

# How to Derail (or Revive) a 100 Year old Movement

Reflections on the [100 Years Rudolf Steiner Conference](#)”

Harvard Divinity School, December 14-17, 2025

by Sebastián Bilbao, Montréal–New England, December 25, 2025

Let's start by observing how a movement can be established in under 3 minutes. Take a moment to [watch this video](#) of a lone dancer doing just that, commented by Derek Sivers.



**Stage 1**  
Lone "Crazy" Dancer  
16 seconds

**Stage 2**  
First Follower  
25 seconds

**Stage 3**  
Crowd of Followers  
120 seconds

In the video, Mr. Sivers observes three stages through which a lone dancer is quickly joined by a crowd of partygoers (see above image). If we accept Mr. Sivers's three-stage premise, we can readily correlate Rudolf Steiner with the lone dancer in Stage 1, the first dancing followers with the members of the Anthroposophical Society in Stage 2, and lastly, the critical-mass crowd in Stage 3 with the still-elusive group that would have turned Anthroposophy into a mainstream movement, permeating all aspects of the human condition.

Mr. Sivers suggests that the success of building a movement lies heavily on two key structural events which need to be fulfilled by the lone dancer and his first followers during the second stage:

- 1) The lone dancer treats the first followers as equals.
- 2) The music and the dancer's moves are easy to follow and learn.

Here we see that Steiner met the first condition, as he not only referred to his anthroposophical contemporaries as brothers and sisters but also yearned for them to join him as peers in researching the many fields of Spiritual Science. Regarding the second condition—easy moves to learn—well, with very few exceptions, that's where the Anthroposophical Movement is still at. The majority of those who have taken on the commitment to carry Anthroposophy are still trying to 'listen into' the music and learn the

moves to join the groovy dancer, and the few success stories are not sufficient to trigger the third critical mass adoption stage.

So how come after 100 years we are still struggling with Stage 2? Maybe it's because the vigorous will of the Central European-Saxon folk-soul, which Steiner was counting on to embody the pivotal second stage, did not materialize; instead, it was de-materialized in the trenches of WWI and battles of WWII. These two wars alone misaligned the timely opportunity for the Central Europeans-Saxon's Will to unfold it's enlightened phenomenological gifts to the world, a process which the Anglians have always felt compelled to 'oversee' (see threads on WWI causation in "The Karma of Untruthfulness", [GA 173](#) and [GA 174](#), & predicament of the [Western Mechanistic Occultism](#) in GA186).

This empirical observation infers a gap in Anthroposophy's early development where the introduction of will forces would have developed its limbs. Those who attempted to re-join the Movement in the post-war era had to 'go out on a limb' to bypass the missing experiential segment of the trunk, rejoining upstream with intellectual phantom-pain-images of the experience. Consequently, the majority were only able to join the first dancer intellectually, and this bypass approach has now become the norm. Anthroposophy, which was meant to be an experiential movement, thus became an intellectual one because it skipped its 'limb stage'. Anthroposophists missed learning how to dance with the lone dancer and, since then, have looked for intellectual crutches elsewhere. They found them in the Anglian materialistic religion, which—without the balancing opposition due from the recovering Central European/Saxons—had by then not only taken over the world, but had perpetually enshrined them with guilt for the two wars. Thus, post-war Anthroposophy is primarily 'all head and no limbs', and the head has had to capitulate to the use of counter-materialistic intellectual crutches to attempt to re-join the music that Steiner danced to.

Yet there is hope; at the vibrant [100 Years Rudolf Steiner Conference](#) at Harvard—so gracefully organized by [Dan McKanan](#)—I had the opportunity to witness several archetypal phenomenological talks. Exemplary was Gopi V. Krishna's [paper presentation on Racism](#), delivered in his signature 'living thinking' style, not only deconstructed the materialistic crutches set as the de facto playing ground for addressing the explosive theme of racism, but also introduced a novel, phenomenological, practical solution to the polarized status quo. Less consciously and more intuitively, Nathaniel Williams also eloquently re-enacted the 'eureka' moment he had in his self-realization that Steiner's [National Economy Course is intrinsically phenomenological](#) and directly accessible without crutches. In fact, he emphasized that the use of crutches makes Steiner's Economic Course incomprehensible, demanding that practitioners enter it experientially (Williams is writing a book on this). In short, these two presenters—along with several others in the excellent Christology and Phenomenology tracks—brought much-needed inspiration to re-Goethenize and phenomenologize anthroposophical research.

Needless to say, when you accept to play a game, you become bound to the limits of its rules; if you joined the game hoping to either play a different game, change the rules, or add new rules, you end up with a few self-gratified heroes, a mediocre compromising survival strategy (see Anthroposophy during the [National Socialism](#) or [Corona](#) periods), or, most likely, make you quit all together. These grandiose heroic illusions to 'bridge' the first dancer to the critical-mass crowd third stage by bypassing the Second Stage—the important peering stage—is the choice that Spiritual Science researchers have to take today. Academizing Anthroposophy has this bypassing gesture and is the path that the majority of supported, funded, and published anthroposophical research has taken. Complying with someone else's game makes introducing your own game into it difficult. The ongoing justification in the Movement for consenting to this hijacked approach is that it invokes the sense of progress, adaptation, and integration into mainstream relevance; however, it simply dilutes Anthroposophy's gifts into the insignificance of mainstream ephemeral trends.

One of these is the Social Justice trend, born out of the Anglian-Western culture which has deeply permeated academia and the political left; it is one of the trending crutches that western anthroposophists have been flirting with, or dragged into. It was also the playing field chosen for the 2025 Centennial Steiner Conference at Harvard. For some context, 99 % of Harvard professors are registered with the Democratic Party, arguably making Harvard one of the universities with the least diverse or equitable views in the USA. The conference was intentionally kicked off with an awkwardly provocative and ambiguous '[Steiner is/is not a Jew' academic critical biographical research presentation](#)' by two of the main conference organizers and panel curators, Aaron French and Henry Holland, whose research on this non-issue will culminate in a book funded by progressive SUNY Press.

It is precisely this type of leftist pseudo-anthroposophical academic research—conducted and funded by non-members—that clearly exemplifies how members may get lured to engage in what appears to be 'Third Stage' mainstreaming bridgeheads, but are ultimately trivial diversion games. Ultimately these games confuse potential new followers and distract members from catching up, from developing the long overdue formal experiential language for Spiritual Science. Non-members seem to be hindered from beholding the entirety of Steiner's deeds—deeds that are born out of selfless love for the evolution of the human being as a whole—and approach or criticize Steiner, out of his loving context, with the close-hearted and dead thinking of their reductionist academic conditioning. Ironically, the very same scientific materialistic religion that bolsters academia, the substance these intellectual-bridging crutches are made of—has decisively entered its refutation period, as all their attempts to explain 'everything' continue to reach dead ends, conceding its efforts to failure.

Let us return to the missing 'limb stage' of Anthroposophy to see if the still latent willful spirit of the Central European/Saxons, or even that of their North American cousins, can be reactivated and/or if the Anglians would even allow them to do so. Yet here too, the

Social Justice trend plays on their enshrined guilty nerve like a fiddle, cutting root and branch any sign of independent free will that they might develop, further diverting our Movement into intellectual 8th sphere games. At the Centennial Steiner Conference, Daniel Joseph Polikoff gave a talk to [de-agitate the trending Social Justice](#) institutionalized moral compass/paradigm. Polikoff suggested that, paradigmatically speaking, these Social Freedoms have been displaced (—Auth. by the Anglian West), from the Cultural sphere into the Rights sphere, repackaging them into enforceable Social Justices to once again ‘oversee’ and ordain social life; a sort of theocratic coup d'etat. In the case of the Central European/Saxons, it perpetuates their political immature naivete (consider the lack of political complaint for the Nord Stream pipeline closure, authorized by the Anglians). Like a deer in the headlights, the central Europeans are neutralized and hypnotized, their potential kept latent, like a crowd of anglian-programmed NPCs waiting to be spawned into action.

Maybe a clue to resolve our impasse in the Second Stage and onwards to the Third Stage is seeded in Armin Steuernagel and Philip Kovce's Centennial Steiner Conference thesis on [Threefolding and Democracy](#), who converged with Polikoff from a different angle, in that democratic practices applied to cultural (and also Economic) matters are decisively unfavorable to evolving the human condition. The liberties rightfully demanded by the Social Justice manifesto would be auspicious to humanity if allowed to freely exist in the Cultural sphere, rather than being ordained by the Rights sphere upon the entirety of the Social Body. If anthroposophical research continues to be permeated or lured by this external jarred threefold paradigm it won't find the support it needs from the Rights and Economic spheres to foster the nimble, subtle and nuanced experiential Spiritual Science which is now one hundred years overdue. If anthroposophists never learn to dance to the music the lone dancer danced to, and their music is externally coerced to a different melody, then the path to the third ‘mainstream’ stage will effectively be derailed.

\* \* \*