

2010 AGM
Bio-Dynamic Agricultural Association of Australia
Saturday 24.4.2010

Some years ago at an AGM I posed the following question:- to add up in old English weight - as I still use for weighing out 500, because I don't waste beautiful old and well working scales and replace them with a modern electric one.

| | | |
|---------|------|------|
| 4 stone | 5lbs | 10oz |
| 3 Stone | 7lbs | 7oz |

Few can still do this. One has to add up and down as well as horizontally. When I then asked, "what do you have to undertake in such adding"? There was no answer for a while and then Kathy Barrett almost yelled out "one must think". That is exactly so and it is good to understand which part of ourselves we use each time. One requires systematic, singular thinking concentratedly to add that up. The English had the chance to specially exercise basic thinking.

I have another such question: What do you have to do to be practical? Some of our leading European Bio-Dynamic farmers (used to European Bio-Dynamic literatures, which may be a little up in the clouds) say of my literature that I am practical. I would like to establish what that actually means. What is necessary to be practical? (pause)

"not to be a bureaucrat"

"common sense"

That is not bad but I want an exact description of the requirements of the actual happening. What have we got firstly, if we ask this question? Who asks the question? [please speak up.] Thory McDougall said after 70 you age two years per one and I say, after 80 you age 5 years inclusive of ears.

.... "theoretical thought into"

hum, hum now, he is German and he commences the answer with "theoretical thought" We had an idealistic and rich American come to learn. I give such a dose of hard work to come down to Earth. In this case I sent him to the Hatches. He was given work but then sat in the paddock reading poems. After three weeks Trevor rang and said, please take him somewhere else or Ginger his father (who could lift a 250kg petrol drum) - will kill him.

My real question is: What do you have to start with, if you want to explain what it means to be practical?

(pause) ... Will power? No – you have to start with a human being. You have to be there first or the whole question hangs in the air. And what has this man to do – as a second – to be practical?

You all do it or you wouldn't be on your farm anymore. It is what distinguishes famers from most other people...

“physical work”...

What do you have to do, separating cattle in an old inferior stock yard? You have to isolate two animals out of a mob through a gate and of course these two cows don't want to be isolated.

Where do you look in what you have to do? What do you watch?

...“you have to make a decision”

... Always theoretical words. I want an exact description of what you have to do in the situation: You SEE that the one cow tries to head in an unwanted direction. What do you DO?more talk....

You first have to watch that animal and you have to react according to how that animal moves. You have to observe exactly what the cow's intention is and react skilfully with some “cow sense”, instead of storming after her. But it is the movements of the cow which decide your response action. With cow sense you may have to move without her seeing to reverse her trend. And what would be the worst helper? Some impractical person who in the end finds a spot in the gate the cow is to go in, waving a stick.

I did not expect this question to be difficult in this environment. You are just not conscious of your own actions in these requirements, yet you exactly train your sheepdogs to so act. First of all there has to be a man, and then whatever you have to look at, which suggests to you what you have to do. This comes from there, not your separated “imagination”.

In Bio-Dynamics I came to speak of the colloidal of humus. How do you think I had the chance to find that out myself? In Spring, what comes out of the horns has to be gently squashed to make it into a colloid, it doesn't at first appear like it. In one of my lectures - which does not speak of some airy fairy “cosmic” forces which converted the manure into 500, (Steiner said “you may speak of etheric etc forces, if you can show them) - Earth is also a Planet (not a fixed materialistic substance) which runs round the Sun at great speed and turns around itself. The only planet with the four major elements (soil, water, air and warmth) and therefore of colour and four seasons. 500 is trans-substantiated when physical coldness, inhibiting soil biology, couldn't achieve this in physical winter – by Earth's cosmic winter forces. When the horn shaped content comes out of the horns and soil, this content feels extremely cold (colder than the soil the horns were taken out of, and the horn content, when pressed by hand “breaks” down somewhat like ice hollowed crystalinity. 500 should come out in spring before it gets warm or it is more like compost and not 500. It takes many weeks for these sausages, layered into the 500 bins to ‘grow’ together. Worms, which we don't have at all in the winter pit, because worms bring soil with them into horns whilst forcing manure out – lowering the purity and quality of 500 power – but in the bins – with access only to the original manure, then 500, they and microbes are essential i.e. workers (we also allow manure splashing when layering the horns into the pits as continuing input to the pit soil life, which when no horns are in, is held in dormant dynamic state, becoming active when horns are newly buried in pit – inside – the horns).

How did I find out about the colloidal of 500. That happened over the many decades I served you 500. I had to take whatever amounts of this substance out of bins, weigh it, pack it, move it to suit a parcel weight. Early on, to raise it to understanding as a colloid, I would liken it to

cheese or butter, when soft or hard cheese cut into lumps is inserted into cold water it's soluble content remains within the cheese etc; or I likened it to a substance put into a cellophane bag. These were very limited physical descriptions. 500 is membrane-like, it takes in and only releases (NPK) under jurisdiction of the Sun. Much to observe and learn yet.

If I go back to the situation where: here is the observer farmer and there is what is surrounding you and if you are practical everything you have to do starts with observation of the object. The object tells you what to do. You may plan to sow. But only if there is rain overnight. If there is, that tells you to go ahead. So is it with any other activity. First there is the individual and then there is the reality in his sight and the process of taking into consciousness arises. This is not just an activity of Thinking, it can equally be one of Feeling or Willing, or, in various ways an activity of all three – as activity of the individual and the object. - In place of the basis of a real object, there is often today a hypothesis. Something is “invented” either by the fantasy of an individual and so starts “in” him, or he has not truly checked at the origin of whatever pushes him. It could be a voice unknown. (Many “depressions” in humans are feared happenings “imagined” which are most unlikely to ever happen.)

In my early years at Universities, in classical science a real object was the base for gaining knowledge, as it is still today when in zoology or biology a new creature or plant is discovered and requires examination and naming. Much of “science” today however is based on a “working hypothesis” – quite unashamedly, as a proper method because the question “put” or the hypothetically created situation “allows” this, eventually “suggests” it namely when the particular area of “science” is already hypothetical and is “generally” already “accepted”. Or, there is “need” of knowledge which can only be hypothetically dealt with. – Once such has become “common scientific practice”, it eventually even is “taken” as fact. “Studies” in place of factualness. When long enough in use – in medicine, agricultural chemicals, “research” in the “universe”, becomes accepted. The eventual effect of thalidomide and ever so many other medical drugs or agricultural chemicals disregarded. A woeful (factually and oppressingly, even life taking) story. Sometimes pushed by financial greed: “terminator” seed, what horrific concept, i.e. new “reality” in Nature, genetic modification, mixing, with use of unquestioned chemicals, the mixing of creation's kingdoms etc etc etc. In fact unforeseeable effects, often “guaranteed” by a Prime Minister, legislating to permit such by reliance and naming the “Government Chief Scientist”, who may have experience in only a totally differing form of science. We must not forget being powdered with “safe” DDT after WWII, with senior officials drinking “safe” 24d, 245t (agent orange) etc. No private citizens group has the finances to take a Government to court, but such may happen and tax payers have to pay for their woes a second time.

If you watch every step of growing consciousness, you will find it is based on an observation: 500 a colloid; distinction of white feeder roots and water intake roots; plants have no warmth organisation, rely on Sun Warmth; plants take up elements out of hummus exactly to decree of Sun; under artificial fertilizer plants forced to take up excess NPK on account of these salts being available in all soil water and being taken up by the older water uptake roots; plants full

of excess NPK blown up in size by having to hold excess water in each cell to counter balance the excess salt, because of this transpiration rate is lowered.

20,000 acre's sand farm, farmer sprayed 500 on only one half of the field. Cattle could walk on sprayed or unsprayed land. First effect of 500 a chelation process: cattle walking on unsprayed land – with constant wind – cause sand to “blow” whereas walking on sprayed area there is no wind blow. Step by step these and many other examples came to consciousness through active perception of a reality.

At the same time equivalent **observations** leading to new farm management requirements for the effective preparations to be received and activated: rotational grazing (cattle and sheep etc together); in place of set stocking, or as often seen in Europe if animals are allowed out of stables at all or only on the same paddock each day (full of plant stems and no new clover leaves); animals moved daily (electric fence) to new pasture, ideally, at optimum growth, i.e. still growing actively, but near full height for time of year, full life, (makes milk) grazed once, with fast regrowth (dynamic management) after -each time- manure has been harrowed (Thory McDougall once expressed “If I don’t harrow the manure right away I feel unclean as though I need a shower – exactly as I felt. Such harrowing is a point in our Demeter certification). No pock marked paddocks with good looking clover etc growing around cowpats, not eaten by animals because it is full of soluble NPK ex raw manure; old roots, digested by soil biology, new roots of vital dynamic plants (not stagnated and too old to graze) hay, silage, regrow fast and deeper down each time – dynamic Bio-Dynamic grazing management when first introduced to the USA soon became (“American”) cell grazing without consciousness of overall biological aspects, administered by bureaucratic calendar instead of watching plant, season, growth recovery etc as much as possible there should be total exchange of farm area over year, pasture recovery, cropping, green manuring etc. When possible grazing as mentioned leniently so topping of pastures allow for light green manuring throughout which is also basic to the development of sheet composting and much else to suit each farm and as decided by farmer conscious of the desirables; soil cultivation. The conventional assumption that the NPK leaving a farm with products has to be replaced by equivalent inputs is wrong. The only new production of physical substance happens in the plant leaf, but not, as otherwise, through recycling of physical substance, but through use of non-earthly substance: Sun Energy and air born carbon dioxide – light assimilation. All burnable wood stems from leaves. Green manuring supplies new substance to Earth. But at least 25 plant varieties should be used varying over the years (also regarding seed prices). Each plant gives soil differently. The method of chemistry comes to an end of its dictum, when it is assumed that P or N in every plant is the same and according to a chemical analysis, P or N quantities are suggested for green manure. The chemical analysis can only assess quantities not **qualities**. With plant varieties it is somewhat similar as with a 50 instrument symphony orchestra, where each instrument plays the same C sharp: a trumpet, violin, Harp, flute. So varying, yet each tone the same by physics. (see DVD: Cosmo-Earthly ecology and green manure.)

All this and much else is based on observation to be effective and not a prefixed “learnt” ideal. So from the early days I would only supply 500 and preparations if the farmer would adopt this

general farm management to be suitable for the preparations to work as well as possible. And creative farmers would make more and more implements for these purposes.

Everything I have said or written is based on observation, initially maybe on simple physical observation (often without being conscious of just that) and from these it can go further. One must be in a state of wondering (and too much “education” can hinder that). Wondering, totally open and one must learn to watch, wherefrom something enters into this openness, contrary to curiosity or even ambition, demanding kind of, to know. That is absolutely different to waiting in wonderment, and when something comes being quite clear – visually so – that it is not pressed out of one’s own wishfulness, but one clearly observes that it is coming. There creativeness begins, a process towards something new. Thinking alone cannot do this. This process of gradually recognising in consciousness commences in the much less “finished” substance of Will, then Feeling and only towards end in the form, finalising where Thinking is involved. Thinking alone is too pre-formed by my own input – not observed in status *nascendi* - A while ago I read in a publication, “we must learn to think the etheric”. That is as hypothetical as much of modern “Science”.

Will Feeling, Thinking – like in Art. Journalism can write “about” once the reality of it is there, but “writing about it” after could never have come up with it originally, it always lacks the life of originality however well put. Similar is the intellectual repeating of another’s creative writing – even when calling theirs “spiritual”. It stems from isolated thinking unable to show any reality (etheric or otherwise).

In the lecture “Living Knowledge” I describe the differing methods of stirring (500 or 501). The accepted anthroposophic scientists are accepted because they are university trained. This – generally - brings with it an inhibition, a lack of openness. Lily Kolisko was a wonderful discoverer (and hard worker), she **simply** observed, uninhibited, and demonstrated; the prime example. Rudolf Hauschke cleared himself from his chemistry training inhibition: Nature of Substance, Biogen; and beyond that a new way of potentising plant based medicine avoiding the common preservative of alcohol; a very creative deed opening a new realm of medicinal power. The Lerois’ most seriously taking up Steiner’s cancer suggestions. Interestingly, both these also having to use **new** technical means, even a large physical centrifuge of a so far not existing speed. A farmer inventor is reminded of stirring machines. These few have not just followed Steiner quotations in a journalistic way.

In Botany, plant breeding proceeds from “male” and “female” parts arbitrarily portrayed as existing in the flower. One could likewise take one part of the male reproductive system and call it “female” and other parts “male”. The real female side is Mother Earth, which today is detrimentally compacted, made to dust, poisoned, in which under Bio-dynamics, a slow change of metamorphose like character takes place: potatoes are healthier after several years than when first introduced, wheat becomes better and better. The appearance of plants in uprightness, colour, health increases - breeding from the female side.

I am not interested in “proving” Bio-Dynamics in conventional ways of “Science” it is us who can farm large acreages healthy and provide **knowledge** of Nature open to anyone – not “science”: “facts” of a theoretical and disassociated singularity.

In examining the stirring methods my observing enters right into the stream of the water and, like when listening to the andante middle movement of a Mozart piano concerto or sonata, my feeling melts into the water, I move in it and so experience and bring to consciousness. Say with a stirrer activated (like a washing machine) by blades stirring from the centre bottom of the vessel, I am pushed from the bottom up the sides, and when at last a vortex is forced up and a chaos is to come, the water abruptly crashes down the sides and a washing machine bubbling sound, a dull noise arises as the water is slowly pushed up in reverse; a much slower happening, and, no such suction at the bottom centre etc. to examine thus does not require a follow up of a conventional comparative trial a' la University training. Entering flow form “stirring” alike! Catapulting down is beautiful – for children without access to creeks, originally intended for water purification. I've seen the latter work at Arne Klingborgs. It is effective, but requires acreage for 2 people. Nature's largest design for water purification is: real (i.e. biodynamic) plants uptake of water for transpiration (can be quite a large gallonage per tree). With flow form “stirring” there is no proper Vortex, no chaos and with a volume of 400 litres to stir, the same volume of water is pumped (centrifugal) to top of cascade 3 times per hour. Totally inadequate.

In the practice of this methodicity there **IS** man engaged (contra to no “subjectivity” in conventional science and therefore supposedly no man) and subjective man is objectively touched by an object. The exact methodicity of this is explained in the book ‘Active Perception’. (Note: how living acoustic can be created in a new building). Rita Leroi said, “at last a methodicity of imagination.

Maybe the time for Theories of Knowledge has passed. Goethe, whilst entertaining friendships with philosophers, was not himself interested in theories, but in observing. The absolutely exceptional book by Wolf von Engelhardt “Goethe im Gespräch mit der Erde” shows not only this; but aligns Goethe's poetic work at the same period.

Alex de Podolinsky