does not contain the Christmas Conference impulse?

On pages one and two of the May 6, 2005, issue of our (german) newsletter there is an article entitled “**The Executive Council’s Position Regarding the Claims of the Group that Calls Itself the Living the Christmas Conference [Gelebte Weihnachtstagung].**” In this position statement, the Council tries to shake off the accusation of having spread half-truths that distort the facts and “asks” the members “not to be led astray by the circular [entitled “The General Anthroposophical Society Has Been Saved from Dissolution”]”.

However, the statement only serves to lend additional credence to the accusation, since the Executive Council claims that both courts denied the existence of the Christmas Conference society of 1923. The Council further claims that the society of 1923 was absorbed by the Building Society in 1925, which then changed its name to the General Anthroposophical Society.

These are the half-truths the Council persists in. **The Council never mentions** that, in truth, the Building Society was not the society which received the society founded at Christmas 1923. Quite the contrary –it was the Building Society which became a subdivision of the General Anthroposophical Society. It is true that the General Anthroposophical Society founded in 1923 made use of the no-longer-needed legal framework of the Building Society, including commercial registration, and thus avoided having to pay transfer taxes on Building Society assets, but within this legal framework, the goals and intentions of the Christmas Conference were fully realized. Again, **the Executive Council never mentions** that this same legal framework was fundamentally altered so as to be able properly to serve the impulse of the Christmas Conference. **It never mentions**, either, that the name of the General Anthroposophical Society derives directly from the Christmas Conference. **In short, the Council takes great pains to lead members away from the fact that the General Anthroposophical Society GAS is the Christmas Conference Society CCS.**

GAS = CCS

The court has shown that the Christmas Conference Society of 1923 lives on as the General Anthroposophical Society, **while denying** the existence of the “General

Anthroposophical Society (Christmas Conference) GAS(CC)”, -- that is the name of the artificial society the Executive Council tried to create in 2002. The court cannot share the Executive Council’s view that there is such a second society, inactive since 1925, but reactivated in 2002. **All the facts show that the esoteric and exoteric aspects of the Society were UNIFIED in 1925 and received a proper legal foundation in the comprehensively altered statutes of the Building Society.**

**CCS does not equal “GAS(CC)”
“GAS(CC)” = nonexistent**

In its position paper, the Executive Council does quote short passages from the High Court document, but since they are taken entirely out of context, they completely falsify the situation. As soon as they are placed in context, the Council’s falsification becomes apparent:

“Therefore, the court concludes *that only the General Anthroposophical Society still exists.*” (*Nachrichtenblatt*, p. 2). **We supply the context**, quoting from the High Court Judgment (II.11): “ [...] *For the reasons just presented we must assume that the members of the Building Society founded in 1913,(and later called the School of Spiritual Science) became members of the **General Anthroposophical Society founded in 1923 and reorganized in 1925.***” **Additional Context:** “*Since the administration planned to make the former Building Society a subdivision of the General Anthroposophical Society, it seemed an obvious course to continue to use the legal framework of the Building Society (also known as the School of Spiritual Science), including its status as a commercially registered society, for the General Anthroposophical Society. The statutes of the School of Spiritual Science were accordingly completely revised. The former Building Society was now a subdivision.*” (High Court Judgment, II, 3).

What is the Council trying to achieve by continually misleading the members? Why has the Council been holding back and suppressing the clear statements the two courts have unanimously made? Why is the Executive Council intent on severing our General Anthroposophical Society from its spiritual roots?

WHY?

Dr. Michaela Jordan

888GOYA.org – Our Work continues!

To every member who would like to help ensure that Anthroposophy can go on living within the General Anthroposophical Society – a heartfelt plea for assistance.