

3. The Spiritual World and its Beings in the View of S. Prokofieff

In the spiritual world there is no distinction between beings on the one hand and nature-processes on the other. Rudolf Steiner explains this as follows: „In the spiritual world we are only confronted by Beings, and over against these Beings there is nothing that could be called a nature-process. Everything one encounters is Being ... and one cannot say as in the sense-world: There is an animal, and those are outer substances which are eaten by it. This duality is not to be found there ...“ (29.8.1912, GA 138).

For this reason one cannot abstract the relation to the spirit world from the relation to its Beings; here the laws of being, of development, of the activity of Beings, are at work, and cognition of the spiritual world is always as concrete as are the spiritual individualities who become the object of cognition.

Prokofieff's works have surprises in store for the reader, in this realm too. In this chapter we will analyze a few examples and show by means of them how arbitrarily and irresponsibly he operates with those concepts which relate to Beings of the spiritual worlds. This kind of treatment of them is only possible if they are regarded as purely nominal concepts devoid of all real content; knowledge of the spirit world is here replaced by abstract constructions of schemes and definitions, which create the outer impression of spiritual scientific research.

3.1. Which Folk has the Larger Soul?

At first sight, this appears to be a strange and unanswerable question. In order to be able to determine what is bigger or smaller, measure, number and weight are required. A whole palette of possibilities is conceivable: from simple calculation to the precise quantitative methods of natural science, and the impressive methods of calculation used by applied mathematics; from the most primitive scales to the most precise electronic measuring instruments – they are all achievements of science. However, there is something lacking in all these methods and instruments which are developed for research into the material world: namely, they are not applicable beyond the confines of this world.

Rudolf Steiner's Anthroposophy has extended the sphere of cognition, and has shown that cognition is also possible beyond the limits of the sense-perceptible world. But in order to gain knowledge of the spiritual and remain within the bounds of what is scientific a method must be devised which is just as precise as, even if fundamentally different from, the methods of the materialistic sciences. But now a new generation of researchers appears on the scene, foremost among them Prokofieff, and it turns out that not only through cognition but through quantitative methods of the sciences – starting with the most simple, namely statistics – boundaries can be crossed. A quite ordinary calculation is enough to establish the size of the various „Folk-souls“, and compare them with one another. It is all extremely simple: The more populous a nation, the larger is its „Soul“; the size of any Folk-soul is dependent on the size of the population. But a theory underlies every method, and we will now inquire what this is.

The basic outlines of this theory are formulated in his book „The Spiritual Tasks of Middle and Eastern Europe“ (VII).^{*} The most important is the following: „Their (the angels') totality ... constitutes what can be termed 'Folk-Soul'. Hence there belong to this, in the first place, all the guardian angels of the human beings who are members of the Folk in question; that is to say, who constitute its physical (earthly) body“ (p. 118; emphasis S.O.P.). Prokofieff derives his theory from the „universal law of the correspondence of Micro and Macro-Cosmos“ (ibid.), and adds the following reflection: The soul of the human being acts as a mediator between his spirit and his body. If, therefore, according to Rudolf Steiner, the angels act as mediators between the archangels – the Folk-spirits – and the human beings who constitute the Folk, then – so Prokofieff concludes – the totality of the angels is the Folk-soul.

Why only the totality of the angels? One can prove to oneself that this assertion does not correspond to the truth. For example: When a leading politician is inspired by the Folk-spirit, then he too acts as a mediator between the Folk-spirit and the Folk. Following Prokofieff's theory one would therefore have to include amongst the constituent parts of the Folk-soul not only the angels, but also prominent human beings such as state functionaries or personalities in the armed forces.

^{*} The author refers to an extract from the book, which was published in the Russian journal „Anthroposophical Messenger“, Nr. 10, June 1996. We are therefore unable to indicate page numbers (Ed.).

Moreover, he applies the law of the correspondence between Micro- and Macrocosm in an arbitrary and false manner, as he has not taken the trouble to reflect on the relation between part and whole. The human being as microcosm is a „miniature version“ (a mirror image) of the Macrocosm, and there is thus a similarity between them. But this does not mean that the Microcosm is similar to any arbitrarily chosen part or fragment of the Macrocosm; if this were so one might compare the human being with any conceivable thing.

There is no rationally plausible analogy to be made between the spirit, soul and body of the human being, on the one hand, and the Folk-spirit, the totality of the angels, and the Folk itself on the other. The human soul mediates between the spirit and the body, behind which the spirit is also present. But the physical bodies of the human beings who, in their totality, constitute a Folk, cannot constitute the body of the archangel, however firmly convinced Prokofieff may be of this.* The archangelic body is spiritual in nature. „The entire Folk“, says Rudolf Steiner, „[is] as it were embedded as a whole within a spiritual substance, and this spiritual substance is the body of a Fire-spirit [an archangel]“ (6.8.1908, GA 105). Thus the angels mediate between the archangel and the Folk, not between the spirit and the body of the archangel - hence their totality is not comparable to the human soul as Prokofieff maintains.

The totality of the angels consists of a multiplicity of autonomous spiritual individualities, which cannot be said of the human soul. Prokofieff has realized this fact, only it does not disturb him. He says that, as in the Folk-soul, there is multiplicity in the individual human soul also, expressed in the three basic forces of thinking, feeling and willing, „each of which comprises a multiplicity of complex processes“ (VIII, p. 121). Something analogous to this „applies also to the Folk-soul ... The Folk-soul is always a multiplicity, but it can nevertheless be summed up as a threefoldness ... constituted by the three principal groups of angel-beings“ (ibid., p. 122). Then, in order to demonstrate the importance of his analogy, he goes on to describe those three groups, unaware of the fact that in the case in question the analogy does not apply. Although the human soul is differentiated it lives as a single whole; its parts have no individual being of their own; the Folk-soul, as described by Prokofieff,

* In „The Spiritual Origins of Eastern Europe“ he also speaks of „Archangels who are incarnated completely or partially in the earthly bodies of the peoples“ (p. 128; emphasis S.O.P).

would be split up into a multiplicity of independent spiritual individualities. Prokofieff speaks of an „infinite multiplicity of soul processes“ (ibid., p. 121) in the human being on the one hand, and a multiplicity of angels in the Folk-soul on the other (ibid., p. 122). But how can he compare undefined processes taking place within a single individual being, with the independent angelic spirit beings? This can only apply if the individuality as such is left entirely out of account.

If, for example, large-scale migrations of a population were to take place, then Prokofieff's Folk-spirits would continually have to exchange the members belonging to them. When have human beings ever exchanged amongst themselves parts of their own souls? If the reader reflects on these questions, he will be able himself to find enough arguments to demonstrate the untenability of Prokofieff's analogies.

But Prokofieff also has something of a problem with the archangel of a people. He says: „The totality of the guardian angels of the human beings who belong to the Folk in question [constitutes] as it were a part of the supersensible soul-body of the archangel who guides this Folk“ (ibid., p. 120). But, as Rudolf Steiner tells us, some human beings can also have guardian angels of a Luciferic nature. As a result of this, the leading archangel of the Folk would be involuntarily Luciferized, as his soul-body would be permeated by Luciferic spirits. A human being, through the exercise of free-will, can resist the temptation of Lucifer, but the archangel, as distinct from the human being, would come into a difficult position in such a case. As we know, the human being proceeds from one incarnation to the next with the same guardian angel, and once he has incarnated into a given Folk his angel must also be accepted. The archangel cannot dismiss the angel of a human being through a command from above! – So we see that Prokofieff needs to work at this question a bit further. Assuming that, for some reason, migrations to another land by human beings with Luciferic guardian angels were to take place on a larger scale, what consequences would this have for the archangel of that land?

Now some readers will perhaps reply that logic is one thing, but supersensible experience must also be considered. And Prokofieff does indeed appeal to this. He says: „And when their (the guardian angels') united working takes a harmonious course ... then spiritual perception can see the Folk-soul merging into one with the Folk-spirit to some degree, becoming an integral part of it“ (ibid.,

p. 120). From the point of view of content this assertion is an example of what one is not permitted to do and say in Anthroposophy, and also in occultism in general; in this particular instance the statement also has value in that it gives an indication of Prokofieff's „spiritual perception“ and of the source of his „knowledge“ of the so-called „Folk-soul“.

In the following paragraph he repeats what we have just quoted, brings forward the same analogies with the individual human being, and says that, just as in clairvoyant observation the human aura presents the picture of a unity of soul and spirit, so this is also the case with the „angel-soul and the archangel Folk-spirit, which, for the spiritual perception of their combined working, form an indissoluble whole“ (ibid.). Here he forgoes the demand for a „special harmony“; there is also no „integral part“, but only an „indissoluble whole“; however, the „spiritual perception“ is the same, namely Prokofieff's own. He has „perceived“ all this „spiritually“. This is confirmed by the following words: „Such a picture is presented to the eye of clairvoyance when it beholds these processes more from the standpoint of the archangel as he incarnates into the Folk-soul. From the standpoint of the angels who constitute this (Folk-soul), it appears somewhat different“ (ibid., p. 121). To judge by the context, the first sentence of the passage quoted above could refer to an indication of Rudolf Steiner mentioned earlier, which does not, however, confirm in any way Prokofieff's assertion. In the second sentence Prokofieff presumes to correct Rudolf Steiner, through observing these things from his own standpoint, namely that of the angel.

In order not to tire the reader any further with the casuistry of Prokofieff's clairvoyance, we will not, in what follows, take account of his „spiritual perception“, which is supposed to lend support to his theory. There are statements of Rudolf Steiner from which one can infer that the Folk-soul is definitely not the totality of the guardian angels of the human beings who constitute a Folk. In the daytime, says Rudolf Steiner, the Folk-soul is united with the human soul. „Every time we fall asleep we leave, as it were, the habitation of the Folk-soul to whom we belong“ (27.11.1914, GA 64). „In waking consciousness we exchange our forces with our own Folk-soul“ (12.12.1914, GA 156). The relation between the human being and his guardian angel is built up in a contrary way in the rhythm of sleeping and waking. „So long as the human being is awake, the angel is in the lap of ... the higher spiritual beings“ (17.7.1921, GA 205). But when the human being leaves his physical and etheric bodies during sleep, he is

accompanied by his angel (if the materialistic outlook of the human being concerned does not prevent this). „... The Archangeloi principle is [connected] with the etheric nature, ... the Angeloi principle must as it were accompany the human being from one state to another and back again. This Angeloi principle, this essential being of the Angeloi, must accompany the human being on his way into the sleeping state and on his return from the sleeping state“ (ibid.).

Now this should suffice to lead Prokofieff's theory „ad absurdum“. In the waking state the Folk-soul is united with the human soul, whilst the angel is resting in the lap of the Hierarchies. Conversely, in sleep the human being leaves the physical and etheric body – the dwelling-place of the Folk-soul – and unites with the angel. Thus the Folk-soul is connected with the physical and etheric body of man, so that the angel cannot be a part of it. The angel works within the human astral body and, in contrast to the Folk-soul, accompanies the human being through sleep. There is yet another interesting and unambiguous statement of Rudolf Steiner regarding the Folk-soul: „The Folk-soul is a real Being, but it has no physical body; its lowest member is the ether-body ... it spreads itself out like a body of mist, and all the ether-bodies of individual human beings of a given Folk are embedded within it, and its forces flow into the ether-bodies of the human individuals“ (21.6.1907, GA 100).

3.2. Mental Arithmetic as a Means of Bringing Order into the Angelic Worlds.

How can the spiritual tasks of Middle and Eastern Europe be fulfilled if one is not clear on the question of what the Folk-souls actually are? Prokofieff is accustomed to resolving spiritual-scientific questions speedily and without effort, but here his ideas become unexpectedly complicated. His Folk-soul has grown too many-layered and many-faceted. But things may have grown uncomfortable for the archangel too, as he now possesses a soul-body which consists of a multiplicity of the most varied and continuously changing individualities. As Prokofieff is considering things from the standpoint of the archangel, then from the standpoint of the cosmos, and finally from the standpoint of the spiritual beings who guide humanity, contradictions appear. And in order that no anarchy should arise in the Folk-soul as he has conceived it, he decides to create order in the angelic realm (and thus also in the Folk-soul) through arranging the angels according to various spheres of responsibility or more or less easily sur-

veyable „categories“. (Something of this kind was undertaken by Swedenborg, of whom we know that he was the reincarnated Ignatius de Loyola.)

First, he envisages three stages in the evolution of the angels (VII, p. 123). The principle whereby the stages arise – they are categories – is amusing. To the first category belong the angels of „ordinary human beings in all their different gradations“ (ibid.). Here Prokofieff ought to have asked himself the question: what, from the standpoint of spiritual science, is the meaning of „ordinary human beings in all their different gradations“? He is doing nothing less than to set up a classification according to rank within the angelic realm! What gradations are meant here? Has it to do with social status, doctor’s degree, or military rank? Such concepts have no place in Rudolf Steiner’s Anthroposophy.

To the second category belong the angels of „prominent“ human beings (ibid., p. 124). And even the concept of a prominent human being is unknown to spiritual science. Though it may deserve mention that Otto Weininger wrote a book entitled „Genius and Mental Confusion“!

To the third category belong, according to Prokofieff, the angels of the Initiates. „Among these most highly-developed angels“ – he informs us – „are to be found, for example, the guardian angel of Rudolf Steiner, and also the guardian angels of the other leading initiates of Mankind“ (ibid., p. 123). In order that the third category should not coincide with the second (or the first), the Initiates should not be counted among the prominent – and still less among the ordinary – people. That Prokofieff knows so much about the Initiates of humanity should no longer be any cause for surprise.

The question might be asked: what is the value of such an abstract scheme whose concepts are completely lacking in contour? Is the progress made by the human being to be determined, not by himself, by the efforts of his individual ‘I’, but by the level of his angel in the order of rank set up by Prokofieff? – Or, conversely, is it the case that the angel on the ascending ladder rises higher when the human being entrusted to him has worked his way up from the category of „ordinary“ to the category of „prominent“ people? What kind of criteria determine whether a human being has become prominent, or whether he is still ordinary? Is it the number of books the person has written, which is the decisive factor, or is it their thickness? In this question Prokofieff gives no concrete recommendations to the heavenly guiding powers, and allows them room – within the framework he provides – to act at their own discretion. In this respect Pro-

kofieff differs from the Catholic clergy, who decide such things themselves, even if the process of deciding may extend over a matter of centuries.

According to Prokofieff the first category of angels is still „at the beginning of its development“ (ibid., p. 124), while the angels of the Initiates are preparing „to ascend to the next higher rank, that of the archangels“ (ibid.). According to Rudolf Steiner’s research into karma, human beings who, in one incarnation have undergone an initiation, do not necessarily incarnate thereafter as „prominent human beings“ – to use Prokofieff’s expression – but sometimes as „ordinary“ ones, because they have to fulfil certain tasks which have no direct connection with their past incarnation. But what happens to the angels? – Are they, after having almost attained the rank of archangel, made to return to the beginning of their development?*

Prokofieff says to this: „In individual development, and also in the general historical development of mankind as a whole, these three groups of spirits of the angelic realm correspond approximately to the developmental stages of sentient-soul, intellectual or mind-soul, and consciousness-soul“ (ibid.). One can find no fault with this statement, because it is without content. It arises on the basis of the trivial fact that between two quantities consisting of the same number of elements there exists a numerical correspondence. One can maintain with equal validity that there is a correspondence to these three angelic groups in: head, rhythmic and metabolic system in the human being; Atma, Buddhi, Manas in relation to the human spirit; June, July, August in relation to the summer months of the year. And why the formulation „approximately“? Is an approximation needed when one is counting up to three?


If we consider his last assertion from the aspect of the development of the individual, are we to take it that „ordinary“ people develop the sentient soul; the particularly „prominent“ ones – such as Goethe and Schiller, through whose work the Folk-spirit was able to speak to human beings (ibid., p. 123) – develop the intellectual soul; and the Initiates the consciousness-soul? According to Rudolf Steiner this is not the case, for the ordinary human beings of the 3rd post-Atlantean epoch develop the sentient-soul, those of

* Here again we remark that it is impossible to work through these things without humour. Let the reader try to imagine how terrible it would be if we were to carry out our analysis with a long face and a deadly serious expression!

the 4th the intellectual soul, and the ordinary human beings of the 5th epoch develop the consciousness-soul. The Initiates develop still higher members.

Let us now try to examine the above statement from the aspect of the „historical development of mankind as a whole“ (ibid., p. 124). When Prokofieff maintains that the three post-Atlantean epochs in question correspond to his three angelic groups, to whom (or what) do the 1st, 2nd, 6th and 7th post-Atlantean epochs correspond? If there are correspondences between the epochs of human development and the groups within the Hierarchies, then a certain lawful structure is to be expected in these correspondences, and all the Hierarchies of an epoch should be assigned their place. But this is not the case.

We conclude that Prokofieff's attempt to introduce a new order in the angelic world is unsuccessful. Pursuing the investigation still further one realizes that, within the second category, there is yet another second category, consisting of angels „who are not the guardian angels of individual human beings“ (ibid.). This second second category is again divided into three categories: messengers, leaders of (human) communities (ibid.) and – let us call them for brevity's sake – „Folk-Gods“. Thus we have as a third second category: the angels of the communities. So as not to tire the reader with the verbal, hair-splitting account of Prokofieff's categories, we will attempt to bring order into his categories by means of a diagram:



How many categories of angels has Prokofieff „found“ altogether? His answer is: seven, for he says: „in all the seven angelic categories described ...“ (ibid., p. 125).

Is he leaving out the larger „categories“ and counting only the small ones into which they are divided? But there are only six. What ought to be included as the seventh category he calls, not category, but „group“. This consists of beings who actually „belong to the hierarchy of archangels“! Thus the seventh group of angels consists of those archangels who are „willing in a spirit of sacrifice to work in the spiritual world bordering on the Earth, on the same level as the angels“ (ibid., p. 124). Consequently the angelic realm in Prokofieff's scheme is divided into six (small) „categories“ of angels and a „group“ of archangels – not into seven categories of angels.

Let us see what he understands by the remaining approximately three or four (or whatever is needed to bring them up to the number seven) categories of angels: „The angel-messengers carry out the instructions of a Folk-spirit in relation to various human beings belonging to the Folk“ (ibid.) – i.e. they are something like cosmic postmen. Or could the guardian angels also take on this task, perhaps? Why does the separate institution of angelic messengers need to be set up? Rudolf Steiner does not mention them. He says only that the angels have an affinity with the human soul-life, because they are „engaged in the transformation of their astral body into Manas ... but have not yet completed this work. The human being stands at the beginning of this work ... Thus they understand fully all that the human personality can experience through sorrow and joy“ (9.6.1910, GA 121). And this applies to the angels in general, not only to a special group. But as the angels also reach up with their consciousness to the sphere of the archangels they serve as mediators between the human being and the Folk-spirit: „They receive the instructions of the Folk-spirits“ – says Rudolf Steiner – „and carry them into the individual souls ...“ (ibid.). Nowhere does he speak of a division according to which some angels serve only as messengers, and the others as guardian angels.

To the third „second category“ of angels in Prokofieff's system belong the „leaders or ‘group-souls’ of individual human communities or associations within the sphere of activity of a given Folk-archangel“ (VIII, p. 124; emphasis S.O.P.). The regular angels work together with individualities, and it is their task to work with the aim of individualizing. The angel-being works in the

astral body of the human being; if the angel were to work as a group-spirit, this would give him the possibility of working for the development of group-soul qualities, thereby creating a dominance of the group-soul consciousness in relation to the individual. However, this would conflict with the task of our epoch. Only the Luciferic angels work in this way. Are they the ones Prokofieff meant, perhaps?

To work with groups is the task of the archangels, whose sphere of activity is the human etheric body. In our time only the retarded spirits are concerned with the development of the group-soul nature. (There are exceptions; but one would have to deal with these separately, and they are unrelated to Prokofieff's theme.)

To a further third category in Prokofieff's system belong „those angels whose working reaches across the boundaries of the sphere of activity of a Folk“ (ibid.). From spiritual science, however, we know that we have here to do with neither angels nor archangels, but with Archai. What kind of activity does Prokofieff ascribe to the „angels“? He says: „These angels bring about the connection between the various peoples on the level of the angels“ (ibid.). What could the meaning of this be? „On the human level“ connections of this kind are realized through diplomatic representatives – i.e. through embassies. Perhaps „embassies“, modelled on the earthly ones, arise also in the angelic realm, and Prokofieff's angels of the third category are appointed as their staff?

We arrive at an interesting observation if we compare these „calculations“ of Prokofieff with what he says about himself in the book „The Spiritual Tasks of Middle and Eastern Europe“. In the Foreword he says: „The book can [also be regarded] as a task assigned to me by Destiny, which has made me into a mediator between two peoples. The mutual understanding of these peoples I see therefore as one of my most important tasks“ (p. 12). Here one would wish to ask Prokofieff: Would it not have been simpler to say quite straightforwardly – „My guardian angel is not just an angel like other people's (the ordinary, the prominent, and the initiated), but an angel of the (second) third category, whose activity reaches across the boundary of a people – in other words, an Archai“? Indeed, something comparable to this regarding his relation to the Spirit of the Age, Michael, was already expressed in his autobiographical essay (cf. § 1.2.).

Might there not, we ask, in addition to Prokofieff's personal „Archai-guardian-spirit“, also exist other „angels“ of this kind? Yes, of course. And Prokofieff

tells us about them: „To this group belong many of the gods, known to us in the different mythologies, who were revered by various peoples in antiquity. (Thus the Egyptian god Thoth was revered in Greece as Hermes and in Rome as Mercury“ (VIII, p. 124). We gather from this that one and the same Being was known in Egypt as Thoth, in Greece as Hermes, and in Rome as Mercury, i.e. this Being „brought about the connection between the various peoples“, and does so to this day. According to Rudolf Steiner, Hermes – or Thoth, as the Egyptians called him – was an individuality who was once a pupil of Zarathustra, and received from him the Sun Wisdom and the power of judgment, and later appeared in the realm of science. Thereafter this pupil appeared in the astral body sacrificed by his teacher, as Hermes, the great teacher and sage of the Egyptian Mysteries (cf. 15.2.1909, GA 109 and 2.9.1910, GA 123). That Hermes is an angel who brings about the connection between peoples – of this Rudolf Steiner said nothing, it was „discovered“ by Prokofieff. But Rudolf Steiner did speak in unmistakable terms about the hierarchical Being who in the ancient religions was also known as Hermes or Mercury (cf. 4.1.1918, GA 180). He says: „The god Mercury is an Archangelic being“ (1.6.1924, GA 236).

Thus Prokofieff's scheme of the angelic realm has, on closer inspection, dissolved into nothing.

3.3. From Arithmetic to Algebra. The Spiritual Beings as Variable Quantities.

The spiritual world as it is described by Rudolf Steiner presents considerable difficulty to anyone who wishes to grasp it with a simplistically dogmatic and schematic understanding. There are spirit beings who express themselves through other beings; relationships reproduce themselves in different forms on different levels of the Hierarchies; the one serves as a model for much else through undergoing metamorphosis and appearing under various aspects on various evolutionary stages of world-being. The manifoldness of revelation is brought about through the activity of individual spirit-beings who are as original and concrete as the human beings living on the Earth; for the spirit-world is neither simpler nor poorer in content than the earthly world. But the latter has congealed into sharply outlined material forms, and can on no account be forced into a definitive series of easily surveyable abstract schemes.

In contrast to the spiritual world, the way in which phenomena are perceived in the physical world ensures the permanent correction of schematic and incorrect representations of it. The spiritual world is revealed to the human being only in conceptual form unless, as in the case of Rudolf Steiner, he has it before his inner eye as an immediately perceptible reality. In order to be able to grasp this in its full complexity the human being must, on the one hand, attain the faculty of inner beholding and, on the other – so as to be able to apprehend correctly what is beheld – carry through concentrated work in his thinking, achieving thereby a shifting of the boundaries of understanding and consciousness to the level of inspiration.* The thought-forms in which the picture of the spiritual world appears leaves one free, and thus there are also paths of minimal resistance, corresponding to the innate forces of understanding. In such a case the human being remains within his everyday associative thinking which only provides the basis for the attainment of this (picture of the spiritual world – Trans.). We will illustrate by means of the following example how this works out in practice.

In Rudolf Steiner's lectures there are indications regarding the Bodhisattvas, individualities who have a significant „head start“ in advance of general human evolution, and incarnate on the Earth in accordance with certain laws, but not by stereotype. There are also communications of Rudolf Steiner concerning the Masters of Wisdom and Harmony of Sentiments (Meister der Weisheit und des Zusammenklangs der Empfindungen), who are united in the White Lodge of the leadership of mankind. In the description of these there is a certain similarity, a parallelism, but there are also important differences. In the present book we are not able to examine this more closely, and instead refer the interested reader to the relevant lectures of Rudolf Steiner.† Here we wish only to show how Prokofieff deals with this question.

In his first publication Prokofieff, citing Rudolf Steiner, comes to the overhasty conclusion that in the Lodge of the Twelve whose teacher appears as the thirteenth, the Masters of Wisdom and The Harmony of Sentiments – are the

* „The only thing that I can ascribe to myself is that I have gone through a rigorous training thanks to which I cannot succumb to the fantastic in any way. This was obligatory for me. For, what I experience in spiritual realms is thereby free from all illusion, from all deception, from all superstition ... I know how to distinguish between truth and illusion“ (Rudolf Steiner to Elisa von Moltke on 12.8.1904 – Ed.).

† Especially the lectures of: 31.8.1909 (GA 113); 25.10.1909 (GA 116); 17.9.1912 (GA 130); and GA 264, pp. 201-205.

Bodhisattvas (I, p. 73). To which it must be said that not everything that is analogous is identical – a truth apparently not grasped by Prokofieff. It can also be said of the disciples of Christ that, as the Twelve, they surrounded their Teacher as the thirteenth. Does this mean that they were the same persons (including Judas)?

In the attempt to justify his standpoint Prokofieff says: „Even the name ‘Masters of Wisdom and Harmony of Sentiments’ expresses this, for the true ‘Harmony of Sentiments’ – sentiment (feeling) is connected above all with the astral body – is only possible when the latter, as is the case with the Bodhisattva, has been transformed into Spirit-self“ (ibid.). This „proof“ does not stand up to criticism. For what does one prove by saying, firstly, „sentiment (feeling) is connected above all with the astral body“? One could infer from this that the plant does not, while the animal does, have feelings. And what would we gain from this play of associations? And, secondly, what is the meaning of the statement: „the true ‘Harmony of Sentiments’ is only possible when the astral body has been changed into the Spirit-self“? – Here we have the purest abstractions. Prokofieff would have to explain what he understands by the ‘Harmony of Sentiments’ and how this is related to the Spirit-self; or what the difference is between an untrue harmony of sentiments and the true one. And thirdly, how does he know that in the case of the Bodhisattvas the transformation of the astral body into the Spirit-self takes place? Prokofieff refers to p. 70 of his book (I), where he states that the Bodhisattva is only working with the angels at the transformation of his astral body into Spirit-self, and that he would only accomplish the full development of the Spirit-self in his final earthly incarnation – i.e. when he ascends to the rank of Buddha. On the other hand, Prokofieff tells us that „the true ‘Harmony of Sentiments’“ is only possible when the astral body „has been transformed into the Spirit-self“ (ibid., p. 73), at the Buddha and not the Bodhisattva stage, therefore! But in this case how could the Bodhisattvas be at the same time the „Masters of Wisdom and Harmony of Sentiments“? That such is indeed the case Prokofieff concludes from Rudolf Steiner's lecture of 20.5.1913 (GA 152), where it says that the angel attains freedom when the human being rises from Bodhisattva to Buddha. But this very argument ruins his „demonstration“. Because this would mean that only the Buddha knows the „true Harmony of Sentiments“, while the Bodhisattva, whose Spirit-self is not yet developed, is not endowed with this, and can there-

fore not be called „Master of Wisdom and the Harmony of Sentiments“. Prokofieff refutes himself.

He seems to have noticed this himself, and tries now to extricate himself from this awkward position by concluding his „demonstration“ in the following way: „It needs to be stressed in connection with what has been said, that in addition to the [highest and most fundamental] definition (thought up by himself) of the ‘Masters of Wisdom and the Harmony of Sentiments’ as the College of Bodhisattvas in the sphere of Providence, there are yet other great teachers of humanity (this is therefore the ‘lower’ and ‘secondary’ definition!) who can be called ‘Masters of Wisdom and the Harmony of Sentiments’ [in Christian esotericism]. For they too are inspired from this sphere and have a direct relation to it“ (I, p. 74 [p. 86]. Here Prokofieff raises himself above the whole of Christian esotericism and shows what little regard he has for the reality of those he names ‘Masters of Wisdom and the Harmony of Sentiments’. For if we have here to do with real individualities, then there can only be the definition of the reality, regardless of whether it is a „higher“ or a „lower“. Identifications of this (Prokofieff’s) kind are normal in abstract algebra - they are what is known as „isomorphisms“, where only the number of elements composing a quantity is taken into account, and the structure of their interrelationships, the „individuality“ of the element being completely absent. In Anthroposophy we are concerned above all with individualities and not with relations, abstract structures and numbers. But for Prokofieff there appear to be no individualities. He treats the names of the spiritual beings as variable quantities which can, according to need, be made to mean all kinds of things through the attaching to them of the appropriate definitions. And, as he states in his „Autobiography“, everything that Rudolf Steiner says about the Bodhisattvas was „already known“ to him, only he „had not until then been able to express it in thoughts“ („My Path ...“, p. 85).

The situation appears still worse when he is speaking of the „Group-soul“ of the Anthroposophical Society. This „variable“ is assigned an endless variety of different meanings, which is particularly scandalous considering that the theme in question is the Christmas Conference, which he has chosen as the main emphasis of his life’s work.

In his first book he says: „Just as [in evolution] the single ‘I’ of the individual human being is only ignited through contact with the physical plane, so also the

esoteric essential being of Anthroposophy [the Being of Anthroposophy itself], its ‘I’, was only able to enter fully into earthly development when the Anthroposophical-Michaelic impulses had, at the Christmas Conference, united themselves completely with the earthly world, when the Anthroposophical movement and the Anthroposophical Society had become one. At that moment, in the 21st year of the life of the movement (from 1902-1923), the Group-‘I’ of the new community of Michaelites was truly [actually] born. The birth of the new Group-‘I’ of the Michaelites as the spiritual foundation of their community is ... [the profoundest mystery] of the Christmas Conference ... If we ask ourselves: Which Being can we bring into connection with what was here called the Group-‘I’? Then the answer must be: This Group-‘I’ [is the leading Time-spirit of our age – Michael himself]“ (I, p. 346, [p. 381-382]; emphasis S.O.P.). From this the following conclusion is to be drawn: Firstly, Michael would then be the esoteric essential Being, the ‘I’ of Anthroposophy, so that even the Being of Anthroposophy itself would be none other than Michael, which means that Anthroposophy is neither spiritual science nor anything else, but simply the leading Spirit of the Age.

Secondly, it follows from what is said, that Michael was only able to enter fully into earthly development as the esoteric essential Being of Anthroposophy by virtue of the Christmas Conference. However, the present Michael epoch did not begin in 1924, but in 1879, nor is it the first. In addition we know from Rudolf Steiner’s communications, of numerous cases of concrete Michael revelations in Earth development, which took place long before the Christmas Conference. But – did he perhaps not reveal himself completely? Unfortunately, Prokofieff does not let us know what he means by completely in this case.

If, thirdly, the esoteric essential core of Anthroposophy only came to full expression after the Christmas Conference, then what did Rudolf Steiner develop up to that point in time? Was it neither a highest nor a fundamental Anthroposophy, but perhaps no Anthroposophy at all, since it had no esoteric central core, and true Anthroposophy only began with the Christmas Conference? We recall Prokofieff’s words in his autobiographical essay: „After the Christmas Conference ... everything becomes different ... in the Anthroposophical movement“ (cf. § 1.2.). If someone were to believe, in contrast to this, that the Anthroposophy developed by Rudolf Steiner before the Christmas Conference was the genuine thing, then he would have at the same time to ac-

knowledge that at the Christmas Conference Anthroposophy had come to an end. For Rudolf Steiner did not say that Michael was the Group-‘I’ of the Anthroposophical Society, which in the passage quoted above is described by Prokofieff as the Michael community.

Let us now turn our attention to the question of the Group-soul of the Anthroposophical Society, and not be confused by the fact that, in the fragment quoted, Prokofieff calls it the Group-‘I’. Both terms are familiar to us and are basically the same because, when occultism speaks of Group-soul, it is pointing to a concrete Spirit-being who has an individual ‘I’, and not an abstract s o u l . But with Prokofieff the whole thing drifts into the abstract again, as he asserts that Michael is this Group-soul; in other places he tries to assign this role to other Beings.

In „The Occult Significance of Forgiveness“ (V) we read the following: „This ‘Good Spirit of the Goetheanum’ ought more and more to become a kind of (?) ‘Group-soul’ of the General Anthroposophical Society ... In the physically visible Goetheanum ... the visible expression of the Being of Anthroposophy itself“, etc. (V, p. 165). As we have already explained, this „actual“ Being of Anthroposophy is Michael himself. From this we infer that the Goetheanum is the visible expression of Michael. And if we take into account what has been said above, then it is he who at the Christmas Conference became the Group-soul of the Anthroposophical Society. In the eyes of Prokofieff, are Michael and the Spirit of the Goetheanum one and the same Being? Is the Goetheanum the visible expression of Michael? - But why should it become more and more a Group-soul? And if they are two different Beings, does this mean that the Anthroposophical Society will have two Group-souls, or that Michael’s post will be taken over by the Spirit of the Goetheanum?

Let us try to state clearly what Prokofieff understands by the „Spirit of the Goetheanum“. This will be no easy task. (It is always the first Goetheanum that is meant.)

In his book „The 12 Holy Nights and the Spiritual Hierarchies“ (III) Prokofieff says: „This etheric development consisting of three successive steps, and the ‘four soul qualities’ which support this, were embodied in the forms, the painting, and the architecture of the first Goetheanum.“ He then goes on to speak of the Goetheanum as the „artistic revelation (objectification) – of initiation processes, which are connected to the ether-body of the human being.“ The

Goetheanum appears, in this instance, not to be „the visible expression of the Being Anthroposophy“, but „stages, qualities and processes“. He continues: „This spiritual Goetheanum (which every human being can himself build up within his ether-body through developing the lotus-flowers) will bear him (the human being) into the worlds of the Cosmos, into the widths of etheric space, and up into that sphere where in the present time the ‘macrocosmic Goetheanum’ or the ‘Spirit of the Goetheanum’ is to be found, of which Rudolf Steiner spoke at the conclusion of the Christmas Conference“ (p. 134-135).*

We will not linger to consider this remarkably abstract and arbitrary idea of Prokofieff’s, which describes the three higher lotus-flowers of the etheric body as the „spiritual Goetheanum“. Essential for us is the fact that, according to the statement in this book (III), the „spirit of the Goetheanum“ is to be found in the widths of the Cosmos, did not therefore i n c a r n a t e at the Christmas Conference, and did not become the G r o u p - s o u l of the Anthroposophical Society; that conceivably it has no intention of doing so although, according to the passage in another book (cf. quote from given above: V, p. 165), it o u g h t to do so.

Let us now return to „... The Founding of the New Mysteries“ (I), where Prokofieff says: „The Goetheanum shows us the picture of the human being in his eternal and divine aspect ... The Goetheanum [is also] the true home of the ‘Anthropos-Sophia’, where the wisdom of man, born of the Holy Spirit, where this cosmic wisdom became for the first time visible also to earthly human eyes on the physical plane“ (I, p. 156). Why „for the first time“? Were not all the temples and cultic centres of the past a visible expression of „cosmic wisdom“? Prokofieff tenaciously reiterates his (presumably h i g h e s t a n d m o s t f u n d a m e n t a l) definition of Anthroposophy as „the wisdom of man, born of the Holy Spirit“. And what could be the meaning of: „the human being in his eternal and divine aspect“? On p. 163 (ibid.) he says that „the soul of the Nathan Jesus ... the ideal, cosmic archetype of the human soul’ is „the archetype of all mankind“. Then who is actually the „Spirit of the Goetheanum“ and the „Group-soul of the Anthroposophical Society“? – The Nathan Soul? Or Michael? Or Anthroposophy (in the one or the other sense of this word)? On

* The chapter „The Building of the Inner Goetheanum as a Path to the Experiencing of the Etheric Christ“, from which the quote is taken, is missing from the German translation available to us – Editor.

p. 157 (ibid.) we read: „Living, etheric divine Word, revealing itself in physical form, ... such was the first Goetheanum. It was the embodiment of Anthroposophy itself.“ – Now we will have to add to our list: „etheric divine Word“.

Of the Goetheanum Prokofieff writes „that it was itself a living Being“ (ibid., p. 158). What happened to it when it was burned down? - From Prokofieff we learn that „after it had, like a living Being, gone through the process of death and disembodiment [it] revealed itself during the Christmas Conference as a purely spiritual reality, as the Spirit of the Goetheanum“ (ibid., p. 164; emphasis S.O.P.). Who was it who went through incarnation in the forms of the Goetheanum, through death, and resurrection at the Christmas Conference? – Michael? – the Nathan Soul? – or perhaps – the processes of initiation?

Finally, Prokofieff himself grows tired of this chaos; he recognizes in it „a highly significant problem“, and asks the question: „What is this ‘resurrected Goetheanum’ for us now? What is the meaning of the ‘Spirit of the Goetheanum’? What will its significance be for the further development of the Anthroposophical movement and the Anthroposophical Society?“ (ibid., p. 165). But his answer confuses the issue still further: „We have in the Goetheanum the first great Michael revelation, made visible to the physical eye of the human being ... The divine Word ... ‘became flesh’ in full reality in the forms of the Goetheanum ...“ and „when within the fire-element it went through the solemn act ‘of transsubstantiation in the great Temple of the Cosmos (?) [it became] pure spirit, the spirit of the Goetheanum ... it passed over, in agreement with world Karma, into the great Temple of the Cosmos, identifying itself with it, and thereby became the archetype of the second great Michael revelation ... the archetype of the true communion, the ‘beginning of the cosmic cultus which is appropriate for present-day humanity’“ (ibid., p. 168; emphasis S.O.P.). Where do we stand now? Did it become the Group-soul of the Anthroposophical Society? – Or ought this still to happen in the future? What about the first or second Michael revelation? – What about Michael himself, the Nathan Soul, and the Divine Word itself?

With this guided tour through the labyrinth of Prokofieff’s demagoguery we have tried to highlight the unintelligibility of his rhetoric. But there is still more to come, in the shape of the conclusive, depressing formulation of his theory of

the Spirit of the Goetheanum and of the emergent Group-soul of the Anthroposophical Society.

„Rudolf Steiner“ – he states – „engages intensively in a profound study of the results of contemporary science. Then as an Initiate he bears them up to the gods in the Cosmos, and receives this knowledge of modern science – transformed into the language of the gods – back from them in the form of the world wisdom ... He then endows this divine wisdom with a bodily sheath in the imaginative forms of the Goetheanum ... ; during the fire these forms pass through the substance of the warmth-ether and return to the astral light, expanding then into remote regions of the Cosmos ... From thence Rudolf Steiner receives them again, but now as the sublime divine Word, as the living Spirit of the Goetheanum as it returns transformed out of the depths of the Cosmos“ (ibid., p. 211).

Thus the „knowledge of modern science“, which has undergone transformation in the way described, ought more and more to become the Group-soul of the Anthroposophical Society ... – Healthy common-sense has nothing more to say.

3.4. Occult Materialism Makes its Début in Anthroposophy

The epoch of the consciousness-soul had of necessity to become the epoch of materialism, as a right development of individual ‘I’-consciousness needs the support of sense-experience and knowledge of the laws of the material world. In Prokofieff’s view of things the epoch of materialism is already nearing its end, as we showed in 3.3. Since the end of Kali-Yuga and especially since the Christmas Conference a victory of universal spiritualization ought to have begun, many details of which he describes in Chap. 7 of his first book (I). And in our time, so he mentions in a later book (V), the whole of mankind stands on the threshold between consciousness-soul and Spirit-Self (p. 124), so that the end of materialism is imminent.

But what is the reality of the situation? Rudolf Steiner warns us: The materialistic outlook is on the increase and will continue to grow for a further four or five centuries (18.11.1917, GA 178). The spirits who inspire materialism have altered neither their intentions nor their strategies, but only their tactics. They no longer deny the spirit, but attempt to present it to the world with concepts and pictures taken from physical reality. In this way a kind of world-view arises,

which explains everything, including the spirit, with the technical terms „matter“ and „energy“. Among such pseudo-scientific occult-materialistic streams we may count parapsychology, Ufology, extra-sensory research etc., which speak of abstract, energetic processes, forces, fields, substances of the spiritual world, and represent these according to the model of the phenomena of the physical world.

That Prokofieff too is aware of this can be seen in his later writings. But, for him, even this knowledge remains an abstraction. He polemicizes against such occult streams and unmasks their occult materialism, but he succumbs, himself, to their influence. His materialistic conceptions of the spiritual world are hidden behind concepts which he borrows from spiritual science.

The first symptom of the infection can be seen in the way Prokofieff operates, as we have described, with the conceptions of spiritual beings, who appear in the role of nomenclature abstractions after the model of earthly „ministries and official bodies“.

His altered concept of the Folk-soul, which now, instead of the archangels, comprises the numerical totality of angels, and his explanation of the manifoldness of such a soul by means of analogies with the processes and attributes of the human soul, call to mind the following words of Rudolf Steiner: „If, as a spiritual scientist today, you tell people that there is a Folk-soul which is an archangel, and so on, then they ridicule you. What in materialism is spoken of as the Folk-soul is only the abstract aggregate of the qualities possessed by the members of a Folk“ (18.5.1915, GA 159). With his theory, Prokofieff builds a firmly-constructed bridge between spiritual science and materialism, which he is the first to cross.

In Prokofieff's books there is a progressive de-personalizing of the spiritual world; instead of concrete spiritual beings we find mostly nameless powers. Thus in the „Spiritual Origins of Eastern Europe ...“(IV) he speaks in the course of a very long chapter - repeatedly, not just in passing, but as an essential theme - of the „spiritual-divine powers, who guide earthly development“ (p. 373); of „higher powers which direct the karmic relationships of human beings“ (ibid., p. 379); of the „higher guiding powers of earthly development“ (ibid., p. 383), etc. Nowhere does he tell us what he understands by these powers. In this way his argumentation is neither spiritual-scientific nor religious, for even theologians refer by name to the Beings of whom they speak.

The reference made by Prokofieff in the same connection, to „levels of meta-historical reality“ - of which we will speak later (§ 6) - belongs in the same category. On these „levels“ there are neither archangels nor Folk-spirits, nor is there a Time-spirit - there are no spiritual personalities at all; he describes only „powers“, and „all-encompassing laws“ (admittedly also „karmic undercurrents“), as in a well-designed mechanism. In Chap. 9 of the same book there suddenly appears an „inexhaustible source of the cosmic forces of childhood and eternal youth, in whose lap are contained all the great possibilities of the future“ (IV, p. 60). Is there concealed behind all this, perhaps, a star in the cosmos, which radiates these rejuvenating energies and a light-filled future?

In the book „The Occult Significance of Forgiveness“ (V) Prokofieff exhibits his materialistic thinking even more plainly. There he attempts to describe the „occult mechanism of forgiveness“ (p. 58), which works as follows: „By dint of the effort made by the moral will springing from the individual ‘I’ ... there are formed in the unbroken memory-stream permeating our ‘I’ and bearing our ‘I’-consciousness (?), ‘spaces which are free of memory’, as it were, into which the substance [with the power to transform all evil], of the higher ‘I’ or Spirit-self, can pour itself. And this Spirit-self substance is borne further on the stream of memory, which carries it into the human ‘I’, transforming and spiritualizing it“ (ibid. [p. 46-47]).

How such a theory can arise, it is difficult to say. Out of the free play of fantasy, perhaps, or out of the chimera of an atavistic clairvoyance? The description can easily remind one of a production-line. What could be meant by this „memory-stream“? At the beginning of the chapter in question Prokofieff makes reference to Chap. 2 of „Occult Science“, where it says that the human ‘I’ has the faculty of memory. There is no mention of any kind of „memory-stream“. Then Prokofieff goes on to say: „Having acquainted ourselves with this introductory thought, we can now consider the process of forgiveness from the standpoint of modern spiritual science“ (ibid., p. 54). And here we now find this „memory-stream“, of which the „old“ spiritual science of Rudolf Steiner knew nothing, but which has only been revealed through today's „modernized“ spiritual science of Prokofieff.

With some effort we have succeeded all the same in finding the source from which Prokofieff probably drew, unconsciously, or without a clear understanding of what is being said. In the lecture of 4.11.1910 Rudolf Steiner describes

the 'I'-development of the child, and says that when the 'I' starts to become aware of inner representations (Vorstellungen), „the 'I' must unite itself with the on-flowing stream, with that which we have called the ether-body ... At the moment when the child begins to develop its 'I'-consciousness, the stream of the soul-life has made an imprint of its own upon the ether-body. But the 'I'-representation (Vorstellung) also arises through this process ... The child, before it has the 'I'-representation [is] unable to sense its own ether-body; at the moment when it begins to develop 'I'-consciousness it senses its ether-body and mirrors back into the 'I' the being of its own ether-body ... This is the essential feature of 'I'-consciousness, that it is the ether-body reflecting itself inwards“ (GA 115). In this way the memory of experienced events comes about.

Prokofieff makes no reference to this lecture. Although similar expressions are used in it, it is precisely this passage which shows the untenability of Prokofieff's constructions. – He asserts that the 'I' through an effort of the moral will arising from the individual 'I' has to make a small hole in the ether-body! For manipulations of this kind, at least a developed Life-spirit is necessary. And it will not succeed automatically in implanting the Spirit-self substance in this little opening: the Spirit-self has a substantial affinity with the astral body and not the ether-body.

The reader will have no difficulty recognizing the difference between these descriptions. Rudolf Steiner's is concrete, living, graspable as a whole, and the theme is the movement in the ether-body. In Prokofieff's we find nothing but abstractions. Whence and whither his stream flows, in what relation it stands to the supersensible members of man's being, whether it belongs at all to one of these members, or flows from eternity to eternity – Prokofieff is silent on this; but his stream carries the 'I'-consciousness, and might carry it off completely. What is his stream composed of? Memory-substance, perhaps? And what might that be? From his description it grows clear, that it flows in and out through the 'I' (like the blood through the heart?). And then this 'I', through an effort of the will, makes a little opening somewhere in the stream, and lets the Spirit-self substance flow into the person concerned. All this happens without contact with the 'I', because, as we gather from the quote, the Spirit-self substance is carried further by the memory-stream, and only afterwards does it pass over into the 'I'. We ask the following: Can the 'I'-consciousness, which bears the stream, exist somewhere outside the 'I'? And who is that mysterious benefactor who watches on the

bank of the stream and pours the healing substance into the opening just at the moment of its appearance? Prokofieff gives no precise indications. Presumably the whole thing proceeds with the movement of a well-functioning conveyor-belt – fully automated.

And as the process of forgiveness advances, the memory-stream receives „mending-patches“ from the Spirit-self. This Spirit-self substance is borne by the stream into the 'I', which is thereby transformed. - Interesting! At the present stage of evolution the human being possesses only a germ of the Spirit-self, which begins to unfold as soon as the 'I' works upon the astral body. According to Rudolf Steiner the Spirit-self is the astral body transformed by the 'I'. In Prokofieff's theory the opposite occurs: the Spirit-self works upon the 'I'. But where does this Spirit-self come from? Is it the Spirit-self of the human guardian angel? If so, the guardian angel should let all the more Spirit-self substance flow into the human being, the more he forgives. This could become difficult for the angel, as his Spirit-self is involved in a process of development which will only culminate at the end of the Earth aeon. Rudolf Steiner says that for the creation of Saturn the spirits of will sacrificed of their substance; that on the Moon e.g. the spirits of movement let the astral body flow out of their being into the human being; and that on the Earth the spirits of form endowed him with the 'I'. It is not conceivable that Rudolf Steiner should have said that on the Earth the angels implanted the Spirit-self in man. In the 6th post-Atlantean period the angel will overshadow the human being with the Spirit-self, but even then it will not become his own possession. In connection with Prokofieff's view of evolution according to which the human beings on the Earth develop the Spirit-self, no further commentary is really necessary.

And yet the question still remains: when and how did Prokofieff see all this? In the electronic calculating machine such a thing is possible, when in the working process of a programme of any kind the content of the memory-cells is erased, and into the „spaces free of memory“ new data are fed in, and all this is guided by a higher programme-system. Anyone who is familiar with these things is amazed at the similarity between Prokofieff's occult processes and what is known from the world of technology.

Prokofieff fabricates false pictures of the spiritual world. His listeners, having no supersensible experience of their own, rashly open their consciousness to materialistic imaginations of this kind, which are of the same nature as those

with which Lucifer and Ahriman are building up the eighth sphere. To recognize such false teaching no supersensible experience is required; it is enough to study systematically, and understand, what Rudolf Steiner has given. The task of Anthroposophy can only be the attainment of objective knowledge of the spiritual world, and not some kind of experience acquired by chance. Today a great deal can sound Anthroposophical, although it may come from a quite different source. The danger that threatens us from the camp of the occult materialists and their inspirers is great indeed. If we do not develop the capacity to counter these „viruses“ from the eighth sphere – which can mutate to suit every taste – with clear insight into their true nature, an insight which stems not from atavistic experience but from a conscientious study of spiritual science, then Anthroposophy will before long become a tool of those spirits whose goal it is „to make the physical plane absolutely dominant. And a spiritual world will be spoken of only insofar as the revelations of the physical plane require it“ (15.1.1917, GA 174).