

P. G. Bowen's Theosophical Philosophy

The theosophical philosophy of Capt. P. G. Bowen, President of the Hermetic Society of Dublin, will be found in the following, which I commend to those who harbor the idea that Leaders and Teachers can set them firmly on the Path:

Sayings of the Ancient One, \$1.25.

The Way Towards Discipleship (included in the above), 10 cts. or sixpence, stamps.

The True Occult Path, 15 cts. or sevenpence, stamps.

Teachings of Robert Crosbie

Hitherto the writings and addresses of Robert Crosbie, founder of the United Lodge of Theosophists, have been available only in scattered papers and fragments published in the magazine *Theosophy*. The publishers of that magazine, The Theosophy Company, have now collected these and other material by Crosbie in a single volume entitled *The Friendly Philosopher*. Crosbie's theosophical writings are characterized by their breadth and common-sense and this volume should be in every theosophical library. 433 pages, \$3.00; from the O. E. LIBRARY.

Also, Crosbie's *Answers to Questions on Judge's Ocean of Theosophy*, \$1.50.

What Is Buddhism?

What is Buddhism? An elementary and untechnical book prepared by the Buddhist Lodge of London, \$1.00.

A Buddhist Catechism. By Col. H. S. Olcott, \$0.50. Has had an enormous sale in Buddhist countries.

A Buddhist Bibliography. Compiled by A. C. March, of the Buddhist Lodge of London, \$7.50. Only complete bibliography of all books on Buddhism in the English language, and of all English translations of Buddhist texts, etc. Invaluable for students of Buddhism.

Buddhism in Translations, by H. C. Warren, \$3.15. Highly recommended.

Buddhism the Science of Life, by A. L. Cleather and B. Crump, \$1.50.

A Brief Glossary of Buddhist Terms, paper, \$0.50.

Buddhism in England. Bi-monthly organ of the Buddhist Lodge of London, \$2.00 a year. Leading Western exponent of Buddhism. Sample for 5 cents postage.

All from the O. E. LIBRARY.

Leadbeater Debunked

Ernest Wood's new book, *Is This Theosophy?*, just published, is the best exposé of Arhat Leadbeater yet written. Mr. Wood was long his private secretary and quite familiar with the wiles of the "Grand Old Man". \$5.50, from the O. E. LIBRARY.

Complete Works of H. P. Blavatsky

Four volumes already published. Mostly magazine articles, including those in early issues of *The Theosophist*. Each \$5.00, from the O. E. LIBRARY.

T. Subba Row's Lectures on the Bhagavad Gita

This invaluable theosophical classic can be had in either of two editions: The Point Loma edition, containing the valuable introductory lecture and a full index and glossary of Sanskrit terms, \$1.00.

The Adyar edition, without the introductory lecture or glossary, but with a sketch of the activities of this remarkable man, \$1.25.

If I had to choose between these editions I should choose both.

From the O. E. LIBRARY.

THE O. E. LIBRARY CRITIC

Published monthly at 1207 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

BY

The O. E. Library League

Vol. XXIV

June-July, 1936

No. 3

Yearly subscription, United States and Canada, fifty cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or 62 cents. Single copies, five cents. Blank (unfilled) British postal orders and stamps, Canadian paper money and stamps accepted.

DEMOLISHING THE MAHATMAS

Who Wrote The Mahatma Letters? By Harold Edward Hare and William Loftus Hare. pp. 326; index, illustrations. London, Williams & Norgate, 1936. 10/6; \$3.75.

The existence of Mahatmas and the genuineness of the various written communications purporting to come from them have long been a matter of controversy. It is a matter of some importance as a great part of the theosophical philosophy is based on the belief in the existence of superior men, called Masters, Elder Brothers and the like, and in the *bona fides* of H. P. Blavatsky. The above contribution to the discussion maintains that the *Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett* and other supposed Mahatmic communications were the product of the hand of Madame Blavatsky, who invented the Mahatmas out of the whole cloth, wrote the letters, and was, therefore, one of the greatest impostors of our times. It is claimed that with this "exposure" the whole theosophical structure falls to the ground; it is demolished from attic to sub-basement, and there is nothing left for theosophists to do but to meditate on what fools they have been.

Who are the Authors?

While the book is to be taken on its merits or demerits, one may say a word of the authors. Of Harold E. Hare I know nothing whatever except that he is the brother of William Loftus Hare—a bit of very reprehensible ignorance on my part, no doubt—and I am left to judge him by his work. William Loftus Hare is of Quaker family, is, or was, editor of a British agricultural paper, *The Ploughshare*; was at one time a member of the Adyar Theosophical Society, but much to his credit, an opponent of the vagaries of Mrs. Besant and Mr. Leadbeater. As late as 1922 he was a member of the National Council of the British Section and from 1916 to 1919 Director of Studies in Comparative Religion and Philosophy to the T. S. in England and Wales. He was therefore closely in touch with doings in the Adyar T. S. Because of his very justifiable opposition to the Besant-Leadbeater cult he was constantly in hot water with the powers in control, was relieved of his position as Director of Studies in Comparative Religion and Philosophy, and thereupon resigned from the T. S. Upon the founding of the Society for the Promotion of the Study of Religions he became editor of its excellent journal, but was dropped from that office in 1935 because, so I am authoritatively informed, of his excessively critical attitude towards everybody and everything. Thereupon he left that society likewise. It was in 1927 that he communicated to me his conviction that the Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett were fraudulent and the work of H. P. B., and that the attitude of the theosophists regarding Mahatmas is untenable. The present work is an elaboration of that opinion.

Methods of Examination—Handwritings

A portion of the present work (pp. 224-251) is devoted to the question of handwriting. W. L. Hare was permitted to examine the manuscripts

of the Mahatma Letters and the H. P. B. Letters to Sinnett in the presence of Mr. A. Trevor Barker, their editor, and I am informed by Mr. Barker that one or two evenings were spent in this way. Besides this necessarily very cursory inspection a few facsimiles of Mahatmic Letters have appeared in public print and could be studied at leisure. These will be found in Mr. Jinarajadasa's book, *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?*, (ignored by the author) and in his earlier book, *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom, Vol II*, and a few in Mr. Barker's edition of the Letters to Sinnett.

Today the equipment of a reputable handwriting expert is a highly technical and elaborate one, demanding much study and experience, and the hit or miss—often miss—methods of the days of Hodgson and Nethercliff would be laughed at. Nevertheless Mr. Hare does not hesitate to find damning similarities in the several scripts, on most of which he could not have spent more than a few minutes, and to assume that as these exist both in the Mahatmic letters and in the letters of H. P. B., therefore H. P. B. wrote the Mahatma Letters. Mr. Jinarajadasa presents facsimiles of communications from six different purported Masters, comparing them with facsimiles of letters by H. P. B., Damodar, Col. Olcott and others. Certainly to the superficial observer each of these scripts differs totally from the others. Mr. Hare professes to find certain characteristic Russian features in the K. H. letters (pp. 228; 244), thereby fastening them on H. P. B., but as he makes the assertion without an iota of detailed evidence it must be said that it has no more value than a mere guess. If the authors propose to pass their judgment off as expert evidence it must certainly be called farcical.

The Fadéef Letter

The first known Mahatmic script is the French letter received November 7th, 1870, at Odessa by Madame Fadéef, H. P. B.'s aunt, informing her that her niece, from whom her relatives had not heard for a long time, was safe and well and would soon return to them. This letter, delivered to Madame Fadéef by a mysterious Oriental, "who then disappeared before my very eyes," so she reported, is in the well-known "K. H. script" so familiar later on, up to 1886 at least. The original is at Adyar and a facsimile is to be found in the two books of C. Jinarajadasa, *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom, Vol. II*, p. 13 and *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?*, p. 7. Between the handwriting of this letter and the much later ones there is no discernible difference, so far as can be seen from the available facsimiles, notwithstanding the authors' assertion that the K. H. handwriting "degenerates into a scribble" (p. 245). Comparison of the numerous facsimiles in the above books and in *The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett* shows the writing to be as clear, careful and characteristic in 1886 (see below) as in 1870. The Hare brothers maintain that the Fadéef letter was written by H. P. B. herself, who was preparing to put on airs with her family on her return (p. 303). Think of that, will you! H. P. B. had already concocted the Mahatma hoax in 1870, wrote a faked letter, hired an Oriental to carry it to Odessa and *mirabile dictu*—to vanish before Madame Fadéef's own eyes! Further, as there are no known K. H. letters between 1870 and 1880, she must have nursed her idea of a grand imposture, remembering the exact style of writing she used in the Fadéef letter, so as to put it over on Sinnett. Perhaps she spent her spare moments between 1870 and 1880 practising "K. H. script", so as not to forget it! She even refrained from practising it on Olcott, a most likely victim. All of which is most fishy.

Facsimiles of several purported letters from other Mahatmas received by Olcott, mostly while still in America in the early T. S. days, will be found in the two books of Mr. Jinarajadasa above named. The scripts are as different among themselves as could well be imagined. The Hare Brothers profess to discover certain features in common, for example a disguised Germanic hand in the Serapis letters (why Germanic?).

H. P. B. Wrote Them All!

The Hare hypothesis is that all of these numerous letters were written by H. P. B. herself, using *six different handwritings* besides her own and that she did this through a space of over fifteen years (1870-1886) without any marked change in any of them. I do not deny that such a feat might be possible for a skilled forger, but H. P. B. gave no outward evidence of possessing such skill. There are few who could carry on such a game for fifteen years without betraying themselves among their intimate associates. Furthermore H. P. B. was notoriously disorderly in her habits; her papers were scattered about her room and it is unimaginable that some scraps of her faked writing would not have been left lying about and have been seen by someone, notably Olcott, who was with her dally and was quite blunt enough to have come out with it. We have likewise to assume that H. P. B. had a considerable number of confederates paid to do her bidding, not one of whom has confessed or been exposed. In short, the Hare Brothers are asking us to accept something little short of a miracle in support of their hypothesis, for which they give little evidence beyond mere surmises.

Kinds of Paper

W. L. Hare, as a result of his inspection of the Sinnett collection, now in charge of Miss Maude Hoffman, his executrix, has given us a very brief description of the 142 letters and notes, mostly from Mahatmas M. and K. H., as to paper and ink or pencil used (pp. 230-238), as well as of some of the Blavatsky and other letters. For this information we are grateful. It is noted that several of these Mahatma letters are written on Sinnett's office or personal stationery, and that some are on mere scraps of pink, yellow or blue paper purchasable in any shop—"billet-doux" stationery, they call it (p. 224). To him this is damning proof that the letters were written by H. P. B. on any paper at hand, and passed off on Sinnett.

H. P. B. No Fool; nor Sinnett Neither

The Hare theory that H. P. B. wrote these letters assumes that she, so shrewd a forger as to be able to keep up the farce for years, writing six different scripts without detection, was fool enough to steal Sinnett's own stationery and write Mahatmic communications on it and expect to be believed. It further sets Sinnett down for a fool, instead of being a keen business man. He must have noticed it. Would any deceiver write you pretended Mahatmic communications on your own letterheads? On the "precipitation" theory, which, of course, the Hare Brothers do not accept, nothing is more likely than that the precipitating agent would use any paper at hand, instead of wasting effort in generating it *de novo*. I regard this one fact as a strong argument for the genuineness of the letters.

Hare Brothers' Examination of Printed Texts

While restricted in their opportunity to examine the original letters the Hare Brothers had ample time to study the printed volumes, the *Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett* and *The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett*. Here we are presented with their results, and a worse case of flea-biting, of straining at gnats and swallowing camels I have seldom encountered. The study claims to prove that there are such similarities of expression in the writings of the Mahatmas and of H. P. B. that she must have written all of them. Here we find what seems to be a hang-over from the Besant regime. Besant gave it out that the Masters are perfect men, men who have learned all that earth life could teach them. Students of Blavatsky and the Mahatma Letters know that no such claim is made either by H. P. B. or the Mahatmas themselves. They are regarded as real men, somewhat above the ordinary mortal, but still men. The authors, while disclaiming all belief in Mahatmas, seem to assume that if they exist at all they must be perfect and omniscient, even in their knowledge of the English language and literature, and that errors in punctuation, spelling, quotations, the use of Gallicisms

or colloquialisms such as anybody may do in writing letters, yea, even occasionally of Americanisms, must prove that they are not only not Mahatmas, but don't exist at all, and, if similar faults are found in H. P. B.'s hastily written letters, she must have written the Mahatma Letters likewise; she must have invented all. Space is lacking to cite more than a few examples.

"Key-Words"

Both the Mahatmas and H. P. B. occasionally use the admonition "Try" (pp. 177-179). How silly. Doesn't anybody but a moron know that every mother admonishes her child to "try"? Doesn't every teacher do the same? Both H. P. B. and the Mahatmas use the word "though" in a commonly occurring colloquial manner; thus "All I could obtain from Him though" (K. H. in M. L. p. 210), while H. P. B. writes "One thing I can tell you though" (pp. 181-182). Both H. P. B. and the Mahatma are blamed for using "better" incorrectly according to the canons of good English; thus, "You better write me" (K. H. in M. L., p. 26), while H. P. B. writes "I better not say a word more" (B. L. p. 57). And the small word "but". Its colloquial use by K. H. and H. P. B. is simply damning. K. H. writes "to awake but at the hour of the last judgement" (M. L. p. 131) while H. P. B. writes "It reached Damodar but Sunday" (B. L. p. 16). These three words, "though", "better", "but", used colloquially by both H. P. B. and the Mahatma—and it must be said by thousands daily,—simply prove that they are one and the same person. To show the authors' critical itch *ad absurdum*, their search through the Mahatma Letters and the H. P. B. Letters shows the following results (p. 182):

Try... H. P. B., 7 times; K. H., 10 times; Serapis, 10 times.

But... H. P. B., 7 times; Mahatmas, 12 times.

Though... H. P. B., 7 times; Mahatmas, 8 times.

and this in these two large volumes of letters of roughly five-hundred pages each! Lordie Me! If any but Loftus Hare had based an argument on such a slender gleaning I should say that his ears had outstripped his brains.

They Split Their Infinitives!

H. P. B. and the Mahatmas occasionally split their infinitives (p. 183). This proves that H. P. B. wrote the Mahatma Letters. This may not be elegant English, but it is done constantly, even by people of culture and in the press, and is conceded by some writers of authority to be permissible. To argue that if two writers now and then use a split infinitive they must be one and the same is nothing but an example of rabid flea-biting. And H. P. B., to whom, as a cultivated Russian, French was as a second mother tongue, sometimes uses Gallicisms, that is, she translates a French phrase into English literally. And Mahatma K. H. sometimes does the same—K. H., who studied in Europe and knew French as well as English. And now and then he uses an "Americanism", as does H. P. B., and many an Englishman who has never been in America. That makes the twain one person. And, even worse, both of them occasionally express some sentiment in semi-scriptural form (pp. 200-202), as most of us do, instead of getting out our King James version and following it *verbatim*. And both of them on one occasion speak of "Simon" Stylites instead of "Simeon" Stylites (pp. 192-193). Hereafter, when we find two persons making a singular trivial error in Christian hagiology we must assume them to be one and the same. In this case it was Olcott, not H. P. B., who was to blame. Perhaps he wrote the Letters.

I would fain linger longer in this gallery of curiosities of criticism, but I must hurry along and refer the reader to the book itself. At the very most they make the Hare theory vaguely possible, but involve almost inconceivable difficulties.

Facts to the Contrary

Are there any facts which show that some of these letters were produced and received under conditions where H. P. B. could not possibly

have been involved either directly or aided by confederates? The authors have totally, and much to their discredit, ignored such evidence for the defense, which is accessible to everybody. First, how about "precipitation"?

Precipitated Communications

The formation of written communications at a distance, or as enclosures in other correspondence, is usually designated as "precipitation". The authors do not believe in this (pp. 127-139) and indeed the propounded explanations are by no means clear. Even if indisputably proved it would be as mysterious as the appearance in a New York newspaper three hours later of a photograph of a military review by Mussolini would have seemed to our grandparents. But the question is not *how*, but *whether* such a phenomenon ever occurs, and if so, whether under conditions which prove that K. H. and other Mahatmic scripts appear where H. P. B. could by no possibility have been involved. If so, it demolishes the charge that she wrote the remaining letters, or makes it too improbable to be worth considering.

Specific Cases of Mahatma Letters in Absence of H. P. B.

I can cite but three cases and must refer to the appended list of references for others.

Olcott, whose honesty no one doubts, describes (*Old Diary Leaves*, Vol. I, pp. 35-37) the receipt of letters from distant correspondents, while in America, which were handed to him personally by the postman, which contained Mahatmic writing on blank spaces. His story is worth reading. Collusion of his distant correspondents with H. P. B. seems out of the question except upon almost impossible assumptions.

The Tookaram Tatya Letter

On June 1st, 1886 Col. Olcott, then at Adyar, wrote a business letter to Mr. Tookaram Tatya, a well-known and highly reputable theosophist living in Bombay. Mr. Tatya replied June 5th, appending an inquiry about Damodar. When received by Col. Olcott it was found that the blank back of the paper was covered by a communication in the well-known K. H. script, conveying information about Damodar. This letter was seen and certified to and endorsed by T. Subba Row, Mr. Cooper-Oakley and another. The facsimile can be seen in Jinarajadasa's book, *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?* (p. 23). Now the interesting point is that at this time H. P. B. was in Germany, yet the letter is undoubtedly K. H. script, and signed by him. It was not on the back of Tatya's letter when he wrote it—the paper was too thin to permit its escaping notice,—yet it was there when Olcott received it. Even assuming that some confederate of H. P. B. in Tatya's office had had a chance to write it before mailing, or that another confederate in Olcott's office had tampered with it, or even that Tatya, known to be an honorable man, had written it, the fact remains that a perfect sample of K. H. writing was produced in India by another than H. P. B. herself, who was in Germany. The facsimile of this letter and its history were available to the Hare Brothers, not only in the Jinarajadasa book, but in *The Theosophist* of a year or two earlier. Yet they conveniently ignore it.

The Shannon Letter

Col. Olcott, traveling from India to London on the steamer Shannon in August, 1888, H.P.B. being in London or Paris, "received phenomenally" while alone in his cabin, between Port Said and Brindisi, a long letter from Mahatma K.H. advising him what to do on reaching London. This letter is on file at Adyar and is published in Jinarajadasa's *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol. I, (p. 50; notes p. 116). No facsimile is available. On the Hare hypothesis we must assume that H. P. B., in England, wrote the letter, sent it to some confederate in India or Egypt, who boarded the steamer and dropped it in Olcott's cabin while he was there, without being detected. No trapdoors or holes in the ceiling either. This would involve poor H. P. B. paying traveling ex-

penses and a fee. Here, too, this incident is ignored by the Brothers Hare.

Other examples of letters mysteriously received under conditions where neither H. P. B. nor a confederate could have been involved will be found in the books mentioned below, especially in Besant's *H. P. Blavatsky and the Masters of the Wisdom*.

Visible Appearances of Mahatmas

Quite apart from the matter of letters, there seems to be abundant evidence of the existence of Mahatmas with supernormal powers. They have been seen and conversed with by various persons under conditions precluding the possibility of illusion or deception. One of the most interesting cases is the one described by Col. Olcott (*Old Diary Leaves*, Vol. I, pp. 377-81), where a gigantic Oriental of the most majestic mien appeared to him in his room in New York, the door being closed and he himself fully awake, discussed his theosophical future with him and vanished on the spot, but before doing so, dropping his turban as evidence of his visit, said turban being now at Adyar. This was the supposedly mythical Mahatma M., and Olcott met and conversed with him on other occasions in India. Are we to suppose that H. P. B. was able to locate such a majestic Hindu in New York, and hire him to impersonate a Mahatma before Olcott, playing a role which no hireling could fill, and then transport him to India to play the same part with Olcott and others, including becoming the teacher of T. Subba Row? And this is but part of the available evidence.

After Writing the Big Q. E. D.

The authors, after emphatically proclaiming that they have proved that H. P. B. invented the Mahatmas, wrote their letters and faked the whole scheme of Theosophy, and having ignored all evidence to the contrary which was accessible to them, devote some space to a discussion of the vagaries of Annie Besant and C. W. Leadbeater. Here at last we see that they have set out on the path of appeal to prejudice. While sympathizing with their strictures on these two worthies, I contend that this has nothing whatever to do with H. P. B. and the Mahatma Letters, which were on hand long before Besant and Leadbeater came in sight. This will influence only the weak-minded. Space cannot be given here to the various mistakes in the book, as where it is assumed that the Philosophical Teachings in the Mahatma Letters came suddenly to an end and were followed by a series of grouchy and critical letters (p. 252), whereas the authors, had they been more intent on facts and less absorbed in catching fleas, would have seen from the dates that this was not a fact. Their obtuseness is further indicated by the statement: "From these turgid pages not one memorable passage has emerged as a quotable text or maxim after fifty years of faith. . . ."—an assertion which is pure bosh, as the Letters are constantly quoted, and a considerable volume of such passages was prepared by William Kingsland.

Concluding, and without intending to reflect on the sincerity of the authors, who doubtless have done their best, it must be said that the whole book reminds one of the prosecuting attorney who assumes guilt in advance, uses every means, fair or otherwise, to convict, ignores evidence and finally, after his Q. E. D., proceeds to abuse the defendants before the jury. This is not the attitude of the impartial judge who weighs both sides. The whole book presents an example of the critical spirit gone mad; it affords a psychological problem bordering on the abnormal.

To those who would look more carefully into the subject and get the opposing evidence I commend the following:

C. Jinarajadasa, *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?* (\$1.25). This contains facsimiles.

C. Jinarajadasa, *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom Vol. II*, with facsimiles (\$2.00).

Annie Besant, *H. P. Blavatsky and the Masters of the Wisdom* (ppr. 50 cents).

Hints on Esoteric Theosophy (out of print).

H. S. Olcott, *Old Diary Leaves*, especially Vol. (out of print) but also Vols. II, III, IV (\$3.50 each).

Goose-Stepping the T. S.

In theosophical circles, chiefly in those centering about Adyar, we hear much about "God's Plan of Evolution". About just what this plan is there may have been some question, but now we are to be left in no further doubt, God and Dr. Arundale have gotten together and the result is a poster 19 inches wide by 35 inches tall, assuring us not only that "There is a Plan", but telling us just how to fall in line. I infer from internal evidence that it is Dr. Arundale rather than the Almighty who did most of the work.

The poster elaborates a plan for a series of semi-weekly meetings, Sundays and Wednesdays, to be held all over the world in theosophical lodges, beginning October 1st next and continuing till March 24th. The members are not left in any uncertainty as to what to do and the precise moment and exact way to do it. There are not only general directions, but the utmost detail, the number of speakers, how many minutes to speak, to how many members books on the subject of the day are to be issued, when to eat and when to pour tea, and much more. I am reminded of Master K. H.'s (?) specific directions to Mr. Leadbeater about Krishnamurti's socks and undies.

It seems to be characteristic of Dr. Arundale that with God's approval he is trying to goose-step the T. S., and that in double quick time. The T. S. is to be one big machine, everybody doing the same thing in all parts of the world at the same time, and doing it fast. It is a species of regimentation with Dr. Arundale as the commander-in-chief. Nothing is left to individual initiative, to spontaneous thought. Further, the amount of work he has laid down for these few months is far more than anyone could undertake profitably in the allotted time and there is danger that mental indigestion will ensue and that members will feel "Now that we are through with that job, let's forget all about it and await a new series of orders on something else."

So it happened that I found the "Plan" decidedly entertaining—it is so thoroughly Georgian. Nevertheless there are two features of the program which are worthy of the highest commendation. Neither is perfect, but both seem to betoken a degree of vision regarding the duties of a theosophist to the world.

One of these consists of a long list of books to be studied, and we find as much variety as in a grab bag. The commendable feature of this list is that whereas heretofore recommended lists of books have been exclusively theosophical or pseudo-theosophical, here we find many written by prominent thinkers who are by no means theosophists and who would doubtless be surprised and shocked to discover themselves bedfellows of Leadbeater with his absurd *Man: Whence, How and Whither* and his *Hidden Side of Things*. Among the writers we find Alexis Carrel, G. Santayana, Will Durant, Gen Smuts, J. S. Haldane, Eddington, John Dewey, Dean Inge, Edward Bellamy, H. G. Wells, Henri Bergson, U. S. Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, C. A. F. Rhys Davids, and many others.

This is just as it should be even though one might wish some other titles substituted for some of the theosophical books. The Doctor might have substituted *Light on the Path* and the *Bhagavad Gita* for his own productions, and have included a few books of science, especially on the history of science and the development of physiological knowledge. Still, these books will show theosophists that there are various ways of thinking not strictly in accord with Theosophy as it is usually taught. They will not make more learnedly dogmatic theosophists, but they will

In Defense of "The Mahatma Letters" and H. P. B.

Not a few, lacking discrimination and critical ability, have been imposed on by the arguments in the recent book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, by H. E. and W. L. Hare, attempting to prove all the supposed letters from Mahatmas bogus, concocted and written by H. P. Blavatsky, who was therefore one of the greatest impostors of her time. That one of the authors was long a member of the T. S. and therefore supposed to be a competent authority has doubtless influenced some. This and forthcoming issues of the Critic will contain a series of articles analyzing the book and presenting evidence for the defense ignored by the authors. You should subscribe for yourself and some friends at once. Annual subscription, U. S. and Canada, 50 cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or the equivalent (62 cents). Canadian paper currency and stamps, British stamps and blank postal orders accepted. Those interested in seeing how much fallacy, folly and folderol can be compressed into one volume can get the Hare book from the O. E. LIBRARY for \$3.75. The following, presenting the defense, can also be supplied:

The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett, the book itself, \$7.50.

Jinarajadasa, Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?, with 39 facsimiles, \$1.25.

Jinarajadasa, Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom, Vol. II, with facsimiles, \$2.00.

Besant, H. P. Blavatsky and the Masters of the Wisdom, ppr. 50 cents. Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett, a few left, \$5.00.

Bursting the Leadbeater Bubble

Ernest Wood's new book, *Is This Theosophy?*, just published, is the best exposé of Arhat Leadbeater yet written. Mr. Wood was long his private secretary and quite familiar with the wiles of the "Grand Old Man". \$5.50, from the O. E. LIBRARY.

A New History of Science

A History of Science and its Relations with Philosophy and Religion, by *William Cecil Dampier*, M. A., F. R. S., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, etc. pp. xxi, 514. Macmillan Co., 1930. \$4.00 from the O. E. LIBRARY.

Since Whewell wrote his famous *History of the Inductive Sciences* nearly a hundred years ago, no such complete record of the intellectual achievements of man in the way of comprehending the Universe has appeared. Beginning with 2500 B. C. it covers the latest important discoveries, deductions and speculations of our most eminent men of science of today in every field of research, and their philosophical and religious bearings. Fascinating as a novel, and far above the ordinary sketchy history, to read it is to get a fair education in all of the sciences, a clearer grasp of Nature, from atoms to nebulae, from the amoeba to man.

The Blavatsky Pamphlet Series

From THE O. E. LIBRARY, 20 cents each, as follows:

1. H. P. Blavatsky to the Archbishop of Canterbury—an Open Letter.
2. *The Secret Doctrine* on the Problem and Evolution of Sex.
3. The Signs of the Times and Our Cycle and the Next, by H. P. B.
4. Practical Occultism and Occultism vs. the Occult Arts, by H. P. B.
5. An Outline Study of *The Secret Doctrine*, by W. B. Pease.
6. A Tibetan Initiate on World Problems.
7. H. P. Blavatsky on Dreams.
8. A Turkish Effendi on Christendom and Islam.
9. H. P. B.'s "Introductory" to *The Secret Doctrine*.
10. Karmic Visions, by *Sanjna* (H. P. B.).

THE O. E. LIBRARY CRITIC

Published monthly at 1207 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

BY

The O. E. Library League

Vol. XXIV

August-September, 1936

No. 4

Yearly subscription, United States and Canada, fifty cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or 62 cents. Single copies, five cents. Blank (unfilled) British postal orders and stamps, Canadian paper money and stamps accepted.

DID H. P. BLAVATSKY WRITE THESE MAHATMA LETTERS?

It would be a mistake to think that the recent book of Harold E. and William Loftus Hare, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, is to be taken lightly or set aside as unworthy of consideration. Their thesis is that all of the alleged Mahatma letters, whether supposed to have been written by Mahatmas M. and K. H., or by any other Masters, were deliberately concocted and written by H. P. Blavatsky and palmed off on her dupes either directly or through the connivance of confederates and that the whole matter of Mahatmas is a hoax perpetrated by her.

It must be frankly conceded that many of these Mahatmic letters passed through H. P. B.'s hands, being delivered either directly by her or by some other person acting for her. If it could be shown that this applies to all of the letters, whether received by Mr. Sinnett or others, one would have to admit that the arguments of the Brothers Hare carry considerable weight. If, however, there are such letters, in the same Mahatmic handwriting, which could not by any possibility have been written or delivered by H. P. B., or instigated by her, or by any person who might have been employed by her, we should have a complete alibi for H. P. B., and the assumptions of the Brothers Hare with regard to the rest of the Mahatmic literature would rest upon a very shaky foundation indeed. Their arguments based on defective English, or on similarities of expressions of H. P. B. and the Mahatmas will count for little, for certainly no one has the right to assume that a Mahatma is necessarily omniscient with regard to classical English, while similar errors or colloquialisms are easy enough to discover in other cases without assuming that the writers are identical.

Below I shall present a few such letters which form a full and complete alibi for H. P. B., as well as for several other persons who might be suspected as having been her confederates. Exact references and data are given as far as obtainable.

One usually expects that an honorable person who proposes to demolish the moral reputation of another, whether living or dead, shall at least present whatever evidence may exist in their favor. He may not accept the force of such evidence and he may do what he can to confute it, but to act like a judge who would refuse to hear evidence for the defense and who would take up the time of the jury with utterly irrelevant matters is unpardonable. Have the Brothers Hare considered the letters which are presented below? They have not; they have preserved the silence of the grave about them. And it cannot be said that these letters were inaccessible, or that they had no space in their book to devote to them. They have devoted many pages to commenting on the vagaries of Annie Besant and C. W. Leadbeater, who had not appeared on the scene at all when the Mahatma letters were written and who therefore have absolutely no bearing on the subject other than to make a fatter book. And having ignored the evidence for

the defense and presented a mass of irrelevancies they write a big Q. E. D.: "We have proved beyond question that H. P. Blavatsky was an out-and-out fraud and that her alleged Mahatmas were invented by her and were ignoramuses at that." They run amuck through the whole Theosophical Movement. I need not throw stones at the fragile scholarship of these authors here, but on a future occasion I may present some interesting facts about it. Here we are concerned only with certain letters, omitting mention of many another about which there might be a reasonable doubt, however improbable. For convenience these are numbered.

1. *Olcott's Philadelphia Communications.* See *Old Diary Leaves*, Vol. I, pp. 35-37. During the summer of 1875, before the organization of the Theosophical Society, Colonel Olcott was living in New York and H. P. B. in Philadelphia. Having occasion to go to Philadelphia to see H. P. B. and expecting to be absent but two or three days, he left no mail forwarding address at his office or club, further than stating that he was going to Philadelphia. Finding, however that he was likely to be detained longer than expected, and thinking that his office might perhaps forward mail to Philadelphia without street address, trusting that he might get it, he went on the second day to the Philadelphia postoffice and filed his temporary local address. On the very same day the postman handed to him *personally* letters from widely distant places which, on opening, were found to carry on the blank spaces inscriptions in a handwriting identical with that of certain supposed Masters with which he was already familiar. Curiously these letters, properly postmarked at place of origin, while addressed to New York, did not pass through the New York Postoffice at all, as shown by the absence of the forwarding postmark. The original postmark, the lack of a New York postmark, and direct receipt from the hands of the postman showed that no one but the original correspondents and the postal service had handled them. During his two weeks' stay he received many such letters, all bearing his New York address but none bearing the New York forwarding stamp. On the Hare theory of fraud one must assume either (a) that H. P. B. had tampered with the postal authorities and secured the letters and opened them, or (b) that she was in collusion with a number of Olcott's correspondents or other people in distant parts, who were trained to write the Mahatmic script familiar to Olcott and who wrote, or had written, these "communications" before mailing--rather a large proposition, one might think, as people do not do such things for nothing and H. P. B. was almost penniless. No good reason can be advanced for such an elaborate and costly conspiracy.

In the following the abbreviated references refer to Jinarajadasa, *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?* ("Did H. P. B. Forge?"), to his book, *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol. II ("L. M. W. II") and to *H. P. Blavatsky and the Masters of the Wisdom* ("H. P. B. & M. W."), a Transaction of the Blavatsky Lodge, London, prepared by Annie Besant and first issued in 1907. Reference is to the 1907 edition and to a later American edition which has a different pagination.

2. *The N. O. Trivedi Letter* (H. P. B. & M. W., p. 18; Am. ed. p. 30). I quote:

"On the 17th of March, 1884, Mr. Narotamram Uttanram Trivedi was at the Headquarters, Adyar, and wrote out some questions on a sheet of foolscap: 'I wanted Damodar to have the questions answered, but he did not take any notice of them. At about noon I sat at a table, with Mr. Damodar opposite to me. This was in the office room downstairs. I read over to myself the questions I had written out, and laid the paper upon the table. In a few minutes, while I was talking to Damodar, the paper disappeared, and I silently remarked this, but I kept on talking, and in a short while an envelope was found lying upon the floor. It was addressed to me, and, on opening it, I found my own sheet of questions written in blue pencil. The answers

to my questions were full, and had been written close to each of the questions on my own paper. The handwriting was that of Mahatma K. H. Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott were then not at Adyar, but had proceeded to Europe, and were probably in Paris.'"

Mr. Trivedi was a highly regarded member of the T. S., referred to as late as 1896 by Olcott (*Old Diary Leaves*, Vol. VI, p. 2), and above suspicion. The questions and answers, copied from the original document, will be found in *The Theosophist*, July, 1907, p. 782, and in Jinarajadasa's *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol. I, p. 89. The answers are concise and pertinent to the inquiries. The records show that H. P. B. and Olcott were then in France. No one in Europe could possibly have answered immediately questions propounded in India, the nature of which was specific and not of a general character. The only person who could be suspected is Damodar, who might have soothed Mr. Trivedi to sleep while he was talking, secured the paper and written the answers on the same sheet. Hardly likely. And then, too, the replies were written in the K. H. script, the same that the Hare Brothers would have us believe to be the property of H. P. B. And as for Damodar, see the Tatyia letter (No. 7) below, written in Bombay in K. H. script when H. P. B. was in Germany and Damodar in Tibet.

A Mahatma Letter on a Railway Train

3. *The Keshava Pillai Letter* (H. P. B. & M. W., p. 18; Am. ed. p. 31). Mr. R. Keshava (or Casava) Pillai was an Inspector of Police. He says:

"In the year 1882, while I was travelling by railway between the Allahabad and Mogul Sarai stations, a letter fell in the compartment of the railway carriage in which I was sitting. I was alone in the compartment, and the carriage was in motion. I had wished that Mahatma K. H. should give me instructions regarding a certain matter about which I was then thinking, and when I opened the letter I found that my thoughts had been answered, and that the letter was in the handwriting of Mahatma K. H., whose writing I know so well. Madame Blavatsky was then in Bombay."

This letter will be found in *L. M. W. II*, p. 130. Note (a) that H. P. B. was in Bombay, 800 miles distant, (b) that Mr. Pillai was alone, (c) that compartments on Indian railway carriages are completely separated, (d) that the train was in motion, and a letter could not have been delivered except through the door or window from the outside, (e) that the writing was that of K. H., known to Mr. Pillai, who had had several letters from him before, (f) that the original is at Adyar and was copied by Mr. Jinarajadasa, who is fully familiar with the K. H. script, and (g) that the letter was an immediate reply to questions in the Inspector's mind. Had H. P. B. in Bombay written the letter she would have had to know what Mr. Pillai was going to be thinking of, on just what train he would be traveling, and would have had to bribe a guard. A somewhat similar case is letter No. 5 below.

4. *The Bhavani Shankar Letter* (H. P. B. & M. W., p. 19; Am. ed., p. 31). I quote:

"When Pandit Bhavani Shankar was staying at Mr. Sinnett's house in Allahabad, in March 1882, Madame Blavatsky was in Bombay. Mr. Sinnett one evening gave him a note addressed to the Mahatma K. H. The Pandit put the letter near his pillow, locked his doors, lighted his lamp, and was alone. Between ten and eleven he saw his Master astrally, and He took the letter. The next morning he found the answer under his pillow, addressed to Mr. Sinnett, and handed it to him."

Here, whether or not one accepts the vision of the Master as real or illusory, the fact remains that H. P. B. was in Bombay, 800 miles distant, that the letter was an almost immediate reply to Sinnett's questions, and that writing must have been K. H. script, with which Sinnett was

thoroughly familiar. The only persons concerned were Sinnett and Pundit Bhavani, unless we assume (that some confederate of H. P. B. skilled in K. H. script, had climbed into the Pundit's bedroom, secured the letter, written the reply and climbed back to deliver it. Sinnett (*Occult World*, Amer. ed., p. 222) describes a similar incident, or more likely the same, in which two letters were answered through the agency of "Bhavani Rao, a young native candidate for *chela*-ship," who spent two days at his house in company with Colonel Olcott. Was it perhaps the Colonel, with his long beard, who sneaked into Bhavani's bedroom and was mistaken for Mahatma K. H.?

5. *The Hübbe-Schleiden Letter* (H. P. B. & M. W., p. 20; Am. ed., p. 33). I quote:

"On the 1st August, 1884, Madame Blavatsky being in England, Colonel Olcott and Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden were travelling from Elberfeld to Dresden by express. As the latter partly rose from his seat to hand the railway tickets to the guard, Colonel Olcott noticed something white lying on the seat; it turned out to be a Tibetan envelope, in which was a letter from Mahatma K. H. in His well-known writing."

"This letter will be found in *L. M. W.* II, p. 136. It was addressed to Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden and was copied from the original by Mr. Jinarajadasa. This would rule out H. P. B. as the writer. She was in England, would have had to know on just what train in Germany Colonel Olcott and Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden would be traveling, and would have had to bribe an unknown guard on an unknown train to drop the letter while taking the tickets. Further, there was no reason why H. P. B. should know the train, as they were traveling, not towards England, but away from it. Otherwise we should have to charge either the Colonel or the Doctor with being still another master of the K. H. script which the Brothers Hare would fasten on H. P. B.

6. *The Srinavasa Rao Letter* (H. P. B. & M. W., p. 25, Am. ed., p. 43). P. Srinavasa Rao was Small Court Judge in Madras and a well-known theosophist. He states:

"On the 4th March, 1884 (Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott were at this time on the ocean, having left Bombay on Feb. 29th, for Marseilles) I, owing to certain domestic afflictions, felt exceedingly miserable all day." He went to Adyar, and on seeing Damodar, said he wished to see the Shrine. "He conducted me to the Occult Room upstairs forthwith, and unlocked the Shrine. He and I were standing hardly five seconds looking at the Mahatma K. H.'s portrait in the Shrine, when he (Mr. Damodar) told me that he had orders to close the Shrine, and did so immediately. This was extremely disappointing to me. But Mr. Damodar reopened in an instant the Shrine. My eye immediately fell upon a letter in a Tibetan envelope in the cup in the Shrine, which was quite empty before. I took the letter, and finding that it was addressed to me by Mahatma K. H., I opened and read it."

It is in evidence that the wall back of the Shrine was intact at this time, or at least as late as February 15th, 1884. If we insist on incriminating H. P. B. we must assume that she had written a letter to Judge Srinivasa Rao in K. H. script before sailing, had left it with Damodar to slip into the Shrine for the purpose of fooling the Judge. We must also assume that Damodar was a sufficiently expert juggler to have slipped in the letter while being intently observed by an intelligent man.

Can the Hare Brothers Explain This?

7. *The Tookaram Tatya Letter*. This was described in the June-July *Carrie*, but for the sake of completeness I quote what was said then. The letter to Olcott with the K. H. letter written on the back, with facsimile of the latter, will be found in Jinarajadasa's *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?* pp. 21-23. Repeating from the *Carrie*:

On June 1st, 1886, Col. Olcott, then at Adyar, wrote a business let-

ter to Mr. Tookaram Tatya, a well-known and highly reputable theosophist living in Bombay. Mr. Tatya replied June 5th, appending an inquiry about Damodar. When received by Col. Olcott it was found that the blank back of the paper was covered by a communication in the well-known K. H. script, conveying information about Damodar. This letter was seen and certified to and endorsed by T. Subba Row, Mr. Cooper-Oakley and another . . . Now the interesting point is that at this time H.P.B. was in Germany, yet the letter is undoubtedly K. H. script, and signed by him. It was not on the back of Tatya's letter when he wrote it—the paper was too thin to permit its escaping notice,—yet it was there when Olcott received it. Even assuming that some confederate of H. P. B. in Tatya's office had had a chance to write it before mailing, or that another confederate in Olcott's office had tampered with it, or even that Tatya, known to be an honorable man, had written it, the fact remains that a *perfect sample of K. H. writing was produced in India by another than H. P. B. herself, who was in Germany.*

8. *The Olcott-Shannon Letter*. In August, 1888, Colonel Olcott was voyaging from India to London on the steamer Shannon. H. P. B. was in London or Paris—she had left India in March, 1885. He "received phenomenally", to use his own words, in his cabin, the day before reaching Brindisi, a long signed letter from Mahatma K. H., advising him what to do on reaching London. This letter is in the Adyar archives and may be found in Jinarajadasa's *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol I, (p. 50-56; notes, p. 116). In this case, in order to implicate H. P. B. in the writing of this letter one must suppose that she had sent it to some confederate in India or Egypt, who boarded the steamer, traveled to Europe, and dropped it in Olcott's cabin while he was there without being detected. Of course she would have had to pay the confederate's traveling expenses and a fair honorarium, including insurance against damages should the irate Colonel have caught him at his trick and punched him.

Other letters could be cited, but as space is lacking and as many of them do not absolutely exclude the possibility of the connivance of H. P. B. or others acting under her direction, I limit myself to the above, which seem to me to be conclusive in her favor. Bear in mind that an *immediate* reply to a question propounded or thought of could not have been made by any person at a distance. No theory of confederates would admit of a person in Europe promptly replying to a question raised in India. All of the letters, except those under No. 1, were written in the characteristic K. H. script, either so stated, or to be recognized by the recipient who was familiar with it, and who would have suspected any other writing. Further, it will be noted that no one person who might be suspected could have written all of these letters and that on any theory of forgery several persons must be assumed, all well practised in writing K. H. script. Let us summarize briefly.

Summary of Results

No. 1. Letters in other scripts than that of K. H. H. P. B. is excluded.

No. 2. H. P. B. and Olcott excluded, as being in Europe. Almost immediate reply to questions. Only Damodar could be suspected.

No. 3. Immediate reply to mental queries received on moving train; H. P. B. 800 miles distant; H. P. B., Olcott and Damodar excluded.

No. 4. Immediate reply to queries by Sinnett; H. P. B. (800 miles away) excluded, Damodar not present.

No. 5. Received on moving train in Germany; H. P. B. in England; only Olcott and Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden could be suspected.

No. 6. Olcott and H. P. B. on the ocean; Damodar might be suspected.

No. 7. H. P. B. in Germany; Damodar in Tibet; only Tatya, Olcott, or some unknown person with access to Tatya's or Olcott's mail, able to write like K. H., might be suspected.

No. 8. H. P. B. in London or Paris. Only alternative is that Olcott faked the letter himself. The tenor of the letter makes this altogether improbable.

The only conclusion I can reach concerning these letters (those under No. 1 being in a different script) is that no *one* person could have written them and in the same script and that even then it would have been impossible for that person, if an ordinary human being, to have answered inquiries immediately and to have delivered the letters on a moving train in another country or on shipboard. Apparently the only conclusion possible is that they were written by someone of entirely superhuman powers, using methods of which we know nothing. And in this we have exactly the superman or Mahatma whose existence the Brothers Hare attempt to disprove. It may be a hard matter to admit what would ordinarily be called a miracle, but what is one to do? Certainly not to evade the facts as do the Brothers Hare, and to fall back on a vociferous Q. E. D.

The Hares' Solution—All Liars!

And what do they do? When their attention has been called to these matters the best they can do is to write to the *London Spectator* (July 24, 1936) that

"We have proved that the Letters were conceived in the mind and written by the hand of Madame Blavatsky, and we submit that this fact deprives her teaching of the celestial authority which she sought to claim for it As for the four persons who are alleged to have seen the 'Masters' we have no confidence in them. Colonel Olcott was the partner of Madame Blavatsky while Damodar and Babajee were her creatures.

"The apologies for 'precipitation' have been exposed in our book and cannot be repeated here. There is no use in appealing to psychics when fraud is the only possible explanation."

A Theosophical Giraffe

In short, these two gentlemen excel the Psalmist. He said in his haste "all men are liars." The Hares say it deliberately and stick to it. They remind me of the countryman who went to the circus and saw a giraffe. This was too much for him and he exclaimed: "There ain't no such beast."

I am not through with this book of the Brothers Hare. And I shall have reason for recalling the admonition about stone-throwing to those who live in glass houses.

Who Will Write to This Prisoner?

Note.—The following letter appeals to me and I hope that it may to some of our readers who have a little leisure for correspondence. The institution is the Washington State Penitentiary. In writing, please mention the O. E. LIBRARY LEAGUE and write the prisoner's register number after his name.

O. E. Library Asso.
Dear Sir:

Aug. 16, 1936

I have heard that you find people to write to men in prison who has no people or anybody to write to. I would appreciate it very much if you would find someone who would write to me. My name is Buddy Brown and I am 22 years old. My people died when I was 4 years old and since I was 9 years old I have had to make my own way. I am in prison at the present time due to the fact that I had no money and could not secure work. I have no friends or people of any kind and would sure like to hear from someone once in a while.

Yours truly

Buddy Brown, No. 16613
Box 520, Walla Walla
Wash.

AMORC, the Ballards and the Mount Shasta Myth

Mount Shasta, in northern California, which for some years has been the center of weird stories, seems to be falling into disrepute. Rumors were current of a strange people inhabiting its slopes, supposed to be descendants of the ancient Lemurians. Prof. Edgar Lucien Larkin of California, an amateur astronomer and a sort of occultist who, it is said, finally went crazy, claimed to have seen through his telescope strange lights and mysterious ceremonies on the mountain, though he was several hundreds of miles distant and would have had to see through an intervening mountain. Apparently instigated in part by Larkin's story H. Spencer Lewis, Emperor of AMORC, published in 1931, under the pseudonym Wishar Spencie Cervé, a book entitled *Lemuria, the Lost Continent of the Pacific*, in which Mount Shasta's wonders were featured. This gave impetus to the fables. Parties went to Mt. Shasta to find the Lemurians, while adventurers made some money by organizing parties to seek for purported hidden treasures and decamping with the funds. Finally one G. W. Ballard, alias Godfré Ray King, wrote a most entertaining but preposterous book purporting to be a true story of his miraculous adventures on Mount Shasta with an "Ascended Master", Saint Germain. Meanwhile, however, merchants and newspaper editors in the vicinity of Mount Shasta, in reply to inquiries, stated that there was no truth in the stories and that there was nothing unusual about the mountain. The California state forester in charge of Mount Shasta, who knows every foot of the region, absolutely denied the veracity of the stories about a mysterious people living on its slopes. These correspondents regarded the stories as gotten up by enterprising writers to sell.

The Emperor Gets Cold Feet

All of these things were a bit too much for Emperor Lewis. He didn't intend to start such a hubbub and, apparently, didn't expect to have a rival like the Ballards who made use of Mount Shasta as the foundation of a cult which might withdraw the patronage of the credulous from AMORC. Consequently in his July *Rosicrucian Digest* (p. 232) under the title "The 'Great Master' Hoax" he expressed his regret at having mentioned Mount Shasta in his book. He says in part (p. 234):

"But we never suspected that sane men and women would believe one-tenth of the foolish, fantastic, extremely improbable stories that a score of individuals and groups have invented in the past two years and issued for the purpose of leading men and women to the foothills of Mount Shasta, and incidentally leading them also into disgrace, dishonor, imprisonment and even suicide. If we could retract today everything we have ever said about Mount Shasta, we would gladly do so, and thank God for the opportunity. But the books are now in the public libraries, and the stories that have been reprinted from our book in newspapers and magazines and partly verified by recent explorations, cannot be retracted, and all we can do is to continue to republish the original statements in our book and then show by comparison with the idiotic propaganda of these other individuals and groups just how foolishly they are being misled by exaggerated statements and money-making illusions."

In short, Mr. Emperor Lewis is sorry he ever said anything about Mount Shasta and would gladly retract everything he ever wrote about it, yet he is still selling the book and advertising it in the very same issue of the *Rosicrucian Digest* and not as a remnant either. God has given him the opportunity of withdrawing it which he so much craves, but he does not avail himself of it. Why? Ask the Emperor himself.

Meanwhile the Ballards—Mr. and Mrs. Ballard and the Bellowing Boy—seem to have tired of Mount Shasta as a rendezvous for Ascended Masters—it was getting to be entirely too public—and have removed their entire outfit and stage properties to the Royal Teton, a mountain

Dr. de Purucker's "Esoteric Tradition"

The latest work of the Head of the Point Loma T. S. Two large volumes, 1109 pages text with comprehensive index of 71 pages. No matter how much you may regard as really traditional and how much as the author's contribution to occult speculation, you will find it a charming book; you may begin at the front, at the back, or in the middle, and read either way, and you will be overwhelmed with the author's erudition and may revel in his views on nearly everything. As someone said, the Doctor might write a volume on each paragraph. \$5.00, from the O. E. LIBRARY.

Tarot Cards

Pack of the 78 cards with Key book by A. E. Waite, in box \$3.00. Waite, Pictorial Key to the Tarot. Pictures of all 78 cards in the book. Text same as above. Just as good for study of Tarot symbology. \$2.10.

"You Must Eat Meat"

You Must Eat Meat, by Max E. Jutte, M. D. 175 pp. Putnam's, 1936. \$2.00, from the O. E. LIBRARY.

A popular book written by a specialist (a theosophist, by the way), dealing very simply and scientifically with the theory and facts of nutrition. Meets the vegetarian, the raw fruit, baked beans and orange juice faddists with an array of facts and figures based on the latest investigations. Explodes the uric acid theory. Gives apparently conclusive evidence that man is a flesh-eating animal and cannot depart from it without risk to health. Commended to anemic persons who make themselves still more anemic by exclusive vegetarian diet and thank God they are not sicker than they are.

"Concentration and Meditation"

Concentration and Meditation is a reprint of a remarkable series of articles prepared by the Buddhist Lodge of London and reprinted from Buddhism in England. It presents the Buddhist views and methods on these subjects and includes an account of Zen Buddhist procedure. 340 pages with glossary, bibliography, and index. Price, \$1.25, from the O. E. LIBRARY.

H. P. B.'s Introductory to "The Secret Doctrine"

The Secret Doctrine? What is it about? Read H. P. B.'s "Introductory," now reprinted in pamphlet form. Price, 20 cents.

"The Secret Doctrine"—H. P. Blavatsky

Photographic facsimile ed. of original, 2 vols. in one, \$7.50. Point Loma edition in two volumes, cloth, \$7.50, paper, \$5.00. Point Loma edition has obvious typographic errors corrected; paging same; either edition is commended. From the O. E. LIBRARY.

Theosophy or Neo-Theosophy

A set of fifty Curries comparing in parallel columns the words of the Masters and of H. P. Blavatsky with quotations from Besant, Leadbeater, etc. They prove that Besant and Leadbeater corrupted the original Theosophy. Exact references. Price, \$1.00.

H. P. Blavatsky on "Raja Yoga or Occultism"

Raja Yoga or Occultism; a collection of twelve articles by H. P. B. Bombay, 1931. Price, 75 cents, from the O. E. LIBRARY.

To follow.—Fool's Gold, a View of Ballardism; The Pseudo-scholarship of the Brothers Hare.

THE O. E. LIBRARY CRITIC

Published monthly at 1207 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

BY

The O. E. Library League

Vol. XXIV

October, 1936

No. 5

Yearly subscription, United States and Canada, fifty cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or 62 cents. Single copies, five cents. Blank (unfilled) British postal orders and stamps, Canadian paper money and stamps accepted.

THE BOGUS MAHATMIC AMERICANISMS OF THE BROTHERS HARE

And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

Mutt. vii, 3

In their recent book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters*, Harold E. and William Loftus Hare attempt to prove that the *Mahatma Letters* to A. P. Sinnett and other purported Mahatmic communications, as well as the Mahatmas themselves, are nothing but frauds invented by H. P. Blavatsky. One of their arguments is that these pretended personalities, natives of India and living in Tibet, do not write in an oriental style at all. While they write "a sort of English", their style is western and, indeed, to some extent American, which proves that they were invented by H. P. B. (a Russian!). In two pages of concentrated nonsense (pp. 119, 120) they provide us with a list of Americanisms used by the Mahatmas M. and K. H., twenty-seven in all. In order not to risk doing the authors an injustice I quote their own words, under the caption "Transatlantic Elements":

"We must now remark upon another component of these polyglot pages; which, though Western, and a sort of English, we must for convenience (and we hope without offence) call 'American'. Here follow a few gleanings in this field."

Let us examine these purported Americanisms, all of which will be found quoted in the two pages mentioned. I shall show that virtually all of them are not American, but good, sound British English, used by standard English writers. For the citations in rebuttal I am largely indebted to the great Oxford English Dictionary, edited by Sir James A. H. Murray, and the recognized authority in England, as well as to the Century Dictionary. The citations from Shakespeare I have copied direct from the First Folio Edition of Shakespeare's Plays, 1623, photographic facsimile published by Methuen and Co., 1910. It must be remembered that later editions of Shakespeare and of some of the other authors quoted frequently change the spelling, notably of the two words in question, "skeptick" and "checkered". Every effort has been made to quote the original spelling. The dates in the margin are the original dates of publication as nearly as can be ascertained.

1. *Skeptick* vs. *Sceptic*—*Skeptickism* vs. *Sceptickism*. Say the Hares: "the words 'skeptick' (pp. 1, 3, 5) and 'skeptickism' (pp. 4, 35) tell their own tale." Quite so, and the tale is not creditable to the scholarship of the Brothers Hare, who add: "Evidently she [H. P. B.] had forgotten that Webster had already adopted her own and K. H.'s 'psychological whim' by calling 'sceptic' a variant of 'skeptick.'" Please remember that Noah Webster published his *Compendious Dictionary of the English Language* in 1806. Are these "awkward k's"—to use the Hares' expression—an Americanism? No, they are not. The *Oxford Dictionary* says:

"The spelling with *sk*, for which cf. *Skeleton*, occurs in the earliest instance, and has been used occasionally by later writers. It is adopted without comment or alternative in Johnson's Dictionary [Dr. Samuel Johnson, publ. 1755], but did not become general in England; in the U. S. it is the ordinary form."

The 4th edition of Dr. Johnson's Dictionary, 1770, admits "sceptick" but refers to "skeptick", which is preferred, for the definition. As examples of British use I cite:

1598 JOHN MARSTON, *The Scourge of Villanie*, I, ii, 174:
"Fye, Gallus, what, a Skeptick Pyrrhomist."

1631-1700 DRYDEN, *Lucian*:
"All knowing ages being naturally skeptick."

1847 WHEWELL, *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*:
"This doctrine, taken in conjunction with the known scepticism of the author on religious points . . ." (Vol. I, p. 171).
". . . . The Utilitarian's skeptical hypotheses" (Vol. II, p. 465). "There is by no means any ground of general skepticism" (Vol. II, p. 655).

We see, then, that the "awkward k" was the early English form, far antedating Webster (1806), and that the Hares' charge is baseless.

2. *Checked* vs. *Chequered*.

Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 296: ". . . . the very day when the *Eclectic* sprung into its checkered existence."

Say the Hares: "'Checked' (p. 296) is another Webster-warranted word in the Mahatma's vocabulary." That means it is an Americanism. But it is also "warranted" in good classical British use from as early as 1485 at least, through Shakespeare, Dickens, and many another British writer of repute. The *Oxford Dictionary* says:

"Although the spelling *checker* is historically better supported, and more in accordance with English usage, *chequer* predominates in current use; of 20 quotations since 1760, 16 have *chequer*, 2 *checker*." And as a verb the same authority says: of 100 quotations since 1755, 70 have *chequer*, 21 *checker*, 2 *chequer*."

And the *Century Dictionary*:

"Checker [also written in England *chequer*, a recent and imperfect 'restoration' of the French form.]"

Here are a few examples of many in English literature of this "Webster-warranted" spelling, this Americanism of the Mahatmas and H. P. B. 1485 *Morte Arthure*, 3268, (printed by Caxton in 1485): "chekyrde".

1486 *Book of St. Albans*:

"They be calde armys chekkerit when they ar made of ij colouris to the maner of a chekker."

Shakespeare always used the "awkward k" even though, as far as I can learn, he was not an American and was unacquainted with Noah Webster, or even with H. P. B. or the Mahatmas. There are but three instances of the word in Shakespeare, always with the "American" k; some later editions change this to *chequer*.

1597 *Romeo and Juliet*, II, iii, 2:

"The gray ey'd morne smiles on the frowning night,
Checking the Easterne Cloudes with streaks of light."

1594 *II King Henry VI*, III, i, 229:

"Or as the Snake, roll'd in a flowing Banke,
With shining checker'd slough doth sting a Child."

1594 *Titus Andronicus*, II, iii, 15:

"The greene leaves quauer with the cooling winde,
And make a cheker'd shadow on the ground."

1670 JOHN EACHARD, *Contempt of the Clergy*:

"to checker a sercion."

1699 WM. DAMPIER, *A Voyage Round the World*, II, iii, 109:

"'Tis checker'd with Natural Groves and Savannahs."

1770 THOMAS FORREST, *A Voyage to New Guinea*:

"A white ensign, bordred with a checker of blue, yellow and red."

1840 DICKENS, *Barnaby Rudge*:

"His sleep was checkered with starts and moans."

1877 C. WYVILLE THOMSON, *The Voyage of the Challenger*:

"Nine tolerable days fortunately checkered the uniformity of the heavy weather."

3. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.* p. 39: "that you, at least—mean business; that you are in right good earnest."

The *Oxford Dictionary* says, without referring to a possible American origin: "To mean business; to be in earnest (colloq.)". Also: "In good earnest: seriousness, etc."

1570 DODSLEY'S *Sel. Coll. of Old Plays; Marriage and Wit*, II, 362:

"But in good earnest, Madam, speake—off or on."

1640 MILTON, *Eikonoklastes*, xxvii:

"He acted in good earnest what Rehoboam did but threat'n."

1857 THOMAS HUGHES, *Tom Brown*, I, ix:

"I tells 'ee I mean business, and you'd better keep on your own side."

4. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 60: "Some thirty-five years back."

1787 ROBERT BURNS, *The Auld Farmer's Salutation*, iv:

"It's now some nine-an'-twenty year."

1836 MRS. CARLYLE, *Letters*, I, 56:

"We expect John Carlyle in some ten days."

1579-1623 JOHN FLETCHER, *Love's Cure*, v, 8:

"Oh, that constant time
Would but go back a week."

1799 SOUTHEY, *Letters from Spain*, 139:

"Dug up, a few years back."

1876 FREEMAN, *Norman Conquest*, III, xi, 58:

"A House which, two generations back, had been ignoble."

And many more, as "Far back in the middle ages"; "look back", etc.

5. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 202: "considering how tight the negotiations for the *Phoenix*-capital prove."

The *Oxford Dictionary* says: "Tight, said of a contest in which the combatants are evenly matched; close, so of a bargain . . . originally American." Quite so but evidently adopted in England long before the *Mahatma Letters* were written.

1846 *Daily News*, London, Jan. 21:

"In Paris money is 'tight' also."

1866 CRUMP, *Banking*, v, 152:

"A tight money market."

1867 TROLLOPE, *Last Chronicle of Barset*, xlii:

"I never knew money to be so tight."

1868 LEVER, *Brambleighs*, I, xvi, 219:

"Money was 'tight' being the text of all he said."

6. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 263: "the hopes of their original backers."

1588 ANTHONY BARRINGTON, *Command*, 380:

"A backer to beare out my foule oppressions."

1838 DICKENS, *Nicholas Nickleby*, I, i:

"When fortune is low and backers scarce."

1850 LYTTON, *My Novel*, IX, ix, 85:

"Take any odds against him that his backers may give."

7. Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 270: "if he would not break with the whole shop altogether."

1837 DICKENS, *Sketches by Boz: Drunkards Death*:

"And what does he want? . . . money? meat? drink? He's come to the wrong shop . . ."

- 1838 DICKENS, *Nicholas Nickleby*, iv:
 "They have come to the right shop for morals."
 8. Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 271: "We will split the difference and shake our astral hands . . . and square the discussion."
Oxford Dictionary says: "To split the difference, to halve an amount in dispute between parties . . . to compromise on this basis."
 Before 1778 Wm. Pitt, *Speeches*, I, 85:
 "The common course, when parties disagreed, was what the vulgar phrase called 'to split the difference'."
 1787 GEORGE SMYTH, *The Generous Attachment*, (play), I, 213:
 "My aunt, coming in, began to split the difference."
 1816 WHATELY, *Rhetoric*:
 "The result will usually be, after much debate, something of what is called 'splitting the difference'."
 "Square the discussion": *Oxford Dictionary* says: "Colloquial. To put a matter straight; to settle satisfactorily; to compound."
 1825 WALTER SCOTT, *Journal*, Dec. 7th:
 "Square the odds."
 10. "Promise" in the sense of "assure". Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 271:
 "And I like it all the more I promise you." American? No, it is Shakespeare, Addison, Fielding, Sheridan, Thackeray.
 1598 SHAKESPEARE, *Much Ado About Nothing*, IV, ii, 47:
 "Pray thee fellow peace, I do not like thy looke I promise thee."
 1733 ADDISON, *Italy*, 211:
 "For, I promise, I long for it."
 1749 FIELDING, *Tom Jones*, XVIII, i:
 "promise thee it is what I have desired."
 1777 SHERIDAN, *School for Scandal*, iv, 3:
 "I promise you I don't think near so ill of you as I did."
 1862 THACKERAY, *The Roundabout Papers, Peal of Bells*:
 "Magnificent dandies, I promise you, some of us were."
 11. Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 272: "Only, look out sharp."
 The *Oxford Dictionary* under "Sharp" says: "Phrase, to keep a sharp look-out."
 1828 P. CUNNINGHAM, *New South Wales*, (3d ed.), II, 333:
 "he will naturally keep a sharp look-out."
 1889 JESSOPP, *Coming of Priars*, iii, 138:
 "The bishop kept a sharp look-out upon them."
 12. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 289: "I have very little time to explore back letters."
Oxford Dictionary quotes as examples *back rent*, *back years*.
 13. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 39: "her nerves are worked to a fiddle string." Possibly of American origin, but long ago adopted into British. Thus:
 1835 Mrs. CARLYLE, *Letters*, I, 43:
 "I do but fret myself to fiddlestrings."
 14. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 40: "the Elementary Spooks."
 Spook is neither English nor American; it is Dutch for ghost. *Oxford Dictionary* says: "First in American usage." As to how it came to be used in America authorities differ, but it has long been adopted in British usage, including writers dealing with Dutch South Africa. I cite two Scottish translators of Goethe in 1859:
 1859 W. S. AYTOUN and L. MARTIN, tr. *Goethe's Poems and Ballads*. The line in Goethe's "Der Zauberlehrling" (Magician's Apprentice), "Gleich, o Kobold, liegst du nieder" is translated "Lie, thou spook, there."
 1873 J. B. STEPHENS, *The Black Gin and Other Poems*, II, (Melbourne, Australia).
 "I am haunted by a spook."
 1878 AYLWARD, *Transvaal of Today*, 213:
 "I became acquainted with a spook story."

- 1883 OLIVE SCHREINER, *Story of an African Farm*, II, ii:
 ". . . knew it was your father coming to 'spook' her."
 15. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 67: "it is extinguished, or as H. P. B. has it—snuffed out."
 1687 MIBOE, *St. French Dict.*, II:
 "To snuff out the Candle."
 1819 BYRON, *Don Juan*, xi, 60:
 "'Tis strange the mind, that very fiery particle,
 Should let itself be snuffed out by an article."
 1841 DICKENS, *Barnaby Rudge*, iii:
 "Slight yellow specks, that seemed to be rapidly snuffed out one by one."
 16. "Humdrum" in the sense of "commonplace". Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 196: "some hum-drum person, some colourless, flackless personality." Is that an Americanism? It is not. It is Ben Jonson, Samuel Butler, Sheridan.
 1598 BEN JONSON, *Every Man in His Humour*, I, i:
 "By gadslid, I scorne it, I, I doe, to be a consort for every hum-drum."
 1763-78 BUTLER, *Hudibras*, I, iii, 112:
 "Shall we, (quoth she), stand still hum-drum?"
 1775 SHERIDAN, *The Rivals*, ii, 1:
 "A regular humdrum weddlug."
 "Flackless" does not occur in any dictionary, English or American, and is possibly an error for "flaccid".
 17. Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 256: "he was in the wrong box." American? No.
 About 1555 BISHOP NICHOLAS RIDLEY (burned 1555), *Works*, p. 163:
 "You shall perceve that you are in the wrong box."
 1588 JOHN UDALL, *Diotrephes*, p. 31:
 "I perceive that you and I are in a wrong box."
 18. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 312: "What a Yankee would call 'a blazing cock-a-hoop'". A Yankee, perhaps, but also Shakespeare and Butler, and as for "blazlug", Tindale and Coverdale. Witness:
 1533 TINDALE, *Answer to More's Dial.*, Works, III:
 "The blasing hypocrites."
 1549 COVERDALE, *Erasmus, Paraphrase*, 2 Cor., xii, 12:
 "Let them never so much with their blasyng wordes boaste themselves."
Oxford Dictionary defines "blazing" as "Boastful, 'blowing their own trumpet'."
 1597 SHAKESPEARE, *Romeo and Juliet*, I, v, 83:
 "Youle make Mutlinie among the Guests:
 You will set cocke a hoope, youle be the man."
 1603-78 BUTLER, *Hudibras*:
 "And having routed a whole troop,
 With victory was cock-a-hoop."
 19. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 326: "he can play the deuce with yourself and society."
 1763 GEORGE COLMAN (Sr.), *Deuce in Him*:
 "If our author don't produce
 Some character that plays the deuce."
 1810-24 BYRON, *Don Juan*, xv, lvii:
 "His fame too—for he had that kind of fame
 Which sometimes plays the deuce with womankind."
 20. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 370: "as the Americans would say—the fix I am in" (in original, "the fix I am in.")
Oxford Dictionary says: "original U. S." but it is evidently British since De Quincey (1785-1859).
 1812 BARRIAM, *Ingoltsby Legends, St. Medard*:
 "a stranger there, Who seemed to have got himself into a fix."

Also, in the same, II, 156:

"It's 'a pretty particular Fix,'"

About 1852 DE QUINCEY:

" . . . he is in an almighty fix."

1873 WM. BLACK, *A Princess of Thule*, vii, 101:

"And this is the fix you wish me to help you out of?"

21. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 391: "the 'Almighty Smash' that is in store for them."

1798 CHARLOTTE SMITH in *The Young Philosopher*: "Broke to smash."

1830 JOHN GALT in *Lawrie Todd*: "Immortal smash."

1849 CHARLOTTE BRONTE in *Shirley*: " . . . shivered to smash."

About 1850 THACKERAY in *Letters*: "I have made an awful smash."

1857 THOMAS HUGHES, *Tom Brown*, II, ii:

"The door panels were in a normal state of smash."

1883 STEVENSON, *Treasure Island*, v:

"You cannot imagine a house in such a state of smash."

Nor are "mighty" and "almighty" American. Besides De Quincey, cited above, "he is in an almighty fix", we find Matthew Prior (1664-1721) in *Daphne and Apollo* saying: "You have 'em mighty cheap at Pekin fair," and Sheridan, in *The Rivals* (iv, 3; 1775) writing: "There is a probability of succeeding about that fellow that is mighty provoking."

22. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 37: " . . . is, I am sorry to say, a true skunk *mephitis*". Here we must yield to the Hare Brothers. The skunk is an American animal, and the only applications to offensive persons that I can locate are in American literature, which is not saying that the British have not adopted this very useful colloquialism—they need it. (I have just located it in Australia.)

23. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 176: "'Then and there' in the eternity may be a mighty long period." This the Hares call "an example of the French and American styles in graceful fusion." Where is the French and where the American? As for the "mighty" see above. The *Oxford Dictionary* gives quotations showing the British use of "then and there" as early as 1436, *e. g.*:

1436 *Rolls of Parliament*, IV, 498: "yen yere" and the same, V, 42/1:

1442 " . . . was thenne and there graunted."

24. Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 256: "If the laugh is not turned on the Statesman . . ."

1771 SMOLLETT, *The Expedition of Humphrey Clinker*:

"He . . . found great difficulty in turning the laugh upon the aggressor."

25. Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 75: " . . . he is butting against the facts."

1859 TENNYSON, *Geraint and Enid*, 1525:

"Amazed am I,

Beholding how ye butt against my wish."

26. Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 269: "send you a telegram and answer on back on't." Is that American? No, it is Shakespeare and Robert Herrick. Witness:

1623 SHAKESPEARE, *Tempest*, I, ii, 87:

"that now he was

The Iuy which had hid my princely Trunck,

And suckt my verdure out on't."

1648 ROBERT HERRICK, *The Honey-combe*:

"If thou hast found an honie-combe,

Eate thou not all, but taste on some."

27. Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 259: "And now we will talk." This is such a common expression everywhere that one can but express surprise that the Hare Brothers should set it down as peculiarly American. This completes the list of examples of Mahatmic Americanisms cited in their book.

I regret having to bore the reader with so many quotations, but it is necessary in order to expose the quality of the scholarship of the authors of this attack on the authenticity of the *Mahatma Letters*. Their aim was to prove them written by someone who had lived in America and had absorbed Americanisms unconsciously, presumably H. P. Blavatsky. What they do prove is either their crass ignorance of good usage in their own language, or, which one hopes is not the case, a wilful attempt to deceive. I may sum up the results as follows. *Of twenty-seven purported Americanisms twenty-three cannot be assigned to an American origin; three originated in America according to the Oxford Dictionary, but have long been in use in England, long enough for their nativity to have been forgotten by the users; while one only is distinctively American.*

In short, we have twenty-six flunks out of twenty-seven! In the space of two pages we find the Brothers Hare designating as "Americanisms", as "a sort of English", words, phrases and spellings used by Shakespeare and before him, by Bishop Ridley, John Udall, Tindale, Coverdale, Ben Jonson, Herrick, Samuel Butler, Dr. Samuel Johnson, Dryden, De Quincey, Barham, Smollett, Fielding, Sheridan, Wm. Pitt, Charlotte Bronte, Byron, Mrs. Carlyle, Dickens, Tennyson and others earlier and later. I hardly know whether this exhibition of scholarship is to be regarded as pathetic or ludicrous. Further comment is needless, as the facts speak for themselves. In future articles I shall point out more of the misstatements and puerilities which characterize this book.

"Back to Blavatsky"

The above title first appeared in the *Curric* of November 14th, 1917, over a short list of books recommended to those who would know what Theosophy really is as taught by the earlier writers. It was stated that:

"As an antidote to the pseudo-theosophical doctrines now being put forward by certain leaders of the T. S., who are using their position and influence to push the Society into the arms of the Catholic Church, I recommend the study of the following books . . ."

As the slogan "Back to Blavatsky" soon came to be widely used and is current today, it may be of interest to state briefly how it originated. In those days H. P. Blavatsky was nearly forgotten. Both *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine* were out of print, except the editions issued by the much maligned Katherine Tingley, of Point Loma; and, you must know, no properly trained theosophist of the Adyar T. S. at that time would touch anything issuing from that source even with a pair of tongs. I knew plenty of people at that time who distinctly stated that they would rather do without *The Secret Doctrine* at all than read any edition that has passed through the hands of Mrs. Tingley.

In T. S. lodges *The Secret Doctrine* was almost forgotten. It was a rare and valuable book, so rare and valuable that it was usually kept—I can certify to my own experience in that respect—locked up on the top shelf of the lodge junk closet. It might be had on special request to the librarian, that is, if she could find it, but it must not be taken from the room under any circumstances. Novices who wanted to read it were told that it was entirely too deep for them—wouldn't they like to read Annie Besant's *Ancient Wisdom*? As for Judge's *Ocean of Theosophy*, that couldn't be had at the book table even on order; we don't approve of him, don't you know. H. P. B.'s *Key to Theosophy* was in a stultic state of opprobrium and rumors were circulated from Adyar book headquarters that it, too, was out of print, which was not true. In short, every effort was made, presumably by superior orders, to press the sale of the books of Besant and Leadbeater and to discourage the reading of the older theosophical literature. C. W. Leadbeater, popularly supposed to be "on the threshold of Divinity"—for didn't Annie Besant say so in those very words—issued a list of recommended books in a small concoction entitled *A primer of Theosophy*, which concluded with saying

Are the Mahatmas Fact or Fiction?

The recent attempt of the Hare Brothers to discredit the Mahatma Letters, to prove H. P. Blavatsky a common swindler who invented the Masters for her own purposes, and to knock the props from under the Theosophical Movement, makes the following books of great importance at the present time. Theosophists who are unwilling to play the ostrich stunt should know about these letters and the strong evidence for their authenticity; they should be prepared to defend their position by knowing the facts, not by accepting the authority of some leader. For this purpose the following books are recommended, all obtainable from the O. E. LIBRARY:

The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett, ed. by A. T. Barker; the most important theosophical book of this century, \$7.50.

Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom, Vol. I, ed. by Jinarajadasa, \$1.25.

Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom, Vol. 11, ed. by Jinarajadasa, with many facsimiles, \$2.00.

Specially in defense:

Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?, by Jinarajadasa; 30 facsimiles of Mahatmic letters compared with facsimiles of writing of H. P. B., Damodar, Olcott, etc., with elucidative text. \$1.25.

H. P. Blavatsky and the Masters of the Wisdom. 1907 Transactions Blavatsky Lodge, London, ed. by Besant. Actual, not speculative, evidence of the existence of Mahatmas. Paper, 50 cents.

Also, the Hare book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, \$3.75.

Back to Blavatsky—Books by Mrs. A. L. Cleather

H. P. Blavatsky; A Great Retrayal, paper, 50 cents. One of the best exposures of the vagaries of Neo-theosophy and of immoral tendencies in the T. S.

H. P. Blavatsky; Her Life and Work for Humanity, boards, \$1.25. An expansion of a series of articles written for the *Maha Bodhi* journal at the request of the Ven. Anagarika Dharmapala. The best brief account of H. P. B.

H. P. Blavatsky as I Knew Her, boards \$1.25.

Raphaels and Heindels for 1937

Raphael, ephemeris, 50 cents; almanac, 35 cents; combined almanac and ephemeris, 70 cents. *Heindel*, ephemeris, 25 cents. Back years. *Raphael*, ephemeris (from 1830) and *Heindel*, ephemeris (from 1858) same prices. Ask for list.

"The Sayings of The Ancient One"

This long awaited book has now been published. Captain F. G. Bowen, a British officer stationed in Africa, translates portions of an ancient manuscript in the possession of a mysterious and learned Berber whom he met among the Bantus of South Africa and with whom he spent several years as a learner. The selections, while partly allegorical, present a most striking resemblance to *Light on the Path* and point to an ancient and possibly independent esoteric school in South Africa. "The Sayings" are pure gold and form one of the most impressive and important esoteric publications, fit to rank with *The Voice of the Silence* and *Light on the Path*. Price, \$1.25, from the O. E. LIBRARY. Also, by the same, *The True Occult Path*, 15 cents, stamps.

Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the "Mahatma Letters"?

This important series of articles by Mr. Jinarajadasa on the genuineness of the Mahatma Letters, published in *The Theosophist* and reviewed in the Jan.-Feb. *CRITIC*, has been issued in book form. Thirty facsimiles of letters by six different Masters, by H. P. B. and Damodar, and other pertinent matter. Price, \$1.25, from the O. E. LIBRARY.

THE O. E. LIBRARY CRITIC

Published monthly at 1207 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

BY

The O. E. Library League

Vol. XXIV

November, 1936

No. 6

Yearly subscription, United States and Canada, fifty cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or 62 cents. Single copies, five cents. Blank (unfilled) British postal orders and stamps, Canadian paper money and stamps accepted.

CHOICE TITBITS FROM THE HARES' BOOK ON "THE MAHATMA LETTERS"

The recent book of the Messrs. Hare attacking the authenticity of the Mahatma Letters and endeavoring to prove these letters, as well as the Mahatmas themselves, pure inventions of H. P. Blavatsky, is written with such an air of assurance, such a parade of what looks at first inspection to be genuine scholarship, that it is likely to deceive even the elect. In fact, the authors have covered their work with a veneer of learning which is likely to dissuade casual readers, yes, even students, from looking beneath the surface. Should they examine it carefully they will discover a mass of erroneous statements, some of little importance, others of vital bearing on the topic, a collection of piddling arguments which make one wonder how the authors could have had the courage—or shall I say effrontery?—to pass them on the public. To enumerate all of these would be quite beyond the scope of the *CRITIC's* space. It is possible, however, to mention a few, and if I have called these "choice titbits" I must also say that they are what may be designated as "the run of the mine". Some of these have been treated separately, as for instance, the purported "Americanisms" of the Mahatmas (October *CRITIC*), supposed to prove the Letters to have been written by someone who had lived in America, but which prove on examination to be no Americanisms at all. Page references are to the Hare book unless otherwise stated. "H. L." refers to *The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett*, and "B. L." to *The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett*.

False Dates

Pp. 249-250. Here we find the most astonishing perversion of dates, which can only be explained either by the mental irresponsibility of the Hare Brothers, or by a deliberate intention to deceive the reader for the purpose of blackening the character of H. P. Blavatsky. Unwilling to accept the latter view I must regretfully adopt the former. The case is this:

In the *CRITIC* of June-July and of August-September I referred to a letter received at Adyar in 1886 by Colonel Olcott from Tookaram Tatya, on the blank back of which appeared a letter in the well-known K. H. script, which was not there when Mr. Tatya mailed it, but was there when Olcott received it. A photograph of this letter appears in Jinarajadasa, *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol II, facing page 14, and is numbered "Letter 2". On this photograph is endorsed, in the clearest possible handwriting: "Received and opened by me this 7th June 1886. H. S. Olcott". There can be no possible doubt about the date—1886. Notwithstanding this visible evidence, the Hares, who prove that they had the letter before them, for they refer to it as "Letter II" in the above book, and make comments on the style of handwriting, state:

"Letter II is signed 'K. H.' and dated 1876; it is in similar hand-

writing to No. 1 [the Fadéef letter of 1870], though written in a freer style."

1876!—when it is distinctly dated 1886; and this is not a typographical error, for on the next page the Hares say:

"If the dates of Letters II and XXVIII are genuine, we learn from them that these Masters were invented and named in America."

Now H. P. B. and Olcott were in America in 1876, while Olcott was in India and H. P. B. in Germany in June, 1886. The Hares have deliberately moved the date back ten years in order to make a case against H. P. B. Further, of the "Letter XXVIII", mentioned by the Hares as just quoted, and which they also had before them in photographic facsimile in the same book (p. 81), commenting on the handwriting, they say; "(the date is given as October 3rd, 1879." This is false; the letter bears no date whatever. Further, the date "October 3rd, 1879", attributed to this letter by the Hares, is the date of an entirely different letter received by Olcott in India, as shown in Jinarajadasa's book just mentioned, page 81.

In short, the Hares, who should have known that in October, 1879, H. P. B. and Olcott were in Bombay, and that in June, 1886, Olcott was at Adyar and H. P. B. in Germany, juggle the dates so as to delude the unwary reader into the idea that the letters were written, and the Masters invented and named in America! Further, while asserting that the Mahatma K. H. was "invented and named in America", they refer (p. 249) to the Fadéef letter in the same handwriting, received in 1870. I am quite sure that if anyone should come into court as a witness with such stuff he would either be held for perjury or sent to an insane asylum for observation.

The facsimile of the Tookaram Tatya letter, dated by Olcott 1886, which the Hare Brothers change to 1876, can also be found in Jinarajadasa's *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?*, p. 23 and facing page 24.

Here are some other dates jumbled by the Hare Brothers:

P. 299. "In the eleventh year of the Society (1886) Madame Blavatsky published *The Secret Doctrine* . . ." Not so. The preface to the original, or first edition, signed by H. P. B., is dated "London, October, 1888".

P. 314. "Twenty-five years after the foundation of the Theosophical Society, Madame Blavatsky died . . ."

Not so. The Society was founded in 1875 and this would place H. P. B.'s death in 1900. In fact, she died May 8th, 1891, a fact which W. L. Hare, at one time "Member of the National Council of the T. S. in England, Vice-President of the London Federation, Director of Studies in Comparative Religion and Philosophy to the T. S. in England and Wales from 1916 to 1919", as he announced himself elsewhere, should certainly know, especially as that date is annually commemorated in all Theosophical Societies as "White Lotus Day".

P. 300. "The publication in 1924 of the Blavatsky letters . . ." Not so. One has but to refer to that volume, back of title page, to read: "First published in 1925".

Pp. 246-248. The Hares present a facsimile of "a letter in the undoubted 'K. H.' hand, believed to have been addressed, about April 6, 1885, to Dr. Franz Hartmann, author of *Magic, White and Black*, who was at that time in partial control of the Theosophical Headquarters at Adyar." They also repeat the date. Now at that time Dr. Hartmann was not in India, much less in control at Adyar, as Olcott had returned from a visit to Europe. Jinarajadasa, in *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol. II, (p. 143)—a book which the Hares had before them—says "Early in 1884", which is correct, as at that time Olcott and H. P. B. were in Europe, and Hartmann was one of the temporary managing committee.

P. 282. ". . . the Theosophical Society was founded in 1875, at which time it consisted virtually of no one but the founders." Very true, but who ever heard of a society consisting of any but its founders when it was founded? This is what the Hares would call "a sort of English".

P. 282. "The Mahatma Letters only began to appear after the migration to India in 1880." Now "the migration to India" occurred in December, 1878. And yet the Hares, see above, actually change the date of a Mahatma letter from 1886 to 1876 in order to make it appear to have been written in America, and mentioned the Fadéef letter written in 1870! This is also what my be described as "a sort of English." They have described several Mahatma letters written long before 1880. Do they mean all Mahatma letters, or only those to Sinnett? More muddling.

P. 295. "Truth to tell, the Tibetan Brothers made their virtual exit as long ago as the year 1884 . . . Koot Hoomi's last letter reached London some time in the following year." Not so. The K. H. letter written on one of Tookaram Tatya (see above) was received June, 1886; another from K. H. was received on shipboard by Olcott in August, 1888; another dated June, 1886, is mentioned by Jinarajadasa in *Letters from the Masters*, Vol I, p. 98. This takes no account of the communications in the early nineties associated with W. Q. Judge, the authenticity of which has been questioned.

Some of these false dates—but not the first—are of trivial importance, merely illustrating the carelessness with which this libelous book of the Hares was thrown together. On reading page 57, however, one is reminded of the old proverb warning people who live in glass houses not to throw stones. Mahatma K. H. is taken to task for the statement (*Mahatma Letters*, p. 2) that Francis Bacon helped to found the Royal Society in 1662, whereas he died in 1626. Fie! Such mistakes by an omniscient Tibetan Mahatma? Somebody must have invented him, and it was obviously H. P. Blavatsky. I concede the error, but am wondering whether some many years hence, if the Hare book is still a standard authority among those who would demolish Theosophy, the theory will not be put forth that somebody invented the Hare Brothers. Do they not say that H. P. B. died in 1900, while in reality she died in 1891? Sauce for the goose, sauce for the gander.

"Biblical References"

Pp. 199-202. The Brothers Hare take the Mahatmas and H. P. B. to task for using incorrect scriptural quotations. This proves not only that the Mahatmas were ignorant—not having the Christian Bible *verbatim* in their heads—but that they were the invention of H. P. B. herself. They attempt to convince the reader by means of fictitious references and exaggerated assertions that the Mahatmas misquoted scripture in identically the same way as did H. P. B., thus proving that the same person wrote the Mahatma Letters and the Blavatsky Letters. Most of us, I suppose, when desiring to express some sentiment which is a universal possession, but which occurs in the Bible, are prone to adopt a more or less biblical form of expression. But we do not, at least in letter writing or conversation, reach for our King James Version and with the aid of a concordance seek out the exact verse and words where this occurs. Why should we? The Hares' argument would prove that the author of the Sermon on the Mount was misquoting the *Dhammapada*. Let us consider these instances of "misquotation", omitting only a few which have no special significance, because of lack of space, and placing them in parallel with the scriptural passages which the Hares cite:

"Blavatsky and the Bible"

<i>Blavatsky</i>	<i>The Bible</i>
<i>B. L.</i> , p. 8: "All this is vexation of spirit and vanity and nothing else."	<i>Ecclesiastes</i> , 4, 14: "Behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit."

B. L., p. 24: ".....to throw their personalities to the dogs to rent them."

B. L., p. 43: "The God of Israel who loved his son so well that he sent him to be crucified."

The Theosophist, April, 1924: "They that be whole need not the physician, but they that be sick." [Note. This is not to be found in April, 1924, *Theosophist*.]

Grossly unfair is the Hares' quotation from B. L., p. 124: "One or other of the London Potiphars." To this they add the comment; "Potiphar's wives, surely." To make a fool of H. P. B. they do not finish her sentence which is, continued: "One of these days one or the other of these London Potiphars shall turn round in her fury and act like Mrs. Potiphar of the Pharaohs . . ." And her words are correct according to current usage. Don't these Hare Brothers know that Mr. Jones' wife is a Jones, and Mr. Potiphar's wife a Potiphar?

B. L., p. 198. " . . . like Jehovah and Eve before they were split into two by sin." To this the Hare Brothers add the comment: "Adam and Eve, surely." Not so, it is just the Hares displaying their ignorance. Space is lacking here to discuss the subject, but if the reader will turn to *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. II (orig. ed., p. 124; rev. ed., p. 131), the section on "The Divine Hermaphrodite", he will find that she meant exactly what she was saying, and gives her reasons. "Hovah" means Eve. On the other hand the Hares fail to give any scriptural reference to Adam and Eve being split into two by sin. My Bible says it was a surgical operation on Adam's rib by the Lord. The Hares are distinctly libeling the Almighty; they identify him with sin.

P. 201. Under the caption "Blavatsky and the Bible" the Hares cite the following by H. P. B., giving the indefinite reference "Th., p. 248" which effectually prevents checking:

"Your scientists . . . generally bowled out 'Eureka' when they ought to remember that even the Alpha did not hold quite secure in their empty heads."

On this the Hares comment: "Alpha and Eureka? Surely not." The poor old ignoramus should have said "Alpha and Omega", which at least would suggest scripture. But she meant just what she said. Read the paragraph in *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 559, quoted from Henry Alabaster's *Wheel of the Law* and a sentiment attributed to Buddha:

"Do not believe in guesses, that is, assuming something at hazard as a starting point, and then drawing conclusions from it—reckoning your two and your three and your four before you have fixed your number one."

"The Mahatmas and the Bible"

Turning to the gross scriptural blunders of the Mahatmas, according to the Brothers Hare, we find the following cited:

The Mahatmas

K. H. in B. L., p. 7: "Spirit is strong but flesh is weak."

K. H. in M. L., p. 28: "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther."

K. H. in M. L., p. 142: "The ways of the Lord are inscrutable."

The Bible

Matt. xxvi, 41: "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."

Job, xxxviii, 11: "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no farther."

Rom. xi, 33: "How unsearchable are his judgements, and his ways past finding out."

Matt., vii, 6: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you."

John, iii, 16: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son . . ."

Matt., ix, 12: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick."

K. H. in M. L., p. 317: "To be all to everyone and all things."

K. H. in M. L., p. 53: "God who hath made the eye, shall he not see?"

Here the joke is on the Hare Brothers again, for K. H. is not attempting to quote Scripture, but says distinctly that he is quoting Dr. Clarke (Dr. Samuel Clarke's essay, "A Discourse concerning the Being and Attributes of God", Boyle Lectures, 1704-5).

K. H. in M. L., p. 268: "They that be whole need not the physician but they that be sick."

Note this last. The Hares say (p. 200): ". . . we are about to give instances from H. P. B. and the Mahatmas, in which all but two out of twenty-four citations are incorrect, while several of these are identical on both sides of the parallel"—by "parallel" meaning between H. P. B. and the Mahatmas. Several? It would indeed be a feather in the Hare cap if they could prove that H. P. B. and the Mahatmas both repeatedly quoted Scripture incorrectly and in identical words. They say "several are identical". The fact is that only one case is given, that of the physician, as above, and the reference to H. P. B. having used it is a false one, not to be found in the place mentioned. This can only be designated as a plain lie.

Further:

Master Serapis, Letters from the Masters, Vol. II, p. 46: "Brother Henry must have the wisdom of the serpent and the gentleness of a lamb."

1 Cor., ix, 2:2: "I am made all things to all men."

Psalms, xciv, 9: "He that formed the eye, shall he not see?"

Matt., ix, 12: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick."

Matt., x, 16: "Be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves."

This last, with which I must close this special topic, is truly delightful. Hereafter, would you speak of gentleness, you must not mention lambs, you must say "doves". Otherwise you may have the Hare Brothers down on you for misquoting Scripture!

A further selection of "Choice Titbits from the Hare Brothers" will follow, some of which are even more delectable.

Fools' Gold

The "I AM" Experiences of Mr. G. W. Ballard (Godfré Ray King); An Analysis by Dr. Gerald B. Bryan, Brochure No. 1, 50 pages.

The "I AM" Teachings of Mr. G. W. Ballard (Godfré Ray King); An Analysis by Dr. Gerald B. Bryan. Brochure No. 2, 48 pages.

Each 35 cents (postage extra, 2 cents), from the O. E. LIBRARY.

Of late one reads occasional references in theosophical journals to a certain new gospel that is being preached in this country, but the warnings are likely to lack effectiveness because no mention is made of the names or whereabouts of the New Messiahs. To my mind this is a poor way of combating error. As well indulge in denunciations of fraudulent remedies or stock companies without mentioning them by name. What has even as much impressed me in this connection is the prevalence of the notion that any amount of error and nonsense can be justified and defended on the plea that it contains a modicum of truth, or at least, something which is thought helpful by those accepting it. A curious attitude, surely. It amounts to asserting that falsehood can be justified by adding a strain of truth; it is equivalent to maintaining that a glass of poison—and falsehood is that in the end—can be rendered harmless by adding a little sugar. Do not these persons know that just as the bitterness of the poison is concealed by the addition of sweetness, so it is, and always has been, the policy of purveyors of folly and fraud

Some Special Theosophical Classics

- Blavatsky, H. P.*—Key to Theosophy, photo. facsimile of original, \$2.00. Theosophical Glossary, photo. facsimile of original, \$2.00. The Voice of the Silence, Cleather-Crump ed. with notes, \$1.00; McKay ed., fabricoid, \$0.75. Both reprints of original.
- Isis Unveiled, two photo. facsimiles of original; U. L. T. ed., \$7.50; in Complete H. P. B. Series, \$5.00.
- The Secret Doctrine, photo. facsimile of original, \$7.50.
- Five Addresses to American Theosophists, ppr., \$0.25.
- Collins, Mabel*—Light on the Path, fabricoid, \$0.75.
- Through the Gates of Gold, \$1.50.
- Idyll of the White Lotus, \$1.35.
- Crosbie, Robert*—The Friendly Philosopher, (collected papers), \$3.00.
- Bhagavad Gita—Judge version, \$1.00; Johnston version, \$1.25; Edwin Arnold's poetical version (Song Celestial), cloth, \$1.00; red leather, \$1.65.
- Rowe, T. Subba*—Lectures on Philosophy of Bhagavad Gita; Adyar ed with biographical sketch, \$1.25; Pt. Loma ed., with Glossary and Index, \$1.00.
- Patanjali*—Yoga Aphorisms, Judge version, \$1.00; Johnston version, \$1.25.

"Unmerited Suffering and Karma"

We have left a few of Oscar Ljungström's interesting discussion of this subject. A copy free on request. A stamp appreciated.

"The Sayings of The Ancient One"

This long awaited book has now been published. Captain P. G. Bowen, a British officer stationed in Africa, translates portions of an ancient manuscript in the possession of a mysterious and learned Berber whom he met among the Bantus of South Africa and with whom he spent several years as a learner. The selections, while partly allegorical, present a most striking resemblance to *Light on the Path* and point to an ancient and possibly independent esoteric school in South Africa. "The Sayings" are pure gold and form one of the most impressive and important esoteric publications, fit to rank with *The Voice of the Silence* and *Light on the Path*. Price, \$1.25, from the O. E. LIBRARY. Also, by the same, *The True Occult Path*, 15 cents, stamps.

Alexis Carrel's "Man, The Unknown"

The distinguished physiologist and biologist, Dr. Alexis Carrel, has rendered a great service by writing a book which not only presents in popular form the recent achievements of science regarding the material nature of man, but which also takes account of the little known and less understood mental phenomena, such as telepathy, clairvoyance, etc. To tell and explain what we know of man's body is well, but to point out what we dimly perceive as yet, but must concede, and to do so in a strictly scientific fashion, is an exceptional accomplishment and must have called for no little courage on the part of the author. The book has attracted wide attention among theosophists, and is one of the "Adyar recommended" books and is worth study not only for its information, but for its debunking qualities. \$3.50 from the O. E. LIBRARY.

Tarot Cards

Pack of the 78 cards with Key book by A. E. Waite, in box \$3.00. Waite, Pictorial Key to the Tarot. Pictures of all 78 cards in the book. Text same as above. Just as good for study of Tarot symbology. \$2.10.

To Follow.—More Hare Flea-pickings: about Om Cherenzi; Fool's Gold; "Spain", an Appeal; Lemurians see Mt. Shasta.

THE O. E. LIBRARY CRITIC

Published monthly at 1207 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

BY

The O. E. Library League

Vol. XXIV

December, 1936

No. 7

Yearly subscription, United States and Canada, fifty cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or 62 cents. Single copies, five cents. Blank (undilled) British postal orders and stamps, Canadian paper money and stamps accepted.

THE HARE BROTHERS' ARSENAL OF "DUDS"

Some commentators on the Hare Brothers' recent book, *Who wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, have taken the attitude that the work is not worth considering and should be ignored. They overlook the fact that it is not only taken seriously by non-theosophists who still refresh themselves with the old charges of the Society for Psychical Research, and by others who read uncritically the assertions of hack book reviewers, but that even persons who have accepted the teachings of Theosophy about Mahatmas have confessed themselves unable to controvert its arguments, while still holding that no matter what the authors may say, there must be Mahatmas, H. P. B. must have been honest and the fundamentals of Theosophy must still hold. For those who believe but will not defend the word is: "You are to be congratulated on your faith, which doubtless gives you comfort, but you are not to be complimented on your indifference to the effect which this attack may have and is having on others. You may naturally have neither the time, nor the ability, nor the knowledge required for defense; if so you are not to be censured; you can do just what millions of others do—accept what has been taught you without questioning. But if you have the ability, the sources of information, the means of publication, and remain silent, then you are neglecting a sacred duty, the defense of those who are unjustly attacked, and you can reckon up the karmic results of such indifference."

Here is a book written by two men, one at least of whom has some pretensions to scholarship and who was long associated with the Theosophical Society. Certain arguments, if they can be called such, and certain facts, if they be such, are presented and are claimed by the writers to level the whole theosophical edifice with the ground (*c. g.*, pp. 19, 287). Either these facts and arguments are valid, or they are not. If they are not, they must be met face to face and confuted if one will not concede their force and the consequent annihilation of what theosophists have been accustomed to regard as the basis of their belief.

An Arsenal of Duds

"Dud" is a recent slang word meaning a supposed explosive shell or grenade which does not explode. I apply it to the Hares' arguments and facts because they are hurled at H. P. Blavatsky and the doctrine of Mahatmas and it is my aim to show that they are but imitation ammunition. The Hares rely upon three principal arguments: (1), that Mahatmas, if there be such beings, must be infallible and omniscient; if they make mistakes they are not Mahatmas; the *Mahatma Letters* contain mistakes, consequently whoever wrote them could not have been Mahatmas; (2), there are certain similarities of expression in the *Mahatma Letters* and the *Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett* and it was she who advanced the doctrine of Mahatmas, consequently she invented the Mahatmas and wrote the Letters herself; (3), some later writers and leaders, especially Annie Besant and C. W. Lead-

beater, after the death of H. P. Blavatsky, have advanced certain doctrines, notably that of Krishnamurti as World Teacher, based upon purported Mahatmic authority; these ideas have proved fallacious, consequently the whole doctrine of Mahatmas and the Theosophy based on it are knocked into smithereens, (p. 287). We may add a fourth class of argument to be found throughout the book—coarse wit combined with a cocksure conceit as to the authors' impeccable scholarship. We may summarize these arguments in this fashion:

Mahatmas can make no mistakes;

The writers of the *Mahatma Letters* make mistakes;

Consequently they are not Mahatmas.

And further:

The *Mahatma Letters* contain mistakes;

The H. P. B. Letters contain similar mistakes;

Therefore H. P. B. wrote the *Mahatma Letters*.

Straw Men

Setting up a man of straw and knocking him over is a favorite tactic and here we find it made use of to the fullest extent. The assumption is made that Mahatmas must be infallible and omniscient. This is the bug that is gnawing at the brain of the Hare Brothers from start to finish, and by proving mistakes by the Mahatmas, proving that they do not know everything, the conclusion is reached that they are not Mahatmas. This notion of omniscience and infallibility is entirely unwarranted. It seems to have been inferred in part from remarks of A. P. Sinnett (pp. 26, 28, 43), partly from the claims of Annie Besant, who was fond of speaking of Masters as "perfect men" and, perhaps, from the somewhat long association of one of the authors with theosophists with muddled ideas.

The fact is that neither H. P. B. made any claim for the infallibility of the Masters, nor do they make such claims for themselves. On the contrary they admit their fallibility on occasions (e. g. *Mahatma Letters*, pp. 181, 364). This is not the place to discuss this subject, but it might be mentioned that infallibility in one subject does not imply infallibility in all others. The most learned chemist may not be wholly trustworthy in anthropology or linguistics, nor he of the highest spiritual development an authority on botany. But this is just what the Hares assume.

We read (p. 170):

"Lastly, we ask why an omniscient Mahatma, endowed with the treasures of great dictionaries, archaic books and akasic records, walked unwarily into the pit of plagiarism"

"The above is the substance of the evidence obtained from the *Mahatma Letters* themselves in disproof of the Mahatma thesis. No Mahatmas could have written such letters. Nevertheless they were written; if not by the Mahatmas then by whom?"

The answer is easy. A few similar expressions (June-July CURRIC), a few colloquialisms in common, such as are used by every Tom, Dick and Harry, a few Gallicisms, used by both, and you have it; H. P. Blavatsky wrote the Letters; she invented the Mahatmas; she was the biggest swindler of her time and died unrepentant. And the answer is made easier by wholly ignoring the incontrovertible evidence of Mahatmic Letters in the same script which could by no possibility have been written by her (Aug.-Sept CURRIC).

Who Wrote the Hare Book?

I don't like to speak unkindly, but the Hare book contains far more mistakes than are to be found in the *Mahatma Letters*. If the Mahatmas are to be blamed for making mistakes when they had "great dictionaries, archaic books and akasic records" at their disposal, one is prompted to ask why the Hare Brothers, living in London, who had, if not akasic records, at least the great British Museum Library and the *Oxford Dic-*

tionary at their disposal, to say nothing of Latin and French dictionaries, should have made such ridiculous mistakes as they have, fathering on the Mahatmas a whole string of errors of their own, "Americanisms" which they could easily have determined to be no Americanisms at all (Oct. CURRIC), bad Latin which is not bad Latin, but good Latin and even good French, false dates of their own invention (Nov. CURRIC), charging a Mahatma with libeling Tennyson in attributing to him verses which he actually wrote (Aug.-Sept. CURRIC), and numerous other blunders designed to prove the ignorance of the Mahatmas and therefore their non-existence. Exactly the same line of argument might be used to prove the non-existence of the Brothers Hare and that some impostor wrote this book and fathered it on them.

Hare Dog-Latin vs. Mahatma Dog-Latin

Under the sub-title "The Mahatma's Dog-Latin" (pp. 125-6) the Hares present us with ten samples of "Dog-Latin" which they say, "present a remarkable series of inexcusable slips, nearly all from the hand of a graduate of a German university, who never forgets what he has once read." Very generously they concede that some of these slips may be errors in transcription by the editor of the Letters, and I, on my part, am willing to admit that the Latin of even a Mahatma may not always be faultless, especially when writing in a hurry. I cite eight of the ten damning examples quoted. (*M. L.* signifies *Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett*.)

1. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 193: "The *Modus operandus* of nature".

2. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 318: "Independent of its *modus operandus*."

This, of course, should be *modus operandi*, as the Hares point out. But they very conveniently neglect to state that on p. 144 K. H., and on p. 470 H. P. B. (who they claim wrote the above letters), write it correctly, *modus operandi*, clearly proving that the error was a mere slip of the pen. Score two for the Mahatma.

3. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 213: "Most unfortunate *qui pro quo*—"

4. Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 227: "a most unique *qui proquo*."

5. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 297: "indirectly mixed in the *qui-proquo*."

Fie! say the Hares, this is Mahatmic Dog-Latin; and from a graduate of a German university! Think of it! It should be *quid pro quo*. But the joke is on the Hares. It isn't Latin at all, "Dog" or otherwise—it's French. My French dictionary gives "Quiproquo, mistake, blunder." And if the reader will refer to the context in the *Mahatma Letters* he will see that the word "mistake" or "blunder" makes sense in all three cases, while the Latin *quid pro quo*, meaning something given in exchange for something else, would make nonsense. Score three more for the Mahatmas.

6. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 53 (first edition only), quoting Spinoza:

"praetu Deum nequi dari nequi concepi potest substantia"

This, say the Hares, is Dog-Latin and should read:

"praeter Deum neque dari, neque concepi potest substantia"

Quite right, but they do not tell us that in the revised edition (p. 53) of the Letters, of which they had knowledge, as they mention it (p. 23), the sentence is corrected to read:

"praeter Deum neque dari neque concepi potest substantia".

One error, "concepi" for "concepi", is left uncorrected, but if one will study the several facsimiles of K. H. script available in Jinarajadasa, *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?* in *Letters from the Masters*, Vol. II, and in the Hare book, p. 218, it will be seen that K. H. occasionally—as some people habitually—neglected to dot an "i", that he generally wrote his final "e" and often others like an undotted "i", that there are cases where final "er" is not to be distinguished from "u", and that therefore there is not the slightest reason for blaming the Ma-

hatma rather than the transcriber, who took the words for what they looked like. Mr. W. L. Hare, at least, should know this. I have several handwritten letters from him in which "er" is indistinguishable from "u". I must therefore decide this in favor of the Mahatma.

7. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 386: "*suppressio veri, suggestis falsi*". *Suggestis* should of course be *suggestio*. The K. H. facsimiles show cases of "o" looking like "s". *e. g.*, in the facsimile in *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?*, p. 11, line 8 from top, the second "o" in London is a perfect "s"; so also the "o" in "who", p. 12, lines 11 and 15 from top, and the "o" in "possible" on p. 13, line 10 from top. Had the Hares studied the facsimiles at their disposal they would have seen that their unfavorable and rather insulting comment is quite uncalled-for. Another point must be scored for the Mahatma.

8. Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.* p. 193: "Swimming in *adversum flumen*".

This, say the Hares, should be in *adverso flumine*. Alas and lackaday, there is no such Latin word as "flumene." It is just Hare-Dog Latin, the correct word being "flumine". And in casting this reflection on the Mahatmas the Hares have made another blunder. In *adversum flumen* is perfectly good Latin as used by the Mahatma; it was used in the same sense by the great Roman philosopher-poet, Lucretius, who may be supposed to have known his native tongue as well as, if not better than, the Brothers Hare. In his poem, *De Rerum Natura*, Book IV, line 423, we read, without giving the context:

"vis et in adversum flumen contrudere raptum,"

the Munro translation being:

"Again when our stout horse has stuck in the middle of a river and we have looked down on the swift waters of the stream, some force seems to carry athwart the current the body of the horse which is standing still and to force it rapidly up the stream . . ."

We must therefore score still another point for the Mahatma. But for the benefit of the Hares it must be said that *adverso flumine* (not flumene) is also good Latin. Thus Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, Book VI, lines 710-20:

"nam dubio procul haec adverso flabra ferunter
flumine quae gelidis ab stellis axis aguntur"

Munro's translation:

"For beyond doubt these blasts which start from the icy constellations of pole are carried right up the stream."

And Caesar's *Gallie War*, VII, 61:

"magnum ire agmen adverso flumine sonitumque remorum in eadem parte", etc.

Edward's translation:

"that a large column was moving up stream", etc.

In eight out of the ten cases cited, then, the Mahatmas win out, and the Hares present a case of their own Dog-Latin and three cases of a French word being mistaken for Mahatmic Dog-Latin. To do the Hare Brothers justice it is but fair to give the two remaining examples, their correction being in parenthesis:

Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 31: "*Missto in partis infidelium*" (*partibus*).

Mahatma M. in *M. L.*, p. 386: "*Qui bono*, then? (*cui bono*).

Whether these errors are the fault of the transcriber or the Mahatmas I think the Hares will have to settle with their Maker, though I should suggest their first preparing better in Latin and French, else they might be admonished to read *Matthew*, vii, 3.

Two Fleas Try to Bite a Mahatma

As a curiosity I cite the following. The Hare Brothers, as we have seen in their strictures on the Mahatmas and H. P. B. for misquoting Scripture when they use their own words to express scriptural ideas

(Nov. Critic), are obsessed by the thought that Mahatmas may not say anything in their own way when there is some writer they could quote, and if they do, they are charged with quoting incorrectly; they are then no Mahatmas. At the risk of taking too much space the following example is given. On page 124 we read:

"Swift's well-known but seldom correctly quoted lines on fleas suffer two violations from the Mahatma's pen. In the author's own volume (1733) the following lines are found in a satirical piece 'On Poetry':

So, Natur'lists observe, a Flea
Hath smaller Fleas that on him prey;
And these have smaller still to bite 'em,
And so proceed *ad infinitum*.

"In accordance with popular habit, Swift's lines are misquoted:

'These fleas have other fleas to bite 'em,
And these—their fleas *ad infinitum*' (*M. L.* p. 190).

"Not content with this common mistake, the Mahatma adds another of his own, in attributing the lines to Butler, for he calls his verse 'the Hudibrasian couplet'."

Now the Mahatma does not attribute the lines to Butler. If the Hares had referred to the *Oxford Dictionary* instead of their own akasic imagination, they would have seen that "Hudibrastic" (of which the Mahatma used a variation) does not mean written by Butler or contained in *Hudibras*, but "In the metre or after the manner of Hudibras . . . burlesque-heroic." Further, the observation was not original with Swift, but as he himself says, with "Natur'lists". Anybody, even a Mahatma, therefore has the right to express the idea in his own words without being guilty of misquoting.

Just to show how the observation of the "Natur'lists" can be elaborated without quoting Swift, who seems to have been the first to poetize it, I cite the English mathematician Augustus De Morgan. In his *Budget of Paradoxes*, p. 377, published in 1872, we read:

"Great fleas have little fleas upon their backs to bite 'em,
And little fleas have lesser fleas, and so *ad infinitum*.
And the great fleas themselves, in turn, have greater fleas to go on;
While these again have greater still, and greater still, and so on."

And De Morgan does not even credit Swift. And the editor of *Buddhism in England* (Nov.-Dec., 1936, p. 122) is guilty of the following literary offense against Swift:

"Big fleas have little fleas
Upon their backs to bite 'em;
And little fleas have lesser fleas
And so *ad infinitum*."

In awarding prizes for an essay on fleas I think the grand prize should go to De Morgan and the booby prize to the Hare Brothers. Their attempt to demonstrate the "Natur'lists'" observation by biting the Mahatma shows that they are not even a success as fleas.

Spain!

Editor's Note.—The Critic has received the following letter from the Spanish Committee for raising funds and supplies for the aid of the Spanish Loyalist cause and for relief purposes. Being in full sympathy with the cause of the Loyalists I take pleasure in publishing it as requested. Those interested may send donations to, or communicate with the authorized American agency, *American Friends of Spanish Democracy*, Room 414, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Spain

The civilized world cannot stay unconcerned with the intense drama which is actually taking place in Spain. The war in this country is a fight to death between the reaction which has enslaved it for centuries

Are the Mahatmas Fact or Fiction?

The recent attempt of the Hare Brothers to discredit the Mahatma Letters, to prove H. P. Blavatsky a common swindler who invented the Masters for her own purposes, and to knock the props from under the Theosophical Movement, makes the following books of great importance at the present time. Theosophists who are unwilling to play the ostrich stunk should know about these letters and the strong evidence for their authenticity; they should be prepared to defend their position by knowing the facts, not by accepting the authority of some leader. For this purpose the following books are recommended, all obtainable from the O. E. LIBRARY:

The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett, ed. by A. T. Barker; the most important theosophical book of this century, \$7.50.

Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom, Vol. I, ed. by Jinarajadasa, \$1.25.

Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom, Vol. II, ed. by Jinarajadasa, with many facsimiles, \$2.00.

Specially in defense:

Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?, by Jinarajadasa; 30 facsimiles of Mahatmic letters compared with facsimiles of writing of H. P. B., Damodar, Olcott, etc., with elucidative text. \$1.25.

H. P. Blavatsky and the Masters of the Wisdom. 1907 Transactions Blavatsky Lodge, London, ed. by Besant. Actual, not speculative, evidence of the existence of Mahatmas. Paper, 50 cents.

Also, the Hare book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, \$3.75.

Some Special Theosophical Classics

Blavatsky, H. P.—Key to Theosophy, photo. facsimile of original, \$2.00.

Theosophical Glossary, photo. facsimile of original, \$2.00.

The Voice of the Silence, Cleather-Crump ed. with notes, \$1.00; McKay ed., fabricoid, \$0.75. Both reprints of original.

Isis Unveiled, two photo. facsimiles of original; U. L. T. ed., \$7.50; in Complete H. P. B. Series, \$5.00.

The Secret Doctrine, photo. facsimile of original, \$7.50.

Five Addresses to American Theosophists, ppr., \$0.25.

Collins, Mabel—Light on the Path, fabricoid, \$0.75.

Through the Gates of Gold, \$1.50.

Idyll of the White Lotus, \$1.35.

Crosbie, Robert—The Friendly Philosopher, (collected papers), \$3.00.

Bhagavad Gita—Judge version, \$1.00; Johnston version, \$1.25; Edwin Arnold's poetical version (Song Celestial), cloth, \$1.00; red leather, \$1.65.

Row, T. Subba—Lectures on Philosophy of Bhagavad Gita; Adyar ed with biographical sketch, \$1.25; Pt. Loma ed., with Glossary and Index, \$1.00.

Patanjali—Yoga Aphorisms, Judge version, \$1.00; Johnston version, \$1.25.

"Unmerited Suffering and Karma"

We have left a few of Oscar Ijungström's interesting discussion of this subject. A copy free on request. A stamp appreciated.

Reprint—Westcott on Numbers

W. Wynn Westcott's classical book, *Numbers, Their Occult Power and Mystic Virtues*, first published in 1890 and long out of print, has been reprinted by David McKay Company. Mr. Westcott, eminent theosophist and close associate of H. P. B. in her E. S. T. Council, has collected all available information on the occultism of numbers from Greek, Hebrew, Chaldean, Egyptian and Hindu sources. It is in no sense a fortune-telling book, like most modern books on numerology, but tells you what the ancients, including Pythagoras, thought about numbers. Price, \$1.50, from the O. E. LIBRARY.

THE O. E. LIBRARY CRITIC

Published monthly at 1207 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

BY

The O. E. Library League

Vol. XXIV

January, 1937

No. 8

Yearly subscription, United States and Canada, fifty cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or 62 cents. Single copies, five cents. Blank (unfilled) British postal orders and stamps, Canadian paper money and stamps accepted.

THE HARE BROTHERS ON THE MOTIVES OF H. P. BLAVATSKY

Having proved to their own satisfaction that H. P. Blavatsky invented the Mahatmas, wrote the Mahatma Letters and founded a cult based upon her deceptions, the Brothers Hare, in their book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, naturally find it desirable to speculate on the motives which instigated such a gigantic hoax. True, they insist that having proved their point, a consideration of motives is needless (pp. 301-3), their facts (largely fiction!) are enough. But as there are people who are always looking for motives and who might otherwise not accept their Q. E. D., the authors indulge in some speculation. Why, these skeptics might ask, should Madame Blavatsky, a woman of high birth and connections, of such talent that she could easily have earned an honest living, have started out in 1870 with a fraud on her relatives, a fraud which grew in magnitude as years passed, and which involved the mastery of at least six different styles of handwriting, the employment of numerous confederates in Europe, Asia and America, presumably for remuneration, many of whom were skilled in writing the same scripts, the training of some of them in feats of legerdemain, the bribing of railway guards in distant parts—not one of whom has ever confessed or been detected—a hoax which would have made her life one ever repeated lie, one constant effort to avoid detection? And why should she have devised a remarkable system of philosophy and attributed it to imaginary Mahatmas instead of taking the credit for herself?

The authors felt the need for some explanation, lest their Q. E. D. should be questioned. But instead of seeking her real motives in her own writings, especially in her letters to Sinnett, where they can be easily found, but where these authors can see only mistakes in English, misquotations of Scripture and other literary defects, they proceed to tread the dangerous ground of speculation. To be somewhat personal, the Hare Brothers present us with their own photographs as frontispiece to their volume, a not uncommon but very objectionable custom of unimportant writers who think to add force to their arguments by displaying their physiognomies. They appear to be men of rather advanced age, which is not their fault, but they seem to say: "Look at us. Don't we look like people who know what they are talking about? Shouldn't our statements be enough for anybody?" But what impresses me is that such scholarly gentlemen should at their age prove themselves so ignorant of human nature that they should utterly fail to read between the lines and should see in the anguished and despairing cries of a persecuted and almost dying woman nothing but confessions of fraud by one finally overwhelmed by the muddle she had involved herself in through her impostures. But that is another chapter. Here we are concerned with the Hares' hypothesis of fraud and the motives they assume to lie beneath it.

"Three Suggested Motives"

Here they are (p. 303):

"Having proved in these pages that Madame Blavatsky foisted an illiterate apocrypha upon the infant Theosophical Society in 1880, and attempted thereby to foist it upon the world, we propose to satisfy inquirers as to her motives by making three interpretative suggestions. First, we trace the power-seeking motive as the original and main cause of her deceptions; second, we note an animus against Christianity, both exhibited and avowed, which led her to the extremity of abuse and to tactics of opposition void of moral scruple; third, we perceive that her earlier deceptions placed her in positions which in time became untenable, so that necessity compelled her to adopt greater and more unabashed measures of defence."

The authors continue (pp. 303-4):

"It is clear to a reader of the sketches of Madame Blavatsky's life which have come down to us from several friendly sources that she was from her childhood a person of exceptionally strong and independent character. Consequently it was in the circle of her own relations that she first exercised her extraordinary talents. It is therefore significant as an interpretation of her later career that the first 'Mahatma Letter' which she produced should have been one of merely domestic concern, suggesting that while travelling abroad she was in receipt of some kind of metaphysical favour and protection. This message would naturally herald her return to Odessa with an accretion of personal power, and would build up a reputation which it was both desirable and necessary to maintain. Even if we may speculate that this experiment was Madame Blavatsky's 'first disobedience', it could not be her last; its success would tempt her to repeat it, or its failure would compel her to outdo it. Events proved that she did one or the other, according to the predicament in which she was placed."

In short, she started her Mahatmic hoax by writing to her aunt, Madame Fadéef in 1870, the famous French letter in K. H. script, though unsigned, because she wanted to make an impression of mystery and pose as something extraordinary. The common person not bent on mischief might have written: "Dear Auntie; I am in a distant land and have been sick, but am now well and being well taken care of, and expect to be home in a few months. Good-by, Auntie dear, Lovingly, Helena."

But not so Helena. She had to invent the Mahatmas so she could startle the relatives with cock-and-bull stories on her return. She started the hoax, thought it worked well and proceeded to try it years later on Olcott and then on Sinnett and others till it grew like a rolling snowball, finally overwhelming her, ruining her health and killing her (pp. 310-12). I think it worthwhile to present that letter of 1870 to Dear Auntie Fadéef, so that it may be seen that the Hare theory regarding it is pure and unwarranted assumption. The original French letter and Mr. Jinarajadasa's translation will be found, together with facsimile, in his *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol. II, (pp. 9-12) and in his *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?* (pp. 7-8):

"A l'Honorable,
Trés Honorable Dame—
Nadyéjda Andréewna,
Fadéew
Odessa.

Les nobles parents de Mad. H. Blavatsky n'ont aucune cause de se désoler. Leur fille et nièce n'a point quitté ce monde. Elle vit et désire faire savoir à ceux qu'elle aime, qu'elle se porte bien et se fort heureuse dans la retraite lointaine et inconnue qu'elle s'est choisie. Elle a été bien malade, mais, ne l'est plus; car grâce à la protection du Seigneur Sangyas elle a trouvé des amis dévoués qui en prennent soin physiquement et spirituellement. Que les dames de sa maison se tranquillisent donc. Avant que 18 lunes nouvelles se

lèvent—elle sera revenue dans sa famille."

Mr. Jinarajadasa's translation:

"The noble relations of Madame H. Blavatsky have no cause whatsoever for grief. Their daughter and niece has not left this world at all. She is living, and desires to make known to those whom she loves that she is well and quite happy in the distant and unknown retreat which she has selected for herself. She has been very ill, but is so no longer; for under the protection of the Lord Sangyas she has found devoted friends who guard her physically and spiritually. The ladies of her house should therefore remain tranquil. Before 18 new moons shall have arisen, she will return to her family."

It will be noted that there is no mention whatsoever of the existence of Mahatmas, not the slightest indication that the writer was more than an ordinary person. The phrase "under the protection of the Lord Sangyas"—a Tibetan name of the Lord Buddha—is no more than a Christian might write: "under God's protection" or "by God's grace". There is absolutely nothing in the letter, expressed or implied, more than what one friend might write about another, thinking her family would be worrying about her. The theory of the Brothers Hare that H. P. B. wrote the letter herself in the later familiar K. H. script with the idea of imparting an air of mystery is therefore nothing but a figment of their suspicious and prejudiced imagination. And note, please, that this peculiar script did not appear again until ten years later, in 1880, in letters to Sinnett, although Olcott received other purported Mahatmic communications between 1875 and 1880. Are we to suppose that H. P. B. invented this peculiar handwriting and reproduced it accurately ten years later without trying it out on Olcott and others in the interval? With regard to the Messrs. Hare pretending to read in the Fadéef letter that which simply does not exist in it, I venture an "interpretative suggestion" of my own: they are *non compos mentis*, in other words, cracked.

"The Anti-Christian Motive"

When the Hare Brothers speak of "the fact that a strong bias against Christianity was formally avowed and patently exhibited in the public and private writings of Madame Blavatsky" (p. 304) they are simply playing with a word. What is Christianity? Is it the pure and simple gospel of Jesus to be found in the New Testament, or is it the theology of later "Christian" writers? Is it in the simple seamless garment which, according to tradition, was worn by its Founder, or in the gorgeously colored and embroidered vestments of the priests and the elaborate ceremonials of some of the Christian churches? Is it in his gospel of love or in the tortures of the Inquisition, in the Massacre of St. Bartholomew? Is it going alone into one's closet and praying to the Father which is in secret, or in the Mass, the absolution and remission of sin by a priest? Is it salvation by living the life, or salvation by belief? Surely the Hares should have stated just what they mean by "Christianity" before charging H. P. B. with attacking it. And it must be remembered that W. L. Hare at least—I know nothing of his fellow author—is a professor of comparative religion and was a lecturer on this to the Theosophical Society in England and Wales. He at least is aware of the distinction drawn by some writers between the simple teachings of Jesus as given in the Gospels and what they somewhat humorously call "Churehianity".

Any student of the writings of Madame Blavatsky must know that while she attacked Churchianity unsparingly she defended the teachings of Jesus on every possible occasion. To quote *in extenso* would be impossible. I cite only the following:

Isis Unveiled, II, p. 559: "The Buddhist divine, following literally the ethical doctrine of his master, remains thus true to the legacy of Gautama; while the Christian minister, distorting the precepts re-

corded by the four Gospels beyond recognition, teaches, not that which Jesus taught, but the absurd, too often pernicious, interpretations of fallible men—Popes, Luthers, and Calvin included."

Isis Unveiled, II, p. 575: "Why, then, should not Jesus of Nazareth, a thousandfold higher, nobler, and morally grander than Mahomet, be as well revered by Christians and followed in practice, instead of being blindly adored in fruitless faith as a god, and at the same time worshipped much after the fashion of certain Buddhists, who turn their wheel of prayers. That this faith has become sterile, and is no more worthy the name of Christianity than the fetishism of Calmucks that of the philosophy preached by Buddha, is doubted by none."

Secret Doctrine, I, p. 280 (orig.); p. 301 (rev.): "'The Kingdom of Heaven' and of God 'is within us' says Jesus, not outside. Why are Christians so absolutely blind to the self-evident meaning of the words of wisdom they delight in mechanically repeating?"

H. P. B. was not attacking Christianity as taught by Jesus, but Churchianity, its many-headed corruption. Yet the Hares charge her with a strong bias against Christianity! And they make this a reason for her "inventing the Mahatmas", as if that had anything to do with it.

As an example of the bias of the Hare book I give below a passage from *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. I (orig. pp. xli-xlii; rev. pp. xlvii-xlviii) quoted by the Hares in support of their thesis, and in parallel the original, showing that they have suppressed an essential sentence which would have proved their claim wrong. It was not the object of H. P. B. to blacken Christianity in the eyes of the Orientals, but to show them that the missionaries were, at least no better than, if as good as, their own teachers. She was quite aware of the gross misrepresentations of Eastern religions fed out to the Westerners, who were being invited to contribute to foreign missions. Bishop Heber's famous missionary hymn, "From Greenland's Icy Mountains", still sung before passing the collection box, specifically includes India and Ceylon as well as the naked savages of Africa (who, by the way, take far more readily to Islamism than to Churchianity):

In vain with lavish kindness
The gifts of God are strown;
The heathen in his blindness
Bows down to wood and stone.
Can we, whose souls are lighted
With wisdom from on high;
Can we to men benighted
The lamp of life deny?

It is really a beautiful hymn and when well rendered by a good choir with the usual accompaniments of stained glass and vestments fairly draws the dollars out of our pockets. We feel so superior to these blind heathen; we must show them that our own ceremonials and rituals, our bowing down before the altar and crossing ourselves, the genuflections of our gorgeously befrocked priests, the swinging of censors, the mechanical repetition of prayers and invocations, often in a language that none of the worshippers understand, the offer of absolution and remission of sin if we will but believe and eternal damnation if we do not, and much more, are far more acceptable in the eyes of the Almighty than their own ways and beliefs, and that if they want to escape eternal hell-fire they must accept our creeds and our customs. It was an object of H. P. B. to show these "men benighted" that the corrupted religion of the Western world was no better than the corrupted religion of their own, that the noble precepts of Jesus were disregarded and that greed, crime, misery, were as rampant in the West as in the East, and that before rejecting their own beliefs they should try to purify them and practise them. It must be remembered that in H. P. B.'s day far more than now it was the prevailing belief that the heathen were destined to certain damnation unless they accepted church Christianity, that many

missionaries were prompted, not so much by love of the heathen as by the desire to run up a big credit on the Book of Life by saving souls, and that while they ought to be morally good people the essential point was to teach the sound hell-fire and salvation-through-the-blood-of-the-Lamb doctrine.

Here is the quotation from *Isis Unveiled* as written and as deleted by the Hares. It refers to the Theosophical Society.

As Quoted by the Hares

Later, it has determined to spread among the "poor benighted heathen" such evidences as to the practical results of Christianity as will at least give both sides of the story to the communities among which missionaries are at work. With this view it has established relations with associations and individuals throughout the East, to whom it furnishes authenticated reports of the ecclesiastical crimes and misdemeanors, schisms and heresies, controversies and litigations, doctrinal differences and biblical criticisms and reviews with which the press of Christian Europe (not America?) constantly teems

The Theosophical Society

thought it simple justice to make the facts known in Palestine, India, Ceylon, Cashmere, Tartary, Thibet, China and Japan.

It will be noted that the Hares have omitted just those portions (italicized by me) which show H. P. B.'s real reasons, thereby making a fairly good case for their theory of a blind animus against the Christian religion in whatever form. It may also be noted that they do not indicate why her attack on the corruptions of the Christian church should have necessitated, or even rendered desirable, her "invention" of Mahatmas. She had ample reasons without going to all that trouble.

In conclusion I cannot better illustrate the true position of Madame Blavatsky towards Christianity than by quoting the final paragraph of Manly P. Hall's December letter, on "Jesus". He says:

"There is no great teacher whose doctrines have been more intentionally misunderstood than those of Jesus, but the intelligent thinker is able to distinguish clearly between Christianity and churchianity. Churchianity prays and pleads and exhorts, with formulas for every failing of the soul, washing out all the sins of man with holy water. The real teaching of Jesus simply states: that he who lives the life shall know the doctrine."

As Written by H. P. B.

Later, it has determined to spread among the "poor benighted heathen" such evidences as to the practical results of Christianity as will at least give both sides of the story to the communities among which missionaries are at work. With this view it has established relations with associations and individuals throughout the East, to whom it furnishes authenticated reports of the ecclesiastical crimes and misdemeanors, schisms and heresies, controversies and litigations, doctrinal differences and biblical criticisms and revisions, with which the press of Christian Europe and America constantly teems. *Christendom has been long and minutely informed of the degradation and brutishness into which Buddhism, Brahmanism, and Confucianism have plunged their deluded votaries, and many millions have been lavished upon foreign missions under such false representations.* The Theosophical Society, seeing daily exemplifications of this very state of things as the sequence of Christian teaching and example—the latter especially—thought it simple justice to make the facts known in Palestine, India, Ceylon, Cashmere, Tartary, Thibet, China, and Japan

Nucleus of a Theosophical Library

The large number of theosophical, semi-theosophical and pseudo-theosophical books listed in some catalogs is calculated to raise the question: "Which of these shall I read?" Many are of little value, others misleading and still others positively foolish or pernicious. The following *strictly recommended list* aims to include the best books dealing with Theosophy as originally taught, including the writings of H. P. Blavatsky, letters from the Masters, books elucidative of the same, historical and biographical books bearing on Theosophy, and a few not strictly theosophical books included as aiming to keep the student out of the rut of dogmatism, or otherwise of value. A few titles of special importance are printed in bold type. Information as to other theosophical and allied books supplied on request.

All from the O. E. LIBRARY. Prices subject to change without notice.
Blavatsky, H. P.—

Complete Works of H. P. Blavatsky, Centenary Edition, edited by A. Trevor Barker. This edition aims to include everything written for publication by H. P. B., including magazine articles. No alterations other than correction of typographical errors. Vol. I, (1874-79); Vol. II (1879-81); Vol. III (1881-82); Vol. IV (1882-83), \$5.00 each, sold separately. Further volumes at same price in preparation. Invaluable for students of H. P. B. Contains all her papers in *The Theosophist*, *Lucifer*, etc.

Isis Unveiled; photographic reprint of original in one volume, U. L. T. edition, \$7.50.

Isis Unveiled; photographic reprint of original in one volume, part of series, *Complete works of H. P. Blavatsky*, \$5.00. Contains a much improved index and her article, *My Books*, telling how she wrote *Isis*.

Isis Unveiled, London edition, with a very few corrections, practically a reprint of original, \$12.50.

Isis Unveiled, Point Loma edition in 4 vols., \$7.50.

The pagination of all of the above is the same and there is little choice between them.

The Secret Doctrine; photographic reprint of original 2 vols., bound in one volume, \$7.50. This is the edition usually supplied.

The Secret Doctrine; Point Loma edition, 2 vols. in 4 parts, \$10.00; same in two parts, \$7.50; same, paper, \$5.00.

The Secret Doctrine, revised by Besant and Mead, 3 vols., \$17.50.

Much altered from original, but containing a very complete index of great value, as well as the questionable "third volume."

H. P. B.'s introductory to *The Secret Doctrine*; pamphlet reprint, \$0.20.

The Key to Theosophy; photographic reprint of original, \$2.00.

This will be supplied unless otherwise specified.

The Key to Theosophy; Bombay U. L. T. edition, paper, \$1.00.

This follows the original except in pagination.

The Key to Theosophy, revised by Mead, \$2.00.

Greatly changed and many omissions, but with a valuable index.

A Theosophical Glossary; photographic reprint of original, \$2.00.

The only reliable glossary, indispensable to all students.

Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge (London), \$2.00.

H. P. B.'s answers to questions on *The Secret Doctrine*.

The Voice of the Silence; reprint of the original edition, edited by A. L. Cleather and Basil Crump, \$1.00. Peking edition made at request of the Tashi Lama. This is the edition we recommend.

(To be continued)

THE O. E. LIBRARY CRITIC

Published monthly at 1207 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

BY

The O. E. Library League

Vol. XXIV

February, 1937

No. 9

Yearly subscription, United States and Canada, fifty cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or 62 cents. Single copies, five cents. Blank (unfilled) British postal orders and stamps, Canadian paper money and stamps accepted.

THE HARES USE A BOOMERANG IN REBUTTAL

In the October, 1936, *Occult Review* (pp. 251-6) appeared an article by Miss Helen Savage, of Point Loma, entitled "The Hare Attack Repulsed." To this the Messrs. Hare make a lengthy reply in the January, 1937, *Occult Review* (pp. 52-61). The Hares bring up eleven points in Miss Savage's article and attempt to answer them as best they can which, in my opinion, is for the most part not answering them at all except by evasions and quibbling. This is not the place to cover these in detail, but I must draw special attention to point No. 9. It will be remembered that the whole argument of the Hares, in their book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, aims to prove that the Mahatma Letters were written, and the Mahatmas themselves invented, by H. P. Blavatsky. One of the strongest arguments for the genuineness of the Letters is found in the letter in K. H. script written on the back of a letter received in 1886 by Colonel Olcott at Adyar, from Tookaram Tatya in Bombay, *H. P. B. being at that time in Germany*. This proves that at least this Mahatma letter could not have been written by H. P. B., as it refers to a matter only brought up in the Tatya letter itself. This has been referred to before in the CRITIC (June-July, August-September, 1936).

In her *Occult Review* article Miss Savage says (p. 253):

"While crowding details forward when they so wish, the authors are just as likely to ignore or suppress points which would invalidate their entire argument. No mention is made of a letter sent by Tookaram Tatya from Bombay, June 5, 1886, to Colonel Olcott (rec. June 7) at Adyar, which letter was found to contain a message written diagonally across a free sheet signed 'K. H.' and in the familiar K. H. script. H. P. Blavatsky was in Germany at the time. (See *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?* C. Jinara-jadasa, pp. 21-6.)"

To this the Hares reply (p. 57):

"(9) Under the heading 'suppression of points which would invalidate their entire argument,' it is asked why we did not mention a letter from one Tookaram Tatya, from Bombay, to Col. Olcott, containing a message from K. H., when H. P. B. was in Germany. We were reviewing *The Mahatma Letters to Mr. A. P. Sinnett* and examining the original documents in the hands of Mr. Barker. No letter from Tookaram Tatya was printed in the book or found among the papers shown us. Moreover, our book was in proof before Mr. Jinara-jadasa's pamphlet for the defence came out. Could we 'suppress' our book and all the 'points' that made our arguments *valid* on such a ground as this?"

The excuse that they were "reviewing *The Mahatma Letters to Mr. A. P. Sinnett* and examining the original documents in the hands of Mr. Barker" and that "No letter from Tookaram Tatya was printed in

the book or found among the papers shown us" is simply fatuous and worse. It is true that the Tookaram Tatya letter and the accompanying K. H. letter were not among the Barker documents, for the simple reason that they were not written to Mr. Sinnett but to Colonel Olcott. But the authors were not only reviewing the Sinnett correspondence, but other purported Mahatma letters, as the Fadéef letter of 1870 (January *CARRIC*), several letters received by Colonel Olcott while still in America before 1878 and a K. H. letter to Dr. Franz Hartmann, of which they present a facsimile (pp. 246-8). Whether their "book was in proof before Mr. Jinarajadasa's pamphlet for the defence came out" I have no means of determining and must accept their statement. But their book distinctly states, back of title page, "First published in 1936." Mr. Jinarajadasa's "pamphlet"—it is a bound volume of 56 pages—was published in 1934, and was a reprint of a series of articles in *The Theosophist*, September, October, November, December, 1933, and February, 1934. The portion containing the Tookaram Tatya letter with facsimile of the K. H. letter, and stating that H. P. B. was in Germany at the time, is printed in the October, 1933, *Theosophist*, reaching England in the same month. There was therefore ample time for the Messrs. Hare to have seen it, and to have mentioned it in correcting their proof. In view of the fact that at least one of the Hare Brothers was in close touch with theosophical circles, was known to be writing a book attacking the authenticity of the Letters, and that *The Theosophist* is widely read among theosophists, it seems incredible that the articles of Mr. Jinarajadasa should not have come to his attention. But be that as it may.

The Hares Fling a Boomerang

But that is not the worst of the story. 'The Messrs. Hare did have the K. H. letter accompanying the that of Tookaram Tatya in hand when they wrote their book together with its history. The K. H. letter with facsimile is published in Jinarajadasa's *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol. II, p. 14, and its history on p. 13, specifically mentioning Tookaram Tatya, and this very book and this very letter they comment on at length (pp. 249-250 of their book), distinctly stating that they had it before them and commenting on the K. H. handwriting. Further, the facsimile before them bears Olcott's signed endorsement: "Received and opened by me this 7th June 1886, H. S. Olcott," which date, written with the greatest clearness, they change from 1886 to 1876, making it appear that the letter was conceived and written in America and an invention of H. P. B.

There is no question whatever that the Hares had the letter and its history before them; there is no question about the date; there is no question that they had H. P. B.'s letters to Sinnett, to which they devote much attention, and must have known that H. P. B. was in Europe in 1886 when the letter in question was written somewhere between Bombay and Adyar.

No, we must insist that Miss Savage's comment quoted above and referred to by Messrs. Hare is by no means "on the fringe of the problem" (p. 61), but at the very heart of it, as it concerns the question whether there are Mahatmic letters with which H. P. B. could by no possibility have been connected. One may sympathize with the authors for their forgetfulness—that is something which can happen to anybody. But one's sympathy is decidedly dampened when one sees that in spite of the very obvious fact that they gave some time to the study of this letter which they now have forgotten, they ignored the very evident fact that H. P. B. could not have written it, and worse, with the date 1886 before their eyes that they changed it to 1876, thereby apparently reinforcing their case against H. P. B. These are matters which, it appears to me, call for a further explanation from them.

To follow.—The Hare Brothers on He-Mahatmas and She-Mahatmas; The Lemurians Flee Mount Shasta.

Why "Back to Blavatsky"?

One of the most valuable effects of Upasika's mission is that it drives men to self-study and destroys in them blind servility for persons.
—Mahatma K. H.

The above quotation referring to H. P. Blavatsky is found in a letter from Mahatma K. H. to Colonel Olcott (Jinarajadasa, *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol. I, p. 51). "Upasika," of course, means H. P. B. The statement is of particular interest because it occurs in a letter received phenomenally by Olcott in 1888, on shipboard, while traveling from Bombay to England, and while H. P. B. was in Europe. It is therefore one of the few Mahatmic communications which could not by any possibility have been written by H. P. B. herself. No one can say: "Oh, she wrote that about herself, so it carries no weight whatever." It is also one of the letters which the Brothers Hare, with the book at their disposal, have completely ignored.

What Annie Besant Once Said

It is the custom in Adyar T. S. circles to observe the birthday of Annie Besant, and the October issue of *Theosophical News and Notes*, the official organ of the Adyar T. S. in the British Isles, contains an interesting article of reminiscences of Mrs. Besant by Mrs. Esther Windust, an old-time theosophist and associate of H. P. B. Towards the end of the article is a purported remark by Mrs. Besant to Mrs. Windust not so very long after H. P. B.'s death. I say "purported" because it presumably represents the spirit rather than the exact words of Mrs. Besant. Mrs. Windust says:

"I remember once saying what a help the little manuals were, and wished they had been in existence when I joined. A. B. replied thoughtfully: 'Yes, Leadbeater and I meant them to be a help, but I am not sure they are. Do you know there is an immense difference between the old members who had to study to get anything, and the younger ones who can reel off a string of facts they have gathered from the manuals? You see in the old days one simply had to study and the teaching about evolution in the *Secret Doctrine* caused the mental body to evolve and grow. There is an immense difference visible in the mental body of the old members who studied the S. D. and the young ones who have strings of names from the manuals, which have left the mental body unaltered.' If, as is stated, we contact the mind of the writer of any book we read, it is comprehensible that the study of H. P. B.'s books must have an effect on those who study carefully."

The date of this conversation is not given, but it was obviously about the time that Mrs. Besant was beginning to fall under the influence of the cock-sure Leadbeater and yet before she had succumbed wholly to his uncanny influence and had become persuaded that she was a much wiser person than her old teacher. Instances innumerable of this have been given in the *CARRIC* in a series of articles entitled "Theosophy or Neo-Theosophy" (still obtainable) in which quotations from H. P. B. are placed in parallel with quotations from Mrs. Besant and Leadbeater, showing how completely Mrs. Besant had set herself up above H. P. B., even to the extent of saying that she did not know what she was talking about.

Besant Contemns Blavatsky

Permit me to quote Mrs. Besant in *The Theosophical Review*, August, 1899:

"She (H. P. B.) often in her humility, buttresses her own true statements with a mass of rubbish from inferior writers picked up haphazard; on minor points she often speaks hastily and carelessly; and further, she confuses her teachings with excessive digressions . . ."

And Mrs. Besant did not limit herself to such general remarks. She not only in endless cases sets up her own authority above that of H. P. B.

Nucleus of a Theosophical Library

(Continued from January CRITIC)

All from the O. E. LIBRARY. Prices subject to change without notice. Blavatsky, H. P. (continued)—

The Voice of the Silence; McKay ed., blue fabricoid, \$0.75.

Both of the above are reprints of original, the latter differing only in lacking editorial notes.

The Voice of the Silence; U. L. T. edition with numerous emendations by W. Q. Judge, \$1.00.

The Voice of the Silence; Bombay U. L. T. edition, same as last, \$0.50.

All editions of the *Voice* published under auspices of the Adyar T. S. or its publishing houses are grossly corrupted and emphatically to be condemned.

Practical Occultism and Occultism vs. the Occult Arts; cloth, \$0.50; pamphlet, \$0.20.

Nightmare Tales, paper, \$0.50.

Five Messages to the American Theosophists, paper, \$0.25.

Raja Yoga or Occultism; reprint of some important articles, paper, \$0.75.

The Esoteric Character of the Gospels, \$1.25.

The People of the Blue Mountains, \$1.75.

An account of the strange peoples of the Nilgiri Hills in India. Blavatsky Quotation Book; a quotation from H. P. B. for each day of the year, paper, \$0.60; cloth, \$1.00.

Moments with H. P. B.; a quotation book, classified and with index, paper, \$0.50.

The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett, edited by A. Trevor Barker, \$5.00. Almost autobiographical, and shows H. P. B. as revealed by herself. A highly valuable collection.

Some Unpublished Letters of H. P. Blavatsky, \$2.65.
Letters to Prof. Hiram Corson, edited by his son.

Some Books Relating to H. P. Blavatsky

Kingsland, William—The Real H. P. Blavatsky, \$5.75.

The latest and best biography.

Was she a Charlatan? paper, \$0.50.

Reprint of appendix to The Real H. P. Blavatsky; defense against the Psychological Research Society's charges.

Butt, G. Baselden—Madame Blavatsky, \$2.25. Also an excellent biography.

Besant, Annie—H. P. Blavatsky and the Masters of the Wisdom, paper, \$0.50.

In defense of H. P. B. against the Coulomb charges, evidences of the existence of Mahatmas, etc.

Cleather, Alice L.—H. P. Blavatsky; her Life and Work for Humanity, boards, \$1.25. By one of her personal pupils.

H. P. Blavatsky as I Knew Her, boards, \$1.25.

H. P. Blavatsky, a Great Betrayal, paper, \$0.50.

Exposes the vagaries and immoralities of certain "leaders", the Liberal Catholic Church, the World Teacher craze, etc.

In Memory of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, by Some of Her Pupils, \$2.25. Blavatsky Association reprint of the original edition published shortly after H. P. B.'s death.

Jinarajadasa, C.—Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters? Proof that H. P. B. did not write the Mahatma Letters, with 30 facsimiles of handwritings. Cloth, \$1.25.

(To be continued)

THE O. E. LIBRARY CRITIC

Published monthly at 1207 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

BY

The O. E. Library League

Vol. XXIV

March, 1937

No. 10

Yearly subscription, United States and Canada, fifty cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or 62 cents. Single copies, five cents. Blank (unfilled) British postal orders and stamps, Canadian paper money and stamps accepted.

THE HARES ON HE-MAHATMAS AND SHE-MAHATMAS

Fate has placed upon the brothers H. E. and W. L. Hare the task of proving, in their book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, that these letters were not written by two men as they purport to have been, but by a woman, namely, H. P. Blavatsky. She was the She-Mahatma who composed them, and the view that they were written by two He-Mahatmas must be dismissed. So! And Why? That's clear enough; the Letters are so very masculine in style that no real men could have written them; they must have been produced by a woman, and a very masculine woman at that. And as it was necessary to fix the fraud on H. P. Blavatsky it was needful to call attention to her masculinity. Listen to the argument (p. 205) under the caption

"The Masculine Disguise"

"Helena Blavatsky's equestrian practice, acquired in youth and pursued in her early Asiatic travels, accustomed her to the assumption of a male habit in dress, and it was no less evident, from the vigour of her literary style, that she as readily played the male role with her pen, whenever the necessities of anonymity or pure deception required it. The persistent maintenance in being of her imaginative masculine creations in long correspondence with credulous male associates, was no small achievement; of this there is proof in the many characteristic passages we have quoted from the letters of the supposed Mahatmas. In addition to the positive pose of the masculine disguise, the negative device of anti-feminism was frequently employed, and of this we give the following examples."

Wearing pants and riding straddle when young afforded a suitable preliminary training for writing several wholly different styles and in as many different handwritings—anybody should see that. But H. P. B. was not satisfied with the fullness of her imitation of the masculine style. Some doubting Thomas might still suspect and sniff the eternal feminine behind it. So, to make doubly sure, she endeavored to reinforce it by making her hypothetical Mahatmas anti-feminist, or shall I say?, misogynous. Surely even the Thomases would not suspect a woman of belittling her own sex. So she introduced some not exactly laudatory remarks about women, of which the Brothers Hare cite seven, and of which I can quote but two (p. 206). This step, to be sure, might set the ladies against her Mahatmas, but then she was not writing these letters for the ladies, but for Mr. Sinnett. We read:

Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 302: "Generally I never trust a woman more than an echo."

Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 421: "Verily woman—is a dreadful calamity in this fifth race."

Even this was not enough to make her feel sure of her trick being accepted. "Ah," thought she, "I'll make doubts doubly impossible by putting in some derogatory remarks about myself; nobody, however skeptical, would suspect a woman of belittling herself." So in they go. The Brothers Hare cite eight examples—there are many more in the

Letters—of which I quote two:

Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 105: "Another fine example of the habitual disorder in which Mrs. H. P. B.'s mental furniture is kept. . . . As in her writing-rooms confusion is ten times confounded, so in her mind are crowded ideas piled in such a chaos that when she wants to express them the tail peeps out before the head."

Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, p. 129: "She is a fanatic in her way, and is unable to write with anything like system and calmness."

Well, what of it? One has but to read her letters to Sinnett, written, not with deliberation and for publication, but on the spur of the moment as one writes letters to friends, to see the truth of the statements, and I fail to see how anybody but a "brass-clad donkey"—to use her own expression—could read into these statements in the Mahatma Letters evidence that she wrote them herself. Perhaps she was a misogynist; does that prove that men may not make disparaging remarks about women? As well argue that Shakespeare was a woman.

Anti-Anna Kingsford

A further parallel cited by the Hares (p. 208), of which they make much, is the frankly expressed detestation of H. P. B. for Dr. Anna Kingsford, author of *The Perfect Way*, and the milder but somewhat sarcastic remarks of Mahatma K. H. H. P. B. called her "An unbearable female snob" (*B. L.*, p. 65), "a snake, a horned aspic among roses" (*B. L.*, p. 66), "The hypocritical she-devil" (*B. L.*, p. 212). And the Hares cite two sentences which they think clinch the proof that H. P. B. wrote both. They are:

Mahatma K. H. in *M. L.*, (p. 428): "She is too haughty and imperious, too self-complaisant for me; besides which she is too young and 'fascinating' for a poor mortal like myself."

H. P. B. in *B. L.*, (p. 64): "a haughty, imperious, vain and self-opinionated creature, a bag of western conceit."

H. P. B., in fact, if we are to accept the Hare hypothesis, simply couldn't refrain from getting back at "the Divine Anna" even when writing the Mahatma Letters, she had to risk the reputation of her Mahatmas in order to vent her spite. Those interested in the controversy will find abundant material in the portions of the *Mahatma Letters* dealing with the London Lodge, and in Edward Maitland's *Anna Kingsford, Her Life, Letters, Diary and Work*. Mrs. Kingsford was really a terrible woman, whatever her virtues and minor failings. As one may see from her own confessions in the latter book, so fanatical an opponent of animal experimentation was she that she actually attempted to use thought force for murdering Pasteur, and boasted that she had, as she thought, put the physiologists Claude Bernard and Paul Bert to death by her black magical processes, something which one would think differs in no way from actual assassination by dagger, bullet or poison. Lest this statement be thought extreme read her own words. Here is an extract from her *Diary (Life and Letters, Vol. II, p. 291)*:

"Paris, November 12 [1886].—'Mort de M. Paul Bert.' 'La nouvelle de sa mort, arrivée Jeudi soir à quatre heures, n'a surpris personne.' Yesterday, November 11, at eleven at night, I knew that my will had smitten another vivisector! Ah, but this man has cost me more toil than his master, the fiend Claude Bernard. For months I have been working to compass the death of Paul Bert, and have but just succeeded. But I *have* succeeded, the demonstration of the power is complete. The will *can* and *does* kill, but not always with the same rapidity. Claude Bernard died *foudroyé*; Paul Bert has wasted to death. Now only one remains on hand—Pasteur, who is certainly doomed, and must, I should think, succumb in a few months at the utmost. Oh, how I have longed for those words—'Mort de M. Paul Bert!' And now—there they actually are, gazing at me as it were in the first column of the *Figaro*,—complimenting, congratulating, felicitating me. I have killed Paul Bert, as I killed Claude Bernard; as I

will kill Louis Pasteur, and after him the whole tribe of vivisectors, if I live long enough. Courage: it is a magnificent power to have, and one that transcends all vulgar methods of dealing out justice to tyrants. It would interest M. Charles Richet to know of the two episodes in question."

H. P. B., who knew of her attempts, remonstrated with her (*L. & L.*, Vol. II, p. 297), but was answered with scorn, and it is not to be expected that the Mahatmas would admire a person with such murderous propensities.

To show the Hares' attitude still further I quote (pp. 204-5):

"If any words were needed by way of comment on the literal analysis and demonstration just made, or as a retort to the ignorance, perversion and bad taste exhibited in the writings, none could be found more apt than those addressed by the Syrian maid to the Apostle Peter while he warmed his hands by the fire in the governor's courtyard: *Thy speech bewrayeth thee*. In the Gospel drama the denier's tongue belied the truth of his own words; here, in the Theosophical evangel, the deceiver's pen unwittingly discovers her deceit. Writings said to have come from wise men in the East, and professing to reveal occult philosophy, disclose without intention the nativity, the acquired languages and the literary culture of their unacknowledged author. While pretending to lay open the secrets of the macrocosm, they are everywhere interleafed with the biography of Madame Blavatsky, penetrated with her desires and aversions, her tastes, habits and ideas, and reminiscent of her abodes, travels and personal associations. Whatever may have been H. P. B.'s skill in her professed fictional and philosophical writings, her inventive talent deserted her in composing the Mahatma Letters, from which, despite all her endeavours, she was not able to exclude herself."

One may pardon the Hares, who make much of the Mahatmas' and H. P. B.'s purported misquotations of Scripture (pp. 199-202; November CRITIC) for committing the same sin themselves, for their story about the "Syrian maid" and her remark "Thy speech bewrayeth thee" as presented by them is not to be found in the Gospels (Compare Matt., xxvi, 73; Mark, xiv, 70; Luke, xxii, 59; John, xviii, 17, 25, 26). Attention to such trivial details can hardly be expected of scholars engaged in the task of assassinating the Mahatmas. But the above is a blanket accusation for which there is not the least basis whatever. It must be remembered that H. P. B., Sinnett and the Mahatmas—supposing them to be real—were working together for the spread of Theosophy and the welfare of the Theosophical Society. It was therefore inevitable that she should be mentioned constantly in the Mahatmas' letters to Sinnett, that incidents in her life as well as her personal peculiarities should receive frequent mention. It would be most astonishing did they not. Wherever she is mentioned it is for perfectly obvious reasons which none but those as blind as the Hares could fail to see. Those who have studied both the Mahatma Letters and H. P. B.'s Letters, both written to Sinnett, cannot fail to have been impressed with the moderate tone of the Mahatmas' letters and the often impetuous tone of the letters of H. P. B. If she had written both, both for Sinnett's consumption only, why should there be any difference of style?

The Tobacco Incident

A curious and rather amusing attempt of the Hares to discredit the authenticity of the Mahatma M. is found in their comments on his using tobacco. They neglect to argue that because H. P. B. smoked and Mahatma M. smoked therefore the Mahatma was the work of her imagination, which would have been a fit parallel with their other arguments. They rather attempt to annihilate him by showing that he could not have lived in Tibet and have used tobacco. We read (p. 38):

"The liberty that Mahatma M. allows himself in respect of tobacco smoking may not strike a European reader as worthy of remark, but

when we learn from two highly reputed British travellers in Tibet that smoking is in that country regarded as a crime, we wonder where Mahatma Morya obtained his tobacco, how he escaped detection in smoking it, or, in the alternative, from whom he received special dispensation to indulge in it. Dr. McGovern, the author of *To Lhasa in Disguise*, says: "Tobacco smoking is in Tibet the most heinous vice, the greatest crime against religion and decency," and Mr. George Knight, F. R. G. S., in a note in *The Theosophical Review*, July, 1925, [p. 365], confirms this statement. He writes: "It is strictly forbidden to smoke in Tibet."

Now is it a fact that tobacco smoking is forbidden in Tibet? Dr. McGovern (an American, by the way, not an Englishman) is regarded as a good authority on Mahayana Buddhism; his book on this subject earned him the honor of being made an honorary Buddhist priest in Japan. But his practical knowledge of Tibet was limited to his having made a trip to Lhasa. In his book, *To Lhasa in Disguise*, this is exemplified by his repeatedly speaking of the Tashi Lama as the *Trashi Lama*, either a very poor joke or lack of knowledge of this religious potentate whose name is a household word in Tibet. To quote his book (pp. 264-5):

"During his stay in Kalimpong, Sonam had acquired a taste for cigarettes—a taste which he had found it impossible to overcome in spite of the terrible anathema against tobacco on the part of the Government. The sale or use of cigarettes was particularly prohibited by the Dalai Lama, but, as with all prohibitory laws, there was the usual 'bootlegging.' Sonam had managed to smuggle in a supply which he kept carefully hidden and locked away, for in Tibet drinking is only a vice, while smoking is a crime."

Note that it was the sale and use of cigarettes which was particularly prohibited by the Dalai Lama, a parallel for which is to be found in Kansas where, but a few years ago, the sale of cigarettes was a crime forbidden by state law. Against this one may set the statements of W. W. Rockhill, an American traveller in Tibet—regarded as a competent authority by the Smithsonian Institution, which published some of his writings—in his book, *The Land of the Lamas*, which makes at least thirteen references to the cultivation, sale and use of tobacco in Tibet, coming under his own observation. He saw tobacco growing, visited towns where the tobacco trade was the chief occupation of the inhabitants and visited communities where virtually everybody, even women, smoked. He says (p. 245):

"Lamas, however, never smoke, the use of tobacco, except as snuff, being prohibited inside their monasteries."

Why? As well ask why smoking is prohibited in churches, public conveyances and other places in America. It would seem from this that that Mahatma M. might well have been able to secure his tobacco and to smoke it, provided he did so in his own home, without being a law-breaker. It would have been much more natural had H. P. Blavatsky, an inveterate cigarette smoker, portrayed her invented Mahatma as smoking cigarettes rather than a pipe.

I apologize for these allusions to tobacco. It may seem a trivial matter, but it is not. The Hare Brothers imply that a tobacco smoking Mahatma in Tibet is an impossibility and must therefore have been invented by H. P. B. I think it indicates quite the opposite. Considering the fact that the use of tobacco is looked on by many good people as a vile and degrading habit unworthy of a lofty personage, she would hardly have risked imperiling the success of her invention by attributing smoking to her Mahatma. She wanted to gain the adherence of such persons; why, then, prejudice them by such a wholly needless detail? As for myself, I do not blush to confess that this pipe smoking habit of the Mahatma has been one of the things which has attracted me to him. Should I ever become wild enough to start for Tibet with the idea of finding the Master and becoming his chela I know that I may take my pipe along.

A Parallel

H. P. Blavatsky in 1877

"Nevertheless, we accept the saying of the gifted author of *Pestus*, that the human heart has not yet fully uttered itself, and that we have never attained or even understood the extent of its powers. Is it too much to believe that man should be developing new sensibilities and a closer relation with nature? The logic of evolution must teach as much, if carried to its legitimate conclusions. If, somewhere, in the line of ascent from vegetable or ascidian to the noblest man a soul was evolved, gifted with intellectual qualities, it cannot be unreasonable to infer and believe that a faculty of perception is also growing in man, enabling him to descry facts and truths even beyond our ordinary ken."

The citation on the left is from H. P. Blavatsky's *Isis Unveiled*, third paragraph of the Preface; that on the right is from an address of Prof. Julian S. Huxley before the Zoological Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at its meeting last summer at Blackpool. Need one comment on the similarity of the ideas expressed? H. P. B. wrote at a time when students of the biological sciences, rightly exultant over the establishment of the doctrine of evolution, were prone to look on man as solely a product of the interaction of atoms scarcely more complex than a cobblestone. I well remember the profound impression I received from Prof. Tyndall's famous Belfast address in which he declared that he saw in matter "the promise and potency of every form of life." Well and good, provided we concede at the same time that we have not more than the remotest inkling as to what matter in its essence really is. The scientists of broader caliber saw this and were not too dogmatic, but the lesser fry did not, and so we had a host of cock-sure savants who thought that by interpreting, and quite rightly, a biological process in atomic terms, they could reach the bottom of the problem. Even the shining lights were too apt to look askance at any sort of phenomena which did not fit themselves readily into their limited scheme.

It is therefore encouraging to observe that a man of high standing in his field is willing to make the statement which I have quoted. But a few years ago he would have been regarded by his colleagues as a little unbalanced. Herein we may see the opening of the door which leads such subjects as telepathy and clairvoyance towards "respectability." We perceive a beginning among men of science looking towards the "investigation of the powers latent in man", and may hope for a recognition of the possibility of the existence in the universe of intelligences as far above man as man is above a black beetle, to quote the saying of the first Huxley, still and wrongly derided among narrow-minded theosophists as an uncompromising materialist.

Mahatmas—Do They Exist?

In the above quotations there lies the hint that man may eventually evolve to a much higher level than even the highest intellects of today have reached. It is a cheering theory, one calculated to inspire effort and hope, and we could ill afford to be without it. But to assume it as certain is a different matter. Granted that man has reached his present state through a process of evolution from a lowly form, say an amoeba,

Julian S. Huxley in 1936

"If for all the main attributes of mind the average of a population could be raised to the level now attained by the best endowed tenthousandth or even thousandth, that alone would be of far-reaching evolutionary significance.

"Nor is there any reason to suppose that such quantitative increase could not be pushed beyond the present upper limits. There are other faculties, the bare existence of which is as yet scarcely established. These might be developed until they were as commonly distributed as, say musical or mathematical gifts are today. I refer to telepathy and other extra-sensory activities of mind, which the work of Rhine, Salter and others is now forcing into scientific recognition."

to assume without further evidence that this will continue indefinitely is like assuming that because a seed develops into a shrub, that shrub will eventually grow to be a huge tree, or that because a child is seen to grow from month to month he will ultimately become a super-giant. In fact, those who insist on a law of cycles might well maintain the contrary. Further, even assuming that such evolution is to continue indefinitely, how shall we know that our present humanity, as we know it, does not represent the upper limit of progress so far? Are there any who have outstripped the rest of us and have already become super-men? If so, who, what and where are they?

If we would do more than entertain a pleasing and helpful hypothesis we should, if possible, secure all available information tending to demonstrate that such men, or super-men, actually exist. There is imagined evidence a-plenty. One can hardly walk along a crowded street for an hour without passing one or more persons who think themselves possessed of such evidence, who believe themselves in touch with superior beings who have chosen them as their media of communication with less favored mankind, and some of whom have felt it incumbent on them to write whole books telling about it, books which are witness to the ease with which people can delude themselves with platitudes and sentiments which are inferior to the productions of ordinary men who make no claim whatever to superiority.

So it is desirable to gather all attainable evidence of the existence of Mahatmas, to sift it carefully and not to be content with simple faith in the existence of "Elder Brethren," "White Lodges" and the like. An ounce of valid evidence is worth a ton of faith. Does such evidence exist?

On the second page of the Preface to *Isis Unveiled* we read:

"When, years ago, we first travelled over the East, exploring the penetralia of its deserted sanctuaries, two saddening and ever-recurring questions oppressed our thoughts: *Where, WHO, WHAT is GOD? Who ever saw the IMMORTAL SPIRIT of man, so as to be able to assure himself of man's immortality?*

"It was while most anxious to solve these perplexing problems that we came into contact with certain men, endowed with such mysterious powers and such profound knowledge that we may truly designate them as the sages of the Orient. To their instructions we lent a ready ear."

Highly important, if true. The question of its credibility depends upon the question whether Madame Blavatsky was testifying truly here and in her other writings, or was for some reason seeking to mislead her readers. Aside from Madame Blavatsky there are a few others who claimed to have seen and conversed with these superior men. All of these matters have to be sifted thoroughly. Quite apart from these there are any number of people who, as just stated, think they are in touch with such beings, even the very same that H. P. B. told of, while there are some who apparently are making such claims for reasons of their own. This is not the place to consider these. One may say, however, that a superior being, if he aims to communicate with us common mortals, will probably do so with the intention of being understood; he will speak in the clearest possible language rather than present a string of words which seemingly mean nothing and serve but to delude their recipients into puzzling over them with the idea that there is some deep esoteric meaning hidden behind them. One can do the same with Mother Goose or even Jabberwocky. Some persons have the idea that it is beneath the dignity of a super-man to talk common English. It is a matter of no importance should he perchance make an occasional slip in grammar, or, if writing, put in a comma or two too much. The essential point is that he is speaking or writing to be understood. Sentimental or puzzling language, far from being evidence of superiority, is to be taken as evidence that the purported intelligence is not what it claims to be. If clear common sense is to be desired in an ordinary human, even more is it to be looked for in a Mahatma. A real Mahatma would no more talk above his

hearer's head than would a mathematician talk calculus to a school child. If these tests are applied, much of the material can be dumped at once. But it does not apply to the Mahatmas of H. P. B.

The question of the existence of super-men is just as scientific as any problem in astronomy, chemistry, physics, geology, biology or any other science. It should be approached in the same spirit. Those who belittle such investigations are acting like those who laughed at Columbus, Copernicus and many another explorer and investigator. If anyone claims to have firsthand knowledge of the matter, his claims are to be carefully examined—this applies especially to the above claim of Madame Blavatsky. And to make such an investigation one has to be equipped with some common-sense. Further, we must have critics who are able to point out the weak points in the evidence; these also should be possessed of common-sense. It is not common-sense to assume that one somewhat more advanced in evolution than the everyday mortal must be omniscient and may make no mistakes in his English, Latin or punctuation, and that because two persons make the same mistakes they are necessarily one and the same. I have had considerable to say about a recent book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?* It is well worth studying by those who are not too credulous, for it affords a brilliant example of the way in which an investigation should not be made; As an example of "How Not to Do It" it is perhaps the finest to be found in theological literature.

William Loftus Hare in Rebuttal

Editor's Note.—I take pleasure in publishing the below letter from Mr. Wm. Loftus Hare, co-author of *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?* Whether the CRITIC has or has not "made a single scratch" cannot be discussed here. Readers are referred to the several articles in the CRITIC on this book, a list of which is appended. The comments of *The Occult Review* and of Dion Fortune's *Inner Light* will be dealt with in due time. Both indicate that the editors of these well-meaning publications swallowed the Hare book without chewing it, much as one swallows a doctor's pill. Mr. Hare's letter refers to the first two CRITIC articles only. The argument, apparently, is that having discussed 150 letters which they think might have been written by H. P. B., it is needless to consider eight which could not by any possibility have been written by her. It was shown in the February CRITIC that they did have one of these eight, ignored its significance and altered its date by ten years, giving it a false significance.

Equity House, 164a Strand, W.C. 2
London, Feb. 26; 37

Dear Dr. Stokes

After years of silence I resume for a moment my correspondence with you!

Was it a small lapse on your part not to send me your 2 issues of the CRITIC containing the review of our book? Many times I thought of getting 15 cents to send you for a copy but the Canadian saved me the trouble.

Only yesterday I turned out your letter to me of February 26, 1929 in which you urged me to be quick with the publication of *Who Wrote*, etc.? and promised a hot reception from the critics; your teeth were getting sharpened.

My dear friend, it is your wits that need sharpening! When I read the C. Th. [*Canadian Theosophist*] saying that you were laying about you in fine style I expected that you were demolishing our book but having read your critique it appears to me you have not made a single scratch. There is a forensic opening and a serio-comic close but in respect to evasion you go far beyond all the other critics by completely ignoring the authors' investigation of the problem: *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett?* Really you might never have read our book (or else found it unanswerable) for you simply present another question:

Who could have written eight other letters that were not in Barker's book to which ours is a reply? Having found an alibi in 8 cases you assume an alibi in 150. Why did you not reverse the order and prove [?] the 150 and leave the 8 to take care of themselves? That would have been fine!

What you have done is to request us to write another book about 8 letters we have not seen. We reply that having satisfied ourselves that the Sinnett letters are fraudulent we are disposed to believe that the 8 are also deceptive. The circumstances in which they were produced are not known to us and the accounts presented by you are just such as were staged for many of the others.

No court would listen to your case for five minutes. The Occult Review, L'Astrosophie and Dion Fortune all *admit* we have proved our case. The wildness of the counter-critics and their disagreement among themselves reveals the weakness and collapse of the case for the defence.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM LOFTUS HARE

The CRITIC on the Hare Attack on H. P. B.

- June-July, 1936; Demolishing the Mahatmas.
August-September, 1936; Did H. P. B. Write These Mahatma Letters? The Hare Twins and "A Libel on a Laureate".
October, 1936; The Bogus Mahatmic Americanisms of the Brothers Hare. Bad Aim at the Wrong Target.
November, 1936; Choice Tibbits from the Hares' book on the Mahatma Letters.
December, 1936; The Hare Brothers' Arsenal of "Duds".
The Hares' Cockeyed Sanskrit; Jinarajadasa Jumps on the Hare Brothers.
January, 1937; The Hare Brothers on the Motives of H. P. Blavatsky.
February, 1937; The Hares Use a Boomerang in Rebuttal.
March, 1937; The Hares on He-Mahatmas and She-Mahatmas. Mr. Hare Contradicts Himself about the Mahatma Letters; The Stroke over the "M".
The set, 30 cents (1 shilling threepence), U. S., Canadian or British stamps.

Mr. Hare Contradicts Himself about Mahatma Letters

While the following has only an indirect bearing on the book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, in which Mr. William Loftus Hare and his brother attempt to prove that these famous letters were forgeries of H. P. Blavatsky, it throws light on the careless literary ways of Mr. W. L. Hare, numerous examples of which can be found in the book itself.

Shortly after the death of the late C. W. Leadbeater Mr. W. L. Hare wrote a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Leadbeater, which was published in the May, 1934, *International Psychic Gazette*, and reprinted in the June, 1934, *Canadian Theosophist*. In this he says, in part:

"Mr. Leadbeater was a country curate in the South of England, and in the 'eighties or thereabouts was interested in Psychism. He joined the T. S., and was discerned by Madame Blavatsky to be one whom she should do well to put on the right path. There is before me a photograph of a letter written to him about the time of his first journey to India, advising him to meet and join forces with 'Upasita' in Egypt. It was the first of those missives written in a feigned hand by the lady herself, supposed to come from the Master, K. H., and was a bad beginning to C. W. Leadbeater's career."

This letter will be found in Jinarajadasa's *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol. I, pp. 35-36, and its history on pp. 112, 113. It was received by Leadbeater at midnight of Oct. 31-Nov. 1, 1884, and was claimed to have been "precipitated" in his presence. However that may be, the date 1884 is important and is a matter of record. The odd point

is that Mr. Hare asserts that this letter, written in October, 1884, was "the first of those missives written in a feigned hand by the lady herself." Yet elsewhere, and as early as 1927 (in a letter to the *Critic's* editor), he maintained that all the Mahatma Letters to Sinnett, written in 1880-1884, were forgeries of H. P. B., the thesis he defends in his recent book. It would be interesting to know how this purely personal letter, the original of which is in the Adyar Archives, came to be photographed, and whether Mr. Hare's photograph is really a photograph of the original.

Spain!

The *CRITIC* having been denounced as "a Communist rag" by a group of foreign readers who obviously approve of the methods of the butcher General Franco, because it ventured to express its sympathy with the Loyalist cause in Spain, the Editor is glad to reiterate that expression of sympathy and to call attention again to an American organization which is collecting funds for the assistance of the Loyalists, especially for the aid of the wounded, sick and starving, the women maimed or widowed, the children orphaned or mutilated by said Franco and his Moors and Italians.

The American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Room 414, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City, receives donations, large or small, for the above purposes. It will also send *free on request* to any address documents giving authentic information regarding the abominably savage and bloody methods of the Spanish rebels, for example:

The Spanish News Digest, published from time to time.

The Truth About Spain.

A Reading List of Books, Pamphlets, Magazine Articles on the Current Situation in Spain.

Further articles as published.

Also, for 10 cents:

Spain; a 24 page pamphlet compiled from reliable sources by a group of thirteen eminent American clergymen and professors, showing the atrocities of the rebel troops, the attitude of the Loyalist Government as representing a majority of the Spanish people, etc.

The Editor ventures to suggest that those asking for this information should at least send enough to cover the postage.

At the Periscope

Latest News in Brief.—"Father Divine" growing popular in some theosophical circles.—Dr. Arundale, ill of a fever, unable to edit *March Theosophist*; ordered by physician to stay at home at Adyar for a year.—Odorless onion invented; boon for Ballardites.—Dr. de Purucker proposes to visit England and the Continent next summer and autumn.—Sydney Lord's Amphitheater finally sold for £1,900 to "Ladies of the Holy Grail"; cost £20,000.—G. B. Bryan, in new pamphlet, shows Ballard to have cribbed many of his fantastic stories from earlier writers, claiming them his own experiences.—Ghosts of Besant and Leadbeater slight Benares T. S. Convention; conspicuously absent, but Dr. George was there, mostly in bed; no mention of Leadbeater in *Convention Indian Theosophist*.

Bryan Punches Ballard Again.—In his fourth brochure, *The Source of the Ballard Writings*, Dr. Gerald B. Bryan shows that many of the fantastic personal experiences described by W. G. Ballard and given as his own, are taken almost bodily from three older books, *A Dweller on Two Planets*, *Brother of the Third Degree* and *Myriam and the Mystic Brotherhood*. I hope to review this shortly; meanwhile it may be had from this office for 37 cents.

Nucleus of a Theosophical Library

(Continued from February CRITIC)

All from the O. E. LIBRARY. Prices subject to change without notice.
Aids to Students of The Secret Doctrine
Crump, Basil—Evolution as Outlined in the Archaic Eastern Records, \$1.30.

A faithful summary and bird's eye view of *The Secret Doctrine*, free from its numerous details and digressions; valuable for those not wishing to read the larger work. The gist of *The Secret Doctrine* in 200 pages.

Hillard, Katherine—An Abbreviation of *The Secret Doctrine*, \$3.00.

Judge, William Q.—An Epitome of Theosophy, paper, \$0.25.
An excellent bird's eye view of Theosophy, suitable as an introduction to *The Secret Doctrine*.

Pease, W. B.—An Outline Study of *The Secret Doctrine*, paper, \$0.20.

Wadia, B. P.—Some Observations on the Study of *The Secret Doctrine* of H. P. Blavatsky, paper, \$0.25.

Letters from the Masters

The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett; edited by A. Trevor Barker, \$7.50.
This incomparable collection of genuine letters from the Masters should be owned and studied by every serious student. It ranks first in authority on Theosophy.

Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom; edited by C. Jinarajadasa, Vol. I, \$1.25. A small but invaluable book.

Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom; edited by C. Jinarajadasa, Vol. II, \$2.00. Contains numerous facimiles of Masters' letters.

A Master's Letter (Bombay U. L. T. pamphlet No. 29).

The Great Master's Letter (Bombay U. L. T. pamphlet No. 33). Single copy, \$0.06; more than one, \$0.05 each.

Bombay U. L. T. Blavatsky Pamphlet Series

This series of reprints of articles by H. P. B., Judge and others consists of the following to this date: (1) H. P. B., *Is Theosophy a Religion?*; (2) H. P. B., *What Theosophy Is*; (3) Judge, *Universal Applications of Doctrine*; (4) Damodar, *Castes in India*; (5) Judge, *Theosophy Generally Stated*; (6) Judge, *Karma*; (7) H. P. B., *Thoughts on Ormuzd and Ahriman*; (8) Judge, *Reincarnation in Western Religions*; (9) H. P. B. & Judge, *Reincarnation, Memory, Heredity*; (10) H. P. B. & Judge, *Reincarnation*; (11) H. P. B. & Judge, *Dreams*; (12) Damodar & Judge, *Mind-Control*; (13) H. P. B., *Mediatorship*; (14) Judge, H. P. Blavatsky; (15) H. P. B. & Judge, *On The Secret Doctrine*; (16) Judge, *The Secret Doctrine Instructions*; (17) H. P. B., *Truth in Modern Life*; (18) Judge, *Culture of Concentration*; (19) H. P. B., *Hypnotism; Black Magic in Science*; (20) H. P. B., *Kosmic Mind*; (21) Judge, *Overcoming Karma*; (22) H. P. B., *What Are the Theosophists, Some Words on Daily Life by a Master*; (23) H. P. B., *Christmas*; (24) Judge, *Cyclic Impression and Return and Our Evolution*; (25) H. P. B., *Memory in the Dying*; (26) H. P. B., *The Origin of Evil*; (27) H. P. B., *The Fall of Ideals*; (28) H. P. B., *On the New Year*; (29) *A Master's Letter*; (30) Judge, *Karma—The Compensator*; (31) H. P. B., *Let Every Man prove His Own Work*; (32) H. P. B., *The Dual Aspect of Wisdom*, etc.; (33) *The Great Master's Letter* (by the Maha-Chohan); (34) Judge, *Living the Higher Life*, 5 cents each from the O. E. LIBRARY; one copy only, 6 cents.

Some Other Books of Value

At the Feet of the Master. An admirable and widely read elementary treatise on theosophical ethics, attributed to J. Krishnamurti, but probably written by C. W. Leadbeater. Millions sold. Paper, \$0.50; cloth, \$0.75.

(To be continued)

THE O. E. LIBRARY CRITIC

Published monthly at 1207 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

BY

The O. E. Library League

Vol. XXIV

April, 1937

No. 11

Yearly subscription, United States and Canada, fifty cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or 62 cents. Single copies, five cents. Blank (unfilled) British postal orders and stamps, Canadian paper money and stamps accepted.

A TRIP TO REVIEWLAND—HARE REVIEWERS ON PARADE

Having devoted portions of several issues of THE CRITIC to a consideration of the book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, by Harold E. and William Loftus Hare, let us for a diversion consider some other reviews of this book. I am prompted to do this by the letter of Mr. W. L. Hare published in the last CRITIC, in which he says: "*The Occult Review*, *L'Astrosophie* and *Dion Fortune* all admit that we have proved our case." What value have these admissions? Are they based upon a thorough study of the book, or upon a mere superficial reading, influenced by the purported scholarship of the authors, leading the reviewers to assume that what is said may be taken for granted and that no further analysis is necessary?

The review in *L'Astrosophie* I have not seen and so cannot comment on it, but the editorial reviews in the July, 1936, *Occult Review* and in *Dion Fortune's* magazine *The Inner Light*, July, 1936, are before me. In commenting on these I wish to make it clear that both of these reviewers are students of occultism, both are believers in the possible existence of Masters, and both are somewhat in sympathy with the Theosophical Movement. For this reason what they say has to be distinguished from the comments of hack reviewers of whom nothing more is asked than that they shall produce a readable "story" and who are equally able to discourse on Einstein's theories, on the Peking Man or the latest discovery in antitoxins. Such reviewers write for the cash; anything, true or false, will do, provided it appeals to the ignorant public which accepts as truth whatever appears in a supposedly reputable newspaper or magazine. Neither the editor of *The Occult Review* nor of *The Inner Light* belong in this class; both are deserving of respect and I am glad to express it.

The *Occult Review* Editor devotes six pages to a consideration of the Hare book and to expounding his own theory of Masters. He begins by saying:

"In the course of its chequered career, the Theosophical Society has time and again suffered violent upheavals which have shaken the organization to its foundations. . . . The inclusion of the name of H. P. B. in this connection may seem at first sight a gratuitous affront, but in truth it really is not so; for Mr. William Loftus Hare and his brother have between them set in motion in her name another earthquake to rock the Theosophical edifice. A book which is the joint production of the brothers Hare has just been published under the title *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?* in which not only is the reception of the communications in question carefully investigated, but their contents intensively scrutinized and analysed, with the result that it is practically impossible to find an answer to the charge of wilful deception.

"This is a hard thing to say, and the present writer puts his considered opinion on record with a full sense of responsibility; for in spite of the disclosures which a perusal of the analysis of the *Mahatma Letters* brings in its wake, he is as firm and confident as ever in his belief in the authenticity of the inspiration and spiritual guidance of the Theosophical movement"

This is indeed an admission that the Hares are right, that H. P. Blavatsky was a swindler and that whatever may be thought about other Mahatmas her Mahatmas were pure inventions. What is the value of such an admission? Its value depends upon a thorough and exhaustive examination of the arguments and purported facts of the Brothers Hare, and an equally exhaustive study of the evidence for the defense, and one would think that "a full sense of responsibility" would have led the Editor of the *O. R.* to make such a study before designating as "another earthquake to rock the Theosophical edifice" what a more careful investigation would have shown him to be nothing but a bean-shooting expedition. Had he devoted even a portion of the two weeks which the CRITIC consumed in studying but two pages of the Hare book, citing "Americanisms" to be found in the *Mahatma Letters*, in proof that the writer thereof had lived in America, he would have discovered that 95 percent of these purported Americanisms were not such, but good British dating back even to Shakespeare and before (CRITIC, Oct., 1936). He would have discovered that the purported "Dog-Latin" of the Mahatmas, supposed to betray their ignorance, was mostly good classical Latin, partly good French, partly attributable to mistakes of the transcriber, as shown by a study of facsimiles of the Letters themselves (CRITIC, Dec., 1936). Further he would have found that the Hares had ignored a number of Mahatmic letters in their characteristic script produced under conditions where H. P. B. could not by any possibility have written them (CRITIC, Aug.-Sept., 1936). The facsimile of one of these letters, together with its history, was in their hands, and they deliberately altered the clearly endorsed date of receipt, 1886—as shown by the facsimile before them—to 1876, making it appear that the letter was written in America (CRITIC, Feb., 1937).

Further, the *O. R.* Editor would have discovered that the so-called misquotations of Scripture by H. P. B. and the Mahatmas were not misquotations at all, but just expressions of biblical sentiments in other words, and that even then the Hares themselves fall into blunders about Scripture and about what H. P. B. wrote in *The Secret Doctrine* (CRITIC, Nov., 1936). And surely, had he studied the few cases of common colloquialisms cited by the Hares as found in the Mahatma Letters and the Blavatsky Letters he would hardly have regarded them as proof of a common origin (CRITIC, June-July, 1936).

The Fadéef Letter

The *O. R.* Editor states (p. 158) that:

"The brothers Hare, however, make no mention of a letter from 'K. H.' received as long ago as the year 1870 by Madame Fadéef, an aunt of H. P. B. But then this hardly comes within their scope."

Not so. The Hares distinctly mention this letter on page 249 and again discuss it on pages 303-304, which could not have been overlooked in a careful reading. The CRITIC of January, 1937, discussed this matter fully and showed that the Hares read into this letter motives which are wholly unwarranted by the text. I call attention to it here simply as an indication of the superficial study which the *O. R.* Editor gave to the book.

The *O. R.* Editor quotes some of the Hare arguments and is rather unfortunate in his selections as every one of them is either fallacious or a falsification of facts. He quotes a statement of the Hares that one of the Mahatma Letters (p. 363) says that "Damodar went to Tibet," this being regarded as evidence that the letter was written at Adyar and therefore by H. P. B. The Mahatma, being in Tibet, should have written

"came to Tibet". "Went" is entirely correct, even if written in Tibet. Anyone who will read the full passage in the Mahatma Letter referred to will learn that after a certain controversy "Subha Row resigned and Damodar went to Tibet." Should I, writing in Boston, say "Congress adjourned, Senator X went to Florida and Senator Y went to Boston" I should be writing correctly. Were I to write "Senator Y came to Boston" I should be introducing my own personality into a bit of history having nothing to do with myself.

Hokum About Damodar

Speaking of Damodar K. Mavalankar the *O. R.* Editor falls into a curious error of his own. He says (p. 156):

"First, then, as to the nature of the evidence brought to light by the brothers Hare in their dissection of the contents of the *Letters*, and allied matters; considerations of space forbid more than the choice of a few typical examples of the analysis which has been made. We will take first the case of the mysterious disappearance of the young chela, Damodar. It will be remembered that he and a few fellow enthusiasts set out from Adyar to find the Masters. All but Damodar gave up the quest . . ."

Pure imagination! The complete story is told in Olcott's *Old Diary Leaves*, Vol. III, pp. 259-268, partly in Damodar's own words as recorded in his diary. No "fellow enthusiasts" set out with Damodar either from Adyar or any other place. He had expected to have the company of a man who was in the habit of journeying between India and Tibet, though not with the object of "finding the Masters." Being disappointed in this, he set out alone, accompanied only by some hired coolies whom he later sent back with his belongings, including his diary of his trip, and proceeded alone. For the rest of the story the reader is referred to Olcott's book.

Even a worse case is a further quotation by the *O. R.* Editor from the Hare book, also concerning Damodar. (Hare, p. 222):

"The mysterious disappearance of Damodar would seem to be the natural sequel to his much-trying life. Cut off by his father for his attachment to H. P. B. and the rule of the Masters, he received in consequence the nickname of 'the Disinherited' (generally written in the MSS. 'Desinherited', as if it were derived from the French *Deshérité*). He had not long entered on his clerical career at Adyar when his 'shadow-name' became detached from his substance and was passed off as another man! For H. P. B. wrote to Mr. Sinnett: 'Disinherited wants to write to you he says—if you permit him—through Damodar' (B. L. p. 10). Through Damodar? 'Disinherited' is Damodar! Why this pretence of duality?"

All this is false and an invention of the Brothers Hare, and would have been found to be such by the *O. R.* Editor had he troubled himself to look up the story of Damodar as told by Col. Olcott in *Old Diary Leaves*, Vol. II, pp. 292-293. Damodar was never "nicknamed the Disinherited" as there would have been no foundation for it. Here is what Colonel Olcott says about him:

"When this dear young man joined the Society and put his heart into the work, he got from his father permission to live with us, irrespective of caste restrictions and as though he had taken the vows of the Sannyasi. The father and an uncle were also active members at that time. According to the custom of Guzerati Brahmans, Damodar had been bethrothed in childhood, of course without his consent, and the time arrived when he would have to take up the married life. But his sole ambition in life was now to lead the existence of the spiritual recluse, and he viewed marriage with the greatest repugnance. He felt himself the victim of custom, and was passionately eager to be freed from the abhorrent contract, so that he might become a true *chela* of Mahatma K. H., whom he had seen in his youth, and again after coming to us. His father, a wise and high-

minded man, at last consented, and Damodar assigned over to him his share of the ancestral estate, amounting, if I rightly recollect, to some 50,000 rs., on condition that his child-wife should be taken to his father's house and comfortably maintained."

The confusion of Damodar with the "Disinherited" is simply a blunder of the Hare Brothers, for which there is not the slightest foundation. The "Disinherited" was a chela living with the Masters in Tibet. The references to him in the *Mahatma Letters* and in the H. P. B. Letters afford no support for the Hares' statement.

The "tobacco incident" quoted by the O. R. Editor (p. 157) from the Hares' book has been sufficiently disposed of in the March, 1937, CRITIC.

It appears, then, that the sample "analyses" quoted from the Hares' work as proving their thesis are baseless and afford no grounds for the conclusion of the O. R. Editor that "it is practically impossible to find an answer to the charge of wilful deception" on the part of H. P. B. Had he devoted as much time as I have to the study of the Hares' production and other literature about the *Mahatma Letters*, he would probably have come to a directly opposite conclusion to that expressed above. But the mischief has been done. It is no light matter to publish an endorsement of a book purporting to prove H. P. B. a fraud and the Mahatmas her invention. To do this without really serious analysis of the book is unpardonable, and that such a study was not made is obvious. The views of the O. R. Editor in the same article about Masters are interesting, but do not concern us here.

Dion Fortune's "Admission"

In her review in the July, 1936, *Inner Light*, Dion Fortune swallows the Hare book hook, line and sinker, and so effectively that she does not regurgitate a single one of the Hare Brothers' arguments, either by direct quotation or otherwise. Her "admission", which delights Mr. William Loftus Hare, consists in passing what she calls her "verdict of guilty" without an iota of the evidence on which it is based. The reader is therefore expected to accept the verdict that H. P. B. wrote the *Mahatma Letters*, not on the basis of what the Hares say, but on her own unproved assertions. Doubtless absorbed in her own engrossing work it is not to be expected that the editor of *The Inner Light* would have time to examine thoroughly the validity of the arguments and pseudo-arguments of the Brothers Hare, or to inform herself fully as to the mass of evidence to the contrary. Why, then, not ignore the book entirely, rather than indulge in vituperative snap-judgements which simply bespeak her ignorance?

Says Dion Fortune (p. 186):

"There was a certain cupboard in Mme Blavatsky's house in which messages for the Masters were placed, and in which their replies were found, 'precipitated' from the Himalayas. But when that cupboard was examined by the delegates of the S. P. R., it was found to have a false back, opening into the next room, and that is an ugly matter."

The writer is clearly ignorant of the mass of testimony proving that up to February 13th, 1884, at least, there was no "false back" to the cupboard, nor any hole in the wall behind it. On that date, and earlier, Colonel Olcott had removed the loosely hanging closet and found everything intact. Others had made investigations and found nothing out of the way. Space does not permit describing these, but the evidence is conclusive that up to the time that Madame Blavatsky left Adyar for Europe, February 8th, 1884, none of the purported Mahatmic letters could have been delivered in this way. (For details see Trans. H. P. B. Lodge, London, published as *H. P. Blavatsky and the Masters of the Wisdom*.)

The *Inner Light* Editor is apparently unaware of the various Mahatmic letters received by certain individuals under circumstances where H. P. B. could not by any possibility have written them, she being many

hundreds of miles distant, and even in Europe, and which were almost immediate replies to inquiries. These were treated at some length in the August-September CRITIC. Space cannot be taken here to repeat, but the data have been long available both to the Hares and to the *Inner Light* Editor in Mr. Jinarajadasa's *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?* and in his *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, Vol. II. I do not blame her for being unfamiliar with these, but she is certainly to be censured for pronouncing a snap judgement on the dishonesty, long continued, of H. P. B. without a careful survey of the evidence, and for passing a verdict in a fashion otherwise characteristic of only the worst type of yellow journalism.

Let me quote another passage (p. 187):

"My verdict is 'Guilty, with a strong recommendation to mercy.' Being myself the head of an occult organization with Masters behind it, I know the difficulties she had to contend with and the temptations to which she was liable. I think she faked the Letters, but I do not think she faked the Masters. The Letters were, in my opinion, faked to raise funds and obtain support in the days of her early struggles, for people will attend to a miracle that proves nothing at all, while the best of one's brain-work goes for naught, as I know to my cost. I am also of the opinion, in the light of my own experience in the same field, that the tales of personal meetings with the Masters on the physical plane, and all the evidence for their local habitations and names, is also bunkum, and I do not believe that whoever originated these stories, or whoever substantiated them, has ever been sincere . . ."

How funny! Here is a fourth motive of H. P. B. to be added to the three the Brothers Hare have advanced (Hare, pp. 301-303; CRITIC, January 1937). To raise money! For what? To obtain support! For what? People often enough resort to fraud and forgery to raise money for themselves, but they don't do it out of pure benevolence. What was her work? To spread the teachings of Masters she had invented in the first place and to get funds to keep these Masters going. Hardly likely.

And then the Faded letter, (CRITIC, January, 1937), written in 1870 in the later well-known K. H. script from some unknown place to her aunt in Odessa. Did this ask for money or hint that it was wanted? Did it give any address to which a kind and sympathetic aunt might send it on her own initiative? Did it hint at support of any kind whatever? By no means. On the contrary it told the aunt that her niece was being well taken care of by devoted friends. If no personal motive, financial or otherwise, is discernible in this first letter, why should it be looked for in later letters in the same handwriting? The Hares have made themselves silly over this first letter, and their example is hardly one to be imitated or surpassed.

As for the "sincerity" of the various persons who have borne witness to having seen and talked with the Tibetan Masters, or received communications from them which could not by any possibility have passed through H. P. B.'s hands, these, including not only Colonel Olcott, but Damodar K. Mavalankar, Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden, Bhavani Shankar, P. Srinavasa Rao, Police Inspector Keshava Pillai, Judge Sir S. Subramania Aiyer, T. Subba Row and others, are not lightly to be charged with never having been sincere. Dion Fortune tells us about a fire salamander which walked out of her fireplace, lived for a month or more in her house, growing to be five feet long and learning to walk on its hind legs (*The Inner Light*, July, 1932, p. 8). In telling this story I suppose she desired to be believed, and certainly to charge her with not being sincere in telling it would be no more unfair than her wholesale condemnation of the persons spoken of--sauce for the gander, sauce for the goose.

But Dion Fortune believes in the existence of Masters, even Himalayan Masters, and writes interestingly about them in the article under consideration. It is worthwhile to quote the following (p. 188):

"When Mr. Wadia, once a worker at Adyar, and later founder of

the United Lodge of Theosophists, was in England shortly after the War, trying to make a start with his scheme, he gathered together a small group of people, of whom I was one, and put us in touch with the Himalayan Masters. For what my testimony is worth, I can vouch for the genuineness of these contacts; I certainly got in touch with something; but although it was not evil, it was to me alien and unsympathetic, and it seemed to me that it was hostile to my race, but that is another story. Anyway, the rapport soon came to an end so far as I was concerned. Whether I was cast out, or walked out, I cannot be certain, anyway, the parting was simultaneous and by mutual agreement."

While not questioning the general statement above, the assertion that Mr. Wadia was "the founder of the United Lodge of Theosophists" is entirely untrue, this having been founded by Robert Crosbie in Los Angeles in 1909, and Mr. Wadia is hardly likely to have made such a claim. We read in the current *Theosophical Movement* (March, 1937), organ of the Bombay U. L. T., originated by Mr. Wadia, that: "There is only one United Lodge of Theosophists. Groups of Associates exist in various parts of the world." But that has no bearing on the present question.

I may, in concluding, repeat Dion Fortune's suggestion (p. 189) that "the Theosophical Society be bound over to keep the peace and tell no more fairy tales" as applicable to the Head of The Fraternity of the Inner Light. Certainly, if one of the qualifications of an occultist is to do equal justice to all, her review falls further short of so doing than almost anything I have seen. Hack reviewers, ignorant of the subject and working for pay at so much a line may perhaps be pardoned, but for a genuine occultist to present as a review what is nothing but unfounded condemnation based on imperfect study of the book in question and of other literature bearing on it, and without citing a single argument, is but talking through the hat.

Some Reported Sayings of The Lord Buddha

Teacher.—It is reported that The Lord Buddha said:

"Do not believe anything because you have heard it.

"Do not believe in traditions because they have been handed down for many generations.

"Do not believe in anything simply because it is spoken and rumoured by many.

"Do not believe anything simply because it is found written in your religious books.

"Do not believe in anything merely on the authority of your teachers and elders.

"But after observation and analysis, when you find that anything agrees with reason and is conducive to the good and benefit of one and all, then accept it and live up to it."

—*The Maha-Bodhi*,—March, 1937

"Concerning Damodar K. Mavalankar"

Concerning Damodar K. Mavalankar. Issued by the H. P. B. Library, Victoria B. C., 1937. Limited multigraph edition, paper, pp. 108. \$2.00 from the O. E. LIBRARY.

To most theosophists of today Damodar K. Mavalankar, familiarly known as "Damodar", is little more than a name, if indeed they have ever heard of him. He received some mention in the Hodgson report of the S. P. R. and was charged with being an accomplice of H. P. B. in fraudulent transactions. Very recently the Brothers Hare, in their book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, indulge in uncomplimentary remarks about him, and publish as God's own truth statements about him which are pure inventions of their own. For these see the leading article in this issue of the CRITIC.

Nevertheless students of the early history of the Theosophical Society and of the early issues of *The Theosophist*, and also of *The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett* and *The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett* frequently encounter his name or articles written by him. H. P. B. regarded him as one of two or three members who had succeeded as a chela. He was a Brahmin youth of a well-to-do family, with every prospect of leading a life of ease and contentment with his ancestral religion. Clearly, however, there were latent aspirations in him. During an illness while a boy he "had a vision of a benignant sage who came and took his hand and told him he should not die but should live for useful work", this visitor being later regarded by him as his guru K. H. Before he was 19 he had read *Isis Unveiled* and was induced to contact H. P. B. and Colonel Olcott, who had recently come from America, and was prompted to join the Theosophical Society, with the consent of his father, giving up caste and voluntarily assigning his share of the ancestral estate to his family in consideration of their caring for the young girl to whom he had been betrothed in childhood. He then threw himself heart and soul into the work of the T. S. He was one of the few who were directly in touch with the Mahatmas, his special guru being Mahatma K. H. He was very active in the T. S. work and was one of its secretaries. Finally he went to Tibet at the bidding, we are told, of his Master, and never returned. It is stated that he arrived safely, but all the information is vague.

As the information about Damodar, as well as his few letters and writings (partly in early issues of *The Theosophist*) are accessible to but few students in these days a young student associated with the H. P. B. Library in Victoria, B. C., whose name is not given, undertook to collect the literature by and about him into one volume. Of this we are told in the Foreword that:

"The whole literary output of D. K. Mavalankar is given in this volume with the exception of some reviews and correspondence, to include which would shed no fresh light upon his work in general."

In addition to material by Damodar himself we are given a brief sketch of his life, taken for the most part from Colonel Olcott's *Old Diary Leaves* (see leading article in this CRITIC). As it was expected that the book would be of interest to but a limited circle of students it was not printed, but was issued in mimeograph form, and in a very limited edition, so it is suggested that those who want it should get it at once.

Personally I have found it a fascinating compilation. His autobiographical sketch, published in *The Theosophist* of May, 1880, pp. 196-197, under the title "Castes in India", telling how he was led to give up his hereditary religion and to renounce family ties, is a masterpiece which should inspire any reader. One sees, too, how as time progressed his faculties and ideals developed. Of frail body and poor health he was an indefatigable worker for the T. S. and the cause of the Masters, and one wonders how anyone reading his articles and letters could suspect him of being a fraud and an accomplice in fraud, a liar and the distributor of lies; but so it is. The Hares, who have apparently adopted at leisure the Psalmist's hasty expression, appear to regard all men as liars, and Dion Fortune, who can tell almost incredible stories of her own experiences, seems to be of the same mind (see leading article in this CRITIC). Space is lacking to go further into these matters here. I can only recommend the book to those interested in theosophical history. It is worthwhile, however, to reproduce three letters of Mahatma K.H., not to be found in this volume. The first is a letter in K. H. script to Dr. Franz Hartmann in 1884, published in facsimile in Jinarajadasa, *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?* (p. 15):

"Damodar has undoubtedly many faults and weaknesses as others have. But he is unselfishly devoted to us and to the Cause and has rendered himself extremely useful to Upasika. His presence and as-

Nucleus of a Theosophical Library

(Continued from March Critic)

All from the O. E. Library. Prices subject to change without notice.

- Bowen, Capt. P. G.*—Sayings of the Ancient One, \$1.25. From an ancient mystical manuscript discovered in South Africa. The teachings bear a close resemblance to those of *Light on the Path*, and we regard this as one of the most valuable and inspiring of recent publications.
- Buddhism:**—
- Arnold, Sir Edwin*—*The Light of Asia*; pocket ed., cloth, \$1.00; leather, \$1.65. Famous poetical account of Buddha and Buddhism. No other book has done so much to bring a knowledge of Buddhism to the Western World.
- Carus, Paul*—*The Gospel of Buddha*, \$1.25.
- Olcott, Col. H. S.*—*The Buddhist Catechism*, boards, \$0.50. A classic, recognized as reliable by all schools of Buddhism.
- The Dhammapada*; Sacred Books of the East series, \$3.60.
- What is Buddhism?*, \$1.00. A popular and untechnical handbook issued by the Buddhist Lodge of London.
- Warren, H. C.*—*Buddhism in Translations*, \$3.15. Highly recommended.
- A Brief Glossary of Buddhist Terms, paper, \$0.50.
- A. L. Cleather and B. Crump*—*Buddhism the Science of Life*, \$1.50.
- March, A. C.*—*A Buddhist Bibliography*, compiled by A. C. March, of the Buddhist Lodge, London, \$7.50. Only complete bibliography of all books on Buddhism in the English language, and of all English translations of Buddhist texts, etc. Invaluable for students of Buddhism.
- The Bhagavad Gita.** Many translations; the ones usually called for are the version by *W. Q. Judge*, \$1.00, and by *Charles Johnston*, \$1.25, both with commentary. Also *Sir Edwin Arnold's* poetical version, "*The Song Celestial*", pocket edition, cloth, \$1.00; leather, \$1.65.
- Notes on the Bhagavad Gita*, by *W. Q. Judge* and *Robert Crosbie*, \$1.00.
- Lectures on the Philosophy of the Bhagavad Gita**, by *T. Subba Row*. Adyar ed., with sketch of author, \$1.25; Point Loma ed., with comprehensive glossary and index, \$1.00. An admirable work, often quoted in *The Secret Doctrine*. Both editions are to be commended.
- Collins, Mabel*—*Light on the Path*, \$0.75. One of the greatest of the theosophical classics.
- The Idyll of the White Lotus*, \$1.35.
- Through the Gates of Gold*, \$1.50.
- When the Sun Moves Northward*, \$1.50.
- Dampier, Sir William*—*A History of Science and its Relations with Philosophy and Religion*, \$2.50.
- No serious student of occultism should neglect to read this work. Because of its philosophic aspect it is invaluable. Up to date; said to be the best general history of science since Whewell's *History of the Inductive Sciences* (published in 1840).
- Das, Bhagavan*—*The Science of Peace*, \$2.50; *The Science of the Emotions*, \$3.50; *The Science of Social Organization, or the Laws of Manu in the Light of Atma-Vidya*, \$3.00.
- de Purucker, G.*—*Fundamentals of the Esoteric Philosophy*, \$7.50.
- The Esoteric Tradition*, 2 vols., 1009 pages and index, 71 pages, \$5.00. By the present leader of the Point Loma Theosophical Society. Opinions differ as to whether these volumes strictly follow *The Secret Doctrine*. Whether or not, they are often elucidative of this, and are full of suggestions stimulating thought and criticism.

THE O. E. LIBRARY CRITIC

Published monthly at 1207 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

BY

The O. E. Library League

Vol. XXIV

May-June, 1937

No. 12

Yearly subscription, United States and Canada, fifty cents; foreign, two shillings sixpence or 62 cents. Single copies, five cents. Blank (unfilled) British postal orders and stamps, Canadian paper money and stamps accepted.

A TRIP TO REVIEWLAND—II

In reviewing in the last CRITIC the reviews of the Hare book, *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?*, by the editor of *The Occult Review* and by Dion Fortune, I selected these because Mr. W. L. Hare adduces them as admitting that he has proved his point, and because they are well-known writers on occult topics. I should, perhaps, have started with the Hares' own opinion of their book. Of course they have a good opinion of their own work, and so have I. It is a perfect Noah's Ark of misstatements and quibblings and false deductions from false premises. What the Brothers Hare have accomplished, so they think, may be shown in these two brief quotations from their book:

(P. 275). "We now know who wrote the Mahatma Letters to Mr. A. P. Sinnett and other persons; and in the course of our statement of the Problem, the Investigation and the Demonstration, we have learned how much or how little to value their contents. The Letters, however, do not stand alone. They form the basis of a superstructure which, as to its magnitude, is immense, and as to its character and claim, stupendous. If this basis be proved unsound, the superstructure must collapse."

(P. 287). "In a word, the Theosophical Superstructure, which could never have been raised but for the Mahatma Letters, is crumbling before our eyes. This book ought to bring it level with the ground—in spite of the eleventh-hour endeavour to sustain it, now to be recounted."

This, then, is their summary of their own work, their thesis, their "case", to use the expression of Mr. W. L. Hare in his letter to the CRITIC (see March issue) which he claims that *The Occult Review* and Dion Fortune "admit" he has proved. Curiously, it is just this thesis which both of these reviewers deny. The O. E. editor says, among other things (July, 1936, p. 160):

"Through their messenger, H. F. B., with all her faults and foibles, the Masters initiated a movement in the outer world which despite its setbacks, despite the side-tracks of akasha reading, of new Messiahs, of séance-room phenomena, of mass-misleaders, of wars and rumors of wars and universal unrest, is destined to grow from strength to strength, even though our limited vision fail to see any signs of progress, but only disintegration and decay."

Does that look much like admitting that the Hares have proved their case?

And Dion Fortune (July, 1936, *Inner Light*, p. 187):

"But I also believe that the inspiration that came from that alleged source was a genuine thing, and although the Theosophical Society will have to cut away a deplorable amount of dead timber before it can be pronounced to be in a healthy state, nevertheless I am of the opinion that the inspiration behind it is a very real thing, and that it will not die out, but, having done the necessary lopping, will make

new and firmer growth."

So, whatever these two occult worthies may think of the Hares' arguments after a superficial reading of their book, they certainly do not share their view that their book will bring the Theosophical Superstructure "level with the ground."

Turning to some other reviews of the Hare book, one of the best, within the scope of a newspaper article, appeared in the *Madras Mail* of August 1st, 1936, under the title "The Blavatsky Riddle Again" and was written by "Henry Sproull". This Henry Sproull, thought I, has some perception and unlike most newspaper critics can read a book with discernment of its faults; there is a theosophist in belief if not by profession. Now, curiously, this very same article, *verbatim* except for a few trifling changes, appears in the November *Theosophist* (p. 152) under the name of James H. Cousins, the well-known theosophical writer. Evidently the two are the same, and the unusual excellence of the *Madras Mail* review is explained. It is impossible to recount the various points made by Prof. Cousins-Sproull, but he shows that the Hares are completely muddled on H. P. B.'s and the Mahatmas' treatment of reincarnation, and that they are wrong in stating that "the Theosophical structure, which could never have been raised but for the *Mahatma Letters*, is 'crumbling before our eyes', which is a palpable misstatement of the history of the Theosophical movement." I can best show an instance that the Hares do not know what they are talking about by quoting a paragraph about the Anglo-French phrases which the Hares regard as proving that H. P. B. wrote the *Mahatma Letters*. Prof. Cousins has long been a resident in India, and is Principal of the Theosophical College at Madanapalle. He says:

"The assembling of phrases to prove that there is a French substratum to the English of the Letters, hence that they were written by Madame Blavatsky, whose second language was French, raises question in anyone who knows that some of the alleged French forms are everyday Indian-English that worries English professors all over the peninsula. The argument seems to be that any phrase used in the Letters that can be turned into French proves its semi-French authorship. The use of the French phrase *n'est ce pas?* is pointed out, though with somewhat ambiguous intent in an ironical passage [Hare, p. 116]. In India the vernacular equivalent is used constantly, thus: It was raining yesterday, is it not? You are going to Calcutta tomorrow, is it not?"

From this hit in the Hare bull's-eye I turn to one more review which, from its place of publication (*Theos. News and Notes*, July-Aug., 1936, p. 18; reprinted in November *Theosophist*, p. 156) is likely to create a false impression about the *Mahatma Letters* in Adyarite circles. It is brief, only one-and-a-half page, is signed "A. G." and presumably was written by Mrs. Adelaide Gardner, General Secretary of the British Section, T. S. (Adyar). With much that the writer says one can agree, but exception must be taken to the following:

"Such labour could have been better employed, for it is now generally admitted by all who have really studied the matter that H. P. B. was either the medium or the amanuensis for most of these writings, and by all the acknowledged laws of psychic phenomena much of her personality would inevitably colour the communications received."

Such a statement is entirely unwarranted. It is conceded that H. P. B. received at times dictated communications, such as the famous Prayag Letter (*M. L.*, p. 461). In such cases, as in this, she frankly admitted it, saying; Master says so-and-so. But there is no evidence that this applies to by far the greater part of the letters. But it is in evidence from the *Mahatma Letters*, especially those of K. H., that he wrote the letters himself, even complaining one occasion of shortage of paper and on another asking for a recipe for blue ink. Why so, if they were dictated? The claim

of the Hares that the letters contain personal peculiarities of H. P. B. has been amply discussed and shown to be puerile. Further, there were various instances of the receipt of such letters, in the same script, where H. P. B. could not by any possibility have written them down. Then, too, Sinnett's letters were directly transmitted to the Mahatma, not read off to him by H. P. B. See the goat incident in *Mahatma Letters*, p. 320. If actually written letters could be transmitted in one direction, why not in the other? Careful students of the Letters will find plenty of instances showing that H. P. B. was not the medium or automatist claimed. Precipitation is a mysterious process on which speculation is fruitless at present, but there are evidences enough quite outside this controversy that such a phenomenon can occur. The transport of objects from a distance is now regarded as an established fact. One cannot go into the subject here, but one would like to hear the evidence on which Mrs. G. bases her assertion.

The fact is that this cock-and-bull story was invented by those who, finding that the teachings of the Mahatmas did not agree with their own notions, fished about in their brains for some excuse for the differences which would not involve charging the Mahatmas with making mistakes, and they unloaded the blame on H. P. B., dead and unable to defend herself.

Notorious among these was C. W. Leadbeater, of whom Mrs. Besant was later but the echo. To put through his "clairvoyant" imaginings, without directly repudiating the Mahatmas, he took it out on H. P. B. In this connection it is of interest to quote part of a letter written by Leadbeater in 1912 to Mr. W. G. John, then General Secretary of the Australian Section, T. S., and evidently aimed to dispel Mr. John's discomfort over differences between the teachings of H. P. B. and of the Arhat Leadbeater. This is quoted from the Hare book (p. 265) which, despite its contempt for the Arhat, is glad enough to put him forward as evidence when it supports their hypothesis.

Mr. Leadbeater wrote in part:

The Leadbeater Theory
BRITISH CONSULATE, PALERMO, SICILY.

February 25th, 1912.

MY DEAR JOHN,

. . . . Remember that the letters to Sinnett and Hume were not written or dictated directly by a Master, as we at the time supposed, but were the work of pupils carrying out general directions given to them by the Masters, which is a very different thing . . . But we do not trouble ourselves in the least about reconciling the earlier statements—we just describe what we ourselves see, or repeat what is said to us by those whom we trust. At the beginning we did not know enough to ask questions intelligently, and we constantly misunderstood what we were told. I lived through these early days, you know, so I remember what the conditions were . . .

Yours most cordially,

C. W. LEADBEATER.

This was written eleven years before the publication of the *Mahatma Letters*, and bristles with the cock-sureness and conceit of the writer. Any student of the *Mahatma Letters* will see at once that Leadbeater's assertion is entirely false, for, with the single exception of one letter, signed by "The Disinherited" (*M. L.* p. 248) the Mahatma wrote out his letters himself, then sometimes giving them to an expert chela to transmit directly or by precipitation.

There is another source of Mrs. G.'s misinformation, namely in Mr. Sinnett's book, *The Early Days of Theosophy in Europe*, pp. 27, 28, published after his death and before the appearance of *The Mahatma Letters*, and which, while a veiled attack on H. P. B. and an attempted glorification of himself, is on its face the work of a disgruntled man who thought he was not getting the credit which was his due. I quote:

"Long after she passed away from this life, as my methods of

communication with the Masters assumed new and improved conditions, I have discussed this matter with the Master K. H. and in reference to some passages in the letters of the teaching period he has frankly told me that as they stand they are a 'travesty' of his meaning."

What were these "new and improved conditions" for getting in touch with the Master K. H.? Why, mediums, including the same Leadbeater referred to above, who succeeded in capturing Sinnett as he did so many others, with his flattery and sham plausibility. From the *Mahatma Letters* we learn clearly why Mahatma K. H. finally dropped Sinnett. But Sinnett was not to be dropped. He hired the "clairvoyant" Leadbeater as tutor to his son; Leadbeater, who depended largely on Sinnett for his oats, got complete control of Sinnett, reintroduced him to "the Master K. H." and things went on merrily as never before, and incidentally Sinnett was set up against H. P. B., whose teachings did not fit in with what Sinnett thought they should have been. That, probably, is the source of Mrs. G.'s misinformation, she, like so many others, being of the tribe of Leadbeater.

The influence of Leadbeater was most uncanny; he was so self-assured in his ways. Here is an instance. I was once called down by a leading American theosophical worker for making a disparaging remark about the Arhat. Asking him how it was that he chose to accept what Leadbeater said rather than what H. P. B. taught, he replied: "Why, don't you know? I once shook hands with him."

Sometime I hope to compile a list of the more important reviews and discussions of the Hare book for the aid of students.

About Initiation

What was said elsewhere in this CRITIC about "initiation" refers only to fake initiations; it is not intended to ridicule the idea of initiation as properly understood. I hold the perhaps very unorthodox opinion that no one can be made different by any ceremonial whatever from what he was ten minutes before it. Look at it in this way. A medical student, let us say, has studied the medical sciences for several years. From time to time he has to submit to examinations which, successfully passed, entitle him to continue his studies in the school he is attending and under the proper instructors. Finally he is given a parchment stating that he is an M. D. But he is not one whit different ten minutes after each examination than he was ten minutes before; nor is he in any way different ten minutes after his diploma is handed to him than he was ten minutes before. At no one moment has he been initiated into anything. You may, if you wish, call his successive examinations and his final graduation initiations, first, second, third and so on. You may call the examiners initiators and the president of the college, who hands him his final diploma, the "Great Initiator", but it means nothing. At no one moment has he been initiated into anything—he has simply had a succession of labels stuck on him, and the sticking of these labels, as they do not in themselves accomplish anything, does not need to be accompanied with any sort of ceremonial whatsoever, and anything of the sort is just for show.

A medical degree is doubtless of value, as it is required by the authorities before he is permitted to practise as a token that he has had sufficient training; it serves on his shingle or the wall of his office to tell what he is. But all that he is he has made himself, by study, aided by his instructors. But brush aside all these formalities and he would be just as good, or as bad, a doctor.

There is a certain parallelism between spiritual growth and growth in material knowledge, but with the difference that the former, being more an inner process, depends more on the development of the inner faculties and less on something coming from without. It is conceded that at proper times suitable instruction must be given, but this is rather

with the aim of calling out the powers latent within one. It is needless to go into this further here. What I want to emphasize is that initiation is a gradual process, just as is the acquirement of medical knowledge, and that it is not something which proceeds by fits and jumps. To speak of a person being an initiate of the first, second, third degree and so on means about as much as dividing students into sophomores, juniors, seniors and finally graduates. It is quite true that moments may come when there is a rather sudden "expansion of consciousness", when ideas before only dimly or not at all perceived suddenly flash on one, just as one may suddenly have the solution of a problem flash on him, while in other cases the process is a slow one. I don't pretend to offer an explanation of this, though I object to the popular idea that whenever one gets a new conception it is because some superior being has thrust it into his mind. I object to this explanation because it is no explanation at all, for one must at once ask, how did this superior and external being get it? I see no essential difference between conceiving some useful invention and conceiving a new sort of safe-cracking or financial swindling. There are people a-plenty who long ago abandoned the idea of being "tempted by the devil" who still attribute each brilliant idea to some kind-hearted angel anxious to help along.

Be that as it may, the idea that initiation is something sudden, rather than a gradual growth brought about by "self-induced and self-devised efforts", that it is something conferred rather than made by oneself is so alluring that the subject has been the field of exploitation without end. Do you really suppose that those wise beings who know the hearts of men will indulge in such puerile stunts as you find described in books on initiation? Do you think that they will put candidates through a course of interrogation and actually require a spoken oath just as if they were judges in a police court? I find the notion rather insulting. The perniciousness of this notion lies largely in the idea that an initiate is made from without rather than by his own efforts. Read the current literature on initiation. You will get the idea that as one progresses along the Path he finally comes to a closed door. This he cannot open himself; it has to be opened for him and he himself pushed or pulled through it by some sort of ceremonial supposed to stir up his spiritual bowels.

So insistent is the human mind on the idea of being *helped* that it has everywhere resorted to ceremonials performed by others as a substitute for self-help. Nearly every religion has followed this course, Christianity, falsely so-called, with its system of salvation by faith and the efficacy of priestly prayers being a glaring example. One might think that occultists would know better, but they are as bad as the rest. They even write books on the subject, with details, gaining much popularity for themselves. I don't pretend to waste time on such books, but there are two very popular ones which are really delightful. Leadbeater, in his book, *The Masters and the Path*, evidently written to sell to suckers, describes in detail how an aspirant is metamorphosed into an initiate. The candidates assemble before the Masters, who are clad in robes of beautifully embroidered white silk—whether rayon, or the real stuff made from the boiling alive of thousands of silk worms we are not told—while the candidates wear flowing robes of white linen. There is an elaborate catechism, the sponsors endorse the candidates just as the godparents sponsor an infant at baptism, and finally, if the Masters have concluded that the candidates are "O. K.", flash! a gorgeous star flares out over their heads, the angelic orchestra starts up, and the candidates become initiates. It is just like a glorified college commencement.

Alice Bailey has given us an even more entertaining account of the various hocus-pocuses used at the different initiations, and it fills a big book. In one initiation the candidate, clad in his best, stands before the Initiator and someone stirs up his "centers" by poking him with an

electrified stick. The stick has been heavily charged—high voltage—at Shamballa, so heavily, in fact, that the candidate runs considerable risk of having his chakras smashed. This untoward result is avoided by interpolating two Masters as resistances (*Initiation, Human and Solar*, pp. 126-8, 1st ed.).

I fear I shall never become an initiate, for were I put through the stunts we are asked to believe that the great Masters require, I am sure I should burst out laughing and be dismissed in disgrace. For I am unable to conceive of the Great Beings seriously performing what one would expect only in a ceremonial of initiation into a college fraternity, a Ku-Klux-Klan or even a Masonic lodge. Such things may give the initiate a swollen sense of his own importance, but that is not what is called for by those who know the hearts of men. So I suggest that if you are making a collection of crank occult literature you put the books mentioned and others of the same sort on the shelf with it. Make up your mind that "initiation" is a slow growth, brought about through your own efforts aided when necessary by higher instruction when you have already made the best use of what has been placed at your disposal, and have learned by the mistakes you will make. But pay no attention to the talk about being suddenly boosted by some external process, or perhaps by some surgical operation on your chakras, into a new and higher state.

Did H. P. B. Write This Mahatma Letter?

As previously promised Mr. Jinarajadasa publishes in the May *Theosophist* (pp. 105-108) a letter of the Mahatma K. H. which is of singular importance because of the time it was written. H. P. Blavatsky, charged by the Hare Brothers with having written the *Mahatma Letters*, died in 1891. This letter was obviously written in 1900, nine years after H. P. B.'s death. The particulars are as follows.

August 22, 1900, a Mr. B. W. Mantri, of Kalbadevi, Bombay, of whom nothing further seems to be known, wrote to Mrs. Besant in London, the purpose of which is indicated in his letter printed below. This letter occupied part of the first page of a four page folded sheet, and below, filling the blank space, was found on receipt a much longer letter written with blue pencil in the characteristic K. H. script, and signed by him, making reference among other matters to the inquiry of Mr. Mantri. This correspondence is in care of Mr. Jinarajadasa, as "O. H." succeeding Mrs. Besant. The letters are given in photographic facsimile, as well as the front of the envelope and the postmark on the back. I am not a handwriting expert, but from a careful comparison with other facsimiles of K.H. script published by Mr. Jinarajadasa in his book, *Did Madame Blavatsky Forge the Mahatma Letters?*, the handwriting seems perfectly identical.

Evidence as to Date

What is the evidence as to date? The Mantri letter says "22nd August" but does not give the year. The cancellation stamp on the face of the envelope shows "00" very indistinctly, but on the back the ship's mail clerk's stamp is very clearly "Sea Post Office, 25 AU 00". This settles the date of the envelope as August, 1900. Further, the handwriting of the address on the envelope is identical with that of the letter of Mr. Mantri. It is addressed "Mrs. Annie Besant, Theosophical Society, 28 Albermarle Street, London". Now the Theosophical Society in England did not occupy the premises 28 Albermarle Street until February 1st, 1900, as announced in the February, 1900, *Yavan*.

As the K. H. Letter could not have been written before the Mantri letter above it, and is, in fact, in part a comment on it, we have the direct proof of a letter in K. H. script (supposed by the Hares to have been invented and used by H. P. B.) written not earlier than August 22d, 1900, over nine years after H. P. B.'s death. As further corroborating evidence it will be noted that Mr. Mantri hopes to see Mrs. Besant on her return to India. She first went to India late in 1893, two-and-a-

half years after H. P. B.'s death, and was in London in 1900. Further, the K. H. letter refers to a hoped for reincarnation of H. P. B., showing that she had already died.

While these data prove the K. H. letter to have been written about August 22d, 1900, or later, they do not establish beyond all question that Mahatma K. H. was the writer. A skeptic might urge that it was a forgery. Several theories to this effect might be suggested: (1) that Mr. Mantri wrote it; (2) that Mrs. Besant or someone in London who had access to Mrs. Besant's correspondence wrote it; (3) that either Mr. Jinarajadasa or another at Adyar who had access to Mr. Jinarajadasa's files did it; and then, too, there is (4) the familiar expedient used when one wants to explain away a Mahatma letter which does not agree with one's conception of what a Mahatma should write, namely, that a "dugpa" wrote it.

As for Mr. Mantri, one may be sure that as he was but an inquirer he could not have had access to a sample of K. H. script which he could imitate. That someone in London or Adyar wrote it would be but adding another to the already considerable list of the experts in K. H. writing supposed to have been in league with H. P. B. as confederates. As for the "dugpa"? Well, if dugpas are given to imparting good spiritual advice, the more the better. However it was written, we may be sure that H. P. B., at least, must be exonerated in this case.

The letters follow.

Kalbadevi

Bombay, 22nd August

Dear Madam

I have long wished to see you, but somehow I have been so confused by many things I heard from several members of the Theosophical Society that I really do not understand what are really the tenets and beliefs of the Society. What form of Yoga do you recommend. I have long been interested in Yoga studies and I send you the "Panch Ratna Gita" by Anandebai who is much advanced in this science. I wish you could see her. I am going to Kholapoor but hope to come back soon and pay my respects to you when you come back to India.

Yours respectfully

B. W. MANTRI

The K. H. letter has never been published before. The hiatuses, which make the letter somewhat disconnected, are due to the omission of portions strictly personal to Mrs. Besant, which were blocked out in the photograph by Mr. Jinarajadasa. It reads:

A psychic and a prānāyāmist who has got confused by the vagaries of the members. The T. S. and its members are slowly manufacturing a creed. Says a Tibetan proverb "credulity breeds credulity and ends in hypocrisy." How few are they who can know anything about Us. Are we to be propitiated and made idols of . . . The intense desire of some to see Upasika incarnate at once has raised a misleading Mayavic ideation. Upasika has useful work to do on higher planes and cannot come again so soon. The T. S. must safely be ushered into the new century . . . No one has a right to claim authority over a pupil or his conscience. Ask him not what he believes . . . The crest wave of intellectual advancement must be taken hold of and guided into Spirituality. It cannot be forced into beliefs and emotional worship. The essence of the higher thoughts of the members in their collectivity must guide all action in the T. S. . . . We never try to subject to ourselves the will of another. At favourable times we let loose elevating influences which strike various persons in various ways. It is the collective aspect of many such thoughts that can give the correct note of action. We show no favours. The best corrective of error is an honest and open-minded examination of all

facts subjective and objective . . . The cant about 'Masters' must be silently but firmly put down. Let the devotion and service be to that Supreme Spirit alone of which each one is a part. Namelessly and silently we work and the continual references to ourselves and the repetition of our names raises up a confused aura that hinders our work . . . The T. S. was meant to be the corner stone of the future religions of humanity. To accomplish this object those who lead must leave aside their weak predilections for the forms and ceremonies of any particular creed and show themselves to be true Theosophists both in inner thought and outward observance. The greatest of your trials is yet to come. We are watching over you but you must put forth all your strength.

K. H.

Note—It is to be regretted that Mr. Jinarajadasa felt it his duty to withhold certain portions of this letter, of a personal nature. But as it stands, students of later Theosophy will find it profitable to compare the admonitions of the Master with the latter actions of Mrs. Besant and Mr. Leadbeater with regard to the Liberal Catholic Church.

A Theosophical Year Book—1937

The International Theosophical Year Book, 1937. Edited by George S. Arundale. 244 pages; The Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar. Price in U. S., \$1.25.

The Adyar Theosophical Society has undertaken to publish a Year Book, and this is its first attempt. It must be distinctly understood, as is obvious throughout, that this is not a Year Book of the Theosophical Movement, but a Year book of the Adyar T. S. exclusively. To this there could be no objection were its limitations made perfectly clear, but they are not. Readers are permitted to infer that there is no such thing as Theosophy, and no Theosophists, outside the Adyar organization, past and present. Even a few pages descriptive of other theosophical organizations would be welcomed, but as it stands the claim to represent Universal Brotherhood is belied and it is obvious that in the opinion of the editor Brotherhood means "Brotherhood among our own members and the devil take the others."

The volume is clearly the product of much hard work and one must be tolerant of a first attempt. It is certainly a useful compilation. We find all sorts of information about the Adyar T. S.—not the Theosophical Movement, mind you—including chronological and statistical tables. There are also accounts of the several countries where Adyar activities exist, and some where they do not exist, and these are not limited to theosophical data, but go at considerable length into social, political and economic matters and are usually well written. It is interesting to note that more space—five-and-a-half pages—is devoted to the Soviet Union than to any others except Great Britain and India. This description is most sympathetic, one might almost say Utopian, and should be instructive for those who look on Russians as just "horrible Bolsheviks". These accounts will doubtless contribute to Dr. Arundale's "Campaign for Understanding".

An important part of the book (pp. 185-243) is a "Theosophical Who's Who". One must accept the editor's apologies for the deficiencies of this which it is promised to improve and which is sorely needed. It is, of course, limited to members of the Adyar Society at one time or another, both dead and living, and the omissions constitute a sort of "Who Isn't Who" in the estimation of the compiler. Any number of quite insignificant persons are listed, while others of far greater importance are omitted, especially if it happens that they are not redolent of the Adyarite "odor of sanctity". Thus we fail to find the names of Robert Crosbie, B. P. Wadia, Elliot Holbrook, Alice Bailey, James M. Pryse, H. W. Percival, Aug. A. Neresheimer, Charles Johnston, Tookaram Taty, Dion Fortune, the two Coryns, Elliott Coues, Claude Falls Wright, all mem-

bers at one time. On the other hand we find listed Thomas A. Edison, Sir William Crookes, Camille Flammarion, Wu Ting-Fang and others of eminence who serve well for advertising purposes, though there is no evidence given as to whether their interest in the T. S. was more than transitory and whether they remained members till their demise. It is really too bad that the T. S. neglected to confer an honorary membership on Henry Ford, whose purported belief in reincarnation has been widely exploited for theosophical advertising purposes.

The "Leadbeater Method" for Boys Honored

The above are defects which may be remedied, but there is one point which must be mentioned and most emphatically condemned. As is very well known, the Adyar T. S. is virtually committed to C. W. Leadbeater and all his deeds, at least officially. It is a matter of record, abundantly established by evidence and his own admission, that this man taught sexual self-abuse to boys entrusted to him, that he manifested a sort of fiendish delight in so doing, and that his record, as shown by the Sydney police investigation years after, indicated that he was still besmirched with this. We have his own words to the effect that he regarded onanism as preferable to marriage (His letter to Annie Besant, forming part of the exhibits at the famous Aleyone trial; *Mrs. Besant and the Aleyone Case*, p. xxv).

In order to maintain the saintly reputation of this person in the face of the undeniable facts, leading members of the T. S. were forced to condone and even endorse self-abuse as a wise proceeding supported by physicians and psychologists. Of late this has been openly and brazenly done by Adyarite leaders. Mr. Jinarajadasa has made no bones about it—witness his address at Wheaton three years ago, printed and circulated by the Society (*Unfolding the Intuition*, p. 119), to say nothing of articles by him in *The Theosophist* (e. g. Feb., 1927, p. 519 ff.; *CRITIC*, April, 1927). Now onanism is given an official status in this *Year Book*—edited by George Arundale—as good ethics, as just the thing. The devil is no longer attempting to hide his hoofs. In the *Year Book* there are two articles about Leadbeater. On page 37, column 2, we read that Mr. Leadbeater's "advice which was twenty years ahead of his day and is approved by modern psychologists . . ." On page 219, column 2, we read, speaking of Leadbeater: "he had suggested measures which have since been recognized as admissible by medical authorities of the last two decades." And on page 240, in a sketch of the late Dr. Weller Van Hook, we are told that Van Hook defended Leadbeater, but we are *not* told that he later withdrew his defense and in a published "Personal Statement" in his magazine *Reincarnation* (Vol. vii, No. 5, Sept. 1926-Jan., 1927), to be found in full in the *CRITIC* of April, 1928, declared that other motives than altruism lay at the basis of Leadbeater's actions.

The evidence, still accessible to those who would know the facts, indicates clearly that this man, Leadbeater, was either an insane sex-pervert, or perhaps taught this habit to boys out of sheer devilishness, as shown by his urging them on, giving them specific directions and "congratulations" and warning them not to let their parents know. And now, in order to defend him, the T. S. gets out an official publication—George Arundale the editor—plainly defending an abnormal habit which, if taught by a school teacher, would cause his dismissal, his probable legal prosecution and perhaps his manhandling by irate parents.

For this reason, no matter what may be said in favor of the T. S., I have no hesitation in warning parents against allowing their young boys to be associated with the Adyar Society as long as such things are officially endorsed. As far as I know this is the only society with any pretensions to morality which openly publishes and endorses what the vast majority of decent people regard as a most dangerous and destructive habit. The warning is especially needed as the Adyar T. S. is making huge efforts to enroll young people. Not until it has purged itself of