

The Missing Michaelic Millions

Joel Kobran

The Problem

In recent years, a number of Anthroposophists have written or spoken about the so-called Michaelic millions, often numbered at six or seven million, claiming that although all or most of them are incarnated in our time, the overwhelming majority have not found their way to Anthroposophy and to joining the Anthroposophical Society. They are also referred to as Michaelic souls, Michaelites, the Michael(ic) stream, and the Michael(ic) movement.* We are further told that those who identify themselves as Anthroposophists are obliged to *reach out* in an attempt to find the others and to unite with them in their realms of activity.

Whenever my co-editor and I questioned those we could who have referred to these numbered millions, not one could tell us where this idea can be found in the works of Rudolf Steiner. And yet, due to the apparent lack of scrupulosity of most of those who bring this idea forward, many are led to believe it comes directly from Steiner's lectures, even as it continues to spread within the Society membership and beyond. This supposed knowledge is being used in an obvious attempt to influence people and to create policy within the Anthroposophical Society as it relates to the rest of the world. An example would be the Anthroposophical conferences that devote far more time to meetings of members *and friends* (that is, non-members) than to members meetings.

Another example can be found in the opening paragraphs of the lead article in the newsletter of the Anthroposophical Society in America, *News for Members*, September 1999, written by Hans Brodal, Håkan Blomberg, and Alexander Iván for the Organizing Group, Anthroposophical Society, Gothenburg, Sweden, titled "Series of International Conferences to Explore the Present Social Intentions of Michael":

In his book, The Spiritual Event of the Twentieth Century, Jesaiah Ben-Aharon describes how the stream of the Michaelic School was split into two separate groups, a small one consisting of anthroposophists and a much larger group that expresses itself in all kinds of organizations in what is now called the civil society movement. These organizations now wield power, but they lack spiritual science to articulate their Michaelic impulses, which drastically decreases their efficiency.

Therefore, the most important task for the anthroposophical movement in the age of globalization is to

* Michael is the archangel who, according to Rudolf Steiner, has been the Guiding Spirit of our Age since 1879.

unite with the other participants of the spiritual Michael School in order to develop a living spirituality within a creative context.

The relevant chapter of Ben-Aharon's book is number four, "The Rebirth of Anthroposophy," in which he states that "the Michael School on the Earth is divided into two groups, between which as yet no conscious and fruitful connection exists,"¹ but he does not claim that the "much larger group . . . expresses itself in all kinds of organizations in what is now called the civil society movement." No doubt the authors of the newsletter article may have heard Ben-Aharon speak of this or have read it in an article of his elsewhere, but this is yet another typical example of the careless way such ideas are being presented. This particular idea is certainly in circulation and has a direct relation to much that is being put forward by Nicanor Perlas, with whom Ben-Aharon has often collaborated. For example, one finds the following in the original, undated version of "Working Group for Global Threefolding," co-authored by Ben-Aharon and Perlas: "The primary task of the Working Group with regard to unconscious Michaelites outside the anthroposophical movement is to develop ways of informally and formally linking up with global cultural creatives* and global civil society at all levels—global, national, and local" (p. 10). The beginning of the corresponding passage of the "Short Version Updated May 2000" of this article was changed to: "One task of the Working Group is to develop ways (p. 2) . . ." (The founding members of the Working Group include Ben-Aharon, Perlas, and the authors of the newsletter article, Brodal, Blomberg, and Iván.)

Chapter four of Ben-Aharon's book begins as follows:

In his memoirs René Maikowski reports on an important conversation with Rudolf Steiner, in which the question concerning the number of potential anthroposophists in the world was discussed. After Rudolf Steiner made it clear that some millions of them exist, he added, noticing Maikowski's bewildered expression: "The souls that seek Anthroposophy are incarnated; but we don't speak their language!" Today, at the end of the [20th] century, a still greater number of Michael pupils are incarnated, but there

* Cultural creatives is a philistine neologism Perlas borrows from the anthropologist Paul H. Ray. For more on this see chapter seven, "Cultural Creatives and the Cultural Revolution of the 20th Century," of Perlas's book *Shaping Globalization: Civil Society, Cultural Power and Threefolding* (Center for Alternative Development Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines, 1999).

*Posted with permission of editor, Gary Lam 6
Fall 2000—Issue No. 19 — The Threefold Review*

has been little real increase in the number of human beings who seek active identification with anthroposophical life and thought. We must ask ourselves: Are we yet speaking the appropriate language of spiritual science, or is a considerable part of our anthroposophical life and thought straying behind the supersensible movement of our Time Spirit, Michael. . . ?²

The following should be noted about this quotation. When my research began over one year ago, Ben-Aharon's book was the only reference in English I could find to Maikowski's memoirs. However, it is Ben-Aharon who places the emphasis on certain words, not Maikowski. The latter's memoirs are the actual source of one of Steiner's references to the missing millions, a fact unknown to all those my colleague and I had queried.

Before continuing on to Maikowski's memoirs, it is necessary for the sake of clarity to address the related matter of the Michael School already referred to in the newsletter article. One of the authors of that article, Håkan Blomberg, has also written the lead article, "Seeking a Culture of Active Will," in the May 2000 issue of *Anthroposophy Worldwide: Life in the Anthroposophical Society, U.S. Edition*, a publication addressed to members and friends of the Society, where he discusses the Michael School at greater length:

Jesaiah Ben-Aharon writes in his book, *The Spiritual Event of the Twentieth Century*, that anthroposophy is essentially isolated. It has not succeeded in reaching most of those individuals who, while in the spiritual world, had been active in the School of Michael. These people are filled with the powerful impulses of the Michael School, but they may lack a consciousness of the science of the spirit and thus cannot effectively work with their Michaelic impulses. Most of them are also not conscious of their direct relationship to the anthroposophical souls with whom they had developed their impulses.

It must be the goal of the people within the anthroposophical movement to reunite with their karmic brothers and sisters. This necessity and the realization of Michael's intentions were the decisive motifs of the conference.* Michael's intentions encompass all people in all cultures. They presuppose broad collaboration among diverse interests.

Nowhere in this article does Blomberg describe the Michael school, nor does he provide the reader with any helpful references. And many of those who do bring it up have only the vaguest picture of it.

Rudolf Steiner spoke of the Michael school during the last year of his life, after the refounding of the Anthroposophical Society, in at least three of his lectures on karmic connections when he tried to awaken his audience to a particular form of self-knowledge; one was

* Held near Gothenberg, Sweden, at the end of 1999, on "The Anthroposophical Society and Its Relationship to the Present Social Intentions of Michael."

given at Arnhem, Holland, on July 20, 1924, another at Dornach, Switzerland, on July 28, 1924, and another at Torquay, England, on August 21, 1924. The following is taken from the Arnhem lecture:

Michael gathered his hosts, he gathered from the realms of the Angeloi and the Archangeloi the supersensible Beings who belonged to him, but he gathered, too, human souls who in one way or another had been connected [to] him. And thus there arose [something like] a great and ever-widening supersensible school. . . . a supersensible [schooling] now took place, from the fifteenth into the eighteenth centuries, under the direct leadership of Michael—a supersensible schooling in which the great Teacher, ordained by cosmic decree, was Michael himself. Thus, . . . numbers of human souls had already received a supersensible schooling whose results they now carry [unconsciously] within them. These results come to expression in the urge felt by such people to come to Anthroposophy.³

Turning now to the relevant passage in Maikowski's book, one finds this record of a conversation he had with Rudolf Steiner in 1922:

Another time I was reporting about a student who, at the university, had handed in a paper that Rudolf Steiner had advised him on. It was rejected. Whereupon Rudolf Steiner suddenly asked me: "How many members do we actually have?" I gave him a certain figure of several thousand, as well as I knew at the time. Then he said, "If we had that many million members, one would have to listen to us, and such works could no longer be rejected." I was somewhat astonished; he noticed this and added, seriously and emphatically: "The souls who are seeking Anthroposophy have incarnated, but we do not speak their language!"⁴

According to Martin Barkoff, in *Das Goetheanum* (the Anthroposophical Society newsletter from Dornach, Switzerland), December 1, 1991, writing when he was still editor of that publication: "René Maikowski is said to have asked Rudolf Steiner how many people took part in the Michael School in the spiritual world. 'About seven million' was Rudolf Steiner's reply." This incident is not reported in Maikowski's book, and thus this supposed conversation recedes into the dubious realm of hearsay without a named source. Barkoff then goes on to suggest that these souls would incarnate "in the course of seven generations between 1900 and about 2150," with "one to two million incarnated at the same time who are on earth seeking to make contact with the Michael forces." He provides no basis for this idea. However, it must be admitted that if the total number of such souls is about seven million, and only "several" million** were on the

** In the Maikowski quotation, "that many million" means as many as there were thousands, which was *einigen*, that is, *some, a few, or several*. (It is, of course, regrettable that Maikowski is not more specific.) Often it is forgotten that in the decimal system the

earth in Steiner's time, then all seven could not have been incarnated at that time.

It is not at all clear how many of these souls are incarnated now, but in contrast to Barkoff's conclusion that "the Society has 50,000 members and lives in a sea of one to two million Michael School students!," one must consider Steiner's remark from his lecture of July 28, 1924:

Those who are able to receive Anthroposophy today with true and deep devotion in their hearts—those who are able to unite themselves with Anthroposophy—have within them the impulse, as a result of all they have experienced in the supersensible world at the beginning of the 15th century and at the beginning of the 19th century, to appear again on earth at the end of the 20th century together with the others who have not yet returned. By that time anthroposophical spirituality will have prepared for what must then be realized, through the community of them all, namely, for the fuller revelation of all that has been supersensibly prepared through the different streams that I have mentioned.⁵ [emphasis added]

A further complication is that during the year following his conversation with Maikowski, Steiner spoke on at least two occasions about certain millions somewhat differently. It should be noted that in the material available to me concerning the missing Michaelitès, no reference is made to these statements of Steiner.

In Stuttgart, Germany, on February 13, 1923, he said:

If we look back over the twenty-one or twenty-two years of the Society's development, we will certainly discover that by far the greater number of those who approach the Society do so out of a sense of dissatisfaction with the spiritual, psychological, and practical conditions they find surrounding them in life today. In the early days of the Society, which, when considered factually and not critically, might even be called its better days, something was taking place that almost amounted to flight from the life of the present into a different kind of life built on human community, a community where people could live in a way they felt in their souls to be in keeping with their dignity as human beings. This alienation from the spiritual, psychic, and practical situation prevailing in the life around them must be taken into account as a factor in the founding of the Anthroposophical Society. For those who became anthroposophists were the first people to feel what millions and millions of others will be feeling keenly indeed in a not too distant*

millions column goes no higher than nine; the next column records the number of ten millions; and the next, of hundred millions. Thus, many million would be at least five or six, but no more than nine, and several would be fewer than the seven in question.

* Rudolf Steiner considered his work within the German Section of the Theosophical Society from 1902 through 1913 as part of the development of the Anthroposophical Society.

future, that older forms have come down into the present from by-gone days in which they were not only fully justified but the product of historical necessity, but that they no longer provide what modern man's inner life requires and the dignity of full humanness demands.⁶

And in Dornach, Switzerland, on June 16, 1923, he said:

*But what in this third period** must be of special importance, that is the consciousness of having built up a society that is taking the first step in a matter in which a large part of mankind will have to follow. Indeed, consider this my dear friends, a relatively small society is building itself up with the intention of doing something wherein a large part of mankind should follow. That sets the obligations not only for those who will follow, but rather it sets obligations of a far higher sort; that sets obligations of a very high potency as against that, say, of the duties of those who, as a great number of people, will take Anthroposophy for their orientation.*

Today's Anthroposophists are not to think that they have only those obligations that the people who will be committed to Anthroposophy will have when the Anthroposophists are in the millions, not in the thousands. If the thousands hurry ahead of a movement, those thousands have an obligation raised to a higher power. That means they have an obligation to practice in all details greater courage, greater energy, greater patience, greater tolerance, and, above all, greater truthfulness."⁷

Many questions related to the material under consideration are difficult to answer without genuine spiritual-scientific research, questions such as: How many Michaelic souls are there? And how many of them are on the earth now?

However, the careful study of the works of Rudolf Steiner may bring us to the answers of such questions as: Why have most, however many, failed to find their way to the Anthroposophical Society? Can we recognize them? And can we help them?

During another lecture given in Dornach on July 6, 1924, Steiner said:

At the same time, if we look out into the world with a clear perception of what has happened hitherto, we are also bound to admit: There are many human beings whom we find here or there in the world today, and of whom—looking at their connection [to] their pre-earthly life—we must say that they were truly predestined by their prenatal life for the Anthroposophical Society; and yet, owing to certain other things, they are unable to find their way into it. There

** The first period was from 1902 "approximately up to 1907, 1908, 1909;" the second came to an end "around 1913 and 1914;" the third was "from 1914 onwards." (From the same lecture.)

*are far more of them than we generally think.*⁸

One may well ponder what other things render them unable to find their way into it. At the very least one must consider the karmic difficulties brought from prior earthly lives and the crippling effects of the anti-spiritual form of education that has been prevalent for some time and that continues to get worse.

Regarding those who were children in the 1920s, at least some of the six million referred to by Inge Boese in an article that appeared in *Das Goetheanum* (March 8, 1992) may have been Michaelic souls. She states that: "In July 1924, during the pedagogical lectures in Arnhem, Holland, when Mr. van Bemmelen, in a break, accompanied him on a short walk, Rudolf Steiner said to him that originally six million souls had wanted the Waldorf pedagogy, but they had been scattered by the war." This problem may well continue up to the present, for all the obvious reasons.

One may also ponder Rudolf Steiner's observation that "we do not speak their language." Surely Steiner himself was neither incapable of speaking their language nor unwilling to do so. This observation must apply rather to how his followers were representing Anthroposophy. On January 18, 1924, a few weeks after the 1923 Christmas Conference in Dornach that refounded the Anthroposophical Society and during which Steiner joined and became its president, he said:

*Nothing is to be said against anyone who wants to learn. On the contrary, this must be cultivated far more intensively in the future than it has been in the years since 1918, when the attempt was made to bring all manner of academic usages, and other allurements too, into the Anthroposophical Movement. But something else must now be added—which, by the way, we have always striven for. Anthroposophy must now be represented before the world at large, and this requires quite another style. This, among other things, weighed with me in deciding to take the Presidency of the Society, for thereby it will be possible for me to show to the world more fully how I should like Anthroposophy to be represented by the Society. The point of view we adopted in 1912, 1913—and that with the best intentions—was that I should withdraw into the background and only have the office of a teacher. But there came a time when this gradually proved to be impossible. My real intentions were constantly being blunted by the Society. The inner force and impulse was taken from them—especially after 1918.*⁹

As has been shown, one response to Steiner's observation that we do not speak their language and to the lack of members in the Anthroposophical Society is to attempt to unite with those active in civil society.*

* See our issue no. 17 for a review of the usage of *civil society* and a critique of the idea that it is equivalent to the spiritual-cultural sphere of the threefold social order.

A second response (which can blend with the first), particularly to the lack of members and to the idea that there are many million missing Michaelites, is the attempt to reach out in all the problematical ways typical of our age, the implicit rationale being that the ends justify the means (as if one can even reach the desired ends by *any* means). One example is the increasing reliance upon electronic-mechanical media such as television, videotapes, radio, and tape recordings to present the content of Anthroposophy. Another is the drive merely to market Steiner's works in English without regard for whether the presentation is in harmony with the contents or is accurate, even to go so far as to delete passages of great significance to his pupils. Yet another is to publish books by those attempting to popularize Anthroposophy, books that only trivialize it. And so on.**

Would not an alternative approach that is more to the point be to *reach in* and be more responsible in taking up and representing Anthroposophy? Whether or not Barkoff's numbers are correct, he is certainly justified in claiming that the current skewed proportion of Michael School students in the Society to those outside it "can furnish an idea of how little our Society is up to its tasks or focuses on these tasks."

A beginning in reversing this trend and in speaking their language would be to take to heart the "obligation raised to a higher power" incurred by the members of the Anthroposophical Society, that is, "to practice in all details greater courage, greater energy, greater patience, greater tolerance, and, above all, greater truthfulness."

Another step would be to take seriously what Rudolf Steiner said in Stuttgart, Germany, on February 6, 1923:

Those who read The Philosophy of [Spiritual Activity] as it should be read speak with inner conviction and assurance about the findings of researchers who have gone beyond the state one has oneself reached as a beginner. But the right way of reading The Philosophy of [Spiritual Activity] makes everyone who adopts it the kind of beginner I am describing. Beginners like these can report the more detailed findings of advanced research in exactly the same way in which a person at home in chemistry would talk of research in that field. Although he may not actually have seen it done, it is familiar to him from what he has learned and heard and knows as part of reality. The vital thing in discussing anthroposophy is always to develop a certain soul attitude, not just to project a picture of the world different from the generally accepted one.

The trouble is that The Philosophy of [Spiritual

** It would require a separate series of articles adequately to address the nature of the media, including print. Let it suffice in this context to raise two questions: What does electronic-mechanical mediation of Anthroposophy do to its content? Is it really the art of eurythmy that one experiences by observing a videotape of a performance?

*Activity] has not been read in the different way I have been describing. That is the point, and a point that must be sharply stressed if the development of the Anthroposophical Society is not to fall far behind that of anthroposophy itself. If it does fall behind, anthroposophy's conveyance through the Society will result in its being completely misunderstood, and its fruit will be endless conflict!*¹⁰

A dubious development in relation to the challenge of "speaking their language" is the growing sentiment that lecturing is merely old hat. A recent example appears in Blomberg's article, mentioned earlier, where he characterizes the conference held in Sweden at the end of 1999. He writes: "Each day of the conference had a particular theme. Certain questions provided direction. It was a process leading through the past, present, and future. There were no group leaders or any kind of speakers. Each one of us was responsible for allowing constructive conversation to occur."

While constructive conversation should always be welcome, obviously there is a time and a place for other things, including speakers. This ideal of the democratization of culture is a far cry from what Steiner called for in *The Art of Lecturing*, six lectures given in Dornach in October 1921. The day has not yet come when any significant number of English-speaking lecturers have mastered the art "of delivering a lecture for Anthroposophy"¹¹ in the manner indicated by Steiner. He began by saying: "I am of the opinion, that, in this course we are now starting, it is a question of a discussion of what is necessary in order really to connect one's self responsibly [to] the movement of Anthroposophy and the Threefold Idea."¹²

Blomberg also states: "The intention of the conference was to contribute something to an anthroposophical culture based on the initiative of individual anthroposophists living in all parts of the world. Such anthroposophy is a culture of active will, not exclusively one of wisdom (which can sometimes lead to passivity). In our time it is important to want to dare to act, because every development requires an initiative that is spiritually inspired."

No doubt an unhealthy relation to wisdom can lead to passivity. But for anyone truly concerned with the present social intentions of Michael, the Spirit of the Age, which include the threefolding of the social order, this observation is both one-sided and, in the context of Blomberg's article, self-serving. What of the opposite danger—those who are active because they are driven by impatience, restlessness, or impetuosity?

Rudolf Steiner himself, who surely cannot be characterized as being passive, said near the very end of a lecture given in Bern, Switzerland, on December 12, 1918:

Even if the faults and tragedies of the age are very visible to Spiritual Science, this should not be an

*incitement to pessimism or optimism but rather a call to an inner awakening so that independent work and the cultivation of right thinking will result. For above all things, adequate insight is necessary. If only a sufficient number of people today were motivated to say, "We absolutely must have a better understanding of things," then everything else would follow. It is just in regard to social questions that there is a need to consciously strive for insight and understanding. The development of the will activity is planned for, it is coming. If we in daily life would only wish to educate ourselves about social issues, and develop new social ideas, then (according to an occult law), each of us would be able to take another human being along. Each of us can therefore work for two if we have the will. We could achieve much if we had an earnest desire to acquire insight at once. The rest would follow. It is not so bad that not many people can do much about the situation of society today, but it is incredibly sad if people cannot at least make up their minds to become acquainted with the social laws of Spiritual Science. The rest would follow if serious study would take place.*¹³

Furthermore, inasmuch as we are concerned with recognizing what is Michaelic, due regard must also be given to statements of Rudolf Steiner such as those found at the end of "At the Dawn of the Michael Age," one of the letters written to members of the Society after its refounding:

One who understands how to observe such things knows what a great change took place in the last third of the nineteenth century with respect to the life of human thought. Before that time man could only feel how thoughts formed themselves in his own being; from the time indicated he is able to raise himself above his own being; he can turn his mind to the Spiritual; he there meets Michael, who proves his ancient kinship with everything connected [to] thought. He liberates thought from the sphere of the head; he clears the way for it to the heart; he enkindles enthusiasm in the feelings, so that the human mind can be filled with the devotion for all that can be experienced in the light of thought.

*The Age of Michael has dawned. Hearts are beginning to have thoughts; spiritual fervour is now proceeding, not merely from mystical obscurity but from souls clarified by thought. To understand this means to receive Michael into the heart. Thoughts which at the present time strive to grasp the Spiritual must originate in hearts which beat for Michael as the fiery Prince of Thought in the Universe.*¹⁴

It should be obvious that merely to glorify as Michaelic those active in civil society and to demonize those involved in elite globalization, as Perlas and Ben-Aharon do, represents a tendency to extreme oversimplification and a failure carefully to consider all the facts

available to us.*

Those inclined to the point of view of Ben-Aharon and Perlas may be surprised that Rudolf Steiner said the following during the lecture of January 18, 1924, mentioned earlier:

If you adopt the point of view which I have here explained, you will already be cherishing in your heart that 'more' of which we said the pursuit of Anthroposophy stands in need. Anthroposophy can neither be a theory, nor can it altogether do without the element of thought. We are living in a time when Anthroposophy would become a burning question for countless human beings on the earth—if only the Anthroposophical Society succeeded in working in such a way that the real needs of men could 'catch fire' by what is presented to them as Anthroposophy.

The point is . . . let me put a concrete instance before you. A wonderful 'book of life,' if I may so describe it, has once again been published. It is a kind of autobiography—a description of his own life—by Henry Ford. What this 'Automobile King' places before the world as a description of his life is highly characteristic. There is something delightful and truly great about it and what he says about the spiritual and material longings of all his life, makes this impression on me: Imagine someone standing before a door. He is full of urgent needs—not exactly spiritual needs, in this instance. But what he desires is not only urgent, but justified; his voice however is quite inadequate to express his legitimate and urgent desires. He would fain cry out aloud to all the world what he desires, but his voice does not seem loud enough. So he knocks at the door, knocks urgently—invents all manner of devices to thunder out what he desires.

When I read Ford's book, I feel almost as though I myself were the door. Nevertheless, it is delightful. You feel yourself beaten black and blue in your soul, but you cherish these bruises, for the book is indescribably intelligent. And there behind that door is Anthroposophy. Hitherto, however, it has been so constituted in a Society as to make it quite impossible for that which stands before the door to come near to that which is behind it. It is simply impossible. To this end we need something quite different.

Ford, after all, is a representative man. What he is on a grander scale—truly, on the grandest possible scale—is after all only representative of many, many people of our time. . . .

There is the knocking and hammering at the door. Behind the door is Anthroposophy, but—however loud the knocking—the door has not been opened. Now, at last, however, we may find the possibility for Anthroposophy herself to open the door from within.

To this end, however, it must be made possible for anthroposophical matters to come before the world in such a way that men who grow out of the civilization of our time with the type of mind possessed by Henry Ford, the Automobile King, will say to themselves: 'Here I have written that modern science itself is, after all, something that points to the past. Man cannot only live in the past. There must also be something that guarantees life for the future. We cannot merely absorb so much information; we must also have something that is alive. All this I have written'—(you may read this in the highly interesting book by Ford, especially in the penultimate chapter)—'all this I have written, and yet . . . something is lacking.'

And that is just where Anthroposophy belongs! It would become possible for people to speak so, if only we knew how to take in real earnest what was intended in the Christmas Foundation Meeting, so that as time went on the Christmas Foundation Meeting would not lose content but on the contrary gain more and more.¹⁵

Whether or not Ford is one of the Michaelic souls is not the issue here. It is, rather, that Steiner presents the Automobile King, who adapted the conveyor belt and the assembly line to the production of automobiles and was considered to be the apostle of mass production, as "a representative man," "knocking and hammering at the door."

Of course, it is a real challenge to develop the ability to recognize a Michaelic soul. Generalizations about groups will hardly suffice. A Michaelic soul is an individual, after all, and a striving Anthroposophist can only recognize them one by one. Allowing for all the obstacles of modern life, and for the damage inflicted on so many people, it is conceivable that they may appear anywhere—for example: in prison, living on the street, living with the use of recreational drugs or the abuse of prescribed drugs, enjoying techno at raves,** or even working for transnational corporations.

While many active in civil society may indeed be part of the Michael stream, most of these who present their thoughts in articles, books, and talks do not seem to have escaped damage to themselves, particularly if they are Michaelic souls, because a significant characteristic they have in common is materialistic thinking, which is hardly Michaelic. Returning to Steiner's letter to the members, "At the Dawn of the Michael Age," one can read:

In earlier times the human beings related to Michael saw him develop his activity in the spiritual sphere; they now know that they ought to let Michael dwell in their hearts; they now dedicate to him their spiritual life which is based on thought; they now, in their

* A detailed examination of the works of Perlas will appear in a future issue of this magazine.

** Techno is a form of electronic music. Raves are all-night dance parties. Participants are mainly youths; the use of recreational drugs is common among them.

*free and individual life of thought, allow themselves to be instructed by Michael as to which are the right paths of the soul.*¹⁶

It is Michael who enables us to spiritualize our thinking, to overcome materialism. But what is untransformed in those active in civil society manifests itself relentlessly and unsubtly, even if it is overlooked by many; for the most part their outlook is colored by the ideas of Adam Smith, Karl Marx, Charles Darwin, modern physics and biology, and so on.

A review of certain of the quotations provided in this article will reveal another significant problem. According to the article by Brodal, Blomberg, and Iván, the larger group of Michaelic souls is not in the Anthroposophical Society, but “expresses itself in all kinds of organizations in what is now called the civil society movement.” The smaller group, of Anthroposophists, is supposed to unite with them “in order to develop a living spirituality within a creative context.” But this context is not to be the Anthroposophical Society.

Blomberg, in his separate article, also referring both to the smaller group and to the larger, says: “It must be the goal of the people within the anthroposophical movement to reunite with their karmic brothers and sisters. This necessity and the realization of Michael’s intentions were the decisive motifs of the conference. Michael’s intentions encompass all people in all cultures. They presuppose broad collaboration among diverse interests.” Thus, the two groups are to reunite, but once again, not within the Anthroposophical Society.

Both of these articles rely in part on Ben-Aharon’s book, the first article going so far as to credit it with an idea that does not appear in it. But subsequently Ben-Aharon does present this idea in the article he wrote with Perlas where they state that the “primary task of the Working Group,” composed of Anthroposophists, is to link up with the “unconscious Michaelites” in “global civil society at all the levels.” Yet again this linking up is not to take place within the Anthroposophical Society.

What Ben-Aharon writes in his book regarding the two groups of Michaelic souls is ambiguous, if not misleading. Where he quotes the single sentence from Maikowski’s report of his conversation with Steiner, Ben-Aharon states that they were speaking of “potential anthroposophists” when Steiner said “we don’t speak their language.” But even the attentive reader may initially be thrown by this because in current usage, which is often imprecise, people who are not members of the Society have been referred to as Anthroposophists. Why Ben-Aharon chose not to include the entire quotation is not known to me, but in it Steiner and Maikowski are speaking not just about Michaelic souls but about potential members of the Anthroposophical Society.

Ben-Aharon further enhances the ambiguity when he adds: “Today, at the end of the [20th] century, a still greater number of Michael pupils are incarnated, but

there has been little real increase in the number of human beings who seek active identification with anthroposophical life and thought.” Is “active identification with anthroposophical life and thought” to be understood to mean membership in the Anthroposophical Society or, in fact, something quite different?

Further on, Ben-Aharon states that: “The urgently needed bridge across the abyss that still separates the two parts of the Michael stream on Earth can only be built if Anthroposophy succeeds in re-establishing a direct spiritual connection with the supersensible events of this [20th] century and of the next.* This is possible at the end of the [20th] century. This renewed possibility belongs to the true destiny of the Michael stream and the Anthroposophical Movement and Society in the Michael age described by Rudolf Steiner in 1924 in his studies of the karma of the Michael stream. Because this cannot be dealt with here in greater detail, we shall only point to the following relevant perspective.”¹⁷ (What follows this passage does not, in fact, refer to “the two parts of the Michael stream.”)

Notwithstanding the fact that Ben-Aharon, in his book, gives no indication of the two streams uniting in the Anthroposophical Society and that elsewhere Ben-Aharon, Perlas, and their colleagues claim that the two streams are to come together in civil society, it is in the very same esoteric studies of the karma of the Michael stream referred to by Ben-Aharon above that one is given the clear picture of all the Michaelic souls *uniting in the Anthroposophical Society*.

The quotation already provided from Steiner’s lecture of July 20, 1924, describes those who had been pupils in the Michael school as carrying results “unconsciously within them” that “come to expression in the urge felt by such people to come to Anthroposophy.” In other words, *to come to the Anthroposophical Society*. Those who may doubt this should consider what Steiner said in the same place, Arnhem, Holland, two days earlier, on July 18, 1924.

He first explains that the Anthroposophical Movement, the “stream flowing in the spiritual worlds through the present phase of the evolution of mankind,” was originally to be distinguished from the Anthroposophical Society, which “was a kind of administrative organ for the anthroposophical knowledge flowing through the Anthroposophical Movement.” However, since the Christmas 1923 Foundation Meeting, during which Steiner became the leader of the new Anthroposophical Society, “the opposite of what went before must be recognized: no distinction is to be made henceforward between Anthroposophical Movement and Anthroposophical Society, for they are now identical.”¹⁸

Then somewhat further on he says:

When we think today of how the Anthroposophical

* What Ben-Aharon means by this and whether he establishes its veracity cannot be addressed in this article.

*Society exists in the world as the embodiment of the Anthroposophical Movement, we see a number of human beings coming together within the Anthroposophical Society. Any discerning person realizes that there are also other human beings in the world—one finds them everywhere—whose karma predisposes them to come to the Anthroposophical Society, but, to begin with, something holds them back, they do not immediately, and in the full sense, find their way into it—though eventually they will certainly do so, either in this or in the next incarnation. We must, however, bear the following in mind: Those human beings who through their karma come to the Anthroposophical Movement are predestined for this Movement.*¹⁹

Much could be said about these remarks of Rudolf Steiner, but for the purposes of this article it will have to suffice to emphasize the following. We only know about the Michael school, its pupils, and the challenges facing the Anthroposophical Society because, based on his spiritual-scientific research, Steiner has revealed this knowledge to us. It was given to awaken the members of the Anthroposophical Society to necessary self-knowledge and to inspire them to represent Anthroposophy in a way that would be helpful to all the Michaelic souls predestined to join the Society.

Without adequately addressing Steiner's description of the intrinsic relation of the Michael stream to the Anthroposophical Society (or of the Society to the School for Spiritual Science*), Ben-Aharon, Perlas, and others have created a counterpicture leading to a goal opposed to the one that is based on Steiner's picture.

In his works, Perlas began by directing our attention to civil society, *which he mistakenly characterizes as the cultural component of the social order*, crediting it with being the driving force for threefolding in our time. In fact, *Anthroposophy is the driving force for threefolding.*

In the last lecture of *The Art of Lecturing*, Rudolf Steiner makes abundantly clear the intrinsic and inseparable relation of Anthroposophy to threefolding.

What one must strive for is a genuine knowledge of the events of the time. And, you see, such a firm grounding in the events of the time, an arousal of the really deeper interest for the events of the time, can only be evoked today by Anthroposophy. For these and other reasons, whoever speaks effectively about threefolding must be at least inwardly permeated with the conviction that for the world to understand threefold, it is also necessary to bring Anthroposophy to the world.

Admittedly, since the very first efforts toward the realization of the threefold social order, there have been, on the one hand, those who are apparently interested in the threefold social order, but not Anthroposophy; while on the other hand, those inter-

*ested in Anthroposophy, but caring little for the threefold social order. In the long run, however, such a separation is not feasible if anything of consequence is to be brought about. . . .*²⁰

An independent cultural life must be a real life of the spirit. Today, when people speak of the spiritual life, they mean ideas; they speak only of ideas.

*Consequently, since Anthroposophy exists for the purpose of calling forth in people the feeling for a genuine life of the spirit, it is indispensable when the demand arises for a threefold social organism. Accordingly, the two should go together; furtherance of Anthroposophy and furtherance of the threefold social order.*²¹

However, in two distinct ways, an impulse counter to the indications of Steiner appears in the work of Perlas. Firstly, he tends to separate both Anthroposophy and Rudolf Steiner from his presentations of threefold. An extreme example can be found in David Korten's September 5, 1996, interview of Perlas in which Korten asks him about his relation to an "associative economics model."²² It is remarkable that Perlas then goes on to describe what the people he works with "call associative economics" without once mentioning Rudolf Steiner or Anthroposophy, without which he could never have created his "model," however defective it may be.

Secondly, Perlas never makes it clear that "since Anthroposophy exists for the purpose of calling forth in people the feeling for a genuine life of the spirit, it is indispensable when the demand arises for a threefold social organism." Quite to the contrary, in some of his writings he actually presents the Catholic Church as the vitalizing element in cultural life; instead of representing Anthroposophy, he refers us to five papal encyclicals from 1891 to 1987.**

In his book, Ben-Aharon began by adding to what Rudolf Steiner had said about the Michael School his own description of later developments. He states that "The imagination of the Spiritual Event of the Twentieth Century presented below describes the actual supersensible action of the Michael School in the middle third of this [20th] century. . . ."²³ And earlier on he refers to the contents of his book as "The anthroposophical research presented below. . . ."²⁴, meaning his research; in the introduction it is made abundantly clear that he is relying upon his own supersensible experiences.²⁵

However, it is not clear how Ben-Aharon is presenting himself to the reader regarding his research. On the one hand, he may think of his research as being on the level of Steiner's and of himself as an occult teacher. Regarding this possibility, we must consider what Steiner wrote about himself: "Now I reached my fortieth year, before which no one should appear publicly as a teacher

** See *Associative Economics: Responding to the Challenge of Elite Globalization* (1997) and *Elite Globalization: The Attack on Christianity* (1998).

* The esoteric school within the Anthroposophical Society.

of occultism, according to the intention of the Masters.* (Everywhere, when someone taught earlier, a mistake was made.)"²⁶ Ben-Aharon was born in 1955, gave his lectures on this subject in 1992-1993, and the first edition of his book was published in 1993. On the other hand, if he does not view himself this way, any reader confronting the grandiosity of his claims in the realm of knowledge can only be perplexed.

Once Perlas and Ben-Aharon begin to collaborate, the counterpicture emerges: the Michaelic souls will not gather in the Anthroposophical Society as Steiner had said, but rather, the Anthroposophists, few in number, will unite with the many others active in civil society.** Neither of these authors, nor those who follow their lead, ever attempts to convince us that Steiner's picture has been superseded by theirs—Steiner's picture is simply never mentioned, and theirs merely takes its place.

One can imagine that their perception of all the apparent negativity and failure associated with the history of the Anthroposophical Society has prepared them to accept the idea that what has not yet happened (the uniting of the Michaelic souls in the Society) will never happen and has driven them to seize upon a goal that they themselves intend to bring about—the linking up of Anthroposophists with the “unconscious Michaelites” in global civil society.

Ben-Aharon's spiritual research has led him to an enhanced perception of what has gone wrong. According to him, in the foreword to his book:

*The world tragedies of the second third of the century, and especially of the twelve years [1933-1945], came about because Rudolf Steiner could not continue his life task to its completion. This was not his failure but our own. This failure has constituted since then the main anthroposophical karmic debt of this century, and this applies not only to the individuals who were physically involved in the anthroposophical life of the first and second thirds of the century but to all the members of the Michael school that strive truly to make the carrying and resolving of this karmic debt into their own karmic duty.*²⁷

He goes on to claim:

Then we can realize that the negative world and Society results of our failure in the first third of the century created also the possibility for a transformation of this failure into a higher good in the supersen-

* According to Steiner, the Masters are those “elevated beings [who] have already passed along the path which the rest of mankind still has to travel.”²⁸ They are the great leaders and teachers of mankind.

** It is not surprising that Ben-Aharon has incorporated Perlas's focus on civil society into his own picture of the current situation on earth when one considers his characterization of the Michael pupils who “reached the age of 21 years in 1966/7.” According to him: “They were the first to lead the great social, ecological, political, cultural and spiritual transformations of the last third of the [20th] century, in the midst of which we are living now.”²⁹

*sible anthroposophical life in the second third of this century. The anthroposophical research presented below shows that beside the externally visible historical tragedies of this century caused by Rudolf Steiner's unfinished life-task there occurred also the hidden purely supersensible compensatory Michaelic act that, on a higher level, aimed to compensate for this omission.*³⁰

While it is true that Ben-Aharon seems to address the significance of the Anthroposophical Society in relation to the problem of the division in the Michaelic stream, what he says is filled with ambiguity. For example:

*The always preserved and living possibility to bring the whole spiritual development of the Michael stream in the twentieth century, in its physical as well as in its spiritual aspects to a fully conscious anthroposophical earthly as well as supersensible life at its end, is to be found in the eternal Life-Spirit forces of Anthroposophy. This Life-Spirit constitutes the substance of the Christmas Foundation Conference and is the Foundation Stone of the School for Spiritual Science and the General Anthroposophical Society, initiated and consecrated by the life-sacrifice of Rudolf Steiner.*³¹

Here and elsewhere he is implying that the spiritual development of the Michael stream, as a consequence of Rudolf Steiner's death, was separated from earthly life and, therefore, from the Anthroposophical Society. He does not clearly state that a fully conscious anthroposophical earthly life includes the unification of the Michael stream in the Anthroposophical Society. Nor is the matter made any clearer when he states near the end of his book:

*The reopening of the spiritual world to conscious anthroposophical research is the esoteric aspect of the rebirth of Anthroposophy at the end of the [20th] century. The exoteric aspect must gradually demonstrate this fact in the increasing unification of the Michael stream on earth.*³²

This is all the more puzzling since I have yet to find in the works of Ben-Aharon, Perlas, or other members of the Working Group for Global Threefolding the basis, clairvoyant or otherwise, for the assertion that the “unconscious Michaelites” are to be found in global civil society, nor do I find anywhere in their works the reason for not striving more than ever before to make it possible for Michaelic souls to unite within the Anthroposophical Society. Of course, it is clear that what Rudolf Steiner hoped would transpire by the end of the 20th century, the community of all the Michaelic souls,^{***} did not take place, but this is not a sufficient reason to abandon the goal of uniting the Michaelic souls, now on the earth, within the Anthroposophical Society. Nor are we given any indication how the proposed, clearly stated alterna-

^{***} See the quotation from July 28, 1924, on our page 40.

tive to this goal can truly bring about the necessary results for the ultimate benefit of mankind. The more we work for this alternative goal, *the weaker the Society will become and the more difficult it will be for it to fulfill its tasks.*

Furthermore, while altogether sidestepping the issue of how Steiner wanted Anthroposophy to be represented before the world at large, many people have put considerable effort into selling more anthroposophical books and into training more and more people to be active in the various endeavors inspired by Anthroposophy, such as Waldorf teaching, eurythmy, biodynamic agriculture, anthroposophically extended medicine, and so on. The students in these training courses must inevitably learn something about Anthroposophy, and in some cases they will take a whole introductory year of general anthroposophical studies. In all this the Anthroposophical Society is kept in the background, and almost all introductory courses in Anthroposophy, whether or not connected to further training, are not given by the Anthroposophical Society, as they should be, but by Waldorf training colleges and other institutions. Is it, therefore, any wonder that many of those who buy the books and take the courses or even become active in anthroposophically inspired endeavors do not join the Society?

Finally, we must consider those who know they are being nourished by Anthroposophy or even claim to be working out of it while remaining apart from the Anthroposophical Society. How many of them have studied *The Life, Nature, and the Cultivation of Anthroposophy*, a collection of letters to the members in which Rudolf Steiner describes the refounded Society, taking up topics such as "The right Relationship of the Society to Anthroposophy," "Members' Meetings," "The Relation of the Members to the Society," and "The Work in the Society"³³ In these letters he presents us with the highest ideal of how human beings *can* come together in cultural life in freedom, an ideal with which he fully united himself. Why would anyone who has a true connection to Anthroposophy not want to do the same? And for anyone who recognizes Rudolf Steiner as his teacher, the further question arises: Am I truly his pupil if I do not join him in his commitment to the most positive experiment of our age?

These are the very considerations that led me to join the Anthroposophical Society. It should be added that this happened seven years after I began studying Anthroposophy and attending public anthroposophical lectures because it took almost that long before I was introduced to the book in question (although in print, it was not advertised at the time). My impression of the Anthroposophical Society did not motivate me to join it, and after joining it, I have often been among the disappointed and the aggrieved. But for anyone who has truly grasped the points made above, it makes no sense to argue that what is problematical or unpleasant within

the Society is reason enough either not to join, or to withdraw from it.

Those who have studied *The Philosophy of Spiritual Activity*, the book Steiner referred to in the February 6, 1923, lecture from *Awakening to Community*, will be able to recognize the relation between the new form of the Anthroposophical Society and the "free spirituality [which] is the ultimate stage of man's development."³⁴

A significant confirmation and deepening of this awareness is granted to anyone who will study as well the published record of *The Christmas Conference for the Foundation of the General Anthroposophical Society 1923/1924*.³⁵ Surely the lack of a proper understanding of what Rudolf Steiner accomplished at the Christmas Conference has contributed to the problem of the missing Michaelic millions.

Michael (the Spirit of the Age), Threefolding, and the Future of the Anthroposophical Society

In "Economic Profit and the Spirit of the Age," written in 1919, Steiner states:

Today's party groupings are still quite removed from what the spirit of the age is shown here to demand. Thus it is inevitable that the idea of the threefold social order should meet much prejudice stemming from opinions prevalent in these party groupings. . . . What is needed now is . . . an unprejudiced insight into the demands of "the spirit of the age."³⁶

A few years later, in Dornach on April 2, 1923, Steiner said:

When, by complementing the Easter thought with the Michael thought in this way we have become able to perceive rightly the primordial trinity in all existence, then we shall take it into our whole attitude of soul. Then we shall be in a position to understand that actually all life depends upon the activity and the interworking of primordial trinities. And when we have the Michael festival [celebrated on September 29th] inspiring such a view in the same way that the one-sided Easter festival inspired the view now existing [where everything appears as a pantheistic mixture—a unity], then we shall have an inspiration . . . to introduce threefoldness, the impulse of threefoldness into all the observing and forming of life. And it depends finally and only upon the introduction of this impulse whether the destructive forces in human evolution can be transformed once more into ascending forces.³⁷ . . .

We can even say that it is only possible to have true ideas of the free spiritual, the life of rights, the social-economic life, when we perceive in the depths this triple pulse of cosmic activity, which must also permeate human activity.³⁸

It was during this lecture that Steiner also made the

following interesting and challenging observations:

One might say that when we spoke of the threefold impulse it was in a certain sense a test of whether the Michael thought is already strong enough so that it can be felt how such an impulse flows directly out of the forces that shape the time. It was a test of the human soul, of whether the Michael thought is strong enough as yet in a large number of people. Well, the test yielded a negative result. The Michael thought is not strong enough in even a small number of people for it to be perceived truly in all its time-shaping power and forcefulness. And it will indeed hardly be possible, for the sake of new forces of ascent, to unite human souls with the original formative cosmic forces in the way that is necessary, unless such an inspiring force as can permeate a Michael festival—unless, that is to say, a new formative impulse—can come forth from the depths of esoteric life.

If instead of the passive members of the Anthroposophical Society, even only a few active members could be found, then it would become possible to set up further deliberations to consider such a thought. It is essential to the Anthroposophical Society that while stimuli within the Society should of course be carried out, the members should actually attach primary value, I might say, to participating in what is coming to pass. They may perhaps focus the contemplative forces of their souls on what is taking place, but the activity of their own souls does not become united with what is passing through the time as an impulse. Hence, with the present state of the Anthroposophical Movement, there can of course be no question of considering as part of its activity anything like what has just now been spoken of as an esoteric impulse. But it must be understood how mankind's evolution really moves, that the great sustaining forces of humanity's world-evolution come not from what is propounded in superficial words but from entirely different quarters.³⁹

Of course, the "state of the Anthroposophical Movement" in April 1923 was changed by the 1923 Christmas Conference, as a consequence of which "the opposite of what went before must be recognized; no distinction is to be made henceforward between Anthroposophical Movement and Anthroposophical Society, for they are now identical." The Christmas Conference itself brought just such a new formative impulse, coming forth from the depths of esoteric life.

I am well aware that from not long after Rudolf Steiner's death until the present there have been those who are convinced that with his death the Christmas Conference was proved a failure, that the Anthroposophical Movement is no longer united with the Anthroposophical Society, that the Society is esoterically bankrupt, and that Steiner is no longer connected to it.

In his book, Ben-Aharon adds more than one twist to

this theme. He characterizes what he perceives, as a result "of the fact that Rudolf Steiner's earthly life came to a too early end,"⁴⁰ as the "hindered life-forces that were destined for earthly-anthroposophical work until 1933" and "were spiritually preserved" to "become purely supersensible, anthroposophical formative forces, shaping the purely spiritual-supersensible Michael Event of the [20th] century,"⁴¹ which in turn should lead to certain culminating earthly events during the last third of the 20th century. Although his presentation is both unclear and confused, one can only come away from it with the impression that he does not picture the Anthroposophical Society in a positive way; and while anthroposophists may gather within it, one of their main tasks is directed outside it—to unite somewhere else with the majority of Michaelic souls.

A few years after the publication (1993) of his book, Ben-Aharon went considerably further in an undated article⁴² with his characterization of the problem with the Anthroposophical Society and of his own role in the current situation. In it, he reveals what he claims to be "a central spiritual-scientific fact of evolution that must be applied also to the anthroposophical society and the practical movements springing out of Anthroposophy." He goes on to write:

We must see that this "horizontal" spiritual transmitting of what Rudolf Steiner gave physically is bound to become weaker from one generation to another, and that this is occurring notwithstanding the question of the significance of any individual contribution offered along the way. This is so because of the operation of an important spiritual law that governs the natural spiritual decline in the vitality and fertility of any spiritual inheritance in the physical world.

This law works in such a way that a spiritual impulse on the physical plane can maintain its—already declining—inner vitality only in the course of three generations. After three times 33—a century—the physical ability to transmit a spiritual impulse ceases entirely. Then any spiritual movement stands at a crossroads: It has only two possibilities before it. Either it becomes purely traditional, carrying forward things past in an old and hence increasingly irrelevant form, or is able to break through to the at present living supersensible sources out of which its inspiration came in the first place.

Until now in human history, no spiritual movement that created for itself a physical-social form of organization, succeeded in this. Every such movement has chosen to remain bound to the physical-organized body and use the teachings to keep the dead body in a semblance of life and thus be entirely separated from its founding spirit, which obviously continues to develop, creating for itself new forms of

manifestation on the physical plane. Will the anthroposophical society be the first to break this tradition of all traditions? Eventually, perhaps already in the course of the present Michael Age, but if not, then in the course of the present fifth cultural epoch, a spiritual society on the earth will achieve this goal. But is it the present society that shall be able to achieve it, or one of its future manifestations in the coming century or centuries? This is precisely the question that must increasingly engage the attention and true heart forces of anthroposophists.

All of this is introduced by the assertion that “most anthroposophists seem to be unaware” of this supposed “central spiritual-scientific fact of evolution” and, by implication, of “an important spiritual law.” It is one thing for Ben-Aharon to share, in his book, his spiritual imagination; it is quite another for him to make these subsequent claims. Surely he would have revealed to the majority of ignorant Anthroposophists just where Rudolf Steiner described this law had Steiner in fact done so. Therefore, it should be obvious that Ben-Aharon, with affected modesty, is claiming, but only by implication, that *he* is the discoverer of this “important spiritual law” and that he has indeed taken on the role of occult teacher. Although he was past forty years of age before announcing this discovery, his performance in the book under consideration cannot inspire confidence in the careful reader.

Before entering upon spiritual-scientific research, one is supposed to attain to a certain rigor, cognitively and morally, in relation to ordinary earthly experience. The way one handles the anthroposophical material at one’s disposal is certainly an indication of how far one has progressed in regard to these preliminary requirements. Only a knowledgeable reader of Ben-Aharon’s book will notice such as the following, which is not to say that such defects in his book are without effect on those lacking this knowledge.

The last paragraph of chapter 2 of his book (p.22) reads: “During the last week of Rudolf Steiner’s lecturing activity he directly alluded to the apocalyptic nature of the time beginning in 1933. ‘The Beast will be released from its captivity in the Earth . . . Before the Etheric Christ is recognized rightly by man, humanity must first come to terms with the confrontation with the Beast that comes out of the depths in 1933.’ ” And the endnote that Ben-Aharon provides for this quotation merely reads: “In an unpublished lecture (20 September 1924).”

However, Ben-Aharon had to know the following. The quotation is from the sixteenth lecture of the cycle on the *Apocalypse* given by Rudolf Steiner to the priests and potential priests of the Christian Community.

Since Ben-Aharon’s book appeared, the *Apocalypse* cycle was published in English in 1998.⁴³ In the publisher’s forward one can read: “Since 1924, this text (in a slightly revised form) has been in private circulation

among the priests of the Christian Community. For many years the Rudolf Steiner Nachlassverwaltung, the literary estate of Rudolf Steiner—a fully independent organization which holds the literary copyright to his work—has not ventured to publish its copy of the notes, respecting Steiner’s original intention that they were intended only for the circle of priests. In 1995, however, the decision was taken—without the support of the Christian Community—to publish a version of the texts.”

Of course, during the interval between 1924 and 1995, illicit copies of this material were in circulation in German (and eventually, in English). Thus, there were only three possible sources of this material at the time Ben-Aharon wrote his book: the archives of the Nachlassverwaltung, a priest in the Christian Community, or an illicit edition. What is one to think of Ben-Aharon’s failure to reveal both his source and the cycle this quotation is taken from, let alone the reason the cycle was as yet “unpublished”? By not being forthright, Ben-Aharon has not only created a false impression as to the facts of the matter but has drawn many of his readers into an *unconscious* participation in countering Rudolf Steiner’s original intention.

It should also be noted that an author who would go this far in order to quote from a Steiner lecture would not fail to cite where Steiner revealed the spiritual law referred to earlier if indeed there were such a lecture.

Inasmuch as we have only Ben-Aharon to rely upon for the veracity of the apparently dire conditions in the Anthroposophical Society due to the law he claims to have discovered, the reader of his words cannot be too cautious or too skeptical. The first obvious question, after considering his credibility, is: Do Ben-Aharon’s assertions resonate within the soul the same way Rudolf Steiner’s do?

Furthermore, in the undated article referred to above, Ben-Aharon gives himself a most prominent role in saving the situation, as he sees it.

What actually happens if man enters this abyss, crosses its threshold, and arrives at the other side, I have tried to portray in my two books, The New Supersensible Experience, and The Spiritual Event of the 20th Century: One meets the Higher Guardian of the Threshold, the Christ, in His Etheric form, and is guided into the inner supersensible activity of the true, currently living Michael School. For now, suffice it to say that the actual, real, not learned or abstract, abyss situation, the crossing of the threshold of the 20th century and the meeting with the Christ on the other shore, are yet to become the central work situation of true esoteric anthroposophical work in [the] beginning of the next century.

This means that first this future esoteric anthroposophical work be centered around a shared study of the experience of the modern Damascus event. A

communal, social study of the spiritual-scientific knowledge process of the second coming, individualized through many human beings in the course of this century, is essential to the formation of a new schooling in the secrets of the living Michael School and its esoteric content.

Thus far Ben-Aharon points only to his own work as the basis for the “shared study of the experiences of the modern Damascus event.”

Although Ben-Aharon, Perlas, and the rest of the Working Group for Global Threefolding are members of the Anthroposophical Society, implicit in the goal they all share are negative judgements regarding the Society as the intended vessel for the Michaelic community and regarding Anthroposophy as the driving force for threefolding, negative judgements that many should have the insight and the courage to reject. ▲

Notes:

1. Jesaiah Ben-Aharon, *The Spiritual Event of the Twentieth Century* (London: Temple Lodge, 1996), p. 50.
2. *The Spiritual Event*, p. 49.
3. Rudolf Steiner, *Karmic Relationships* (lectures to members of the Anthroposophical Society), Vol. VI (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1971), p. 168.
4. René Maikowski, *Schicksalswege auf der Suche nach dem lebendigen Geist [Paths of Destiny in the Search for the Living Spirit]*, (Freiburg, Germany: Verlag die Kommenden, 1980), p. 27—not yet translated into English.
5. Rudolf Steiner, *Karmic Relationships* (lectures to members), Vol. III (London: Anthroposophic Publishing Co., 1957), p. 116.
6. Rudolf Steiner, *Awakening to Community* (lectures to members), (Spring Valley, New York: Anthroposophic Press, 1974), p. 56.
7. Translated by John Root, Sr., who also translated the Maikowski quotation and the material from *Das Goetheanum*. The corresponding passage in *The Anthroposophic Movement* (lectures to members) (Bristol, England: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1993), appears on page 98 of that book without the last sentence of the first paragraph. (This translation is presented as “abridged.”)
8. *Karmic Relationships*, Vol. III, pp. 48-49.
9. Rudolf Steiner, *The Constitution of the School [for] Spiritual Science* (lectures to members published in abbreviated form) (London: Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain, 1964), pp. 15-16.
10. *Awakening to Community*, p. 45.
11. Rudolf Steiner, *The Art of Lecturing* (lectures to members) (Spring Valley, New York: Mercury Press, 1984), p. 2.
12. *The Art of Lecturing*, p. 1.
13. Rudolf Steiner, “Social and Anti-Social Forces in the Human Being” (lecture to members) (Spring Valley, New York: Mercury Press, 1982), p. 28.
14. Rudolf Steiner, *Anthroposophical Leading Thoughts* (letter of August 17, 1924) (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1973), pp. 53-54.
15. *The Constitution of the School [for] Spiritual Science*, pp. 14-17.
16. *Anthroposophical Leading Thoughts*, p. 53.
17. *The Spiritual Event*, p. 51.
18. *Karmic Relationships*, vol. VI, pp. 120-121.
19. *Karmic Relationships*, vol. VI, p. 123.
20. *The Art of Lecturing*, p. 114.
21. *The Art of Lecturing*, p. 116.
22. PCDForum *Paradigm Warrior Profile #4*. Profile of Nicanor “Nicky” Perlas. Interviewed by David Korten. <http://iisd.ca/pcdf>.
23. *The Spiritual Event*, foreword to the second edition, p. 8.
24. *The Spiritual Event*, foreword to the second edition, p. 3.
25. *The Spiritual Event*, introduction, p. 9.
26. Rudolf Steiner, “Autobiographical Sketch” (written for Eduard Shuré at Barr in Alsace, France, on September 9, 1907). *The Golden Blade: 1966* (London: Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain), p.1.
27. *The Spiritual Event*, foreword to the second edition, p. 2.
28. Rudolf Steiner and Marie Steiner-Von Sivers, *Correspondence and Documents: 1901-1925* (New York: Anthroposophic Press, 1988), p. 269, end note no. [II]²⁷ (from a letter to a member of the Theosophical Society, Berlin, January 20, 1905).
29. *The Spiritual Event*, chapter 4, “The Rebirth of Anthroposophy,” p. 50.
30. *The Spiritual Event*, foreword to the second edition, p. 3.
31. *The Spiritual Event*, foreword to the second edition, pp. 6-7.
32. *The Spiritual Event*, chapter 4, “The Rebirth of Anthroposophy,” p. 52.
33. Rudolf Steiner, *The Life, Nature, and the Cultivation of Anthroposophy* (London: Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain, 1963), p. vii.
34. Rudolf Steiner, *The Philosophy of Spiritual Activity* (Blauvelt, New York: Multimedia Publishing, 1980), chapter IX, “The Idea of Freedom,” p. 184.
35. Rudolf Steiner, *The Christmas Conference for the Foundation of the General Anthroposophical Society 1923/1924* (Hudson, New York: Anthroposophic Press, 1990).
36. *The Threefold Review*, issue no. 13, p. 16 or *The Renewal of the Social Organism* (written by Steiner for the weekly newspaper *The Threefold Social Order*) (Spring Valley, New York: Anthroposophic Press, 1985), pp. 97-98.
37. Rudolf Steiner, *The Cycle of the Year* (lectures to members) (Spring Valley, New York: Anthroposophic Press, 1984), p. 45.
38. *The Cycle of the Year*, p. 49.
39. *The Cycle of the Year*, pp. 45-46.
40. *The Spiritual Event*, foreword to the second edition, p. 3.
41. *The Spiritual Event*, foreword to the second edition, p. 6.
42. “Future Tasks of a Timely Anthroposophical Society and the High School for Spiritual Science: As Preparation for The Gothenburg Conference, December 29th, 1999—January 3rd, 2000, and the Cape Town Conference, January-February, 2001.”
43. *The Book of Revelation and the Work of the Priest*, London, Rudolf Steiner Press, 1998.