

Anna-Katharina Dehmelt
Möthengasse 16
53347 Alfter
02222/938237
AKDehmelt@gmx.de
s.a. www.InfaMeditation.de

June 3, 2018

AKDehmelt, Möthengasse 16, 53347 Alfter

Public letter
to Irene Diet

per <http://www.InfaMeditation.de/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Dehmelt-Diet.pdf>

**Your article "Meditation and Rudolf Steiner's Anthroposophy: Where is the Connection?"
in: A newsletter PLUS No. VI from April 29, 2018 ¹**

Dear Mrs. Diet!

We have never met and do not know each other personally. This makes a written argument in connection with your article "Meditation and Rudolf Steiner's Anthroposophy: Where is the connection?" not so easy. But since your article in fact contains a number of misunderstandings and also mistakes and insinuations, and you attempt to discredit not only my work but also that of my colleagues and ultimately our entire treatment of the topic of "Anthroposophical Meditation", I do not want to leave it unanswered.²

In your article, you deal with the question of whether the Anthroposophical Meditation movement correctly bears the attribute "Anthroposophical." Your answer is 'No'. In summarizing a Facebook discussion on 29.5.2018 you describe the intention of your article:

"One alleges that one refers entirely to Rudolf Steiner, and yet makes something that does not correspond to his Anthroposophy In my search for the origins of this approach, I came across the two articles by Anna-Katharina Dehmelt. ... These two articles are also particularly important for me, because when anyone takes the trouble, the original text from which she describes her article and her work (in **Occult Science – An Outline** there is the chapter: 'The Knowledge of Higher Worlds'), they can recognize that the reference to Rudolf Steiner made by Mrs. Dehmelt does not exist.

Perhaps in summary once again my basic concern: Gladly anyone can offer such meditation courses, as he would like to offer them. I think that is right and justified. However, it seems to me it is unjustified to refer directly to Rudolf Steiner without this reference actually existing. For this is how the path that Rudolf Steiner has pointed to becomes invisible. It has to remain visible, however, for there will always be people who are seeking for THIS path. This one, and no other." ³

Both of my articles appeared in the monthly magazine **Die Drei** in 2009. The first article asks the question about the specific nature of Anthroposophical Meditation on the basis of a study of the Rose Cross Meditation given by Rudolf Steiner in **Occult Science – An Outline**; ⁴ the second article carries over the approach derived from the Rose Cross Meditation to research questions.⁵ Both articles are about meditation and spiritual research; they are also about the

three higher levels of consciousness: imagination, inspiration and intuition; and they are about the path that ordinary consciousness can take when practicing on these higher levels of consciousness.

To begin with, I would like to address in a general way these three points and your objections to them, because content-wise they seem to me to be central to the whole debate. In an appendix, I then go into the details. It will become apparent that your text contains not only misunderstandings but also errors, distorted paraphrases and insinuations, and that the consequences that you derive from them are dubious. All your attempts to prove "that the reference to Rudolf Steiner made by Ms. Dehmelt does not even exist" vanish on closer inspection.

In particular, on the last pages of your essay I understand that the training of pure or sense-free thinking is a very special concern. Again in a Facebook comment ⁶ you write:

"BOTH paths (and Rudolf Steiner does not name any others) lead over thinking. Yet thinking does not even occur in 'Anthroposophical Meditation'; there it is about the 'transformation' of an idea (imagination) – feeling (inspiration) and will (intuition)."

Your argument is approximately as if you were complaining about an article on cultivating wild plants in which there is not much about working the soil. It makes no sense to play off the practice of sense-free thinking and the exercises for imagination, inspiration and intuition, because they are simply different stages of the Anthroposophical training path.⁷ We could probably easily come to agreement about the importance of thinking for Anthroposophy and Anthroposophical Meditation⁸; even the participants of my meditation courses and many of my colleagues can sing the praises of that – yet that was not the topic of the essay.

The topic of the essay is an attempt to show that already in the buildup of the Rose Cross Meditation, the first experiences of an imaginative, inspirational and intuitive kind can be made. Without actually going into the overall context of my essay, and in particular, without contributing any of your own observations or experiences, you vehemently oppose my understanding of the three concepts of imagination, inspiration, and intuition.

For this, I have often made use of a comparison: in evolution there are always repetitions of repetitions of repetitions of previous states. Thus the 'Old Sun' begins with a repetition of 'Old Saturn', the 'Old Moon' with a repetition of 'Old Saturn' and 'Old Sun', within the latter 'Old Saturn' is then repeated again in a smaller period – thus it is a matter of continual repetitions of repetitions of repetitions. Imagination will be fully developed as a world-forming state of consciousness on 'Jupiter', inspiration on 'Venus' and intuition on 'Vulcan'. However, just as there are repetitions of repetitions of repetitions, there are pre-stages of pre-stages of pre-stages. This is why today, at least in a beginning way, we are able to build up the state of consciousness of imagination: as a pre-stage of something increasingly realizing itself in future, yet already announcing itself today.

You, it seems to me, look at imagination more in the sense of the fully developed 'Jupiter' form, I in the sense of a pre-stage of a pre-stage of a pre-stage. Can one not understandingly acknowledge each other [literally wave at each other-tr.] from these two points of view?

Finally, in your essay you deal again and again with the transition from ordinary consciousness with its ideas to imagination. For example, on page 10 of your essay it states:

"Imaginations" cannot form directly from physical-sensible ideas; this is quite impossible."

Decisive for you here is certainly the word "directly". Apart from the fact that my essay does not speak at any point about the fact that the formation of imaginations is possible "directly" from physical-sensible ideas, I wondered why you are so strongly chafing on this. In particular from your comments on Facebook I gained the impression that for you fainting, pain and the abyss are missing in my presentation about the transition from ordinary consciousness to higher levels of consciousness,. Although there are various hints in this direction in my text, at the time it was above all important to encourage practice; and indeed, more than nine years later, I believe that courageous practice is the prerequisite for crossing the threshold to the spiritual world, if one arrives at it, in a healthy way.

And yet: today I would perhaps even put this aspect more in the foreground.

Dear Mrs. Diet! You will undoubtedly now, and especially after reading the appendix, want to counter a great deal. Does it really make sense if we now give out a ping-pong game of Steiner quotes? I do not think so. Would it not be more fruitful, if we were to meet in the context of work? I would like to cordially invite you to attend the next Conference on Meditation in Stuttgart from the 22nd to the 24th of March, 2019. Perhaps, even though of more short notice, the 8th Colloquium on Meditation Science with the theme "The Limits of Ordinary Consciousness and Body-free Consciousness in Meditation" on June 9th in Stuttgart would be suitable for this: Perhaps we shall meet here or there sometime.

Sincerely!

Anna-Katharina Dehmelt

Footnotes:

1. To be read at: http://www.infameditation.de/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/180429_ENB_PLUS_VI_Irene-Diet.pdf
2. Under completely different aspects, Michael Eggert has dealt with your essay at: <https://egoistenblog.blogspot.de/2018/05/niemand-hat-das-rosenkreuz-fur-sich.html#more>
3. In the group "No Bullshit Anthroposophie" at the site of Michael Eggert on 22.5.2018 "Nobody has leased the Rose Cross for themselves" at: https://www.facebook.com/groups/2073248482692411/permalink/2089850491032210/?comment_id=2100059000011359¬ifid=1527759988073393¬if_t=group_comment_follow
4. <http://www.infameditation.de/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Dehmelt-Meditation-I.pdf>
5. <http://www.infameditation.de/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Dehmelt-Meditation-II.pdf>
6. On 31.5.2018, see Note 3
7. See more detailed below
8. See for example, my essay "The thinking individuality as a starting point" in "Anthroposophie" Easter 2015, online at: <http://www.infameditation.de/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Die-denkende-Individualität-als-ausgangspunkt-Stuttgart-März-2015-Anthroposophie-3.15.pdf>.
9. Andreas Heertsch's approach "A gateway to the real – on the scalability of imagination, inspiration and intuition" in **Die Drei** 11/2016 and Terje Sparby with "The Areas and the Stages of Higher Realization" in **Die Drei** 12/2017
10. <https://www.akanthos-akademie.de/forschungskolloq-meditation/>

Appendix to the public letter from Anna-Katharina Dehmelt to Irene Diet

So, now here are the details.

After you cite individual passages from my texts, on page 8 of your essay you write:

" Before we turn to Rudolf Steiner's explanations in **Occult Science - An Outline**, let us summarize what has been worked out so far: Dehmelt claims:"

There follows 7 points, from which, in the style and context of your explanation, is shown that you are not willing to accept them. I go straight to each one of the points.

1. "Rudolf Steiner described in **Occult Science - An Outline**, using the example of the Rose Cross Meditation, the path from imagination over inspiration to intuition." What you call "claims" should at best have earned a subjunctive, if it were false. It says nonetheless with respect to the presentation of the Rose Cross Meditation in "**Occult Science**" on p.316 ¹¹, whereby with "inner contemplation (meditation)" the Rose Cross Meditation is referred to: "It is evident from the preceding account that inner contemplation (meditation) is a means for attaining knowledge of the higher worlds but also that not every imaginative content leads to this, rather only one which is furnished in the manner described above. The path which is pointed to here leads first to what one can call *imaginative* knowledge. It is the first higher stage of knowledge." On p.359 it then says: "A person can attain knowledge through inspiration and intuition also only through soul-spiritual exercises. They are similar to those which have been described as "inner contemplation" (meditation) for the attainment of imagination. But while in those exercises which led to imagination, a connection takes place to the impressions of the sensible-physical world, in the case of inspiration, this connection must increasingly disappear. In order to clarify for yourself what has to be done, one should think again of the symbol of the Rose Cross." For intuition, there follows then on p. 368: "The exercises for intuition require that the spirit pupil not only lets the pictures disappears from their consciousness, which they had provided for themselves for the attainment of imagination, rather also the living into one's own soul activity into which the person sunk themselves for the acquisition of inspiration. "

Rudolf Steiner has thus fully "described the path from imagination over inspiration to intuition using the example of the Rose Cross Meditation", and it is by no means a claim, rather a fact.

2. "For inspiration and intuition, the instructions for practice remained unclear from the text, but one further step could be taken than that explicitly presented by Rudolf Steiner: A description of how to work on the three levels of higher knowledge was already to be found in his presentation of the building up of this meditation."

In fact, on page 56 of my essay, I ask a few questions about the instructions about practice for inspiration and intuition.¹² From that then comes about through you on page 6 of your essay:

"Let us make the situation clear in which the writer of these lines found herself: Thanks to her experiences in meditation, she had reached a crucial point. At that point, namely, at which she had to realize that what she had extracted from Rudolf Steiner's work **Occult Science**

- **An Outline** about "inspiration" and "intuition" was beyond her. ... How did she deal with this situation?

Immediately after determining her non-understanding, which means in the immediately following sentence (1), appears her answer. And it looks like this:

"It turns out, however, that already in the very first activities to be performed, namely in the buildup of the symbol, not only its meaning, rather also the three higher stages of imagination, inspiration and intuition, are laid out." ²¹

Dehmelt therefore claims to have recognized that in the buildup of the Rose Cross symbol described by Rudolf Steiner, "the three higher stages of knowledge of imagination, inspiration and intuition" are already laid out, and on the basis of this assertion, she develops her approach that is the content of the whole study:"

The presentation of "the situation in which the writer finds herself" according to your opinion is truly breathtaking. It may serve your purposes. Anyone who reads my essay in context will certainly understand that I did not start from a claim, rather from questions and experiences of practice in which the connection between the buildup of the Rose Cross Meditation and the higher levels of consciousness became apparent to me. The text gives a report of this. That in it I anticipated the result cited by you, was due to its comprehensibility.

3. "From this it would result that a "'placing of smth. before the mind' made porous and receptive" leads to imagination, a "feeling made porous and receptive" to inspiration and a "willing made porous and receptive" to intuition."

With regard to this you had already written on page 4:

"The following relationships are considered fundamental:

1. Imagination and 'placing smth. before one's mind',
2. Inspiration and feeling,
3. Intuition and willing

These relationships are presented by the most diverse teachers of "Anthroposophical Meditation". In numerous articles, seminars and study announcements and descriptions, they appear again and again in a similar form. The essential thing is that they are active completely in the sense Rudolf Steiner intended; if they are mentioned, it usually happens with a reference to a text by Rudolf Steiner."

Why should not the connections between imagination and 'placing smth. before one's mind', inspiration and feeling, as well as intuition and willing be addressed with a reference to Rudolf Steiner? You insinuate that such references are somehow improper, although you do not point out what is improper about it, nor do you present something more correct. As well – these relationships can be found in Rudolf Steiner.

The most basic account of this relationship comes from the sixth appendix in **Von Seelenrätselfn**. There on p.160f it says: "Just as from the body, awareness rests on the activity of the nerves, so it streams from the other side out of a spiritual being that is revealed in imagination. ... The feeling of ordinary consciousness rests, from the body side, on what

happens rhythmically. From the spiritual side, it flows out of a spiritual being, which is found within Anthroposophical research by methods that I in my writings characterize as those of inspiration. ... Willing, which, from the body, rests on the metabolic processes, streams from the spirit for the beholding consciousness through what I in my writings call real intuitions." Rudolf Steiner very often presented these connections; they are central to an understanding of the three higher levels of consciousness. Perhaps it is still important to emphasize that this is not, of course, about equivalences, rather about connections.

4. "The insights made in the buildup of the Rose Cross Meditation could be applied "to other contents as a methodology ", i.e., it could be transferred over."

Imagination, inspiration and intuition are the tools of spiritual research. They are trained up as ability through meditation and configured as spiritual organs of perception through spiritual research questions. Steiner describes this research in **Occult Science** on p. 354 based on the preceding chapters of **Occult Science**; in countless other portrayals, he has presented imaginative, inspirative and intuitive research and its results.

With my research approach described in the second essay, it is not claimed that through imaginative practice and research imagination is immediately realized to the fullest extent. But these are rewarding practice steps in the direction of imagination, and the same goes as well for inspiration and intuition.

5. "On the development of imaginations: What is "unconsciously experienced" of the ideas that occur in the object consciousness (also called "ordinary consciousness" by Rudolf Steiner) could, by becoming "described in a comparative way in pictures", gradually become further developed into imaginations."

These are inner experiences that are difficult to discuss, if there is no attempt to seek out these experiences. See also the next point.

6. "In order to build up such ideas, "everything that is perceptible" and what can be applied "as an eloquent comparison" ("a corner of the mouth may look like a dark mountain cave", etc.) could be made use of. It is the applying of this 'what is perceived' and 'as eloquent comparison', which could be developed further to imagination."

On page 12 you write additionally:

"The exercises given by the representatives of an "Anthroposophical Meditation" for the achieving of "imaginations", however, are aimed at the exact opposite: a thinking is not intended there at all; all the instructions that are made for the achieving of "imaginations" are limited to ideas that take their start from what was physically-sensibly perceived, and in fact to such a perceived that can be transformed into fantasies."

Here it is a question about the transition from idea to imagination. For this fantasy can quite well be an intermediate stage, as Rudolf Steiner describes on 15.11.1911¹³. And just as in fantasy so also in the symbolic exercises for the imagination as also in imaginations themselves, there is still a connection to the impressions of the sensible-physical world. The difference from ordinary ideas lies in the fact that they depict something external, while these bring something inward to expression. This difference can be learned quite precisely in the exercises for

imagination. It becomes the measure for the appearance of imaginations, even if one has proceeded from an observation or question based on the consciousness of ideas. The further exercise then consists precisely in stripping off the attachment to the physical-sensible world. "While, however, in those exercises that lead to imagination a connection takes place to the impressions of the sensible, physical world, with those for inspiration this connection has to increasingly fall away." (p.359).

7. "That an imagination has emerged is shown by the fact that *"the images and qualities of the other meditators are comprehensible"*, i.e., it is the group that decides whether an imagination has been achieved or not."

Your reproduction is wrong.¹⁴ Nowhere is there any talk of a decision about what has been achieved or what has not been achieved. A training process is described that takes place in a group and is primarily for helping the practice. How preliminary most results are, one learns quickly. However, such exercises show that contributions by other participants have a corrective effect on one's own subjectivity; they help to purify one's own impressions of their purely personal elements, and this is a very essential aspect of such exercises, be it alone or in a group. Nothing is said in the slightest regard about truth criteria.

The remaining five pages of your essay deal with the already quoted argument:

"Imaginations" cannot be immediately formed from physical-sensory ideas; that is simply impossible."

On the following pages you lead my text with the help of this argument into more and more irrelevant areas that I do not wish to comment on any further.

The second topic in the final part of your essay is the meaning of thinking. You quote from **Occult Science** p. 340: "The inner solidity of the imaginative stage of knowledge is achieved through the fact that the soul contemplations (meditations) presented are supported by what one can call habituation to 'sensory-free thinking'." And continue with p. 343: "It is the path that leads through the communications of spiritual science into sense-free thinking, a thoroughly more secure path. There is another path, however, that is safer and, above all, more accurate, but more difficult for many people. It is presented in my books **Goethe's Theory of Knowledge/The Science of Knowing**, and **The Philosophy of Freedom**."

You conclude from this (p. 12): "Thus, according to Rudolf Steiner there are two paths that are able to lead into an imaginative state of consciousness: One goes hand in hand with the training of sense-free thinking, the other with so-called "pure thinking".

It sounds like you want to replace the imaginative exercise using the Rose Cross Meditation with "the habituation to 'sensory-free thinking'". Yet this would be based on a complete misjudgment of the overall situation. For the training of sense-free or pure thinking is the first stage of the Rosicrucian training path, which Steiner summarizes in seven stages at the end of the training chapter of **Occult Science** on page 393. The second to fourth stages then include "2. The acquisition of imaginative knowledge 3. The reading of the hidden script (corresponding to inspiration) 4. The immersion into the spiritual environment (corresponding to intuition)." As already mentioned, it makes no sense to play these different stages off against each other.

Let's leave it at that. I believe that it has become sufficiently clear that there is no reason to deny of me and my paper that we are rightly relying on Rudolf Steiner. Of course, every personality who deals with Steiner's work persistently and deeply sets their own priorities and deepens one thing a great deal, the other not at all. Not every contribution is able to consider everything that is most important to others. Only then does diversity, color and development emerge.

Footnotes:

11. The page numbers of **Occult Science** refer to the 30th edition of 1989.
Die Seitenangaben der „Geheimwissenschaft“ beziehen sich auf die 30. Auflage 1989.
12. See also my conversation with Ingrid Haselberger in the comments below
<https://egoistenblog.blogspot.de/2018/05/niemand-hat-das-rosenkreuz-fur-sich.html#more>
13. GA 115 p. 271
14. see for this also my conversation with Ingrid Haselberger
<https://egoistenblog.blogspot.de/2018/05/niemand-hat-das-rosenkreuz-fur-sich.html#more>