

NEW UNIVERSE

“Try”

Vol. 1. No. 2.

December, 1937.

6d.

Editor - Beatrice Hastings.

“New Universe” is not intended to deal with teachings or philosophy. It is intended as a double line of activity in the practical defence of Madame Blavatsky, to bring out facts in her defence. Facts alone will avail against the false allegations spread once with astounding malice all over the world, and circulated anew every few years for the delusion of people and especially of every new generation of reviewers of books. Where the indirect evidence is so strong as to convince me that the link fact must be somewhere in the records, I do not hesitate to express an opinion, but the fact alone can decide. We want the truth. Anyone who may bring me instances of errors in my data will find the correction printed with grateful thanks, if no undue humility seeing that I am holding in memory thousands of dates, names of persons and places, statements true, false and parti-coloured — in short, the contents of about a hundred books for and against, about and by H.P.B. and Company, as well as the files of the “Theosophist”, “Lucifer”, “Path” and other publications. (Don’t imagine any martyrdom! The greatest pleasure.)

Several good defences have been begun, but have failed for want of following up and support. “New Universe” was started to avoid any such mishap in my case. Numbers will be issued between the volumes, “Defence of Madame Blavatsky”, of which I now reckon there will be seven; but more may be needed. The volumes all published, “New U.” will become a monthly journal, and I am as sure as one may be of anything that support will not be lacking. Years and years hence, students will still be discovering new data in favour of H.P.B. She was not a charlatan, she was not a fraud. She was a woman of superb genius, she was an occultist. Therefore, the upshot of all the researches can only glorify and vindicate her. This is my conclusion, and on this I work.

Lucky young Theosophist brought up on Blavatsky! The most brilliant day for her is to come. Too brilliant, some may find it. Their trial will be to see her figuring in plays, novels, films — and no doubt a model of the famous Hole in the Wall will tempt Madame Tussaud, with life-size Coulombs conspiring close by. In the meantime, Theosophists would be wise to get control of the coming movement and try to guide it in the right direction; fill their magazines from their archives, reprint faithfully the early books and make typed copies of all Reports and articles; in short, collect libraries of all the literature for and against H.P.B., and thus be in command of the position. For one of these days not too far ahead, the world will claim Blavatsky: in her vast and varied writings *is something for everyone*.

The self-styled Theosophist, then, who will not know what he ought to know will be ridiculous and, in morality, shown up as far below any ignorant Baconian, Browningite or any follower of anyone from whom he professed to have profited intellectually or morally. I meet today people who talk about being on the “Path”, shown them by H.P.B., and who do not defend the reputation of their teacher. If I found myself on any path with such individuals, I should jump down the precipice as the likelier road to salvation. Mahatma K.H. wrote once of a certain kind of folk: “They are of the Universal Brotherhood *but in name*, and gravitate at best towards Quietism — that utter paralysis of the Soul. They are intensely selfish in their aspirations and will get but the reward of their selfishness.” (Mahatma Letters, p.210.)

Whom the cap fits . . .

But there are real aspirants who have a differently dangerous outlook. These imagine that the present Defence is going to have a walk-over. They are wrong. Fifty years' calumny is not going to be wiped out at once. Besides, big Interests are concerned. These will work secretly; and as I am convinced now, the Attack is systematic and periodical, the key position being behind the infamous S.P.R. Report. That Report must be publicly withdrawn. The present average S.P.R. member probably knows little but the name of Blavatsky as a "charlatan". When these members begin to know the facts, there will be a buzz in the S.P.R. Students! make it your business to make the S.P.R. members all over the world aware of my "Defence" — until someone even better equipped comes out with a better one. Defend Blavatsky, write about Blavatsky, lecture on Blavatsky, talk about Blavatsky at every good opportunity. She is now an Outlaw, thanks to the S.P.R. Anyone may safely say what he pleases against her. The world will finally correct this, but the friends of Blavatsky should be able to claim the honour — and *reward*. Blavatsky is a source of more than one kind of energy.

No fear of falling into blind worship, either. She, herself, has taken precautions against hysteria in the devotee; and, on this point, her Master has taken the further precaution of dotting i's and crossing t's. No goddess at all — but a great soul.

A great soul and a great genius. Neither Emile Zola in defending Dreyfus nor Voltaire in defending Jean Calas had such a personage to defend, and yet, look how these two men of genius set about it! Jean Calas, a Protestant, of no interest as such to Voltaire, was already tortured and executed. The Jesuits fancied him safely, silently dead and done with. But Voltaire threw up all his own work to vindicate Calas. Why? Because the defence of Calas represented the defence of the universal ideal of justice and liberty. Dreyfus was tightly shut up on Devil's Island, had no friends, was a Jew and poor. Yet, Zola risked position, fortune and reputation and went into exile to defend him. In both cases, atrocious conspiracy in high quarters was unmasked, and the victim vindicated. And as much may be done for H. P. Blavatsky and Company. Get Defence Groups together, people of intelligence and clear wits, loyal and resolute, who will tabulate, master the facts and spread them abroad, and never let go until the most influential of enemies will not venture to call her a charlatan, under penalty of public indignation.

I continue in this number the defence of H.P.B. and others, taking it for granted that students know what I have written previously. In future, plain figures will be used for numbering cases.

8.

Hodgson's mishandlings of Olcott's evidence.

On May 11th, 1884, O. testified to the SPR Committee concerning Damodar's astral flight from Moradabad to Adyar. (First, or "Pri. and Con." Report, p.40. Refer also, "New U.", No. 1, Case 4 (IV).

O. At the headquarters (Adyar) resides M. Alexis Coulomb, Librarian of the Society. He was, at the time of Damodar's alleged visit, engaged at some work adjoining the writing bureau where Madame Blavatsky was. Suddenly he came into the room and asked Madame Blavatsky where Mr. Damodar was as he had heard his voice in conversation with her.

Myers. From whom did you hear this?

O. From M. Coulomb himself.

~ ~ ~

On page 235 of Hodgson's Report, H. comments: "I may notice here that M. Coulomb has stated to me that he told Colonel Olcott a falsehood at the request of Madame Blavatsky; and I may recall the fact, that we felt bound to mention in our First Report (p.40, note), that when Colonel Olcott quoted to us M. Coulomb's testimony as that of a trustworthy witness, he was aware that M. Coulomb had been charged with making trap-doors and other apparatus for trick manifestations. Further, when Colonel Olcott received the proof-sheets of his deposition, he must have been aware that the Coulobms had been expelled from the Theosophical Society".

This is a characteristic small sample of the SPR Report. With the dates under his hand, Hartmann's pamphlet, p.41, and Mme. Coulomb's pamphlet, P.3, in both of which it is shown that Coulomb only confessed about the trap-doors on *May 16th*, Hodgson attacks Olcott for quoting Coulomb on May 11th. On May 11th, C. had *not* been charged with making trap-doors. There was then no evidence against him at all. On May 15th, he was politely requested to *resign*, simply because his wife had been expelled on that day for attempted extortion of money and malice. (Coulomb pamphlet, p.107.) On May 11th, Olcott was still in full belief that Mr. C. was the "good honourable husband" of his wife, and himself one of the victims of her stupid stories. (See Vol. 2 "Defence of Madame Blavatsky", p.96, for O.'s letter to Mme. C.)

Hodgson talks about "proof-sheets". O. certainly never saw the printed proof-sheets of the First Report. H. can only mean the shorthand notes of the deposition, done into longhand. And he omits to give any date. From which I conclude that the date would not serve his turn, and was probably only a day or two after May 11th. HPB's notes on the depositions show that she received in Paris all sheets within a few days. Stretch the date to the 17th, when Hartmann cabled O. for authority to expel both the C's: stretch it to the end of the month, even — Olcott had no details condemning Mr. C. until the middle of June, when letters, posted after the examination of the trapdoors on May 17th, reached Europe. Olcott was decidedly not required to withdraw C's testimony, published six months earlier in "Theosophist", Dec. 83, or to supply the SPR with an account of what was then regarded as simply a domestic trouble in the TS. As for denouncing Coulomb, so recently a member of the TS, the Colonel, at that time of shock and doubt, would have thought twice about it. Queer people, these "psychists"!

~ ~ ~

"Mr. Coulomb has stated to me that he told a falsehood at the request of Madame Blavatsky", says Hodgson. *So this must be true*. Or, if not true, quite true, compared with the falsehood C. told to Olcott. When O. quotes Mr. C., he is charged with quoting a man whose word could at no time be accepted, not six months before, not on the spot, not any time. And yet, Coulomb will do for the SPR! "Mr. Coulomb has stated to me . . ." — and Madame Blavatsky stands condemned on his bare word!

My lord, the witness, Colonel Olcott has misleadingly quoted the testimony of an untrustworthy person as though this person were trustworthy, but this person has stated to me . . .

No wonder the Indian lawyers smiled at Hodgson's Report — and stuck to Olcott!

The Moradabad Case.

During the whole of the years 1882-3, Olcott had been engaged in magnetic healing. His cures were so many and so marvellous that at last he had half India flocking after him for treatment. "One morning," so he tells us in "Old Diary Leaves", Vol.3, p.22, "I found my left forefinger devoid of sensation — a clear warning to be careful; and between Madras and Bombay [Sep.83], it had taken me much longer and demanded far greater exertions to effect cures than it had previously: there was a much larger percentage of failures. This is not to be wondered at, for after treating one way or another some 8,000 patients within the twelve-month, the sturdiest psychopath, let alone a man of fifty-odd, might be expected to have come to the last "volt" in his vital battery: a state to which the tiring journeys, the nights of broken sleep, the often meagre food, and the ceaseless intellectual strain of a large correspondence, daily converzaiones, and almost daily extemporaneous lectures on profound themes must, naturally, have greatly helped to bring about."

On Oct. 19th, O. received an order from his Master to cease treatments.

He was just off on a tour of the north of India. The programme had already been printed for the Supplement to the "Theosophist", Nov. 83, and the following notice had accompanied it: "The President-Founder extremely regrets that the enormous growth of the Society and the heavy work that it entails on him prevents his giving more than a day and a half to each place instead of at least three, as he was very anxious to do. He therefore hopes that the Branches will utilise every available moment . . . so that all the work may be got through in one day. The next morning may be devoted to the treating of patients by Mesmerism. Even with all this shortness of visits, he fears very much that he may not reach the Headquarters in time to prepare for the celebration of the Society's Eighth Anniversary . . .

"This programme will be as strictly adhered to as possible. Any change necessitated by unforeseen contingencies, will be signified by telegram. Bombay, 17th. October."

In 1881, the Anniversary had had to be postponed for several weeks, as Olcott could not leave Ceylon. After the above was in press, came the order from the Mahatma, and HPB, editing at Adyar, was apparently obliged to cut out front page matter and insert the order:

"President-Founder's Circular. Since the printed programme of his tour was despatched [to Branches] on the 18th, the President-Founder has received peremptory ORDERS from his SUPERIORS not to take a single case for treatment until further advised. For fear, therefore, that this prohibition may not be removed before his reaching your Station, the President-Founder requests you to notify the fact of the ORDER to parties who have been promised or may be expecting his help."

~ ~ ~

This Order, couched in such language, was so implicitly respected by the Indian public that Olcott had no trouble the whole way until he reached the town of Moradabad, where "the Moradabad case" came into being.

From "Theosophist", Dec. 83: "We have much pleasure to be able to lay before the public a remarkable psychological phenomenon, as interesting as it is well-authenticated. On Nov. 10th, a European

gentleman [Coulomb] attached to the Theosophical Headquarters was engaged in some work in a room adjoining that of Madame Blavatsky, when he heard a voice which he believed was that of Mr. D.K.M. [Damodar K. Mavalankar], an officer of the Parent Society, speaking to Madame Blavatsky in her room. As this young man had, to that gentleman's knowledge, left the Headquarters some weeks previously to join Colonel Olcott at Poona, he naturally thought at the time that he had come back, and so entered Madame Blavatsky's room to greet the officer in question on his return. But fancy his surprise when, on entering the room, he found that D.K.M. was nowhere to be seen; and his surprise positively grew to amazement when, on enquiring, he found that, though this young Brahmin was at the moment at Moradabad, N.W.P., yet Madame Blavatsky, who was then standing looking very much perplexed before the shrine, setting it in order, had also not only heard that chela's voice, but assured the gentleman that she had a message from D.K.M. that was of great importance, the words of which *she* was asked to repeat by telegram. She immediately proceeded to have them wired to Moradabad, and the message was sent. In the evening, General and Mrs. Morgan from Ooty, Miss Flynn from Bombay, Mr. Mohini M. Chatterji from Calcutta and others on a visit to Adyar, talked the matter over a great deal, all expressing surprise and intense curiosity as to how far the phenomenon would be verified.

“With these prefatory remarks, we may safely leave the following documents to speak for themselves . . . These documents were received at Adyar five days later:

“On the evening of November 10th, Mr. D.K.M., having at the request of Mr. Shankar Singh of Moradabad promised to ask the Mahatmas whether Col. Olcott would be permitted to treat mesmerically two children, in whom Shankar Singh was interested, and having at his request gone to Adyar Headquarters in the *Sukshma sarira* (astral body), told us that he had received a message at the Adyar ‘Shrine’; at the same time he also said that he had asked Madame Blavatsky to give Col. Olcott a confirmation of his visit as well as of the order received through the shrine from Col. Olcott's *guru* by sending a telegram to him, D.K.M. or to Shankar Singh; after which he reported (4.50 p.m.) its substance in these words: *Henry can try the parties once, leaving strongly mesmerised. Cajaputti oil to rub in three times daily to relieve sufferers. Karma cannot be interfered with.*

[Signed by Shankar Singh and eleven other witnesses.]

“The telegram mentioned by D.K.M. has just been received (8.45 a.m., Nov. 11th) as a deferred or night message of 34 words, in which the above exact words are repeated. Madame Blavatsky says “a voice from shrine” spoke the words, and adds that D.K.M. heard the voice, and the telegram is sent at his request.

“Copy of the telegram received from Madame Blavatsky by Mr. D.K.M.
(Class D)

To Moradabad				From Adyar (Madras)
Words	Days	Hours	Minutes	
49	10 [Nov.]	17 [5 p.m.]	15	
To Damodar K. Mavalankar				From H.P. Blavatsky.
c/o Colonel Olcott.				

Voice from Shrine says Henry can try parties once, leaving strongly mesmerised. Cajaputti oil, rub three times daily to relieve suffering. Karma cannot be interfered with. D. heard voice; telegram sent at his request.

“Noted that the telegram is dated Adyar, 5.15 p.m., or but 25 minutes later than the time when D’s psychic message was reported at Moradabad. The two places are 2,281 miles apart.” [Signed by 8 witnesses.]

~ ~ ~

O. gave further details to the SPR Committee on May 11th, 1884 (First Report, p.36): I was strongly importuned by a gentleman named Shankar Singh, a Govt. official and not then a Theosophist, to undertake the cure of two lads aged 12 and 14 respectively, who had each on arriving at the age of ten years become paralysed . . . I refused in this instance, having already within the previous year done too much of it for my health. The gentleman urged me again. I again refused. He spent perhaps 10 or 15 minutes in trying to persuade me . . . but as I still refused, he went to Mr. Damodar, who was travelling with me in his official capacity. Shankar Singh represented the case, and appealed to Mr. Damodar’s sympathies, and at last persuaded him to go in double, or phantasm, to the headquarters of our Society at Madras, and try to enlist the goodwill of Madame Blavatsky.

Myers. Was it known at headquarters that you were at Moradabad on that day?

O. It was not known . . . for while on a tour, I was constantly obliged to interrupt the previously settled programme, and go hither and thither to found new branches. All the elements are against any procurement. To understand the present case, you must know that it is the rule in those Eastern schools of mystical research that the pupils are not permitted to seek intercourse with Teachers other than their own. [But they are allowed to *apply* through the chelas of other Masters, the Master deciding whether or no to notice the communication]. Hence Damodar, who is the pupil — the Sanskrit word is *chela* — of Mahatma Koot Hoomi, could not himself approach my own Teacher, who is another person. Madame Blavatsky and I are pupils of the same Master, and hence she was at liberty to communicate with him on this subject. [By the rules, O. himself could not question MM’s order to him to stop healing, published in “T’t”, Nov. 83.] Mr. Damodar, preparatory to taking his flight, then sent Mr. Shankar Singh out of the room and closed the door. A few minutes later he returned to his visitor, who was waiting just outside in the verandah. They came in together to the part of the house where I was sitting . . . Mr. Damodar said that he had been in the double to headquarters, and had talked with Madame Blavatsky, who had refused to interfere. But while they were conversing, both heard a voice, which they recognised as that of my Teacher . . . Mr. Damodar remarked that . . . he would dictate from memory the message.

O. [after showing the documents above]: According to the best of my recollection, it must have been a quarter past four when Shankar Singh first appealed to me to heal the boys, that being 35 minutes before the actual date of the memorandum. The memo. states that Damodar added, after repeating the message he had received from headquarters, that he had asked Mme. Blavatsky to confirm the thing to me by sending a telegram repeating the message or its substance, either to him or Mr. Shankar Singh. The next morning the expected telegram arrived. [Dated by P.O. Adyar, 5.15 p.m. the previous day, that is, 25 minutes after date of Damodar’s 4.50 p.m. memorandum at Moradabad. P.O., Colonel explained, is three quarters of a mile from headquarters, man going there on foot after Mme. B. had written telegram, given him money and directions; then message had to be received, registered and get its date, 5.15 p.m.]

Stack: It was practically an immediate reply? O.: Yes.

Colonel then gave the information about Coulomb (see No.8, above). Myers asked if they might apply to the telegraph people for confirmation of wire. To this and other questions of the sort, HPB replied

affirmatively from Paris; and the Report states, p.80; “Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott have repeatedly offered to assist us in India to examine all telegrams sent by or to any members of their group during the existence of the Theosophical Society”. And, no doubt, Hodgson did so., with no good results for himself, as his Report omits all this. The SPR suppressed this First Report so far as they could and, as I know from a personal letter from one of their then members, the people in the office positively denied that any such Report had ever existed! My distinguished and well-known correspondent had lost his copy and had applied for another. I myself have been so fortunate as to obtain recently a copy, and I have several typed copies, made last spring, to lend to Defence groups.

Stack and Myers then questioned O. as to whether D. could have gone out and wired to HPB. O. replied in the negative. O. replied to query — that D. had never met Mr. Singh before, complicity between them impossible; also that the gentleman held the rank of Thakur and that Damodar was an honourable person; then O. continued.

O. I will state circumstances that will show the little probability there was of any such conspiracy. Notice had been put into the *Theosophist* some months before that I was going to make such and such official tours throughout India, and that persons who had sick friends, might, within certain hours on the second day of my visit to each station, bring them to me to be healed. Shankar Singh had written to me long before my coming to Moradabad, asking me to undertake the cure of these boys, and offering to bring them to Madras to me. I refused to see anybody there, but told him he could bring the boys to me when I came to Moradabad, in the course of my tour; and it was in pursuance of that authorisation that he came and importuned me so. He said, “Here is something that you are, in a way, pledged to undertake”, and that is what made him so urgent. [Finis.]

~ ~ ~

Now let us have a look at the Plot.

Shankar Singh has a promise from Olcott to try and heal his boys. In the meantime, Olcott’s strength has sunk so low that one of his fingers “goes dead”. On October 19th, Olcott receives an order in the following terms, to stop healing: “not to take a single case for treatment until further advised.” This order is printed in “Theosophist” for November and Branch Secretaries are desired to circulate the notification “to parties who have been promised or who may be expecting his help”. Throughout the tour, Colonel has no trouble with importunate people, but at Moradabad, awaits Shankar Singh whose persistent faith is to rival that of the woman in the Bible.

Now, Madame Blavatsky and Damodar, neither of whom have ever met the gentleman, *have foreseen this* faith on the part of Shankar Singh. It was on this foresight of Shankar Singh’s faith that they have based their Plot. Their penetration has gone even further, for they have foreseen that nothing would prevent Olcott from being at Moradabad on scheduled time, namely Nov. 10th, although it was the commonest thing for the tour schedules to be altered on the route (“Old Diary Leaves”, many pages). Their prescience does not stop even here, for they have foreseen that Shankar Singh would come to the Colonel before 4.50 and not after 5.15 — at the extreme latest, in fact a good fifteen minutes must be allowed off this. They have left nothing unforeseen: not the certainty of there being no railway breakdown or other accident anywhere en route; no sudden indisposition of Olcott or of Singh himself or one of his relatives; no sudden important visitor to detain either of them, no call of either anywhere by anyone; no sudden dust-storm, or thunderstorm, or any other Act of God. Providence, Transport, Olcott, Singh and all behave exactly as Madame Blavatsky and Damodar have foreseen. Rather lucky, because they have left

themselves a narrow fifteen minutes to play with! And they are 2,281 miles apart. And then, we have not finished! They have foreseen that nothing would happen at the Adyar end of the line, that neither rain, fire, wind, disease nor man would put any impediment to jeopardise the success of the Plot within the available fifteen minutes. Wonderful, for nothing went wrong!

And the Plot, based on the aforesaid foresight, was this: that, at Moradabad, on Nov. 10th, near 5 p.m., Damodar should pretend to fall into a trance and to take an astral flight to Adyar and bring back a certain message, and that at Adyar, 2,281 miles away, on Nov. 10th, near 5 p.m., Madame Blavatsky should despatch a telegram saying that Damodar had been to Adyar and had asked her to repeat the message and confirm his presence.

Intelligence reels under the audacity of Madame Blavatsky if there really had been a plot. Where is there anything comparable? But, calming down, we are forced to murmur — “But how could she know for certain that Shankar Singh would come at all, let alone just in the absolute nick of time?”

~ ~ ~
And so, the SPR was driven to enquire whether there might not have been conspiracy between Damodar and the Thakur Saheb, a Govt. official, and not even a Theosophist. Decency, one would have thought, would have forbidden any such enquiry concerning a man whose life was shadowed by the double tragedy of his two orphan nephews. And they printed it, too, months after, although they omitted all Sennett’s testimony. Truly, there were few depths known too deep for the 1885 SPR in its dealings with the Theosophical Society, and the Indian subjects of the British Crown.

Hodgson (Dec. 85 Report, p.231) begins his comments on this incident: “I shall now proceed to show that there is nothing in the circumstances connected with Mr. Damodar’s ‘astral journeys’ that renders it difficult to suppose a prearrangement between him and Madame Blavatsky to make it appear that he took them; and even that some of the circumstances suggest a suspicion of such an arrangement,” H. then quotes all the testimony of Olcott given above, to the conclusion, “that is what made him so urgent”. H. continues:

“Now in dealing with the real sequence of events, this last statement should be considered first. It appears that before Colonel Olcott started on his tour, it was known at headquarters that when he reached Moradabad, Mr. Shankar Singh would expect him to fulfill his promise and mesmerise the boys.”

Where Hodgson gets his data, I do not know. I have none on the point. I have plenty to show that Olcott did his business himself, quite apart from Madame Blavatsky, who rarely knew exactly where Olcott was, let alone what he was doing. What is certain and in cold print is that the notice to Olcott to do no healing was emphatic to the last degree: “The President-Founder has received peremptory ORDERS from his SUPERIORS not to undertake a single case of healing until further advised”. Imagine that to devout Indians! Olcott could be certain of no importunity except from the most despairing of men. Mr. Shankar Singh had never been to Adyar, was unknown either to HPB or Damodar, was not even a Theosophist, and Olcott tells of no communication but a letter. Who could have supposed that he and he alone among the people at the towns all along the route would throw himself on the mercy of the Mahatmas and force “virtue” out of them? The case, although pitiful, was not more so than hundreds that Olcott had treated. Listen to this: a letter to the “Indian Mirror”, March 21. 83.

“Sir, The presence of Colonel Olcott in Calcutta has afforded us a long-needed opportunity to test the claims of mesmerism as a curative potency. We have attended at the Boitokkhana house of Maharajah Sir Jotendro Mohun Tagore Bahadur, K.C.S.I., the past seven or eight mornings, to see Colonel Olcott heal

the sick by the imposition of hands. Our experience has been of a very striking nature. We have seen him cure an epileptic boy whose case had been given up in despair by his family after resorting to every other known mode of treatment. The lad is of respectable parentage, his father being the Deputy Magistrate . . . But a case that occurred this morning is of so remarkable a character as to prompt us to join in this letter for the information of your readers. A young Brahmin was brought by the relatives of the epileptic boy for treatment. He had a facial paralysis that prevented his closing his eyes, projecting his tongue and swallowing liquids in the usual way. The paralysis of his tongue prevented his speaking without the greatest efforts. In our presence and that of other witnesses, Colonel Olcott laid his hands upon him, pronounced the command *Aram Ho!*, made some passes over his head, eyes, face and jaws, and in less than five minutes the patient was cured. The scene that followed affected the bystanders to tears. For a moment the patient stood, closing and opening his eyes and thrusting out and withdrawing his tongue. And then, when the thought flashed upon him that he was cured, he burst into a fit of tears and joy and with exclamations of gratitude that touched our hearts, flung himself on the ground at the Colonel's feet, embracing his knees and pouring out expressions of the deepest thankfulness. Surely no-one present can ever forget this dramatic scene.

Yours etc., Srinauth Tagore.
Shautcorry Mukerji. N. Chandra Mukerji.

~ ~ ~

It was after this tour that the Colonel's strength began to fail, and he says that he never again had such power. And now listen to the dirt that Hodgson poured over him (SPR Report, P.233):

“But what were the peculiar circumstances that would compel Colonel Olcott to resist the importuning of Mr. Shankar Singh? Before starting on the tour [to Moradabad, etc.], Colonel Olcott had endeavoured to heal certain sick persons at Poona ‘by the voluntary transference of vitality’. I was informed by a Poona Theosophist that some 200 patients assembled, and that Colonel Olcott had striven mesmerically with about 50 of them, the result being *nil*, whereupon the Poona Theosophists drew up a protest against Col. Olcott's disgracing the Theosophical Society by professing to produce cures in the face of such conspicuous failure.”

I looked up the “Theosophist” for any word on this subject. No sign of any protest, but the most respectful report from Judge N. D. Khandalvala, Pres. of the Poona Branch. Stressing Olcott's value as President and the loss to the Society if he were invalided, he writes: “About 20 or 25 persons were treated magnetically, but there was scarcely one patient who was sensitive to any marked degree. We were therefore not fortunate enough to see perfect cure effected. Two or three persons having pain in some parts of the body were relieved of that pain, and in the case of two paralytics, a little more ease of motion of the paralysed parts was induced . . . It is truly astonishing to see the President-Founder patiently and perseveringly mesmerising a number of sufferers for hours together. The drain upon his vital powers must be immense, and all our Fellows here are of opinion that he should give up this practice that is sure to be injurious to his health . . . Our President has acquired through the report of his cures a reputation that may be said to be ‘dangerous’ to himself and to the Society, for people expect too much and disappointment is sure to cause dissatisfaction”.

Olcott having shown his self-sacrifice to the nth degree, his Master gave him a positive order — a very rare thing from a Master to a chela — to stop.

“Notwithstanding this,” continues Hodgson, “this” meaning his own tale above, “Colonel Olcott might have been persuaded by Mr. Shankar Singh to the redeeming of his promise; it was, perhaps, for this reason that a special injunction against his undertaking any cure was issued in the form of a Mahatmic document that reached him through Mr. Damodar”.

Mr. Singh was of no more importance than a hundred other people, the case was no more tragic than many others, and the Colonel’s promise would be absolutely annulled in all Indian eyes by the Mahatma’s order. It is quite difficult to follow Hodgson in his twisted reasonings, if they may be called such. He goes on to imply that the order was concocted by HPB. and Damodar for the sole purpose of ensuring Olcott’s refusal to *Singh*, and thus enabling them to carry out their plot!

“In this way, Colonel Olcott’s refusal was ensured. It may be observed that this important fact is not disclosed in Colonel Olcott’s deposition. The reason there given by him for his refusal was that he ‘had already within the previous year done too much of it for his health’.”

So, Colonel, now, enters the plot! A sentence ago, he was so out of it that his refusal had to be ensured by a fraudulent Mahatmic communication, but now he is deliberately deluding the SPR by not disclosing “this important fact”. The fact had been printed and circulated all over India, as Hodgson knew perfectly well, for his Report shows how desperately, and vainly, he searched the pages of the “Theosophist” for incriminating bits and pieces; in fact, we shall see soon that he had read the notice. Yet, he ignores the notice itself and quotes from W. T. Brown, who was on tour with Colonel: “Colonel Olcott . . . had been ordered by his *Guru* to desist from treating patients until further notice”.

I know not why Hodgson should act thus. I think his brain was so twisted that it is a wonder he did not finally go insane; he certainly went wonderfully awry, had a row with the SPR. and went to America and became a Spiritualist on grounds that most modern scientific Spiritualists would unhesitatingly qualify as the territory of trance mind-reading. His reports of his experiments there touch the delirium of fanatical belief induced by squeezing one and one until they split under the strain and make two and several; then he calls the fragments mutually corroborating evidence. In the intervals he gave public lectures denouncing Blavatsky.

Hodgson: “But the most crucial point of the incident turned on Madame Blavatsky’s ignorance or knowledge that the travellers were at Moradabad, and in reply to the definite question put by Mr. Myers, Colonel Olcott declared that it was not known at headquarters that he was at Moradabad.”

Neither was it! It might have been surmised that he was there; it could not be known-unless Damodar had wired the news to HPB. Hodgson needed only to avail himself of HPB’s authority to look up the telegraph files, and no doubt, he did so. But, Damodar could not have wired *about Singh’s visit*, for the gentleman did not come until too late for any wire to get from Moradabad to Adyar.

Olcott, as well as lending his personal diary to assist Hodgson, told him to look up the dates of the tour where they were published, in the “Theosophist”. Hodgson says “It appeared from the programme that Moradabad was to be reached on Nov. 9th, and left on Nov. 11th (and it appears from Colonel Olcott’s diary that it *was* reached on Nov. 9th, and left on Nov. 11th), so that it was known long previously at headquarters that Colonel Olcott would be at Moradabad on Nov. 10th. Colonel Olcott’s reason for asserting that it was not known at headquarters that he was at Moradabad appears to be that, in the course of his tours generally, he was constantly obliged to interrupt the previously-settled programme, and that, therefore, no certain reliance could be placed on the programme for this particular tour. This, at least, is

the most favourable interpretation of the evidence he gave before the Committee.”

O’s evidence did not “appear” at all, but *was exactly that*: “I, while on a tour was constantly obliged to interrupt the previously-settled programme”; and neither Madame Blavatsky nor Providence itself, unless it had an obliging finger in the pie, could have known before the tour began whether Colonel Olcott would be at Moradabad on Nov. 10th. This was one of the few tours that were run to schedule, doubtless owing to the circumstance that the Colonel’s time was all his own, thanks to the Master’s order. Of course, the unerring Madame Blavatsky had also foreseen this!

Hodgson: “I may note, however, that the following special proviso was attached to the list antecedently published in the *Theosophist*: ‘This programme will be as strictly adhered to as possible. Any change necessitated by unforeseen contingencies will be signified by telegram’. (Thus, in case of change of programme, Mr. Damodar would have an adequate reason for visiting the telegraph office, and might have sent a warning to Madame Blavatsky without exciting any suspicion. But the programme, as we have seen above, was closely kept, and the circumstances throughout were admirably adapted for a pre-arrangement”.

~ ~ ~

I put an ice-cloth around my head and relieve my disgust with a burst of laughter. I bet few psychiatrists have often more morbidly cruel and stupid stuff to deal with! As if Damodar were kept on a chain! And “special proviso”! See “Theosophist” all through. All changes were notified by telegram on all tours to *Secretaries of Branches*, of course; and not by H.P.B., from Adyar, but by Colonel himself. Neither did he usually send Damodar running such simple peon’s errands in strange towns!

~ ~ ~

In the middle of writing this, I verified some notes about O’s tours. It took me about three hours, but two and three-quarters went in reading the other pages. Surely there never was a more fascinating journal than the “Theosophist” under the editorship of H.P.B.! If literary folk wish to know what she was about *Between the Plots*, they may read this. It ought to be re-published verbatim, down to the advts. and with nobody’s “cuts” of the supposed impermanent; it is all permanent, the life of the Society was lived in it.

Well, I found that Olcott’s Calcutta tour in March 1883, was twice altered; due to leave there on March 12th, he did not leave until April 4th; moreover HPB not having the programme herself, copied it from the Calcutta “Indian Mirror”! The Ceylon June tour programme can hardly be called a programme at all; it was all altered and made up as they went along. The same applies to the South India tour, Aug.-Sept., the Colonel frequently breaking the settled route and going here and there on invitation. “In compliance with an invitation” Col. O. went here; “A deputation awaited the train” there, at so-and-so, “to beg him to deliver a lecture”. That is the sort of thing one finds all along.

Hodgson: “Yet Colonel Olcott, after asserting that it was not known at headquarters that he was at Moradabad, and giving a general reason for supposing that it could not be known, adds: ‘All the elements are against any procurement’. His promise to the waiting Shankar Singh, the ‘Chohan’s’ emphatic prohibition bestowed on him by Damodar, the programme that pointed with a steady finger to Moradabad on November 10th, the easy opportunity afforded to Mr. Damodar of guarding against a *fiasco* in case of any unforeseen contingency — ‘all the elements are against any procurement’!

And one can see the snigger that went around the SPR meeting when Hodgson's report was first read out by Sidgwick, and the TS thus shown up by this thrilling wit as a den of humbugs, liars and fools. They forgot the judge — Time.

~ ~ ~

I conclude this section with Hodgson's crowning petard. In the message from the Shrine, the word "parties" is used. Hodgson; p.233: "The use of the word 'parties' seems to be a suspicious circumstance. Why should this general and rather odd word be used if it were not to cover possible but unforeseen contingencies? The word 'boys' would have been shorter and more natural". (See "N. U." No. 1, Case 4.)

What contingencies? That the boys might have grown up in the meantime and become adult parties? Or, that some other sick parties, at this very Moradabad, on this very Nov. 10th, at this very hour of five, might have butted in, defied the order to Olcott to do no healing, and obligingly forced forced him to waver — so as to enable Madame Blavatsky and Damodar to carry out their plot?

Hodgson has built up his whole "plot" on *Shankar Singh*, so if the "parties" in the message had meant anyone *but* Mr. Singh's "boys", he would need to build an entirely different case! There is what can happen when a man's malice outruns his reason.

10.

Dr. Hartmann's rose-coloured ribbon.

Before Dr. Hartmann joined the TS in 1883, he had been a Spiritualist for many years and had seen so much phenomena that it took a good deal to surprise him. The common phenomenon of an *apport* certainly could not, and he relates the following very drily. ("Theosophist", April, 1884.)

"On the morning of the 20th of Feb. 84, I received a curious Tibetan medal through Madame Blavatsky. I then accompanied her on board the steamer on which she was to sail for Europe. On my return to the shore, I went into a native jeweller's shop and bought a locket to deposit my medal, but could not find a chain long enough for my purpose. I then returned to my room, and paced the floor, studying what to do in regard to the chain. I finally came to the conclusion that I would buy a rose-coloured ribbon. But where to get it, being a stranger in Bombay; that was the question. My pacing the floor brought me again in front of the open window, and there before me on the floor lay exactly the very silk ribbon, brand new, and just the one I wanted. F. Hartmann. Bombay Feb. 21st, 84." As editor, pro tem of the "Theosophist", Hartmann published this in the April issue.

The SPR First Report, p.100 remarks: "The case does not appear to us evidentially of much importance, because it was at the open window that the ribbon fell, and Madame Coulomb was with Dr. Hartmann at Bombay."

Coulomb pamphlet, p.80: "We arrived at Bombay. I went to a friend's house to stay, and Madame with her 'suite' put up in some rooms in Apollo Street." (The friend was a Mrs. Dudley.)

P.82. "I remained some time on board. Dr. Hartmann, Mr. Lane-Fox and many others left; Miss Flynn and myself remained very long after, but seeing no sign of the steamer starting, and knowing that Mrs. Dudley was waiting for me at home, we took leave, and Madame, embracing me very warmly wished me health and happiness. I went home, and told Mrs. Dudley all I suffered on this journey, and my opinion of

the Theosophical concern.”

So, so far from obliging Madame Blavatsky by throwing ribbons into Dr. H’s room (on the third floor of the hotel, he says, elsewhere), Mme. C. was not only *not* “with Dr. Hartmann at Bombay”, but was busy blackguarding HPB.

11.
Babajee’s “alias”.

SPR Report, P.247. Hodgson: “He seems to have no objection to assuming different characters, since at this very time he represents two persons in the last Official Annual Report issued by the Theosophical Society; that is, to say, he appears under two different names. On p.8 he appears as the delegate of the Vizianagram Branch under the name of *Babajee D. Nath*, and on p.131, he appears as one of the Assistant Recording Secretaries under the name of *S. Krishna-swami*. Yet Babajee D. Nath is the same person as *S. Krishna-swami*, the latter being Mr. Babajee’s real name, according to his account to myself.”

And to a few others! The whole Society knew that Babajee D. Nath was the *sunyasi* or “mystic” name of Krishnaswami; and the members from Vizianagram when at Adyar for the Convention would, on applying to the Assistant Recording Secretary for any information, meet certainly — “one and the same person”! Alias! Not near so much of an alias as “Timothy Shy” or “Y. Y.” or lots of other people, for such is the custom in India.

“I may add”, says the learned agent of the SPR., “that Mr. Babajee, if I may judge from the account (perhaps not very reliable) that he has given me of his changeful life, appears to be almost isolated and entirely homeless apart from the Theosophical Society, and is, I think, eagerly ready, out of gratitude for sheltering kindness received from Madame Blavatsky, to dispense on her behalf most freely with the truth.”

A. P. Sinnett, in “The ‘Occult World’ Phenomena” (that should, by now, have run to fifty editions if the beneficiaries of Blavatsky had done their duty; a brilliant piece of work!) writes on p.47: “I protest against the cruel misrepresentation of the position of Mr. Babaji, that occurs on p.247 (Hodgson Report). He is *not* ‘entirely homeless, apart from the Theosophical Society’, in the sense in which alone the words will be understood by the English reader. He is homeless as any man of respectable parentage may be if he takes monastic vows. His family, who are well off, will gladly find him a home if ever he should want it. But, in adopting a religious life he has, in accordance with custom, set himself apart from the world and its ties.”

In a letter to Sinnett (“Letters of HPB to APS p.340), Babajee says: “I send you herewith the General’s (Morgan) letter stating that he saw my brother and Mr. Lane-Fox himself has seen one of my brothers . . . Dr. Hübbe, Mohini and Miss Arundale too are in correspondence with my brother, who is well-known in the University as an able graduate . . . Bertram and Arch. Keightley know that D.N. [Dhabagiri Nath] is not the name given me by my physical self’s father.”

~ ~ ~

Some day, the story of Babajee may strike the imagination of some new Bulwer Lytton, some occultist writing fiction. Meanwhile, the canards perpetrated by the SPR go circulating all over the world.

NOTES.

There has been some misunderstanding of my remark about the “limited editions” of my volumes, “limited” having been supposed to mean a couple of hundred. Not so, but 1,000; Vol. I. is now in second 1,000 — but what is this among so many?

~ ~ ~

I have to thank Dr. Stokes for the gift of Peeble’s “Around the World”, kindly sent from Washington; Mr. Albert Smythe for gift of Dr. Farquhar’s “Modern Religious Movements in India”, sent from Hamilton, Ontario; Miss Edith Ward for loan of Moncure Conway’s “Pilgrimage to the Wise Men of the East”; Mrs. Henderson for long loan of “Theosophist” first 6 vols, sent carriage and insurance paid both ways from Victoria, B.C.; Mr. A. Trevor Barker for long loan of “Lucifer”, Vols. 1-8 and “Path”, Vols. I-X; Mrs. Alice Cleather, of Darjeeling, for gift of her three books in defence of H.P.B.: “H. P. Blavatsky, her Life and Work for Humanity”, “H. P. Blavatsky as I knew her” and “A Great Betrayal”, kindly sent through the Blavatsky Association; Miss Elsie Savage of Point Loma for bringing me the file of “Occult Word” to look over, and for excellently typed extracts from same.

I still lack W. T. Brown’s “Life” and Ruthnavelu’s article in “The Philosophic Inquirer”, April 8th, 1883, very important and necessary. I need Olcott’s “People from the Other World”; “Isis Further Unveiled”, by the son of Ramaswamier; “Madame Blavatsky, her tricks and her dupes”, a Christian tract issued by the Christ. Lit. Society of Madras; Ninth Annual Report of the T.S., 1885; and a lecture given by Mrs. Gordon at Earl’s Court Lodge, Nov. 13th, 1892, on “The Early Days of the T.S. in India.”

~ ~ ~

I have secured the “O.E. Library Critic” from 1917 to date, and I strongly advise students to get the same. It is sold at the low price of one pound, and contains innumerable data for the defence. Address: 1207 Q. Street, N.W. Washington, D.C., U.S.A. (Takes up about 7 inches by 5 inches.)

~ ~ ~

A Society of the Friends of Blavatsky will be started next year. The Society will not be concerned with anything but the practical defence of H.P.B. I shall take no official position, but edit “N. U.” as the organ.

~ ~ ~

The general notion that H.P.B.’s personal friends are all resting in Devachan is wrong. I am now in active correspondence with seven of them, and doubtless there are more. And a miraculously lively and charming bunch they are! I’m getting priceless stories and bits of first-hand information, photos, autographs and copies of letters. And here is “a strange coincidence”: last Sunday, I had spent a worrying two hours over a certain subject. On Monday morning, came a letter from India enclosing a copy of a letter from H.P.B. on this very subject.

~ ~ ~

“New Universe” appears in a cover this time, and I have had covers printed for No. I. Covers may be had for 1½d. which pays for postage. A third number of “N. U.” will appear before Vol. 3, “Defence of

Madame Blavatsky”.

~ ~ ~

Messrs. Hare, I presume, have sent me their latest “bark” from Letchworth. Having shown, with chapter and verse, that they are mostly wrong about everything and everyone and that they maliciously distort and misquote, I have no more to say to them. If Mr. Jinarajadasa replies to them, as I suppose he will, that he was in error about the “Disinherited”, that *may* silence Messrs. Hare, but I doubt it. Anyway, I should only notice them again if they were to bring me a correction of some error in my data, when I would print the correction — with thanks.

~ ~ ~

On advice from various quarters, I decided to send the “Defence” vols. for general review. Thus, I am now relieved of the charge I heard from both Theosophist and “secular” friends that I was prejudicing the circulation. Below are extracts from reviews received mostly before this. The very first review came from “*The Workers’ Monthly*”, a Co-op and Labour paper, published at Farnham, Surrey and widely circulated through the counties.

“Defence of a woman of genius. Mrs. Beatrice Hastings wields a trenchant pen in repelling some of the attacks made on a very remarkable woman, and she is the more effective because she is no blind admirer.”

The Theosophical Forum (English Section). “We strongly recommend all members of the English Section to obtain this powerful defence of the Life and Work of H.P.B.”

The Canadian Theosophist. “Mrs. Beatrice Hastings has come like the spring of the year . . . and tells us the old old story of the goodness and truth and beauty of Madame Blavatsky and her Message.”

O.E. Library Critic. “I thought I had sucked about all the juice out of the Hare lemon, but I deceived myself. I recommend the reading of this section [The Mahatma Letters and Messrs. Hare, Vol. 1.] to Dion Fortune and the editor of the *Occult Review*, who have passed favourably on the Hare book, evidently after a most superficial reading.”

The Theosophical Forum (Point Loma). “There is a glow comes over one as he becomes absorbed in these pages, and I don’t suppose there is a single dyed-in-the-wool Theosophist who won’t get what Americans call a ‘kick’ out of reading this brilliant championing of the Great Theosophist.”

The New English Weekly. “The rights and wrongs of the bitter war, who were the liars and who were not, has never been settled, for one of the protagonists, the S.P.R., was in those days vowed to uphold materialism at all costs. Hence Mrs. Hastings’ very serious work . . . will be of interest . . .”

The Right Review. “We are very pleased to see the defence of Madame Blavatsky undertaken by one who has a genuine reputation in the world of letters . . . Madame Blavatsky, at the lowest estimate, was an astonishing genius . . . If her mahatmas and their letters were forgeries, all the better: for then she was herself their creator . . . Persons who regard the *Secret Doctrine* as a mass of plagiarisms have never read it, unified as it is by her peculiar and excellent style.”

The American Theosophist. “Noteworthy indeed is this small volume, slight only in format, but commanding in its ringing demand for justice for a great person, H.P.B. . . . Every Theosophist will welcome this critical examination and dissection of the baseless assaults on our revered Founder.”

Light (Editorial). “It may cheer Mrs. Hastings to know that there are at least a few — ourselves among them — outside the Theosophical Society (the members of which will, we suppose, give her a large measure of support) who will be delighted if she achieves complete success . . . There are doubtless many Spiritualists . . . who will be delighted if the stigma of ‘Charlatan’ can be finally disassociated from Madame Blavatsky’s name.”

News and Notes. “Full of interesting and authentic facts.”

Buddhism in England. “Mrs. Hastings is the latest warrior to take up arms against the attack upon the personal integrity of H. P. Blavatsky. It is right that those who accept the teachings of the Masters and their agent, “H.P.B.”, should rally to defend her name.”

~ ~ ~

“*Path*”, received too late for quotation in this issue.

~ ~ ~

Future vols. and “N. U.” will be sent to journals that have reviewed previous issues and forwarded copies of review. Readers please send me any cuttings they come across.