

NEW UNIVERSE

“Try”

Vol. 1. No. 3.

February, 1938.

6d.

Editor - Beatrice Hastings.

This paragraph may interest mainly readers who sign “F.T.S.”

What does the following mean? —

“‘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 proved due to fiendish malice and systematic intrigue — could help it on.” (Mahatma M. to Sinnett in 1881. “Mahatma Letters”.) [*M.L.* Letter received about February 1882, p.254]

~ ~ ~

On p.15 is reproduced a public notice recently sent out to the Friends of Madame Blavatsky. The idea of this association to defend her reputation has, however, been circulating privately since October, in India and elsewhere, and, already two Overseas groups have started, one in Melbourne and one in Canada. The first provincial group to start is in Liverpool. This is fine. Before next New Year, we shall have put a girdle round about the earth.

~ ~ ~

Remember the words of Anatole France in the funeral oration of Zola:

“Emile Zola had conquered fame; his reputation was secure; he was enjoying the fruits of his toil, when suddenly, and of his own free will, he bade goodbye to his work — to a life of lettered ease — because he knew that there is no serenity save in justice — no repose save in Truth . . . Let us not pity him because he suffered. Let us envy him! Let us envy him because his great heart won him the proudest of destinies. He was a moment in the conscience of man.”

None of us, the Friends of Madame Blavatsky, will wear any such palm individually. But, collectively, we may become “a moment in the conscience of man”. Some of us can put all other work aside and give our pens, some can give money — but what every “F.T.S.” can do is to devote all the time he or she now spends on profiting *by* Blavatsky to vindicating her. How? By studying her case. There is no other way to begin! By demanding that Lodge lectures shall be devoted to the stuff of her defence. Before I get through with my volumes, the whole of the charges will have been dealt with. I have resolved to go on until every attack has been met. While this is going on, the Friends of Blavatsky will learn and spread abroad what they learn, get sure of their facts and put them to others in a convincing way according to the mental capacity. Take a short case first, and ram it home. *There are few persons* who cannot be led to take an interest in a case of injustice, but it is of no use to expect the world to defend Blavatsky — and that is our aim! — unless it is made acquainted with the case.

FRIENDS.

Get groups together and get to know the case yourselves, then you can tell it on public platforms to other

people and in time we shall have the public in all countries clamouring for justice for Blavatsky. No need to meddle with the secrets of the phenomena — just need to prove first that on the evidence brought in the SPR Report, there is not only no case, but that the Report itself is a tissue of falsehood, suppression of facts, deliberate twisting and expression of mere slanderous opinion. The aim of the Friends of Madame Blavatsky is to get that Report publicly withdrawn and we shall carry on a campaign until it is withdrawn.

~ ~ ~

A friend has sent me Chesterton's "Autobiography" wherein he refers to Madame Blavatsky as "a coarse, vigorous old scallywag". I am the more content to have long considered Chesterton as a dangerous Jesuitical buffoon whose Catholic confession was secretly made long before the public he wrote for was allowed to suspect it, and whose cunning Loyolaisms together with word-foppery that many mistook for true paradox, worked enormous mischief with the brains of his generation, beginning with his own brother, Cecil, a better man than himself. His "Autobiography", with its indecent slander on a literary genius incomparably beyond him, is not a piece of writing at all, not a work that any critic would preserve for the style, but is rattled here and laboured there like the confidences of a giggling Fanny or a club bore. This interminable clown to speak of the writer of "Blue Mountains", "The Caves and Jungles of Hindostan" and "Nightmare Tales", to name only works that all the world can, and will in time, appreciate, as a coarse old scallywag! Time will forget him, while her fame can only increase.

~ ~ ~

And, O Theosophists, that is still another attack to add to my long shelf of such; and gone into sixteen impressions among a public that, *so far*, knows no better. There has been a quite new crop in the last two or three years. Come along and get to work to stop it once and for all.

~ ~ ~

The Adyar "Theosophist" for December contains a review by "J.R." of "Defence" (at least I presume so, as I have received advance proofs of a review). The notice refers to but one volume and gives neither price nor address. Unless Indian readers care to risk a blank cheque to me at the rather large town of Worthing, they will remain in the dark. True, "The Hindu" of Madras, the biggest paper in South India, gave Vols. 1 and 2 a splendid review on Nov. 21st, with both price and full address, so most educated Indians will be aware that the case of Madame Blavatsky is being seriously taken up. True, also, that scores and scores of copies are now circulating between Bombay and Kalimpong. True, again, that Adyar has recently sent an order by Air-mail.

However, the review is not in the least calculated to make anyone rush to buy even the one volume mentioned, let alone send blank cheques to Worthing. I won't go into the pinchbeck, patronising style, merely giving a sample. My detailed exposure of the Hares with some few hundred hard-won data is referred to as "a tilt". This is extremely impertinent, but I have more serious fish to fry.

The reviewer, "J.R.", remarks complacently that "Mrs. Hastings has no access to the many private documents at Adyar". This a very foolish remark, as it might be taken to mean not only that I have not the equipment for the defence, but that Adyar is deliberately withholding matter that would help to vindicate Madame Blavatsky. However, I reply to "J.R." that the case against the SPR can be proved without the addition of a single document beyond what is now in circulation. In fact, entirely new documents, unless

they could be verified against already published matter, whether produced by any friendly group or by the SPR, could scarcely be accepted by either side. Too long a time has passed and the documents still concealed have gone through too many hands to be of much weight in the case. I should be very wary of using such. I receive frequently new personal testimonies to the character and phenomena of HPB, and shall publish them some time; but that is a different matter. With the publication of the “Mahatma Letters”, the case for the defence really closes.

Next. Four correspondents, including two editors of Theos. journals, have sent me privately half a dozen corrections of data, leaving it to my discretion to make the corrections where these would be most effective, in the volumes or “New Universe”, where the defence is being collected. “J.R.” takes a different line and corrects me in his own pages. On the ground that “Mrs. Hastings likes correct documentation”, his readers are given three alleged samples of my inaccuracy. They are informed that Mrs. Gordon had already met HPB in Allahabad in 1879 before the Simla meeting, something I might be supposed to know, really! I saw that the sentence was ambiguous but considered that my thesis was in no way affected and so left it. Next, I am instructed as to my error, serious enough to use up several lines in the “T.”, in alleging that HPB suffered from shortness of breath in the “heat and dust” of October at Lahore. It appears that Lahore is not very hot “although there is always dust”. Well, I take the dust and let the heat go — to whatever it may be above that of Simla whence HPB had come.

The reviewer’s third effort to be helpful in defending Blavatsky is, however, one that corrects not only myself but a higher authority, namely Mahatma K.H. “There is no record”, writes “J.R.”, that H.P.B. left Simla in a state of nerves and heart-break (Vol. 1. p.16.), and that therefore she developed a raging fever [I did not say so. I said “running for a break-down”.] — fevers are easily provoked in India, a chill is enough”.

I drew my conclusion from several records. 1. Major Henderson’s “ultimatum”, (O.D.L. Vol. 2, p.235). This public challenge, almost denunciation, by the all-powerful Chief of Police, may have made HPB inclined to sing and dance, or even made no impression at all on her heart and nerves; but in this case we should have to conclude that she cared nothing about the future of the TS. or about the result of Olcott’s appeal to the Indian Govt. to cease treating her as a suspicious character. 2. The attacks in the “Englishman” and the “Statesman” and other papers on the Oct. 3rd phenomena. 3. The cooling-off of Simla people and the general verdict, recorded by Olcott, that she was in league with the Devil. 4. Her own letter to Sinnett, and finally, 5. The Mahatma’s post-script *the which I quoted in full* on p.21. He says: “This dangerous nervous crisis was brought on by a series of unmerited insults . . . Her reason as well as her life was in danger . . .”

I think it is now made fairly clear that HPB’s heart must have been somewhat sorely wounded before leaving Simla and that her nerves had long been stringing up to the crash that came at Lahore. However, she caught the fever, it was not this that brought the Mahatma to her side but the fact that she had suffered mentally so intensely since Oct. 3rd, when the Henderson quarrel started the “series of insults”, that she was on the point of losing her mind.

I trust that since “J.R.” has corrected the Mahatma, he will correct himself now where this would be most effective, namely in the pages where he has led the Indian Theosophists to distrust *my* accuracy. And I take the occasion to beg Theosophical reviewers, at least, to be very sure that their corrections are, firstly, serious ones, and secondly *correct*, before publishing such and thus putting me to the waste of time, space and cost of printing in making a public reply.

~ ~ ~

I have been informed by a Theosophical leading light that my books are over the heads of the average Theosophist, who knows nothing of the history of the Society. I regret it, but suppose that the average Theosophist is so ignorant . . . whose fault is this? Not mine. Anyway, they now have a chance to learn, let them learn. I find Theosophists wide-awake, remarkably so; some only rather useless because their minds need clearing of a lot of pretty-coloured fog. Here is the very best chance for these last to sharpen their brains. Of course I cannot write with an eye to the really ignorant. My books are written to command the attention of the most cultured people, in and out of any TS., and to challenge effectively the remarkably cunning and clever people on the enemy side. Some of the latter, anyway, *know already* much of what I am bringing out. It must not be supposed that everyone in the SPR has overlooked the fact that no telegrams were produced; or that Olcott's testimony was practically solid; or that Solovyoff faked the translation of HPB's "confession". Of course all these and hundreds of other things are secretly known. The knowers have merely lain low, and will continue to lie low until absolutely forced into the open.

It is not my business to teach Theosophists ignorant of their history how to defend their benefactor, but the business of those in charge of the Lodges. Let these take one case at a time and master it. That will do more to give the ignorant real confidence in Madame Blavatsky than any amount of hymn-singing to our beloved HPB: the difference between a flag-waving bystander, who may run away, and the drummer in the ranks who will not. It is shocking that such lambs should be allowed to suppose that they can float into Nirvana with a copy of the "S.D." under their arms while the agent of the teaching can be publicly called "a coarse old scallywag", without a protest on their part. And, if the theory of individual karma prove to be true, they must unconsciously be laying up for themselves a life where they, too, will be accused and left undefended. In any case, they will leave behind them a terrible injustice in the astral ocean to affect *somebody*. How can the world believe that Theosophists really believe in karma and the effects of causes and the oneness of humanity so long as they leave the atmosphere fouled by an injustice that it is their own particular, unescapable duty to redress?

~ ~ ~

It is not the province of this magazine to review books, even when kindly sent, unless they contain something really helpful to the Defence. Most of the so-called historical books published of late years are lifeless paraphrasings (amounting to blank plagiarism, for they "worsen the matter") of Olcott's delightful "Old Diary Leaves", Countess Wachtmeister's "Reminiscences", Sinnett's "Incidents" and other early books that *belong to literature*, because they are well-written and are first-hand narratives. However many faults there may be in "ODL", this can never be surpassed as a record, and anyone who tries to do it over again or to do anything but correct material errors in a commentary, or add from the original diary, is simply tinkering. His "politics" are a separate question.

Miss Neff's book, "Personal Memoirs of H. P. Blavatsky" (Rider, 18s.), although of little use to the advanced student will, I presume, find a rightful place in every Theosophical Lodge where there are members needing enlightenment about H.P.B. Miss Neff has had the tact to leave the quotations she uses mostly without comment. The book is so likely to lead many to the *sources* themselves that I feel quite disinclined to criticise it in any way but the sympathetic. Miss Neff, as I know, has done a fine bit of work on the chronology of the "Mahatma Letters". Some of her dates are out, but this seems to be due to her lack of material such as the SPR and other documents. She ought to be subsidised to do nothing but research, and I take the occasion to offer her scripts of anything I have, the which is now a very

respectable HPB library.

~ ~ ~

I continue the defence of H.P.B. and Company.

Case 12.

Examination of "fraud" letters by Theosophists.

Since writing Vol. 2, I have been able to secure a copy of the 1904 reproduction of the original 1884 articles, "Collapse of Koot Hoomi", whereas previously I had had to work on a typed summary. This republication, twenty years later, was undertaken by the Christian Literature Society of Madras for the avowed motive that "certain facts should be brought to the notice of those who are ignorant of what transpired some twenty years ago". These people are evidently quite aware that so long as Madame Blavatsky may be slandered, the Society may be made to bear the brunt, she being dead. I am, by the way, quite against the absurd dictum, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*. The bad frequently become infinitely more harmful when dead, their evil lives after them; and it is impossible to hale them into police court or libel court. If we might not expose the secret villainy of the departed, neither logically, could we defend any dead or, even, living victim. I have said a few things about the late lamented Monsieur and Madame Coulomb and their colleague, Hodgson, and a few about their victim; if they might not be attacked, I could not defend her.

She was thirteen years dead, anyway, when the C.L.S. of Madras "thought it desirable" to reprint the original "Christian College Magazine" attack on her. These articles shall have a section to themselves in some future volume. For the moment, I am only interested in correcting myself. I said (Vol. 2, p.28) that only one fraud letter had been shown to Theosophists for examination, namely, a letter wherein Major-Gen. Morgan was named. There has been considerable chicanery on the part of the enemy concerning the question as to whether the letters were ever shown, and I think I have now got to the bottom of the mystery.

It appears that *four* letters were shown to Theosophists at Adyar, after General M. had seen his letter. But what *were* these four letters? One was the same letter Morgan had seen and which he pronounced a forgery! The second was a long letter from HPB to the Coulomb from Paris (Vol. 2, App. I, 4.): but this letter was never disputed! The third was a letter written on the back of another, containing no "fraud" and, also, not disputed. The fourth was the letter concerning the "Maitland cigarette" (Vol. 2, p.37); it will be noted that I considered the main part, or first sheet, of this letter as certainly genuine and, I add, actually written by HPB. Curious that the Rev. Patterson should have picked out just this one to present! It was the one that contained the "note on the fly-leaf", rejected by Judge Gribble as "unsafe", and the "fraud" slip of paper that he apparently found beneath legal consideration as he ignored it completely. The SPR used it.

And *that is* what the Rev. Patterson in the "Methodist Times", Oct. 31, 89, called *showing the letters!* The missionaries showed just enough to be able to tell the half-truth that is so difficult to expose.

(Note. I thought I had made it clear (p.16) that the "fraud" screed translations in Vol. 2 are as given by Mme. C. I altered nothing. Also, double columns are exactly as she printed them.)

Case 13. *The “Kiddle incident”*.

(Refer Vol. 1, Section 2.) In the First (P. and C.) SPR Report, we read on p.22: “Mr. Massey showed that quoted sentences seem to have been ingeniously twisted into a polemical sense, precisely opposite to that in which they were written . . . but the odd coincidence remains that words should have been originally quoted most of which were capable of being pieced together into a coherent meaning other than that intended by their original author.”

A feat unparalleled! Try it. Read a page of a book and then write that page in such a manner that you can, later, make a coherent article *by adding here and there half a page more* that gives a coherent meaning other than that intended by the original author. I have failed to be able to do it even in one moderately long sentence.

Incidentally, you may search and expect to find, but you will not find the remark above (probably by Mr. Myers) taken from the First Report, in the Second; it was suppressed — naturally.

Of course, the Mahatma’s own explanation that the chela, in precipitating, had omitted the polemical parts of his dictation, is the only one possible. The omitted passages were only supplied three years later! And the letter, when made whole, not only reads coherently but expresses what we know to have been his usual personal point of view.

Case 14. *First versus Second SPR Report*.

Re Damodar’s “Moradabad flight” (“New U.” No. 1, Case 4 (iv) and No. 2, Case 9.).

First Report, p.34: “The dates and circumstances, as described, scarcely admit of previous arrangement.” (That is, plot between HPB and D.).

Second Report, p.209: “For Mr. Damodar’s ‘astral journeys’ I could find no additional evidence which rendered pre-arrangement in any way more difficult than it appeared to be under the circumstances narrated to us at the time of our First Report, when we considered that collusion between Madame Blavatsky and Mr. Damodar was not precluded.”

For face-saving! I think that the reason why the SPR adjudged HPB as the champion fraud of all the ages was because they had committed themselves so deeply in the First Report, even in the self-revealing hedgings and manglings in which we have it — that they could only regain their position as *esprits forts* by allotting her “a title to permanent remembrance” as an impostor. The remembrance will be permanent all right, but not on those grounds.

Case 15. *Mahatma M’s Portrait*.

First Report, p.35: “The production of the portrait of Colonel Olcott’s Master, Mahatma M. is interesting, because this is the portrait from which other persons recognise Mahatma M. when they see him or his supposed apparition. We can hardly regard it as evidence, however, without knowing more about the gentleman who is said to have drawn it.”

Perhaps if they had known the gentleman’s name and address (it was M. Harisse, “O.D.L.” Vol. 1, p.370), that would have made some difference to the fact that the persons who saw Mahatma M. both in

person and in “astral” recognised him from the portrait! The only difference would have been that we should have had this gentleman handed down to us as — one more confederate.

Case 16. *Professor Smith’s “No chance” letter.*

(Refer Vol. 2, p.51). Prof. Smith: “She then desired us to sit down and in so doing took my hands in both of hers.

In a few seconds, a letter fell at my feet.” Quoted in First Report, p.109.

Committee’s remark: “There is the additional possibility in this case that Madame Blavatsky may have thrown it.”

Even if she had only thrown it with her disengaged feet without the Professor seeing her, that would have added *something* to her title to permanent remembrance.

Case 17.

Testimony to Damodar’s London astral flight, May, 1884.

I do not possess the Journal of the SPR, 1884-5-6, and I should very much like to have it; I tremble when relying on notes and extracts. However, I now quote it from the SPR First Report, and hope that their extract is exact. Their shorthand notes are doubtfully so. The Committee must have cursed this 1884 “Journal” that gives them away appallingly as having once countenanced Blavatsky and Company and psychic phenomena in general.

“The Journal of the Society for Psychical Research for June, in an account of a meeting held at the Garden Mansion, May 28th, contains the following passage (pp.75-6): —

““At the conclusion of the Literary Committee’s Report, some further discussion was raised on Colonel Olcott’s evidence, and Mr. E. D. Ewen, of Chattisgarh, C.P. India, stated that he had himself a few days ago (on Friday, May 23rd, at about 10 p.m.) received a visit from Mr. Damodar in the astral body. He (Mr. Ewen) had gone to an upstairs room, at 77 Elgin Crescent, to replenish his tobacco-pouch. He was in the act of doing so from a store of tobacco in a drawer, when he suddenly perceived Damodar standing beside him. He recognised Damodar distinctly, having previously known him personally in India. His first impression was that Damodar had come to see Colonel Olcott, who was in the house at the time. He (Mr. Ewen) rushed out on the landing, and called to Colonel Olcott. As he stood on the landing, just outside the door of the room in which he had seen Damodar, Damodar appeared to pass through him, to emerge from the room without sensible contact, although the door was not wide enough to admit of a normal exit while Mr. Ewen stood in front of it, without a collision, which Mr. Ewen must have felt. After thus apparently passing through him, the form of Damodar descended the stairs for some little way and then seemed to disappear through a closed window.””

The Committee, with Olcott’s assistance, sent a telegram to Damodar asking for confirmation. To this D. refused to reply, but he wrote to HPB expressing his decided unwillingness to reveal his own intimate proceedings to the SPR. (A pity he was ever persuaded otherwise!) However, the Committee, the which at that period did not include either Hodgson or that most suitable spouse of Professor Sidgwick, Mrs. Sidgwick (this couple, along with the Coulombs, probably did more to retard psychical research than all the other inquisitors and their tools together) — the Committee wrote: “Common fairness forbade us

positively to conclude that . . . Mr. Damodar's reluctance to divulge his own affairs to satisfy our curiosity was merely a simulated feeling." There was still a remnant of gentlemanliness among the Committee, even if their faculty for examining evidence might not have excited very considerably the envy of a common jurymen.

In the Second Report, Hodgson's, Mrs. Sidgwick was selected to deal with this distressing incident. She does it in her usual style, which is something between an oiled butcher's knife and a rusty saw. She writes: "Mr. Ewen, who is a Scotch gentleman of honourable repute, whose organisation is highly nervous, saw Mr. Damodar (with whom he was acquainted) in 'astral' form, as he supposed, on May 23rd, 1884, in London. On his mentioning this at a meeting of our Society on May 28th, Mr. Damodar was at once telegraphed to by Colonel Olcott (Mr. Myers being present) in the following words: 'Olcott to Damodar, Adyar, Madras. Have you visited London lately? Write Myers full details.' To this telegram no reply was received, from which it is a natural inference that Mr. Damodar was unaware of the vision, though he *may* have had other reasons for his silence."

No "common fairness" for Mrs. Sidgwick! In her view, if a man does not wish to divulge his personal experiences, "it is a natural inference" that he is humbugging. But note how neatly she *denounces* Myers for disgracing the SPR by this telegram attempt to verify a phenomenon! This irritation with Myers appears frequently throughout the Second Report. The rest of the Committee were not out to prove that psychical phenomena were possible but to prove that all "psychics", and especially Madame Blavatsky, were frauds. The tale of persecuted mediums during this period is a long long one. Hapless wretch who ever got into Professor Sidgwick's hands! And such a nice man too, as the song says — so smooth and reasonable to talk to. Disastrous person.

But suppose that Damodar had replied? We should merely have found Mr. Ewen suspected of complicity — like the Thakur Saheb at Moradabad. When "donkeys" are "brass-clad", to quote HPB, they don't stick at much, as we have seen rather often by now.

Case 18. Norendra Nath Sen and Hodgson.

N. N. Sen was editor of the "Indian Mirror", a big Calcutta daily, and belonged to one of the well-known Bengal families. He frequently said that phenomena should be kept secret, but to help Madame Blavatsky, he consented to give Hodgson a few examples he had seen. Hodgson picks out *one*, and of course one that could not penetrate the brass-clad. But (p.376) he says: "Mr. N. N. Sen did not appear to me to have been much impressed by 'phenomena'". Note the contemptuous inverted commas. Mr. Sen would not have endorsed them! He himself lived among phenomena, and he did not need HPB at hand, either. He never doubted her at all, but was one of her most devoted friends. In "Letters from the Masters" (Vol. 2, p.135) his son is quoted as follows: "Sometimes late at night, when correcting proofs, Norendra Nath Sen after a hard day's work would fall asleep over his proofs. More than once, when he woke up, he found the proofs corrected in blue pencil". A blue pencil was usually used by Mahatma KH and his chelas. And Hodgson, not daring to take any other liberty with this very influential Bengalee editor, writes phenomena in scrubby inverted commas next to his name, as though Mr. Sen might have approved . . .

Case 19. HPB and the Telegraph files.

I call all these points *cases*, for convenience, although many of them are separate pieces of evidence,

picked out as affecting the more notorious of the “charges”; they will be indexed in “NU”, No.7, and correlated in due course. (A very good exercise for those to whom they are quite new would be to make the chronology and index themselves. The reason I know the “M.L.” so well is because I was obliged to search for the chronology. It must be nearly time now, though, for a chronological edition of “M.L.”.)

Madame Blavatsky’s note on Olcott’s deposition of May 11th: “Why not write to some trustworthy unprejudiced person in India to examine all those telegrams, original messages, and even search in the Records of those dates other telegrams from Damodar and myself? I give full permission to do so. I shall be very glad — as glad as in the case of Mahatma K.H’s telegram from Jhelum (Vol. 1, p.16) — to give an opportunity to settle finally all such questions of *conspiracy* — for, indeed, it does become rather monotonous. H. P. Blavatsky.” (Refer “NU”, No. 2, p.10.)

THE FRIENDS OF MADAME BLAVATSKY.

Everyone who believes that an injustice has been done to Madame Blavatsky by the Report of the Society for Psychical Research is welcome among the Friends. No belief but that is required of anyone, neither are we connected in any way with any other society under the sun.

There has been sufficient welcome shown to the Defence by groups and persons entirely independent of any Theosophical organisation to prove that the consciousness of an injustice done is wide-spread. Indeed, we have received sympathy from quarters that might have been supposed to be rather antagonistic to H.P.B. But there is nothing that the human conscience condemns so intuitively as an injustice and, when such injustice has been wilfully repeated and aggravated and the friends of the victim boycotted and silenced, whereas the enemies be allowed full voice — at length, the cycle of redressment comes around, and help flows in from all sides.

The aim of The Friends of Madame Blavatsky is to bring pressure on the Society for Psychical Research to withdraw their Report that denounced her as an impostor. The S.P.R. produced no evidence that she was an impostor. The case, if tried today on the basis of that Report, would be thrown out by any of our Law Judges, if, indeed, a single Public Prosecutor could be found to present it. We intend to stir the world-public until educated people in every country begin to demand that justice shall be done. When that Report is withdrawn, then we shall be satisfied — *because every new attack on Madame Blavatsky is based on that Report and, once it is withdrawn, there will be no more attacks for the good reason that no editor or publisher would look at one.* Thereafter, we can leave the fame of H.P.B. to make its own way with a fair field before it.

The registration fee for The Friends of Madame Blavatsky will be only one shilling, so as to permit of the widest possible membership, but Members will subscribe as much more as they are able. Members of already existing Groups may, if they please, send a collective list through some selected person, with names, addresses and subscriptions; cards of membership will be sent individually. Donations to any amount, none too small or too large, may be sent. We shall need money for this campaign; for the best public lecturers, hire of halls, printing and advertisements etc. We are now looking about for a London Headquarters, and meanwhile, names and fees should be sent to: Mrs. Hastings, 4 Bedford Row, Worthing, Sussex, England.*

NOTES.

Vol. 3 will be delayed for two reasons. Firstly, because Rao Saheb G. S. Chetty, who was the young architect of the Occult Room, is going to have a Plan made for me; and, secondly, because “New Universe” must receive much more attention than hitherto. People outside the Theosophical groups have been very quick to see that this wee basilisk will cause more alarm in the enemy camp than the volumes themselves. These last might be ignored and allowed to go silently out of print. But “New Universe” will not go out of print but go into print, constantly, until the victory is won. Now, although Theosophists have bought the volumes in a way that has simply astonished me — for I ignoring the Movement and knowing almost nobody, reckoned I might have to wait several years before making such an impression — although, I say, there is now scarcely one group that has not sent repeated orders for the volumes, they have not ordered anything like an equal quantity of “N.U.” They may regret this soon enough, for the

*(Note. The application form on the notice sent out may be cut off, or, preferably, copied.)

Defence is *continued* in “New Universe”, orders come in from mysterious, anonymous quarters, and editions are limited. The Lodge that lets the occasion go by will not be able to romp in later on and get what it lacks; and some Presidents will get their hair pulled.

So many people have sent in subscriptions, in spite of my warning that the magazine would be irregular for some months, that I have decided that the thing is solid enough at least to justify me in taking subscriptions. The subscription for twelve numbers, starting from any number, is six shillings and sixpence, post free, and three shillings and threepence for six numbers. Cheques and orders payable to Beatrice Hastings. Usual terms to the Trade.

~ ~ ~

I have to thank Mr. C. J. Ryan for sending me some extracts from the Point Loma archives; Mr. Cyrus Field Willard of San Diego for many useful and interesting “recollections”, with dates and names of persons and places; Mr. Harold Cox of Ontario for two copies of his “Who wrote the March-Hare attack on the Mahatma Letters?”; Mr. “G.” for offer to pay cost of 100 Press and Library copies of “New Universe”, No. 3; several of H.P.B.’s old Friends, who wish to remain unnamed for the present, for generous donations towards printing and other costs; Mrs. X. for the gift of one dozen sets sent to international Public Libraries — and, in this connection, I mention that the Director of one of the largest American libraries has written me a personal letter, saying, “We are very glad indeed, to have these books”; Mr. Oderberg, of Melbourne for offer to send any extracts I may need from early Australian papers; Mr. T. B. Lawrie for similar offer as regards South Africa; and I close by asking for *several* Indian correspondents willing to do the same out there, and for someone to make extracts from British Museum.

~ ~ ~

Errata. Vol. 1, p.21, line 10. Read “weeks” for “days”. P. 25, line 11. Branches had not been actually formed, but groups had been made and the Branches were formed soon after Olcott’s return from Ceylon. p.103. App.2. The Swami’s testimony did not appear in “Theosophist” but in “Lucifer,” Sep. 1889. Incidentally, if the Swami’s testimony were not trustworthy, he must somehow have had access to the Tatyia letter of 1886 that was long kept almost a dead secret, and to information about Madame Blavatsky that had not been published. As he was a stranger at Adyar and, of course, not a Theosophist, his marvellously accurate information can only be accounted as personal testimony from Tibet. “New Universe,” No.2. p.18, bottom par. Next time I have to verify notes from HPB’s “Theosophist,” I shall take precautions against being lured off from my business to read the other pages! Olcott’s first Calcutta tour apparently was not altered before March 12th; I cannot find that he did return to and leave Calcutta as scheduled in the “Indian Mirror”, but must take it for granted that he did. The second tour, however, *was* twice delayed because Colonel hopped off to establish Branches at Jessore and Narail, and doubtless made a few more hops as he only returned on the 30th April instead of the 18th, as announced.

I shall not make typographical corrections as a rule. I get into sufficient hot water with my printer for overlooking things without drawing his attention myself; but Vol. 2, p.95, line 20, contains an error that may baffle some readers. Read “hostility” for “hospitality”.

I see that “impostor” has been spelled with an e in the notice sent out to Friends of Madame Blavatsky. However the word were spelled, it couldn’t be spelled right in connection with Madame Blavatsky, but I correct it, registering my dislike of reading the word at all.

~ ~ ~

“New Universe” and “Defence of Madame Blavatsky,” Vols. 1 and 2, may now be obtained by American readers from The H.P.B. Library, 348 Foul Bay Road, Victoria, B.C.; “The O.E. Library Critic,” 1207 Q. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.; The Theosophical Press, Olcott, Wheaton, Illinois; The Theosophical University Press, Point Loma, California.

English readers can order from me, or from The Theosophical Publishing Co., 3 Percy Street W.C.1.; or from The Theosophical Bookshop, 68 Great Russell Street, W.C.1.; or through any agent or bookseller.

I am arranging for Indian and Australian depots.

Holland is supplied by the well-known firm of Dishoeck, Bussum, Holland.

~ ~ ~

“N.U.” No.4 will devote a few pages to “The Mysterious Madame” by “Ephesian.” Also, in No.5, I shall put a case and ask readers to detect the flaws in the “charge”; correct answers will be published in No.6.

~ ~ ~

I calculate that this Defence will take from three to seven, or even to ten, years, according to the effort of world-wide propaganda made. It may cost a good deal of money, and would be cheap at any price. We want — and shall get — a million signatures.

Every progressive movement will benefit indirectly by our victory against the long nightmare campaign of unchecked lies and slander; and certain have already intuitively realised this. All will realise it before we get through.

Our aim includes no plea for any Theosophical Society. This is the affair of Theosophists, and may be rather more successful once they have proved to the world that a “valiant defence” of their unjustly attacked Founder is really a part of their ethics, as well as being “a step to wisdom.” Some seem to fancy that they can skip this step and that it will not move away from under them when they are just getting to the very top! Their look-out. The rest of us can only stare when they climb up on the Chariot and do Krishna, for if the Charioteer comes along, they will get a “bop” off. Arjuna’s role is in the battle for justice, not spouting; any shirker can spout, but around him will collect none but those whom HPB called “our Theosophic moles” on the path. Happily, there is another sort!

Our battle is for justice to a deeply-wronged woman. That she was also a woman of genius is all to the good and will help us when the world wakes up to the pleasure of her writings. But the case affects everyone, and even civil liberties and free expression will gain by the abolition of the lying, slandering or boycotting tyranny exercised by a thousand apes since the SPR. issued its ukase in 1884, intolerably dictating its Opinion and offering as ground for that opinion almost nothing but the bare assertions of two dismissed servants, ready to ruin themselves for revenge, and a Report by one, Hodgson, a member of the SPR. Hodgson’s expenses were privately paid by Professor Sidgwick, thus forestalling the protests of members and affording the Society in general no right to complain of the misuse of funds in a mere detective expedition. That Report disgraces honesty and even common decency over and over again, insulting scores of people and having done incalculable mischief in India. Many attempts have been

made to get the SPR. to withdraw it, but on the contrary, the offence has been repeated and aggravated. Time will bring out the truth.

~ ~ ~

I think I must state that my intention is absolutely not to be drawn into any Theosophical “politics”. Whatever questions may interest me later, at present my concern with things Theosophical stops at May 8th, 1891, when HPB passed away. What happened after that has nothing to do with our case.

A fourth, fifth, and perhaps a sixth “New Universe” will be issued before Vol. 3.

Reviews of Vol. 2 and “N.U.” are held over to next number. Reviews have come in from “The Hindu”, Madras; “Light”; “The Path”, Sydney; from H.P.B.’s old friend, “The Civil & Military Gazette”, Lahore; the “Pioneer”, Lucknow; the “Leader”, Allahabad; and several other journals.

Some English journals seem to be boycotting this “Defence”. Well, two can play at this game when the other party is rather numerous and not merely one lone Russian.

Readers please send me any reviews they come across, as some editors do not send.

FIRST LIST OF VICTIMS OF THE S.P.R.
BESIDES MADAME BLAVATSKY.

The first list is of persons actually named in the Reports, and referred to directly as Confederates or indirectly as Fools and Dupes, or as being non-existent.

Non-existent: Mahatmas K.H. and M. Ramalinga Deb. R. Gargya Deva. Bholā Deva Sarma.

Confederates: Damodar. Bhavani Shankar. Babajee. Babula. Shankar Singh (suspected). Colonel Olcott must be included for, in Solovyoff's book, p.116, Walter Leaf states: "The committee held, and its surviving members still hold, that on the evidence *which they then had before them* it was just possible to regard Olcott as merely a dupe." The italics are Leaf's own, the inference being that since *then* the SPR had obtained evidence that Olcott was a confederate. Thus lightly, in those days, a man might be hinted a criminal, if the hincer were a member of the SPR and the victim a Theosophist! The President of the United States guaranteed Olcott personally.

Fools and Dupes: Mohini (doubtfully, rather a confederate). Judge Khandalavala, of Poona. A. D. Ezekiel. Dewan Bahadur Ragoonath Row. Captain Maitland. The Maharajah of Benares (and of course, his Phantom Highness of *Lahore*). Major-General Morgan and Mrs. Morgan. Rao Saheb G. Soobhia Chetty. Mrs. Colonel Gordon. A. P. Sinnett. Mrs. Sinnett. Judge P. Sreenevas Row. Dr. Hartmann. Mr. and Mrs. Cooper-Oakley. T. V. Charloo. T. Subba Row. N. Swamy Naidu. J. K. Ghosal. Bertram Keightley. T. Tatyā. Bal. N. Pitale. M. R. G. Sreenivas Row, Registrar of Cumbum. Professor Smith of Sydney. Judge Gadgill of Baroda. K. M. Shroff. Martandrao B. Nagnath of Bombay. Dorab H. Bharucha. S. J. Padshah. St. George Lane-Fox. Madame N. Fadeev (HPB's aunt and doubtfully a confederate). Mr. Jacob Sassoon. Ramaswamier Iyer, Registrar of Madura. P. Rathnavelu, editor, "Philosophic Inquirer". Norendra Nath Sen, editor, "Indian Mirror". V. Coopposwamy Iyer, Pleader, Madura. T. C. Rajamiengar, M.D. G. N. Unwala of Bhaunagar. Pundit Balai Chand Mullik. Nobin K. Bannerjee, Deputy Magistrate of Berhampore. Pundit Chandra Sekhara of Bareilly.

(To be continued in our next)

NEW UNIVERSE.

A review devoted to the practical defence of Madame Blavatsky, examining charges that may be dealt with briefly. Not concerned with philosophy. Gives news of the progress of the campaign. As many subscriptions have been sent in, although the review was announced to be irregular for some months, general subscriptions will now be accepted. Rates as follows: — 12 numbers, 6/6d.; 6 numbers, 3/3d., post free. America: 7 numbers, 1 dollar. India: 6 numbers, 2 rupees 4 annas, starting from any number.

Cheques and orders payable to Mrs. Beatrice Hastings, 4 Bedford Row, Worthing, Sussex, England.