

NEW UNIVERSE

“Try”

**A Review devoted to the defence of
MADAME BLAVATSKY**

6^{d.}

NEW UNIVERSE

“Try”

Vol. 1. No. 1.

July, 1937.

6d.

Editor - Beatrice Hastings.

This review will be issued to support my volumes “Defence of Madame Blavatsky.” The volumes will be devoted mainly to subjects that need lengthy treatment; but there is a multitude of other matters to be considered. There are “charges” that may be met immediately by some recorded fact, hitherto neglected; others for which the defence lacks data, research in different countries being necessary; others, still, may be shown as based on the mere opinion of someone for whose opinion the modern student has little, when any, respect. The review is intended for friendly students whether at present in or out of any Theosophical group, and the Editor will be glad to insert signed, or initialled, well-documented paragraphs or short articles; but nothing will be used without verification, so jokers need not lose their sleep.

There is certainly a growing interest in Blavatsky in the outer courts, as it were. I know personally more than one of the younger literary generation whom I have persuaded or badgered to read her works and who have realised that the “charlatan” and “forger” holds a place in the circle of literary genius. However, Theosophists need not expect that these persons may risk their position in the reviewing world, until there will be a certainty of strong support by Theosophists. Neither publishers nor editors regard a defence of Blavatsky as a “paying proposition;” quite the contrary, only attack pays. Wherefore, I have been agreeably surprised to receive orders for my volumes from seven of the various, and rather bewildering, Theosophical groups, one or two of these orders having been considerable and already repeated. It seemed to me too soon yet for orders from far distant lands — and yet, a certain vast Christian organisation has ordered copies for a far land! I would prefer that these people, whom I cannot stretch charity so far as to assume friendly to H.P.B., should not take up my limited stock, but I cannot help it if they do.

My personal position being somewhat favourable to independence of publishers and reviewers, I shall certainly continue the defence of H.P.B., for this promises an ever-deepening interest. It is not every day that a writer discovers a writer of genius, a martyr and an occultist all in one! And when there may be added a strain of history percolating half through the globe, a personnel that includes many famous men and women, as well as hundreds of lesser known, and even obscure, but profoundly interesting, characters, Europeans, Orientals, Australians, Americans, and a picturesque and fascinating environment — well, one can only throw up one’s cap and thank the gods, who are not prodigal of fine “subjects.”

Still, of course, I have only printed a limited edition. I have used no advertisement but a leaflet, and I have sent out no copies for review, except three by request. Being familiar with the stockish attitude of most editors towards Blavatsky, I have no intention of wasting a single copy on them and thus presenting some reviewer with a shilling to put in his pocket for a new book. There certainly are many reviewers who would review if allowed to, but they are not allowed to. And until Theosophists make it clear that a defence of Blavatsky can find a large public, “No space” will be the word.

Although this review starts under no “auspices,” I hope that it may soon enough come under the auspices of an international H.P.B. Defence Group. My protoplasm is not immortal, and defence will be needed

for a considerable time; the adversary will not let go all at once. I am warned, indeed, that, for defending this Charlatan, my own past is sure to be dragged in by her foes. Well, I have published most of it myself, and with a youthful *abandon* to which I might not commit myself nowadays. But, what some Foe might do would be to concentrate on *dates*. I am always pestering my family for dates, and theirs and mine frequently disagree; I seem sometimes to have been in two places at once! However, it does not interest me much. I grow cheerless to reflect what a silly sort of youth mine was compared with that of Helena Petrovna. . . .

* * *

A defence group, would be quite a practical step. It would be easy as winking if Theosophists took the lead. Every Branch might soon have a special group, each taking some personage or incident or week of events, and collecting all the data on that head; this to be handed to a central group, and, by that body, to some person who can not only handle documents like an historian, but can write. Chronology is the first necessity. My own week-to-week lists show many a blank space; and yet, as I know, the case for the defence frequently rests on a question of one day, or less. When one gets that day, one can leave defence and swoop down in a counter-attack. *Everything* should come into print as soon as possible and be available to students everywhere; very often, a decisive clue is to be found in some hardly-known letter or article by a “minor” character, who thus becomes a major witness. Personally, I have gained the conviction that the *whole* data will magnificently vindicate H.P.B. Even “charges” that depend for disproof on esoteric data have been much simplified by the publication of the “Mahatma Letters” and “Letters From H.P.B. to Sinnett,” where there are a thousand hints for the serious student. As for the difficulty of getting at old records, there is not such a great difficulty; a certain number of the early prints are still procurable, and for such as are not now to be had for money, groups can do as I did, namely, borrow the record and have it fully typed, pasted on thick paper, and bound. A Central Group, which would, of course, be in touch with the records everywhere, could arrange the supply. In a year or two, every important town in the world might have a complete historical record.

Poor H.P.B. was often her worst witness. Ill, faced with howling enemies, a foreigner from a then hated country, and she as helpless as her defenders to collect the little clues for lack of which the innocent often go under — she sometimes lost her memory and made mis-statements actually against herself, or gave out hasty half-explanations that merely condemned her once more for lack of corroboration. Even when the corroboration was there, it was frequently overlooked. For instance, she declared that she was out of Cairo on the day when the mediums she had engaged for her mistaken Société Spirite organised a cheating séance. The S.P.R., *et hoc*, merely shrugged, and the Theosophists had no reply. But, Madame Coulomb herself, in her book, “Some Account of my intercourse with Madame Blavatsky,” p.1., lets slip a little mouse of a remark: “I went away, leaving the crowd red as fire, ready to knock her down when she came back.”

It is with the help of a host of such “mice” that this review will loosen the ropes around the lioness. The first cases I shall take concern not H.P.B., but Olcott and others. The establishment of Olcott’s probity, nowadays attacked by any pot-boiling scribbler who pleases, is as necessary as that of H.P.B., and perhaps comes first.

I.

On May 11th, 1884, Olcott (hereinafter O.) was under examination in London by “the committee appointed by the Society for Psychical Research to take evidence as to the alleged phenomena connected

with the Theosophical Society.” (Private and Confidential Report, Dec. 84). Messrs. Stack and Myers examined O. Myers had asked O. to mention the circumstances of the first appearance to him of Mahatma M. (hereinafter MM.). O. had described the scene as this may now be read in “Old Diary Leaves,” Vol. 1, p.377. But he did not give a certain detail that I shall presently give for him. In his innocence, he had exhibited the silk turban that MM. left on his table; and, to his horror, found that he had merely raised a scarcely-concealed smile. Evidently, he grew indignant, even excited, and when Myers said, “I wish to see on what grounds you think it impossible that this was a living Hindu who left the apartment by ordinary means,” O. exclaimed: “In the first place, I never saw a living Hindu before I arrived in London on my way to India [when he and others saw MM. in Cannon Street, Jan. 79. “ODL.,” Vol. 2, p.5.]. I had had no correspondence with anyone until then, and had no knowledge of any living Hindu who could have visited me in America.” Thus, the shorthand notes, no doubt substantially correct.

On p. 237 of Hodgson’s Report (Proceedings of the SPR. Dec. 85.), he pounces on O.: “I will give another instance of Colonel Olcott’s unreliability. In replying to a question put by Mr. Myers in connection with Colonel Olcott’s account of the alleged ‘astral’ form of a Mahatma which appeared to him in New York, Colonel Olcott stated” [as above]. Hodgson continues: “The Theosophical Society was founded in 1875, and long before this, Colonel Olcott had travelled with Hindus from New York to Liverpool [1870] During the years, 1877 and 1878, he wrote many letters to one of them.”

Correct; enough to hang a man — and hang him innocent.

Olcott did explain, after Hodgson’s preliminary attack at an SPR. meeting, May 24th, 1885, that he had been full of his vision of the splendid Mahatma in Indian robes, and that the figures of his Hindu fellow-passengers in common-place European costume, never came to his mind. They seem to have stirred his sub-conscious, for he mentions correspondence; but the second Mahatmic figure, seen in London, immediately fills the field, and he concludes that he knew no living Hindu who could have visited him in America.

Hodgson knew all this but, in the Dec. 85. Report, he slips by Myers, who is often to be discerned insisting on points for the defence (these Reports make quaint reading!) Hodgson clings to his prey: “He seems to have volunteered the odd remark that ‘he had had no correspondence with anybody until then,’ whereas he had written numerous letters to M.T. [Mooljie Thackersay] and other Hindus.”

Well, no he had not!

“Then” refers to the Mahatma’s visit in New York, continuing, “and I had no knowledge of any living Hindu who could have visited me in America.” Now, the correspondence with MT began in 1877 (Supp. “Theosophist,” July, 1882.). The Mahatma’s visit occurred “during the writing of *Isis Unveiled*” (“ODL.,” Vol. I, p.377.); that is, sometime during 1876, perhaps early, perhaps late. It may be even late 1875. I have not, so far, found exact date; perhaps it could be dug out of the Adyar archives? “Isis” was handed to the publisher, Bouton, early in 1877, and by May 19th, Bouton was tearing his hair at HPB.’s alterations in the *printed* text.

It struck me as significant that Hodgson omitted to ask Olcott for the exact date of MM.’s visit — or omitted to say that he had done so; in either case, an omission — and I have long since learned that all Hodgson of the S.P. *Research* omits is the thing one should search for. Olcott’s casual remark in “ODL.”

gnaws away Hodgson's knot. O. had had no correspondence with any Hindu before the Mahatma's visit.

It is gratifying to the friendly student to find HPB. and Co., expected on every occasion to exhibit perfection and never make a mistake. However, we do not expect any such thing from mortals. In considering statements, one has to take the ordinary care and to keep in mind that the Theosophists were often speaking about events that had happened months, and even long years before, and to search always for the fact itself, over and above what may be said about the fact. Olcott sometimes fails in memory and puts carts before horses; on occasions, he exhibits a curious ignorance of the complexities of chelaship and occult science and sacrifices HPB. to his conservative notions; he has his share, too, of the general human shortcomings : but *lying* was outside his nature. His own Government was proud of him, and one has only to examine his historical negotiations with the British Government over the 1883 riots in Ceylon, to see that some of our statesmen and high officials had "passed" him in the tests they know well how to apply to men they have to deal with.

II.

Gwala K. Deb and Babaji Dhabagiri Nath. (SPR Report,p. 246. Hodgson:)

"Babaji must have joined the Bombay Theosophical Society at least as early as 1881 and remained some time at the headquarters that year. . . The assertion made by Madame Coulomb that Mr. Babaji D. Nath is the same person who was previously known at Bombay as Gwala K. Deb, is confirmed by testimony of Messrs. Hume, Taty, Pitale and Ezekiel . . . it is by no means likely that all these witnesses should mistake another person for Mr. Babaji, for he is very small and his voice has a very peculiar *timbre*."

Testimony? Witnesses? There is no corroborative statement from any of the "witnesses." The student, wary of Hodgson's methods of compiling a "report," is "by no means likely" to accept his unendorsed word. And here we find him at one of his commonest tricks, that of presenting as if voluntary and enthusiastic "testimony" what is nothing more than his own version of a reply *of some sort* to his leading questions. Hume, even, gives him no written statement; Ezekiel refused a written statement on anything; Taty distrusted Hodgson from the first; Pitale was a signed witness to phenomena, but he signed nothing for Hodgson. The most to be accepted is that these persons answered that Babaji resembled Deb. But, if they had all sworn their testimony — 21 witnesses swore Adolph Beck into prison, so perfectly did this unfortunate resemble another man. No doubt, Babaji did resemble Deb, since he was chosen to "double" him as chela, when sent on mission. But the data on Babaji distinguishes him from Deb.

"1881", says Hodgson. From Aug. 9th, or 13th, 1881, HPB. was guest of Hume at Simla, remaining until the very last days of October. No mention of any Deb. Then, she travelled in the Plains, arriving at Bombay on Nov. 29th for the Convention. No mention of any Deb, and no Deb appears in the Conv. group photos. On March 17, 82, HPB. writes to Sinnett, describing Deb in full ("M.L.", p.464.) as a new-comer, wearing a Chinese Tartar cap (such as are common in parts of Tibet), and as an advanced chela of Mahatma K.H. (hereinafter, MKH.). It was the week *after* the "plaster cast phenomenon", when a piece of plaster was conveyed from Bombay to Allahabad in a few minutes; and a week *before* the "*Vega* phenomenon", when letters were conveyed from a ship at sea to Bombay, and two days later, from Bombay to Calcutta in a few minutes. So it looks as if Deb were a specialist at *apports* and had come there to supply power for these two big *apport* phenomena.

In June, Deb was to go with HPB. to Tibet ("HPB. to APS.", p.28.). The trip was vetoed by the Chohan; and, early in August, Deb went north alone and was seen no more. At end September, Babaji Dhabagiri

Nath, “his living picture”, appeared at Darjeeling. Where could he have come from?

Countess Wachtmeister had many talks with Babaji at Würzburg, in Dec. 85. (“Reminiscences of H.P. Blavatsky.”, p.24.). He told her that he first came to HPB. at Adyar, in a state of terror and collapse, having escaped from a Tamil *guru* who had put him through Hatha Yoga, for which he was quite unfitted. The enemy laughs at this story, because Babaji came from Darjeeling to Bombay in Nov. 82, and the Adyar house was not occupied until December. Looks bad! But, Babaji was a Madras Presidency man, and his *guru* a man of the Giri sect; and, from April 23rd to May 3rd, 1882, HPB. was in Madras, and from May 3rd to 30th, was travelling by canal in the wilder parts of the Presidency, and from May 30th to June 6th, was frequently at Adyar, looking over the property then offered for sale.

It is credible that Babaji was led to her in this region; it is hardly credible that, in March, 1882 (first appearance of Deb), when even Madras city had scarcely heard of the TS. — let alone Hodgson’s 1881! — Babaji found his way through the jungles and across the continent to Bombay headquarters, wearing a Chinese-Tartar cap. Deb was at Bombay until August; and it looks as if Babaji, after meeting HPB. somewhere in his native Presidency, had been sent straight to Tibet or Sikkim and there had been trained for “double-chelaship.” (People who don’t like this need only to write to the Order, as Hume did, advising the Chiefs to change their methods.) I think it is clear that HPB. never knew everything about Babaji, and it would be against the rules if she had known. Babaji kept his old *sunyasi* name of Dhabagiri Nath, and HPB., although she occasionally dubbed him “Deb,” usually in inverted commas, was obliged to use no other name but Dhabagiri Nath when speaking of the Tibetan chela he represented. Hence her hopeless “explanations” and the bewildered tears of Sinnett (“HPB. to APS.”, many pages).

Babaji played an important part, if he did not over-play it, in weakening European curiosity about the Adepts; as did Mohini, another sacrifice to the mysteries. HPB. was never quite docile about this necessity. Having introduced the Mahatmas (but have we ever had their real names, let alone their addresses — highly improbable?), she could not endure to hear them doubted. If she had lived to see General Macdonald’s inquisitive cannon smashing through the Toeichen monastery in 1904. . . ! There must have gone up very early in her Indian career a protest from ascetic Orders the length from Comorin to Lhasa against her indiscretions. We hear something of it from the chela, R. Gargya Deva, who roundly rates HPB. in an “Open Letter” in the “Theosophist,” Dec. 83. Her joyous despatch of Babaji to Sinnett at Simla to prove the existence of the Adepts, was just what was to give later a big blow to Western belief in the Occult Orders. After a few preliminary blunders, the “little man” played his part almost terribly well in Europe. I will trace it one day. Now, it will take a century to restore any belief of the kind, and before that, India, with the northern states, will either be reconciled and left more to its own mystical ideas of “progress” — or lost. I hope it will not be lost.

British rulers may be asses, but there are snakes and hyenas waiting. The missionaries and the SPR. did us a rotten turn by attacking the conciliatory TS. of the eighties.

III

The “black on Hodgson” (Sinnett) was not sufficient for the SPR. In 1894, the Council sponsored Solovyoff’s book, “A Modern Priestess of Isis,” translated by Walter Leaf. I hope to publish a review of this. S. had an expert pen, of a sort, and made a book that Professor Sidgwick and lady — the latter dutifully sharing her husband’s hobby, or mania, of hounding psychic persons — might well find “entertaining,” especially as coming from the pen of a member of their Society. But, there can be few books with a more unenviable claim to be signed “Scoundrel.” Knowing the data, I could detect a

falsification every few pages. Like Mme. Coulomb, S. often cunningly works up something charged against HPB., or even some mere insinuation, into a little drama.

Many readers must have been impressed by page 165 of his book, where he makes HPB. jeer at the worthy signatories to her phenomena. Thereon, he makes her declaim: "How often has it happened that, under my directions, minutes of various phenomena have been drawn up; lo, the most conscientious people . . . have signed at the foot of the minutes!" The reader wonders how S. could have invented such a thing as that. Well, as in other cases, he had not even the trifling agony of invention. In his member's copy of the 1st Report, he had read: "Many worthy persons would be willing to sign a statement that a 'gas-burner gave a good light,' when in point of fact, they could scarcely see their hands before them."

I refer now to the famous "Confession" written in Russian by HPB. to Solovyoff, and translated by Leaf on page 176 of "M.P. of I." S. used this letter to break up the Paris TS. in Feb. 86. He translated the letter into French, had it sealed by Jules Baissac, Sworn Interpreter to the Court of Appeal, Paris, and brought what he alleged to be this same document to Mme. de Morsier, Sec. of the TS., whom he had long been "preparing" against HPB. To the consternation of Mme. de M. and her coterie, HPB. was found declaring that she had invented the Mahatmas. There was the sealed French translation! But, here is the passage, as rendered by Leaf in English:

"If I am lost, I am lost with everyone. I will even take to lies, to the greatest of lies, which for that reason is the most likely to be believed. I will say and publish it in the *Times* and all the papers, that the 'master' and 'Mahatma K.H.' are only the product of my imagination."

There is no statement that they *are* imaginary. She says that she will say so as "the greatest of lies." What made the Morsier coterie, believe that she had categorically denied the Masters? There is no data to show whether anyone outside coterie, that immediately broke away, ever saw the French document. S. left it in confidence with Mme. de M. and returned to Russia. The news of the Paris *débâcle* travelled to St. Petersburg and reached Mme. Jelihovsky, HPB.'s sister, who was then, early 1886, "out" with HPB. and "in" with Solovyoff. He showed her the *Russian* letter. She writes (P.318, "M.P. of I.": Leaf's synopsis of a controversy between Mme. J. and S.): "I at once expressed my perplexity; there was in the letter no admission that the Mahatmas were an invention. How then had the Parisians come to believe it? Mr. Solovyoff himself answered that he did not know how." He also said that he could not show her the French translation; it was in Paris. Apparently he had no copy!

Leaf's translation from the Russian shows why S. had a good reason to have no copy to show a lady who knew both Russian and French. For, by one of the "chances" that accompany HPB., we have *one* sentence from the French.

In 1891, after HPB.'s death, Mme. J. went on the warpath for her sister's memory. She went to Paris to demand a view of the French document. But Solovyoff had got in first, had written to Mme. de M. and got back his translation. However, in the course of attack, Mme. J. forced him to cite one single sentence — and this sentence does not agree with Leaf's version. Solovyoff had translated the sentence: "I will even take to lies, to the greatest of lies, which for that reason is the most likely to be believed" by "Je vais mentir, horriblement mentir, et on me croira facilement". English "I mean to lie, lie horribly, and people will easily believe me."

It is absolutely incredible that Baissac passed that. The Sworn Interpreter at the Paris Court of Appeal would know his Russian as well as Mr. Leaf.

At the time of the break-up, there was a belief among certain of the Theosophists that Solovyoff, during an absence of Baissac from his office — a piece of information Louis Dramard had obtained — had tampered with the official seal, had either stamped a blank sheet on which he afterwards wrote, or had stamped a falsified copy he had brought. Mme. J. accused him of this to Brusiloff; and Solovyoff did not prosecute her. In a letter that S. solicited from Baissac, the latter declares that he himself stamped the document, but does not contradict the statement that he had left S. alone in the office. It was supposed also, that S. had so re-arranged the spacial position of the sentences as to make them read as if HPB. meant to “lie horribly” against everyone and make them all “lost” along with herself; the reference to the Masters beginning on a new line as a new subject and so appearing to be a categorical denial.

In my future study of all this affair, I will show how Leaf wriggled. What may be asked now is:

1. Why the SPR. did not request S. to produce the French translation?
2. Why Leaf did not publish, even in Latin letters, or by photography, the Russian text of the disputed passage?
3. Why he allowed the discrepancy between his English and the French sentence wrung from Solovyoff to go unnoticed?

As Leaf interfered in the controversy between Mme. J. and S. and went so far as to write a footnote (P.319.) that is a sample of literary cunning, it is to be hoped that some member of the SPR. may press for an inquiry. The SPR. *fought* the TS. through the person of H. P. Blavatsky and, as the modern student sees, won by a succession of *fouls*. The SPR. can never clear itself, but students determined to have the truth may yet persuade it to pronounce the *Mea culpa!*

IV.

Damodar's astral flights. Nov. 83, from United Provinces to Adyar.

The first flight was a surprise to everyone. He carried to Adyar a post-stamped letter received by Olcott at Cawnpore, Nov. 4. To Adyar, 5 days' post. The letter (“ODL.” vol. 3, pp. 27, 30. Also, “HPB. to APS.” p.68: “Damodar has so developed that he can get out of his body at will.”) was reposted from Adyar on Nov. 5, and stamped at Aligarh, Nov. 10th. Immediately after this, General and Mrs. Morgan, Theosophists at Ootacamund, were summoned to Adyar by a Mahatmic letter; they were there by Nov. 10th. On the 10th, Damodar made his second astral flight. Olcott had been ordered by MM. to stop healing, as his vitality had been getting low for months past. D. went in astral from Moradabad to Adyar to ask HPB. who was MM.'s *chela*, to ask MM. for an exception in favour of two paralysed boys.

D. brought message, confirmed by wire from Alyar: “Henry can try the parties once”. Hodgson (SPR Report, p. 233.): “The word ‘parties’ seems to me a suspicious circumstance . . . The word ‘boys’ would be shorter and more natural”. Maybe. But in the notice that O. was to stop, dated Oct. 19th, and published in “Theosophist”, Nov. 83., the word “parties” is used instead of “patients”. All part of the plot, no doubt!

The Morgans remained at Adyar. On Nov. 17th, D. made his third flight, gate-crashed in on HPB., made Mme. Coulomb scream and let go a chair she was holding, and HPB. fell and hurt her knee. That night,

came a wire from Olcott, asking her to confirm D's report of an accident. But HPB. was "legless" and cross and had gone to bed, so put off reply until next day. Besides, the marvel of D's flights had worn off; in a letter to Sinnett, Nov. 26th, she does not even mention the affair. Next day, she wired, confirming news of accident and also, D.'s report that the Morgans were at Adyar. When O. described this incident to the SPR. Committee, in May, 1884, HPB. wrote on his deposition:

"They had just arrived from Nilgherry Hills". Hodgson later learned, what nobody had any reason to conceal, the Morgan's arrival being published in "Theosophist", namely, that Morgans had been there a week. HPB. a liar, of course!

Not a bit of it. D's third flight had been pigeon-holed by her among the thousand and one other phenomena. The first had bowled her over, the second was impressed by the Mahatma's summons of Morgans to Adyar — and on *this* occasion, they had "just arrived from Nilgherry Hills".

HPB. merely mixed two dates, six months after. The pages of Hodgson's Report dealing with *astrals* would afford Theosophists some amusement. But, to think that innocent Olcott actually lent his Diary to assist this — sleuth!

V.

SPR Report, p.301. Hodgson: "Madame Coulomb asserts that the earliest specimens of the "M." writing were written by Babula."

As Babula, HPB's servant, a natural linguist, but unable to write English, was also unable even to read it, his testimony to the Adyar Committee (Report, p.133.) had to be written for him by V. C. Iyer, Pleader at Madura, read to Babula, and witnessed. "We, the undersigned, declare that the above paper was carefully read and explained to the signer in our presence", etc. Signed by 4 witnesses. "Madame Coulomb asserts . . .!"

VI.

In Sinnett's pitiable "Early Days of Theosophy in Europe", p.46, he writes: "We were all so much impressed by this paper [later called *Light on the Path*] that we felt it was not one to be kept merely for our private edification."

I happen to possess a copy of the rare 1st edition, and on the flyleaf is a note in pencil, signed "F.H.B.": "Redway [the publisher] told me that Sinnett called today and told him that this little book was too good for the public and ought to have been reserved for the Inner Circle of Theosophists. 7th October, 1885."

There is a state known to mountaineers as "altitude deterioration": You have come too high for your stamina, and you begin to lose sight of your object, and presently you don't even care to get down lower; but if you don't get down, you go all to pieces. Sinnett resembles this type of sufferer. In "Early Days", on many pages, he seems willing to throw down even the Masters as so much baggage encumbering his ease, keeping only the phantoms of his conjecture . . . that all flatter Sinnett as a high-region climber, while he is obviously slowly suffocating. He had found bewildering inconsistencies and faults in H.P.B., and he threw her away. He might as well have thrown away tubes of oxygen because the outside was spotted.

VII.

A quotation. “To your first question — there’s little to answer: ‘Can you do anything to help on the Society?’ Want me to speak frankly? Well, I say *No*: neither yourself nor the Lord Sang-yias Himself — so long as the equivocal position of the Founders is not perfectly and undeniably proved due to fiendish malice and systematic intrigue — could help it on.”

Mahatma M. to Sinnett, Nov. 1881. (*Mahatma Letters*, P.254.)

I have to thank the Blavatsky Association for loan of SPR. P. and C. Report; also, Mr. John Watkins for loan of Adyar 1885 Report; also, Mr. A. T. Barker for loan of “Theosophist”, 1879; also, Mr. R. Morris for “Theosophist”, 1882-3, and other books. Will someone please lend me W. T. Brown’s “Life”, and Peebles’ “Around the World” Could anyone get me a full copy of Ruthnovel’s article on Adyar phenomena, in “Philosophic Inquirer”, April 8th, 1883?

Will anyone in America make extracts from “Occult Word”? Can anyone state or supply data to show whether there were a shelf *inside* the Shrine? Hodgson frequented Coulomb, who designed the Shrine, for three months and *omitted* to get either a full description or a design. Inference : something in favour of the defence.

“New Universe” may be obtained from Mrs. Hastings, 4 Bedford Row, Worthing, Sussex. Review copies sent only by request. Usual Trade terms on orders of twelve or more. Price will remain the same even if circulation permits of enlargements.

Cheques and orders payable to Beatrice Hastings.

“DEFENCE OF MADAME BLAVATSKY” Vol. 1. 2/6d.

Vol. II. will not be issued until end of September. Subscribers are notified that the section, “Coulomb Pamphlet”, has had to be greatly lengthened, and will take up the whole of Vol. II. The other sections previously advertised will appear in Vol. III. “New Universe” is the same size as the volumes, and is stitched for binding.