

REPORT

OF

THE RESULT OF AN INVESTIGATION

INTO THE CHARGES AGAINST MADAME BLAVATSKY,

BROUGHT BY THE MISSIONARIES OF THE
SCOTTISH FREE CHURCH AT MADRAS,

AND EXAMINED

BY A COMMITTEE APPOINTED FOR THAT PURPOSE

BY THE

General Council of the Theosophical Society.



M a d r a s :

PRINTED AT THE SCOTTISH PRESS,
BY GRAVES, COOKSON AND CO., POPHAM'S BROADWAY,
AND PUBLISHED BY THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AT ADYAR.

1885.

(Price one Rupee.)

“ I may have said something in my rage, but I swear on all that is sacred *for me* that I never said *fraud, secret passages, traps*, nor that my husband had helped you in any way. *If my mouth has uttered these words, I pray to the Almighty to shower on my head the worst maledictions in nature.*”—Letter from Madame Coulomb to Madame Blavatsky.—See page 133.

For the consideration of the Committee.

THE persons outside the ranks of the Theosophical Society, who demand the publication of a pamphlet giving an absolute demonstration that the letters published in the *Christian College Magazine* are forgeries, and that Madame Blavatsky never performed any fraudulent phenomena, are asking for an evident impossibility.

The fact is, that nobody ever saw the Coulombs forging any letters, neither has any one ever supervised the performance of occult phenomena, most of which occurred under no test conditions, because they were not intended for tests; and, although many of them may have convinced those persons who witnessed them, such a conviction carries no weight with the general public.

The proofs therefore consist entirely in the internal evidence which the phenomena and the letters present to the mind of the observer; but the effect produced on the mind of the observer varies according to the standpoint of the investigator. Those, who have studied the subject of Occultism and are convinced of the possibility of the occurrence of such phenomena, will be easily convinced; while those, who believe that such phenomena *can only be produced by fraud*, will, under no circumstances whatever, be convinced, unless they are first made to study the

subject. Such people we cannot compel to study, and if they are willing to do so, there is already sufficient theosophical literature in circulation to explain to them what Theosophy is. To put all such explanations and discussions into this pamphlet would defeat its object, because those whom we wish to convince would not read it and those who are convinced would not need it. Such a laborious exposition, which would involve entering into innumerable side-issues, would render the pamphlet useless for the object in view.

But to bring before the public a pamphlet, which does not possess these qualifications, and which can therefore be neither conclusive nor satisfactory to them, would only give rise to interminable fruitless discussions.

Let those who feel a sufficient interest in having the matter thoroughly explained to them, read our books, and study the subject.

Those who are unwilling to do so have no right to demand an explanation, neither is there any possibility of giving them such an explanation as would satisfy them; because no one can by mere assertions be forced to believe in a subject of which he knows nothing, and which he does not desire to investigate.

ADYAR, }
 January 27, 1885, }

H.

Committee's Report.

At the Ninth Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society at Adyar (Madras), a Committee was appointed to advise Madame Blavatsky as to the best course to be taken by her with reference to certain letters published in the September number and the following numbers of the *Christian College Magazine*, a sectarian paper published at Madras under the auspices of the Scotch Free Church Mission. In this Madame Blavatsky was denounced as being an impostor and having performed so-called "Occult Phenomena" in a fraudulent manner by the assistance of a woman named Coulomb and her husband, both of which persons had been for some time residing at the head-quarters of the Society in the capacity of house-keepers and servants, but who had been recently expelled from the head-quarters and from the Society, and on whose evidence the accusations brought forward by the missionaries rested.

After a thorough and patient investigation, your Committee finds that the charges contained in the said numbers of the *Christian College Magazine* are entirely unfounded, and that in no case has any sufficient evidence been brought forward to show that Madame Blavatsky ever committed any fraud whatever.

They therefore propose the following resolution :

Resolved :—That the letters published in the *Christian College Magazine* under the heading "Collapse of Koot Hoomi," are only a pretext to injure the cause of Theosophy, and as these letters

necessarily appear absurd to those who are acquainted with our philosophy and facts, and as those who are not acquainted with those facts could not have their opinion changed even by a judicial verdict given in favour of Madame Blavatsky, therefore it is the unanimous opinion of this Committee, that Madame Blavatsky should not prosecute her defamers in a Court of Law.

NARENDRO NATH SEN, *Chairman.*

FRANZ HARTMANN, M. D.

S. RAMASAWMIER.

NAVARAJI DORABJI KHANDALAWALLA, B. A., L. L. B.

H. R. MORGAN, Major-General.

GYANENDRA NATH CHAKRAVARTI, M. A.

NOBIN K. BANERJI.

T. SUBBA ROW, B. A., B. L.

DEWAN BAHADUR R. RAGOONATH ROW.

RUDOLPH GEBHARD.

P. IYALOO NAIDU.

THE HON'BLE S. SUBRAMANI IYER, B. L.

P. SHRINIVASA ROW.

A. J. COOPER-OAKLEY, B. A., F. R. H. S., *Secy.*

Reasons.

The reasons which have caused the Committee to adopt this resolution are as follows :

1. The fact, that ever since the beginning of the Theosophical Society certain Protestant clergymen have attempted to impede its progress.

2. That they have not always been very careful in the selection of their means for that purpose.
3. That the article in the *Christian College Magazine* was entitled 'The Collapse of Koot Hoomi, which seems to indicate that it was not so much the desire of the missionaries to expose Madame Blavatsky, as to overthrow the belief of some of the members of the Theosophical Society regarding the existence of the Mahatmas.
4. The absurdity of the charges, which are in no way consistent with known facts, and the impossibility of performing such phenomena as are known to have occurred, with the contrivances found at head-quarters.
5. The fact that circumstances, which may appear suspicious to the missionaries, have been shown to be no proof whatever of fraud to those who are at all familiar with the connecting circumstances,
6. The unreliability of the testimony given by experts as to the genuineness or imitation of hand-writings.
7. The impossibility of proving in a Court of law the possibility of the occurrence of occult phenomena.
8. The non-existence of a law which would admit any evidence proving the possibility of such an occurrence.
9. The character of the accusing persons and the absence of other witnesses,

Sectarianism versus *Theosophy*.

It is a fact, well known to every student of history, that sectarianism has been at all times and in every country opposed to every liberal movement which had in view the expansion and freedom of thought. Especially certain sectarian missionaries have continued to oppose the deductions of logic, reason and common sense. They have so far proved themselves either ignorant of the teachings of a high and pure Christianity, or unwilling to apply the teachings of their church in their practical life, as to act in direct opposition to the doctrines which they profess to believe.

But while such sectarians attempt to replace the true spirit of Christianity as well as ancient religious systems of the East by a system of misinterpretations and forms without life; they are not ill adapted to teach to the East the sciences and discoveries of the West, and they are, consequently, to a certain extent, looked upon as spreaders of civilisation;—a civilisation which has spread in Europe not by the help but in spite of the efforts of their prototypes to keep it back.

Their position as teachers entitles them to a certain amount of respect, and as long as they do not abuse their position to obtrude their own peculiar sectarian views by associating them with the science they teach, they ought to be credited for whatever may be their merit. But it is a well known fact, that whenever they find any occasion, they will not hesitate to promulgate their peculiar religious opinions by every means, even going to such

lengths as during the time of famines to make at least pretended conversion to their peculiar system a condition for salvation from starvation.

Looking upon freedom of thought as an enemy, they have assailed the Theosophical Society ever since its existence, in the press and in public, and these facts are too well known to make it necessary to go into details. It may however be said that whenever they entered into any discussions with the defenders of Theosophy, they invariably were forced to retreat, and it could not well be otherwise, as the "Theosophists" never attacked the true Christian ethics upon which the so-called Christian system is based, but on the contrary upheld and scientifically explained the essential truths, which were misunderstood and misrepresented by the missionary party, and attempted only to remove the superstructure of superstition and error.

Soon after Col. Olcott and Madame Blavatsky left for Europe in the month of February 1884, the missionaries of the Scottish Free Church, evidently thinking their time favourable, began a renewed attack on the Theosophical doctrines by a series of discussions in the public papers,—which were terminated under the pretext that no more could be written against the Missionaries without "hurting their feelings," but in which nevertheless they were forced to a hasty retreat,—and by attempting to give a series of lectures against Theosophy, which likewise came prematurely to an end. This was the beginning of the warfare in true earnest; and not long after that retreat they held a meeting at

Calcutta in which, it is said, means were proposed to uproot Theosophy.⁽¹⁾ How far the Missionaries in taking this attitude, were induced to do so by religious fanaticism, to what extent they were driven to do so for their own selfish considerations may be left to the decision of those who desire to investigate further; but one thing is certain, that when a woman by the name of Coulomb, who had been for some time the personal attendant of Madame Blavatsky, *offered them for sale* a number of letters throwing discredit on the honesty of one of the leaders of the Theosophical Society, they, without taking due precaution to investigate the probabilities or possibilities of the facts referred to in those letters, *bought them*, and published them under the title "The Collapse of Koot Hoomi," after sending advance proof-sheets to all prominent papers in India.⁽²⁾

The Missionaries claim that they thoroughly investigated the genuineness of the hand-writing of the so-called Blavatsky-letters; but if they did so, it was from a partial stand-point and with the view of becoming convinced of what they hoped to be true and they evidently neglected what would have seemed under such circumstances the most necessary step, namely, to visit the head-quarters of the Society and to inquire how far the facts corresponded with the charges. But it seems probable that the assailers of the Theosophical Society cared very little about getting any information in regard to Madame Blavatsky's private character. Their object was to root out a belief in the existence of the Mahat-

(1.) Appendix I. II.

(2.) Appendix II.

mas,—a belief which they erroneously supposed was essentially necessary to become a member of the Theosophical Society, and which they considered the main pillar upon which that Society rested⁽³⁾; because, having as foundation of their own religious system nothing but the supposed declaration of an invisible deity, it is not difficult to understand that they looked upon our system of philosophy as resting upon a similar weak basis of personal authority, which they hoped to undermine,—to use their own expression,—*in the interest of public morality.*

The Existence of the Mahatmas.

To give to those who know nothing of the present theosophical movement a complete comprehension of the causes which gave rise to the missionary scandal, it would be necessary to again rewrite the history of the Theosophical Society from its beginning, to give an exposition of its aims and its doctrines, to review the labor performed, and especially to give again an account of the recent events that occurred at the head-quarters. To do the former would require several volumes instead of a pamphlet and would involve on the part of the reader a thorough study of Theosophy—the latter has already been done in a pamphlet written before the so-called “exposure” took place, and entitled *A Report of Observations during a Nine months’ stay at the Head-quarters of the Theosophical Society at Adyar (Madras), India*, and those for whom the present pamphlet is destined, have undoubtedly read that report, and the majority of them must have arrived at the con-

(3) Appendix II.

clusion, that if the Coulomb scandal, as described by Dr. Hartmann, proves anything at all, it proves conclusively the existence of the Mahatmas. It proves that neither Col. Olcott nor Madame Blavatsky were at that time over-anxious to get rid of the Coulombs and the letters, written by Madame Blavatsky from Paris, bear sufficient internal evidence, that in her goodness of heart Madame Blavatsky would have been willing to forgive Mrs. Coulomb if the latter had shown herself worthy of such forgiveness; while the letter written by Colonel Olcott to Mrs. Coulomb contains a direct invitation to remain and to be truthful. Neither was there a single member of the Board of Control or any other person in the house, who had any inimical feelings against either of the Coulombs,⁽⁴⁾ and it was only when the Coulombs, after having been expelled, obstinately refused to leave the premises, that the members of the Board were forced to take such measures as the circumstances required. Now, if neither Madame Blavatsky, nor Colonel Olcott, nor any one in the Society wanted to drive them away, why did they attempt to get rid of them? They wanted to get rid of them, because they followed the advice emanating from those whom they consider their superiors in wisdom, and which advice moreover indicated the true character of the Coulombs and showed—as was afterwards verified—that they then and there were actively engaged in upsetting Madame Blavatsky's rooms and transforming them into a conjuring shop.

(4) Appendix VIII, IX, X.

This advice could not have emanated from Col. Olcott or from Madame Blavatsky; for not only was the advice given therein not at all in accordance with—if not contrary to—the wishes of Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky, but these letters also contained information about other matters of which Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky were at that time uninformed, and besides all that the “occult letters,” containing this advice, were received in such a manner, that the Founders could have had nothing to do with them. Finally there were other circumstances connected with the time and place of their reception as precludes all suspicion of confederacy, even if such suspicion could have arisen in a small circle to whom such experiences were nothing new, and who were all equally desirous of obtaining the truth.⁽⁵⁾

It has been repeatedly asserted, that the doctrines of the Theosophical Society are based upon scientific principles and not upon a creed or upon a belief in the existence of Mahatmas.⁽⁶⁾ Yet the existence of these Mahatmas is for many members of the Society an undoubted fact and is based upon evidence entirely independent of Madame Blavatsky, and it must be borne in mind that various people in different parts of the world have received letters from them when neither Madame Blavatsky, nor Mrs. Coulomb were near, and that such letters corresponded in style and hand-writing with those received when Madame Blavatsky was present and which were said to come from certain Mahatmas, who were seen and

(5) Appendix V and VI.

(6) Appendix XI.

conversed with on various occasions by different members of the Society as also outsiders.⁽⁷⁾

Evidence against Madame Blavatsky.

The charges brought by the Missionaries against Madame Blavatsky may be divided into three classes. They assert—

1. That at the Head-quarters of the Theosophical Society certain trap-doors and sliding panels existed by which, with the assistance of Mr. and Mrs. Coulomb, fraudulent “occult phenomena” were performed.

2. That a puppet dressed up and consisting of bladders and muslin was made to represent a “Mahatma” through the instrumentality of Mr. Coulomb.

3. That certain letters were written by Madame Blavatsky to Mrs. Coulomb, which prove that the so-called “occult phenomena” were produced by fraud and with the knowledge and consent of Madame Blavatsky.

The whole of the evidence rests :

1. On the credibility of the assertions of Mr. and Mrs. Coulomb.

2. On the belief in the possibility or impossibility of the occurrence of such phenomena.

3. On the opinion of experts as to whether the letters produced are written in the hand-writing of Madame Blavatsky, or whether they are forgeries.

Let us now examine the charges :

I.—*As to the existence of trap-doors and sliding panels at the Head-quarters of the Theosophical Society.*

In Dr. Hartmann's private *Report of Observations* an account of these contrivances is given, and it is also conclusively shown how they came into existence. At the time of their discovery they were all new and unfinished, and the members of the Committee as well as outsiders, including experts and engineers, have examined them, and they all came to the unanimous conclusion, that it was absolutely impossible to produce by these means any such phenomena as had frequently occurred inside as well as outside of the "occult room;" because (a) the hole in the wall was too narrow for any one but a small child to crawl in, and such a child after having crawled in—even if it had not suffocated in a few minutes in the narrow enclosure—could have accomplished nothing, because it would not have had the necessary intelligence to act without being immediately detected in the attempt;⁽⁸⁾ (b) because there was no connection between the hole in the wall and the shrine⁽⁹⁾; and (c) even if all the conditions had been favorable to fraud, there would have been no explanation for the internal evidence which the letters contained and the rapidity with which even mental questions were answered.⁽¹⁰⁾

Mr. Coulomb asserts that he made these contrivances with the consent of Madame Blavatsky, that

(8) Appendix VII.

(9) Appendix VII.

(10) Appendix V and XI.

they had been used for fraudulent purposes, and that they had been hidden or covered up before the departure of Madame Blavatsky. This Madame Blavatsky denies, and to support her denial we have:

(a.) The unanimous statement of very reliable witnesses, that they—previous to, and during the Anniversary of 1883, at which many of the said phenomena occurred,—examined thoroughly the so-called “shrine” and both sides of the wall on which it was hung, and that then no opening existed, while if it had existed, it could not have escaped detection. Mrs. Morgan personally superintended the papering of the wall in which the hole was afterwards made by Mr. Coulomb.⁽¹²⁾

(b.) The extreme improbability, that Madame Blavatsky would in such a case have given possession of her rooms to Dr. Hartmann and Mr. St. George Lane-Fox, both of whom were sceptical gentlemen, who had come to India for the purpose of investigation and to detect fraud instead of protecting it, and that she should consent to have the persons who were her supposed confederates driven away and thereby make them her enemies.⁽¹³⁾

(c.) The evidence that Mr. Coulomb either was not present when the phenomena which he wanted to “expose” occurred, or, having forgotten how and where they occurred, made the panels at the wrong place.⁽¹⁴⁾

(12) Appendix VII.

(13) Appendix I, II S. VIII 7, a, b.

(14) Report of “Observations.”

(d.)—The unreliability of the statements of the Coulombs.⁽¹⁵⁾

II.—*The second charge is that the appearance of a Mahatma known by the name of Koot Humi, was an artificial mask made up of muslin and bladders.*

This charge must appear very absurd to those who ever saw the real appearance of the Mahatma in question, and who were sufficiently able to judge whether they were then *talking to* a mask of bladders, or to Mr. Coulomb, or to a superior person. We have therefore to refute this absurd charge :

(a.) The evidence of Col. Olcott, Mr. Brown, Mr. Damodar, and others who have seen that Mahatma in his physical body and conversed with him.⁽¹⁶⁾

(b.) The evidence of many persons who have seen and recognised the same person in his astral form.⁽¹⁷⁾

(c.) The extreme improbability that such intelligent persons should mistake a mask of bladders for a man and talk with him.⁽¹⁸⁾

(d.) The circumstances which were connected with such appearances and which rendered any assistance of either H. P. Blavatsky or Mr. or Madame Coulomb impossible on account of the absence of these persons, and for other reasons too numerous to enumerate.⁽¹⁹⁾

(15) Appendix IX.

(16) Appendix VI.

(17) Appendix VI.

(18) Appendix VI.

(19) Appendix VI.

(e.) The extreme unreliability of the statements of the Coulombs who were forced by circumstances to make a lie stick after they had it invented.⁽²⁰⁾

III.—The third question is : *Whether or not the so-called Blavatsky-letters, published in the "Christian College Magazine," are genuine.*

This question would be easy enough to decide, if there were any infallible experts who could decide it; but unfortunately experience teaches, that in every important law-suit it is usually only a question of money or position, whether the accused or the accuser has a majority of experts on his side, and the opinion of so-called experts is therefore of a very doubtful and unreliable nature. In refutation of this charge we have to rely on :

(a.) The evidence of two experts in favour of Madame Blavatsky against that of one Mr. Gribble who thinks the letters may be genuine.⁽²¹⁾

(b.) The assertion of Madame Blavatsky that those letters are mostly forgeries, against the assertion of the Coulombs, and who have openly expressed their desire for revenge, and who moreover could have come into possession of some of these letters—granting that they were genuine—only by theft.⁽²²⁾

(c.) The circumstance that a letter, supposed to have been written by Dr. Hartmann to Madame Coulomb, has been proved a forgery.⁽²³⁾

(20) Appendix X.

(21) Appendix VIII.

(22) Report of Observations—Appendix I, VIII 7, 9, X.

(23) Appendix. I, II.

(d.) The fact that Mr. Coulomb's ordinary hand-writing resembles in some of his letters very much the handwriting of Madame Blavatsky.⁽²⁴⁾

(e.) The fact that Mr. Coulomb is a clever mechanic and copyist who writes English very well, although he cannot speak it correctly.⁽²⁵⁾

(f.) That some of the letters in the pretended hand-writing differ from the genuine hand-writing of Madame Blavatsky, while they resemble the hand-writing of Mr. Coulomb.⁽²⁶⁾

(g.) The extreme improbability, that Madame Blavatsky would have mis-spelled the names or given the wrong initials of her most intimate friends and correspondents.⁽²⁷⁾

(h.) The extreme improbability that she would have written entirely useless and unnecessary phrases and repetitions. For instance a man, writing to a friend, would not write to him: "Please tell your wife, whose name is Katarina, and whom you see every day, that I am well;"— because all these additions are purposeless, as a man is supposed to know his wife's name, and to see her every day, provided he lives with her. (Such a blunder ought not to have escaped the sharp eyes of the Missionaries.)⁽²⁸⁾

(i.) The facts to which the letters refer are entirely irreconcilable with the circumstances under which they occurred; they are only reconcilable

(24) Correspondence to *Madras Mail*.

(25) Mr. Coulomb acted as proof-reader for *The Theosophist*.

(26) Appendix VIII.

(27) Appendix VIII.

(28) Appendix I, VIII.

with what the Coulombs may have imagined those circumstances to have been.⁽²⁹⁾

(*k.*) Madame Blavatsky gives an entirely different and more reasonable explanation of such passages in the letters as may be genuine.⁽³⁰⁾

(*l.*) Some passages have evidently been mistranslated. "Tomber sur la tête," means to "fall upon the head," if literally translated, but it is an idiomatic French expression, which means to "take by surprise."⁽³¹⁾

(*m.*) There is every probability, that the letters had no existence when the Coulombs left the headquarters. It seems to have taken two months to prepare them.⁽³²⁾

(*n.*) The Missionaries refused to show for inspection the originals of the most important letters they published.⁽³³⁾

(*o.*) The letters make Madame Blavatsky refer to things that never existed and to events that never occurred. It makes her speak of her dinners, at the Governor's house, where she never dined, and refer to a Rajah who never has been known to exist.⁽³⁴⁾

IV.—*Legal Proceedings.*

With such a mass of evidence in Madame Blavatsky's favour, it seems at first sight as if she could do nothing better than to vindicate her cha-

(29) Appendix VIII.

(30) Appendix I.

(31) Appendix I.

(32) Report of Observations.

(33) Statement of a witness.

(34) Appendix I.

acter before a Court of law. But the matter is not quite so simple, and the difficulty arises from the following facts :

1. The evidence is necessarily of an entirely circumstantial character, because no one saw the Coulombs or any other person forge the letters.

2. The testimony of experts differs and cannot be depended on.

3. The case would have to be therefore decided according to the opinion of a judge or jury as to whether the occurrence of occult phenomena is *primâ facie* possible or not.

4. The question as to the possibility of the occurrence of occult phenomena can only be decided by such persons as have studied occultism and are Theosophists.

5. Such persons can at present not be found among the average judges and jurors, and if found, they would probably be considered as having pre-conceived opinions and be challenged by the defence.

6. Even if judge and jury were Theosophists and Occultists, the law would not admit any evidence in favor of what is foolishly called "supernatural" phenomena, and could not accept the evidence of such phenomena even were they to occur in Court ; because there is no Statute for it.

7. A judicial decision in favor of Madame Blavatsky would not change the opinion of those who regard occult phenomena as the work of imposture ; neither could an adverse verdict change

for a moment the opinion of an intelligent Theosophist; because knowledge can neither be annihilated nor enforced by the decision of a lawyer.

Similar cases have been in Court before and have ended without the desired result. It is a mistake to suppose that Henry Slade has been exposed by a certain professor. Nothing was exposed on that occasion except the ignorance of that Professor in regard to metaphysics, although a hundred intelligent witnesses, and some of them of no less position and learning than the prosecuting witness, and who were ready to testify in favour of Henry Slade, were not permitted to put in their testimony; because the "law" would not permit it.⁽³⁵⁾

Neither has the "medium" Bastian ever been exposed, and those who will study the subject impartially may form a different opinion.⁽³⁶⁾

If Madame Blavatsky would submit in spite of her old age and delicate health to the annoyances of a law-suit, with cross-examining lawyers who, ignorant of metaphysical science, could not do otherwise than ask questions which must appear trivial and offensive to every Theosophist, if she would by going to Court make herself a target for idle curiosity, and if she, in spite of all legal obstacles, should obtain a verdict against the Missionaries and the Coulombs—what would she gain thereby? Would her reputation be vindicated in the eyes of those who firmly believe that she must be an impostor? Would

(35) "The Slade-trial."

(36) See Baron v. Hellenbach's Pamphlet.

her friends who understand her and who know that she is incapable of committing fraud, love her any more for being victorious than for being a martyr? Whatever the decision of the law might be, it would have no effect but that of gratifying personal feeling, stimulating curiosity, or satisfying revenge. These are not the objects which the Theosophist has in view.

But there is another class of seemingly less intelligent reasoners, and they clamour that Madame Blavatsky must go to Court, since the public has a right to know the value of the evidence, etc. Who is this public that can claim any such rights? The only public who is in any way concerned with the character of Madame Blavatsky and the genuineness of occult phenomena, are the Theosophists themselves. Those who have never studied the subject and yet clamour for an opportunity to learn all about it by means of a law-suit, are merely curiosity-hunters, whose opinion is not worth consideration; because an opinion formed in regard to a scientific subject, simply on account of the decision of a judge, is not based on knowledge, and is the more useless, if it is proved that the judge knows nothing about the matter which he attempts to decide. If they think that they have any claims to know anything about Madame Blavatsky's opinion, let them state the nature of their claims, and if they wish to know more, let them put themselves into a position by which they can learn more, by investigating Theosophy. They must know the alphabet before they can judge of the value of a book; they must

know how to count, before they can form a correct opinion of the integral and differential calculus.

A story is told, that at the trial of a great astronomer for having taught the "heresy" that the earth moved, his chambermaid gave testimony against him before the Court and produced an instrument which she had stolen from his laboratory. She swore that the astronomer had pretended, that by looking through that instrument he could see the moon much bigger than it really was. The Court looked into that magical instrument (afterwards called a telescope), but could see nothing; they examined it and found it to consist only of a wooden tube with several pieces of glass (lenses) inside. Thus was the fraud exposed and the rotundity of the earth judicially declared an impossibility.

What was possible then, is not only possible but of frequent occurrence now. Ignorance still exists, only it manifests itself in a different manner; and while a hundred years ago the theologians were quarrelling about the rotundity of the earth, they are now engaged in quarrels about other matters, which appear no less absurd to those who know something about them.

The annexed Appendices contain a few of the documents upon which the above conclusion is based.

APPENDIX I.

The Latest Attack on the Theosophical Society.

ISSUED BY

THE COUNCIL OF THE LONDON LODGE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

CERTAIN letters have lately been published by a magazine in India, imputing to Madame Blavatsky gross impostures, alleged to have been practised by her in furtherance of the Theosophic movement. The following papers are now circulated by the Council of the London Lodge of the Theosophical Society for the information of Fellows and any of their friends who may be interested in the matter.

In the *Times* of October 9th, Madame Blavatsky herself wrote as follows:—

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN INDIA.

[TO THE EDITOR OF "THE TIMES."]

SIR,—With reference to the alleged exposure at Madras of a dishonourable conspiracy between myself and two persons of the name of Coulomb—to deceive the public with occult phenomena, I have to say that the letters purporting to have been written by me are certainly not mine. Sentences here and there I recognize, taken from old notes of mine on different matters, but they are mingled with interpolations that entirely pervert their meaning. With these exceptions the whole of the letters are a fabrication.

The fabricators must have been grossly ignorant of Indian affairs, since they make me speak of a "Maharajah of Lahore," when every Indian schoolboy knows that no such person exists.

With regard to the suggestion that I attempted to promote "the financial prosperity" of the Theosophical Society by means of occult phenomena, I say that I have never at any time

received, or attempted to obtain, from any person any money either for myself or for the Society by any such means. I defy any one to come forward and prove the contrary. Such money as I have received has been earned by literary work of my own, and these earnings, and what remained of my inherited property when I went to India, have been devoted to the Theosophical Society. I am a poorer woman to-day than I was when, with others, I founded the Society.

Your obedient servant,

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

77, Elgin Crescent, Notting Hill, W., }
October 7.

The same paper also contained, on the same date, the following letter from Mr. St. G. Lane-Fox :

[TO THE EDITOR OF "THE TIMES."]

SIR,—In "The Times" of September 20 and September 29, you publish telegrams from your Calcutta Correspondent referring to the Theosophical Society. As I have just returned from India, and am a member of the Board of Control appointed to manage the affairs of the Society during the absence from India of Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky, I hope you will allow me through your columns to add a few words to the news you publish. First, then, these Coulombs, who, in conjunction, with certain missionaries, are now trying to throw discredit on the Theosophical Society, were employed at the Society's Head-quarters at Adyar as housekeepers, and the Board of Control, finding that they were thoroughly unprincipled, always trying to extort money from members of the Society, discharged them. They had meanwhile been constructing all sorts of trap-doors and sliding panels in the private rooms of Madame Blavatsky, who had very indiscreetly given over these rooms to their charge. As to the letters purporting to have been written by Madame Blavatsky, which have recently been published in an Indian "Christian" paper, I, in common with all who are acquainted with the circumstances of the case, have no doubt whatever that, whoever wrote them, they are not written by Madame Blavatsky. I myself attach very little importance to this new scandal, as I do not believe that the true Theosophic cause suffers in the slightest degree.

The Theosophical movement is now well launched, and must go ahead, in spite of obstacles. Already hundreds, if not thousands, have been led through it to perceive that, for scientific

and not merely sentimental reasons, purity of life is advisable, and that honesty of purpose and unselfish activity are necessary for true human progress and the attainment of real happiness.

Your obedient servant,

ST. G. LANE-FOX, F.T.S.

London, Oct. 5.

Madame Blavatsky has sent to the Secretary of the London Lodge a paper embodying some detailed criticism on the letters published by the *Christian College Magazine*. Her comments are as follows:—

The first letter is supposed to be written in 1880 or 1881. It seems to contain in its first portion the original of a note I wrote to the woman Coulomb, from Simla, and which was shown to Colonel Olcott and others. She was asked to go and see whether the cigarette had not fallen in some crevice. She answered there had been a storm, rain and wind that night, and that probably the cigarette was destroyed. As it is so long ago I could not swear to the words; it is possible that down to the signature the letter is mine. But the flyleaf spoken of in the editor's note, and the words quoted in the footnote, I pronounce to be a forgery.

The second letter may be mine, or a reproduction of a portion of one of mine, as far as the first paragraph is concerned. The rest is either greatly altered or an entire fabrication. I vaguely remember the letter; what I said was, that if any fresh slanders should be trumped up at Bombay, it would be dreadful. That Damodar should, if possible, see one of the Brothers, and that I was going to write to him. Who "King" is I do not know. I never called Padshah by that name. As Damodar had at the time quarrels with his relatives, I said that I would beg of Master K. H. to write to him.—"*Lui tomber sur la tête*" means simply that the letter ought to stan him; "*tomber sur la tête comme une tuile*," a common French expression, which does not mean most certainly that the letter should fall physically on his head! Again, the original letter says, "*il doit battre le fer*," &c., and the translation alters this to "We must strike while the iron is hot," &c. "*Il*," if I really wrote this sentence, would have meant Damodar, but "*we*" means quite another thing. A request to M. Coulomb to "save the situation" and do what he was asked, might have referred, if written, to a lawsuit then going on in which Damodar was interested, certainly not to any phenomena. This letter, in fact, is either a forgery altogether or is full of interpolation.

The third letter, supposed to be written from Poona, is an entire fabrication.* I remember the letter I wrote to her from Poona. It asked her to send me immediately the telegram contained in a note from Ramalinga if he brought or sent her one. I wrote to Colonel Olcott about the experiment. He thinks he can find my letter at Madras. I hope to either get back Ramalinga's note to me or obtain a statement of the whole matter from him. How could I make a mistake in writing, however hurriedly, about the name of one of my best friends. The forgers make me address him—"care of H. Khandalawalla"—when there is no such man. The real name is N. D. Khandalawalla.

The brief note which is fourth in the series has no significance, except for the words "in a miraculous way," which assuredly are not mine. I have no recollection of the note at all, which is given without any date.

The fifth letter I never wrote at all. All about a handkerchief is pure nonsense. There is no "Maharajah of Lahore," hence I could not have spoken of such a person, nor have been attempting mock phenomena for his deception. If such a sentence as "do something for the old man, Damodar's father," was ever written by me, it would have referred to a wound in his leg, of which he afterwards died. Madame C. boasted that she could cure him; at any rate she nursed him, for I asked her to.

The sixth letter is a pure forgery. The phrase "the Adyar saucer will become historical like the Simla cup," is a phrase first pronounced by Madame Coulomb, as Colonel Olcott may remember, and I have used it since. I do not know any "Soobroya"—perhaps "Soobaya" is meant.

The seventh and eighth letters are forgeries again. I could never, in writing to her who saw the man every day, use all his names and titles. I should simply have said "Diwan Bahadur," without adding "Raghunath Rao, the President of the Society," as if introducing to her one she did not know. The whole name is evidently put in now, to make it clear who is meant. The ninth letter, if possible, is worse nonsense still. I never called any one "Christophe." That was a name given by Madame Coulomb to her husband behind his back, and "Christopholo" was a name by which she called an absurd little figure, or image, of hers. She gave nicknames to everything.

* It will be seen later on that Mr. Ezekiel, one of the persons to whom is supposed to relate, concurs with this opinion.

Letter 10 : fabrication again. Letter 11. A letter was written by me from the Nilgiris to introduce the General, but it was not *this* letter, which appears to be altogether a fabrication. Letter 12 is the only clearly genuine letter of the series. Letter 13 may have been written by me. All depends upon knowing who is "Christopholo"—a little ridiculous figure in rags, about three inches high ; she wrote to say it had accidentally been destroyed. She joked over it, and I too.

The following passage occurs in a letter recently received by Madame Blavatsky from Mrs. Morgan, wife of the General Morgan referred to in the alleged correspondence :

We have seen the letters—the capital letters carefully copied—overdone, the General thinks ; the whole writing is more flowing than yours. I think she has copied parts of original letters, and interpolated sentences to suit her book.

Major-General Morgan himself has also examined one of the letters purporting to be from Madame Blavatsky to Madame Coulomb, and he pronounces it to be a forgery.

The following letter was received in this country by Colonel Olcott shortly before his return to India.

POONA BRANCH OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,
21st September, 1884.

TO COL. H. S. OLCOTT,

President Founder of the Theosophical Society.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—The *Christian College Magazine*, a sectarian journal of Madras, has in its last number (published on the 11th inst.) printed an article entitled the "Collapse of Koot Hoomi," and given in it several letters alleged to have been written by Madame Blavatsky to the Coulombs, who want to make out that they were her sole confederates in showing spurious phenomena ; yourself and all the rest being dupes, and having been cleverly deceived all along for the last nine years.

To those who have carefully read the alleged letters and who know something about the Founders and the affairs of the Theosophical Society, the absurdity of the concocted letters is quite apparent. Dr. F. Hartmann, in his "Report of Observations made during a nine months' stay at the Head-quarters of

the Theosophical Society," has prominently brought out several facts as to how the Coulombs came to be expelled, how the nefarious plot that they were maturing was exploded, and how in chagrin and revenge they have put forward suspicious letters, which the missionaries of the *Christian College Magazine* have been credulous enough to suppose to be genuine.

Dr. Hartmann deserves the thanks of our Society for so ably and successfully drawing up a statement of facts, which cannot fail to show to every impartial inquirer the utter improbability of the allegations made by some of the missionaries and the Coulombs to ruin the reputation of one of the respected Founders of the Society.

Two of us know full well all the particulars of Madame Blavatsky's last visit to Poona; and the absurd letter that is made to hang upon a telegram that was received by her at the time simply deserves contempt. Madame Blavatsky never attempted even to place the telegram before any one at the time, much less tried to create any impression upon any one thereby.

It is well known to many Theosophists, as well as to some outsiders, that several persons have received letters in a mysterious way personally from two of the adepts. One of these writes with red ink in a rough and rugged way; the other with blue pencil in a beautiful and remarkable hand. Both handwritings are peculiar and unmistakable. According to the alleged letters of the Coulombs, Madame Blavatsky is supposed to write the red ink and blue pencil letters herself, but what would the doubters say if it were proved to them that letters in these same handwritings have phenomenally been received by several inside and outside the "Shrine," even when yourself and Madame Blavatsky have been in Europe, and even since the Coulombs have been expelled. Note, again, that Madame Blavatsky is supposed to have written in Sanskrit a letter as an answer in anticipation to a Sanskrit letter that was to have been placed at the Shrine. Now all of us are aware that Madame Blavatsky knows nothing of Sanskrit, and cannot write the language nor form the letters. We know that one of our Bombay members received in December last phenomenally a letter addressed to him, written in the Mahrathi language, and in the Modi characters. Are we to believe, therefore, that Madame Blavatsky knows Mahrathi, and could write in *Modi*, when she knows nothing of either?

We shall content ourselves by noting but one instance—of which neither yourself nor Madame Blavatsky are aware—which will satisfactorily show that letters have mysteriously been

answered in the absence of both of you, in the very same blue pencil handwriting that is falsely attributed to Madame Blavatsky.

Mr. Nawtramam Ootamram Trivedi, a member of our Branch Society, now at Surat, went to the Head-quarters at Madras simply to see a few friends. He asked Brother Damodar to show him the portraits of the Mahatmas in the "Shrine;" but Damodar at that time did not accede to his request. After a night's rest it occurred to him to note down a few questions, and he wrote them out on a sheet of white foolscap which was simply folded to the size of a fourth part of a sheet. He wanted Mr. Damodar to get these questions answered, but Damodar did not take any notice of them. At about noon he sat at a table with Mr. Damodar opposite to him, and his letter placed upon the table with only his questions, and nothing else written on the paper. In a few moments that paper disappeared, and after a short while a letter placed in an envelope and addressed to Mr. Trivedi was found lying on the floor. On opening the envelope, the *same* foolscap, with the questions, was found written over in several places in blue pencil in the excellent handwriting of Mahatma K. H., and signed with his initials. That paper is now before us.

Yourself and Madame Blavatsky left Bombay for Europe on the 21st of February last. The phenomenon mentioned above happened on or about the 20th of March, by which time you were in Paris. The spurious letters of the Coulombs insinuate that Madame Blavatsky used to guess beforehand what an enquirer would ask, and prepare answers accordingly, and get them cleverly placed in the Shrine through the Coulombs. But how about the letter of Mr. Trivedi, which was answered when Madame Blavatsky was in Paris, and the answers were written not on a separate piece of paper, *but on the very question paper, and close to each of the questions of Mr. Trivedi?*

We would fain call the attention of all Theosophists and impartial inquirers to this fact, and also to the authentic letter of Madame Coulomb (published in Dr. Hartmann's pamphlet), written by her on the very day on which General Morgan saw at Adyar, the saucer phenomenon. That letter shows that Madame Coulomb was herself immensely surprised at seeing the phenomenon; while in one of the spurious letters it is insinuated that she and her husband were instructed to show a false phenomenon to General Morgan by trickery.

We need not say more. We have carefully examined the purport of the alleged letters, along with several facts within our knowledge, and we are thoroughly well satisfied that the

alleged letters are not genuine. To put it in the mildest form, we might say that the missionaries of the *Christian College Magazine* have been very indiscreet in publishing such suspicious letters behind the back of a highly-respected lady, about whom they know next to nothing.

We are extremely sorry to see this good, open-hearted and perfectly honourable lady maligned during her absence from this country, for which she, along with yourself, has so unselfishly been working, giving up everything to promote the moral, intellectual and spiritual welfare of the inhabitants thereof.

The cowardly attempt to misrepresent her character to the public cannot, however, harm her, except causing a little annoyance at the ungratefulness of the persons whom she had treated so kindly, and who sealed their own fate through their own misdeeds.

You will, therefore, on behalf of us, the undersigned members of the Poona Branch of the Theosophical Society, be so good as to convey to Madame Blavatsky the assurance of our unalterable respect, gratitude, and love for her irreproachable and high character, and the truly unselfish and great work that she is trying to do for the welfare of this country. You will also inform her that we look with a feeling of contempt, engendered by the conviction of her innocence, upon the imbecile attempt to injure her character.

Yours fraternally,

(Signed) N. D. KHANDALVALA, B.A., LL.B.
 (") A. D. EZEKIEL.
 (") LAXMAN N. JOSHI.
 (") COWASJI DOSSABHOY DAVAR.
 (") RAJANA LINGU.
 (") P. PALLANJI.
 (") MANAKJI KAIKHUSHRU.
 (") DHONDO BALKRISHNA SAHASRABUDHE.
 (") BALAJI BABAJI GODBOLE.
 (") PANDURANG JANARDAN.
 (") BALLAJI KHANDERAO ADHAV.
 (") GANGARAM BEAU,
 (") GANESH KRISHNA GARDE, L. M. & S.
 (") RAGHUNATH RAMCHANDRA GOKHALE.
 (") (SARDAR) CHINTAMANRAO YASHWANTRAO
 NATTU.

APPENDIX II.

THE following is from an article which appeared in the *Indian Mirror* of September 20, 1884.

(EXTRACT.)

THE CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES AND THE SO-CALLED
COLLAPSE OF THEOSOPHY.

On Saturday last we received the following letter from the Editor of the *Christian College Magazine* of Madras :—

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "INDIAN MIRROR."]

Sir,—I send you by this post a proof copy of an article about to appear in the *Christian College Magazine*, entitled the "Collapse of Kut Humi." May I ask the favour of a copy of the paper containing your remarks and criticisms ?

I am, yours very truly,

GEO. PATTERSON,

Editor, "*Christian College Magazine*."

The above letter was accompanied by the proof sheets therein referred to. It seems that these proof sheets were sent much earlier to the *Times of India* than to any other paper—although it was known that that journal was notoriously hostile to Theosophy; for a telegram giving the purport of the *Times of India's* article had appeared in the *Statesman* two days before. We read the proof sheets sent to us, and found that they were clearly libellous, unless we were assured that the letters from Madame Blavatsky to Monsieur and Madame Coulomb, from which extracts were therein given, were genuine. The extracts looked to us very suspicious, as they bore no dates and were written, half in French and half in English. In order to be satisfied on the point, we sent a telegram at once to a friend at the Head-quarters of the Theosophical Society of Madras, enquiring what truth there was in the statements contained in the article, and

calling for all particulars on the subject. We took the natural precaution not to say anything on the point, until we ascertained all the facts connected with the case. In reply we heard from Madras that particulars had been posted to us the day before. We have now got some of these particulars; and some of the letters, as we suspected, appear not to be genuine ones. In the meantime, we see that the *Madras Mail*, one of the most respectable journals in India, has, according to a Madras telegram to the *Pioneer*, stated its opinion as follows:—

The article in the *Madras Christian College Magazine*, with correspondence alleged to have passed between Madame Blavatsky and other Theosophists, has created a sensation here. The *Mail* censures the Missionaries who conduct the *Magazine* for making such a fierce onslaught upon Madame Blavatsky. It says the Missionaries ought not to have published private and confidential letters written by a lady, without her consent, and in her absence in England.

The *Mail*, we also find, in a telegram sent from Madras to the *Indian Daily News*; questions the genuineness of the letters, published in the *Christian College Magazine*. We do not know how to account for the small discretion used by some of our contemporaries not only in reproducing in their columns the most defamatory article of the *Christian College Magazine*, but also in commenting on it in the manner that they have done. They have only aggravated the libel in the original publication, and, we fear, they may yet have to repent the step they have unadvisedly taken. The *Christian College Magazine* may be a most respectable periodical, though started, we think, scarcely a year ago. But it has been very unwise in the course it has adopted in the present instance; and we have no doubt in our mind, it will have one day to pay heavily for its hastiness. This Magazine was desirous of becoming sensational, and it has succeeded wonderfully in that line. The letters published were so transparent

that we wonder that any man of common sense could not see through their more than questionable genuineness. Even the *Englishman* has been forced to admit that he cannot understand how such a remarkably clever woman as Madame Blavatsky could have written such letters, and that the whole thing seems incomprehensible to him. Also, another paper, the *Indigo Planters' Journal*, observes :—

On Sunday morning, the *Statesman* bloomed out in blue, and those who took their walks abroad in the city of patriotic Municipal Commissioners, were greeted by sensational posters and sandwich men, announcing the collapse of Madame Blavatsky and the reply of the Calcutta Municipality. The collapse consisted of a series of letters, which, it seems to us, Madame Blavatsky is far too clever a woman ever to have written.

We might remind our contemporary, the *Statesman*, for whom we have much respect, that not very long ago, he himself, with all his ability and long experience as a journalist, was successfully deceived into publishing a notice of the death of our fellow-citizen, Babu Hem-Chunder Kerr, Deputy Magistrate and Deputy Collector of Alipore, while he was alive and well, as he is to this day. How are we to believe that the Editor of the *Christian College Magazine* was not similarly imposed upon in the present case? The *Statesman*, probably to vie with the Madras Magazine in the sensational line, also republished the whole correspondence *in extenso*; and we can quite believe when our contemporary says :—

The sensation created by this early exposure of Madame Blavatsky's "occult phenomena" surpassed all expectation, and the sale of the paper on Sunday and Monday mornings was unprecedented.

It has come to our knowledge, but we cannot vouch for the truth of our information, that the Rev. J. M. Thorburn, the great gun of the Methodists, and the Editor of that Methodist journal, the *Indian Witness*, which makes it a point to attack

Theosophy in almost every issue in a most virulent spirit, has had something to do with the *Statesman* office in the "getting-up" of those placards, which are posted in the streets of Calcutta, to inform the public of what is supposed to be the collapse of Theosophy. As in Madras, the Missionary zeal against Theosophy broke out in the libellous article in the *Christian College Magazine*, so it has manifested itself in a milder form in Calcutta in the placards, which are said to owe their appearance to Methodist enterprise. The *Statesman*, incorporated with the *Friend of India*, has a traditional reputation for strong sympathy with Christian Missionary work in India. While under the editorial management of Mr. Riach, that paper narrowly escaped a legal prosecution for defaming Madame Blavatsky by eating humble pie. For the present Editor of the *Statesman* we entertain the highest respect, knowing him to be fair-minded and disposed to deal justly by all interests. But, unfortunately, he happens to be rather too impulsive, and too apt to be led by surrounding influences. Whether in London on Hyderabad affairs, or in Calcutta in the Pigot-Hastie case, he very unwarily fell into the clutches of the law for allowing his belief to outstrip his otherwise sound judgment, and, in the present instance, we fear he has permitted himself to be worked upon to join in a cry against a movement, the nature of which he has as yet only very dimly apprehended. It seems to us that, of all local journals, the *Statesman* has the most cause to be cautious before committing itself to a decided opinion on any question, which has two sides in it to be considered. In the present instance, our contemporary, like other journals, which have commented on the correspondence, should have waited to hear the other side. It is noteworthy that none of the Madras papers, which have not indentified

themselves with either side, have ~~not~~ commented on the case, except the *Madras Times*, which is edited by a Missionary gentleman. It is not, therefore, surprising that this journal "defends the conduct of the *Christian College Magazine* in exposing Madame Blavatsky." On the contrary, the *Madras Mail*, a non-sectarian paper, has, as we have shown, censured the action of the conductors of the *Christian College Magazine* in giving premature publicity to a correspondence, more than suspected to be spurious. As for the Bombay papers, the *Bombay Gazette* and the *Times of India*, which have been always opposed to the Theosophical Movement, have, it is generally known, been strongly prejudiced against Theosophy through the influence of some expelled members; and we had no doubt that both, if they enquired for themselves dispassionately, would find more than sufficient reason to change their present sentiments.

Since the commencement, the Theosophical movement has had to weather many storms, and it has till now weathered them all successfully. But what is of peculiar significance in this connection is that these storms have in every instance been raised through the direct instrumentality or through the indirect influence of expelled members, and that the result has been invariably that Theosophy has spread faster and wider, and taken root deeper after every struggle it has gone through. At the outset of its operations it had to expel Mr. Hurrychand Chintamon of Bombay, for making away with the Society's funds, and it was to be expected that he would backbite its members, and decry its objects. We need not refer to the quarrels between the Society and Danund Saraswati, or between the Society and Miss Bates and Mr. Wimbridge. On neither of these two occasions, or on the first, did the cause of Theosophy suffer, nor do we think it will suffer from the present quarrel

with Monsieur and Madame Coulomb, although all of them left no stone unturned to do it some mortal injury. We are sure that the present controversy, instead of doing any harm to the Society, will do a world of good to the Theosophical movement, as it will necessarily attract greater attention to it, and excite more diligent enquiry into its nature and objects. And we are convinced that the closer the scrutiny, the clearer will come out the character of the Society; and the movement, which has been making steady progress hitherto, will be greatly accelerated. So far as our experience goes, we can safely say that there is no part, however little, in Theosophy that any man, deserving the name, can possibly be ashamed of. The Theosophical Society, having no cause to fear, has always courted, and still courts, the fullest enquiry: and its really beneficent character will, some day, like truth, be found at the bottom of the well. As for the alleged "collapse" of Theosophy, over which the *Christian College Magazine* and the whole horde of anti-Theosophists suppose they have sung a *requiem*, we believe they have been in too great a haste. The Christian Missionaries will see that it will yet take a much longer time to collapse than they imagine. We remind them that if anything should have collapsed so soon, it should have been Mission work in India, immediately after the Pigot-Hastie case in Calcutta. For what terrible disclosures did not that case make during its trial? For the Christian Missionaries to talk of the collapse of Theosophy after the Pigot-Hastie case, it comes with extremely ill grace from them. After that case Christian Missionaries would have done better, if they had left the country with their bag and baggage. It is merely an act of forbearance that they are still allowed to continue playing their trade here. Was not the Rev. W. Hastie the leading champion of the Missionary cause here?

Was he not foremost and bitter in denouncing Hinduism, as some papers are now bitterly denouncing Theosophy? And what has been his lot? In our opinion, it is not improbable, nay it is almost certain, that the present Missionary attack upon Theosophy will terminate in a similarly disastrous result to the cause of Missionary enterprise. We shall not be very much surprised if Madras becomes the scene of as much excitement as Calcutta was lately. The effects of this excitement will not be confined to India alone, but to all parts of the civilized world, where there are Branches of the Theosophical Society. The result of this case will show to what lengths the Missionary body would go to crush a movement which they suppose to be antagonistic. And every movement they look upon as antagonistic, that is not based upon "Christian" principles. The Missionaries have with their eyes open allowed themselves to be made the dupes of two expelled members of the Society, who, by their alleged disclosures, prove themselves to have been accomplices in systematic fraud, and who, by this very admission, put themselves out of any right to be believed, especially when their charges are directed against a lady of the highest birth and rank, whose personal character has hitherto been perfectly free from the slightest blemish, in whatever light it may be regarded. That fraud and trickery have been at work against the Society since the departure of Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky for Europe, will be seen from the following letter we have received from Dr. F. Hartmann, a Member of the Parent Theosophical Society:—

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "MADRAS MAIL."]

Sir,—Having been requested to give the details in regard to a forged letter, which was received by Colonel Olcott, and sent by him to me, I submit the following correspondence:—

My dear Dr. Hartmann,—The enclosure was received by me without explanation in a cover post-marked Madras, some little

time ago. An experience, such as mine, of the past eight or ten years, making it impossible that I should be astonished at any thing, and, least of all, be deceived by appearances, I offset my personal knowledge of you against this blackguard note. I laid the latter away in my despatch-box to be shown you on my return. But this morning, in going through my papers, I noticed that the Master has been putting his hand on the document; and, while reading his endorsement, I heard him tell me to send it to you by to-day's post. It ought to prove to you and others that, whatever agency may be at work against the Theosophical Society, whether incarnate or disincarnate, vulgar, forger, or Dugpen, there are those watching over its destinies, who are stronger than they, and who can always be relied upon to see us through. I shall not even venture to hint from what source this forgery emanates. The trick was stupid enough for an idiot or a crazy woman. Whoever it was, must have awfully miscalculated my intelligence. Of course, one cannot judge very accurately by the handwriting of an envelope, whether it came from a white man, a Eurasian, or a Native, but the aura impressed me as that of some body very inimical to us. And as the only interested party is not acquainted with the "Thinker" crowd, probably it came from one of the willing helpers included in the very Reverend Missionary body, &c., &c.

H. S. OLCOTT.

LONDON, 10th July, 1884.

The enclosure contained in Colonel Olcott's letter is written on a piece of paper, such as is usually used at the head-quarters. It is written in pencil, and signed with my name. The following is what it says:—(Please observe the spelling and the punctuation):—

Private

ADYAR, April 28th, 1884.

My dear Madame Coulomb,—I was very glad to receive Your Kind warning: but I need a new and further explanation before I will believe in Madame Blavatsky's *innocence*. From the first week of my arrieval I know she was a *trickster*, for I had received intimation to that effect, and had been told so by Mr. Lane-Fox before he went to Uty, and who added, moreover, that he had come from England with this purpose, as he had received secret instructions from the London Fellows, and even said that he felt sure she was a spy. She is worse than you think, and she lied to me about lots of things, but you may rest assured that she shall not bamboozle me.

I hope to tell you more when I see you upon your return from Utakamund, and show you that Colonel Olcott is no better

than he should be. Excuse short letter. *I am writing in the dark.**

Yours faithfully,
DR. F. HARTMANN.
(Scrawl.)

On the back of this nonsensical letter which was neither grammatically nor orthographically correct, and which, therefore, must have been *written in the dark*, but which was executed in a tolerably good imitation of my own handwriting, was written in the handwriting of a Mahatma, well-known to me:—"A clumsy forgery but good enough to show how much an enterprising enemy can do in that direction. They may call this at Adyar, a Pioneer."

After the arrival of such a pioneer, we have been expecting to see the main army soon. We were rather amused to see the collection of letters alleged to have been written by Mme. Blavatsky, and which appeared in the *Christian College Magazine*. And the question now arises whether or not a person who has nothing in the world to lose but everything to gain and who stands before the world a self-accused and self-convicted swindler and counterfeiter, would be likely to hesitate to use any means in her power with the benignant assistance of somebody who would, moreover, be willing to pay her something for her trouble. But if we are correct in our surmises that the author of the letter, *written in the dark*, and of the letters in the *Christian College Magazine*, is one and the same person, it remains to be explained what motives that person had to give vent to ** feeling of revenge by throwing dirt at Mme. Blavatsky.

The reason why the Coulobms were expelled from the Society, how Mrs. Coulob tried to do "a little trading", how Mr. Coulob was frightened away before he had finished his hole behind the shrine, and other curious and interesting things have been collected in a pamphlet, entitled *A Report of Observations made during a nine months' stay at the Head-quarters of the Theosophical Society*. It is in press, and will be ready to-morrow.

Respectfully yours,
F. HARTMANN, M.D.

ADYAR, 12th September 1884.

After reading the above, the reader can draw his own inferences in the matter. We are certain that

* A letter from Madame Coulob to Madame Blavatsky says:

GALLE, 12th April.

My dear Madame Blavatsky,

I wrote to you some few days ago a letter which I feel convinced, was illegible. I wrote it I may say in the dark. I think I must have left off half the letters in some words and put too many in others. I hope you will excuse me for it, etc., etc.

if the alleged letter of Dr. Hartmann, which Dr. Hartmann himself declares to be a forgery, had been tendered to the Editor of the *Christian College Magazine* as evidence against Madame Blavatsky, it would have been published in the correspondence, which is supposed to have extinguished Theosophy. We do not know how to characterize the conduct of the so-called Christian conductors of the *Christian College Magazine*, for they have overstepped all bounds of propriety in publishing the article they have done. They have attacked a lady of the highest respectability and character behind her back, while she is touring in Europe, and they make themselves willing instruments in the hands of persons who confess themselves to be infamous accomplices in one of the grossest frauds ever perpetrated upon humanity. The Missionaries accept as genuine the documents that are placed in their hands by such characters as these! Nothing could be more mean and cowardly than the publication of the present article in the *Christian College Magazine*, in the absence of Madame Blavatsky from India. The pious Missionaries, who have mixed themselves with such people and with such things, should be ashamed of themselves. If Madame Blavatsky is such an impostor, as she is described by these people to be, which we do not for a moment believe, she should be hooted out of society. If, on the other hand, it should be proved that Madame Blavatsky is what we know her to be, we hope that the Missionaries, who have lent themselves to the present blackguard attack upon that lady, may be meted out the same measure of justice they are wrongly seeking to mete out to her, but in vain.

The collapse of Theosophy means the collapse of Aryan Philosophy; and the occult phenomena of the Theosophical Society may be wholly disbelieved in by those who have not studied our Aryan

Philosophy, and are not acquainted with the laws governing the forces of nature. To tell them that these phenomena are produced by fraud and trickery is something quite ridiculous, much more so to those who have witnessed these phenomena repeatedly, under circumstances which do not admit of the slightest doubt or suspicion, in places where there could be no such accomplices as the Coulombs, and in the absence even of Madame Blavatsky. These phenomena are nothing new to Hindus who have studied their own philosophy and science, nor even is the existence of the Mahatmas, spoken of by Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky. Any Hindu will be able to say that the existence of these great beings is an admitted fact; for at every religious ceremony, the *mantras* are addressed to the *Rishis* and *Munis*, dead and alive, and they are invoked by name, these *Rishis* and *Munis* being neither more nor less than those who are now called *Mahatmas*. What Jesus Christ is to the Christians the *Mahatmas* are to the Hindus.

Every Hindu is interested in this question, for if Theosophy is to collapse to-morrow, then the very foundation of the Hindu and Buddhist religion will collapse at the same time. The question is, therefore, a most important one, and what we want is the fullest enquiry into all the circumstances connected with the present charges brought against Theosophy, or, at least, one of its principal founders, as we perfectly well know and are convinced what the result of such enquiry will be. That the correspondence is not genuine, will appear from the following

letters from Mr. Ezekiel, a relative of the Sassoons, and a well-known merchant of Puna, to the *Times of India*. He is a fellow of the Theosophical Society, and was present at the meeting, referred to in the Puna letter, published in the correspondence. This letter, coming from such a quarter, ought to open the eyes of the conductors of the *Christian College Magazine* and other journals to the real character of the correspondence, on which they have based their remarks :

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES OF INDIA."]

Sir,—In your issue of yesterday's date you have quoted in full, from the advance proofs of the *Christian College Magazine*, an article containing several letters alleged to have been written by Madame Blavatsky to M. and Mdme. Coulomb, who were expelled from the Theosophical Society several months ago.

In one of the letters my name has been mentioned, and you will allow me to make a few observations. I know in detail all the particulars of Madame Blavatsky's last visit to Puna. Some of the particulars have inaccurately been put into the alleged letter. The telegram, referred to therein, was not at all meant, even in a most distant way, to suggest the possession of phenomenal powers by Madame Blavatsky, and she never attempted to put before me or Mr. Sassoon the telegram in any such light. On carefully reading this paper, I can plainly see that Madame Blavatsky could not have written the letter, much less have called for the telegram.

I need not recount all the particulars here, for they will come out along with many other facts in their proper place, when it will be satisfactorily shown to the public that the letters alleged to have been written by Madame Blavatsky are not genuine.

Both Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott are at present in Germany, and they are expected to return to India by the end of next month, and I have no doubt they have been communicated with by the members of the Theosophical Society in charge of the Head-quarters at Madras, from which place I

have just been given to understand that the letters are absurd forgeries. It is somewhat difficult to take immediate action in the absence of Madame Blavatsky, but nothing will be left undone to expose the falsity of the defamatory statements, which no one knowing the facts regarding the Coulobms could for a moment believe in.

I have, &c.,

PUNA, 13th September.

A. D. EZEKIEL.

While on this subject, we may give here the following extract from a letter we have just received from an esteemed friend :—

The so-called "Collapse of Kut Humi" in the *Christian College Magazine* for September, published in Madras, is no collapse at all, except of the much-talked-of "explosion," which the fatuous brain of one or two Madras Missionaries had intimated was coming. We do not believe that the leading lights of the Christian establishment at Madras have countenanced this, but have simply permitted a certain crack-brained fellow, not unknown there, to take the responsibility of libel suits and such pleasant things.

Well, then, what does it amount to ? A lot of mangled letters alleged to be from Madame Blavatsky are published. It is admitted in the article that they were supplied by one Madame Coulobm, and also that she had been expelled from the Society. It is plain, also, that this is the work of a traitor, and one who is willing to be *particeps criminis* in a swindle. For if the letters be true, then Madame Coulobm is, of course, proven to

be one of two swindlers; if they are shown to be false, then Madame Coulomb is proven to be a person who was willing to say that she could be a swindler. Rather unpleasant this is for Madame Coulomb, and very damaging to her credibility in any case.

On reading these letters, they impress one as being not in Madame Blavatsky's style, as being very vulgar, and many of them show such incoherency that suspicion is at once engendered as to their genuineness. This is no doubt the reason why they did not appear in the daily papers. No careful editor would take such responsibility. Then they are not dated. Some of them begin in French and end in English, when every one knows that Madame Coulomb is an Englishwoman, and that Madame Blavatsky prefers to write English. One of these letters is very absurd, and transparently not Madame Blavatsky's. It goes on in French thus: "at dites a Damodar que j'a la promesse do Mr. Webster, *Chief Secretary* tout to transfer Ramasawmy to Madras." Why such a fine French scholar as Mdme. Blavatsky should suddenly and ridiculously drop into English to a place in the sentence, where least needed, and for such simple words, will probably come to light in the Police Courts. If this is the best that the unreasoning enemies of Theosophy can do, then we pity them. Too many phenomena have happened in the absence of both the Coulombs, and Madame Blavatsky, not only at head-quarters but in other places, for people to regard this as a collapse. No doubt the writer of the article will be able to explain how Mr. Sinnett found a cup at a great depth underground in a jungle, or how his wife found a reply to her question just put, on a piece of paper, stuck on a twig of a neighbouring tree.

It only remains for the Council to add that they have the best assurance that Madame Blavatsky is perfectly innocent of the infamous charges which have been brought against her. They learn from India that the article in the *Christian College Magazine* has not produced the intended effect. There

has not been a single withdrawal from the Society ; and two hundred and thirty of the students in the Christian College have invited the Theosophist leaders to lecture and reply to the Missionaries' attack.

APPENDIX III.

Address of the Students of the Christian College of Madras.

The following is the substance of the address of the Students of the Colleges of Madras to Madame Blavatsky :—

In according to you this our heartiest of welcomes on your return from the intellectual campaigns which you have so successfully waged in the West, we are conscious we are giving but a feeble expression to the " debt immense of endless gratitude" which India lies under to you.

You have dedicated your life to the disinterested services of disseminating the truths of Occult Philosophy. Upon the sacred mysteries of our hoary Religion and Philosophies you have thrown such a flood of light by sending into the World that marvellous production of yours, the " Isis Unveiled." By your exposition, has our beloved Colonel been

induced to undertake that gigantic labour of love—the vivifying on the altars of Aryavarta the dying flames of religion and spirituality.

While at one quarter of the globe you had been with all your heart and soul addressing yourself to the work of propagating eternal Truth, your enemies on this side have been equally industrious. We allude to the recent scandalous events at Madras, in which an expelled domestic of yours has been made a convenient cat's paw of. While looking upon such futilities with the indignant scorn which they certainly deserve, we beg to assure you that our affection and admiration, earned by the loftiness of your soul, the nobility of your aspirations and the sacrifices you have made, have become too deeply rooted to be shaken by the rude blasts of spite, spleen and slander, which, however, are no uncommon occurrences in the history of Theosophy.

That the revered Masters whose hearts are overflowing with love for Humanity will continue as ever to help you and our esteemed Colonel in the discovery of Truth and the dissemination of the same, is the earnest prayer of,

Dear and Revered Madame,
Your affectionate Servants,
Students of the Colleges of Madras.

MADRAS, *December* 1884.

APPENDIX IV.
Madame Blavatsky.

1.

The following letter was received by Mr. Sinnett in 1881 :—

I certify by the present that Madame H. P. Blavatsky, now residing at Simla (British India) is from her father's side the daughter of Colonel Peter Hahn, and grand-daughter of Lieutenant-General Absis Hahn VonRottenstern-Hahn (a noble family of Mecklenburg, Germany, settled in Russia). And that she is from her mother's side the daughter of Helene Fadeeff, and grand-daughter of Privy Councillor Andrew Fadeeff and of the Princess Helene Dolgorouki; that she is the widow of the Councillor of State Nicephore Blavatsky, late Vice-Governor of the Province of Erivan Caucasus.

(Signed) ROSTESLAV FADEEFF, Major-Genl.,
Of H. I. Majesty's Staff,
Joint Secretary of State
at the Ministry of the Interior.

St. Petersburg, 29, Little Morskaya, }
18th September 1881. }

2.

The following letter was received from her aunt, Madame N. A. Fadeeff, dated 20th May 1877 :—

“ The phenomena which have occurred through the instrumentality of my niece Helen (Madame Blavatsky) are both very strange and marvellous, veritable prodigies * * * So much power concentrated in a single individual, this entire group of most extraordinary phenomena coming through a single psychic agency, as is the case of Madame Blavatsky, is beyond question an excessively rare exception. My niece is a being quite apart, and who cannot be compared to any living person. As child, as young girl, as young woman, she was always so much higher than the world

to which she belonged, that she could never be appreciated at her true value. Her education was the usual one of a young lady of high family, but no more. Still the uncommon richness of her intelligence, the extreme activity and intuitiveness (*finesse et mobilité*) of her thought, her marvellous readiness to comprehend, seize upon, and assimilate the most difficult subjects, such as might require of others years of the most laborious study; an eminently developed perspicacity, and at the same time a character loyal, straightforward, frank and energetic:—these traits always gave her so marked a superiority, one so high above the level of the insipid majority of human society, that she could not fail to draw upon herself general attention, and consequently the hatred of all who felt themselves wounded in their petty triviality by the grandeur of the talents of this truly astonishing woman.

APPENDIX V.

Occult Phenomena.

I.

Having been called upon to give an account of the phenomena that have taken place independent of, or during the absence of, Madame H. P. Blavatsky, I beg to state as follows:—

1. I was present when Rawal Shree Hurreesinghjee Roopsinghjee (of Varel, Kathiawar, Guzeratha) opened the shrine and found a reply inside his unopened letter. This phenomenon is described in the last paragraph but one of his letters published on page 87 of the Supplement to the *Theosophist* for June 1884.

2. One morning in February, 1884, I was addressing wrappers for subscribers to the *Theosophist*, at my desk in the *Theosophist* Office at Adyar. There lay on my desk a bundle of about one hundred wrappers to be addressed; and next to it on the desk was also stretched out the mailing register of subscribers. In the course of addressing the wrappers, I suspected that a subscriber had changed his address, and that the change was omitted to be noted in the register to satisfy myself on this point, I left my desk and went to the desk of an assistant manager in the same office-room. I returned within a minute to my desk. Damodar K. Mavalankar had not stirred at all, but was working at his desk as usual. We were only three in the room. On ap-

proaching my desk, I saw *distinctly* an envelope and paper *forming* themselves, and in a few seconds, on the partly addressed wrapper lay an envelope (or rather a closed letter) to the address of Mr P. Sreenivas Row, Small Cause Judge of Madras. This phenomenon is recorded in paragraph 4 of his letter, dated 9th July, 1884, published at page 113 of the Supplement to the *Theosophist* for August, 1884.

3. A similar phenomenon happened when we three alone were in the office-room, and it is described in paragraph 2 of Mr. Sreenivas Row's letter above quoted.

4. One evening, my friend and brother, T. Vijiaraghava Charloo Garu (whom we familiarly call here Ananda), was sorely troubled at heart by some private affairs. During the night he slept in his usual place on the verandah as myself and Damodar. Early in the morning he rolled up his bed and put it away. Damodar asked him funnily whether he could not notice anything strange in his bed. I forgot the exact words. In reply Vijiaraghava Charloo Garu rushed at once to examine his bed, and found there where he laid his head a note from Mahatma K. H. in a Chinese envelope, giving him the consolation and encouragement he then so much needed. This happened on the 27th February, 1884, after Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott had left for Europe.

5. On or about the 1st August, 1884, I was examining whether the wrappers addressed to subscribers (to the *Theosophist*) were correct, sitting in the room next to our office-room; and on a large camp table were spread the addressed wrappers. With some noise fell a heavy packet (with a covering letter to me) on the wrappers. The letter contained some wholesome and timely advice to me, and directed me to hand over the packet to Mr. St. George Lane-Fox. I accordingly gave it and found that in the packet was a Chinese envelope and letter addressed both to Dr. F. Hartmann and to Mr. Lane-Fox. When the packet fell on my table, there was nobody then in the room or in the office-room. I was alone. The letter and contents were in the well-known handwritings of Mahatma K. H. and of B. D. S.

6. Mr. Peter Davidson (F. T. S., of 9, Arbeadic Terrace, Banchoerry, Kincardineshire), wrote a letter, dated 27th February, 1884, to the address of Mr. W. T. Brown, who is now with us here. Mr. Brown handed over the letter to Damodar in the morning, as soon as the letter was received by the mail, after reading it. The two Founders, Madame B. and Col. O., had left India then. Damodar left Davidson's letter on our office table. As I was all alone in the office and writing at the table, I know that the letter remained uninterfered with, until in the afternoon we found an endorsement

in blue pencil by Mahatma K. H., directing me to answer Mr. Davidson, to whom I accordingly wrote a letter, dated 21st March, 1884.

7. M. R. Ry. G. Sreenivas Row Garn, Sub-Registrar of Cambum, Karnool District, India, wrote a letter, dated 15th January, 1884, to the address of Damodar, who gave it to me for reply. Early in the morning at 7 A. M. I arranged all the papers to be answered on my desk, with which nobody ever interferes. I put this letter of Sreenivas Row in a prominent place on the table, and then after locking the office-room and taking the key with me, I went out to take a bath; at about 8 A. M. I returned and opened the office door; on approaching my table, what do I find? Endorsement on Sreenivas Row's letter in blue pencil, in the handwriting of Mahatma K. H., ordering me to answer the letter. There is not the least possibility of doubt in this case.

8. Mr. Stanley B. Sexton, F. T. S., No. 2, Park Row, Chicago, Ill., U. S., America, wrote a letter, dated 1st January 1884. It was received on the 18th February, 1884, by Damodar, who, after reading it, put it on the large table in the centre of our office, where he and I were sitting and working opposite each other. On the morning of the 19th idem (next day) at about 8 A. M., Damodar searched for the letter, but could not find it *anywhere* in the office-room! He asked me and another brother (an assistant manager), working in the room, if we saw it. We did not even touch it, but still examined all our papers, desks and drawers in vain. An hour or two after I found Sexton's letter on my own desk, with an endorsement from Mahatma K. H., in his blue pencil handwriting, ordering me to reply. All this I take down from the record then made by me of the circumstances. My desk is in a secluded corner, with a large cupboard to its left, a table of mine to its right (a tin partition wall and wire-work behind the table), and in the front of my desk a glass door with strong bolts, never opened for many months. And, during the hour or two, nobody came into the room, all of us three in the office working at our respective places without stirring.

9. M. R. Ry. P. Iyaloo Naidoo Garu (retired Deputy Collector of Arnee, now at Chudderghat, Hyderabad, Deccan, India) is an old and very devoted member of the Theosophical Society. On the 20th April 1884, he wrote a letter to Damodar, enclosing therewith a letter for Mahatma K. H. Damodar was then at Ootacamund, and as I was in charge of the office, I sent the letter to him. When it was returned to me, I found remarks and endorsements not only on the envelope (of the letter to Damodar), but also inside the letter to the Mahatma, in his well-known blue pencil handwriting. Though, of course, the letters were received by me (opened) from Ootacamund, still this fact

proves that phenomena do occur during Madame Blavatsky's absence. Under similar circumstances, I received endorsements in Mahatma K. H.'s handwriting on the letters of Mr. M. A. Lane (of St. Louis, U. S. A.) dated 25th February 1884, and of Professor J. D. Buck, M. D. (Dean of Pultney Medical College, Cincinnati, O., U. S. A.) dated 18th March 1884.

10. On or about the 27th March, 1884, at about 10 A. M., one morning, there were in the office-room, only (i), myself, at my desk; (ii), Damodar, in his usual place at the large table in the office; (iii), Vijaiaraghava Charloo at his desk in a corner; (iv), Mr. Navatamram Ootamram Trivedi (F. T. S., of Surat, Bombay Presidency); and (v), a peon, who does not know English, nor anything about phenomena or the Society. The peon was taking copy of an official letter in a copying book, by the copying machine. None of us left our seats. I heard a noise suddenly, and found a letter to Navatamram's address lying on the floor between Damodar and the addressee. The letter contained allusions to some advices given by Mr. T. Subba Row (at his house) to our guest and brother of Surat, as well as some remarks on phenomena, which remarks our guest stood in real need of.

11. One morning (I do not remember the date of course, after the Founders left India), only three of us were in the office-room: (i), myself; (ii), Damodar; and (iii), T. Vijaiaraghava Charloo Garu. Damodar told me to look at my table for a communication from the Master. I searched everywhere, but to no purpose; I was not to be deceived by my senses, for I heard a noise. Both Damodar and Vijaiaraghava Charloo were at their seats. I went from place to place, searched not only my table, but the tables of the other two. Damodar told me at length to look into a tin box which I had placed on my table, and in which I keep postage stamps and some cash for sundry expenses. A few minutes before, I opened it and took stamps from it. There was then, of course, no letter of the Master in it. I looked as desired, after opening the tin box, and found there a letter.

12. In conclusion, I have to add that, even before Madame Blavatsky had left for Europe, I had received messages at different times and places, direct from Mahatma K. H., independent of, and far away from, Madame Blavatsky and others at the headquarters; and that I have seen and lived awhile in Thibet, and seen the Masters in their physical body, and conversed with them. But as a narration of the details of these experiences involves much of my personal life, and as I am not prepared to adduce proofs and evidences touching these facts, I leave them out of consideration.

ADYAR, (MADRAS, INDIA), }
13th September 1884. }

BABAJEE D. NATH."

II.

Having been asked to give an account of the phenomena that have occurred during the absence of Madame H. P. Blavatsky, I beg to state as follows :—

1. In a few days after my arrival at the Head-quarters, when Madame Blavatsky was at Ootacamund, and Colonel Olcott was on his Southern tour, Mr. P. Sreenivasa Row, Judge of the Small Cause Court, Madras, came to the Head-quarters, and after a few minutes' conversation, wished to see the Shrine upstairs. Messrs. Damodar K. Mavalankar, Babajee D. Nath, Babu Balai Chand Mallick and myself, went with him to the occult-room and opened the Shrine. Then he said he wanted to put a letter in it. He did so, and the doors of the Shrine were shut and opened. The letter gone and there was a reply in a Chinese envelope. The time expired between shutting and opening may be two or three minutes. To read that reply took him more than a quarter of an hour.

2. On early morning of the 27th February, 1884, after Madame Blavatsky left India for Europe, I found a letter, addressed to me in the familiar handwriting of the Mahatma K. H., underneath my head in my own bed.

3. Subsequently, on two occasions, I found a certain remark made by the Mahatma K. H. in newspapers, after I finished reading and putting them on my table for the Scrap-book.

4. On two occasions (I do not remember the dates) I found letters addressed to Mr. P. Sreenivasa Row, by the Mahatma K. H., on my table when I was doing my office-work during the day.

5. In March 1884, at about 10 A. M., there fell a letter in our office-room to the address of Mr. Navatamram Ootamram Trivedi, F. T. S., in reply to letter when Messrs. Damodar K. Mavalankar, Babaji D. Nath, N. O. Trivedi, myself and a peon were present in the office.

6. One morning, at about 11 o'clock, I found on my table, a letter addressed to Dr. F. Hartmann, Chairman, Board of Control, in the familiar handwriting of the Mahatma K. H., containing certain instructions about the management of the Head-quarters during the absence of Messrs. St. George Lane-Fox and Damodar K. Mavalankar, at Ootacamund. I delivered the message to the Doctor. Intuitively it struck me that there was something more from the Master. There was none in the office. I went to Mr. Babaji D. Nath's table and just then saw a letter wrapped up by a covering letter to the address of Babaji D. Nath.

7. I have also witnessed several other phenomena that took place downstairs, though they did not occur on my table. Therefore I have to say that phenomena, independent of the Shrine and Madame Blavatsky, have occurred where there^d could not possibly be electric wires, trap-doors, panels, &c.

ADYAR (MADRAS), INDIA, }
24th September 1884. }

T. VIJIA RAGHAVA CHARLOO.

III.

The following is from Dr. Hübbe Schleiden, who is a well-known German publicist. It should be noted that Madame Blavatsky was in England at the time of the incident :—

ELBERFELD, *August, 1884.*

DEAR MADAME,—You request me to state to you the particular circumstances under which I received my first communication from Mahatma K. H. I have much pleasure in doing so.

On the morning of the 1st of this month, Colonel Olcott and I were travelling by an express train from here to Dresden. A few days before I had written a letter to the Mahatmas which Colonel Olcott had addressed and enclosed to you which, however, as I now hear, never reached you but was taken by the Masters whilst it was in the hands of the post officials. At the time mentioned I was not thinking of this letter, but was relating to Colonel Olcott some events of my life, expressing also the fact that since my sixth or seventh year I had never known peace or joy, and asking Colonel Olcott's opinion on the meaning of some striking hardships I have gone through. In this conversation we were interrupted by the railway-guard demanding our tickets. When I moved forwards and raised myself partly from the seat in order to hand over the tickets, Col. Olcott noticed something white lying behind my back on that side of me which was opposite to the one where he was sitting. When I took up that which had appeared there, it turned out to be a Tibetan envelope, in which I found a letter from Mahatma K. H., written with blue pencil in his well-known and unmistakable handwriting. As there were several other persons unacquainted with us in the compartment, I suppose the master chose this place for depositing the letter near me, where it was the least likely to attract the unwelcome attention and curiosity of outsiders. The envelope was plainly addressed to me, and the communication contained in the letter was a consoling reflection on the opinion which I had five or ten minutes ago given on the dreary events of my past life. The

Mahatma explained that such events and the mental misery attached to it were beyond the ordinary run of life, but that hardships of all kinds would be the lot of one striving for higher spiritual development. He very kindly expressed his opinion that I had already achieved some philanthropic work for the good of the world. In this letter were also answered some of the questions which I had put in my first-mentioned letter, and an assurance was given me that I was to receive assistance and advice when I should be in need of it.

I dare say it would be unnecessary for me to ask you to inform the Mahatma of the devoted thankfulness which I feel towards him for the great kindness shown to me, for the master will know of my sentiments without my forming them into more or less inadequate words.

I am, dear Madame,
 In due respect,
 Yours faithfully,
 HÜBBE SCHLEIDEN.

TO MADAME BLAVATSKY,
Elberfeld, Platzhoffstrasse, 12.

IV.

(*From Hints on Esoteric Theosophy, No. 1, pp. 86—87.*)

The following are extracts from some of the papers, referring to a remarkable picture :—

“CITY AND COUNTY OF NEW YORK.

“William Q. Judge, being duly sworn, says that he is an attorney and counsellor-at-law, practising at the Bar of the State of New York; that he was present at the house of Madame H. P. Blavatsky, at No. 302, West, 47th Street, New York City, on one occasion in the month of December 1877, when a discussion was being held upon the subject of Eastern Magic, especially upon the power of an adept to produce phenomena by an exercise of the will, equally or surpassing those of mediumship. To illustrate the subject, as she had often done in deponent's presence previously by other experiments, Madame Blavatsky, without preparation, and in full light, and in the presence and sight of deponent, Colonel Olcott, and Dr. L. M. Marquette, tore a sheet of common writing paper in two, and asked us the subject we would have represented. Deponent named the portrait of a certain very holy man in India. Thereupon laying the paper upon the table Madame Blavatsky placed the palm of her hand upon it, and after rubbing the paper a few times (occupying less than

a minute) with a circular motion, lifted her hand and gave deponent the paper for inspection. Upon the previously white surface there was a most remarkable and striking picture of an Indian Fakir, representing him as if in contemplation. Deponent has frequently seen it since, and it is now in possession of Colonel Olcott. Deponent positively avers that the blank paper first taken was the paper on which the picture appeared, and that no substitution of another paper was made or was possible.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 20th day of March, 1878.

SAMUEL V. SPEYER,
Notary Public, New York County.

V.

(From the Journal of the T. S.)

I left Wadhwan on the 15th of February in company with Madame Blavatsky and Baboo Mohini M. Chatterjee. We were on our way to Bombay, returning from a visit to His Highness, the Thakore Saheb of Wadhwan. A few hours before we started, Madame Blavatsky had read an article, which I had written for *the Theosophist*, corrected a few words and returned it to me. I read it carefully to see what corrections she had made, and whether I might not myself make some changes. I only found a few words corrected, folded the paper, put it in my pocket-book, deposited the pocket-book in my satchel, locked the same, entered the car and put the satchel on my seat, where it never left me and never was out of my sight, until the event which I am about to describe, occurred. We travelled on, Madame Blavatsky being in the same car. Towards evening Madame Blavatsky requested me to let her see that article again. I took it out of my satchel, unfolding the paper before handing it to her, and as I did so, imagine my surprise to find on it four long lines written on a space which was

blank before, in the well-known handwriting of our Master, and in a different kind of ink than that used by Madame Blavatsky. How that writing could have been done in my satchel and during the shaking of the cars, I do not pretend to explain.

Another incident occurred when I was alone. On the morning of the 20th of February, I received a curious Thibetan medal from our Master through Madame Blavatsky. I then accompanied her on board the steamer on which she was to sail for Europe. On my return to the shore I went into a native jewelry shop and bought a locket to deposit my medal, but could not find a chain long enough for my purpose. I then returned to my room, and paced the floor, studying what to do in regard to the chain. I finally came to the conclusion that I would buy a rose-colored silk ribbon. But where to get it, being a stranger in Bombay : that was the question. My pacing the floor brought me again in front of the open window,* and there right before me on the floor lay exactly the very silk ribbon, brand new, and just the one I wanted.

BOMBAY, }
21st Feb. 1884. }

F. HARTMANN.

VI.

The following is the substance of a letter sent to the Editor by Babu Parvati Charan Ghosh, a fellow of the Satya Marga Theosophical Society of Lucknow :—

At the request of Pandit Pran Nath, the President of our Branch Society, I beg to report an account

* This happened in a room on the third floor, near a window that would have been inaccessible except by means of a very long ladder, and no Culoomb was near.

of the following occurrence. When the Pandit left Madras after the anniversary celebration, he stayed a few days at Allahabad on his way home. Here it occurred to him to write a letter to the Masters, to obtain information in regard to certain matters. He wrote the said letter, handed it to a probationary Chela residing there, and that Chela sent it with an explanatory note to Mr. Damodar K. Mavalankar, asking him to submit it to his Guru.

When the explanatory note arrived, Mr. Damodar was surprised not to find the letter in question enclosed, and therefore wrote back to the Chela, that he was glad the letter to the Mahatma was by some oversight (as he supposed) not forwarded; because since the VIIth anniversary celebration in Bombay he had received strict injunctions not to accept any letters addressed to his Guru.

The fact, however, is that Pandit Pran Nath's letter *was forwarded* from Allahabad; and the mystery was solved, when, on opening Mr. Damodar's letter, it was found to contain a Chinese envelope, addressed to the said Pandit, and containing a reply from the Mahatma. The letter, as sent by Mr. Damodar, was sufficiently stamped; but when it arrived it required additional postage on account of the Master's reply. The paper on which it was written was of a peculiar kind, such as cannot be found in India. We merely mention these facts with a view to stimulate our Brothers in their search for truth, and to remind them that whenever they deserve the notice of the Mahatmas, such notice will be taken. If any further information in regard to the above related case is desired by any Theosophist, it can be obtained by applying to our President.

LUCKNOW, 24th Feb. 1884.

VII.

I beg to place upon record certain phenomena noticed by me after Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott left Madras to proceed on their present European tour.

1. On the 17th February, 1884—(Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott were then in Bombay)—I was favoured with a kind letter from our Master, Mahatma K. H. It was a long letter in the Mahatma's handwriting, showing me how the spread of Sanscrit literature was likely to prove advantageous to the country; directing me to assume the superintendence of the Triplicane Sanscrit School; and giving me wholesome instructions and advice as to the encouragement to be given to the school-masters and pupils, &c. The letter was handed to me personally by brothers Messrs. Damodar and Bawaji, who furnished the following particulars as to the way in which the letter reached them. That afternoon Mr. Bawaji—who was for some time writing at a certain table in the *office-room* of the Head-quarters,—rose and approached the table at which Mr. Damodar was seated; but the latter,—acting upon the impulse which he just then had—immediately desired the former to go back to the table which he had left a few seconds before. Mr. Bawaji did as he was told; and found the above mentioned letter on the table at a place where there was no paper before. It was enclosed in a note addressed by the Mahatma K. H. to Mr. Bawaji himself, desiring him to hand over the letter to me personally—which was accordingly done; and I need hardly add that the instructions of the Mahatma have been duly followed by me. I may also add that the letter contained a reference to a certain fact about the then working of the school, of which nobody at the Head-quarters was or could be aware.

2. On the 4th March, 1884—(Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott were at this time on the ocean, having left Bombay on February 20th for Marseilles)—I, owing to certain domestic afflictions, felt exceedingly miserable all that day. But in the evening between 5 and 6 p. m. I proceeded to Adyar, and was seated in the office-room of the Headquarters, talking to Mr. Bawaji, without, however, mentioning to anybody the circumstance of my being in an unhappy condition. In the meantime, Mr. Damodar stepped in; and I at once expressed to him my desire 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 re-opened 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 contained very kind words conveying consolation; advising me to take courage; explaining how the laws of *Karma* were inevitable; and finally referring me to Mr. Damodar for further explanation of certain passages in the letter.

How my presence before his portrait attracted the instantaneous notice of the Mahatma, being thousands of miles off; how the Mahatma divined that I was miserable and was in need of comfort at his hands; how he projected his long and consoling letter from such great distance, into the closed cabinet, within the twinkling of an eye; and, above all, how solicitous he, the great Mahatma, is for the well-being of mankind, and more especially of per-

sons devoted to him,—are points which I leave to the sensible reader to consider and profit by. Enough to say that this unmistakable sign of kindness on the part of the great Master armed me with sufficient energy to shake off the miserable and gloomy thoughts, and filled my heart with unmixed comfort and excessive joy, coupled with feelings of the sincerest gratitude to the benevolent Mahatma for this blessing.

3. Two days before the current new year's day of the Hindus (26th March 1884), I wrote a long letter to Mahatma K. H., soliciting instructions and advice in respect of certain important matters, and handed it to brother Mr. Damodar to be put in the "Shrine," at about 6-30 in the evening. And on the following day, at about 2 p. m., brother Mr. Damodar sent me a closed letter, which was in the familiar handwriting of Mahatma K. H., containing replies on all points referred to in my letter, besides valuable information on other matters which he considered necessary that I should understand. On enquiry I learnt that the aforesaid letter had fallen upon Mr. Bawaji's table during the few seconds which intervened between his leaving the table on some business and re-joining it afterwards *in the office-room*, the only two persons in this room, not having left their seats in the interval.

All these three phenomena, transpiring as they have done, during the absence of our Founders from Madras, speak for themselves; and I record them for the benefit of my Brothers.

P. SREENEVAS ROW.

MADRAS, 9th July 1884.

VIII.

"In the year 1882 while I was travelling by Railway between the Allahabad and Mogal 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."

CASAVA PILLAI,
Inspector of Police.

IX.

"On 17th March 1884 I left Poona for the Theosophical Head-quarters at Adyar. After remaining there for two or three days, I asked Mr. Damodar to show me the "shrine," but he refused to do so. The next morning it occurred to me to write out a few questions, and I did so on a sheet of white foolscap which was folded by me to the size of a fourth part of a sheet. 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 that I had written out and 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 question paper, written over 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."

NAVATRAM OOTAMBRAM TRIVIDI,
Late Contractor, Irrigation Department,
(Bombay Presidency).

X.

"I was at Head-quarters very often during my sojourn with my friend H. H. the Thakore Sahib of Wadhwan at Madras, whither we had gone last March for the celebration of his marriage with the daughter of the Hon. Gajapati Row. One day I asked Mr. D. K. Mavalankar to let me put a letter from me to my revered Master K. H. in the shrine. It was in a closed envelope and was regarding private personal matters, which I need not lay before the public. Mr. Damodar allowed me to put the letter in the shrine. The day after I visited again the shrine in company with my wife. On opening the shrine I *did* find my letter unopened, but addressed to me in blue pencil, while my original superscription: "My Revered Master" had a pencil line running through it. This was in the presence of Mr. Mavalankar, Dr. Hartmann and others. The envelope was intact. I opened it, and on the unused portion of my note was an answer to me from my Master K. H. in his familiar handwriting. I should very much like to know how others will explain this, when as a fact *both the Founders were thousands of miles away.*"

HARISINGHJI RUPSINGHJI, F. T. S.

VAREL, 9th September 1884.

XI.

I attended the eighth anniversary of the Theosophical Society held last December, in Madras. I was at the Adyar Head-quarters several times on the

occasion. I was also in the occult room. I witnessed certain phenomena when in the room on the 26th and the 28th of December last. Having been asked to testify to them, I hereby do so :—

2. The room in question is situated upstairs. In the room is the shrine—a wooden cupboard put up against a wall. It is not fixed to the wall but only touches it. I have carefully examined the shrine inside and outside and also the wall against which it is put. I found nothing to suspect the existence of any contrivances which could account for what I saw. Inside the cupboard are two framed likenesses of two of the Mahatmas overhung with pieces of yellow silk, a silver bowl, and some images.

3. On the 26th, it was at about 7 P. M. that I went up to the shrine. There were 14 other Theosophists present. We were all quite close to the shrine. Madame Blavatsky opened the shrine with a key which she had and took out the silver bowl. It was shown to the gentlemen present. There was nothing in it. Mr. Venkata Jagga Row, B. A., N. C. S., then dropped into it a letter addressed by him to one of the Revered Mahatmas. The bowl was then placed inside the shrine which was locked by Madame Blavatsky. In about 5 minutes the shrine was opened and the silver bowl taken out and shown. The letter put in by Mr. Venkata Jagga Row had disappeared and in its place there were 5 letters in the bowl. Four of them were addressed to particular persons present and the other to all the delegates from the different Branches of the Theosophical Society. This last I saw. It was in the handwriting known to or recognized by the Theosophists as that of Mahatma K. H. I had seen the same handwriting before in letters in the possession of my friend Mr. S. Ramaswamier at Madura.

4. On the 28th, I went to the shrine at about 10-30 A. M. Seven persons were present. The

windows were open and it was broad day light. Madame Blavatsky gave the key of the shrine to Mr. P. Srinivasa Row, Small Cause Judge, Madras, and stood aside amongst us. Mr. Srinivasa Row opened the shrine, took out the silver bowl and showed it to all present. There was nothing in it. He put it into the shrine, locked it and kept the key. About 5 minutes after, he was told by Madame Blavatsky to open the shrine, which he did. He then took out the selfsame silver bowl and in it was an envelope well gummed, addressed to Mr. Srinivasa Row. I saw him open the envelope and found it to contain a letter in the handwriting of Mahatma K. H. and currency notes for Rs. 500.

5. I saw no room for deception, no wire, no springs inside or outside the shrine. I requested permission to examine the shrine and was allowed to do so. Not only did I not see any wire or spring or any contrivance, but I *felt* none when I put my hand into the shrine and examined it.

6. What I may here say may not carry conviction where the overwhelming testimony already recorded by Mr. Sinnett and others has failed to produce any. Yet I may be allowed to subjoin my testimony, however slight, in the hope that it may not be altogether useless.

7. I know a very acute and able man, a friend of mine, also jeered at me on finding my name appear in the *Theosophist* as a member of the Society, but who in less than two months from that time became a Theosophist himself and the Vice-President of his Branch.

S. SUBRAMANIA IYER, B. L.,
High Court Vakil, Madura.

MADURA, 10th January, 1884.

XII.

ADYAR, December 31st, 1884.

DEAR SIR,

Complying with your request, I shall give you in the following an account of a phenomenon as witnessed by me in my father's house some couple of months ago.

Before I describe what has happened, allow me to say a few words about myself; it will serve to show that I am better adapted than most other people to advance an opinion on these subjects.

Since my earliest boyhood I have always had a taste and a knack for conjuring tricks. When in London, I took lessons there from a professional conjuror, Prof. C. E. Field, a man whom I consider to be one of the best sleight-of-hand-man I ever met. Later on I made the personal acquaintance of our leading performers in that line and exchanged tricks with them. There is not a single line of conjuring I am not acquainted with, may that be even a card trick or the so-called anti-spiritualistic tricks in imitation of a spiritualistic seance. I then think that when such a phenomenon takes place in my presence, it is quite a natural thing for me to keep my eyes wide open in order not to be deceived by a trick, and this is the reason why I think myself especially qualified to advance an opinion about the matter on hand.

Phenomenon that occurred in Elberfeld (Germany) in September 1884.

About 9 P. M. of the abovenamed date, a small circle of friends, theosophist and non-theosophist, were sitting in the drawing-room of my father's house (Platzhoff Strasse, 12). Madame Blavatsky, who was one of the party, was seated on a couch in the middle of the room, and the rest were seated in a semi-circle around her. Whilst the conversation

was going on, Madame Blavatsky suddenly looked up and taking a listening attitude said there was something going on in the room, but that she could not then make out for certain what it was.

Mrs. Holloway, an American lady and a clairvoyant, said that she had felt an influence since some time already, and Madame Blavatsky and Mrs. Holloway then saw something like a ray of light going towards a large oil painting hanging over a piano in the same room.

My mother sitting with her back to the piano and opposite a looking glass, said that she had seen in the glass something like a faint flash of lightning. After a minute or so, Madame Blavatsky asked the party what they would like to take place as she now felt sure that the "Master" would do something for us that night.

Different requests were made, but finally it was unanimously resolved, "*that a letter should be asked for, addressed to my father, and treating on a subject that he should mentally wish for.*" I draw your attention to three points. Nobody knew beforehand that the whole party must choose a letter! Second, that my father should be addressed! Third, what subject my father might be thinking of. Madame Blavatsky did not influence our choice as she did not advance any suggestion. Madame then said she saw something going on with the picture above spoken of, and that probably we should find something there. I accordingly got up and examined that picture, but could not find anything. As the picture was fastened to the wall in a slanting position, the top part hanging over, I lifted it off the wall and examined carefully every inch of it. No letter! The space then between the wall and the back of the picture was fully 8 inches and perfectly lit up as there was a gas bracket on each side of it. I let the picture fall back and said I could

not find anything, but Madame Blavatsky told me to try again and I repeated my examination in the same way. Not contented with that, I got up on the piano (a grand Flugel) and there again looked behind the picture and passed my hand along the top of it twice, nothing ! (I had been searching all this time for a letter, not for another article—where perhaps a slip of paper might have escaped my attention). I turned round to Madame Blavatsky, saying that I could find nothing, when she exclaimed “ there it is.” I turned sharply round and a *letter* fell down from behind the picture on the piano. I picked it up; it was addressed to *my father* (Herr Consul Gebhard) and treated of the subject he had been thinking of.

Now I wish to draw your attention to some important points.

1. There was no secret receptacle either in the frame or at the back of the picture.

2. The letter was in size $5 \times 2\frac{1}{2}$ (inches), *not* folded up into a smaller compass.

3. I was the only one who came near the picture, all the others kept their seats except one gentleman, who got up, but whom I did not allow to handle the picture: Madame Blavatsky seated all the time on the couch, distance 4 to 5 yards.

4. Between the time I last touched the picture and the moment the letter put in an appearance, there elapsed from 15 to 20 seconds. After Madame B. said, “ There it is,” I turned round. The letter had then not appeared, but came in view one second after that. How could Madame B. have seen it?

5. The letter lay on the piano about 5 *inches off the wall!*

The picture frame at the bottom part touches the wall, because, as I said before, the top part hangs

over; now there may be space enough for a letter being flat against the wall, to glide through, but then that letter continuing its way *ought* to drop behind the piano (*i. e.*, between the wall and the piano, and from there on to the floor) as the piano does not touch the wall. How can it be found 5 inches off the wall?

6. The subject my father had in his mind was known to me, for I knew he had that very morning received a letter from my brother in New York on some personal matter, and when the letter had been decided upon by the party, I whispered to my father to ask for an answer on that letter of the morning. He said he would.

I consider this a most complete phenomenon. I challenge any conjuror of the day to repeat it, and I am willing to pay £100 to see it done by a conjuror under the same conditions. Perhaps Mr. Maskelyne (Messrs. Maskelyne and Cook, Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly) who has done already so much to detect mediumistic fraud (?) will take up this challenge.

If there is any further information you want, I am ready at your service.

I remain, Dear Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) R. GEBHARD, F. T. S.

R. HODGSON, Esq.

XIII.

One evening at about six o'clock we went to the Theosophical Head-quarters at Adyar. With Madame Blavatsky's permission we went upstairs to her room. During the course of conversation, the topic turned upon the present sceptical attitude of some of our countrymen, who have had the benefit of what they call Western "education" and "civilization." We

were then taken to the "SHRINE" in the "OCCULT ROOM," which is a compartment in the same room in which we were seated. In the SHRINE, which is an ordinary cupboard hanging from a wall to which there is no egress or ingress, are two portraits of two of the Himalayan MAHATMAS. We examined all very carefully, and the SHRINE was locked. We did not however move from the place, and within half a minute, Madame Blavatsky told us to open it. We did so ourselves, and found the whole cupboard—where there was nothing when we looked at it half a minute before—filled with fresh flowers and leaves. Each of us took a number of them, and we found that there were also some peculiar kind of leaves which could not be found in any part of Madras, to our knowledge. We made a careful survey of the whole room and its surroundings, and found nothing to warrant or justify any suspicion of trickery.

T. RAMACHENDRA ROW.

The phenomenon, as described above, took place in my presence.

R. RUNGA ROW, B. A.

XIV.

STATEMENT OF MR. S. J. PADSHAH.

(*Extract.*)

I have seen the article of the *Christian College Magazine* reproduced in most Indian newspapers. Recalling to my memory all the facts and incidents that have transpired, and which have come within my own observation, I cannot hesitate for a moment to pronounce the letters embodied in that article as fictitious outcomes of Madame Coulomb's mediumship.

The allegations of the Coulobms (warmly resented in Madras) were left unchallenged in Northern India,

and I therefore addressed a long letter to the *Pioneer*, the editor of which kindly gave it a prominent place in his issue of the 23rd. I am glad to be able to say that the publication of this letter has had a marked effect in non-theosophical circles.

Permit me to state a few facts in addition to those I have already published in the *Pioneer*. I have received two letters in all from the revered Mahatma, whose name is so irreverently dragged in the present controversy. The first I received at about ten minutes to ten on the evening of the 15th July 1881. I copy the endorsement which I immediately made on the back of the envelope which contained the letter:—"Received about ten minutes to ten—a little while after Madame had retired and Baboola had left the lamp on the table. I had just written the first two lines of a poem I was composing on the Brothers, and was thinking how to finish the third, when I heard a sound as if a large butterfly had fallen on the table. It was this letter. It fell from some height. The doors of the room and shutters were closed. My gratitude and thanks. 15-7-81., S. J. P." After I had examined the room to see that there was no trickery in the affair, and satisfying myself that none was possible, I fell on my knees and uttered some words to myself mentally. The following morning I saw Madame Blavatsky in her study. After some conversation she told me she was satisfied that I was devoted to the cause, for the Master had watched me and she proceeded to relate all that had happened in my room *after* I had received the letter, startling me at the same time *by reciting word for word my unspoken thought*. This letter contained an allusion to Mr. Sinnett and his wife who were then in England.

The second letter from the Master I received somewhere about the beginning of the following Sep-

tember. I must relate the history of this letter. I had composed a philosophical elegy on the death of Baron Du Potet, which I wished to see published in the *Theosophist*. It was an ambitious attempt. I forwarded it to Madame Blavatsky, who considered it important enough to be seen by the Mahatma K. H. The Master, after reading it, sent it with his compliments to Mr. Sinnett for his opinion. Mr. Sinnett attentively read the poem, but was of opinion that it would be better not to publish it. This criticism filled more than three sides and a half of the *Pioneer* notepaper. Mr. Sinnett had evidently written more on some other subject, but the writing (some traces of which are still there) was made somehow to fade away, and the Master begins his letter to me on the last page of Mr. Sinnett's letter and adds half-a-page of notepaper of his own. He continues Mr. Sinnett's criticism, but in a much more kindly manner.

"Your spirit," he writes, "is undoubtedly most closely akin to and largely vivified by that of poetry, and your intellectual instinct pierces easily into all the mysteries and abysses of nature, often giving a beautiful form, verity and harmony to your verse, as far as I am able to judge of English poetry. A true seer is always a poet, and a poet can never be a true one—unless he is in perfect unity with occult nature,—'a creator by right of his spiritual revelation' as the great Danish poet expresses it. I was anxious, therefore, you should learn, how far you had succeeded in impressing others. For, it is not enough to carry the true poetic instincts within the recesses of one's soul; these have to be so faithfully mirrored in verse or prose, as to carry the intelligent reader away, wherever the poet's fancy may wing its flight. I sent your poem after reading it myself to Mr. Sinnett who was at one time considered in the London literary circles as one of the best critics of

the day. Writing for me, and at my express wish, his opinion is thoroughly unbiassed, and I believe the criticism is calculated to do you the greatest good. Take up the suggestion, and work over the poem, for you may make of it something grand. Bear with the world and those who surround you. Be patient and true to yourself and Fate, who was a step-mother to you, my poor young friend, may yet change and her persecutions be changed into bounties. Whatever happens know—I am watching over you.”

I have quoted this letter at such length for several reasons. Madame Blavatsky, with all her accomplishments, has hardly any partiality for poetry. I have never succeeded in interesting her in any volume of verse. She, as well as Col. Olcott, has often chaffed me about my partiality for Shelley; and I have reason to believe, from what has frequently fallen from her lips, that she considers a poet to be a poor useless creature. But examine the tone of this letter. The critic, whatever else he is, is himself a poet. In half a dozen lines he surveys the whole domain of true poetry, and with all the authority of conviction lays it down that a true poet cannot but be an occultist.

The Master advises me to bear with the world and those who surrounded me. The advice came in good time, for I was on the point of coming to an open rupture with those that surrounded me at the Headquarters—the Coulombs!

The Master's watchful care has since saved me from many perils. Since my arrival at Lucknow though receiving no favours from him, he has often helped me in the hour of trial.

I have forgotten to relate the manner in which I received this last letter. It was about eleven o'clock in the night.

I had just left Mr. Mavalankar and proceeded upstairs to my room. The lamp was burning on the table. I examined the bed, and lifted the curtains aside to see that no mosquitos had got in. There was then no thing or person in the room except the usual furniture. The house was unusually still. I went to the door and closed it. After closing the door I had to pass the bedstead before I could reach the lamp to lower the wick. I noticed nothing. After turning down the light I went to my bed, and lo! right at my feet lay two white objects on the floor. A moment ago there had been nothing there, and now there was my poem and the Mahatma's letter! In falling they had made no sound. How was it done?

S. J. PADSHAH,
Fellow, Theosophical Society.

APPENDIX VI.

I.

THE THEOSOPHICAL MAHATMAS.

To the Editor of the "Pall Mall Gazette."

SIR,—Since an attempt is now being made by the opponents of the Theosophical Society to discredit the whole movement by circulating the report that the "Mahatmas" or Eastern Adepts are but "crafty arrangements of muslin and bladders," I ask permission to say a word. I have sacrificed all my worldly prospects, as is well known in my native city of Calcutta, to devote myself to the propagation of the esoteric philosophy of my race, in connection with the Society so unjustly slandered. Needless to say I should not have taken this step, with many others of my countrymen, if the Theosophical

Society were but a sham, and the Mahatmas vulgar "concoctions of muslin and bladders." To a Brahman, like myself, it is repugnant to speak of the sacredly confidential relationship existing between a spiritual teacher and his pupil. Yet duty compels me in this instance to say that I have personal and absolute knowledge of the existence of the Mahatma who has corresponded with Mr. Sinnett and is known to the Western world as "Koot Hoomi." I had knowledge of the Mahatma in question before I knew Madame Blavatsky, and I met him in person when he passed through the Madras Presidency to China—last year.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

MOHINI M. CHATTERJI.

12, PLATZHOFFSTRASSE, ELBERFELD, }
GERMANY, Sept. 30, 1884. }

II.

MY EXPERIENCES IN INDIA.

BY MR. T. BROWN.

(*Extract.*)

Lahore has a special interest, because there we saw, in his own physical body, Mahatma Koot Hoomi himself.

On the afternoon of the 19th November, I saw the Master in broad daylight, and recognised him, and on the morning of the 20th he came to my tent, and said, "Now you see me before you in the flesh; look and assure yourself that it is I," and left a letter of instructions and silk handkerchief, both of which are now in my possession.

The letter is as usual written seemingly with blue pencil, is in the same handwriting as that in which is written the communication received at Madras, and

has been identified by about a dozen persons as bearing the caligraphy of Mahatma Koot Hoomi. The letter was to the effect that I had first seen him in visions, then in his astral form, then in body at a distance, and that finally I now saw him in his own physical body, so close to me as to enable me to give to my countrymen the assurance that I was from personal knowledge as sure of the existence of the Mahatmas as I was of my own. The letter is a private one, and I am not enabled to quote from it at length.

On the evening of the 21st, Colonel Olcott, Damodar and I were sitting outside the *shamiana*, when we were visited by.....(the Master's head Chela, and now an Initiate,) who informed us that the Master was about to come. The Master then came near to us, gave instructions to Damodar, and walked away.



III.

STATEMENT OF MR. BHAVANI SHANKAR.

The recent attack made by the Christian Missionaries connected with the "Christian College Magazine," to prove the falsity of occult phenomena by imputing them to the fraudulent tricks of Madame Blavatsky, forces upon me the duty of relating some of my experiences, so that the educated public may have a fair opportunity to draw their own conclusions concerning these phenomena after weighing all the evidences for and against their genuineness. My experience of these phenomena commenced so early as 1881, when the Head-quarters of the Theosophical Society were not removed from Bombay to Adyar, Madras. While I was at Bombay, I have had several occasions to visit its Head-quarters at Breach Candy.

(1.) One night while I was sitting with some of my friends near Madame Blavatsky in the open verandah close to her writing-room, a Mahatma, who was then near Bombay, came walking through the garden attached to Col. Olcott's bungalow and stood silent near a tree at the distance of some eight or ten yards away from us. Madame Blavatsky then went down the wooden staircase leading into the garden, approached the Mahatma and saluted him by touching the back of his hands with both of her open palms. He delivered a packet to her and then disappeared. Madame B. came up afterwards and opened the packet and in it there was a letter from Allahabad. The envelope in question was quite unaddressed, but it bore the official stamp of the Allahabad Post Office of December the 3rd, 1881, and the official stamp of the Bombay Post Office of the *same date*, viz., 3rd December. The two places are 1,000 miles apart.

(2.) In a bright moonlight, on the night of the 13th July 1881, we were engaged in a talk with Madame Blavatsky as usual in the same verandah. Monsieur Coulomb and Madame Coulomb were present on the spot as also all the persons of the house and Madame Blavatsky's servant. While we were conversing with Madame B., the Mahatma, known as Mr. Sinnett's Correspondent and the Author of the letters published in the "Occult World," made his appearance in his "Mayavi Rupa" or "Double," for a few minutes. He was clad in the white dress of a "Punjabee" and wore a white turban. All of those, who were present at that time, saw his handsome features clearly and distinctly, as it was a bright moonlight night. On the same night, a letter was drafted to the "London Spiritualist" about our having seen the Mahatmas. As we were reading the letter in question, the same Mahatma showed himself again. The second time when he made his

appearance, he was very near us, say at the distance of a yard or two. At that time, Monsieur and Madame Coulomb said, "Here is our Brother," meaning the Mahatma. He then came into Madame B.'s room and was heard talking with her and then disappeared. Monsieur Coulomb and Madame Coulomb signed the letter drafted to the "London Spiritualist," testifying to the fact of their having seen the "Mahatma." Since Madame Coulomb now says that the Mahatmas are but "crafty arrangements of muslin and bladders" and her husband represented the Mahatmas, how are we to reconcile this statement with the fact that in "the London Spiritualist" of the 19th August 1881, appeared a letter signed by five witnesses, including myself, testifying to the fact of their having seen a Mahatma, while they were writing that letter; and that this document is signed by both the Coulombs? There is, therefore, no doubt that they were with the company who signed the paper. Who was it then that appeared on that occasion as a Mahatma? Surely neither Monsieur and Madame Coulomb with their "muslin and bladders" nor Madame B.'s servant who was also present, but the "double" of a person living on the other side of the Himalayas. The figure in coming up to Madame Blavatsky's room was seen by us "to float through the air," and we also distinctly heard it talking to her, while all of us, *including her servant and the Coulombs*, were at the time, together, in each other's presence.

(3.) In the month of March 1882, while I was stopping at Mr. Sinnett's house at Allahabad, some occult phenomena occurred *independent of Madame Blavatsky, who was then at Bombay*. One evening, Mr. Sinnett gave me a note addressed to my Master, "K. H." I took it to my room and kept it near my pillow. Every care was taken in bolting and fastening all the glass-doors of the room where my

bed was. I placed a lamp by my bed and began to read the article "Elixir of Life." But I was not able to devote my attention to the study of the article in question as it became wholly directed to the letter addressed to the Mahatma. It was between 10 and 11 P. M. that this letter disappeared and I saw my Master while he was leaving the room with the letter which was placed near my pillow. The doors of the room were well closed, and a light was burning by my bedside and there was no one else in the room. When I got up in the morning next day, I found a reply from my Master to the address of Mr. Sinnett under my pillow and gave it to him. During my short stay at Allahabad with Mr. Sinnett, I had had independent communication with my Master while Madame Blavatsky was in another part of India.

From Allahabad I returned to Bombay. After stopping at the Bombay Head-quarters for a week or so, I left the place for the north in April 1882. *Since then, I have been working in the north.* As a pilgrim, I had to travel from one place to another. Purposely I did not keep Madame Blavatsky or Colonel Olcott informed of my movements on account of some private reasons. During my travels in the north, I have received communications from my Master direct, independent of anybody else and have seen the Mahatmas in their "double."

(4.) On the 8th November, 1883, I was at Bans Bareilly in N. W. P. and was engaged in a private talk with a European friend of mine on some theosophical subjects. At that time, I had a courier bag with me suspended across my shoulder, which I did not allow any one to touch as there was some private correspondence in it. I took particular care to lock it up in a carpet bag of mine whenever I removed it from my shoulder. While I was conversing with that friend, I received a direct communication from

my Master in a Chinese envelope which I found in that courier bag which was always with me. It related to some subject of which I was thinking that day, and contained some instructions to me how I should work, &c. I showed it to some of my friends who were then present. The contents of that letter were in his well-known blue pencil handwriting. All the communications whether received by me direct or through any body else from him, bear the same handwriting.

(5.) In the month of January 1884, I was at Jubbulpore and putting up with Brother Nivaran Chandra Mookerjee, who was then the Secretary of the Bhrigu Kshetra Theosophical Society. One night, while I was with him, I was explaining to some twenty-seven members of that Branch, the article "Elixir of Life" and they were listening to me with great attention. On a sudden, there was death-like silence for some time. I then felt the influence of Madame Blavatsky's Venerated Master, and it was so strong that I could not bear it. The current of electricity generated by an electro-magnetic battery is nothing when compared with that current generated by the trained Will of an Adept. When a Mahatma means to show himself to a Chela, he sends off a current of electricity to the Chela indicating his approach. It was this influence which I felt at that time. A few minutes after, the Mahatma (Madame B.'s Master) was actually present in the room where the meeting of the members was held and was seen by me and Bro. Nivaran while some of the members only felt the influence. All the members would have seen him much more vividly, had it not been for the fact that he did not materialize himself much more objectively. I have seen the same Mahatma, viz., Madame B.'s *Master*, several times in his double during my travels in the North. Not only have I

seen Madame B.'s Master in his double but also my Venerated Guru Deva "K. H." I have also seen the latter, viz., my Master in HIS PHYSICAL BODY and recognised him.

All the above experiences which I had gained in the North, *independent of Madame Blavatsky or Col. Olcott, who knew nothing about my movements*, are sufficient to show to the impartial and educated public that these occult phenomena are genuine. It is immaterial to me whether the statement of these bare facts will carry conviction to those who, instead of being inquirers after the truth, are ready to suppress it and persecute those who give it to the world.

BHAVANISHANKAR, F. T. S.

—
IV.

A GREAT RIDDLE SOLVED.

BY DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR, F. T. S., CHELA.

(*Extract.*)

ON my return to the Head-quarters from the North, where I had accompanied Col. Olcott on his Presidential tour, I learnt with regret of further strictures on the claims of the Founders of the Theosophical Society to be in personal relations with the Mahatmas of the sacred Himavat. For me, personally, the problem is of course *now* solved.

At the outset I must state what is known to many of my friends and brothers of the Theosophical Society, viz., that for the last four years I have been the CHELA of Mr. Sinnett's correspondent. Now and then I have had occasion to refer publicly to this fact, and to the other one of my having seen some of the other VENERATED MAHATMAS OF THE HIMALAYAS, both in their astral and *physical* bodies. However all that I could urge in favour of my

point, viz., that these GREAT MASTERS are not disembodied spirits but living men—would fail to carry conviction to a mind blinded by prejudices and preconceptions. It has been suggested that either or both of the Founders may be mediums in whose presence forms could be seen, which are by them mistaken for real living entities. And when I asserted that I had these appearances even when alone, it was argued that I too was developing into a medium.

In this connection a certain remark by Mr. C. C. Massey in a letter to *Light* of November 17, is very suggestive, inasmuch as that gentleman is not only far from being inimical to us but is a Theosophist of long standing, bent solely on discovering truth and—nothing but the truth. The following extract from the said letter will show how great are the misconceptions even of some of our own fellow-members:—

“Nevertheless, were it an open question, free from authoritative statement, so that such a suggestion could be made without offence by one who would, if possible, avoid offence, I should avow the opinion that these letters, whether they are or are not the *ipsissima verba* of any adept, were at all events penned by Madame Blavatsky, or by other accepted *chelas*. At least I should think that she was a medium for their production, and not merely for their transmission. The fact that through the kindness of Mr. Sinnett I have been made familiar with the handwriting of the letters, and that it bears not the remotest resemblance to Madame Blavatsky's, would not influence me against that opinion, for reasons which every one acquainted with the phenomena of writing under psychical conditions will appreciate. But I am bound to admit that there are circumstances connected with the receipt by Mr. Sinnett of other letters signed ‘K. H.’ which are, as regards those, apparently inconsistent with any instrumentality of Madame Blavatsky herself, whether as medium or otherwise and the hand-writing is in both cases the same.”

Bearing well in mind the italicized portion in the above quotation, I would respectfully invite the Spiritualists to explain the fact of not only

myself, but Col. Olcott, Mr. Brown, and other gentlemen having on this tour received severally and on various occasions letters in reply to conversations and questions on the same day or the same hour, sometimes when alone and sometimes in company with others, when Mme. Blavatsky was thousands of miles away ; the handwriting in all cases being the same and identical with that of the communications in Mr. Sinnett's possession.

While on my tour with Col. Olcott, several phenomena occurred,—in his presence as well as in his absence—such as immediate answers to questions in my Master's handwriting and over his signature, put by a number of our fellows. These occurrences took place before we reached Lahore, where we expected to meet in body my much doubted MASTER. *There I was visited by him in body, for three nights consecutively for about three hours every time while I myself retained full consciousness, and in one case, even went to meet him outside the house.* To my knowledge there is no case on the Spiritualistic records of a medium remaining perfectly conscious, and meeting, by previous arrangement, his spirit-visitor in the compound, re-entering the house with him, offering him a seat and then holding a long converse with the "disembodied spirit" in a way to give him the impression that he is in personal contact with an embodied entity ! Moreover HIM whom I saw in person at Lahore was the same I had seen in astral form at the Head-quarters of the Theosophical Society, and the same again whom I, in my visions and trances, had seen at His house, thousands of miles off, to reach which in my astral Ego I was permitted, owing, of course, to His direct help and protection. In those instances with my psychic powers hardly developed yet, I had always seen Him as a rather hazy form, although His features were perfectly distinct and

their remembrance was profoundly graven on my soul's eye and memory; while now at Lahore, Jummoo, and elsewhere, the impression was utterly different. In the former cases, when making *Pranam* (salutation) my hands passed through his form, while on the latter occasions they met solid garments and flesh. Here I saw a *living man* before me, the same in features, though far more imposing in His general appearance and bearing than Him I had so often looked upon in the portrait in Mme. Blavatsky's possession and in the one with Mr. Sinnett. I shall not here dwell upon the fact of His having been corporeally seen by both Col. Olcott and Mr. Brown separately, for two nights at Lahore, as they can do so better, each for himself, if they so choose. At Jummoo again, where we proceeded from Lahore, Mr. Brown saw Him on the evening of the third day of our arrival there, and from Him received a letter in His familiar handwriting, not to speak of His visits to me almost every day. And what happened the next morning almost every one in Jummoo is aware of. The fact is, that I had the good fortune of being sent for, and permitted to visit a Sacred *Ashrum* where I remained for a few days in the blessed company of several of the MAHATMAS of Himavat and their disciples. There I met not only my beloved Gurudeva and Col. Olcott's Master, but several others of the Fraternity, including One of the Highest. I regret the extremely personal nature of my visit to those regions prevents my saying more of it. Suffice it that the place I was permitted to visit is in the HIMALAYAS, not in any fanciful Summer Land, and that I saw Him in my own *sthulasarira* (physical body) and found my Master identical with the form I had seen in the earlier days of my Chelaship. Thus, I saw my beloved Guru not only as a *living man*, but actually as a young one in comparison with some

other Sadhus of the blessed company, only for kinder, and not above a merry remark and conversation at times. Thus on the second day of my arrival, after the meal hour, I was permitted to hold an intercourse for over an hour with my Master. Asked by Him smilingly, what it was that made me look at Him so perplexed, I asked in my turn :— “How is it MASTER that some of the members of our Society have taken into their heads a notion that you were ‘an elderly man,’ and that they have even seen you clairvoyantly looking an old man passed sixty?” To which he pleasantly smiled and said, that this latest misconception was due to the reports of a certain Brahmachari, a pupil of a Vedantic Swami in the N. W. P.—who had met last year in Tibet the chief of a sect, an elderly Lama, who was his (my Master’s) travelling companion at that time. The said Brahmachari having spoken of the encounter in India, had led several persons to mistake the Lama for himself. As to his being perceived clairvoyantly as an “elderly man,” that could never be, he added, as *real* clairvoyance could lead no one into such mistaken notion, and then he kindly reprimanded me for giving any importance to the age of a Guru, adding that appearances were often false, &c., and explaining other points.

These are all facts and no third course is open to the reader. What I assert is either true or false. In the former case, it will have to be admitted that the Himalayan Brothers are living men and neither disembodied spirits nor the creatures of the over-heated imagination of fanatics. Of course I am fully aware that many will discredit my account, but I write only for the benefit of those few who know me well enough to see in me neither a hallucinated medium nor attribute to me any bad motive, and who have ever been true and loyal to their con-

victions and to the cause they have so nobly espoused. If these few lines will help to stimulate even one of my brother-Fellows in the Society or one right thinking man outside of it to promote the cause the GREAT MASTERS have imposed upon the devoted heads of the Founders of the Theosophical Society, I shall consider that I have properly performed my duty.

ADYAR (MADRAS), }
7th December 1883. }

V.

HOW A "CHELA" FOUND HIS "GURU."

(Being Extracts from a private letter to Damodar K. Mavalankar, Joint Recording Secretary of the Theosophical Society.)

(*Extract.*)

It was, I think, between eight and nine A. M. and I was following the road to the town of Sikkhim whence, I was assured by the people I met on the road, I could cross over to Tibet easily in my pilgrim's garb, when I suddenly saw a solitary horseman galloping towards me from the opposite direction. From his tall stature, I thought he was some military officer of the Sikkhim Rajah. Now, I thought, am I caught! He will ask me for my pass and what business I have on the independent territory of Sikkhim, and, perhaps, have me arrested and—sent back, if not worse. But—as he approached me, he reined the steed. I looked at and recognised him instantly. I was in the presence of him, of the same Mahatma, my own revered *Guru* whom I had seen before in his astral body, on the balcony of the Theosophical Head-quarters!—It was he of the ever memorable night of December 1st, who had dropped a letter in answer to one I had given in a sealed envelope to Madame Blavatsky—whom I had never for one moment during the interval lost sight of—but an hour or so before!

The very same instant saw me prostrated on the ground at his feet. I arose at his command and, looking into his face, I forgot myself entirely in the contemplation of the face I knew so well, having seen his portrait (the one in Colonel Olcott's possession) a number of times. I knew not what to say: joy and reverence tied my tongue. The majesty of his countenance, which seemed to me to be the *impersonation* of power and thought, held me wrapt in awe. I was at last face to face with "the Mahatma of the Himavat" and he was no myth, no "creation of the imagination." It was not night; it was between nine and ten o'clock of the forenoon. My happiness made me dumb. Nor was it until a few moments later that I was drawn to utter a few words, encouraged by his gentle tone and speech. His complexion is not as fair as that of Mahatma Koot Hoomi; but never have I seen a countenance so handsome, a stature so tall and so majestic. As in his portrait, he wears a short black beard, and long black hair hanging down to his breast; only his dress was different. Instead of a white, loose robe he wore a yellow mantle lined with fur, and, on his head, instead of a *pagri*, a yellow Tibetan felt cap, as I have seen some Bhootanese wear in this country. When the first moments of surprise were over and I calmly comprehended the situation, I had a long talk with him. He told me to go no further, for I would come to grief. He said I should wait patiently if I wanted to become an accepted *Chela*; that many were those who offered themselves as candidates, but that only a very few were found worthy; none were rejected—but all of them tried, and most found to fail.

The Mahatma, I found, speaks very little English—or at least it so seemed to me—and *spoke to me in my mother Tongue—Tamil*. He told me

that if the *Chohan* permitted Mdme. B. to go to Pari-jong next year, then I could come with her. . . . The Bengalee Theosophists who followed the "Upasika" (Madame Blavatsky) would see that she was right in trying to dissuade them from following her now. I asked the Mahatma whether I could tell what I saw and heard to others. He replied in the affirmative, and that moreover I would do well to write to you and describe all. . . .

S. RAMASWAMIER, F. T. S.

DARJEELING, *October 7, 1882.*

VI.

HIMALAYAN AND OTHER MAHATMAS.

(An Open letter to Madame Blavatsky.)

BY RAMA SOURINDRO GARGYA DEVA.

(Extract.)

I most emphatically declare that the holy Sages of the snowy range—the Himalayan Mahatmas—do exist and *Guru deva* K. H., has one point in common with his critics of the West, that he is as much a living man as they. I have lived with Him, and some of us, whose names from time to time have appeared in your journal, still live under his protection and in his abode.

DARJEELING, *November 1883.*

VII.

Mr. R. CASAVA PILLAY who is referred to in Madame Coulomb's pamphlet at pp. 45, 49, 50 and 74 states as follows, in a letter to Mr. Damodar, dated 27th January 1885 :*

* The whole letter being too long to print, we give an abstract of the chief points, Mr. Casava Pillay, being a Police Officer, is accustomed to keep a regular daily diary from which he has taken all the material for his present communication.

1. He first saw the Mahatma in a vision in 1869.
2. He again saw the same person, also in a vision in 1873.
3. The something occurred several times between 1876 and 1880, each of the appearances, as well as those above mentioned being for the purpose of conveying definite instruction on philosophical subjects to Mr. Pillay.
4. In 1881 Mr. Pillay joined the Theosophical Society.
5. In 1882 Mr. Pillay and others received a letter at Nellore from the Mahatma, which letter, containing instructions respecting the formation of the Nellore Branch T. S., fell from the ceiling of a room in a house in Nellore, Madame Blavatsky and three gentlemen besides Mr. Pillay being present at the time. This happened in broad daylight at about 3 P. M.
6. About an hour after the falling of the letter, some one present wanted an almanac in order to verify a date. It was suggested that Madame Blavatsky should provide an almanac—and within three or four minutes the almanac “a Phoenix Almanac and Diary for 1882, was flung at us with some force as if from the sky overhead.”
7. While Madame Blavatsky was returning from Guntoor to Nellore, by canal, she received a letter addressed to herself, from the Mahatma “dropping as it were from the cabin ceiling,” several persons being present at the time.
8. Mr. Pillay visited the Society’s Head-quarters at Bombay on the 13th September 1882, and was on that day introduced to Madame Coulomb and afterwards drove out with her to visit another member of the Society, &c.
9. On the same afternoon, in presence of Madame Coulomb and three members of the Theosophical

Society, Mr. Pillay received a letter which fell on his head from the ceiling. A letter in reply was placed, also in Madame Coulomb's presence, near the statuette of Buddha on a shelf in the Hall. "In our presence the letter disappeared."

10. The same night "while retiring to bed in Colonel Olcott's room, with all doors closed, and in a good lamp light, I was startled to see, coming as it were out of the solid wall, the form of my most revered Guru Deva, and I prostrated myself before him and he blessed me and, in good Telugu, desired me to come and see him beyond the Himalayas. A conversation of a private character then followed in the Telugu language. He disappeared in the same way as he had appeared." Neither Mr. nor Madame Coulomb speaks Telugu.

11. The costume referred to by Madame Coulomb on p. 49 of her pamphlet, is the ordinary one worn by certain classes of chelas. As there were none such to be had in Bombay, of course it had to be made.

12. Madame Coulomb says, "they started very quietly, &c." They were accompanied to the station by Messrs. Damodar, Tookaram Tatya and another member of the Society, besides Mr. and Madame Coulomb, filling three carriages in all.

13. On this journey when near Sikkim, Mr. Pillay saw the Mahatmas in their physical bodies and found them to be identical with those whom he had seen in dreams and visions or in astral form as above stated.

14. On the 1st of October, at Gya, "I received a letter from my Guru Deva in the usual occult manner."

15. "The letter published at pp. 44 and 45 of Madame Coulomb's pamphlet, must, from its reference to my presence at Darjeeling, have been written

about 26th, 27th or 28th of September 1882 as I arrived there on the 27th. But from its mention of Babula's illness and the statement 'that she would leave Darjeeling within two or three days,' it must clearly have been written about the 20th or 25th of October. Babula fell ill two or three days prior to my arrival at Darjeeling on the 27th September and continued ill for a month. If the letter was written towards the end of October, there was no necessity for Madame Blavatsky (who knew perfectly well I was at Nellore and had even written me letters, dated 9th and 13th October) to write about me to Madame Coulomb (who saw me at Bombay on my return)."

16. "At page 74, Madame Coulomb having found I was one of the delegates from Nellore, goes on expressing her regret at not recognizing me when I went to salute her.

The fact is that she refused to recognize me although I reminded her who I was and of her introducing me to Mr. Tookaram Tatya at Bombay, &c., (see 8-12 also 15 above). But I *must declare* that Madame Blavatsky was *not* at the time in the hall: *nor did she come down for an hour after this conversation took place.*"

17. "In conclusion let me say that I am, owing to the grace of my Guru Deva, in direct correspondence with my revered Guru and have received several letters from him since 1882, and that even so lately as January 1885, I have received a letter directly from Him permitting me to publish my travels. I beg leave to mention that there are at this moment several dozens of 'Chelas' who are not known to the world—not even to the Theosophical world—nor even to Madame Blavatsky as such."

Attached to Mr. Casava Pillay's letter are the following certificates :

I. From T. Vijiaraghava Charloo, confirming the statement in paragraph 6.

II. From Babajee D. Nath, confirming the statement in paragraph 13, also adding that Mr. Pillay keeps a diary, from which the above particulars have been extracted.

III. From C. Aravamudu Aiyangar in confirmation of paragraph 16.

IV. From C. Aravamudu Aiyangar and B. Ranga Reddy, to the effect that they had heard from Mr. Pillay, an account of the facts mentioned in paragraphs 10—15 long before the accounts of Messrs. Damodar and Ramasawmy Iyer appeared in the *Theosophist*.

VIII.

(From the "*Pall Mall Gazette*.")

(EXTRACT.)

The reason why Colonel Olcott abandoned his professional career in the United States was as follows:—One night he had been meditating deeply and long upon the strange problems of Oriental philosophy. He had wondered whether the mysterious teachings of Madame Blavatsky were after all nothing more than the illusions of an overwrought brain, or whether they had really been revealed to her by those weird Mahatmas—a race of devotees dwelling in the remote fastnesses of the Thibetan Himalayas, who are said to have preserved intact for the benefit of mankind the invaluable deposits of archaic spiritual truth to be revealed in "the fulness of the times." His judgment inclined towards the latter alternative. But if theosophy as expounded by its latest hierophant were true, then was it not his duty to forsake all that he had, and leaving behind him the busy Western world, with its distracting influences which indisposed the mind to the perception of pure spiritual truth, hasten to the East, the chosen home of repose and speculative calm? Yet should a step so momentous be taken without ample

confirmation ; nay, without absolute certainty of the truth for which he was expected to sacrifice all ? Could such absolute certainty be vouchsafed to mortal man ? Colonel Olcott pondered long, revolving these and similar questions, when suddenly he became aware of the presence of a mysterious visitant in the room. The door was closed, the window was shut, no mortal footstep had been heard on the stair, yet there, clearly visible in the lamplight, stood the palpable form of a venerable Oriental. In a moment Colonel Olcott knew that his unspoken prayer had been answered. He was face to face with one of the mysterious brotherhood of the Thibetan mountains, a Mahatma who from his distant *ashrum* had noted the mute entreaty of his soul, and hastened across ocean and continent to remove his lurking doubts. The Mahatma entered into friendly conversation with his American disciple, and in the course of half an hour succeeded in convincing him beyond the possibility of doubt that Mme. Blavatsky's testimonies concerning the existence of the Mahatmas and the mission which invited him were simple transcripts of the literal truth. Ere the sudden visit was over, Colonel Olcott was a fast adherent of the new philosophy so strangely confirmed. But when the Mahatma rose to go, the natural man reasserted itself. "Would you not," he asked, "before you go, leave me some tangible token of your presence, some proof that this has been no *maya*—the illusion of overstrained sense ? Give me something to keep that I may touch and handle." The Mahatma smiled kindly ; then removing his turban he wrought upon it a marvellous transformation. Colonel Olcott saw the shadowy folds of the Eastern headgear thicken and materialize under the fingers of his guest, until at last the shadow became substance, and a substantial turban rested on the head of the spectre. The Mahatma then handed the turban to the astonished

Colonel, and vanished as mysteriously as he had appeared. That turban Colonel Olcott carries about with him to this day, he has it at the present moment, and it can be seen by the unbelieving, "the outward and visible sign" of the mysterious visit that completed his conversion. With that turban in his hand Colonel Olcott could doubt no longer. He ultimately threw up all his business engagements, and left New York for Hindustan.

Colonel Olcott, before he left India, enjoyed another remarkable experience in the shape of a visit from another Mahatma. It was at Lahore, when he was in his tent at night, that he was visited by the sage in question *in propria personâ*. He recognized the person in a moment, and they entered at once into a lively conversation, at the close of which the Mahatma said, "You wanted something tangible when first you met your present teacher. You are going to Europe. Here, I will give you something to take to Sinnett as a message from me." With that the Mahatma encircled the Colonel's palm with the finger-tips of his right hand, and there gradually grew into substance, precipitated as it were out of the thin air, a letter written in English characters, enfolded in Chinese silk, and addressed to Mr. Sinnett.

IX.

1

KOOT HOOMI IN 1870.

In the year 1870, Madame Blavatsky having disappeared from the sight and hearing of her family for so long a time that they thought her dead, and the relatives, after exhausting every source of information, having determined to go into mourning for her, news was brought to them in a most extraordinary manner. Her aunt, Madame de Fadeeff, writes as follows :—

[*Translation of a letter to Col. Olcott.*]

“ DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,

“ I am always ready to render service when within my power, and, above all, when, as in the present instance, it merely requires the speaking of the plain facts.

“ It is true that I did write to Mr. Sinnett some two or three years ago, in reply to one of his letters ; and I seem to remember that I narrated to him what happened to me in connection with a certain note, received by me phenomenally when my niece was at the other side of the world, and not a soul knew where she was—which grieved us greatly. All our researches had ended in nothing. We were ready to believe her dead, when—I think it was about the year 1870, or possibly later—I received a letter from him, whom I believe you call “ K. H.,” which was brought to me in the most incomprehensible and mysterious manner, by a messenger of Asiatic appearance, *who then disappeared before my very eyes.* This letter, which begged me not to fear anything, and which announced that she was in safety—I have still at Odessa. Immediately upon my return I shall send it you, and I shall be very pleased if it can be of any use to you.

Pray excuse me, but it is difficult, not to say impossible, for me, to comprehend how there can exist people so stupid as to believe that either my niece or yourself have invented the men whom you call the Mahatmas ! I am not aware if you have personally known them very long, but my niece spoke of them to me, and at great length, years ago. She wrote me that she had again met and renewed her relations with several of them, even before she wrote her *Isis*.* Why should she have invented these personages ? For what end and what good could they

* In New York, in the year 1875.

have done her if they had no existence ? * * * *
 If I, who have ever been, and hope ever to continue, to be a fervent Christian, believe in the existence of these men—although I may refuse to credit *all* the miracles they attribute to them—why should not others believe in them ? For the existence of at least one of them, *I can certify*. Who, then, could have written me this letter to reassure me at the moment when I had the greatest need for such comfort, unless it had been one of those adepts mentioned ? *It is true that the handwriting is not known to me* ; but the manner in which it was delivered to me was so phenomenal, that none other than an adept in occult science could have so effected it. It promised me the return of my niece,—and the promise was duly fulfilled. However I shall send it you, and in a fortnight's time you shall receive it at London.

Accept, dear Sir and Brother, the expression of my sincere esteem.

(Signed) NADEJDA FADEEFF,

PARIS, 26th June, 1884.*

2.

Ten days later, Madame de Fadeeff having returned to her home at Odessa (Russia), she wrote as follows to Col. Olcott :—

“ DEAR SIR :—Scarcely arrived at Odessa, I count it as my first duty to send you that which you asked of me. Although this letter enclosed is not signed, yet there is no doubt that it comes directly from one of your masters. My only fear is that it should be injured on the way, considering the brittleness of the paper upon which it is written. Accept, Sir, the assurances of high respect and consideration with which I am your very devoted friend.

(Signed) NADEJDA FADEEFF.

* Addressed to Col. H. S. Olcott, London, and registered and stamped at the Paris P. O., June 26th, 1884.

The enclosure was a brief note written upon Chinese rice-paper, a very brittle substance, often used in China for fine paintings and formal writings. It is backed with the glassy hand-made paper one sees in Cashmere and the Punjâb, and enclosed in an envelope of the same paper. The address is "To the Honorable, Very Honorable Lady Nadejda Andriewna Fadeeff, Odessa." In one corner, in the handwriting of Madame Fadeeff, is the note in the Russian language, in pencil, "Received at Odessa, November 7th, about Lelinka (H. P. B.'s pet name) probably from Tibet, November 11th, 1870. Nadejda F." The note says:

"The noble relatives of Madame H. Blavatsky have no cause to mourn. Their daughter and niece has not departed from this world. She lives and wishes to make known to those she loves, that she is well and feels very happy in the distant and unknown retreat that she has chosen. Let the ladies of her family comfort themselves. Before 18 new moons have risen, she will have returned to her home."

Both the note and envelope are written in the now familiar handwriting of the Mahatma K. H. So that those who pretend that Mme. Blavatsky has invented both Mahatma and writing, have to disprove the fact that both were known to the family of Madame Blavatsky fourteen years ago, and five years before the Theosophical Society was founded in America! Many persons, both in Europe and India, have carefully compared this note with others received through the Adyar shrine and in various other places phenomenally, as well as with the voluminous letters in Mr. Sinnett's possession, and find the handwriting absolutely identical. Further comment is useless.

APPENDIX VII.

FACTS REGARDING THE "OCCULT ROOM" UP TO JANUARY
1884, AND AFTER.

1.

"When I was at the Head-quarters at Adyar last January (1883), I went into the Occult room five or six times. Of these, on four occasions during *day time*. On two of these occasions during the day there happened to come into the room several Theosophists from Southern India who were desired by Madame Blavatsky on one occasion and Mr. Damodar on the other to examine the shrine and the walls of the room. These persons, after very careful examination, found nothing suspicious. The shrine was found attached to a solid wall behind, and there were no wires or other contrivances which could escape the trained eye of a Police officer like myself who was watching close by.

R. CASAVA PILLAI,
Inspector of Police, Nellore.

2.

"I witnessed a phenomenon (on 1st April 1883), a full account of which was published by me in the *Philosophic Inquirer* of the 8th April 1883. I went up to the shrine with two sceptical friends of mine and the doors were opened for me to inspect closely. I carefully examined every thing touching the several parts with my hand. There was no opening or hole on this side of the cupboard (shrine). I was then led into the adjoining room to see the other side of the wall to which the shrine is attached. There was a large almirah standing against this wall, but it was removed at my request that I might see the wall from that side. I tapped it and otherwise examined it to see if there was no deception, but I was thoroughly satisfied that no deception was possible.

On 14th September 1884, after reading the missionary article, I again went to see the room at 8 A. M. and was met by Mr. Judge, Dr. Hartmann and Mr. Damodar, who took me upstairs. On the other side of the wall at the back of the shrine, I saw close to the wall an ingenious, furniture-like apparatus, to which was fastened a sliding door, which, when opened, showed a small aperture in the wall. Inside of this there was hollow space large enough for a lean lad to stand in if he could but creep into it through the aperture and hold his breath for a few seconds. I attempted in vain to creep in through the opening and afterwards stretched out my hand with difficulty into the small hollow to see the internal structure. *There was no communication with the back board of the shrine.* I could see that the machinery had not been finished and the sliding panels, &c., all bore the stamp of the freshness of unfinished work."

P. RUTHNAVELU,
Editor, Philosophic Inquirer.

3.

"I first saw the occult room in August 1883. Since then I have frequently examined the shrine and the wall at the back of the shrine up to January 1884, when I left the Head-quarters, and I can safely affirm that any trickery was impossible. Mrs. Morgan was engaged in new papering the back wall of the shrine and I frequently saw the work in progress in December last, so that any tampering with the back of the shrine would have been discovered then if anything of the kind had occurred."

H. R. MORGAN,
Major-Genl., (Madras Army), retired.
19th Aug. 1884.

4.

"I had a scientific education in my younger days, and for the last 12 years or more I have been

a teacher *inter alia* of Natural science. When I was in England in 1870, one of my favourite places of resort was the Polytechnic Institution where scientific lectures are delivered. One of these lectures was—I may mention—the raising of ghosts by Professor Pepper and I am fully conversant with the appliances and apparatus he used to illustrate his lectures with. I have had considerable experience in Parlour Magic, Prestidigitation, &c.

In May 1883, when I was a guest at the Head-quarters, I had many opportunities of being in the occult room, and of examining it and the shrine, and once I very carefully examined the shrine at the desire of Madame Blavatsky before and after the occurrence of a phenomenon that I saw. I can safely say without any equivocation or reservation that in the occult room or anywhere within the precincts of the Head-quarters, I never could find any apparatus or appliances of any kind suggestive of fraud or tricks.

J. N. UNWALLA, (M. A.)

Hd., Master, Bhavnagar High School

3rd Aug. 1884.

5.

“I went to the Head-quarters of the Theosophical Society, at Adyar, on 5th July 1883. I examined the rear, top, bottom and side planking of the shrine as also the walls in its vicinity most carefully and minutely and found no cause to suspect fraud.”

C. SAMBLAH CHETTY,

17th Sept. 1884.

Local Fund Engr., Guntoor.

6.

Mrs. Morgan writes:—“I can state for a fact, that during my stay at Adyar during December 1883, Madame Blavatsky took Mr. C.— and myself and showed us the back of the shrine and the wall she had built behind it, where there had been a door and

the people were welcome to inspect this and see it was barred and bolted, yet she thought it would remove the least occasion for suspicion, were it brick-ed up, and so had it done. The wall then presented a fine highly polished white surface. This wall I shortly after saw papered, as I superintended the hanging of the paper."

7.

"I have very often been at the Head-quarters at Adyar before 18th May 1884 and have been in the occult room and seen the shrine many a time. I have carefully examined the walls and floor of the room, but have never found any secret door, window or trap of any kind."

1st Sept. 1884.

HARISINGJEE ROOPSINGJEE.

8.

"Examined the trap doors which very clearly appear to have been newly made and in such a clumsy manner that they could not be used at all."

14th Sept. 1884.

A. G. BALKRISHNA IYER.

9.

"I have now seen two of the so-called sliding panels, evidently manufactured not with the purpose to assist phenomena, but with the object of bringing discredit on them."

2nd October 1884.

W. BATCHELOR.

10.

"Previous to 18th May 1884 I had examined the occult room several times along with the shrine and its surroundings. I had an interest in so examining as I wanted to be able to give my unqualified testimony conscientiously to a prominent sceptical gentleman at Madras who knew me well and who urged me to state all my experiences about phenomena. Madame Blavatsky herself asked me on several occasions to examine. I knew more of the phenomena of Madame Blavatsky than any outsider.

Madame Coulomb was herself treating me as a real friend, and telling me things which she would not tell to others. I have no hesitation in stating it for a fact that any contrivances like trapdoors, &c., had nothing at all to do with Madame Blavatsky who had not the remotest idea of them. The Coulombs are the sole authors of the plot.

I have witnessed the phenomena of the Mahatmas at different times and places where there was not the least possibility of having trap-doors or practising any trickery. I have seen and known the exalted sages who are the authors of these phenomena, and I could therefore confidently assert that the phenomena that used to take place at Adyar were all genuine."

30th August 1884.

BABAJI DHARBAGIRI NATH.

11.

"I was present on several occasions when witnesses to occult phenomena examined the shrine. There was a ward-robe on the other side of the wall behind the shrine, and this was removed on two occasions in my presence that some Theosophists, who wanted to satisfy themselves, might examine the wall. In July 1883, Madame Blavatsky went to Ootacamund. During her absence, every week without fail, I used to take out all the things from the shrine and clean it myself from the inside with a towel. I cleaned it several times in the presence of Madame Coulomb and on other occasions in the presence of others. I used to rub hard the frame with a towel, and, had there been any workable panel at the time, it would not but have moved under the pressure. It was during that time that General Morgan saw the phenomenon of the broken saucer, and it was also during that period that Mr. Shrinivas Row put in his letter in the shrine and received an instantaneous reply. In December 1883 owing to the

observation made by a visitor, Madame Blavatsky asked me to examine the shrine, and I and Mr. Subba Row very carefully examined it as well as the wall behind; and we were both thoroughly satisfied that there was no ground for trickery."

DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR.

19th August 1884.

12.

Dr. Hartmann on the very day of his arrival (4th December 1883), expressed a desire to see the shrine and was taken there. He states: "The so-called shrine was a simple cupboard hung loosely to a wall in Madame Blavatsky's room. I examined it on this occasion and more carefully afterwards, and found it like any other cupboard provided with shelves and a solid unmoveable back, hung upon an apparently solid and plastered wall."

13.

Apart from the numerous instances on which Col. Olcott had occasion to see the shrine, he states he had twice the opportunity of distinctly seeing the surface of that part of the wall where the cabinet (shrine) was hung up. About the 15th of December 1883 he returned from his northern tour, and, two days after his arrival, feeling much indisposed, he slept in the occult room upstairs. He had been told to try a certain experiment by making some marks "on the spots of the wall corresponding to the centre and four corners of the cupboard." This he did by having the cupboard moved by the assistance of servants. After the anniversary was over, he went to Ceylon, whence he came back to Adyar on the 13th of February 1884 and was there up to the 15th. At this time he again had the shrine moved to examine the marks.

Col. Olcott therefore could distinctly state that from the 17th of December 1883 up to 15th February

1884 there was no hole, or opening of any kind in the surface of the wall which touched the back board of the "shrine."

14.

Mr. Gribble, the gentleman employed by the missionaries as an expert, states as follows:—

"I was also shown two of the sliding doors and panels said to have been made by M. Coulomb after Madame Blavatsky's departure. One of these is on the outside of the so-called occult room upstairs. Both of these have been made without the slightest attempt at concealment. The former is at the top of a back stair-case and consists of two doors which open into a kind of bookshelf. This gives the idea of having been constructed so as to place food on the shelves inside, without opening the door. The other contrivance is a sliding panel which lifts up, and opens and shuts with some difficulty. It is evidently of recent construction. Certainly in its present state it would be difficult to carry out any phenomena by its means. Neither of these two appliances communicate with the shrine which is situated on the cross wall dividing the occult room from an adjoining bed room."

APPENDIX VIII.
THE "LETTERS."

I

STATEMENT OF DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR, F. T. S.

In a local sectarian journal appears an article purporting to be based on some letters alleged to have been written by Madame Blavatsky, which pretend to expose "trickery" in regard to the "occult phenomena." There are several reasons why I do not believe Madame Blavatsky to have been the author of those letters. But I shall confine myself only to such as relate to me personally. Since no dates

are given, it is difficult to determine exactly to what period they refer; but from a knowledge of the surrounding circumstances, I shall endeavour to see if particular periods can be fixed, and if at those times Madame Blavatsky could possibly have written those letters. The first letter having no reference to me, I shall pass over with the remark that it relates to circumstances that occurred about the end of 1880 when Madame Blavatsky first visited Simla. Approximately all the alleged letters may be said to relate to circumstances between 1880 and 1883. Madame Blavatsky was last year in Ootacamund. Now the second letter which is in French, and the English translation of which begins with "In the name of heaven do not think that I have forgotten you"—if genuine—must have been written from Simla, for, therein Madame Blavatsky is made to write as though she were in Simla. She visited Simla only twice, *i. e.*, about the end of 1880 and again about the end of 1881. The letter evidently refers to the occasion of the second visit, for Mr. Padshah is spoken of as though he were living at the Head-quarters, and it was only in that year that he was so staying with us. In the year 1880, he only occasionally came to us to the Head-quarters, and so he could not be mentioned in connection with matters which he came to know only at a subsequent date. If the letter refers to 1880, it is senseless, for it mentions events out of date and place; and hence we must take it to refer to 1881, the occasion of Madame Blavatsky's second visit to Simla. I am not aware of any "GREATEST CRISIS," at that period as mentioned in the letter. Then, at the end, a sort of postscript is put to indicate that Madame Blavatsky had forwarded by post two letters in the names of the MAHATMAS to be put "miraculously" for Mr. Padshah and myself. Leaving that gentleman to speak for him-

self, I shall here point out how such a statement is absurd, at least so far as I am concerned. It is true that during that period, in the absence of Madame Blavatsky in Simla, I *did* receive a letter phenomenally in Bombay; but how and under what circumstances? In the *Subodh Patrika* of August 21, 1881, a Bombay Anglo-vernacular weekly paper, appeared in the vernacular columns a malicious letter directed against the honesty and uprightness of the Founders of the Theosophical Society, and casting a slur upon the MAHATMAS, in regard to my own private family affairs. In fact an attempt was made to induce the public to believe that I was made a dupe of, to have me swindled out of my property. This article annoyed me a little, but I immediately sent a reply; and paid no more attention to it, thinking that the abuse and slander were limited to a small paper, and only in its vernacular columns; and hoping that my reply, which was expected to appear in its issue of the 28th idem, would make matters all right. But on the morning of the 25th of the same month, I found that the matter was mentioned by a correspondent in the *Bombay Gazette*, and it was insinuated that no reply had been given to the letter in the vernacular paper, although his letter was written and published in the *Bombay Gazette* before the next issue of the *Subodh Patrika* was out. I immediately sent in a reply; but the whole day felt unhappy. All my family troubles were then crowding in; and this attitude of the public which I believed to be due to my family connections greatly disheartened me. All the recollections of my past misfortunes and my attempts at being useful to my friends having turned out to be harmful, and the slander and abuse lavished upon the Founders of the Theosophical Society partly on my account—all these considerations harassed me. Already my troubles had told

upon my health, and this made me melancholy. The whole day I was gloomy but attended to the Society's usual business. In the evening I sat at a little table near my bed. When I went there, there was not a scrap of paper on it. I was in a very desponding mood, when suddenly I felt a peculiar magnetic thrill, the presence—of Him I had seen before—and something forming before my eyes on the table. A letter was formed before my eyes, and from it I make the following extract:—

Do not feel so disheartened !.....No need for that. Your fancy is your greatest enemy, for it creates phantoms which even your better judgment is unable to dispel. Do not accuse yourself and attribute the abuse lavished upon.....to your imaginary crimes. Abuse !! I tell thee, child, the hissing of a snake has more effect upon the old, eternal, snow-covered Himavat, than the abuse of backbiters, the laugh of the skeptics, or any calumny upon me. Keep steadily to your duty, be firm and true to your obligations, and no mortal man or woman will hurt you.....

And then it goes on giving me some news about Simla and a message for Mr. Sinnett about the Simla Eclectic Theosophical Society. I wrote about it shortly afterwards to Mr. Sinnett who I believe still has my letter on the subject, or can at any rate substantiate my statements above the Mahatma's letter and its contents. The above phenomenon shows the utter impossibility of any previous or premeditated arrangement on any one's part. When I received the above letter I immediately showed it to Mr. Padshah, who was then talking with Mr. and Madame Coulomb in another part of the bungalow. Col. Olcott was then in Ceylon, and Madame Blavatsky being in Simla, there was no body else in the house. That is the only letter I received phenomenally during the absence of Madame Blavatsky in Simla *in that year*; and the above account shows the impracticability of its being sent by post to be thrown phenomenally before me..... For these reasons I do not believe the above letter

in the *Christian College Magazine* to have been written by Madame Blavatsky. Parts of the same, referring to her health, &c., appear to be facts, but whether she actually wrote about them to Mrs. Coulomb I am not in a position to say. The handwriting of the Mahatma's letter, above referred to, is the same as that of the other letters previously and subsequently received by me from him. I have not put down the dates on which I received the letters, but I know the facts in connection with which I have received the several letters; and by referring to the dates of those facts I can easily determine the date of this letter. Thus, the above letter was received by me on 25th August 1881, because the communication in the *Bombay Gazette*—to which the letter referred—appears in that journal of that date.

The third letter in the *Christian College Magazine* I shall pass over, as it does not relate to me. As regards the fourth letter, it is very difficult to determine the date of the facts related in the letter. But, it must refer only to such periods when the Coulombs and myself were at the Head-quarters and Madame Blavatsky away. There were only four such occasions, *i. e.*, at the end of 1880, when Madame Blavatsky was in Simla, at the end of 1881, when she was again there, at the end of 1882, when she was in Darjeeling, and at the end of last year, when she was in Ootacamund. Of course on her way to and back from those stations, she many a time stopped or went to different places, but her absence from the Head-quarters on those occasions was continued for two or three months; and she left the Head-quarters primarily with the idea of going to those places, I mention them prominently. Now the fourth letter in the *Christian College Magazine* cannot refer to the year 1881, for I have mentioned the phenomenon above; it cannot refer to 1883

either, for mention about the SHRINE, &c., &c., is made in subsequent letters. So the letter must be limited to the years 1880 or 1882. I must therefore confine myself to the phenomenal occurrences in those two years during Madame Blavatsky's absence from, and the Coulombs' and my presence at, the Head-quarters. In the year 1880, several days after Madame Blavatsky's departure, I received a letter from my father about certain family matters. I was thinking deeply over it and did not know how to answer. The next day he sent me another note about the same matter, and I immediately sent a reply, the best way I could. Here I must state that I had begun to live at the Head-quarters of the Society a few months before the Coulombs arrived there from Ceylon. My reply, not being quite satisfactory, my father sent for me the next day and I promised to see him as soon as I could finish my work. I felt myself in a dilemma and did not know how to act. I was greatly worried, and trusted only to the MAHATMAS for a solution of the difficulty. But then I again resolved to take a *determined step*, come what may. I wrote down my resolve on a piece of paper and locked it in one of the drawers of my table, hoping that the MAHATMAS may condescend to take notice of the same. But then I thought over the matter again and tore the paper to pieces, in the firm conviction that if I was doing anything wrong through ignorance, I would be corrected, as my motives and aspirations were pure. With these thoughts I locked my room and went to bed. I got up in the morning, and when I opened the drawer I found a letter from the MAHATMA in *Hindi*, a language very difficult for me to understand! But I gathered what the substance was, and immediately acted to the spirit of the instructions as far as I understood them. Madame Blavatsky knows not a word of Hindi, she was entirely

ignorant of my father's communication, and there was no time for anybody to write to her and get a reply—even if any one could know anything about the contents of my father's letter, which nobody but himself and myself knew. That was the only *letter* I received phenomenally *then*. Subsequently I had some other communication which was *not a letter*; and that too could not have been placed in my room by "trick." Both Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott were then in Simla; and after finishing my work, I shut the door of my room and was with the Coulombs for dinner. All three of us were together; and there was nobody else in the house. The dining-room was opposite to my writing-room; and any one passing into the latter could be easily seen or noticed by me. And after finishing my dinner, when I went into my room, I found a communication which was *not a letter*, the Coulombs being all the time *with me*. I had no other *letter* from the MAHATMAS during that time; and so the letter in the *Christian College Magazine*, if it refers to that period, is an absurdity. But can it refer to the year 1882? In that year, too, during Madame Blavatsky's absence in Darjeeling, I received only one *letter* phenomenally. One evening, I was thinking deeply over an idea that entered my mind; I reached home; the Coulombs had finished their dinner; and I was then the only one in the house to dine. They, however, sat with me at the table, out of politeness. I was talking now and then to them somewhat incoherently as I was engaged in trying to solve the idea in my head. When finished eating, Mrs. Coulomb went into her room, and Mr. Coulomb and myself went to the *open balcony*. We both went together and sat opposite each other. While talking, he rolled a cigarette and held it in one hand and, in the other hand, was a match to light his cigarette with. At that instant

I felt a magnetic shock and a peculiar crumbling sound near my feet, such as I have heard only when these occult letters are integrated and formed in one's presence. Immediately I stooped and picked up a letter, where there was nothing before when I sat down. It was addressed to me, and on opening it I found it referred to some important matters in connection with a brother Theosophist at Nellore. I wrote to him at once all these particulars, and he has still that letter in his possession, I believe. Moreover that letter contained a *direct reply to what I was thinking of that evening*. These particulars show the absurdity of the letter in the *Christian College Magazine*, if it refers to this phenomenal letter; and it has been shown already that it cannot refer to any other. Thus I cannot believe in the genuineness of the said letter in the *Christian Journal*. The fifth letter in that journal I must again pass over, with this remark only, that as it speaks about my father, it must refer to the occasion of Madame Blavatsky's first visit to Simla in 1880, as he disconnected himself from the Society in the beginning of 1881, before Madame Blavatsky left the Head-quarters again. My father was bed-ridden from May 1880 and, before Madame Blavatsky left the Head-quarters about the end of that year, she had asked Madame Coulomb in my presence to look after his health. Whether she wrote about it again or not, I cannot positively say. As regards the sixth letter, I must say that *domestic imbeciles* is a phrase which could never seriously emanate from Madame Blavatsky. It was on the contrary Madame Coulomb who always talked of the Hindus in such a contemptuous manner, and many a time we have seen Madame Blavatsky get annoyed with her on that account. As regards the seventh letter, Mr. Shrinivasa Row will say what he has to say and I need not add anything. I was of course present on the occasion. As

regards the eighth letter concerning Diwan Bahadur R. Raghunath Row, I shall have to say something further on, in connection with another letter. Now to the ninth letter. Dr. Hartmann has already stated in his pamphlet that the insinuation that Col. Olcott was not allowed to have the key of the SHRINE is not true. And I may add my testimony to the same effect, without going into unnecessary details. But I must say a few words in regard to the SHRINE itself. As Mrs. Coulomb always promised to look after the books and furniture of Madame Blavatsky during her absence, the latter always entrusted her with the keys of her room, so that the former might be able to see that none of the books and furniture were damaged. Accordingly, when Madame Blavatsky went to Ootacamund, the keys of her rooms and of the SHRINE were as usual handed over to Mrs. Coulomb, with full permission, *to all of us, to use her rooms and things whenever we liked.* It was only in January 1884, when Madame Blavatsky began to dine in the room, next to the occult room, that the cupboard was put to the wall, so that dishes, plates, &c., might be put in it. But this piece of furniture came into existence after the phenomena were no longer produced in the SHRINE. As regards the letter number ten, I shall have to speak further on, but I may say that my remark about *domestic imbeciles* is also applicable to the phrase *familiar muffs*. As regards the eleventh letter, General Morgan and Dr. Hartmann have said enough of the cup phenomenon to show that the letter cannot be genuine. I was one of the witnesses to the phenomenon, and have for the present nothing to add to what has been already stated. The twelfth letter needs no discussion, and the thirteenth is ambiguous and absurd. The fourteenth letter is ambiguous. But if the writer thereof meant thereby to cover the

case of the receipt by me of a phenomenal letter while Madame Blavatsky was in Darjeeling, I have already shown above how the fabricator has entirely failed in his or her purpose. And since there was nobody else at the Head-quarters at that time, for whom any phenomenon was or could be done *during that period*, I fail to see the allusion of the letter. And now comes the fifteenth letter. As it is dated 13th July and refers to the Adyar SHRINE, it could not be made to refer to anything else but July 1883, when Madame Blavatsky was in Ootacamund. Before leaving Madras, she had asked me to allow Diwan Bahadur Raghunath Row to put a letter in the SHRINE, should he desire to do so during her absence. Sometime afterwards, when I went to his house on business, I told him about it during the course of conversation. He said he would gladly take advantage of the privilege kindly offered to him, and wanted to know if he could bring with him certain friends. As they were not members of the Society, I said I would have to obtain permission for the purpose. So when I returned home, I wrote a letter about it and put it in the SHRINE, in the evening when I went up as usual. I used to go up every evening after seven, not before. The very next morning I went up to see the fate of my letter. It was taken away; but there was no reply. The same evening, however, when I went up, I had hardly time to open the doors of the SHRINE when on me fell a letter. My office colleagues were then with me. I picked up the letter; and, on opening it, I found it to be my own, with the reply of the MAHATMA on the back of the same. Now even supposing that a letter could be fraudulently taken out of the SHRINE—and sent to Madame Blavatsky to Ootacamund, where was the time for it to be sent to her and her reply to be thus received? The letter had been put in the

previous evening, *after the mail had left for Ootacamund, and the very next evening the reply was received.* Moreover, besides the reply to my questions, it referred to a future occurrence which came to pass more than a month afterwards. The first time I met Diwan Bahadoor Raghunath Row, I told him about it and, soon after, he came one evening with a letter to be put in the SHRINE. He put it in, but his letter was not taken, although he waited there for about an hour I believe. He then went away, saying that his letter being in Sanscrit could not be answered by any one here; and moreover the question was of such a nature *as could be answered only by a MAHATMA.* And that, therefore, the nature of the reply would in itself be sufficient for his satisfaction. The next morning, as soon as I got up at about five, I immediately went up to the SHRINE; and on opening it, found the letter had been taken away. I at once communicated the fact to Diwan Bahadoor, adding that no reply had however been received. When I next saw him, he told me that he had a letter from Col. Olcott, a day or two after the above occurrence, in which the Colonel only repeated the words of his GURU without understanding what they referred to; but that he (Diwan Bahadur) had found that they were suited as a reply to his questions. I may also add that during Madame Blavatsky's absence in Ootacamund, I had put in other letters and telegrams in the SHRINE; and I received replies and instructions without there being sufficient time for those papers to be sent to, and received back from, Madame Blavatsky. I was lately informed that after I had left Madras last October, Diwan Bahadur Raghunath Row had put in another letter in the SHRINE. All I know for certain is that when I met the MAHATMA in Lahore, as mentioned in my account published in the *Theosophist*, I was directed to give a certain message to Diwan Bahadoor on my return,

which I did as soon as I saw him. I then learnt that that message was a reply to his questions. Now, having said so much concerning the nonsensical letters in the *Christian College Magazine*, I have to make a few general observations on the same concerning myself. Their general purport is to make of me a dupe along with others, and to ask the public to believe that at any rate since 1880 to 1883, Madame Blavatsky had to continually play "tricks" through the assistance of the Coulobms so that my "faith" may be strengthened! In the first place I must state that I applied for admission into the Society on the 13th of July 1879 and was initiated on the 3rd of August 1879, as I find from the records of the Society. In September I began to work at the Head-quarters, and in January 1880 I began to live permanently at the Head-quarters of the Society. In the month of October 1879, I received a letter from a Parsi gentleman in Baroda, addressed to me as the Librarian of the Theosophical Society. I have not yet had the honour of making that gentleman's acquaintance, nor has he written to me since. He has not yet joined the Society; and I do not know whether he is still in Baroda. That letter of his was handed over to me by the post peon. It contained a remittance for subscription to the *Theosophist*; and in that letter is the writing of a MAHATMA conveying to me a certain important message. Then in December 1879 when I accompanied the Founders to Allahabad and Benares, I met in the latter place a certain Hindu lady, known to respectable people in the town, who knows nothing of English, and who had seen the Founders for the first time then. She corroborated to me all I had read in *Isis Unveiled* about the MAHATMAS and also what Madame Blavatsky had told me verbally. She moreover told me various things which only recently I have begun to understand and comprehend rightly.....

.....All these events occurred before I ever heard of the name of the Coulombs. Even after their coming, I have seen numerous phenomena of an unimpeachable character. Then in May 1880, when I went to Ceylon with the Founders, I witnessed several phenomena. About all this, I wrote several letters to Mr. Judge while he was in America; and I believe he still has those letters. Moreover when both the Founders were away, I received several letters at the Head-quarters, delivered into my hands by the post peon, and on opening them, I found them to contain messages from the MAHATMAS. When in July 1882, I was in Poona, and Madame Blavatsky and the Coulombs in Bombay, and Col. Olcott in Ceylon, I received several letters through the post, containing similar messages. I was then the guest of Mr. E———, and I talked to him as also to other brother theosophists about these messages. Since the Founders left India and since the expulsion of the Coulombs, I have been continuing to receive the same kind of messages as have also my friends and colleagues at the Head-quarters. If such an astounding experience as the receipt of letters, messages, &c ; *independent of* Madame Blavatsky and Col. Olcott, as I had, before the Coulombs came to the Head-quarters, if the subsequent experience of a still stronger nature, if any stronger were possible, if the independent testimony of the people of my own race, such as the lady at Benares, and several others, if all these were insufficient to "strengthen my faith," which could be achieved only through the clumsy trickery of a hysterical old woman and her husband—if any sane person is ready to believe Madame Blavatsky, the author of *Isis Unveiled* and the editor of the *Theosophist*, capable of entertaining such an absurdity and of believing me such a fool as to require trickery for the authentication of genuine incontrovertible facts, within

my own knowledge and experience—and this is the whole attempt that the alleged letters when properly examined resolves itself into—if I say any man can make up his mind to put credence in such absurd twaddle, then further argument with him would be useless.

DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR,
F. T. S.

ADYAR, (*Madras*), }
19th September 1884. }

MAJOR-GENERAL H. R. MORGAN'S REPORT ON THE
GRIBBLE VERDICT.

(*Extract.*)

In a Report on the Blavatsky Correspondence, published in the *Christian College Magazine*, by J. D. B. Gribble, Madras Civil Service, (Retired,) he tells us in his preface that he conducted the examination of the letters at the request of the Editors and Proprietors of the *Magazine*, who considered that the opinion of a person unbiassed either way, and of some judicial experience, might be of value to the public. He further goes on to say that he knows nothing of the persons implicated, nor is he in any way connected with the Theosophical movement, his only connection with the *Magazine*, consisting of a few articles under his name having appeared in it.

Mr. Gribble tells us, his enquiry is confined entirely to the question as to the genuineness of the letters; but to understand the position properly, it is necessary to clear the ground, by showing the motives and intentions of the conspirators, before proceeding to examine the authenticity of the letters. First of all, let us consider the position of the Coulombs at the Head-quarters. They were received by Madame Blavatsky, at Bombay, in a penniless state; were befriended by her, because they had rendered her some assistance in Egypt. The woman Coulomb became a sort of confidential housekeeper, and as Mr. Gribble truly remarks, was the cause of Mr. Wimbridge, and Miss Bates, leaving the Society at Bombay:—When at Bombay, she tried to sell her knowledge of the Society to the *Guardian* a Bombay paper, when she could have known

very little, and when the correspondence now sold to the *Christian College Magazine* was not in existence. At that very time she asserted to more than one Theosophist that she had never thrown away a slip of Madame Blavatsky's writing, and had been the lucky-finder of mischievous letters blown to her feet by the wind!!! Why should she have laid such store by these scraps when she was the possessor of the voluminous correspondence she has now so profitably disposed of? When we consider the characteristics of this woman, her eaves-dropping, purloining of letters, her hatred of the members composing the Society, her swearing she would be revenged, her incessant espionage the motive and manner of her concocting these letters, is not difficult to understand. Her object was to have sole possession of the purse, and access to the purses of others, and when her plans were frustrated by Madame Blavatsky, she hated her accordingly.

It may be asked why, any single member of the Society tolerated her, knowing all this. The answer is—that she is believed to be obsessed. Hence she was tolerated as a person hardly responsible for her actions. Added to all this, her habit of confiding her hatred of the Society and its objects, under the seal of secrecy, closed the mouths of many who would otherwise have exposed her, and have demanded her expulsion. It was only when matters culminated in the Coulombs being expelled, that members began to compare notes, and the cunning and iniquity of the woman became apparent to all. Her husband nominally was Librarian; but really was employed in building and other operations about the premises. What avails it that members of the Theosophical Society assert that letters from the Mahatmas continue to be received, that hundreds of witnesses have testified that the trickeries of the man Coulomb were puerile and incapable of being put in practice? The Editors of the *Christian College Magazine* must stick to their assertions *per fas et nefas*.....

Dewan Bahadour writes as follows:—

“ My belief in the object of the Society, and my feelings towards Madame Blavatsky, continue the same, whatever their opponents might say. I have not yet had any direct communication with the Mahatmas through the shrine in the Head quarters at Adyar. I have examined the shrine, and found nothing to raise any suspicion. My opinion is, that nothing has occurred which should make us ashamed of being called Theosophists.

(Signed) R. RAGOONATH ROW.”

This gives a flat contradiction to the Editors of the *Christian College Magazine*. They asserted that the Dewan Bahadoor had left the Society as President, and was no believer in Madame Blavatsky, (see page 242, *Christian College Magazine*.) To show how they collect evidence here is a case in point. The Coulombs are expelled for being caught *flagranti delicto*, making trap-doors and cup-boards, and this fact is eagerly laid hold of to prove their case. Though the puerility of the mechanism is clear to dozens, who have inspected it, and who declared such absurd attempts at deceiving could never have succeeded, yet they do not hesitate to make use of, and convert to their own purposes, such an absurd piece of evidence.

They reiterate, it is admirably adapted for the production of the Adyar phenomena. What is the testimony of gentlemen worth after this?

Even Mr. Gribble admits, after inspecting the sliding-doors and panels, ("the appliances admirably adapted for the production of the Adyar phenomena,") that it would certainly, in their present state, be difficult to carry out any phenomena by their means. In the October number of the *Christian College Magazine*, it is attempted to prove that the whole of the phenomena are false; but how that is possible, seems to me an attempt to prove the impossible, for it is asserted that the man Coulomb has, on all occasions, personated the Mahatma, so that in reality, he must have been in two or three places at once, and according to the Missionaries, Madame Blavatsky is also ubiquitous; or else, how can we account for the letters received by various persons, in various places where neither of the above parties were present?

The correspondence under examination, consists of some twenty letters, and Mr. Gribble selects, as a *test*, that dated 1st April, 1884, published on page 309 of the October number of the *Christian College Magazine*. The reason he gives is, "that it is far the longest of any published, and it is "of course far more difficult for a forger to continue a simulated hand through a long letter than a short one." Now this, if a person is unaccustomed to forging, may be true; but this assumes that the woman Coulomb has never forged, (admitting that she has not forged this long letter in which there is *nothing incriminating*) yet it may so happen that she is a practised forger. We know that for years, she has

been collecting Madame Blavatsky's letters : in fact, has so stated. Why should she not be able to forge any amount of letters ? She has had years and leisure to accomplish herself in this particular branch of the felonious arts ; and because her handwriting is angular, spiky, and not remarkable for anything except in resembling that of a person not "highly educated," it is no reason why she, with so many opportunities, should not have forged the letter signed "Luna Melanconica," on pages 211 and 212 of the September number of the *Magazine*. The letter in question, which I examined in company with three others, quite as competent as Mr. Gribble, to pronounce on the matter, is certainly a forgery ; and if only one letter is proved a forgery, then may we declare *ex uno disce omnes*. When the above letter was compared with some genuine letters of Madame Blavatsky, one thing struck me at once : it was written, as Mr. Gribble says, *currente calamo*, and, at the time, I made the same remark to Mr. Benson. Then again the capital letters, which in the real letters are very peculiar, were only too faithfully elaborated. They, in fact, were rather overdone. The erasures were too few, as in the real letters there are generally three or four in a page. As for the peculiarities in the formation of certain letters on which Mr. Gribble lays so much stress, it would be very astonishing if a clever forger would fail in closely copying such ; but what struck me at the first glance was the general character of the forged letter, showed the letters to be more sloping than in the true ones, and this is exactly what the forger overlooked. Now, one's first impressions of a person or a writing, or of a picture, are generally the correct ones, because they proceed from a species of intuitive knowledge. Now, as the letter in question contains most incriminating matter, it did not strike me that any portion of it had been interpolated. Mr. Gribble calls this letter No. 11, and says, "this is the letter, the genuineness of which is disputed by General Morgan. On being compared with the *test* letters, the following characteristics are noted :—general appearance of handwriting, the same as that of the test letter, though written with a *different pen* ; in the formation of the letters, the M. C. D. V. D. B. A. are exactly similar to those in the test letter ; the gap in the "A" occurs frequently ; in the second and third lines, it is found three times in "*cachons*," "part," and "*affaires*," and in these last two words the top of the "r" has been added by a second stroke ; the abbre-

vation "vs" for "vous" occurs once; the "Ez" in "manquez" reads like a "y," also in "suffrirez" and "tournez." The letter was compared with the one, the genuineness of which General Morgan admits, and although the latter has evidently been more carefully and *slowly written*, the same characteristics in the capital and other letters appear. In the disputed letter, there is only *one erasure*, and no interpolations or interlineations. In my opinion the letter admitted by General Morgan, the letters in dispute, and the test letter, have all been written by the same person; and when applying the different tests to the handwriting, it appears to be the same as that admitted to have been written by Madame Blavatsky." Now I dissent entirely, "that the general appearance of handwriting is the same as the test letter, though written with a *different pen*." It is on this simple question that the whole thing hangs. Apparently Mr. Gribble was struck by something which did not correspond with the test letter, though what that 'something' was, he is unable to describe, but explains it "as written with a different pen." Had Mr. Gribble been possessed of any intuition, the sloping character of the handwriting of the forged letter must have struck him at once. As for the formation of the capital letters corresponding with those in the test letter, it would be very odd if they did not and, considering the time at the woman Coulomb's command for simulating these letters and various peculiarities of Madame Blavatsky's style, she must be a clumsy forger indeed if, after six or seven years of practice, she had not arrived at some degree of perfection.

It is not surprising that in forging Dr. Hartmann's letter she was not quite so perfect in her task, and the imitation not quite so successful; but her evident desire to cause a split in the camp, points her out most unmistakably as the author of the letter in question, as she, and she alone, *has* an interest in the matter. Mr. Gribble admits that if the incriminating letters are forged, the Coulombs are the only persons who could have done it,—therefore, why not Dr. Hartmann's letter also, which is admitted to be a forgery?

Now, it is a curious thing that of these incriminating twenty letters, most of them are short ones; and why Mr. Gribble, on page 25, should assume, "that it is a moral impossibility for a forger to have written eight sides of closely-written quarto paper," when nobody said she had, is absurd, and intended to throw dust in the eyes of the public.

The simple question is, for it is best to narrow it to a point, not whether the mass of correspondence is all forgery—which Mr. Gribble assumes that the Theosophists say it is,—but whether the letter on page 211 of the September number of the *Christian College Magazine* is a forgery or not. If it is a true letter, then Madame Blavatsky must stand or fall by it; there is no necessity for arguing the question any further, and as I am, the very best evidence, touching this point, no amount of special pleading on the part of Mr. Gribble, can alter the facts of the case connected with this letter. I shall now proceed to detail all the circumstances connected with that letter, and show how the Coulombs have lied concerning all the circumstances attending the affair, and how utterly impossible it was for Madame Blavatsky to have written the letter under consideration. In the month of August 1883, I was obliged to go to Madras on some business, entirely unconnected with Adyar affairs. Madame Blavatsky was then staying in my house, and urged me to stay at the Adyar during my visit to Madras. This I declined, as the place was too far from my business. She then advised me to see the picture of the Mahatma in the shrine, as it was a very peculiar work. I replied that I should make a point of going to see the picture; but the day was not mentioned. Two or three days after my arrival at Madras, I went to visit the Head-quarters, and found that the woman Coulomb was out, and was requested by Damodar to await her return. She came in about one hour, having been out shopping in Madras. On my mentioning the purpose for which I had come, she took me upstairs, and instead of going through Madame Blavatsky's room, we went round outside to the Occult room, as she stated that the rooms of Madame were locked, and the doors blocked up with furniture. On entering the room, she hurriedly approached the shrine or cupboard, and quickly opened the double doors. As she did so, a China saucer, which appeared to have been placed leaning against the door, fell down on to the chunam floor, and was broken to pieces. On this she exhibited great consternation, exclaiming that it was a much cherished article of Madame's, and she did not know what she should do. She and her husband, who had come with us, picked up the pieces. She then tied them up in a cloth and replaced them in the shrine, *in the silver bowl, not behind it.* The doors were shut, and Damodar took up his position on a chair right in

front of the shrine, and only a few feet distant from it. He sat intently regarding the shrine, and in a listening attitude. I was not then aware, as I am now, of the fact that the astral electric current causes a sound exactly like that of the ordinary telegraph to be distinctly heard in the shrine. Unaware of this, I resumed conversation with the Coulobms regarding the accident. When, I remarked, that it would be well if he got some mastic or glue and tried to put the pieces together, he started to get some, which, he said, he had in his bungalow, situated about 100 yards from the house; and I, turning to his wife, remarked, "if the matter is of sufficient importance, the Mahatmas could cause its repair. If not, you must do the best you can." Hardly had I uttered this, when Damodar said, "There is a message, and he immediately opened the door of the shrine, and took down the silver bowl (in which the letters are generally found) and sure enough there was a note, which, on opening, contained the following lines:—

"To the small audience present as witnesses. Now, Madame Coulobm has occasion to assure herself that the devil is neither as black nor as wicked as he is generally represented. The mischief is easily repaired,—K. H."

We then opened the cloth containing the broken saucer, found it intact and whole! *Three* minutes had not elapsed since I had suggested that the glue should be procured! and shortly after, Coulobm returned with the glue in his hand. If he could have gone all round the upper rooms, got behind the shrine, removed the broken saucer, tied up the parcel, having placed a whole one in its stead and written the note regarding the repair of the saucer, (my remark about which he had not heard,) then, I say, his feat rivalled that of the Masters! When I spoke to the woman about the wonderful manner in which the saucer had been restored, she replied, "It must be the work of the devil." Here is her note on the subject, written to Madame Blavatsky, then in Ootacamund. 'The *Printer's* devil has left out a whole line in the letter, which makes nonsense of it, both in Dr. Hartmann's pamphlet and in the copies I have seen (taken from this) elsewhere. Below I give a correct copy:—

ADYAR, 13th Aug. 1883.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I verily believe I shall go silly if I stay with you. Now let me tell you what has happened. On my arrival home, I found General Morgan sitting in that beautiful office of ours, talking with

Damodar and Mr. Coulomb. After exchanging a few words, I asked whether he would wish to see the 'Shrine,' and on his answering in the affirmative, we went upstairs, passing on the outside on account of the furniture of your sitting room being heaped up, to block the doors, and prevent thieves breaking in.

The General found the portraits admirable; but I wish I had never gone up, because on my opening the 'Shrine,' I, Madame Coulomb, who never cares either to see or to have anything to do in these matters, as you well know,—must needs go and open the Shrine, and see before her eyes, and through her fingers pass, the pretty saucer you so much cared for.

It fell down and broke in twenty pieces. Damodar looked at me as much as to say, "well, you are a fine guardian." I trying to conceal my sorrow on account of General Morgan's presence, took up the debris of the cup, and put them in a piece of cloth which I tied up and placed it behind the silver bowl. On second consideration, I thought I had better take it down, *lest some one should throw it down again and reduce it into powder this time.* So I asked Damodar to reach it for me, and to our unutterable surprise, the cup was as perfect as though it had never been broken, and more, there was the enclosed note :—

[Then follows the Note already quoted from the Master, to which the General added the few lines, and signed as an eye-witness. Now make what you like of this. I say you have dealings with *old Nick.*]

Yours very affectionately,
(Signed) E. COULOMB.

There is a discrepancy between my account and that contained in the above letter, as to why the doors of the Shrine were opened the second time. This was done by Damodar, of himself, and not by the Coulombs' desire. I may here observe that, on this occasion, every thing done by the Coulombs, was done mechanically, as if impelled to do certain things, and as directed by me. For instance, it was on *my* suggestion Coulomb went for the glue. I remarked that the masters could repair the saucer if they chose, and it was Damodar who said "there was a message," and opened the Shrine accordingly.

Coulomb's assertion that the saucer was put in at the back of the Shrine, I have shown that, to do this, in the short time allowed him, was simply impossible. Numbers have testified to the fact that the back of the Shrine has never been tampered with. In the letter under discussion, I am said to expect a phenomenon "because I told" Madame

Blavatsky so. I never did so. I really went to see the picture of the Mahatma. Madame Blavatsky knew perfectly well that I was intimately acquainted with spiritualism, and knew all about phenomena, and had no childish curiosity on that head; therefore, she was very *unlikely* to have thought I wanted one. Then again the Mahatma's short note is not addressed to *me* at all, but to the woman Coulomb, so that the Editor's supposition "that it is quite possible that I travelled down the Ooty ghat in the Mail Tonga that carried the letter destined by Koot Hoomi for my edification," has about as much foundation, as the rest of his hypothesis, and carries in itself its own refutation. The man Coulomb asserts he has got the broken saucer. That might easily be!—indeed he might have a dozen.

At page 25, Mr. Gribble says:—"for Madame Coulomb to have written merely the test letter alone, implies a feat of skill and ingenuity which is probably unparalleled in the annals of forgery." I am not aware that anyone ever accused her of having written that letter. Again he writes (same page) "Mr. Coulomb may at once be relieved from any suspicion; he is only imperfectly acquainted with English, and it would have been an impossibility for him to have written the letters."

Considering that all the twenty letters are written in French, *which incriminate* Madame Blavatsky, and that Coulomb is a Frenchman, where is the impossibility?

1st.—That "all the letters show a strong similarity to her admitted handwriting, not only as regards general appearance, but also as regards especial peculiarities." Now, this is just where, those who consider them forgeries, disagree with you, because the general appearance is *not* similar. There is no mistaking the sloping handwriting; but as regards "especial peculiarities," he or she is a clumsy forger, who, having practised for five or six years, with every opportunity of perfecting him or herself, fails to note and to copy, only too closely, the "special peculiarities". I have already pointed out how the capital letters have been slightly overdone. It is to be observed that the incriminating letters have all been written *since* Madame Blavatsky came to Madras, with the exception of one, so that Dr. Hartmann's theory is correct, and Mr. Gribble's incorrect; for in para 2, he says "they extend over a very considera-

ble period of time, and if they have been forged, they must have been forged at considerable intervals." Now, this supposition is contrary to facts. It is a remarkable circumstance that none of these letters are dated, which goes very much against their authenticity. Having thus disposed of two of Mr. Gribble's counts of indictment, I now proceed to the third. In No. 3, it is stated "a very large portion of the disputed letters refer to matters entirely unconnected with any phenomena, and in no way contain admissions of a damaging character, supposing it to have been possible for all these letters to have been forged by Madame Coulomb." Now, here again, Mr. Gribble sets up an hypothesis perfectly untenable. The quarrel is with the *incriminating* letters,—twenty in number,—and if I prove *one* of these a forgery, the rest may be considered the same. I again dissent from the following deductions:—

1st. "That the Morgan letter was written by the writer of the test letter," and if Mr. Gribble's arguments are no stronger regarding this letter, than they are regarding the others, then his deductions are unsound. I shall not follow Mr. Gribble any further, as sufficient has been proved by me to invalidate his remarks and verdict regarding the Morgan letter.

On his *dictum*, the woman Coulomb "could not possibly" have forged Dr. Hartmann's letter, because it is so "badly done," though many people who were acquainted with the Doctor's handwriting, mistook it for that of his own! In the same way the Blavatsky's are "so well imitated," that it was "impossible," according to Mr. Gribble, that "she could have forged them." This style of argument may be ingenious, but is not convincing. On the same principle, the man Coulomb "because he does not know English" (page 25) "could not possibly" have written any of the twenty French letters! This logical deduction is made by a self-constituted expert. On page 28, in the P. S., Mr. Gribble observes that all he was concerned in was the genuineness of the letters, and though he partially admits that the letters of the Mahatmas shown him at the Adyar, had not the characteristics of the test letter, he cannot help, on page 29, trying to efface this by saying the letters had a ribbed appearance as if written on the cloth-binding of a book, which the woman Coulomb confirms by saying "messages coming from the Mahatmas were always written that way." He also admits (same page) that such sliding panels as he saw "could not have been used for phenomena." Again, though he is assured by Mr. Ezekiel that Madame Blavatsky could not have written the Sassoon letter, No. 3, his ingenuity does not desert him, and he immediately sets up an hypothesis that Colonel Olcott *may* have told Madame Blavatsky the day before, and that she *may* have written and despatched it before Mr. Ezekiel came up. If all Mr. Gribble's suggestions and verdicts rest upon a '*may*' or an '*if*,' of what value are they?

III.

STATEMENT OF P. SREENIVASA ROW, ESQ., JUDGE
OF THE COURT OF SMALL CAUSES, MADRAS.

The *Christian College Magazine* for September 1884 contains, *inter alia*, a letter, which its Editor has with some hostile remarks published, as being the one written by Madame Blavatsky to Madame Coulomb, in regard to myself.

Not having seen the original of the said letter, I cannot undertake to declare that it is a forgery. Indeed such a declaration, to be of any weight, must proceed from Madame Blavatsky herself. But there is very strong presumptive testimony, sufficient to justify my arriving at the conclusion that the letter in question *could not* be genuine.

It is to be gathered from the said letter that Madame Coulomb wrote a *letter* to Madame Blavatsky, who was then in Ootacamund, soliciting her sanction to let me see the Shrine; and that Madame Blavatsky sent the required sanction to Madame Coulomb by means of a *letter*, enclosing in it another *letter* to be delivered to me as if coming direct from Mahatma K. H. to my address. Now, it is to be particularly remarked that all this is said to have been done by means of *letters* and *not telegrams*; and this must therefore have occasioned a delay of at least *four* days;—whereas the fact, to the best of my recollection, is, that my wish to see the Shrine was expressed to Madame Coulomb, because she had the key with her,—one evening after six o'clock, when she had come to my house; and on the *very next day* I went and put my letter in the Shrine, and received a reply almost instantaneously. This reply was from Mahatma K. H., and exactly suited my letter, which I had written just an hour or two previously, and had not shown to anybody. It was under these circumstances physically impossible for

Madame Coulomb to write to Ootacamund, and get from Madame Blavatsky a letter to be handed to me,—all this within 24 hours !!

Further, the handwriting of the reply which I received from the Shrine on the said occasion corresponds exactly with that of numerous other letters received by me from Mahatma K. H., both before and after the said occasion, and both in the presence and in the absence of Madame Blavatsky, and even after she proceeded to Europe on a tour.

Moreover, if Madame Blavatsky had written the letter published in the *Christian College Magazine*, she must have done so to devise means to satisfy me that the Mahatmas exist, and that they had taken a kindly notice of my letters and myself. But I had long, long ago been fully satisfied on all these points from the letters of the Mahatmas and various other circumstances; and Madame Blavatsky knew for a certainty that *I was so satisfied*, so that there was hardly any necessity for her to procure any additional proof for me on these subjects.

If, however, at any time she had deemed such additional proof necessary for my edification, she was perfectly able to procure it from the genuine fountain sources, without having recourse to fraudulent practices. For, on the very first day, on which I was allowed to open correspondence with Mahatmas K. H., I had the good fortune of receiving the most convincing proof of Madame Blavatsky's power to communicate with the Mahatmas, however distant they might be from her; and subsequent events have tended to strengthen my conviction in this respect.

And lastly, I beg to add what I know personally to be a fact, that Madame Blavatsky was always averse to make a display of the "phenomena" as the means of satisfying the curiosity of the Theoso-

phists or others ; and, as a rule, no phenomena in the shape of letters, &c., have occurred, except when the Mahatmas had to convey instruction or advice to those who were devoted to them and to their cause. Moreover, the Theosophists do not attach much importance to the phenomena. Mahatma K. H. has stated in one of his letters that ;—“ Let it be known “ that your Society is no miracle-mongering or ban-“ queting club, nor especially given to the study of “ phenomenalism.” And both the founders of our Society, Madame Blavatsky and Col. Olcott, have been echoing these sentiments very frequently ; and hence there was not the slightest necessity for Madame Blavatsky to produce phenomena *per fas et nefas*, as the *Christian College Magazine* writer seems to suppose. Theosophy stands on a firm rock which none can shake ; and my belief in it and in the Mahatmas, under whose auspices the Theosophical Society is established and maintained, is so strong, and my confidence in the honesty, veracity, and unselfish benevolence of the founders, is so great, that nothing in the world would tend to induce me to swerve one inch from the path which I have taken during these several years,—notwithstanding anything which the *Christian College Magazine* writer, or any body else may choose to say to the contrary.

 IV.

STATEMENT OF MISS FLYNN.

In the September Number of the *Christian College Magazine*, a portion of a letter said to have been written by Madame Blavatsky to Madame Coulomb is published, and in the October Number of the same Magazine the whole of that letter appears as the “ Pooná letter ” as I find. In that letter reference

is made to myself as "Mary." Now I distinctly remember reading the real letter from Madame Blavatsky, in which I was mentioned and which was shown to me by Madame Coulomb in December 1883 while I was at Madras, and this original differed entirely from the one published in the *Christian College Magazine*, which is therefore a concoction.

BOMBAY,
November 29th, 1884. }

MARY FLYNN.

I recollect many of the passages in the original letter shown to me by Madame Coulomb as those which are published in the October Number of the said Magazine.

MARY FLYNN.

V.

MADAME COULOMB'S CONTRADICTIONS TO STATEMENTS
MADE IN HER PAMPHLET.

(*Translation.*)

a.

Dear Madame,

My wife has just returned [from Octacamund] and has brought me this short paragraph which concerns you;* and I, out of friendship, send it on to you. She tells me that it is the general rumour that if Mr. L. F. should take your place, your Society, which has cost you so much trouble to build up, will suffer. "Our dear Colonel and our dear Madame

* This was a newspaper paragraph, insinuating a possible split in the Theosophical Society.

Blavatsky," say the majority, "can never be replaced by any others."

I beg you not to give any credence to anything bad they may report to you about us before you hear us, and we have the chance to explain the truth. Those who are attacking us are only using it as a pretext for a covert attack upon you. *And all they are doing is simply to make themselves masters of the situation and overthrow you.*

I have already written you not to permit the meeting of the 18th June to take place,* and it was in your own interest. Do not believe anything (you hear): we have done nothing wrong; disabuse your mind of such a thought. Do not rush into any one's open arms before knowing what sort of characters they are; and I implore you not to take away from me the care of your rooms—which is just what they are trying to effect; and I warn you it is only that they may have free field during your absence to accomplish all their intrigues.

Your devoted friend, &c.,

May 1884.

(Signed) A. COULOMB.

b.

When Messrs. Damodar, Lane-Fox and Dr. Hartmann wrote to Col. Olcott and Madame Blavatsky that Mme. Coulomb was making insinuations about trickery, and Mme. Coulomb was written to from

* This was a convention of representatives of the Society's Branches, ordered to meet on the date specified, for the purpose of legally ratifying a Deed of the Adyar property.

Europe about her strange behaviour, she wrote to Madame Blavatsky as follows:—

“I may have said something in my rage, but I swear on all that is sacred *for me* that I never said *fraud, secret passages, traps*, nor that my husband had helped you in any way. If my mouth has uttered these words, I pray to the Almighty to shower on my head the worst maledictions in nature.”

Writing to Col. Olcott on 27th April, she says: “I never spoke about tricks. I never said that my husband was a confederate to Madame, at best I would be a fool if I *myself* accused my husband, the *only* one I love on *earth* of lending a hand in such degrading practices.”

VI.

Letter from Mrs. Coulomb, showing that Madame Blavatsky could not have been indebted to her in June 1879.*

GALLE, 10th June 1879.

My dear Friend,

Now I will tell you what happened after you left Cairo. You know that you sent me the cloth by Mrs. Sebire, well she left it in a third person's house took some money on it and I did not get one penny and was obliged to pay the money to the man who had lent me the divers sums *you know*; besides which Mrs. S. behaved very badly with me who had been so kind to her, she wrote letters against us and used to make mischief when she returned from—she came

* See also Appendix IV, p. 48.

to us and told my husband that she had the secret of a treasure which was buried in the catacombs of Alexandria. We believed this folly and went with her there, she made us spend no end of money and finally had to give it up, losing Frs. 2,000. Madame S. is therefore better dead than alive, so, as you say, peace to her ashes. Now I must ask you the favor of helping me with the loan of Rs. 200 for a short time and I will tell you what I want this sum for. We have taken a nice garden and villa which we are going to open to the public, we are going to have an Hotel there or rather a restaurant, and to carry this plan out we are obliged to pay license of Rs. 250. Now we have managed to settle all right, but we cannot afford to pay this license. I consider you as a good friend and therefore take the liberty to ask you this favour. If it is not in your power to do so, try to obtain it for me some how. If not all the sum as much as you possibly can and I'll return it in two months. You know well what is to be in trouble and in a strange place. I was in Calcutta and there made my way well, but that climate does not suit us; my husband was always suffering with fever, so we cannot go there. I trust you will not deny me the favour I so much need.

Hoping to hear from you soon.

I remain,
Yours very truly,
E. COULOMB.

P. S.—I'll give a Promissory note.

VII.

*Statement of "Baboola," Madame Blavatsky's
Servant.*

I (Vallah Bulla) commonly called "Baboola," do by this paper declare and set forth: That I am Madame Blavatsky's personal servant, and have been such for over five years; that I know Mr. and Mrs. Coloumb, and that those persons have been in charge of house and household arrangements at the Theosophical Head-quarters for four years in Bombay and Madras; that I went away to Europe with said Madame Blavatsky in February, 1884, and have been continuously away until the 20th day of September, 1884; that when I went away all the walls of the rooms upstairs at said Head-quarters, at Adyar, were unbroken, and not one of them had any holes or trap-doors of any kind whatever, and that Madame Blavatsky never used any such things in those rooms for any purpose, and I never was asked by Madame Blavatsky or Mrs. Coulomb at any time to aid in or perform any trick. That the holes and panels now to be found in the walls of those rooms are quite new to me, and have been constructed since I left India with Madame Blavatsky.

I further desire to state that when Mrs. Coulomb was leaving the steamer after bidding Madame Blavatsky good bye, she, Mrs. Coulomb, said to me that she would be revenged upon my mistress, Madame Blavatsky, for preventing Harrisinghji from giving her, Mrs. Coulomb, two thousand rupees. She said this in French, as follows "Je ne pardon-

nerais jamais dans ma vie," and "je ferai tout le mal que je puis pour elle." On another occasion in Dr. Dudley's house in Bombay, she said that she hated Madame Blavatsky. In French "Je la deteste," referring to Madame Blavatsky.

(VALLAH BULLA.)

We, the undersigned, declare that the above paper was carefully read and explained to the signer in our presence, and that he then and there expressed himself as having a full understanding of it, and that he signed it of his own free will and accord.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

BABAJEE DHARBAGIRI NATH, F.T.S.

DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR.

NIVARAN CHANDRA MOOKERJEE.

V. COOPOOSWAMY IYER, *Pleader*
Madura.

September 21st, 1884.

APPENDIX IX.

Proceedings of the General "Council."

As per notice, dated May 13, 1884, a meeting of the General Council of the Theosophical Society was held at the Parent Society's head-quarters at Adyar (Madras), on the evening of Wednesday the 14th of May, 1884, at 6 P. M.

Present.—Dr. F. Hartmann, Diwan Bahadoor Raghunath Row, T. Subba Row Garu, P. Shreenivas Row Garu, St. George Lane-Fox, Wm. Tournay Brown, B. L., L. V. V. Naidu Garu, M. Singaravelu Mudalyar Avergal, *Members.* Damodar K. Mavalankar, *Secretary.*

Upon motion of Dr. Hartmann, seconded by Mr. Shreenivasa Row, Mr. Subba Row was voted to the chair. Dr. Hartmann then produced the charges against Mr. and Madame E. Coulomb.

The following is a summary of the charges brought against Madame Coulomb.

- I. It was shown by four affidavits, that Madame Coulomb repeatedly said to members of the Theosophical Society as well as to outsiders, that the Theosophical Society had for its object the overthrow of the British rule in India.*

* The following are Specimens.

Affidavit.—I am prepared to affirm that Madame Coulomb has frequently said that the *Theosophical Society* was a movement for the over-throw of British Rule in India and of the Christian Religion. She has also insinuated that Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott were hypocritical designing people actuated by selfish motives.

ADYAR, 13th May, 1884.

W. T. BROWN.

Affidavit.—I, St. George Lane-Fox, hereby declare on my word of honor that Madame Coulomb has repeatedly told me that she knew all the "Phenomena" to be the result of trickery, and that Madame Blavatsky "had gone too far" in that line to be able to withdraw and turn over a new leaf. On several occasions Madame Coulomb said that she could say a great deal more against the Society and against Madame Blavatsky, were she not dependent for her living on the welfare of the Society; otherwise she assured me that she would not remain silent. She told me also that her conscience forbade her from sympathizing with the work of the Society, as she believed that it was altogether subversive of true religion. She further said that she believed the Society had political motives, and that what it was really wishing for, was the overthrow of the British Rule.

May 2nd, 1884.

St. G. LANE-FOX.

Affidavit.—On the evening of March 7th, 1884, I asked Mr. Coulomb for the use of Madame Blavatsky's rooms; but he said he could not grant my request, as Madame Blavatsky was very strict about her rooms, books, etc., and that he would have to be responsible for them. Madame Coulomb repeatedly said that she had a grievance against Madame Blavatsky and was determined to have her "revenge." She said that she did not feel in sympathy with the Society and that her conscience revolted against it. A few days after that, she said that she would burst up the Society.

April 29th, 1884.

DANODAR K. MAVALANKAR.

- II. Nine affidavits gave evidence that she said that the objects of the Society were inimical to what she believed to be true religion.
- III. Ten affidavits proved that Madame Coulomb frequently said that the "occult phenomena" occurring at the head-quarters were frauds, while at other occasions she said they were the works of the devil.
- IV. Four affidavits went to show Madame Coulomb guilty of attempting to extort money from members of the Society.
- V. Three affidavits proved that she had wasted the funds of the Society.
- VI. All the affidavits showed her guilty of lying and backbiting.
- VII. One affidavit proved her guilty of having grossly slandered H. P. B.
- VIII. Two affidavits stated how she had dissuaded people from joining the Society.
- IX. All the affidavits agreed unanimously that her presence at the head-quarters was causing an immense waste of time, energy, money, and that her continuance there was against the interests of the T. S.

- X. Letters proved that a blackmailing letter was sent to H. P. B. by Madame Coulomb.

The charges against Mr. Coulomb were :

- I. Aiding and abetting his wife in the above described machinations.
- II. Disobedience to orders of the Board of Control.

The Coulombs were sent for, to make their defence, but they entirely failed to bring forward anything in their favour. Madame Coulomb neither acknowledged nor denied any of the charges, but gave only evasive answers.

Only the first three charges against Mrs. C. were tried, and Mrs. C. neither admitted nor contradicted them, but the evidence was of such a conclusive nature that no doubt about their truth was possible. It was therefore considered unnecessary to investigate the remaining charges. Mrs. Coulomb was unanimously expelled from the membership of the Society. Mr. Coulomb was requested to resign, but as he could not make up his mind, whether he would do so or not, he was expelled likewise.

Signed by all the members present.

APPENDIX X.

I.

STATEMENT BY MR. AND MRS. COOPER-OAKLEY.

As one or other of the undersigned has been with Madame Blavatsky night and day almost continuously for the last six months, during which time, owing to her illness she has required much care and attention, we take this opportunity of recording our conviction that whatever else may be urged against Madame Blavatsky's character, she is not an impostor or a charlatan. One or two "phenomena" occurred on the journey to India, but these were simply of the nature of personal communications from a Mahatma to Madame Blavatsky. The means employed in the transmission of these communications were not more unusual to those concerned than the use of the telephone in London and as easily and satisfactorily explainable to those acquainted with certain laws of nature as is the action of the telephone to the readers of this pamphlet. As to the existence of the Mahatmas we have the same evidence for their existence as that of any other living persons whom we have not seen, viz. the testimony of intelligent people who have seen and conversed with them. Moreover it has been satisfactorily proved to us by actual occurrences that the Mahatmas while in the East are able to read the thoughts of persons in England. We have every reason to believe that Madame Blavatsky is in direct communication with Mahatmas with whom she passed some years of her

life in Tibet. Madame Blavatsky is by no means faultless, but if her occult phenomena are a fraud she is herself the greatest of her dupes.

H. ISABEL-COOPER-OAKLEY,
ALFRED J. COOPER-OAKLEY.

ADYAR, }
February 1885. }

STATEMENT OF A VISITOR.

2.

Having been requested to state my opinion in regard to the so-called Coulomb affair and to give the reasons, on which this opinion is based, I will say, that although I consider the contrivances made by Mr. Coulomb as perfectly useless for the purpose of trickery and the letters published by the *Christian College Magazine* as fabrications; still I see in the Coulomb affair only the result of causes that produced unavoidable effects.

I arrived in India in the month of December 1883, and I found soon after my arrival that Mr. as well as Mrs. Coulomb possessed the unbounded confidence of Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky; but I could also not fail to see what had been apparent to almost every one at Head-quarters, that the Coulobms were entirely unsuitable persons to have such confidence conferred upon them, and that a great error had been committed in trusting those persons. The fault lay in the want of practical judgment of human nature on the part of the President-Founder

and Madame Blavatsky. Similar mistakes had been committed before ; incapable persons had been received and been allowed to meddle with the affairs of the Society ; when a few weeks or a few months afterwards their incompetency became evident.

The Coulombs were, so to say, the factotums in many respects. If a button had to be sewed on, a fence-post needed repair, or a document was to be published, the Coulombs were often called upon and consulted. But while Mrs. Coulomb knew all about buttons and Mr. Coulomb all about fence-posts ; they both knew absolutely nothing about the principles of the Society.

Theosophy—in the opinion of Madame Coulomb—seemed to consist in uttering what she considered blasphemies, and producing somehow or other phenomena that would astonish people. How these phenomena were produced, Madame Coulomb never explained and knowing nothing of the philosophy that explains them, she assumed that they must be either produced by trickery or by the help of the devil, and attempted to imitate them by inventing tricks and by the practice of incantations and black magic.

Failing in this and being of an exceedingly vain, envious and jealous disposition, too ambitious to see another woman succeed, where she should fail ; having her religious ments daily hurt by what she keenly resented as insults to her system of

“Christianity,”* and being possessed of the malignancy of a fiend, it is not to be wondered at, that she went to see certain clerical gentlemen, offered her services to them and entered into a conspiracy to ruin the Theosophical Society by ruining the reputation of Madame Blavatsky.

Everything was arranging itself towards that end ; but still there may have been on the one hand a certain feeling of affection on the part of Madame Coulomb towards her benefactor ; on the other hand a certain vague hope of making money out of some of the members of the Society, and these considerations caused Madame Coulomb to hesitate ; but when all her anticipations were brought to a climax by a misunderstood promise made rather rashly by one of the members, and when she saw her hopes come to nought by the interference of Madame Blavatsky ; then her feelings of hatred and revenge were roused, she looked upon Madame Blavatsky as her rival and determined to ruin her by all means.

Blinded by rage and now firmly believing that the devil was the source of all these phenomena, she concluded to fight the devil with his own weapons and she had recourse to fraud.

I am certain that Madame Blavatsky had no knowledge of the trap-doors and sliding panels which Mr. Coulomb was secretly preparing ; but it is a question, whether the idea of making these

* See page 133, letter b.

panels was not first called into life by a desire on the part of Mr. Coulomb to ingratiate himself in Madame Blavatsky's favor by making a surprise for her; for believing that these phenomena could only be produced by fraud, Mr. Coulomb in his simplicity may have thought to please Madame Blavatsky by facilitating her supposed tricks. However this may be, his benevolent object came to a premature end, and the conjuring apparatus was discovered before it was finished.

Still there was some hope that Madame Blavatsky might relent, or that Colonel Olcott might receive them back again; but when the last straw was broken, when they were forced to leave the compound and no presidential order came to call them back; then it became their object to look at the matter from a financial and commercial stand-point; to get their revenge and money at the same time; and the letters in the *Christian College Magazine* were the result.

Such is undoubtedly the true history of the case. The friends of Madame Blavatsky have done her harm, by attempting to prove that she did not have any faults. The Coulombs attempted to prove too much, and as the absurdities which they brought forward could not be believed by reasoning people, they defeated their own object; and the missionaries, who had rushed into print with undue haste, will earn what they deserve; while the mistakes of the leaders of the Theosophical movement may trouble

for a moment its progress. Still the errors and evils which have been thus brought to light, will necessarily induce reforms, and the Theosophical Society will step into a new intellectual era, and be of real benefit to humanity as a whole.

The greatest mistake that Madame Blavatsky ever made, is, that being herself sincere and generous to a fault, she expected to find these qualities in others and implicitly trusted to persons, who did not deserve to be trusted. Another error—if it may be so-called—the consequences of which she is now suffering, is that she attempted to bring certain matters which can only be understood by intuition, within the reach of the reasoning powers of materialistic minds, and thereby encountered their combativeness. Such has been the case of all reformers, who forgetting that the old Rosicrucian motto not only enjoins *to know, to will and to dare*; but also *to keep silent*, thereby sacrificed themselves for humanity.

As to my own convictions of Madame Blavatsky's sincerity and the existence of the Mahatmas, I have stated them so often, that it seems useless to repeat my assertions. No amount of material reasoning can convince me of the error of what I know to be true, and if there had been any room for doubt, the occurrences caused by the Coulomb-scandal, would have been themselves sufficient to remove all doubts; because the events which took place were entirely

independent of any interference on the part of Madame Blavatsky and proved to me beyond all doubt the existence of the Mahatmas.

F. HARTMANN, M. D.

ADYAR, *February* 1885.

APPENDIX XI.

OCCULT PHENOMENA.

(*Theosophist.*)

EVER since the advent of the Theosophical Society in India, the occurrence of "Occult Phenomena" has been a thorn in the flesh of those who do not know to discriminate properly. Many an "honest inquirer" has come to Head-quarters for the purpose of "investigating," and made the most frantic efforts to obtain a "test," without any other result than that of being thoroughly disappointed. Some have vainly asked for advice from the "Masters," and their assistance in what seemed to them most important personal affairs; but which on closer examination were found to be such as had best be left to the consideration of the applicants themselves. Others threatened seriously that they would refuse to believe in the existence of the "Masters," unless

the "Masters" would come and comply with their conditions; and others again have gone away, having their vanity deeply wounded, and their sense of self-importance stung to the quick by the apparent negligence of the Mahatmas to take any notice of them or grant their requests, and it is but natural that such should denounce the "Occult Phenomena" because only in this way can they express their indignation for having been disappointed.

Some look at the "Occult Phenomena" in the same manner as the Spiritualist upon messages from the departed as "test," and believe that without these phenomena Theosophy could not exist. They therefore extol the "Phenomena" and wonder why the Mahatmas do not come and perform a public exhibition in their astral bodies, or convince the hardened sceptic by some knock-down argument. Others, who are perhaps of a more gushing and sentimental nature, and are taking a more exalted view of the sanctity of everything that they expect to come from what they call the "Spiritual World," denounce the "Phenomena" as frivolous and unnecessary; they say that our "holy cause" is materially injured by such trivial performances which do not at all agree with their ideas of what the nature of such a communication ought to be. All these show a want of proper discrimination.

"There is only one step from the sublime to the ridiculous." If we notice a phenomenon, which is not within our every day experience, we are liable to look at it as a "miracle" and invest it with an air of solemnity and importance, which was never claimed for it by its authors. Man in his present conditioned state is now just as much in the "Spiritual" World as he ever will be, and that what may be subjective to one, may be objective to another, but being trained by a false education to look at

everything coming from the so-called "spiritual world" with the greatest awe and respect and as something "supernatural" and strange, forgets entirely to apply to such things the same manner of reasoning, which it applies to the common occurrences of his every day life, and which is the only advisable one.

The Mahatmas have often enough assured us that they are not Gods; neither are they anything supernatural. They claim to be only human beings, and we must look upon them as such, although they are far more advanced on the road to perfection than we are, and therefore know a great many things, which are still unknown to our philosophy. Being men, they have evidently the right to write letters to whomsoever they please, and about whatever subject they may choose, and if they have means to do so, without making use of the ordinary methods used for that purpose, and if they can transmit those letters independently of H. M. Mail Service, it would be obviously foolish to offer any captious criticisms on their methods. They may of course write to whom they please and whenever they please, and write in what manner and on what subject they may find necessary, useful or convenient. The only thing that is astonishing to new investigators is the manner in which those letters are written and the (to them incomprehensible) way in which they come, and the recipients of such letters therefore consider it sometimes useful to make public the fact of having received such letters, without deeming it necessary to reveal their contents in full, and the astonished new investigator consequently often fails to see the connection between the apparently insignificant character of what little has been shown to him, and the imaginary solemnity and importance with which he invests the supposed "miracles." Those who see these phenomena every day, look

upon them as they do upon other common occurrences, and they cease to be astonished about them. If we would apply the same standard to the occurrences of every day, with which we judge these so-called "supernatural" phenomena, its absurdity would at once become evident. If I am here in India and have a friend in New York, who would occasionally write me a letter, I would certainly be glad to get a letter from him, partly on account of the information which it would contain, and partly on account of its being a symbol of the continuance of the relations existing between my friend and myself. I would not look upon that letter every time as being a "phenomenon" or go into ecstasies about having the possibility demonstrated to me that letters can be written and that they can be sent from America to India. But if some ignoramus, who had never heard of such things as letters and mails, the mere fact of the arrival of such a letter might appear almost incredible to him, and if to convince him that letter did come from New York, I would show him some very unimportant sentence in the said letter, without letting him see the more important and perhaps confidential contents of the same, he would undoubtedly be surprised that such (to him) abnormal and extraordinary "feat" as the sending of a letter from New York to India would imply, should have been performed to accomplish such a small result.

This comparison may appear ridiculous; but it is certainly true, and the ignorance of the above hypothetical ignoramus does not appear more pitiful to us, than our ignorance about occult matters must appear to those who are in full possession of occult knowledge; and the same line of reasoning may also be applied to the other phases of occult phenomena, which are only "Occult," because the majority of mankind have not sufficiently progressed to understand the processes by which they are produced.

Those persons who know neither the contents of letters, said to have been received from the Mahatmas, nor the process by which they have been written "or precipitated," have no right to complain about "a waste of power," etc., about which they know absolutely nothing, and which may exist only in their imagination. They talk about our relation to the Mahatmas not as it really exists, but only as they suppose it to be, and the sooner they accustom themselves to look upon our revered Masters as teachers and friends and wise men, instead of looking at them with the same feeling of awe and superstition and fear with which the Fiji Islander looks upon his Deity; the sooner will they find that the so-called "Occult Phenomena" are neither intended to convert incredulous sceptics, nor are they produced for the purpose of astonishing the public; but are principally methods of communication or instruction. To appreciate a thing properly and according to its true value, we must neither depreciate its importance, nor over-estimate the same.

As to those persons who have been disappointed in their expectations of obtaining letters or presents from the Masters they—unless superior reasons existed for the non-compliance with their demands—have probably only to blame themselves for not having made themselves sufficiently prominent (in a spiritual meaning of the term) to attract the Masters' attention or to deserve their consideration. No amount of "tests" could possibly convince them, because spiritual things can only be grasped by our rising above the sphere of materiality, and material natures can do that only to such a limited extent as their limited powers will permit. They may perhaps be surprised and startled by some (to them) inexplicable fact, but soon new doubts arise, new "tests" will be asked for, and the "honest investigator" will only be perplexed and dissatisfied.

To arrive at the truth or to become worthy of the attention of the Mahatmas, we must rise up to their sphere, instead of attempting the impossible task of dragging them down to our level. They *cannot* put that into us, which we have not the power to assimilate; they *cannot* grant any personal favours; because the fact of their doing so would imply an injustice and be incompatible with the high standard of morality necessary to constitute a Mahatma.

There is a general misunderstanding on the part of new beginners, who "want to become Chelas" and force themselves upon the attention of the Masters, instead of developing their intellectual faculties and waiting until Chelaship descends to them. High spiritual development is impossible without intellectual development. To live in a cave or jungle, to stand on one leg or to stare may develop a state of useless sensitiveness or insanity, but to develop spiritual powers the intellectual faculties must be strengthened first, because upon them as a basis rest and from thence grow as a necessary result the *Occult powers of the spiritual man*.

APPENDIX XII.

THEOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY.

(*Theosophist*.)

From time to time articles appear in India, European and American papers, comparing Theosophy and Christianity, which show an entire misconception of the meaning of the word "Theosophy" on the part of the writers.

What is meant by the term "Christianity?" Is it the Roman Catholic, the Episcopal, the Baptist, the Methodist, the Mormon Church, or any other of the many denominations, each of which claims to be in the possession of the only true doctrine; is it Christianity in its highest aspect, defined as "The doctrines and precepts taught by Jesus Christ." If so, then if we closely examine the matter, leaving

aside the question whether or not the biblical Jesus ever existed, we will find that pure Christianity, divested of all extraneous matter, is nothing else but pure Theosophy. Remove all the ornaments (or disfigurements, whichever you please), which in the course of time have been hung around the shining body or true Christianity by the prejudices and misconceptions of unenlightened writers and the naked truth will stand forth, proving that the real founder of Christianity, whatever his name may have been, cannot have been anything else but a being full of divine wisdom, or in other words a real Theosophist.

Taken in this sense—and only in this sense can it have any consistent meaning,—Theosophy and Christianity cannot be compared with each other, because Theosophy is simply the complement or the perfection of Christianity as well as of every other religion. Take away from Christianity the element of Divine wisdom, and there will be nothing left but a formless mass of unauthenticated tales, misunderstood allegories, myths copied from other and more ancient systems, clerical dogmas and priestly assumptions. “Theosophy” is the divine light (at least that is what we mean by the word), without which no religious system can exist, and every religion is *more or less* permeated by its rays, which can be seen in spite of all the “theological” rubbish, wherewith ignorance has covered them in its blind effort to hide truth from the sight of the unenlightened masses.

Theosophy in its highest aspect is Religion confirmed by Science, and Science confirmed by Religion. The union of Religion and Science produces knowledge and knowledge establishes faith. The highest development of the intellect leads to understanding and Faith; but Faith does not belong to the plane of mere intellect. Men of the highest intellect may

have their faith confirmed by Reason ; but reasoning from the material sphere alone does not necessarily establish Faith. Faith belongs not to the mere Intellect, it belongs to the spirit and can be obtained to a certain extent by the ignorant as well as the wise. But in the case of the ignorant, their faith is always liable to be overturned by the injudicious use of their reason, while in the case of the true Theosophist, faith is firmly built on the rock of knowledge and understanding.

Truth is intuitively perceived by every healthy and unperverted mind. " Out of the mouth of babes shall come wisdom," &c., and " Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." But as a child grows up, Dogmatism, Bigotry, and Sophistry step in and lead the mind astray. They dress it up and cut its wings and prevent its flight to the true source of all being ; they blind-fold it and lead it from one door of the lodge-room to another, and fortunate is he, who in spite of all those " guides," finally finds his way to the light.

Those that are gifted with spiritual wisdom will find their way ; but those who desire to arrive at the truth by intellectual reasoning, have a long and weary road to travel. If they wish to find out which religious system is right and which is wrong, they must not only study one religious system, but they must study them all. They must study " comparative theology," (and in the end they will find that each of the various religious systems, has a certain amount of truth, on which it is based, and that this truth is one and the same in all systems, and only differs in degree ; while the different superstructures which have been built upon this eternal *truth*, and upon which they all rest, are all more or less imperfect. These superstructures reared by imperfect man are the ones about which priests and bigots, materialists and " theologians,"

have been wrangling and fighting and burning and killing each other for thousands of years. They are the ornaments hung around the beautiful form of the naked truth; but instead of adding to its beauty, they often only desecrate its body and hide its shining light under a more or less elaborately manufactured cloak, and its worshippers become idolators; because instead of beholding the truth, they adore the dress in which they have put it themselves.

To perceive the truth, or, in other words, to become a Theosophist in fact and not only in name, is to enter the right path in the life and to progress forward unimpeded by any inherited or artificially acquired hankering after old superstitions; it is to make persistent efforts, on the part of Man's higher nature, to arrange and organise into a system the various delusions and superstitions (the nett product of human ignorance) of the different races in such a manner as to lessen or destroy their retarding and otherwise baneful influence on mankind. Theosophy attempts to rebuild the temple of the Spirit that has been destroyed. It is not her object to dispute about absurdities.

To restore Christianity as well as all other religions to their original purity, to infuse Divine Wisdom into the cold material forms of dead systems, or perhaps better said, to gather what life is left in all the various systems and to construct from that one all embracing universal system of love and brotherhood, infused by wisdom and devoid of superstition to strive to get rid of the hallucinations of the middle ages and to elevate man to the proper sphere to which he belongs, is the object of Theosophy, and those that properly understand the terms will not only find the same not contradictory to their highest religious sentiments but eminently expressive of the same. *To understand what Theosophy means is to become a Theosophist.*