

CONTENTS

Introduction: The Architecture of the Future by John Kettle	ix
Goethe and Goetheanism Essay in <i>Das Goetheanum</i> , March 25, 1923	1
The Architectural Idea of the First Goetheanum Lecture with slides in Bern, June 29, 1921	5
Appendix 1: Addendum to the Discussion of Slide 7	138
Appendix 2: Emil Berger's "Urachromes" of the Paintings in the Cupolas	140
Appendix 3: Color Drawings by van Bemmelen	144
Appendix 4: Bibliographic Essay by Frederick Amrine	147
Rudolf Steiner's Collected Works	177
Significant Events in the Life of Rudolf Steiner	191

INTRODUCTION

The Architecture of the Future

BY JOHN KETTLE

SCARCELY A SOUL NOW REMAINS ON EARTH who can have seen the startlingly original first Goetheanum building, who can have known its overwhelming beauty, who can have experienced what Rudolf Steiner called the living language of its forms. So it remains to this book to try at least to suggest what the building must have been to those who were there in the few years the building stood.

The foundation stone of the building was laid in the village of Dornach, near the city of Basel in Switzerland, more than a century ago, on September 20, 1913. Within a year the First World War broke out, but the work of construction continued. In 1920, the almost-completed building was formally opened. A year later, at the end of June 1921, in the Swiss city of Bern, Steiner gave the slide lecture that is this book's chief content. Just eighteen months after that, the still incomplete building was destroyed by fire.

The Genesis of the First Goetheanum

As one's eyes scan every form and line of this great structure, it becomes apparent that the Goetheanum is unique. The German architectural historian Wolfgang Pehnt noted, "Steiner's creations are perplexing, for they stand in virtual isolation ... they scarcely show any recognizable origins, and they established no tradition except within the Anthroposophical movement itself." He further wrote: "the fundamental architectural concept of the *Johannesbau* [the unbuilt forerunner of the Goetheanum, designed in 1908 to be erected in Munich], the interpenetration of two domed rooms of different sizes, and many of the details, are without parallel."¹

The need for the Goetheanum can be traced back to Steiner's work in Munich, beginning in 1907. A building was required to house the courses and lectures that Steiner was giving there. "[O]nly an interior structure was specifically envisioned, because it would be surrounded by several houses, occupied

by friends who could settle there,” Steiner recalled. The building and its surrounding of three-, four-, and five-story houses would have occupied a city block in the suburb of Schwabing. “After great difficulty in the arrangements for building on the site already acquired in Munich, we discovered that we were opposed, not only by the police or local authorities, but by the Munich Society of Arts. Indeed, it was done in such a way that we felt our establishment in Munich was objected to by these worthy individuals.”²

The need for a theater or lecture hall was not all that inspired Steiner and the theosophists in Munich, though. According to Hella Wiesberger, “That the idea for building a temple stood in the background of the Munich [Theosophical Congress of 1907] was not just implied by the capital forms in the columns that Steiner created. The connection is also explicit in a letter that Marie von Sivers wrote to Edouard Schuré, whose reconstruction of the *Sacred Drama of Eleusis* was premiered at the Munich Congress. She wrote: ‘With that, we can try to approach the idea of a temple’.”³ The prospect of creating some sort of religious or secular cathedral was vivid in the minds of Expressionist architects in the days following the devastation of Europe in the First World War. “Painters and sculptors, break through the barriers to architecture and become fellow builders, fellow strugglers for the final goal of art: the creative conception of the cathedral of the future, which will once again be all in one shape, architecture and sculpture and painting,” Walter Gropius wrote in a leaflet for an Exhibition for Unknown Architects to be held in Berlin in April 1919. The words closely corresponded to his manifesto announcing the opening of the Bauhaus, which came later that year.⁴ Much the same thought lay behind the German architect Bruno Taut’s idea of building a secular cathedral in every city.⁵

Steiner makes it clear in his lecture, though, that he did not intend the Goetheanum to be a temple, but rather a step forward—as a place where “from the other side, [those within] receive communications that provide knowledge of higher worlds,” adding that to describe the building as a temple reflected “an inability to find new words for new experiences.” Nevertheless, the Goetheanum continued to be described as a temple or cathedral, not entirely, perhaps, but certainly in part because of the expectation that new architectural movements must eventually produce such buildings.

The Society’s impasse in Munich was solved when a Swiss anthroposophist, Dr. Emil Grosheintz, offered the Society a large tract of land in Dornach. The

land itself, the surrounding Jura Mountains in particular, so different from the Munich suburb in which the Goetheanum had originally been intended to stand, had a definite effect on its design. A major feature, the roof line, was significantly softened. When construction started, the work was carried out by hundreds of people, both men and women, from at least seventeen different countries.⁶ There are fine photographs of the building under construction that show women as well as men involved in the heavy work such as carving the building's capitals. The devotion of all the workers was extraordinary; people who were there found it almost overwhelming. Some likened it to another Pentecost miracle.⁷

There is no doubt that Steiner was an architect of extraordinary achievement in his own right. "The major buildings erected at Dornach before his death in 1925 are rightly attributed to him, rather than to the particular architect who carried out the work," Pehnt has noted.⁸ "Steiner conveyed his plastic and architectural ideas in a variety of ways—through verbal instructions, sketches and models, data concerning plans and dimensions, practical work on the site and in the workshops, and lastly through the famous Dornach *Doktor-Korrekturen* [Doctor corrections] at which he made improvements to his colleagues' designs." Some notion of Steiner's approach to design may be gathered from an aspect of the design of the building's two interlocking cupolas. These cupolas were the upper parts of two spheres, the larger set above the auditorium, the smaller above the stage. In Steiner's initial design the larger of the spheres was meant to encompass and express the building's physical aspect while the smaller would encompass its spiritual aspects. Steiner originally envisaged that the larger sphere would rest on the auditorium floor, while the bottom of the smaller, spiritual sphere would float several meters above the stage floor.⁹

Speaking as an architect, Steiner nowhere talks of inspiration from the past or from his contemporaries; rather, he says that "whatever objections may still be raised against this style of architecture, it is nevertheless the style and the architecture of the future."^{10,11} He saw his own architectural impulse on an historical or epochal scale. In several lectures he described the great phases in the development of architectural form: "The god dwelt in the Greek temple, the spirit of the congregation can dwell in the Romanesque or Gothic building, but in the architecture of the future the spiritual world is meant to *speak*."¹²

Theosophy and Modern Art

Nonetheless, Steiner was intensely aware of what was going on in the world around him, in politics, in the economy, in society, and in art; in turn he exerted a considerable influence on contemporary art and architecture. He was connected with the Theosophical Society from 1900, when he gave his first lectures in the theosophical library in Berlin. The connection was at first close, then gradually less so, until in 1912 he finally detached himself from the Theosophical Society and formed the Anthroposophical Society. In these years theosophy had attracted the attention and often the devotion of many artists. In his mid-thirties the Dutch painter Piet Mondrian became interested in theosophy and then anthroposophy (though it would be hard to find much evidence of this in his painting). Wassily Kandinsky, the Russian painter, who lived in Munich when he and Franz Marc founded the Blue Rider group, took much of his approach from theosophical and anthroposophical ideas. Steiner's work in Munich at that time included the writing and staging of his own Mystery Dramas.¹³ In 1910, the year the first of these Mystery Dramas was staged, Kandinsky's first abstract watercolor was painted. Two years later his design for the cover of the *Blaue Reiter* almanac, which gave its name to the art movement led by Kandinsky and Marc, coincided with Steiner's third Mystery Drama. Two years further on, Kandinsky's work had become completely abstract. Franz Marc, Kandinsky's colleague in the *Blaue Reiter* movement, also worked his way from representational painting, for example *The Blue Horses*, to abstraction in the years 1911-13.

Many writers on the art movements of the early twentieth century have found a link between new urges and artists' interest in theosophy and anthroposophy. Many prominent artists—James Joyce, Arnold Schönberg, the Italian Futurists, etc.—were influenced by theosophy in the early part of the twentieth century. Michael Howard, a sculptor and teacher, has written: “Rudolf Steiner's views and practice of art are intimately united with the impulses that have arisen in the souls of many artists of his time. It must be noted that Steiner's own artistic work (from 1907 until 1924) was contemporary with, and sometimes influential in shaping, the development of some significant artists—most notably, Wassily Kandinsky.”¹⁴ Thomas Steinfeld goes further: “A large part of modernism in the visual arts, music, literature and architecture was inspired by theosophy.”¹⁵ Behind this lay a growing despair at Europe's

increasingly oppressive trend toward materialism and the search for a way to counter it—an “outcry against materialism, against anti-mind, against the machine, against centralization, for mind, for God, for the human in man,” as a contemporary put it.¹⁶ Peter Fingesten, the Berlin-born Surrealist painter who moved to the U. S. in 1939 and eventually became chair of Pace University’s art department, wrote: “[W]hat some choose to see today in terms of pure aesthetics, was to Mondrian (and Kandinsky as well) an expression of pure spirit.”¹⁷

Kandinsky’s development as an artist was deeply influenced by his familiarity with Steiner as a lecturer and writer, and Steiner’s profound insight into the nature of art. “When in 1910 Wassily Kandinsky wrote *Concerning the Spiritual in Art*—his artistic manifesto—he mentioned theosophy not only as his main fellow combatant against a world that was far too materialistic but also as the messenger of a ‘new form of expression,’ accorded a completely new ‘truth’ that could only be conveyed in abstract forms.”¹⁸

Kandinsky was familiar with Steiner’s writing, which he quoted in *Concerning the Spiritual in Art*, as well as in his teaching. “During his sojourn in Berlin 1907/8 he also attended Steiner’s so-called *Architektenhausvorträge* [Architect House presentations],” wrote Sixten Ringbom in a penetrating study of Kandinsky’s art.¹⁹ From Ringbom we also learn of Emy Dresler, who in 1908 met Rudolf Steiner, joined the Theosophical Society, and was responsible for the stage decorations of Steiner’s Mystery Dramas in Munich in 1910-13, and then continued as a collaborator in the work at Dornach. It was Emy Dresler who obtained a copy of Steiner’s lecture cycle *The East in the Light of the West* for Kandinsky.²⁰ The more Kandinsky read Steiner’s vivid accounts of his suprasensible experiences, often first published as articles in the journal *Luzifer-Gnosis*,²¹ the greater became the impact of these teachings, “not only for [Kandinsky’s] theories but even more for his paintings. For what Steiner describes as inner experiences resulting from imaginative knowledge is in fact literally echoed by Kandinsky in his art.”²² Another writer describes how Kandinsky in his *Composition IV* “painted something like a schematic image of the theosophical path leading to the attainment of knowledge of higher worlds. In no other of Kandinsky’s works is the relationship of Steiner’s epistemology so close and so complex as in this composition.”²³ Throughout his life Kandinsky’s paintings moved more and more toward the purely abstract, a progress inseparably linked with his deeply spiritual views.

From 1914 to 1921, Kandinsky was in Moscow, then returned to Germany. The next year he became a teacher at the Bauhaus, the design school founded in 1919 in Weimar. It was not until 1930 that the Bauhaus concentrated on architecture—under the direction of Mies van der Rohe, generating a strict, rigid architectural style that is now thought of as the school’s chief contribution. But under the direction of Walter Gropius (an architect who was determined the school should reflect the unity of all the arts) and with the active participation of Kandinsky and others, for three years the school espoused Expressionism. “The primal image of the Bauhaus, which appeared on the front of Gropius’s four-page prospectus of 1919 ... was Lyonel Feininger’s angular black-and-white woodcut of a crystalline church ... This imaginary structure, as much lighthouse as sanctuary, was intended to evoke not specifically religious sentiments but rather the uplifting and unifying spirit of the great cathedral-building enterprises of the Middle Ages.”²⁴

Expressionism

For all Steiner’s uniqueness, today his architecture is regularly discussed in general and architectural reference works under one or other of two different styles, “Organic” or “Expressionist.” The meaning of the term “Expressionism” evolved over the period 1905-1930. In early use it was applied to any art that displayed a strong emotion, that emphasized personal vision rather than observation and knowledge. For a time it was used to denote all new or revolutionary art movements.

Expressionism spread through the world of art, particularly in Europe, and not just in painting. Franz Kafka attended Rudolf Steiner’s lectures in Prague and found them “very stimulating.”²⁵ Robert Wiene’s 1920 film *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* and F. W. Murnau’s 1922 *Nosferatu*, among a number of others, adapted many of the images and approaches of German Expressionist art to thrill audiences.

Eventually the word Expressionism came to be applied more specifically to “the primitivizing Bridge group (*Die Brücke*) ... and the more abstract and intellectually oriented Blue Rider group (*Der Blaue Reiter*) in Munich, whose leader was the Russian Wassily Kandinsky.”²⁶ Andrew Beard linked Steiner’s architecture with “the idea of Gesamtkunstwerk (total work of art), of which Richard Wagner, for example, was an exponent.”²⁷

Beard associated the design of the two Goetheanum buildings with the work of well-known Expressionist architects—Antonio Gaudi, Saint Elia, Herman Finsterlin, Hans Scharoun, Eero Saarinen, and Erich Mendelsohn.²⁸ Mendelsohn was the only other architect beside Steiner who managed to design an Expressionist building in concrete²⁹: the Einstein Tower in Potsdam of 1919-21. The webs connecting artists and architects of those days also connected Mendelsohn with the Expressionist groups *Die Brücke* and *Der Blaue Reiter* and later with the group that staged the Exhibition for Unknown Architects in Berlin, for which Gropius wrote the introductory leaflet in April 1919.

Sam Hunter and John Jacobus see the first Goetheanum as “a distant cousin of the architecture of Otto Wagner and the Viennese Secession. In contrast, the second building is a more extravagantly sculpted work rivaling Gaudi, so unusual in shape as to defy description in familiar architectural terms.” They consider it “the one challenging realization of the notion of the Cathedral of the Future referred to in Expressionist literature, though ... its opacity is a world removed from most Expressionist projects.”³⁰

Steiner continued to expand his own views on art. “It is possible to liberate color from context,” he said. “If for example the juxtaposition of one color with another is one that is never found in nature ... one must feel in actual experience that what comes to expression there does so through its own inherent impulse.”³¹ And in 1918 he commented directly on the art movement Expressionism: “What we offer is truly a work of art only when the legitimate effort toward visions enables us to successfully guess which pictorial or sculptural form we must offer the soul to counterbalance its visionary urge. It seems that many modern perspectives generally labeled ‘Expressionism’ come close to this truth, and their explanations come close to discovering what I have just said; but they do not go far enough.”³²

Organicism

“‘[O]rganic architecture’ in the twentieth century became the name of particular styles of building, such as those of Frank Lloyd Wright, Alvar Aalto or Rudolf Steiner,” Caroline van Eck wrote in her expanded thesis on organicism in nineteenth century architecture.³³ “They are clearly distinguished by a marked use of materials, handling of space, approach to design and by their own ideologies.” Another to claim Steiner as a creator of organic architecture

is Reinhold Fäth. “One of Steiner’s principles of organic design is that, within a building, ‘nothing is there for its own sake alone,’” he writes. “Steiner related the design of the Goetheanum to the concept of metamorphosis, which he had found in Goethe’s writings on the formation and transmutation of organic forms, as described in *Die Metamorphose der Pflanzen* [*The Metamorphosis of Plants*], and used the capitals on the columns in the first Goetheanum as examples to explain how the principle of metamorphosis may be applied ... ‘When we project the specific organization of the human body into the space outside it, then we have architecture.’”³⁴

Steiner’s architecture exhibits some parallels with that of the great Chicago architect Louis Sullivan, and it was a direct influence on Frank Lloyd Wright. Van Eck cites what Wright himself had to say: “What we call organic architecture is no mere aesthetic cult nor fashion but an actual movement based upon a profound idea of a new integrity of human life wherein art, science, religion are one: Form and Function seen as One, of such is Democracy.”³⁵ In his early career Wright was employed by Sullivan, who shortly became Wright’s mentor. Sullivan believed that the forms found in nature had evolved to meet the demands of their environment, that they were designed to perform particular functions, and thought that buildings should be designed on the same basis (“form ever follows function,” he famously said).³⁶ From this it was a short step for Sullivan to declare his architecture organic, and, in the book revealing his theory of architecture, to call it a new faith. He declared: “... architecture in its material nature and in its animating essence is a plastic art ... with its unceasing faith in man as free spirit! as creator, possessed of a physical sense indistinguishable from the spiritual, and of innate plastic powers whose fecundity and beneficence surpass our present scope of imagination.”³⁷ This was the rich formulation of ideas, beliefs, and principles in which Wright developed his own architecture, and it was Sullivan’s faith that prepared Wright for what eventually deepened his own architecture. “Wright insisted that his buildings be organic—that is, unified in conception from the largest principle to the smallest detail ... [H]e was indeed the last surviving practitioner of ideas fostered by ... the Arts and Crafts Movement, the Aesthetic Movement, and the various schools of Art Nouveau. Those ideas included ... the quest for the fully integrated work of art, or *Gesamtkunstwerk* ... Moreover ... the architect’s huge debt to Ralph Waldo Emerson—particularly Emerson’s view of nature as the countenance of the divine—puts Wright firmly among the

Transcendentalists ...”³⁸ Like Steiner and Kandinsky, Wright was also seeking “the spiritual in art.”

Steiner’s Influence on Later Architects

It was at about this time that George Gurdjieff, seeking a foundation for his own esoteric development, found the doctrine of theosophy.³⁹ Frank Lloyd Wright had fallen in love with Olga Ivanova Hinzenberg (known as Olgivanna), an adherent of Gurdjieff’s, and it was she who brought Gurdjieff and theosophy to Wright. Initially at least, her attachment to Wright looks to have been part of Gurdjieff’s plan to find a center in North America from which he could expand his movement, “The Work,” as they knew that Wright was planning to vacate his premises. Some years later, when Solomon Guggenheim, the mining entrepreneur, decided to build a museum for his art collection, his art advisor Hilla Rebay suggested that Wright should be the architect. Rebay, an artist herself, had heard lectures by Rudolf Steiner early in the twentieth century, saw Wassily Kandinsky as one of the greatest artists of the time, and in 1930 visited Kandinsky’s studio in Germany with Guggenheim. By 1943 Guggenheim was ready to build, Hilla Rebay was ready to direct Wright’s work along theosophical lines, and Olgivanna, by then Wright’s wife, was ready to add her own contribution from long reading of theosophy and Steiner.⁴⁰ The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, which was to be a “temple of the spirit,” opened in New York City in 1959. Perhaps not coincidentally, its permanent collection holds one of the largest collections in the world—around 250 paintings—of Wassily Kandinsky’s work.⁴¹

The presence of Rudolf Steiner in the artistic, architectural, and broad cultural world has been pervasive and persistent. The German architect Hans Scharoun, whose Berlin Philharmonic is a masterpiece of the post-1945 era, started to pursue the idea of organic buildings at about the same time as Steiner, whom he admired openly. Avoiding symbolism and elements of mythology, Scharoun’s architecture “attempted to develop the artistic forms of [his] designs directly out of the ‘essence of the building task,’” Peter van der Ree wrote. He went on to say that “a building should function like the ‘organ’ of a living creature,” noting that Scharoun’s designs for schools “seem to have had a considerable influence on the Steiner schools that were built in the 1970s and ‘80s.” Van der Ree added that “Scharoun’s understanding of the

school as a social organism ... has been realized in many Steiner schools.”⁴² Other architects whose work reflected the impression made on them by Steiner’s buildings included Richard Neutra and Le Corbusier. The Catalan architect Antoni Gaudi is often mentioned as the creator of an organic style, though only a little of it, impressive though it is, can be likened to Steiner’s. The most striking, and certainly the best known, of Gaudi’s buildings is the magnificent, still unfinished cathedral Sagrada Familia, which deliberately evokes the natural growth of plants and trees. Two buildings that are less distant from Steiner’s architectural approach are Casa Milá and Casa Batlló, large houses he designed for wealthy families in Barcelona.

The Spiritualization of Built Form

Steiner’s contribution to architectural style, in the mind of at least one writer on architecture, should more properly be identified as the spiritualization of built form. “His work,” Ákos Moravánszky wrote, “was certainly influenced by what could be called the theory of empathy.” According to this view, the basis of the psychological empathy with the structural system is gravity. When one looks at a building as it stands on its site, on the ground, one’s first and fundamental reaction is to ask what holds it up, a reaction one would not have in looking at a bird, say, or a cloud, or a lake. Expounding Steiner’s views, Moravánszky added that the Greek temple was based on a purely physical understanding of space and gravity. He cited Steiner’s conclusion: “But the spirit is not a mere mechanist and dynamist; it reveals itself not only in the relations of space and power—the spirit is alive and consequentially it gives the building a living expression.”⁴³

In the morning of January 1, 1923, while the ruins of the first Goetheanum still smoldered, Steiner determined to rebuild, though the destruction of his creation surely hastened his death. While the design of the original building was his, his contribution to the second was considerably less. In 1924, he determined that the new building would be in concrete. Using plastiline (a material made of clay powder mixed with oil and wax instead of the water used in Plasticine) he created a model as the basis for its design. “The model assumed particular importance as Steiner was unable to participate further in the design process: he died after a long illness in March 1925.”⁴⁴

The second Goetheanum has been variously called the successor to the first,

its memorial, the product of mourning, and “a document of the movement’s development since the time of its foundation.” To some anthroposophists in its early days it seemed a lesser building, perhaps in part because the decision to use concrete meant that it could not be put together in the same painstaking, hand-crafted way the first had been. Marie Steiner, Steiner’s wife, called the new building “this simpler spiritual home.” Steiner himself considered it but a pale shadow of the first.

Later judgments have differed. The architect Hans Scharoun declared the second Goetheanum “the most important building of the first half of the 20th century.” The architectural historian Wolfgang Pehnt went further, calling it “one of the most magnificent pieces of sculptural architecture of the twentieth century.”⁴⁵

It is no longer possible to make a comparison of the two magnificent buildings Rudolf Steiner designed in that Swiss village of two thousand people. He says in this lecture that he meant for the building to nurture the work of anthroposophy, “calling forth the faculties that slumber within each human soul . . . actually rising up into the realm where suprasensory forces and beings reveal their existence to us . . . to the world of the senses, and this is revealed within our building.” One can go and see Steiner’s second major approach to nurturing anthroposophy, but not the first. May this book help the reader to understand how Steiner’s first Goetheanum also achieved this object.

-
1. Wolfgang Pehnt, *Expressionist Architecture* (Stuttgart: Verlag Gerd Hatje, 1973; English translation, London: Thames and Hudson, 1973), 137-8. For a general overview of the secondary literature on the first Goetheanum, see the appended “Bibliographic Essay” by Frederick Amrine.
 2. Steiner’s lecture in Berlin of July 3, 1918.
 3. Hella Wiesberger, in Rudolf Steiner’s *Collected Works (CW) 285; Rosicrucianism Renewed: The Unity of Art, Science, and Religion: The Theosophical Congress of Whitsun 1907*, trans. Marsha Post (Great Barrington, MA: SteinerBooks, 2007); see Frederick Amrine’s appended bibliographic essay for further discussion.
 4. Ulrich Conrads, ed., *Programs and Manifestoes on 20th-century Architecture* (Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1970).
 5. Bruno Taut, *The City Crown*, translated by Ulrike Altenmüller-Lewis and Matthew Mindrup (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015).
 6. Two other volumes of Steiner’s lectures on architecture and the first Goetheanum, volumes 287 and 288 of Steiner’s *Complete Works*, are forthcoming (2017) from SteinerBooks.
 7. Pehnt, *op. cit.*, 34.
 8. Steiner’s extensive fundamental concepts for the Goetheanum were rendered into plans, elevations, cross-sections, details, and working drawings by the architect Carl Schmid-Curtius, who worked on the project in the early years until he had a falling-out with Steiner; for the final

- stages of construction the architects were Ernst Aisenpreis, Hermann Ratzenberger, Hermann Moser, and Albert von Baravalle.
9. Pehnt, 137-39.
 10. Rudolf Steiner, *The Riddle of Humanity*, lecture of July 29, 1916 (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1990), 1-2.
 11. See especially CW 288.
 12. Rudolf Steiner, *Architecture as a Synthesis of the Arts* (CW 286), lecture of June 17, 1914, (London: Rudolf Steiner Press, 1990).
 13. Steiner's own Mystery Dramas (1910-1913). See CW 14: Rudolf Steiner, *Four Mystery Dramas*, trans. Ruth and Hans Pusch (Great Barrington, MA: SteinerBooks, 2014).
 14. Rudolf Steiner, *Art as Spiritual Activity*, edited and introduced by Michael Howard (Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press, 1998), p. 94.
 15. Thomas Steinfeld, "Modernism's Occult Roots," *Axess Magazin* (Stockholm), July 1, 2010.
 16. Herbert Kühn, "Expressionismus und Sozialismus" in *Neue Blätter für Kunst und Dichtung*, II (1919-20), no. 2, 29.
 17. Peter Fingesten, "Spirituality, Mysticism and Non-objective Art," *The Art Journal*, XXI:1. Fall 1961, 2-6.
 18. Steinfeld, op. cit.
 19. Sixten Ringbom, *The Sounding Cosmos: A Study in the Spiritualism of Kandinsky and the Genesis of Abstract Painting* (Turku, Finland: Abo Akademi, 1970), 37.
 20. *ibid.*, 64.
 21. See, for instance, *Wie erlangt man Erkenntnisse der höheren Welten?*, first published as articles in *Luzifer-Gnosis*, 13-28, Berlin 1904-1905; available in English as *How to Know Higher Worlds* (Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press, 1994).
 22. Ringbom, op. cit., 136.
 23. Hubertus Gassner, "Abstraction as Redemption—Kandinsky and Theosophy," in Walter Kugler and Simon Baur, editors, *Rudolf Steiner in Art and Architecture* (Cologne, 2007), quoted in Walter Kugler, "'World Spirit, Where are You?!': Rudolf Steiner and the Emergence of the Modern Age," *Rudolf Steiner: Alchemy of the Everyday*, catalogue of Vitra Design Museum exhibition, Weil am Rhein, Germany, September 2011 to March 2012, 33.
 24. Martin Filler, *Makers of Modern Architecture* [Vol. 2] (New York: New York Review of Books, 2013), 48-52.
 25. Steinfeld, op. cit.
 26. Sam Hunter and John Jacobus, *Modern Art: from post-impressionism to the present; painting - sculpture - architecture* (New York: Abrams, 1976), 95.
 27. For further discussion of the concept, see the bibliographic essay in the appendix of this volume.
 28. Steiner, *Architecture: an Introductory Reader*, compiled by Andrew Beard (Forest Row: Sophia Books, 2003), 2.
 29. Or apparently so. Because of the cost and difficulties of framing and a shortage of materials, in reality the building was built in brick with a stucco facing.
 30. Hunter and Jacobus, op. cit., 192.
 31. Steiner's lecture in Dornach of October 10, 1914.
 32. Steiner's lecture in Munich of February 15, 1918.
 33. Caroline van Eck, *Organicism in nineteenth-century architecture: an inquiry into its theoretical and philosophical background* (Amsterdam: Architectura & Natura Press: 1994), 258. While dismissing Steiner's work off-handedly, Van Eck is eager to say that it does not lie within the genre of nineteenth century organicism that is her subject.

34. Steiner's lecture in Dornach of December 29, 1914, in Reinhold J. Fäth, "Goetheanum style and aesthetic individualism," *Rudolf Steiner: Alchemy of the Everyday*, op. cit., 138.
35. Wright, *An Organic Architecture: The Architecture of Democracy* (1939), 47, in Van Eck, op. cit., 266.
36. Louis Sullivan, *A System of Architectural Ornament According with a Philosophy of Man's Powers* (1923).
37. Louis Sullivan, *The Autobiography of an Idea* (Press of the American Institute of Architects, 1924), 328
38. Martin Filler, *Makers of Modern Architecture* [Vol. 1] (New York: New York Review of Books, 2007), 20.
39. James Webb, *The Harmonious Circle: the lives and work of G. I. Gurdjieff, P. D. Ouspensky, and their followers* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1980).
40. Roger Friedland and Harold Zellman, *The Fellowship: The Untold Story of Frank Lloyd Wright & the Taliesin Fellowship* (Regan, 2006), 50-378 passim.
41. Filler, Vol. 2, op. cit. (2013), 56.
42. Peter van der Ree, "Living thought and plastic art: Rudolf Steiner and organic architecture," *Rudolf Steiner: Alchemy of the Everyday*, op. cit., 189.
43. Steiner, *Wege zu einem neuen Baustil* (Dornach: Rudolf Steiner Verlag, 1992) 146, quoted in Ákos Moravánszky, "The Rudolf Steiner Goetheanum," *Domus* (Milan), 15 February 2011.
44. Moravánszky, 2011, *ibid.*
45. Pehnt, op. cit., 148.