

The Judge Case

*A Conspiracy Which Ruined
the Theosophical CAUSE*

The Judge Case



The Judge Case

A

Conspiracy

Which Ruined

The Theosophical CAUSE

Part 1

Ernest E. Pelletier

Published June 2004
Edmonton Theosophical Society
Cover design and illustrations by Donovan Sterling.

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission.
No part of this book may be stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means including photocopying, magnetic tape, recording, or by any electronic (including computer electronics), electrostatic, magnetic, or mechanical, without the prior permission in writing of the publisher.

For information, address:
Edmonton Theosophical Society, P.O. Box 4587, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6E 5G4

Printed on acid-free paper.

Library and Archives of Canada Cataloguing in Publication Data

Pelletier, Ernest E., 1947-
The Judge case : a conspiracy which ruined the Theosophical cause / Ernest E. Pelletier.

Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-9681602-3-9

1. Judge, William Quan, 1851-1896. 2. Theosophical Society (Great Britain)
3. Theosophy — Quotations, maxims, etc. 4. Theosophy — History — Sources.
I. Edmonton Theosophical Society II. Title.

BP585.J8P45 2004

299'.934

C2004-903119-8

Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
Illustrations: Part 1 & Part 2	ix
Introduction	xi
Explanatory Notes	xv

The Judge Case: Chronology	1-309
— List of Biographical Sketches	311-312

Supplement to The Judge Case

— Contents	315
— Supplement	317-423
— Notes	425-444
— Index to Supplement	445-448

Works Cited	449-463
-------------------	---------

Bibliography of Works by and about William Q. Judge	465-469
---	---------

Illustrations: Sources	471-472
------------------------------	---------

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted and grateful to my wife, Rogelle A. Pelletier. This project could not have been accomplished without the countless hours she contributed to it. Special thanks go to Doris Davy and Ted G. Davy of Calgary, AB, for the incalculable amount of time they dedicated to proof-reading. As past co-Editors of **The Canadian Theosophist**, their expertise and advice were very helpful and most appreciated.

Special thanks to Michael Freeman (deceased) former caretaker to the H.P.B. Library, then in Vernon, BC, for his willingness to let us photocopy rare materials at his home, as well as allowing us to borrow others. This project would not have proceeded without his support, and the cooperation of his wife, Jean Freeman.

Special thanks to Grace F. Knoche, Leader of The Theosophical Society, International, Pasadena, CA, for her support and assistance, and for allowing me to publish, for the first time, two items from W.Q. Judge's notebooks. Thanks also to other members of the organization: Kirby van Mater, John van Mater (deceased), Will Thackara, Jim Belderis, Dave Weitersen and David Blaschke for their valued assistance.

Special thanks to Donovan Sterling, Calgary, AB, for the numerous hours dedicated toward the cover design and preparation of the photos included in Part 1 and Part 2.

Thanks must go to W. Emmett Small (deceased) of Point Loma Publications, San Diego, CA, for his counsel and support, and also to (Mrs.) Carmen Small.

Many thanks are also due to Dallas TenBroeck, Calabasas, CA, for his invaluable help; Dara Eklund and Nicholas Weeks of Studio City, CA; and John Cooper (deceased), Bega, N.S.W., Australia, for their unlimited support and assistance.

Special thanks to all the members of Edmonton Theosophical Society for their support, tolerance and encouragement, especially to JoAnne MacDonald and Robert Bruce MacDonald (Editors of **Fohat**), Doloresse Brisson, Stephania Duffee and Maurice Mercier. Thanks also to Albert A. Pelletier of Toronto, ON, for his input.

I am also grateful to the Directors, past and present, of the Lizzie Arthur Russell Theosophical Memorial Trust (L.A.R.T.M. Trust) for their financial support for my research.

Thanks must also go to Pauline Doberar (deceased) formerly of Vancouver, BC; Marian Thompson, West Vancouver, BC; Sharon Ormerod, Hamilton, ON; Joan Sutcliffe, current caretaker of the H.P.B. Library, Toronto, ON; Professor Sue Politella (deceased) formerly of Orrville, OH; Professor Raymond P. Tripp Jr., Concord, VT; Don Smith, Waialua, HI; Richard Robb of Wizards Bookshelf, San Diego, CA; Jerome Wheeler and Wes Amerman, United Lodge of Theosophists, Los Angeles, CA; Jerry Hejka-Ekins, Turlock, CA; Brett Forray, Turlock, CA; Daniel Caldwell, Tucson, AZ; Joseph Ross, Ojai, CA; Vonda Urban, Chicago, IL; John Patrick Deveney, New York, NY; Michael Gomes, New York, NY; Joy Mills, Ojai, CA; Robert Hütwohl, Sante Fe, NM; Daniel Caracostea, Paris, France; Armand Courtois (deceased), formerly of Kapellen, Belgium; Frank Reitemeyer, Berlin, Germany; William Johnstone (deceased), formerly of Otorohanga, New Zealand; and Gladney Oakley, Morriset, N.S.W., Australia; Chris McRae and Dr. Art Basu, Edmonton, AB; and Dr. Harry Lutzer, Edmonton, AB.

For their assistance with various aspects of my research, thanks are also due to Glenda Gingras (Archivist) and Elizabeth Trumpler (Librarian) of The Theosophical Society in America, Wheaton, IL; Ms Robin Duff, Theosophical Books — London; Leslie Price, London, England; The University of Minnesota, Walter Library, Minneapolis, MN; The New York Public Library Corporate Express Office; and to Woodlawn Cemetery, Bronx, NY.

Illustrations

Part 1 & Part 2

Part 1:

Frontispiece: William Quan Judge, July 1895

1. Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, circa 1877-1878
2. William Quan Judge
3. Henry Steel Olcott in 1875
4. Dr. Jirah Dewey Buck
5. (Mrs.) Melissa M. Buck
6. Major General Abner Doubleday
7. Edward Burroughs Rambo
8. Dr. Jerome A. Anderson
9. Bertram Keightley
10. Dr. Henry Travers Edge
11. Dr. Archibald Keightley and Dr. Herbert A.W. Coryn
12. George Robert Stowe Mead
13. Alfred Percy Sinnett
14. Emil August Neresheimer
15. Alexander Fullerton
16. Walter Richard Old
17. Claude Falls Wright
18. Annie Besant
19. Julia Keightley (Jasper Niemand)
20. Countess Constance Wachtmeister
21. Isabel Cooper-Oakley
22. Daniel Nicol Dunlop
23. Ernest Temple Hargrove
24. Dr. Franz Hartmann
25. Alice Leighton Cleather
26. Basil Crump
27. Tookeram Tatya
28. Gyanendra Nath Chakravarti
29. Subramania (Subrahmanya) Iyer
30. Nowroji (Navroji) Dorabji Khandalavala
31. Bertram Keightley, William Q. Judge, Colonel Olcott and George R.S. Mead
32. William Q. Judge (wearing his pill-box hat)
33. Workers at London Headquarters after Blavatsky's death in 1891
34. Annie Besant, Colonel H.S. Olcott and William Q. Judge in 1891
35. The Neresheimer residence at Bayside, Long Island, New York
36. Delegates to the World's Parliament of Religions, Chicago 1893
37. Group of prominent Theosophists prior to attending the World's Parliament of Religions at Chicago

38. William Q. Judge and Colonel H.S. Olcott, San Francisco, CA, October 1891
39. Mahatma Koot Hoomi
40. Mahatma Morya
41. Notre-Dame-des-Champs in Paris (side view)
42. Notre-Dame-des-Champs in Paris (front view)
43. Le Château Écossais at Enghien, near Paris, France
44. Le Château Écossais at Enghien, near Paris, France
45. Photo of the original Minute Book of The Theosophical Society
46. First page of the original Minute Book of The Theosophical Society

Part 2:

Frontispiece: William Quan Judge, 1892

47. Annie Besant (1891)
48. William Q. Judge (1891)
49. Colonel H.S. Olcott (1906)
50. Cover of the June 1895 issue of **The Path**
51. Clement Acton Griscom
52. Ernest Temple Hargrove
53. Henry Turner Patterson
54. George William Russell
55. Charles Johnston
56. Group photo: H.P. Blavatsky with her sister Vera Jelihovsky, niece Vera Vladimirovna Johnston (nee Jelihovsky) and her husband, Charles Johnston, and Colonel H.S. Olcott
57. Diploma, The Theosophical Society of The Arya-Samaj of Arya-Wart
58. Albert E.S. Smythe
59. William Mulliss
60. Dr. Henry Newlin Stokes
61. James Morgan Pryse
62. Robert Crosbie
63. Alice L. Cleather at the birthday party of the blind Abbot of Kwan Yin Temple
64. Annie Besant with her new colleagues in Theosophy (1894)
65. Kavasji Mervanji Shroff
66. Damodar K. Mavalankar
67. Mohini Chatterji
68. Anagarika Hevavitarane Dharmapala
69. Headquarters of The Theosophical Society in America, 144 Madison Avenue, New York
70. Katherine Tingley
71. Katherine Tingley and Claude Falls Wright on board the steamship "Paris" (1896)

INTRODUCTION

If W.Q. Judge, the man who has done most for Theosophy in America, who has worked most unselfishly in your country, and has ever done the biddings of Master, the best he knew how, is left alone in . . . and if the . . . Society in general and its Esotericists especially leave him alone, without their unanimous *moral support*, which is much more than their money — then I say — let them go! They are NO theosophists; — and if such a thing should happen, and Judge be left to fight his battles alone, then shall I bid all of them an eternal good-bye. I swear on MASTER’S holy name to shake off the dust of my feet from everyone of them. . . .

— H.P.B. [*Letters That Have Helped Me* - J.N., Vol. 2, pp.116-117.]

Man’s destiny hangs by a thread at the best of times, and the actions of a few can affect the destiny of not only one man, but the rest of humanity as well. Insidious interpretations of certain events color and shape the thoughts and lives of those who follow. Throughout recorded history it is proven time and time again that the historical interpretation of events by those who dominate a conflict is generally accepted as the “right” one. Unfortunately, truth is the first casualty of conflict. The history within the Theosophical Society is not exempt from this fate.

Since its inception in 1875 the Theosophical Society has experienced numerous conflicts, some of which have polarized the membership and created splinter groups that held to their own version of the historical interpretation. Errors found in the accounts of theosophical history have skewed philosophical arguments and led to partisanship. Although there are numerous examples, the most troubling remains “The Judge Case”.

Colonel Henry Steel Olcott was the first to use the phrase “The Judge Case” when describing this conflict in his President’s Address at the Nineteenth Anniversary of The Theosophical Society on December 25th, 1894. At that time he stated: “We are at a crisis that is the most serious within our history since that of 1884. The unavoidable failure to dispose of the charges against Mr. Judge last July, has set in motion most powerful opposing currents of feeling. By some he is enthusiastically supported, by others as unreservedly condemned.” These sentiments have survived to this day.

The Judge Case: A Conspiracy Which Ruined the Theosophical CAUSE chronicles the events and tragedy that besieged and diverted the Theosophical Movement from the Original Program created from the inspiration and guidance offered by the true Founders of the Theosophical Society — the Masters of Wisdom.

Since 1875 Helena Petrovna Blavatsky (H.P.B.), William Quan Judge and Colonel H.S. Olcott have been linked as co-Founders of The Theosophical Society. Yet Judge’s contributions to the Society are not sincerely embraced by most theosophists because of the cloud of suspicion cast over his character by his detractors.

An attempt was made in 1884 to discredit Blavatsky by conspiring and fabricating charges of deception against her, the purpose of which was to destroy both her reputation and the Society she helped create. The accusations in that case were advanced by Emma and Alexis Coulomb, whom Blavatsky saved from destitution in 1879. The Coulombs, chided by Blavatsky for unethical behavior, chose to take revenge. They forged letters and constructed apparatus in Blavatsky’s apartment at Adyar, the headquarters of the Theosophical Society, to incriminate her. Eventually, after many years and several investigative reports,

Blavatsky was cleared of any wrongdoing. Still, H.P.B. periodically receives bad publicity by those whose vaunted knowledge is based on ignorance.

Judge, Blavatsky's staunchest ally, was painted with a similar brush a few years later — this time by prominent members of the Society. The Theosophical Society was founded on the premise that all members are seekers of Truth on perfectly equal terms. As a body of students, each has the entire right and freedom to hold any belief (or 'un-belief') that commends itself to them, and to express that unconditionally. The book you are about to read will reveal that in spite of admonition from the President-Founder, Colonel H. S. Olcott, he along with his associates violated the most vital spirit of the Society: of neutrality in matters of belief, of brotherly love, of charity, and of seeking deficiencies in oneself rather than in others.

Light will also be shed on how Judge was unjustifiably denounced with malicious bitterness by those who should have been the first to uphold the principles of Theosophy. Accusations of fraud were directed against him, privately and publicly. While documents were being used in an insidious manner to bring accusations of dishonesty against Judge, impugning his character, his accusers were professing that in the spirit of tolerance and good will, their actions were taken to protect the membership against psychic delusions.

Dr. Archibald Keightley, a prominent London Member of the Theosophical Society and one of twelve in H.P. Blavatsky's Esoteric Section and later her Inner Group (of select individuals for special esoteric instruction), saw the whole attack on Judge as a way to discredit him, H.P.B. and the Society. Dr. Keightley observed that these attacks on Judge were initiated by the more orthodox Brahmins who bitterly resented their esoteric doctrines being presented to non-Brahmins — to Westerners. Dr. Keightley understood, as did Judge, Blavatsky and the Mahatmas especially, that the true Vedic spiritual values had degenerated into a Brahminic spiritual pride which had stagnated into a purely intellectual activity.

Unfortunately, Judge died before his name could be completely cleared. Following his death, dissension occurred among his supporters, and any pursuit to vindicate him was lost. Evidence which Judge said could be used against him in a conspiracy, and could also be used to clear his name, was in the hands of his accusers and kept away from public scrutiny. Since then these same documents have allegedly been utilized covertly to sully this man's honor. In writing history, especially a human tragedy, the story can never be complete or accurate if organizations and historians supporting a particular bias have determined that their cause is served better if certain documents remain hidden. It is indeed a sad state of affairs when whisper becomes fact, especially in an organization whose motto is "There is no Religion Higher than Truth" and whose goal is Universal Brotherhood.

When my wife and I joined the Society in 1977, through The Theosophical Society in Canada, Edmonton Lodge (now Edmonton Theosophical Society), two elderly gentlemen were the firm anchors of the group. The elder of the two, Emory P. Wood, was a serious student interested in theosophical history and completely dedicated to H.P.B., the Masters, and to the Original Program. The other gentleman, Bertram J. Whitbread, a few years younger and just as dedicated, was involved with the Esoteric Section (E.S.) and also associated with a Lodge that had priests in the Liberal Catholic Church (L.C.C.). He studied Alice Bailey's writings as well. Group study was always centered on the original teachings as presented by Blavatsky and the Masters, and these two gentlemen, both sincere and serious students for over sixty years, maintained a balance within Edmonton Lodge. I am grateful for the wisdom and guidance they provided and the technique of study they taught us. Students were encouraged to investigate *everything* and to determine the truth for themselves. It was recommended that they start with an understanding of the *original* program, *its source* literature, and *its* history before exploring other concepts. Examining Judge's writings was part of the process. No contradictions were noted in Judge's writings when compared with Blavatsky's or the Masters'.

In 1985, Edmonton T.S. established a republishing program in an attempt to complete collections of its

library's periodicals and to share its reproductions of these original documents with other libraries and individuals. In 1986, my wife and I attended the European School of Theosophy at Tekels Park, England. Then in 1988 arrangements were made to visit major theosophical centers in California. While the principal objective of our American travels was to seek assistance to fill the gaps in Edmonton T.S. Library's collections, we were equally interested in getting personally acquainted with fellow theosophists and exploring how the various organizations cooperated with each other, as well as how they viewed the Theosophical Movement as a whole. Our findings were that most of them appeared dynamic and that some reconciliation between groups had occurred. In 1989 we toured the mid-Western United States. It became clear that strong divisions remained and that the main source of the separateness in the Movement was the conflict that arose shortly after the death of Blavatsky — more precisely, “The Judge Case.”

Since there did not appear to be any one title in print dealing specifically with “The Judge Case”, I decided to collect as much information as possible and compile it into a format detailing the facts. The intention at the time was to render assistance to someone who could further investigate this critical issue and then write a book delineating the whole situation.

Two specific items provided the starting point. Item one was a copy of Hettie Manske's accumulation of documents pertaining to “The Judge Case” which was borrowed from Emmett and Carmen Small of Point Loma Publications in San Diego, and also offered by Dara Eklund of Studio City, during our California visit in 1988. Item two was received in 1991. Dallas TenBroeck, associate of United Lodge of Theosophists, Los Angeles, mailed me a copy of a synopsis of “The Judge Case” he had recently compiled. Although these documents supplied some valuable insight, innumerable gaps remained. By the mid 1990s, Edmonton T.S. had acquired a complete collection of **The Theosophist** as well as several other early periodicals crucial to researching “The Judge Case.” As the accumulation of documents became quite sizeable, we started to record the information chronologically on computer. A sense of duty has since taken me further than ever anticipated. What started as a query developed into a very complex investigation that has led to the volume of documentation and analysis before you.

In 1894, six charges were brought against W.Q. Judge. He was accused of:

1. being untruthful about his claims that he had been receiving teaching from and communication with the Masters since 1875;
2. being untruthful when denying that he had sent letters or messages purporting to be from the Masters;
3. being deceptive towards Olcott with regards to the Rosicrucian Jewel which belonged to Blavatsky until her death in 1891;
4. lacking straightforwardness with a message regarding Olcott's tenure of the Presidency; and
5. allegedly using a brass seal to substantiate certain messages, telegrams, orders and letters.

The 6th charge brought against Judge was the most disparaging one. He was charged with sending letters for personal advantage that purportedly contained imitation script “as if sent and written by Masters”. Although this charge was vague at best and no substantial evidence was ever presented, the accusations themselves were damaging and condemning. The result was that Judge's reputation became not only tarnished, but ruined in the eyes of many.

It is very easy to accuse or cast suspicion upon a person's character, but it is a nearly insurmountable task to vindicate that individual's reputation. The burden of proving one's innocence can be extremely difficult at the best of times, but never more so than when the accusers withhold material evidence, thereby denying the accused the opportunity to mount a proper defense against the charges. Judge and his supporters maintained, and research sustains, that material evidence has been withheld.

The charges against Judge, virtually impossible to disprove at the time, are even more difficult to defeat one hundred years later, especially after a century in obscurity. When a defense is brought before any jury, in this case in the court of public opinion, the plaintiff's case needs to be examined in order to mount a proper defense on behalf of the accused. Since there are many accusers in this case, some well known and some hiding in the shadows, a liberal spectrum of *factum probans* (probative or evidentiary facts; circumstantial evidence) valuable to the case has been presented. Every extant document made available was utilized to expose the truth behind this conspiracy and great tragedy.

Many errors were found in accounts of theosophical history that could easily skew one's perception of events. Whether accidental or otherwise, they may appear slight at first, but when looked at more closely, they are shown to have steered public opinion in a completely different direction. One such example is in **A Short History of The Theosophical Society**, published in 1938 by Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar. On page 280, Josephine Ransom states that "On 6 May Mrs. Besant, Mr. Judge and Dr. and Mrs. J.D. Buck left New York for England." In fact, Judge did not sail with Besant on that date; he sailed one week later, on May 13th. This small imprecision in Ransom's book leads one to the erroneous conclusion that Judge and Besant reached London at the same time. They did not. Blavatsky died on May 8th, 1891 and Judge was not present to deal with matters related to the immediate impact of H.P.B.'s sudden demise, whereas Besant was.

Many inconsistencies and inaccuracies were also found in Colonel Olcott's memoirs, **Old Diary Leaves**, written much later from notes he kept. It is amazing how Olcott's sometimes foggy memory is widely accepted and relied upon as fact.

Having reviewed all the evidence, the conclusion eventually drawn was that, while the charges themselves could not be proved or disproved, W.Q. Judge was conspired against. I hope that you, the reader, upon a similar process of analysis, facilitated by the information compiled and based upon the merits of the facts presented, will be led to a similar conclusion.

This work is an attempt to bare the facts, to present a detailed factual defense to vindicate W.Q. Judge's reputation, and to repudiate the accusations of fraud. The process used to gather the information is as earlier described, and the information is organized as detailed in the Explanatory Notes that follow this introduction. Other than the Supplement, which summarizes and substantiates the findings of my investigation, all the documentation in this volume, Part 1 and Part 2, is presented in a manner to allow historical records to speak for themselves. Some familiar documents, and others which may be new for many, are presented. In the Supplement, a fresh look at the evidence demonstrates that Judge was not only a chela of Mahatma Morya, but possibly the only westerner aside from Blavatsky to have been initiated by Him into the occult mysteries. The evidence collected also supports the probability that the ego within Judge was a chela (occult pupil) of these Masters of Wisdom for a considerable time.

Through this detailed study it is hoped that Judge will be vindicated of the charges, that justice will finally prevail, that he is awarded his rightful place in the annals of theosophical history as a True Theosophist and a True Founder of The Theosophical Society, and most importantly as one of the individuals chosen by the Masters of Wisdom to initiate a paradigm shift in human consciousness in the Western World. It is also hoped that Judge's writings will be read and studied more widely by students around the world.

All organizations are invited to add to this compilation by looking into their archives for additional information not included in this work, and which should now be in the public domain. The time has come.

Ernest E. Pelletier

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Edmonton Theosophical Society's republishing program has consistently reprinted rare documents without changes, that is, NO editing. It was deemed that the best way to expose the whole "Judge Case" was to present the issues, as they unfolded, by using direct quotations from as many original sources as possible and letting the facts tell the story.

To facilitate this, the Chronology section has been arranged into three columns. The first column states the date that the event occurred and represents one file. The center column first mentions the title of the article or identifies the item from which the quotations are extracted. Titles are in quotation marks and sometimes, additionally, in italics or in capital letters depending on original source. All quotations, taken from the contents of that file, are extracted to reveal the central idea. Titles of books, pamphlets and other publications are in bold letters throughout, except when found within a quotation. On occasion, titles first published as an article are in quotation marks, and appear in bold after they were reprinted as a pamphlet.

Where NOTE appears in the center column, it indicates either extra references to support the quotation or where other information can be found relating to it, providing the reader a thread to follow the topic. I have occasionally added comments, which are clearly identified as such.

The third column indicates the sources of the quotations. These are in bold lettering, except as indicated above. This format was used, rather than italics, to make the titles more visually distinct. To assist the reader not familiar with the material presented, full titles, or as much of them as possible were used rather than abbreviations or acronyms. Vol. indicates volume and Supp. signifies Supplement. Wherever possible, original pamphlets, circulars and letters have been included as reference sources.

Care was taken to place the source directly opposite the quotations, although this was not always feasible. Exceptions arise in the cells containing biographical sketches of some of the main characters. In these instances, the source may not necessarily be directly aligned with the material found in the center column. A biographical sketch might be a synopsis of events or, in many circumstances, simply quoted in part but not necessarily indicated as such by the use of quotation marks. However, all the sources from which the information was drawn are included in the third column.

For quick reference at the end of the Chronology, a List of the Biographical Sketches (in alphabetical order) is provided for the forty-nine main characters featured. A detailed sketch of H.P. Blavatsky is not included here, although information regarding her death is mentioned, as biographical information on H.P.B. is readily available elsewhere.

The Chronology has been compiled as its name implies: chronologically. Documents used in this section have been in the public domain for some time, most from the time they were written. In the Supplement, however, I have imparted my perspective on this highly interesting period of theosophical history. The Supplement includes facts and documents which came my way over the years, but which have not necessarily been generally accessible and/or available for perusal in the past. Some of these documents and observations may alter perception of this history.

The Supplement is followed by: Index to Supplement, Works Cited, Bibliography of Works by and about William Q. Judge, and Illustrations: Sources. The legend of title abbreviations used throughout this volume consists of the first column of Works Cited. Publications reproduced by Edmonton Theosophical Society have additionally been indicated by ^{ETS} (in superscript) after the title.

Part 2 consists of appendices which contain some of the documents most pertinent to “The Judge Case”. Some are fairly rare while others are crucial enough to the Chronology and Supplement to warrant their presence within this volume. The reader is thereby provided with access to documentation in its original context and the opportunity to investigate the evidence themselves. Each appendix includes a detailed Table of Contents.

Appendices “A” to “J” have been assembled, some with an introduction or analysis, and one, Appendix “J”, comprises a fresh look at Judge’s horoscope through commissioned work recently completed by two professional astrologers.


“Mahatma” or “Master” are terms used throughout this work. A definition is included below as it is important to understand what these words imply in the context of this work.

Mah-āman. (Sanskrit) “Great Soul” or “Great Self” is the meaning of this compound word (*mah*—great; *āman*—self). The Mahatmas are perfected men, relatively speaking, known in theosophical literature as Teachers, Elder Brothers, Masters, Sages, Seers, and by other names. . . . They are men, not spirits—men who have evolved through self-devised efforts in individual evolution, always advancing forwards and upwards until they have now attained the lofty spiritual and intellectual human supremacy that now they hold. They were not so created by any extra-cosmic Deity, but they are men who have become what they are by means of inward spiritual striving, by spiritual and intellectual yearning, by aspiration to the greater and better, nobler and higher, just as every good man in his own way so aspires. They are farther advanced along the path of evolution than the majority of men are. They possess knowledge of Nature’s secret processes, and of hid mysteries, which to the average man may seem to be little short of the marvelous—yet, after all, this mere fact is of relatively small importance in comparison with the far greater and more profoundly moving aspects of their nature and life-work. — G. de Purucker, **Occult Glossary**, Theosophical University Press, Pasadena, CA, (1933) 1972, p.92.

Ernest E. Pelletier

Date: April 13th, 2004

THE JUDGE CASE



CHRONOLOGY

	<p>“Lawyers vs Religion, A Paradox.” By Dr. Jerome A. Anderson. “Inasmuch as newspaper writers have alleged that Wm. Q. Judge, Vice-President and General Secretary of the Theosophical Society, was a Methodist exhorter when picked up by Blavatsky at the formation of the Society in New York; it might be well to say that Mr. Judge was born in Dublin, Ireland, in the year 1851 and came to America when he was 14 years old, taking up residence in New York City. For a time he engaged in mercantile pursuits and then began the study of law with Delafield Smith, at that time corporation council for the City of New York. He was admitted to the bar in 1872 and was married 1874. For some years Mr. Judge was a member of the law firm of Olcott, Mestie and Gonzalez and in 1875 he first met Mme. Blavatsky and Col. H.S. Olcott. He soon became devoted to Theosophy and assisted that year in founding the Theosophical Society. Long intimacy with Mme Blavatsky made him closer to her than was any other person, and he saw more marvels than any other. For years the Society made little progress and Mr. Judge had small encouragement as President of the Aryan T.S. and General Secretary of the Society. But within three years a wonderful development has occurred and Theosophy is now spreading everywhere with great rapidity. Is it not unusual to find a layman traveling to expound a religion, especially a lawyer at this age of the World?” [William Quan Judge was born in Dublin, Ireland, April 13th, 1851.]</p>	<p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 1, No. 2, Dec. 1891; p.2</p>
Jan. 16, 1882	<p>“Letters of W.Q. Judge”, XII Letter from Judge to H.S. Olcott. Judge inquires about Mr. Wimbridge an English architect/artist who had designed the cover for The Theosophist and travelled with Olcott and H.P. Blavatsky to India on Dec. 17, 1878. In this letter Mr. Judge mentions that money is very scarce and he is frustrated because he has no money and wants to devote his time to Theosophy. He wrote: “If I was a little harder by nature in my profession, I would perhaps today have a little more to enable me to do good work. I draw a small pittance from the Mine Co., not over \$16 a week and am living within the narrowest limits.” In an earlier letter (Jan. 7th, 1882) to Olcott, Judge mentions that he has just returned from Venezuela and that “[i]f this mining operation succeeds, I will then have time and money to devote myself to Theosophy actively.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 52, May 1931; pp.191-197</p>
Mar. 18, 1882	<p>“To the New York Theosophical Society” Letter from William Q. Judge to Major General Abner Doubleday in which he states that he was willing to meet with him but that he had to go to South America for a month or two. He wrote: “I have been identified with the Theosophical movement from its beginning. . . . “My dear friends I must earnestly and on my honor assure you that these men [“The Brothers” and “The Adepts”] exist. . . . “[O]ne of these <i>Adepts</i> has written me, saying we can expect nothing while we fail to do anything ourselves.”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 4, No.1, Sep. 15, 1932; p.8</p>

<p>Mar. 15, 1883</p>	<p>“Letters of W.Q. Judge”, XVI Letter from W.Q. Judge to Olcott. It had obviously been a long time since the last one. He wrote: “I am still living, but oh my God, what knocks I have had! . . . “I haven’t a damn red cent of my own, and none of anyone else’s either. I had to borrow five cents the day before yesterday, in order to get over the ferry. . . . “Well, here in hell I lift up my eyes to those that are above me and do not deny them. . . . I feel the thoughts of M ^ and K.H. here in my head all the time, and cannot if I would, and I would not, drive them out.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 52, Sep. 1931; pp.754-756</p>
<p>June 11, 1883</p>	<p>Letter from W.Q. Judge addressed to “My Dear Damodar”. “I have your last. On the back is written in red pencil ‘Better come M ^ ’ I do not my dear friend know your Chohan but suppose it is M ^ but I venerate him as you do. Olcott wrote me three days ago begging me to come also & thus I have a great obligation.”</p>	<p>Damodar, p.76</p>
<p>Nov. 4, 1883</p>	<p>“Letters of W.Q. Judge”, XVII Letter from Judge to Olcott. “I am trying to start up the Branch and <i>will</i> succeed. [George W.] Wheat offers his house to meet in, and when [General Abner A.] Doubleday fixes the day we will try it. But people are dead here, and it will be uphill work when we begin to ask for dues and so on to cover expenses. I would like to run a Buddhist religious Society here. In fact, Olcott, I am totally unfitted for any other business but Theosophy and Buddhism.”</p> <p>NOTE: In a previous letter (May 15, 1883) to Olcott, Judge wrote: “T.S. in New York hangs fire. I have been unable to do anything, and Doubleday says there seems to be a great opposition in the air, presumably from India. He said the other day he would like to be permitted to resign; but that’s confidential. Let him write about it himself.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 53, Oct. 1931; pp.67-68</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 52, Sep. 1931; pp.754-756</p>
<p>Dec. 3, 1883</p>	<p>“Official Reports” THE ARYAN THEOSOPHISTS OF NEW YORK. “The New York Branch of the Theosophical Society has been formed with the above title. Officers are: President – William Q. Judge, Secretary – Mortimer Marble, Treasurer – George W. Wheat. . . . “The Society’s objects are— To promote the study of Aryan and other Eastern religions and sciences, and vindicate its importance; to investigate the hidden mysteries of Nature, and the psychical powers latent in man; and to co-operate in the general work of the <i>Theosophical Society</i>.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, Feb.1884; Supp. p.31</p>

<p>Jan. 21, 1884</p>	<p>“Presidential Special Order” The day President Olcott left Head-quarters, (for Ceylon via Bombay then to Marseilles on Feb. 20th on his way to London), he issued a “Presidential Special Order” appointing Messrs. R. Raghoonath Row, Diwan Bahadur; G. Muttuswami Chetty, Garu; P. Sreenivasa Row, Garu; and T. Subba Row, Garu to supervise and carry on executive powers of the President while he was away. “Their jurisdiction to cover the financial, executive and supervisory affairs of the Society.” [See Feb. 19, 1884 entry for more information.] NOTE: H.S. Olcott was to return to Adyar only in July but returned on Feb. 13th. He met H.P.B. in Bombay on Feb. 18th and sailed from Bombay for Marseilles on Feb. 20th. He returned on Nov. 15th. [See Nov. 17, 1884] On Dec. 17th Olcott met H.P.B. in Colombo. She was accompanied by C.W. Leadbeater, and Mr. and Mrs. A.J. Cooper-Oakley.[See Dec. 21, 1884 entry.]</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, Feb. 1884; Supp. pp.41-42</p> <p>Hammer on the Mountain. pp.328-329</p>
<p>Feb. 15, 1884</p>	<p>H.P.B leaves Wadhwan for Bombay after her visit with His Highness the Thakore Saheb. She was accompanied by Baboo Mohini M. Chatterjee and Franz Hartmann.</p> <p>Hartmann (An American Buddhist) returned to Adyar on Feb. 29. H.P.B., H.S.O, Mohini M. Chatterchi, Burjorji J. Padshah, S.Krishnamarchari (Babaji) and Babula (H.P.B.’s servant) sailed on the 20th, from Bombay for Marseilles, France on the <i>S.S. Chandernagore</i>.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, Apr. 1884; Supp. p.65</p> <p>Report, p.32</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 6, p.xxvi</p> <p>First Report, p.123</p>
<p>Feb. 19, 1884</p>	<p>“Presidential Special Orders.” From Camp, Bombay. Three more names are added to the Executive Committee: St. George Lane-Fox, Esq., Dr. F. Hartmann, and W.T. Brown. “. . . and the whole will be known as the Board of Control.” NOTE: [See Jan. 21, 1884.]</p> <p>List of Special Executive Committee appointed by Col. Olcott.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, Mar. 1884; Supp. p.54</p> <p>Vol. 5, Mar. 1884; p.154</p>
<p>Feb. 20, 1884</p>	<p>Madame Blavatsky and H.S. Olcott sail from Bombay for Marseilles, France on the <i>S.S. Chandernagore</i>. They were accompanied by Mohini M. Chatterji, Burjorji J. Padshah, S. Krishnamachari (Babaji) and Babula, Blavatsky’s servant.</p> <p>NOTE: On Feb. 15th Mme. Blavatsky left Wadhwan for Bombay. She was accompanied by Franz Hartmann and Baboo Mohini M. Chatterjee. During their train ride Franz Hartmann describes an interesting phenomenon which occurred which is similar to the phenomenon that occurred at the May 27th, 1891, E. S. Advisory Council Meeting. See May 27, 1891 entry.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, Mar. 1884; p.154</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 6, p.xxvi</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, Apr. 1884; p.65</p>

Feb./Mar. 1884	<p>“In the winter of 1884 news came to William Q. Judge in New York that the long severed relations between himself, H.P.B. and Col. Olcott were to be renewed, and the pen work resumed just where it had been laid down at the time of their departure for India in 1878.”</p> <p>NOTE: There is no indication of an exact date for W. Q. Judge’s arrival in London. In a letter some time after his arrival he wrote: “Since February 27th I have not met a congenial soul save Thomas. . . .” Then he adds “March 20th . . . No further news from Olcott or the rest.”</p>	<p>The Word, Vol. 14, Mar. 1912, p.324</p> <p>p.331</p>
Mar. 25, 1884	<p>William Quan Judge arrives in Paris (from where he eventually made his way to India). He is told by Madame Blavatsky “that the Master had told her in India, that he was doing, or ‘about to do something with and for me’.” Also that he had been “ordered by the Masters to stop here and help Madame in writing the ‘Secret Doctrine.’ . . .”</p>	<p>The Word, Vol. 15, Apr. 1912; pp.17-18</p>
Mar. 27, 1884	<p>H.P. Blavatsky and H.S.Olcott leave Nice for Paris.</p> <p>“We reached Marseilles at 9.30 p.m., and Paris the next evening at 11p.m. Mohini, Dr. Thurman, F.T.S. and W.Q. Judge — who had left New York for India — met us at the station. . . .”</p>	<p>Old Diary Leaves, Third Series, p.86</p>
Mar. 27, 1884 continued	<p>Under orders from K.H. the Board of Control gave a month’s leave, and money for Mme. Coulomb to buy new clothing, for a vacation from Adyar at Ooty (Ootacamund).</p> <p>NOTE: During the period from February 7th up to the 29th, when Hartmann returned to Adyar, the Coulombs had undisputed possession of Madame Blavatsky’s room.</p>	<p>Report, p.34</p> <p>Hastings, Vol. 2, p.77</p>
Apr. 24, 1884	<p>“Letter from W.Q. Judge”, XVII</p> <p>Letter from Judge in Paris to Olcott thanking him for the £5.</p> <p>“I am not going to London . . . just to buy a coat. . . . In my letter I was merely letting out a wishful thought toward London’s cheap coats, as I am ashamed to go out with my rags; that is all.”</p> <p>He was likely meeting Mrs. Holloway who was coming to London in May.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 53, Nov. 1931; pp.196-197</p>
Apr. 30, 1884	<p>“Letters of W.Q. Judge”, XVII</p> <p>Letter by W.Q. Judge in Paris to Col. Olcott.</p> <p>“I do not know what you know about it, but I will bet my head to a lemon that I have got now a magnificent coadjutor, <i>if not a successor</i> to H.P.B. and one who has trained scientific methods of literary work, as well as psychical abilities of the kind that make H.P.B. so remarkable. I thought in the street yesterday I heard the Master say Mrs. H. would be a successor and then they would let H.P.B. vanish. Two hours after in the parlor in talking to Wagnalls, who extolled the character of Holloway (though not referring to anything else) H.P.B. leaned back and said, ‘<i>O my God, if I shall only find in her A SUCCESSOR, how gladly I will PEG OUT!</i>’ A curious ‘scientific coincidence’.”</p> <p>NOTE: See The Mahatma Letters To A.P. Sinnett pp.360-361 for what the Mahatma K.H. thought about Mrs. Holloway.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 53, Nov. 1931; pp.201-202</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 21, Apr. 1932; p.9</p>

<p>May 13, 1884</p>	<p>“Special Orders of 1884.” From London by H. S Olcott. “On 13 May the President issued a ‘Special Order’ constituting a Board of Control to act as a central management for The Theosophical Society in the United States. He appointed Wm. B. Shelley and Mrs. Josephine W. Cables (President and Secretary respectively of the Rochester Branch), G.F. Parsons, Elliott B. Page, T.M. Johnson, Gen. A. Doubleday and Dr. J.H.D. Buck as members of the Board, leaving it to them to agree upon a Chairman and Secretary. The latter officer was to transmit all returns to the Recording Secretary at Adyar, and the Board was to keep an accurate but private register of all Branches and their members. Expenses of the Board were to be met by a small <i>per capita</i> assessment.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 17, 1884.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, July 1884; Supp. p.100</p> <p>A Short History of the T.S., p.200</p> <p>General Report of the 21st Anniversary of the T.S., p.26</p>
<p>June 13, 1884</p>	<p>H.S. Olcott: “On the 13th June I returned to London in company with Mr. Judge, who had come over from New York to see us on his way out to India, his intended future field of work.”</p>	<p>Old Diary Leaves, Third Series, p.155</p>
<p>End of June 1884</p>	<p>William Q. Judge leaves London for Bombay. “Mr. Judge left London at the end of June and arrived, 15 July, at Bombay where he was met by Tookaram Tatya and other members.”</p>	<p>A Short History of the T.S., p.203</p>
<p>July 15, 1884</p>	<p>W. Q. Judge arrived in Bombay and delivered his first lecture: “Theosophy and the Destiny of India.” He reached Adyar on August 10th. Judge had left London at the end of June.</p> <p>Before Judge’s arrival at Adyar, Master M. wrote a letter to Franz Hartmann telling him “Be friendly towards W.Q. Judge. He is true, faithful and trustworthy. . .” The Master’s letter to Hartmann was about M.’s concerns with the investigation brought on by the accusations of fraud against H.P. Blavatsky by the Coulombs.</p> <p>Mr. Judge was asked to go to India “to take charge of the situation. . .” [p.491]</p> <p>“I went to Adyar in the early part of the year 1884, with full power from the president of the Society to do whatever seemed best for our protection against an attack we had information was about to be made in conjunction with the missionaries who conducted the Christian College at Madras.”</p> <p>In a letter dated Feb. 5, 1886, to “Brother Padshah”, Judge explained regarding his stay at Adyar: “I went there with full authority and from the first moment saw all, had all the keys and took complete charge. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: The use of the word “true” by Master M. to denote Judge’s character is not to be taken lightly, as this description is used very sparingly by the Masters; just as H.P. Blavatsky used the term very rarely to describe some Theosophists.</p>	<p>A Short History of the T.S., p.203</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 53, Dec. 1931; pp.307-308</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 8, p.448</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. pp.489-498</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 3, p.204</p> <p>Practical Occultism, p.15</p>

July 20, 1884	<p>“The Poona Theosophical Society.”</p> <p>William Q. Judge arrived at Poona where he was received at the station by several members of the Poona Branch. [Most likely this receiving committee included the President of The Poona Branch, Navroji Dorabji Khandalvala.]</p> <p>On the 23rd he delivered a lecture to 300 persons at the Poona Town Hall on “The West and what India can give it”.</p> <p>On the 25th he arrived at Hyderabad then to Adoni and then to the Gooty Theosophical Society on Monday August 4th.</p> <p>On the 29th he arrived at Secunderabad and lectured that evening on “Theosophy and the Destiny of India” and the next evening on “Is There A Soul in Man?”, both at Mahaboob College.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, Sep. 1884; pp.128-129</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.74-85</p>
Aug. 17, 1884	<p>“Special Orders of 1884.”</p> <p>Another Order from H.S. Olcott, this time from Elberfeld, Germany, adding to his previous one from London.</p> <p>“The following persons are hereby added to the American ‘Board of Control’ created by Special Order of the 13th of May 1884: — Professor Elliott Coues, M.D., Ph.D., F.T.S., of Washington, D.C. [and] Mr. Mordecai D. Evans F.T.S., of Philadelphia, Pa.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, Oct. 1884; Supp. p.139</p>
Sep. 29, 1884	<p>The Madras Mail reports on Mr. Judge’s address to “some Madras students [which] bore the following testimony to Hindu philosophy: — The great Indian nation produced its Sanskrit. Great consideration was due to this language. It contains Philosophy as refined as Herbert Spencer’s and further it used language that Herbert Spencer could not understand. His very ideas were to be found in Indian philosophy elaborated to such an extent that Spencer would do well to throw his books into the sea and apply himself to the study of Hindu Philosophy.”</p>	<p>Theosophy Unveiled, p.58</p>
Nov. 10, 1884	<p>H.S. Olcott arrives in Bombay. He lectures at Framji Cowasji Hall on “Theosophy Abroad”. He arrived in Madras on the 15th.</p> <p>“He stopped at Poona on the way to consult Judge Khandalawala [N.D.K.] on the Coulomb problem and secured his support for his policy”.</p> <p>NOTE: N.D.K., Navroji Dorabji Khandalawala was a highly respected Judge and staunch friend of the Founders, especially Olcott and Blavatsky. “He was initiated into the Theosophical Society on March 9, 1880, and later became President of the Poona Branch of the T.S.”</p>	<p>Ransom, p.204</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 9, p.78</p>
Nov. 16, 1884	<p>“THEOSOPHY ABROAD”</p> <p>“Colonel H.S. Olcott, President-Founder of the Theosophical Society, delivered a lecture on Sunday evening in Patcheappah’s Hall, on ‘Theosophy Abroad’ .”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 6, Dec. 1884; Supp. pp.158-159</p>
Nov. 17, 1884	<p>After Olcott’s arrival at Adyar on the 15th, he dissolved the Board of Control, which had been formed by Special Orders of Jan. 21st and Feb. 19th, 1884 and resumed the executive management of the Society.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 6, Dec. 1884; Supp. p.162</p>

Nov. 26 1884	<p>W.Q. Judge arrives in New York on board the British steamer <i>SS. Wisconsin</i>, which had left Liverpool on Nov. 15th.</p> <p>NOTE: Judge sailed for the U.S.A. from Liverpool on Nov. 15, 1884.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol.1, p.476</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 20, Apr. 1939; p.35</p>
Dec. 21, 1884	<p>On Dec. 1st Olcott and Hartmann leave Adyar and sail to Colombo, Ceylon to meet H.P.B., C.W. Leadbeater, and Mr. and Mrs. Cooper-Oakley and return to Adyar with H.P.B and party on Dec. 21st aboard the S.S. Navarino.</p>	<p>Hammer on the Mountain, p.329</p> <p>Vania, pp.242-244</p>
Dec. 27-31, 1884	<p>“IMPORTANT ACCESSIONS TO THE HEAD-QUARTERS STAFF.”</p> <p>H.S. Olcott in his report about Head-quarters staff mentions that “Mr. W.Q. Judge, a founder of the Parent Society” had been there at Adyar temporarily.</p>	<p>Official Report of the Ninth Anniversary at Madras, 1884, p.17</p>
Dec. 27-31, 1884 continued	<p>“<i>Committee’s Report.</i>”</p> <p>“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 <i>Christian College Magazine</i>, a sectarian paper published at Madras under the auspices of the Scotch Free Church Mission. In this Madame Blavatsky was denounced as being an imposter 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. . . .</p> <p>“<i>Resolved:</i> . . . it is the unanimous opinion of this Committee that Madame Blavatsky should not prosecute her defamers in a Court of law.”</p> <p>Signed by the members of the Committee: Narandro Nath Sen, Chairman; Franz Hartmann, M.D.; S. Ramasawmier; Navaraji [or Navroji] Dorabji Khandalawalla, B.A., L.L.B.; H.R. Morgan, Major-General; Gyanenedra 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.</p> <p>The reasons which led the Committee to adopt this resolution are then listed.</p>	<p>Report of Investigation, pp.3-4</p> <p>Official Report of the Ninth Anniversary at Madras, 1884, pp.99-106</p>
Mar. 31, 1885 Würzburg	<p>H.P. Blavatsky leaves India never to return.</p> <p>“She was accompanied by Dr. Franz Hartmann, . . . a Hindu disciple, Dharbagiri Nath, known also as S. Krishnamachari and ‘Bawajee’; and Miss Mary Flynn. She sailed for Colombo, Ceylon, on the <i>SS Tibre</i> of the Messageries Co., and thence for Europe on the <i>SS Pei Ho</i>. She landed in Naples, and settled for a while in Torre del Greco; after a few months, she left for Wurzburg, Germany.”</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 6, pp.410-411</p> <p>Theosophia, Vol. 5, Nov.-Dec. 1948; p.12</p>

<p>May 1, 1885</p>	<p>“Letter from H.P. Blavatsky to W.Q. Judge (1 May 1885)” From Naples, Torre del Greco. In this letter she reveals to Judge the true nature of Dr. Franz Hartmann. “I say he has two <u>men in him</u>. One highly intellectual, fit for an occultist, a man of the highest intention, the other cunning, lying, possessed by a <u>Dugpa</u>, in short. There is no reliance to be placed upon him. Today he is <u>apparently</u> a friend, an hour later he coolly damns you with one of his infernally cunning lies. . . . [N]o one ought to trust him. “Thus he spoilt all and ruined the Society.” She spares no criticism of Judge claiming that he was “deceived & bamboozled . . .by . . . our witty Dr. Hartmann!” and that the reason Judge left Adyar before Colonel Olcott and herself had returned on December 21, 1884 was “because <u>he wanted to get rid of you</u> — (<u>sic</u>, these are his words). . . .”</p>	<p>Theos. History, Vol. 5, No. 2, Apr. 1994; pp.48-58</p>
<p>May 16, 1885</p>	<p>“The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to W.Q. Judge: Epilogue, Letter from W.Q. Judge to H.P. Blavatsky, May 16, 1885.” Letter from W.Q. Judge to H.P.B. Judge dispels H.P.B.’s concerns. “My first surmise was correct. He [Hartmann] seemed bad and dangerous, but I was lulled by letters from Masters he had received in which he was commended and I was foolish enough to give him confidentially, some analyses of your character which I had better have kept to myself <u>but I was no worse than Olcott</u>. . . . “I did not leave India because I got a message from a Mahatma. <u>I never got any messages from any Mahatma either pretended or real while I was in India. That</u> disposes of Hartmann. He couldn’t fool me with anything. . . . If H.S.O. had not been so nearly[?] there I would not have left. But I had decided long before and only waited this long so that Hartmann should have no time to do any damage. I was therefor right. . . . “I tell you neither you, nor Olcott, nor [Laura] Holloway, nor deceit, nor trick, nor message, nor devil, nor Hartmann, had anything to do with my departure from India. . . . “I am as staunch a friend as ever. I thank you for your belief in me.” Judge finishes his letter by saying: “I have made a contract for six months expiring Oct. next or before, to work here in a law office. After that I know not what; and care not.” NOTE: Josephine Ransom explains that Judge “was ill and restless” at Adyar. She also says that “He and Hartmann did not readily get on together.” [See July 15, 1884 entry.]</p>	<p>Theos. History, Vol. 6, No. 5, Jan. 1997; pp.164-166</p> <p>A Short History of the T.S., p.203</p>
<p>Feb. 5, 1886 Würzburg</p>	<p>Letter from W.Q. Judge to H.P.B. in Würzburg, Germany. Mr. Judge, in writing on the Hodgson Report, refers to letters from Master which he has received. “Then as to letters from ^ you know I have many that came to me which <i>resemble my writing</i>. How will they explain that? Did I delude myself? And so on.” Mr. Judge also asked H.P.B. to explain the meaning of a message he had received, through her, from the Master where the Master stated: “I ‘showed intuition by leaving India’? If you do not care to bother with [it], it will not make any difference.”</p>	<p>LBS, pp.313-314</p>

<p>Mar. 11, 1886</p>	<p>“THE SO-CALLED EXPOSÉ OF MADAME BLAVATSKY”</p> <p>Judge wrote this article for the Boston Index, regarding the fact that while he was in India in 1884 he had not been interviewed by Mr. Hodgson, the investigator on theosophical phenomena for the Psychical Research Society. In this article he stated: “[I]f an adept wanted to write to you, the curious circumstance might be found that the writing would resemble your own. I once saw a message thrown upon the leaf of a book; and it was in the handwriting of him holding it, who was as much amazed as any one else. . . .</p> <p>“. . . I received in Paris several letters from American friends, ignorant of adepts; and inside were pencilled notes in the familiar handwriting which Hodgson has exploded and proved ‘fraudulent’.”</p> <p>NOTE: Judge sent his article to H.P. Blavatsky on Feb. 5, 1886 while she was in Europe. The article also appeared in the Banner of Light in its April 3rd issue.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 35, Jan. 1947; pp.107-109</p>
<p>Apr. 1886</p>	<p>First issue of The Path, “a magazine devoted to the Brotherhood of humanity, Theosophy in America and the study of Occult Science, Philosophy and Aryan Literature, edited by W.Q. Judge, published under the auspices of the Aryan Theosophical Society of New York.”</p> <p>Book review of The Path in The Theosophist.</p> <p>“The first number (April) of this magazine has just reached us and promises well for the future. . . .</p> <p>“The fact that it is edited by Mr. William Q. Judge is in itself a guarantee that the present standard of excellence will be fully kept up, and the magazine bids fair to be a most important factor in helping on the spread of those truths which the Theosophical Society has been the means of once more bringing before the attention of Mankind.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 7, June 1886; pp.604-605</p>
<p>Apr. 1886 continued</p>	<p>One year later, in her letter from Ostende, Belgium, dated March 19, 1887, H.P.B. wrote to Judge:</p> <p>“He <u>who does all & the best he can & knows how</u> — does <u>enough</u> for them. This is <u>a message</u> for you. Your ‘Path’ begins to beat the <u>Theosophist</u> out of sight. It is most excellent. . . . The Path alone is <u>your certificate</u> for you in Theosophy.”</p> <p>NOTE: The passage “This is a message for you” seems to imply that the message is not hers but rather a message from the Masters for him.</p> <p>In another letter from H.P. Blavatsky to W.Q. Judge she stated:</p> <p>“If I thought <i>for one moment</i> that <i>Lucifer</i> will ‘rub out’ <i>Path</i> I would never consent to be the editor. But listen, then, my good old friend. Once the Masters have proclaimed your <i>Path</i> the <i>best</i>, the most <i>theosophical</i> of all theosophical publications, surely it is not to allow it to be rubbed out. . . . One is the fighting, combative Manas; the other (<i>Path</i>) is pure Buddhi. . . . <i>Lucifer</i> will be Theosophy militant and <i>Path</i> the shining light, the Star of Peace. If your intuition does not whisper to you ‘IT IS SO,’ then that intuition must be wool-gathering. No, sir, the <i>Path</i> is too well, too <i>theosophically</i> edited for me to interfere.”</p>	<p>Theos. History, Vol. 5, No. 4, Oct. 1994; pp.125-127</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, June 1895; p.156</p>

Apr. 27, 1886	<p>Letter from W.Q. Judge to H.S. Olcott.</p> <p>“I write to you about an important matter concerning the Board of Control. . . .</p> <p>“When you created the A B of C [American Board of Control] in 1884 it did not have E. Coues upon it. You added him after. I suggested Cables as Secy and Page as Presid^t. They so decided and remained till July ‘85. Coues came back here highly recommended by you. They met in 1885 while I was here and Coues became Pres^t. and Page Secy — Cables remaining a simple member. Certainly the Board’s functions are only administrative and Executive — a small copy of the Council. I did not care to be on the Board satisfied to work unceasingly on the lines we so well understand, and satisfied with you, that any dogmas and mystery are dangerous. . . .</p> <p>“Buck, Cables, Page, Doubleday and the rest are all right. As good as gold; but if this Coues stays in it – especially at its head, he will wreck the whole movement, by means of dessension, jesuitical practises, phenomenalism and all sorts of folly, as you will see. Personally I <i>am convinced he is a jesuit agent and has worked to that end.</i>”</p> <p>Judge also wrote: “I have demanded, privately, from C[oues] his resignation from the Board. . . .” and that Coues was promoting “secrets”, “astral body business, bells etc etc. . . . Not a word of philosophy. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: Judge was proven correct about Coues. Elliott Coues became very troublesome to the T.S. and especially Madame Blavatsky. For references to works on, and by Coues see Theosophy in the Nineteenth Century An Annotated Bibliography [T.N.C.A.B.] by Michael Gomes, pp.528-534.</p>	Practical Occultism , pp.16-20
May 1886	<p>Reply by Judge to a question regarding the authenticity of letters signed “K.H.” received by certain theosophists.</p> <p>“He also said that a disciple of the adepts, whom he met in India, assured him that those Beings must not be held so cheap as they have been made by some, and the disciple (an accepted chela) declared that he would sooner cut off his hand than send a pretended message, referring also at the time, to the well known rule in occultism that any occultist, student or adept, who directly by pretended messages or phenomena, or indirectly by mysterious assumptions or small deceptions, pretends to have <i>siddhis</i> (powers), or otherwise attempts to convey the idea that he has made progress in the secrets of occultism, thereby at once forfeits his progress and throws himself far back.”</p>	Abridgement of Discussions , No.2
June 1886	<p>“In reviewing the situation in America, Judge realized that a radical change was needed in the administration of the Society, if it were to make any headway. Consequently, he wrote to H.P.B. and Olcott suggesting that an American Section be formed. This was done in June 1886, with Judge elected as permanent General Secretary. The new Section soon prospered under his leadership and new branches were chartered all over the country.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Judge’s “Report of The General Secretary” in Report of Proceedings, 1888, p.7.</p>	<p>WQJ T. Pioneer, p.13</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, p.xxvii</p> <p>Report of Proceedings, 1888</p>

<p>June 3, 1886</p>	<p>In a letter to Madam Louise A. Off, Judge commented to her of “the complicated ‘Wants’ of our civilization [which] compel . . . the larger number of our members to live externally as the world does.” He also indicated what his position was regarding how the Society should be promoted: “The Masters have said in writing and everybody will soon be convinced that the Society and its work must prosper on its moral and philosophical strength and not by phenomena.”</p>	<p>Practical Occultism, pp.32-37</p>
<p>June 6, 1886</p>	<p>The “Council of the T. S. meets at Adyar and approves Olcott’s recommendation to the effect that the American Board of Control should be re-organized as a General Council of the Society in America. Charter granted to the American Section, William Quan Judge elected permanent General Secretary and Treasurer.” NOTE: See The Theosophist, Vol. 8, Jan. 1887, Supp., p.xxxii. NOTE: There is an interesting comment by Olcott in his Old Diary Leaves where he stated: “. . . I got the Council to agree to dissolve the American Board of Control and replace it by a sectional form of organization, based on purely republican lines, and having in itself the elements of stability.” NOTE: Which does Olcott want a section or a republic? A republic has its own President elected by its people and is not subservient to any other.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 7, p.xxvi Old Diary Leaves, Third Series, p.364 A Short History of the T.S., p.237 The Theosophist, Vol. 8, Jan. 1887; Supp. p.xxxii</p>
<p>July 1886</p>	<p>A Convention of the American Board of Control was held at Rochester New York where “various matters relating to admission of members and other details of organization were discussed.” Madame Blavatsky “had cabled to Judge to abolish the Board and make a central head”. Olcott in his Old Diary Leaves stated that Blavatsky had written to Judge. He wrote: “The Overland mail of August 12th brought me the consoling news that (of course without the shadow of constitutional authority) she had cabled our people in New York to dissolve the American Board of Control — to pacify Coues, I presume — and she also offered to turn over her share of the <i>Theosophist</i> to Judge and make him her successor (one of two or three dozens).” [As it turns out, it was <i>not</i> Blavatsky who sent that telegram to the American Board of Control. See next cell for more details.] NOTE: See July 27, 1886 and Oct. 30, 1886 entries.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 8, Jan. 1887; Supp. p.xxxii A Short History of the T.S., p.237 Old Diary Leaves, Third Series, p.379</p>

July 1886 continued	<p>While in Elberfeld H.P.B. stayed with the Gebhard family. They had some business interests in America which their son, Arthur, looked after for them. (Blavatsky had commented to Judge to keep in touch with the Gebhard's son as she was fond of him.) Arthur, who was back from America visited Blavatsky in Ostende. It was at this time that "[Arthur] sent a terse telegram to the American Board of Control in July on the eve of their annual meeting in her name advising them to abolish the Board. (Blavatsky gives her own version of this message in a letter to Elliott Coues . . . which was published in The Canadian Theosophist," Nov./Dec. 1984)"</p> <p>Blavatsky also wrote to Arthur Gebhard on July 13th from Ostende. This letter is reprinted in The Theosophical Forum (New Series) Vol. 5, Dec. 1933, pp.107-108.</p> <p>NOTE: In a letter dated May 28, 1886, to Mrs. Waters, Mr. Judge commented: "Now that Arthur [Gebhard] is going away I am left so to say with no one to act near to me, and so perhaps my mind may be getting active."</p>	<p>Theos. History, Vol. 5, No. 3, July 1994; p.86.</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 65, pp.110-116</p> <p>Practical Occultism, p.27</p>
July 27, 1886	<p>H.P. Blavatsky wrote Mr. Judge; "<i>I know</i> that you could do a lot of good in India. <i>Take my place Judge</i>. You will make up in devotion what you lack in occult knowledge. I will give you my share of <i>The Theosophist</i> . . . Replace me at Adyar . . . Even if I am dead you can always get 10% from <i>The Secret Doctrine</i> and <i>The Theosophist</i>."</p>	<p>A Short History of the T.S., p.237</p>
Aug. 22, 1886	<p>Letter from H.P.B. to W.Q.J. from Ostende — Rue d'Ouest 17. Mme Blavatsky is very cross with Olcott. She wrote: "I hold to Masters' <i>original programe</i>, — he is fast running the Society into a Salvation Army business, with FUND & etc. The 'permanent Fund' humbug <i>must</i> cease. . . . Olcott will have to pay your Kali \$50 monthly & have you at Adyar or — I publicly renounce my connection with the Society since MASTERS original programme is departed from, which is — brotherhood <i>in act & deeds</i>, not in show of blue elephants, paraphernalia Boards of Control & flapdoodle generally. I wrote to him & put my <i>ultimatum</i>. I am tired of hearing him criticized, laughed at & <i>very justly</i> I am sorry to say."</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 5, Nov. 1933; pp.87-88</p>
Aug. 22, 1886 continued	<p>Mme. Blavatsky was also very concerned that she had not been getting her royalties for her Isis Unveiled from J.W. Bouton, her publisher in New York. In this same letter she asked Judge to contact Bouton and correct this problem. She wrote: "If the money is sent to Olcott I PROTEST. I am here, ISIS is mine I have enough lost on it let me have, at least, the little I can get. . . . At any rate say to Bouton that [if] he wants to have the Secret Doctrine he has to deal <i>directly</i> with me not with Olcott, or any one else."</p> <p>NOTE: In her Oct. 3rd, 1886 letter from Ostende, Mme. Blavatsky offers more details about her dealings with Bouton. [See Oct. 3, 1886 entry for references.]</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 5, Nov. 1933; pp.87-88</p>

Oct. 3, 1886	<p>Letter from H.P. Blavatsky (in Ostende) to W.Q. Judge: “The trouble with you is <i>that you do not know the great change</i> that came to pass in you a few years ago. Others have occasionally their <i>astrals</i> changed & replaced by those of Adepts (as of Elementaries) & they influence the <i>outer</i>, and the <i>higher</i> man. With you, it is the NIRMANAKAYA not the ‘astral’ that blended with your astral. Hence the dual nature & fighting.”</p> <p>NOTE: At time of publication in Theos. Forum, the original letter was in the Archives of the Theosophical Society, Point Loma, California.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 3, Aug. 1932; pp.251-253</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 7, p.138</p> <p>WQJ T. Pioneer, p.19</p> <p>Theosophia, Vol. 7, Mar.-Apr. 1951; p.7</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, p.xxxv</p>
Oct. 30, 1886	<p>During a Convention held at Cincinnati, “at the residence of Dr. J.D. Buck, there was a meeting of members of the American Board of Control and Presidents of American Branches. . . .</p> <p>“. . . the Convention voted to organize the American section of the General Council of the Theosophical Society, in succession to the late Board of Control. . . .</p> <p>“Mr. W.Q. Judge was, upon motion of Mr. E.B. Page, seconded by Dr. Buck, unanimously elected General Secretary and Treasurer.”</p> <p>“Judge was elected permanent General Secretary and Treasurer, the sole official of the American Section of the General Council of the Theosophical Society.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 8, Jan. 1887; Supp. p.lv</p> <p>A Short History of the T.S., p.237</p>
Mar. 19, 1887	<p>During the spring of 1887 while at Ostende, H.P.B. became gravely ill. Her kidneys were badly infected and she was unconscious for hours at a time.</p> <p>During this time she had received a message of kindness and sympathy from a well-wisher (not identified here), sent through W.Q. JUDGE, to which she took time to answer. “Having heard from my dear old W.Q. Judge how kindly disposed you are toward me, and having received from him several messages on your behalf, let me tell you how grateful I feel for your kind expression of sympathy.</p> <p>“Yes, the work has brought upon me contumely, ignominy of all kinds, hatred, malice and slander. Were it only from the outsiders I would mind very little. But, sad to say, it is the ‘Theosophists’ chiefly who tear me to pieces.”</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 7, p.301</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; pp.76-77</p>

<p>Mar. 19, 1887 continued</p>	<p>“The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to W.Q. Judge: Part III: Letter Dated 19 March 1887.” H.P.B. also wrote a letter to Judge from Ostende on the same day. This letter was to give advice on how to handle the emerging difficulties with the formation of the American Section of the T.S. In regards to independent branches, H.P.B. stated: “Let the Branches be all as free as every state is in America. . . . Make a rule that any fellow found out slandering another — be expelled after the second warning. Make the rules <i>strict</i> and foremost of. Let every one either peg out of the Society or — hold his tongue & mind his own business.” NOTE: This letter from H.P.B. likely contributed to Mr. Judge’s decision in issuing “By Master’s Direction”. [See Nov. 3, 1894 entry.]</p>	<p>Theos. History, Vol. 5, No. 4, Oct. 1994; pp.125-127</p>
<p>Apr. 24, 1887</p>	<p>“REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY, AMERICAN SECTION, THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.” In the report to the Thirteenth Convention and Anniversary of the T.S.,(held at Adyar, Dec. 1888) W.Q. Judge stated: “The first American Convention, subsequent to the dissolution of the Board of Control, was held in New York, April [24] 1887, and then a constitution was adopted under which we are now at work. That instrument declares autonomy and reiterates allegiance to the General Convention.” In the “MINUTES OF A CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN SECTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SECTION. Held at New York, <i>on Sunday</i>, April 24, 1887.” “A letter from the Cincinnati Theosophical Society was . . . read containing the following suggestions: “1st. That the Cincinnati Branch recommends a continuance of the present relations between the Parent Society and the American Section.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 10, General Report, p.24</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 8, July 1887; Supp. p.cvii</p>
<p>May 18. 1887</p>	<p>“The Esoteric Section” Letter from William Q. Judge to H.P.B. “Please reply to this. So many people are beginning to ask me to be Chelas that I must do something, so I have drawn up the enclosed paper which you can send me with some formalities on it as you think right to do so — or whatever I ought to have. If you do not think so, then please tell me in what way I had best proceed.” [See Judge’s draft paper in BCW 12, p.480.] NOTE: This “enclosed paper” drawn up by Mr. Judge was included in his E.S.T. circular entitled By Master’s Direction. See Nov. 3, 1894 entry.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 12, p. 479</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1925, pp.138- 140</p>

<p>Apr. 3, 1888</p>	<p>Letter from H.P.B. to W.Q.J., which she requested be read at the American Convention on Apr. 22nd:</p> <p>“My Dearest Brother and Co-Founder of the Theosophical Society: “We were several to call it to life in 1875. Since then <i>you have remained alone</i> to preserve that life through good and evil report. It is to you chiefly, if not entirely, that the Theosophical Society owes its existence in 1888. . . . [M]y voice is but the feeble echo of other more sacred voices, and the transmitter of the approval of Those whose presence is alive in more than one true Theosophical heart, and lives, as I know, pre-eminently in yours.”</p> <p>NOTE: Also reprinted in H.P. Blavatsky to the American Conventions, (TUP) 1979, p.3, and Five Messages from H.P. Blavatsky to the American Theosophists, 1922, p.3.</p>	<p>Letters That Have Helped Me, 1946 ed., pp.276-283</p>
<p>Apr. 4, 1888</p>	<p>A typewritten letter from H.P. Blavatsky to William Q. Judge, General Secretary of the American Section of the Theosophical Society, and first Vice-President of the Theosophical Publication Society.</p> <p>“Dear Sir and Brother,</p> <p>I hereby grant to you as agent for the Theosophical Publication Society the exclusive right to print and publish all or any part of my forth-coming work entitled ‘THE SECRET DOCTRINE’ during the whole term of the copyright in the same; reserving to myself one half of the net profits accruing from the said work, on account of which profits the sum of £10 [ten pounds] per month shall be paid to me in advance out of the funds of the Theosophical Publication Society, beginning six weeks after the date of publication; any further balance due to me to be paid from time to time as may be agreed on between us; the other half of the net profits to be for the use and benefit of the Theosophical Publication Society.</p> <p>I further agree to confirm this letter by a formal agreement to the same effect whenever called upon to do so by you or by any other authorized agent of the Theosophical Publication Society.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">H.P. Blavatsky ^ ”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">[Blavatsky’s signature is in purple ink.]</p> <p>On the letter there is a note written and signed in pencil by W.Q. Judge.</p> <p>“The £10. monthly is only suggestion as I propose to pay her a royalty which is better & not burdensome</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Judge”</p> <p>NOTE: See March 9, 1890 for another notice from Blavatsky.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 5, Dec. 1933; p.108</p>

<p>Aug. 22, 1888</p>	<p>Letter from Master K.H. to Olcott received on board <i>S.S. Shannon</i> the day before reaching Brindisi. [See NOTE] “Since 1885 I have not written, nor caused to be written, save through her [H.P.B.’s] agency, direct or remote, a letter or a line to anybody in Europe or America, nor communicated orally with, or thro’ any third party. Theosophists should learn it. You will understand later the significance of this declaration, so keep it in mind.”</p> <p>Part of K.H.’s letter to Olcott is quoted in the October 1888 issue of Lucifer.</p> <p>NOTE: According to the records of Lloyd’s of London, the steamer arrived in Brindisi August 23rd, at 7:30 a.m., leaving for London an hour later.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 10, pp.xxiv-xxv</p> <p>Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom, 1st series, 1919, 1st ed., pp.52-53</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 3, Oct. 1888, pp.146-147</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Feb. 1922; p.103</p>
<p>Oct. 9, 1888</p>	<p>“THE ESOTERIC SECTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.” The Esoteric Section was formed by an order, from H.S. Olcott. Attest: — H.P. Blavatsky.</p> <p>“Owing to the fact that a large number of Fellows of the Society have felt the necessity for the formation of a body of Esoteric students, to be organised on the ORIGINAL LINES devised by the <i>real</i> founders of the T.S., the following order has been issued by the President-Founder: — . . .”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 3, Oct. 1888; p.176</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 12, p.481</p> <p>Theos. History, Vol. 6, No. 1, Jan. 1996; p.11</p>
<p>Oct. 19, 1888</p>	<p>“British Section of the T.S.” Included in “Theosophical Activities” in the “EUROPE” segment is a report regarding the newly formed British Section of the T.S. “The only observable difference between this and the American Section is that we declared ourselves autonomous, and at the same time announced our adherence and fidelity to the Indian Council, reserving to ourselves the right to manage our own affairs in accordance with the general rules. However, the English and the American mind differ in method, but the general idea under the new arrangement is the same as ours.”</p> <p>“The adjourned meeting was held at Conduit Street on October 19th, Col. Olcott in the chair.” Dr. Archibald Keightley was elected General Secretary <i>pro tem</i>. The Meeting had been adjourned on October 8th.</p> <p>NOTE: See April 24, 1887 entry on “autonomy”.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 3, Nov. 1888; p.263</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol 3, Nov. 1888; pp.260-263</p> <p>The T.S., 4 pages</p>

Nov. 15, 1888	<p>Col. Olcott, who had left London on Oct. 22nd, reached Adyar with his party of friends. The party included Charles and Vera V. Johnston, Richard Harte of New York, Mr. E. Douglas Fawcett and Baroness Kroummess.</p> <p>NOTE: Richard Harte, a member of the Society since 1877, was an old friend of the Founders from New York where he had been on the staff of the New York Telegram. Col. Olcott needed Harte's journalistic experience at Adyar, as acting Editor, to replace Alfred J. Cooper-Oakley who had resigned on April 1st. (He had edited Vols. VI, VII, VIII, and part of IX.) While Olcott was away in Europe he had asked Mr. C.W. Leadbeater, whom he had recalled from Ceylon, to fill in as temporary editor of The Theosophist.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 10, Dec. 1888, Supp. pp.xxvii-xxviii</p> <p>Old Diary Leaves, Fourth series, p.68</p>
Nov 27, 1888	<p>W.Q. Judge and Dr. Keightley visit Dublin Lodge. [Mr. Judge was in Europe on E.S. matters.]</p> <p>[From "A REMINISCENCE."] W.Q. Judge's message to the Dublin Lodge: "The first and the <i>vital</i> object of the Society was the establishment of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity." "Dr. Keightley, in the course of his remarks, said: . . . he was glad to see that Dublin Lodge had recognized the fact by placing the notable quotation from Lucifer (November 1887) — which was the utterance of a Master — upon its walls. ['He who does not practise altruism; he who is not prepared to share his last morsel with a weaker or poorer than himself; he who neglects to help his brother man, of whatever race, nation or creed, whenever and wherever he meets suffering, and who turns a deaf ear to the cry of human misery; he who hears an innocent person slandered, whether a brother Theosophist or not, and does not undertake his defence as he would undertake his own — is no Theosophist.'] It was necessary to remember that we should be absolutely united in the furtherance of such principles as were contained in that utterance."</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 3, Mar. 1889; p.393</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; pp.79-81</p>
Dec. 1888	<p>Comments by Dr. Archibald Keightley acknowledging that Judge wrote The Book of Rules of the E.S.T. and that he and Mr. Hargrove: "[H]ave both seen the original manuscript in Mr. Judge's handwriting, with written additions in H.P.B.'s handwriting. This manuscript is in the possession of Mr. Judge. H.P.B. further told me that 'all the Instructions should be studied in the light of <i>The Book of Rules</i>.' I have seen letters from H.P.B. to Mr. Judge which show that he originated the idea of E.S.T." [Issued as a Circular dated January 12, 1895]</p> <p>"Judge was in Dublin, Ireland and . . . went from there to London and assisted H.P.B. in the formation of the Esoteric Section."</p>	<p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1; p.xxxii</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 12, p.484</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 1, p.479</p>

Dec. 14, 1888	<p>In certain official documents H.P.B. is quoted as describing W.Q. Judge “as being then ‘a chela of thirteen years standing, with trust reposed in him,’ and ‘the chief and sole agent of the Dzyan (Lodge) in America’.”</p> <p>Special order by H.P. BLAVATSKY. “As head of the Esoteric Section of the Theosophical Society, I hereby declare that William Q. Judge, of New York, U.S., in virtue of his character as a chela of thirteen years standing, and of the trust and confidence reposed in him, is my only representative for said section in America, and he is the sole channel through whom will be sent and received all communications between the members of said Section and myself, and to him full faith, confidence and credit in that regard are to be given, Done at London this the fourteenth day of December, 1888, and in the fourteenth year of the Theosophical Society. ” [Signed and sealed by] H.P. Blavatsky</p> <p>NOTE: This appointment by H.P.B. was reprinted by Annie Besant and W.Q. JUDGE in an E.S.T. circular, To All Members of the E.S.T., from the Eastern School of Theosophy, May 27, 1891; 8pp., London. [See May 27, 1891.]</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 4; May 1896; pp.142-143</p> <p>Theos. or Neo-Theos., p.58</p> <p>Theos. History, Vol. 6, No. 1, Jan. 1996; p.12</p> <p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, pp.84-85</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, Apr. 1915; p.275</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. I, p.xxxii</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.159</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 1; p.479</p>
Dec. 14, 1888 continued	<p>Facsimile of H.P.B.’s “special order appointing JUDGE as her ‘only representative for said Section in America’ and as ‘the sole channel through whom will be sent and received all communications between the members of said Section and myself [H.P.B.]’ and she did so ‘in virtue of his character as a chela of thirteen years standing’.”</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 10; pp.194-195</p> <p>WQJ T. Pioneer p.17</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 25, No. 12, Dec. 1947; [facing p.641]</p>
Dec.27-29, 1888	<p>Thirteenth Convention and Anniversary of the T.S. Early report from Adyar that W.Q. JUDGE “has been selected as Vice President”.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 3, Feb. 1889; p.362</p>

Jan. 7, 1889	<p>Before Col. Olcott left for his trip to Japan he issued a number of orders on this date. One such order was to appoint three Commissioners with the power to represent him while he was absent. The Order stated: “I hereby delegate to the undernamed persons, jointly and severally, under the Rules of the Society, the Custody and Management of the Head-Quarters, and of the Correspondence and Funds of the Society, and of the Organization of the New Sections, and, generally, to exercise my Executive Functions in my name and on my behalf. Namely, to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Dewan Bahadur R. Ragoonath [Ragunatha] Row Dewan Bahadur P. Sreenevasa [Srinevasa] Row Mr. Richard Harte.”</p>	<p>General Report of the 13th Anniversary of the T.S. Dec. 1888; p.67</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 10, Feb. 1889; Supp. pp.xxxix-xl</p> <p>Apr. 1889; Supp. p.lxv</p>
Jan. 10, 1889	<p>“The President’s Japanese Tour.”</p> <p>“Colonel Olcott sailed for Ceylon in the <i>Clan Macpherson</i> on the 10th January, and took the French Mail Steamer for Japan on the 17th.”</p> <p>Col. Olcott returned to Adyar on July 11th, 1889.</p> <p>NOTE: This was Col. Olcott’s first tour of Japan and he had taken Mr. Dharmapala Hevanitarana with him as his companion.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 10, Feb. 1889; Supp. pp.xxxvii-xxxviii</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 10, Aug. 1889; Supp. p.cxlv</p>
End of March 1889	<p>Madame Blavatsky invited Cheiro [pseudonym for Count Louis Hamon] to come for a visit. On his second visit, the next day, she asked him to read her palm. She said, “I want to have some of my own theories confirmed. Nothing you can say will be of any shock to me. Perhaps it will be of help to me. Under such conditions will you not make the effort?”</p> <p>Cheiro re-counts, “Picking up a pencil she pointed to where the Line of Health appeared to cut through the Line of Life. ‘That is the end,’ she said, ‘but give me the exact year, or at least as near as you can’.”</p> <p>After the reading Mme. Blavatsky thanked him and said, “Your warning will do me good, for I will now put my papers in order and prepare in earnest for the short time that lies before me.”</p> <p>NOTE: From this episode, one would expect that Mme. Blavatsky would have written another Will and Testament.</p>	<p>Greatest Occultists by Cheiro, pp.170-180</p>

<p>May 10, 1889</p>	<p>In a lecture at the Convention of the Theosophical Society, Charles Johnston, who married H.P.B.'s niece in late summer of 1888, stated: "Mrs. Besant joined the Society, I believe, on May 10 of that year. . . . But Mrs. Besant's close contact with Mme. Blavatsky began only in the early summer of 1890, ten months before Mme. Blavatsky's death; and of these ten months Mrs. Besant was absent from London for two or three months*, lecturing in this country, and was in fact absent at the time of Mme. Blavatsky's death."</p> <p>* Annie Besant left Liverpool on April 1st, 1891 for New York therefore she was gone for 5 or 6 weeks.</p> <p>"Mrs. Annie Besant joined the Theosophical Society in 1889 and became a pledged member of the Esoteric Section."</p> <p>NOTE: also in: H.P.B. and The Present Crisis in The Theosophical Society, by Constance Wachtmeister</p> <p>NOTE: According to "A Besant Diary of Principal Events" Annie Besant met Blavatsky on May 10th, 1889, but she actually joined the Theosophical Society on May 21st.</p>	<p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol.24, July 1926, p.14</p> <p>Borderland, Vol.1, Oct. 1893; p.175</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, May 1915; p.323</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.156-157</p> <p>Pamphlet, 1894, (12 pages); p.4</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 69, Oct. 1947; p.85</p>
<p>June 1889</p>	<p>"Centres of The Theosophical Movement"</p> <p>In 1889, Mr. Judge submitted an article to The Theosophist under the above title which was withheld from publication by Col. H.S. Olcott for reasons set forth in an article of the same name which was published in the September issue.</p> <p>"My friend and colleague and co-Founder of the Society, Mr. William Q. Judge, has sent me a long article taking exception to certain ideas embodied in two articles which appeared in June <i>Theosophist</i>. They are respectively entitled 'Applied Theosophy,' and 'The Situation.' The criticism of Mr. Judge is marked by his usual force and directness, but at the same time contains passages of far too personal character for me to admit them."</p> <p>Mr. Judge's article, was published "as originally submitted, from a copy of the original which is preserved in the Covina T.S. Archives".</p> <p>NOTE: Olcott was away from Jan. to July 1889. See Jan. 10, 1889 entry.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 10, Sep. 1889; pp.703-710</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 38, July 1950; pp.385-391</p>

<p>June 1889 continued</p>	<p>“<i>APPLIED THEOSOPHY.</i>” by Richard Harte. Judge criticised this article in “Centres of The Theosophical Movement”. One of the statements he objected to was: “‘Adyar’ is not a place only, it is a principle. It is a name which ought to carry with it a power far greater than that conveyed by the name ‘Rome’. Adyar is the centre of the Theosophical Movement . . . Every loyal Fellow has in his heart a little ADYAR, for he has in him a spark of the spiritual fire which the name typifies. ADYAR is the symbol of our unity as a Society, and so long as it exists in the hearts of its Fellows, the power of the enemy can never prevail against the Theosophical Society.”</p> <p>NOTE: This unsigned editorial has been attributed to Col. Olcott* but was written by Richard Harte who was acting editor while Col. Olcott was away in Japan. In his article “Centres of The Theosophical Movement” Col. Olcott stated, regarding the article “<i>APPLIED THEOSOPHY</i>”: “Reading the article now for the first time, what I see is that the writer meant to imply that our movement should have an ideal as well as an executive centre. . . .” He further stated: “I know the writer in question to be a man as loyal to the core as Mr. Judge or myself to the Theosophical cause, its projectors, and their agents.”</p> <p>* [<i>APPLIED THEOSOPHY</i> was republished as an Adyar Pamphlet No. 143 in Nov. 1930 and in a book titled Applied Theosophy and Other Essays, by The Theosophical Publishing House, (1975) and credited to Col. Olcott. It was also republished in The American Theosophist, June 1981, and again wrongfully credited to Olcott.]</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 15, 1889.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 10, June 1889; pp.515-524</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 10, Sep. 1889; p.704</p>
<p>June 1889 continued</p>	<p>“<i>THE SITUATION.</i>” Judge also criticised this article in “Centres of The Theosophical Movement”. He claimed that this article was “intended to support and enforce the first”.</p> <p>NOTE: This article was written by “F.T.S.”, who was Richard Harte.</p> <p>NOTE: See May/June 1989 entry for “DID THE ‘JUDGE CASE’ BEGIN WHILE H.P.B. WAS ALIVE?”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 10, June 1889; pp.565-568</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 38, July 1950; pp.385-391</p>

<p>Aug. 15, 1889</p>	<p>“A PUZZLE FROM ADYAR.”</p> <p>H.P.B. charges the <i>acting</i> editor (Richard Harte) of the Theosophist of “abnormal fancies” and defends herself. Commenting on extracts from Bertram Keightley’s letter (to one of the Commissioners) which were published in The Theosophist as “A <i>Disclaimer</i>” H.P.B. wrote:</p> <p>“1st. The Esoteric Section . . . is a Section entirely apart from the exoteric body, and independent of it. . . .</p> <p>“2nd. It is pure nonsense to say that ‘H.P.B. . . . is loyal to the Theosophical Society and to <i>Adyar</i>’ (!?).’ H.P.B. <i>is loyal to death to the Theosophical CAUSE, and those great Teachers whose philosophy can alone bind the whole of Humanity into one Brotherhood. . . .</i>[T]he degree of her sympathies with the ‘Theosophical Society and <i>Adyar</i>’ depends upon the degree of the loyalty of that Society to the CAUSE. Let it break away from the original lines and show disloyalty in its policy to the CAUSE and the original programme of the Society, and H. P. B. calling the T. S. <i>disloyal</i>, will shake it off like dust from her feet.”</p> <p>Continuing on the subject of “loyalty to <i>Adyar</i>” H.P.B. made the following important statement:</p> <p>“Why not loyal to the compound or the bath-room of <i>Adyar</i>? . . . There is no longer a ‘Parent Society’; it is abolished and replaced by an aggregate body of the Theosophical Societies, <i>all autonomous</i>, as are the States of America, and all under one Head-President, who, together with H.P. Blavatsky, will champion the CAUSE against the whole world. Such is the real state of things.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 4, Aug. 1889; pp.506-509</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 11, pp.378-384</p>
<p>Aug. 26, 1889</p>	<p>Letter from Richard Harte to H.P.B. from <i>Adyar</i>, Madras. Harte “rather condescendingly describes what he interprets to be the effects of ‘pledge fever’ upon Judge, and thinks that ‘bringing to focus the karma of such a good man as Judge’ has been ‘to confuse all his ideas of right and wrong, loyalty and rebellion, truth and falsehood’ .”</p>	<p>WQJ T. Pioneer p.23</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 5, Jan. 1934; pp.130-131</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, p.xli</p>

<p>Sep. 12, 1889</p>	<p>H.P.B. replied to R. Harte. “Nevertheless your wicked and untheosophical denunciation of Judge, which is as false as it is untheosophical falls flat again in its application to the E.S. Judge has never pledged himself, never signed anything; for as in the case of Olcott, my confidence in him is sufficient to trust him without any Pledges. The numerous letters I receive from really good theosophists such as Buck, Mrs. Ver Planck, do not show their ‘disgust’ for Judge. But they show me most decidedly from your tactless writings in the Theosophist and the showers of letters you inundate them with. If the American Section breaks with Adyar it will be your doing. . . . “. . . The Theosophist my dear sir, belongs to myself and Olcott only. It is not the organ of Adyar or the T.S. and you have no right to depart in it from our policy, or make of it your private dustbin to be filled with your liver and spleen purgations. I will not permit Judge to be lowered or humiliated in it. Judge is one of the Founders and a man who has ever been true to the Masters. . . . And <i>Judge will be the President of the T.S. after our death</i> or the T.S. will die with us.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix B for Judge’s E.S.T. circular, By Masters Direction, where he states that his pledge was to the Masters direct.</p>	<p>WQJ T. Pioneer, pp.23-24</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 5, Jan. 1934; pp.132-133</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, p.xli</p>
<p>Sep. 15, 1889</p>	<p>“WHY I BECAME A THEOSOPHIST.” Annie Besant answers questions following her lecture on the subject.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 5, Sep. 1889; pp.47-53</p>
<p>Oct. 1889</p>	<p>“INCORPORATION.” “Mr. William Q. Judge, Genl. Secy. of the American Section, wrote lately that he and some of the other leading Fellows had determined to incorporate the T.S. in America, and that this step had been already taken in some of the States. . . . The Society, or a society called ‘The Theosophical Society and Universal Brotherhood.’ had then actually been thus incorporated in the States of New York and Missouri; no further information however has been received at Head-quarters, and we cannot inform our readers . . . whether the Founders have been placed on the list of incorporators, Mr. Judge holding, we believe, the power of attorney of both of them.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 11, Oct. 1889; Supp. p.v</p>

<p>Oct. 23, 1889</p>	<p>H.P.B. wrote a private letter to W.Q. Judge (who had considered withdrawing from his position as her agent): “H.P.B. would give 7 dozens of Bridges, 77 dozens of Noyeses and the whole esoteric brood in the U.S.A. for one W.Q.J. <i>who is part of herself since several aeons.</i> . . . The Esoteric Section and its life in the U.S.A. depends on W.Q.J. remaining its agent & what he is now. The day W.Q.J. resigns, H.P.B. will be virtually dead for the Americans. W.Q.J. is the <i>Antaskarana</i> [‘the bridge’, ‘the link’] between the two <i>Manas(es)</i> the American thought & the Indian—or rather the trans-Himalayan Esoteric Knowledge.</p> <p>DIXI H.P.B. ^ PS. W.Q.J. had better show, & impress <i>this</i> on the mind of <i>all those whom it may concern</i> H.P.B.”</p> <p>NOTE: Theosophia includes a reproduction of the original letter.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 3, June 1932; pp.192-193</p> <p>Theos. History, Vol. 6, No. 1, Jan. 1996; p.15</p> <p>Theosophia, Vol. 7, Mar.-Apr. 1951; pp.8-9</p> <p>Letters That Have Helped Me, pp.277-278</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, June 1915; pp.371-372</p>
<p>Dec. 25, 1889</p>	<p>“In 1889, Col. H.S. Olcott made a protracted visit to Europe, during which he saw H.P.B. for the last time. The day before he left London for Colombo, Lank~, she handed to him the following document: ‘I hereby appoint Colonel H.S. Olcott my confidential agent and sole official representative of the Esoteric Section for Asiatic countries. . . . (Signed) H.P. Blavatsky’.”</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 12, p.484</p>
<p>1890</p>	<p>“WHY I DO NOT RETURN TO INDIA.” Written to the Indian members of the Theosophical Society by H.P. Blavatsky, addressed “TO MY BROTHERS OF ÂRYÂVARTA”.</p> <p>“In Europe and America, during the last three years I have met with hundreds of men and women who have the courage to avow their conviction of the real existence of the Masters, and who are working for Theosophy on <i>Their</i> lines and under <i>Their</i> guidance, given through my humble self.</p> <p>“In India, on the other hand, ever since my departure, the true spirit of devotion to the Masters and the courage to avow it has steadily dwindled away.”</p> <p>NOTE: “WHY I DO NOT RETURN TO INDIA” was an “Open Letter” written in April 1890 by H.P.B. and “was sent to India by the intermediary of Bertram Keightley who left London for India, at H.P.B.’s special request, sometime in the Summer of 1890, reaching Bombay August 31, 1890.” This letter was not published in the Theosophist until January 1922 although it had been quoted by N.D. Khandalavala in his article “H.P. Blavatsky and Her Masters” (Theosophist Vol. 20, Oct. 1898, pp.23-24). Shortly after B. Keightley’s arrival in India, with the letter, Col. Olcott expressed that he wished to resign as President of the T.S. [See Oct 7, 1890.]</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 12, pp.156-167</p> <p>Theosophy Exposed, by J. Murdoch; p.35</p> <p>HPB Theos. Articles, pp.106-114</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 12, pp.156-157</p>

1890 continued	<p>“E.S. PRELIMINARY EXPLANATIONS TO NO. III OF THE INSTRUCTIONS.” In it H.P.B. warns the Members of the School to defend W.Q. Judge. “<i>I can always take care of myself personally</i>, and really need no one’s defence, though I shall feel always thankful to those who have offered it. But I mean by ‘helpers’ such as William Q. Judge; and I now call upon all those who will remain true to their pledges to do their duty by both, <i>when the time comes</i>. . . .”</p> <p>Speaking of difficulties in America at the time, H.P.B. added: “I shall illustrate the point by citing the case of W.Q. Judge. He is one of the three founders of the Theosophical Society, the only three who have remained as true as rock to the Cause. . . . “Brother Judge refuses to defend himself, even more than I have refused to defend myself after the Coulomb conspiracy. No man who knows himself innocent ever will. But is that a reason why <i>we</i> should let him go undefended?”</p> <p>Letter from H.P.B. Referring back to the comments made about Judge in the preliminary to the Third E.S. Instruction, H.P.B. wrote: “Let them read Master’s letter in the preliminary (to the Third Instructions). All that which I said about W.Q.J. was from HIS words in HIS letter to me. . . .”</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 12, pp.593-595</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, June 1915; pp.371-372</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, July 1915; p.417</p> <p>Letters That Have Helped Me - J.N.; pp.116-117</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 12, p.594</p>
Jan. 1890	<p>A series of articles on Theosophy started appearing in Kate Field’s Washington, beginning with the January number, under the title, “Echoes from the Orient”. The articles were signed “Occultus” a <i>nom de plume</i> adopted by W.Q. Judge at the suggestion of Miss Field. “They deal with Theosophy in a style which has attracted many people who never read our literature, and are at the same time full of information and sound Theosophy.”</p> <p>“We have read the ‘Echoes’ carefully and can fully recommend them to our readers as a clear, succinct and correct summary of Theosophical philosophy. We have never been able yet to satisfactorily express our admiration of the good work of W.Q.J. Words are too clumsy.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 7, Sep. 1890, p.86</p>
Jan. 1890 continued	<p>“MUDDLED RULE-MAKERS.” Richard Harte, acting editor for The Theosophist while Col. Olcott is away from Adyar, admonished the President of a newly chartered Washington branch for their wording of their “Constitution and By-laws” calling it “tomfoolery” and calling “upon Mr. William Q. Judge, General Secretary of the American Section of the Theosophical Society for some explanation thereof.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 11, Jan. 1890; Supp. pp.lxxv-lxxvi</p>
Feb. 1890	<p>“MUDDLED MEDDLERS.” H.P. Blavatsky reproached Richard Harte for his “very untheosophical and undignified — attack made by one officer of the T.S. on another officer of the same. . . . “Such harsh expressions . . . are not only objectionable on account of their offensive character, but detrimental and dangerous to the T.S.” NOTE: See May/June 1989 entry.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 5, Feb. 1890; pp.517-518</p>

<p>Feb. 27, 1890</p>	<p>Shortly after Col. Olcott's return from Europe he issued a "SPECIAL NOTICE".</p> <p>"The undersigned resumes the responsible direction of the <i>Theosophist</i>; at the same time thanking Mr. Richard Harte most sincerely for his valuable services during the period of the absence of the undersigned from India."</p> <p>Col. Olcott arrived in Adyar from Japan on July 11th, 1889, only to sail again for Europe on August 8th, returning on Feb. 5th, 1890. On his return to India he was accompanied by two valuable recruits.</p> <p>"Dr. J. Bowles Daly, LL.D., and Mr. E. Douglas Fawcett, in addition to Mr. Harte, will henceforth be members of the Editorial Staff. Their articles will be signed with their full names or initials. By a friendly arrangement with Madame Blavatsky, a certain class of important articles contributed to either Magazine will appear in both <i>Lucifer</i> and the <i>Theosophist</i>."</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 10, 1889 entry.</p> <p>NOTE: From the above statement by Col. Olcott it would appear that Mme Blavatsky had a serious discussion with Col. Olcott while he was in London regarding unsigned Editorials which appeared in the Theosophist. See June 1889 for "APPLIED THEOSOPHY" by Richard Harte and Aug. 15, 1889 for "A PUZZLE FROM ADYAR".</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 11, Mar. 1890; Supp. p.cv</p>
<p>Mar. 9, 1890</p>	<p>In a letter dated Feb. 9, 1890 H.P. Blavatsky writes: "I send you another legal script & gave to the Countess one to the same effect."</p> <p>The "legal script" she mentioned has not been found but the following notice exists in the Archives of the Theosophical Society, Pasadena.</p> <p>"I hereby authorize Mr. W.Q. Judge editor of the 'Path' & proprietor of the 'Path Office' & Library, — to render the accounts of my books — the 'Secret Doctrine' 'The Key to Theosophy' and The Voice of the Silence,' on sale in the said office, to the 'Theosophical Publishing Society,' of 7 Duke Street, and to pay the Countess C. Wachtmeister the manager of that office, all monies owing to me now, or what may [be] owed in the future, from the sale of my books, as specified above."</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 4, 1888 entry.</p>	<p>Theos. History, Vol. 6, No. 2, Apr. 1996; p.48</p>

Apr. 1890	<p>“The Path’s Fifth Year.”</p> <p>In his opening editorial to the fifth volume of Mr. Judge’s magazine, The Path, he wrote on the occult significance of the number Five and concluded with a prophecy.</p> <p>“Let us press forward with new energy in the work of the next four years, for when the second fifth is reached an important era for theosophists and the world will be at hand, when the result of again being weighed in the balance of events will be more serious than it is now.”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 28th, 1895 and April 29th, 1895 where the American Section declared its autonomy and T.S. in America was formed, resulting in much controversy.</p> <p>NOTE: At the time that Mr. Judge wrote the above Editorial, Col. Olcott was intermeddling in Paris Branch disturbances; the battle with Elliott Coues was culminating; and Bertram Keightley was visiting America. Keightley’s visit prompted H.P.B. to issue a “Notice” in response to his “personal speculative utterances in E.S. meetings [which] were taken by many members to be expressions of H.P.B.’s ‘inner’ teachings and accepted as ‘authoritative’.”</p> <p>The “Notice” stated:</p> <p>“I have neither written, issued, nor sent through Bertram Keightley any orders or instructions whatever respecting the above matter.”</p> <p>H.P.B. had received several letters from American members of the E.S. who had “misconstrued” what was said to them by Mr. Keightley. [See August 9, 1890.]</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 5, Apr. 1890; pp.1-2</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 9, Aug. 1921; pp.305-306</p>
June 1890	<p>William Q. Judge published first issue of “Department Of Branch Work.” They contain valuable suggestions for Theosophical work. These were papers delivered before the Aryan T.S. New York. Forty-six were issued. The first issue was Bertram Keightley’s address before the Aryan T.S. in Nov. 1889 titled, “The Second and Third Objects of the Theosophical Society as Related to the First.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 5, July 1890; p.136</p>
July 1890	<p>In July 1890 the New York Sun published an article by Dr. Coues, in which gross charges were made against the character of H.P.B. and charging Olcott and Judge with assisting H.P.B. in fraud and living upon The Society.</p> <p>NOTE: See Sep. 26, 1892, also see Sep. 12, 1890 for H.P.B. letter to Mrs J. Campbell ver Planck.</p> <p>NOTE: For more valuable information on the Coues-Sun case, see The Canadian Theosophist, Vol. 66, No.6, Jan.-Feb. 1896, pp.127-130; 137-138.</p>	<p>A Short History of the T.S., pp.273-276</p>

July 9, 1890	<p>H.S. Olcott's letter to the "<i>Theosophical Society, Executive Offices.</i>"</p> <p>"To secure a better management of the Society's affairs throughout Europe than I can give from this distance, I do hereby depute to my co-founder, H.P. Blavatsky, full authority to come to an agreement with the Branches of the United Kingdom . . . and other Continental countries for the consolidation of the whole into one section of the Theosophical Society to be designated as the European Section. . . ."</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 25, 1890 for H.P. Blavatsky's letter, "To THE THEOSOPHISTS OF EUROPE."</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 7, Sep. 1890; p.77</p>
Aug. 9, 1890	<p>"Notice from H.P.B." — "<i>Strictly Private and Confidential, E. S. T. S.</i>"</p> <p>"Any report or statement by <i>any one</i> of orders or instructions <i>alleged to be by me</i>' in any other form than 'through William Q. Judge or those which I myself sign my name to with my physical hand' are and 'shall be false'."</p> <p>Full text of "Notice from H.P.B."</p> <p>NOTE: See April 1890 and Aug. 31, 1890, re: Bertram Keightley's American tour.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, Apr. 1915; pp.276-279</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 9, Aug. 1921; pp.306-307</p>
Aug. 25, 1890	<p>Letter from H.P. Blavatsky "To THE THEOSOPHISTS OF EUROPE."</p> <p>"After fifteen years of persistent refusal to take office in the Society, I have at last been persuaded to assume the duties of the President of a new section of the Theosophical Society, to be known as 'The European Section'. My reasons for this new departure are as follows:— "</p> <p>She lists three reasons and concludes with some prophetic comments. "It is hoped that the formation of the European Section is the beginning of the ascending arc of the evolution of the Theosophical Society in Europe, and that the day may soon dawn when each European country will have a section of its own. For were such a happy result to be achieved, and were the units of these sections to work together for the moulding of European thought, as only those who have a right conception of Theosophy can work, then should we surely have advanced a decided step in the direction of that ideal of Universal Brotherhood, which we have set before us as our first object."</p> <p>NOTE: See Olcott's letter of July 9, 1890.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 7, Sep. 1890; pp.77-78</p>

<p>Sep. 12, 1890</p>	<p>Letter from H.P. Blavatsky to Mrs. J. Campbell ver Planck regarding the Coues/New York Sun suit.</p> <p>“I of course have no desire to impose any authority upon the E.S. members of the ‘Aryan’ in this libel affair. If members in supporting Judge act contrary to their ‘convictions’, then such half-hearted support is worse than no support at all. The matter is quite simple: the libel suit has not been instituted to defend personalities, but to defend the Society, the honour of every member of which has been attacked. Theosophically & occultly, a libel suit which would have been untheosophical & selfish if instituted to defend a person, becomes not only a Theosophical action but a Karmic duty if the welfare of the Society is thereby being protected. If Judge is abandoned by any of his fellow-Esotericists because their ‘convictions’ are contrary to the above view, their’s will be the Karma. If it is impolitic to bring a suit, then Judge & myself must be wrong & we do not know what we are about & we are untheosophical & ignorant.* But if, on the contrary it is not only politic, but a necessary duty, then it is the duty of every Esotericist to support in every way this action, for remember that the more people protest, the more grave will be the offence of slandering so many innocent people: and it is necessary that the public should learn that the members of the T.S. are not people of no reputation, who may be covered with mud with impunity.</p> <p>“For myself I care not a jot; neither have I any desire to be unjust to a single member of the E.S.: but you must admit that when the convictions of my pupils are contrary to my own, I have not much hope of their listening to my teachings.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Very Sincerely, (Sgd.) “<i>H.P.B.</i>”</p> <hr style="width: 10%; margin: 10px auto;"/> <p>“* In my own case I do not defend <i>myself</i> but (1) a dear friend & Theosophist, who cannot defend himself; & (2) the ‘<i>Head of the Section</i>’, who would dishonour you all otherwise.”</p> <p>NOTE: The above Letter from H.P. Blavatsky to Mrs J. Campbell ver Planck is important because it establishes both H.P.B.’s and W.Q.J.’s positions in defending against slander.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 4, Sep. 1932; pp.7-8</p>
<p>Sep. 30, 1890</p>	<p>Annie Besant was elected President of the Blavatsky Lodge at the Annual general meeting which was held in the Lecture Hall, Theosophical Headquarters, 19, Avenue Road, Regent’s Park, N.W.:</p> <p>“The following officers were elected 1890-91: — <i>President</i>, Annie Besant; <i>Vice-President</i>, William Kingsland; <i>Secretary</i>, Claude F. Wright; <i>Assistant-Secretary</i>, Sydney V. Edge; <i>Treasurer</i>, Countess Wachtmeister.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 7, Oct. 1890; pp.164-165</p> <p>Mrs. Annie Besant A Modern Prophet, pp.168-169</p>

Oct. 7, 1890	<p>Col. Olcott wrote to H.P.B., telling her he wished to retire as President of the Theosophical Society.</p> <p>“At the Xth Anniversary, it will be remembered, I asked permission to retire, that I might enjoy needed rest after my long and arduous service in the Tropics. The privilege was unanimously refused, with such touching expression of personal affection that I continued in Office. I have now given five more years of service, and feel that I must insist upon my right to withdraw into privacy, and devote myself to certain literary work long contemplated.”</p> <p>NOTE: See 1890; Dec. 27, 28, 29, 1890 and Jan. 21, 1892 entries.</p>	<p>A Short History of The T.S., p.271</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 12, Dec. 1890; Supp. p.xiv</p>
Dec. 1890	<p>“The Theosophical Society and H.P.B.”</p> <p>By Annie Besant as co-editor. She printed this article without first submitting it to H.P.B. for her approval. Besant had defined Blavatsky’s position, claiming that the article expressed the views of the members of the Theosophical Society as to the role H.P.B. played in the Theosophical Society.</p> <p>Besant presented 5 points with regards to H.P.B.’s credibility, including:</p> <p>“1.) Either she is a messenger from the Masters, or else she is a fraud. 2.) In either case the Theosophical Society would have no existence without her.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 7, 1891 entry for H.P.B.’s “Comments.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 7, Dec. 1890; pp.275-280</p>
Dec. 27, 28, 29, 1890	<p>“General Report of the Fifteenth Convention and Anniversary of the Theosophical Society.”</p> <p><i>Constitution and Rules of The Theosophical Society</i>. [Revised]</p> <p>Article XIII (2):</p> <p>“No Fellow, Officer or Council of the Theosophical Society, or of any Section or Branch thereof, shall promulgate or maintain any doctrine as being that advanced or advocated by the Society.”</p> <p>NOTE: See also July 9-10, 1891 entry for Constitution and Rules.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 12, Jan. 1891; Supp. pp.65-72</p>
Dec. 27, 28, 29, 1890 continued	<p>“President Olcott’s Vacation.”</p> <p>“Yielding to the warm remonstrances of Madame Blavatsky and all his friends against the resignation which shattered health seemed to necessitate, Col. Olcott withheld it and accepted the proposal by Convention of a year’s vacation for rest.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 5, Mar. 1891; p.393</p>
Dec. 27, 28, 29, 1890 continued	<p>At the Fifteenth Anniversary of the T.S. Bertram Keightley suggested that an Indian Section be established to relieve Col. Olcott of his heavy burden. This Section would compare with the ones in the West. Constitutional rules were drafted then adopted and Bertram Keightley’s appointment as its first General Secretary was ratified.</p>	<p>General Report of the 15th Anniversary of the T.S., pp.31-57</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 12, Dec. 1890; Supp. p.xiii</p>

Jan. 1, 1891	<p>“EXECUTIVE ORDERS.” Dated “<i>Adyar 17th November 1890</i>” from H.S. Olcott. “In compliance with the above suggestion, the President-Founder hereby declares that, from and after the 1st January 1891, the present four Indian Sections shall be merged into one, to be called the ‘Indian Section of the Theosophical Society,’ with its Head-quarters at Adyar. “Bertram Keightley, Esq., M.A. (Cantab), F.T.S., is hereby appointed General Secretary of the Indian Section, subject to the approval of Mdme. H.P. Blavatsky, to whose staff he is now attached.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 12, Dec. 1890; Supp. p.xiii</p>
Jan. 1, 1891 continued	<p>W. Q. Judge Gen. Sec’y American Section published the first issue of the “Oriental Department,” pamphlets consisting of Sanskrit and other Oriental Scriptures specially translated for students of theosophy. Published by Theosophical Society, American Section. P.O. Box 2659, New York.</p>	
Jan. 7, 1891	<p>“Comments on ‘the Theosophical Society and H.P.B.’” H.P.B.’s comments on “The Theosophical Society and H.P.B.” “Needless to say that Mrs. Besant’s article would not have appeared had I seen it before publication. . . . [T]he ‘Esoteric Section has <i>no official or corporate connection</i> with the Exoteric Society’. Henceforth it will be called ‘the Esoteric School of Theosophy’, simply.” [rather than the Esoteric Section of the Theosophical Society.]</p> <p>Mr. H.T. Patterson objected to A. Besant’s article “The Theosophical Society and H.P.B.” He wrote that the T.S. held no position binding membership to belief in H.P.B. “Even a recognized authoritative leader may be dangerous. H.P.B. herself is always inculcating self-reliance, and discouraging any dependence upon others, herself included.” [see Dec. 1890 entry]</p> <p>NOTE: H.P.B. makes reference to Lucifer, Oct. 1886 but it actually appeared in Lucifer, Vol. 7, Dec. 1890. A pamphlet was “Reprinted from Lucifer, December 1890, by desire of H.P.B.” and titled The Theosophical Society and H.P.B., Three Articles, by Annie Besant & H.T. Paterson, and including H.P.B.’s comments.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 7, Feb. 1891; pp.451-455</p> <p>Pamphlet, 24 pages</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 690, p.210</p>
Mar. 12, 1891	<p>“THE WILL OF W.Q. JUDGE” with Memorandum. W.Q. Judge signed his will on this date, appointing “E. Aug. Neresheimer of New York, as Executor and my wife, Ella M. Judge, as Executrix of this my will.” Memorandum attached stipulated where assets were located (money, insurance policy, pictures) and that he owned The Path magazine. Judge bequeathed, “The Path Magazine and business now carried on by me in New York, and of which I am the sole owner, and all my business therewith connected, to my friends and fellow-students, Mrs. J. Campbell Ver Planck and E. August Neresheimer . . . trusting that they will carry it on. . . .”</p>	<p>Future of the Theos. Publishing Co. (Feb. 1898) by Julia Keightley; (35 pp.), pp.1-3</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, pp.lxv-lxvii</p>

<p>Mar. 27, 1891</p>	<p>H.P.B. to W.Q. Judge, regarding A. Besant: “UNSELFISHNESS AND ALTRUISM ISM is Annie Besant’s name, but with me and for me she is Heliodore, a name given to her by a Master, and that I use with her, it has a <i>deep meaning</i>. It is only a few months she studies occultism with me in the <i>innermost</i> group of the E.S., and yet she has passed far beyond all others. She is not psychic nor spiritual in the least — all intellect, and yet she hears the Master’s voice when alone, sees His Light, and recognises His Voice from that of D____. Judge, <i>she is a most wonderful woman</i>, my right hand, my successor, when I will be forced to leave you, my sole hope in England, as you are my sole hope in America.”</p>	<p>H.P.B. and the Present Crisis in the T.S. by C. Wachtmeister; p.4</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 18, July 1929</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.159, 249</p> <p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, p.73</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, May 1915; pp.323-324</p> <p>Theosophists: Reunite! (1958) by F.P. Spinks, p.38</p>
<p>Apr. 1 1891 (est)</p>	<p>H.P.B. to Besant: “Child, your pride is terrible; you are as proud as Lucifer himself.”</p>	<p>Annie Besant An Autobiography, p.311 (1893) p.442 (1939) T.P.H. Adyar</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, May 1915; p.323</p>
<p>Apr. 1, 1891</p>	<p>“E.S. Order.” H.P.B. document to A. Besant: “I hereby appoint in the name of the Master, Annie Besant Chief Secretary of the Inner Group of the Esoteric Section and Recorder of the Teachings.” [Signed] H.P.B.</p> <p>“Annie Besant left [London] for Liverpool this morning, to embark for New York.”</p>	<p>Minutes of Council E.S.T., Nov. 1894; p.5</p> <p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by Alice Cleather, p.85</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3 Apr. 1915; p.277</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 6, May 1891; p.57</p>
<p>Apr. 9, 1891</p>	<p>“Mrs. Besant reached the States on April 9th, after a stormy voyage in the ‘City of New York’.” “Mrs. Besant accepted the hospitality of Mr. E.A. Neresheimer. . . . On April 13th she delivered her first public lecture. . . .”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, May 1891; p.53</p>

Apr. 9, 1891 continued	Mrs. Besant meets Judge for the first time. “I met Mr. Judge first in April, 1891, when sent to America by Madame Blavatsky to make his acquaintance and to carry a message from her to the American Convention.”	The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); p.9
Apr. 26-27, 1891	Theosophical Society, American Section, Fifth Annual Convention held at Boston. Report of Proceedings On the evening of the 26 th , “The evening will be used for papers, discussions, and an address from Mrs. Besant.” H.P.B.’s letter to the Convention, “read by her messenger and representative, Annie Besant.” [Letter dated Apr. 15, 1891] H.P.B., in her additional message to the Convention, wrote: “I have purposely omitted any mention of my oldest friend and fellow-worker, W.Q. Judge, in my general address to you, because I think that his unflagging and self-sacrificing efforts for the building up of Theosophy in America deserve special mention. “[H]e who has proved in a thousand ways his entire loyalty to the best interests of Theosophy and the Society.” [Also in Report of Proceedings , pp.22-23.]	Report of Proceedings , 51 pp. The Path , Vol. 6, Apr. 1891; p.32 Lucifer , Vol. 8, June 1891; pp.343-345 BCW , Vol. 13, p.176 Theosophy , Vol. 3, Apr. 1915; p.276 Theos. or Neo-Theos. by Margaret Thomas, p.57
Apr. 26-27, 1891 continued	“It Was a Borrowed Body” Cyrus Field Willard narrates his first hand testimony when at the Boston Convention of 1891 W.Q. Judge changed his appearance. “At an E.S. meeting in the large double parlours of the Parker House. . . . “. . . As he started to call the meeting to order, he leaned toward her [Annie Besant] who stood on his right hand, and I heard him say to her in a low voice, ‘Sound the Word with the triple intonation,’. She replied in the same low voice, ‘I don’t dare to,’ or ‘I don’t care to,’ but I think it was the first. I heard him say in a firm tone, ‘Then I will.’ He had been twirling his gavel in his hand but laid it down . . . and stepped to the side of the pedestal, facing his audience . . . and said: “I am about to sound the Word with the triple intonation, but before I do so, I have a statement to make which I do not care to have you speak to me about later, nor do I wish you to discuss among yourselves. I am not what I seem; I am a Hindu’. “Then he sounded the Word with the triple intonation. “Before my eyes, I saw the man’s face turn brown and a clean-shaven Hindu face of a young man was there, and you know he wore a beard.” NOTE: See: May 1932 entry. Comments by Albert E.S. Smythe on Willard’s article.	Cdn. Theosophist , Vol. 13, May 1932; pp.65-67 Echoes of the Orient , Vol. I, pp.xxxv-xxxvii Cdn. Theosophist , Vol. 13, May 1932; pp.69-70

<p>May 6, 1891</p>	<p>“On the 6th Mrs Besant sailed for England in the <i>City of Chicago</i>, Dr. and Mrs. J.D. Buck of Cincinnati accompanying her.”</p> <p>“On 6 May Mrs Besant, Mr. Judge and Dr. and Mrs. J.D. buck left New York for England.”</p> <p>NOTE: The compiler Josephine Ransom erroneously included Mr. Judge as having sailed with Annie Besant on the 6th. Mr. Judge sailed for England on May 13th, 1891. [See May 13th, 1891 entry.]</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, June 1891; p.90</p> <p>A Short History of The T.S., p.280</p>
<p>May 8, 1891</p>	<p>“The Departure of H.P.B.”</p> <p>“Our beloved teacher and friend H.P.B., left us at 2:25 on the afternoon of Friday, May 8th.</p> <p>“During the last few moments of her present incarnation, H.P.B. was sitting in her own arm-chair, her head supported by Miss Laura M. Cooper, and her hands clasped by Walter R. Old and Claude F. Wright. After the change, the face, we know so well, wore an expression of the most complete serenity and dignity”.</p> <p>“Death was caused by a clot of albumen touching the heart.”</p> <p>“In Memoriam” by Archibald Keightley.</p>	<p>The Vahan IS, No. 12, May 15, 1891; pp.1-2</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.158</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 8, June 1891; p.95</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, July 1891; pp.362-364</p>
<p>May 8, 1891 continued</p>	<p>“Chronological Table of Events in The Life of Madame Blavatsky.”</p> <p>NOTE: See also H.P.B. by Sylvia Cranston, pp.xiii-xv, for Chronology. See also the “Notes” of events pp.557-616</p>	<p>The Real H.P.B. (1928) by Wm. Kingsland, pp.251-252</p>
<p>May 8, 1891 continued</p>	<p>“H.P.B. left us and her last message for the Society was given to Mrs. Oakley the night but one before she died. At three a.m. she suddenly looked up and said ‘Isabel, Isabel, keep the link unbroken; do not let my last incarnation be a failure’.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, July 1894; p.124</p>
<p>May 8, 1891 continued</p>	<p>“But Mrs. Besant was not in England when H.P.B. died, <i>quite unexpectedly</i>, and with only three of her pupils present, namely, Mr. Claude Wright, Mr. Walter Old and Miss Laura Cooper (now Mrs. G.R.S. Mead.)”</p> <p>In a footnote Mrs. Cleather adds:</p> <p>“How ‘unexpected’ was the manner of her passing may be gathered from the fact that she was, at that very time, building a little ‘occult’ room next to her own . . . in which each of her pupils was to ‘sit’ — alone — ‘for development’ . . .”</p>	<p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, pp.81-84</p>

<p>May 9, 1891(est.)</p>	<p>“In reply to the announcement of ‘H.P.B.’s’ death . . . Mr. Judge promptly cabled to “<i>Do nothing till I come</i>”.</p> <p>NOTE: In a written testimony (March 5th 1998) by Mr. Dallas Ten Broeck, recalling his experiences while living in India, stated that on several occasions he heard Mr. B.P. Wadia saying that when W.Q. Judge had received the cable of H.P. Blavatsky’s passing that he (Judge) immediately cabled London to “Seal her rooms. I am sailing immediately.” [Similarly, this compiler heard Emory Wood (past President of Edmonton Theosophical Society and a dedicated student of history, known for his excellent memory for detail) on many occasions utter the same details about this event. Mr. Wood corresponded with Mr. Wadia and other individuals and likely picked up this information through these contacts.]</p>	<p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, pp.27-28</p>
<p>May 11, 1891</p>	<p>“Last Hours of Madame Blavatsky.” The cremation of H. P. Blavatsky took place at Woking, 25 miles from London. NOTE: W.Q. Judge was not present.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, June 1891; p.95</p>
<p>May 13. 1891</p>	<p>General Secretary W.Q. Judge sailed for London on the <i>S.S. City of New York</i>.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, July 1891; p.128</p>
<p>May 15, 1891</p>	<p>“A DECLARATION.” Signed by twelve “Fellows of the Theosophical Society (and members of the Inner Group of the E.S.), at the stake of our personal honour and reputation, hereby declare: “That we have fully investigated all the accusations and attacks which have been made against the personal character and <i>bona fides</i> of H. P. Blavatsky, and have found them in the vast majority of cases to be entirely false, and in the few remaining instances the grossest possible distortions of the simple facts.” [“A Declaration” follows “My Books” an article by H.P.B. which deals with accusations of plagiarism, want of method and inaccuracy against her works.]</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, May 1891; p.247</p>
<p>May 19, 1891</p>	<p>“The Press.” Updating readers regarding bad press which H.P.B.’s passing had generated; signed by ten prominent members of the T.S.: Annie Besant, C. Carter Blake, Herbert Burrows, Laura M. Cooper, Isabel Cooper-Oakley, Archibald Keightley, G.R.S. Mead, Walter R. Old, Constance Wachtmeister, and W. Wynn Westcott. “We do not propose to attempt any answer in detail to libels as monstrous as they are vile, libels which deal, moreover, with supposed events laid in distant quarters of the world, without any evidence being adduced to substantiate the allegations.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, June 1891; pp.319-320 Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1; p.xxiii</p>

<p>May 21, 1891</p>	<p>W.Q. Judge arrived in London. Letter to The Theosophist from A.L.V.[sic] [C. (Cleather)]. “Mr. Judge will remain in England until Col. Olcott’s arrival early in July; his presence with us at such a sad time is most welcome, for all who have the privilege of knowing the Vice-President and Co-founder of the Theosophical Society will at once realise how we must value the sense of strength, courage and hope, which he inspires wherever and with whomsoever he is.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 12, July 1891; p.634</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1; p.xxiii</p>
<p>May 23, 1891</p>	<p>“Consultative Emergency Council.” “<i>Consisting of the European Advisory Council and the British Section Council; held in the Lecture Hall at Headquarters, London, May 23rd, 1891, at 8 p.m.</i>” “William Q. Judge, as Vice-President T. S., in the Chair.”</p> <p>“Resolved, that under the authority of this Council, a notice be sent out by the General Secretaries to all the Branches and unattached members, informing them that a Convention is to be held, and containing the order of business to be decided upon by this council; and that the Convention be held at Headquarters, London, on Thursday and Friday, July 9th and 10th, 1891.”</p>	<p>Circular, 4 pages</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, June 1891; p.336</p>
<p>May 27, 1891</p>	<p>W.Q. Judge convened a meeting of the Advisory Council of the Esoteric Section.</p> <p>To All Members of the E.S.T. “The Council passed the following minute: “In virtue of our appointment by H.P.B., we declare: “That in full accord with the known wishes of H.P.B. . . . we primarily resolve and declare that the work of the School ought and shall be continued and carried on along the lines laid down by her, and with the matter left in writing or dictated by her before her departure. . . . “That it was resolved and recorded that the highest officials in the School for the present are Annie Besant and William Q. Judge, in accordance with the . . . order to William Q. Judge of December 1888, and with the order of April 1, 1891 to Annie Besant, as well as with the written declaration of H.P.B. in a letter to William Q. Judge dated March 27th, 1891. . . .” This segment ends with: “. . . and that from henceforth with Annie Besant and William Q. Judge rest the full charge and management of this School.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 3rd, 1894, E.S.T. circular issued at New York by W. Q. Judge, or Appendix B for the full text of By Master’s Direction.</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 14, 1888 entry.</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 1, 1891 entry. NOTE: See March 27, 1891 entry.</p> <p>Complete verbatim appointments reprinted from original order.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.159</p> <p>Pamphlet, 8 pages</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, Apr. 1915; pp.277-279 May 1915; p.325 July 1915; pp.425-426</p> <p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, pp.84-85</p> <p>Theos. or Neo-Theos. by Margaret Thomas, p.58</p>

May 27, 1891 continued	“The assumption, by Mrs. Besant and Mr. Judge, of the office of Outer Head in succession to H.P.B. was, therefore, the beginning of all subsequent trouble.”	H.P.B. Her Life and Work for Humanity , p.120
May 27, 1891 continued	<p>Mrs. Besant included with her letter to Mrs. Ver-Planck (Mrs. Keightley) in New York, the following signed declaration (together with the slip of paper bearing the message “W.Q. Judge’s plan is right”):</p> <p>“I took from William Q. Judge, on the afternoon of May 27th, 1891, certain papers selected from a number of letters in his possession. These I took one by one, read them, folded them up, tied them into a packet, and said I would read them myself to the Council, as they concerned Bro. Judge. I opened this packet myself in the Council meeting, in my place as chairman. I took up the papers one by one and read them (or parts of them) aloud, and on raising one of them saw a piece of paper lying between it and the next that was not there when I tied them together. After reading those remaining I took it up, and found it was a slip bearing some words written in red and signed with ^’s initials and seal. The words were: ‘W.Q. Judge’s plan is right’. The paper is attached hereto.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Signed) Annie Besant.”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 6, 1891 entry. The Message “W.Q. Judge’s plan is right” was not included in the E.S.T. circular sent to E.S. Members.</p> <p>According to Archibald and Julia Keightley, Besant claimed that no one could have had access to those papers other than herself.</p>	<p>E.S.T. circular by A. Keightley, pp.3-4</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; p.97</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.147-148</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Apr. 1922; p.176</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, July 1915; p.426</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; p.148</p>
May 27, 1891 continued	A. Besant states “Only as <i>They</i> have put us together, I have no power to stand aside.” [Letter dated July 2, 1891]	The Path , Vol.10, June 1895; p.100
May 27, 1891 continued	“Eastern” and “Western” divisions of E.S. were established with Besant in charge of the “Eastern” division and Judge in charge of the “Western” division (American).	Theosophy , Vol. 3, May 1915; p.325

<p>May 27, 1891 continued</p>	<p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge A. Besant's version, four years later, of how W.Q. Judge became Co-Head with her and on the paper containing the words "W.Q. Judge's plan is right." "Mr. Judge, who was sitting close beside me while I picked out the letters, must have slipped the scrap into the bundle without my noticing his action; at the time, being void of all suspicion of his good faith, I accepted it as genuine."</p> <p>Claude Falls Wright, in a signed statement dated April 24, 1895, wrote: "[O]n the afternoon of Wednesday the 27th of May, 1891, a message from the Master among documents read by Annie Besant was found by her in full sight of all present. Annie Besant was sitting at a small table several feet distant from the group of Councillors, who sat opposite her while she read the documents. William Q. Judge was not seated by her at the time, but among the group and on the left side of the hall." NOTE: Claude Falls Wright's statement can be found in Appendix A, No. 13.</p>	<p>Pamphlet (1895) by Annie Besant, pp.82-83</p> <p>Reply by William Q. Judge, pp.22-23</p>
<p>May 27, 1891 continued</p>	<p>NOTE: For details on precipitation of letters see Mar. 1893 entry. "<i>H.P. Blavatsky on Precipitation and Other Matters.</i>"</p>	
<p>May 28-29, 1891</p>	<p>The beginning of 'troubles' relating to Master M's SEAL. Items relating to this include:</p> <p>The Theosophical Society and The Westminster Gazette Bertram Keightley wrote to The Westminster Gazette "to add to Mrs. Besant's exhaustive reply to Mr. Garrett. . . ." He mentions a letter from W.Q. Judge dated May 29, 1891 "bearing the 'seal'." ". . . [T]he presence of the seal was not necessarily traceable to Mr. Judge, though its appearance did raise a doubt in my mind."</p> <p>Isis Very Much Unveiled by Edmund Garrett. W.Q. Judge quoted: "I have long ago denied all knowledge of Master's seal either genuine or imitated. I do not know if he has a seal. . . ."</p>	<p>Pamphlet, Dec. 23, 1894 (16pages); pp.14-15</p> <p>Pamphlet, 2nd ed. (132 pages); pp.126-127</p>

<p>May 28-29, 1891 continued</p>	<p>Letter of Wm. Lindsay to Countess Wachtmeister dated London, Feb.17, 1895 (posted March 1st): “What you told me was, that before H.P.B. died she showed you a box wherein was Master’s seal and that immediately after H.P.B.’s death you took the box with the Master’s seal in it into your keeping, and that the box was not in <i>anyone</i> else’s hands till given over by you to Annie Besant on her return from America. When the box was opened by Annie Besant the <i>Master’s seal was not to be found in it</i>, and all that took place <i>before</i> Mr. W. Q. Judge came to England [May 21, 1891].”</p> <p>Letter of C. Wachtmeister, addressed to G.R.S. Mead re: Wm. Lindsay’s letter in which she stated: “H.P.B. never sh[o]wed me the seal above named. I did not even know of its existence. I had seen the impression of the seal during H.P.B.’s life-time, but not the seal itself, and I believed these impressions to be from a genuine seal belonging to the Master.”</p> <p>In The Case Against W.Q. Judge Annie Besant quotes from a statement from Colonel Olcott that on Nov. 13, 1883, he had an imitation “seal” made in brass of Master M’s seal while he was passing through the bazaar in Lahore, Punjab, India.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; p.141</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; pp.164-165</p> <p>Pamphlet (1895), 88pp., pp.12, 19, 30-31, 41, 43, 53, 69, 71, 73-75, 83-84</p>
<p>June 10, 1891</p>	<p>W. Q. Judge came from London to attend a Dublin Lodge meeting. On another evening at the Rotunda Lecture-hall, Liverpool, both Mr. Judge and Mrs. Besant lectured jointly to an audience of 1800. “The lecture was entitled ‘Theosophy — what it is, and what it is not’.” “[Mr. Judge] proposed to speak to them of what Theosophy was not. In the first place Theosophy was not Spiritualism, nor Buddhism, nor Brahminism, nor Mohammedanism, nor Christianity, nor atheism, nor materialism. Theosophy was the reformer of the religion of the East, and the opponent of materialism in the West. . . . Mrs. Besant continued the subject, dealing with the metaphysical aspect of Theosophy.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, July 1891; pp.134-135</p>
<p>July 2, 1891</p>	<p>Letter by Mrs. Besant to esotericists who did not wish to accept her as co-head of the E.S.T. “<i>If I could</i>, I would say to you, my dear —, sign only to Mr. Judge. I should be quite content, for indeed there is no reason why you should have any confidence in me. <i>Only as They have put us together</i>, I have no power to stand aside.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; p.100</p>
<p>July 4, 1891</p>	<p>After having reached Marseilles on the 2nd, Olcott arrived in London at about 6 p.m. where he was met by Judge. “After reaching Headquarters, [Olcott] meditates together with Annie Besant in H.P.B.’s bedroom.”</p> <p>“He [Olcott] went at once to Avenue Road, where he and Mrs. Besant visited H.P.B.’s room together and pledged themselves to be true to the Cause and to each other.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 18th, 1891 for more details on Olcott.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 13, p.xxv</p> <p>A Short History of the T.S., p.278</p>

July 6, 1891	<p>A letter from Annie Besant in London to Mrs. Julia Campbell-Ver Planck at New York City.</p> <p>“[S]oon after that Council Meeting of May 27th, 1891 . . . Mrs. Besant sent to Mrs. Ver-Planck (now Mrs. Keightley), in New York, the slip of paper bearing in red the Council message, ‘W.Q. Judge’s plan is right,’ and initialled by Master M. With it was sent [the declaration] written out in full by Mrs. Besant, and signed:”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 27, 1891 entry for text of declaration.</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 6, 1891 entry. Meeting at Astor House.</p>	<p>E.S.T. circular by A. Keightley, p.3</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Oct. 1922; p.402</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1925, p.646</p>
July 9-10, 1891	<p>“The Theosophical Society in Europe, First Annual Convention.”</p> <p>The Convention was held at the Lecture Hall of the Blavatsky Lodge, (Headquarters, Avenue Road, Regent Park) London, at 10 A. M. H.S. Olcott, W.Q. Judge, and A. Besant were present.</p> <p>Resolution to institute an “H.P.B. Memorial Fund”.</p> <p>“[T]he two sections, British and European, unanimously resolved to combine into one. Then the new Constitution for the European Section was adopted, almost exactly on the lines of the American Section.”</p> <p>G.R.S. Mead elected General Secretary, W.R. Old elected Librarian and E.T. Sturdy, Treasurer.</p> <p>In his closing statement Olcott praised Judge.</p> <p>“[America] was almost a graveyard of Theosophy when Mr. Judge felt what you may call the ‘divine afflatus’ to devote himself to the work and to pick up the loose threads we had left scattered there and carry it on. The result shows what one man can do who is altogether devoted to the cause.”</p> <p>“The London Lodge . . . was not represented either by Mr. Sinnett as President, or by any proxy. The London Lodge held itself aloof from the general activities of the Society.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, Aug. 1891; pp.166-167</p> <p>Report of Proceedings T.S. in Europe, 1891; p.49</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 1, p.477</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.160</p>
July 9-10, 1891 continued	<p>European Section of The Theosophical Society. Constitution and Rules. List of Officers and General Information. Also contains the Constitution and Rules of the Theosophical Society as revised at Adyar Dec. 27, 1890.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 20 pages</p>
July 17 & 27, 1891	<p>Two Executive Orders from H.S. Olcott.</p> <p>July 17th order: “The death of H.P. Blavatsky necessitates certain changes, among which are the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The office of Corresponding Secretary remains vacant. . . . 2. The name of H.P.B. disappears from Charters and Diplomas. . . .” <p>July 27th Order: “As the survivor of the two principal Founders of the Theosophical Society, I am called upon to state officially the lines upon which its work will henceforth be prosecuted.”</p> <p>Also a Notice signed by H.S. Olcott, W.Q. Judge, Bertram Keightley, G.R.S. Mead and A. Carroll giving details of the “H.P.B. Memorial Fund.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, Aug. 1891; pp.514-516</p>

Aug. 1891	<p>Article by Jasper Niemand “A Theosophical Education”, was preceded with a quotation from the Master.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">△</p> <p>“‘<i>INGRATITUDE IS NOT ONE OF OUR FAULTS.</i>’ <i>WE ALWAYS HELP THOSE WHO HELP US. TACT, DISCRETION, AND ZEAL ARE MORE THAN EVER NEEDED. THE HUMBLEST WORKER IS SEEN AND HELPED.</i> ”</p> <p>Positive comments on the article.</p> <p>NOTE: W.Q. Judge was then in the U.K. and had not seen the article when it was published.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, Aug. 1891; pp.137-138</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 9, Sep. 1891; pp.86-87</p>
Aug. 1891 continued	<p>Olcott questioned the “message” from the Mahatma in Jasper Niemand’s article. Judge replied in what was later published as “An Interesting Letter.” Olcott’s name was not mentioned. The letter was subtitled “<i>Written to an Indian Brother</i>”. In it Judge asserted:</p> <p>“<i>I did not write the article you quote. I am not Jasper Niemand. Hence I did not get the message he printed a part of in his article. Jasper Niemand is a real person and not a title to conceal my person.</i>”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 15, 1893 entry.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, Apr. 1893; pp.101-104</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Apr. 1922; pp.180-183</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1925, p.426</p>
Aug. 6, 1891	<p>W.Q. Judge left London.</p> <p>“William Q. Judge, whom we had comfortably assimilated as a working member of the staff. . . . sailed for New York on August 6th, in the ‘City of Paris,’ carrying with him the warmest good wishes of all who met him here, and from those of us who had the privilege of working with him the most grateful thanks for strong help rendered in a time of sore need”.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, Aug. 1891; p.518</p>
Aug. 21, 1891	<p>Both Bertram Keightley, Gen. Sec. of the Indian Section, and Sydney V. Edge sailed for Adyar; Mr. Edge to “join the Headquarters’ staff and help the General Secretary of the Indian Section. . . .”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, Aug. 1891; p.518</p> <p>The Vahan, Sep. 1891; p.7</p>

<p>Aug. 30, 1891</p>	<p>Lecture by Annie Besant delivered at the Hall of Science in London entitled 1875 to 1891: A Fragment of Autobiography in which she claimed to have received messages from the Masters after the death of H.P.B.</p> <p>“You have known me in this hall [the Hall of Science, in London] for sixteen and a half years. You have never known me to tell a lie. [‘No, never!’ and loud cheers.] I tell you that since Madame Blavatsky left I have had letters in the same handwriting as the letters which she received. [Sensation.] Unless you think dead persons can write, surely that is a remarkable fact. You are surprised; I do not ask you to believe me; but I tell you it is so. All the evidence I had of the existence of Madame Blavatsky’s teachers, of the so-called abnormal powers, came through her. It is not so now. Unless every sense can at the same time deceive me, unless a sane person can at the same time be sane and insane, I have exactly the same certainty for the truth of the statements I have made as I know that you are here. I refuse to be false to the knowledge of my intellect and the perceptions of my reasoning faculties.”</p> <p>NOTE: The text of the New York Sun article and Besant’s pamphlet vary slightly.</p> <p>NOTE: Also see Aug. 4, 1894 entry for criticism by F. W. Read. For the New York Sun article on “<i>The Brass Seal</i>” see Appendix A.</p>	<p>New York Sun, Nov. 25, 1894</p> <p>Pamphlet, (1891) (14 pages) by Annie Besant; pp.1, 10, 11, 14</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.165-166</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 9, Sep. 1891; p.175</p>
<p>Aug. 30, 1891 continued</p>	<p>In “Character Sketch: . . . Mrs. Annie Besant”, W.T. Stead, the editor of Review of Reviews wrote:</p> <p>“One of the most difficult things in writing these sketches is the attempt to delineate the character of one’s personal friends.” W.T. Stead quotes from Besant’s final speech in the Hall of Science, Aug. 30, 1891, and added:</p> <p>“To me the essential miracle is the conversion of Mrs. Besant from Materialism to a firmly based belief in the reality of the spiritual world. . . . To have secured Mrs. Besant for Theosophy is an achievement much more wonderful to me than the duplication of any number of teacups or the tinkling of whole peals of ‘astral bells.’</p> <p>“Mrs. Besant has not only abjured Materialism, she has repudiated her advocacy of neo-Malthusianism.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 15, 1895 for more on Annie Besant by W.T. Stead.</p>	<p>Review of Reviews, Vol. 4, Oct. 1891; pp.349-367</p>

Aug. 30, 1891 continued	<p>A. Besant’s public claims to have received messages from the Masters as well as the message in Jasper Niemand’s article in The Path, “aroused a furore in the world and particularly amongst Theosophists [b]ecause . . . it was . . . inferred that she herself was in ‘communication with the Masters’ and this inference was strengthened by the fact that she made no denial, and by her subsequent statements to various newspaper interviewers and by other direct statements. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 1891 entry.</p> <p>“[T]he press has taken up Annie Besant’s statement that she was in direct communication with the Masters.”</p> <p>In a section titled “Additional Matter” is found <i>Statement of Annie Besant</i> (dated April 24, 1895) on messages she received from the Masters after H.P.B.’s death and before her lecture at the Hall of Science. She wrote: “I add now an account of the ‘messages’ received from Mr. Judge by me;” in which she claims Judge was responsible.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.148-149</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 9, Sep. 1891; p.83</p> <p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); pp.81-84</p>
Sep. 1, 1891	<p>The Vahan announced that “Annie Besant proposes to visit India for a lecturing tour during the cool season, leaving the London Headquarters about the end of November. . . . Miss F.H. Müller proposes to accompany Annie Besant.”</p> <p>H.S. Olcott “hopes to induce Mrs. Besant to join him at Headquarters” for the annual Convention at Adyar and “make at least a short cold-weather tour in India”.</p> <p>NOTE: Mrs. Besant did not go to India at this time. [See Oct. 1891 and Nov. 18, 1891 entries.]</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 1, Sep. 1891; pp.7-8</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 12, Sep. 1891; Supp. pp.civ-cv</p>
Sep. 8, 1891	<p>“The General Secretary’s Tour.” “[W.Q. Judge] was to have started for the West upon the very day when the death of Madame Blavatsky caused him to sail for Europe, and upon his return the new date was fixed for Sep. 5th, but sickness caused postponement till the 8th, at which time he left for Omaha.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, Oct. 1891; p.230</p>
Sep. 15, 1891	<p>“Some Words on Daily Life (<i>Written by A MASTER OF WISDOM.</i>)” Republished by A. Besant. “Theosophy . . . expects and demands from the Fellows of the Society a great mutual toleration and charity for each other’s shortcomings, ungrudging mutual help in the search for truths in every department of nature — moral and physical. And this ethical standard must be unflinchingly applied to daily life.” [Originally published in Lucifer, Vol. 1, Jan. 1888, pp.344-346.]</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 9, Sep. 1891; pp.5-7</p>

<p>Sep. 16, 1891</p>	<p>“Col. Olcott sails from Liverpool for the U.S.A. Arrives at New York Sep. 23rd, where he is for the first time since 1878, and is met by Fullerton, Neresheimer and his sister, Mrs. Belle Mitchell. Gives one lecture. On Sep. 28th, takes the overland train and stops at Sacramento and San Francisco where Judge meets him.”</p> <p>NOTE: Col. Olcott was en route to Japan. [See Oct. 7, 1891.]</p>	<p>BCW Vol. 13, p.xxvi</p> <p>A Short History of the T.S., pp.283-84</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 13, Dec. 1891; Supp. pp.xxvi-xxvii</p>
<p>Oct. 1891</p>	<p>In a letter to Judge, Vera Jelihovsky, H.P.B.’s sister, details that in Oct. 1891 she had written a letter to her daughter, Vera Johnston in London, asking her to transmit to A. Besant “<i>that Mrs. Besant must not go to India</i>, because the results of her voyage would be bad, dangerous, harmful, and disastrous to the extreme. In the same time I felt conscious that <i>I was in duty bound to warn her.</i>”</p> <p>She felt the impression had come from H.P.B. “So I resolved to write to my daughter . . . asking her to transmit to Mrs. Besant my profound conviction it would not be safe for her to go over to India, or to interfere with any other branch of the Theosophical Society elsewhere than in England, for <i>I Knew</i> for sure <i>that my sister Helen was against it.</i>”</p> <p>“. . . Mrs. Besant’s answer [was] . . . ‘<i>I am ordered to go.</i>’”</p> <p>Mrs. Jelihovsky added: “I thought then and there that she was mistaken (now [1895] I am sure of it!) . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 27, 1893, for more details as they relate to Bertram Keightley. [Annie Besant’s statement “<i>I am ordered to go</i>” was uttered by her only after Mr. Chakravarti’s visit to London in August 1893.]</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 27, 1891, about Besant’s health.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; pp.25-26</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 9, Dec. 1891; p.344</p>
<p>Oct. 7, 1891</p>	<p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by Annie Besant</p> <p>W.Q. Judge and H.S. Olcott met in San Francisco.</p> <p>“O. put the question direct to J. if he had written the letters, for the good of the T.S. and to help vindicate H.P.B.s memory; telling him that he (O.) knew of his (J.’s) remarkable talent for imitating handwriting, that he had heard of his imitating some at Adyar. . . . W.Q.J. denied emphatically that he had written the letters, or any of the sort.”</p> <p>RE: “Rosicrucian Jewel”</p>	<p>Pamphlet (1895), (88 pages), p.72</p> <p>pp.76-78</p>

Oct. 7, 1891 continued	<p>“Col. Olcott, <i>the President Founder, in California</i>. — When it became known that Col. Olcott was to pass through San Francisco <i>en route</i> to Japan, preparations were at once made to give him an appropriate welcome. . . .</p> <p>“Col. Olcott . . . was met . . . by a delegation led by Mr. Judge, who had returned to San Francisco, having changed route and dates of his own tour especially to meet and welcome his worthy colleague, the President-Founder.”</p> <p>A reception was given to the President-Founder. “As the proceedings were about to start, Col. Olcott said to [Judge]: ‘Take your seat by my side as you did at New York in 1875: we were one in the work then and are now’.”</p> <p>“The next day Col. Olcott and Mr. Judge were photographed in different positions, singly and together. . . . also an 8 x10 size of the Col. and Mr. Judge standing together.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 9, Nov. 1891; pp.259-260</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 1, No. 1, Nov. 1891; p.8</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 6, Nov. 1891; p.260</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, pp.xxiii-xxiv</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 13, Dec. 1891; Supp. p.xxvii</p>
Nov. 1, 1891	<p>“AN OLD MESSAGE FROM THE MASTER.” Message from Master M. for A.P. Sinnett sent through W.Q. Judge. Judge forwarded it to A.P. Sinnett from Wyoming. “We sent him to London and made him stay so long in order to lay down currents which have since operated. . . .”</p> <p>A.P. Sinnett denies its genuineness, Feb. 26, 1895. “In reference to an article by Mr. Judge in the last number of <i>The Irish Theosophist</i>, I feel reluctantly compelled to deny that I regard the message he sent me as genuine.”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; pp.84-85</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; pp.106-107</p>
Nov. 15, 1891	<p>A 3rd volume of The Secret Doctrine to be produced. “The first two volumes of the <i>Secret Doctrine</i> are practically out of print, and a new and revised edition has to be at once put in hand. The third volume has also to be brought out.”</p> <p>Also, an IMPORTANT NOTICE. A REVISED EDITION OF THE “SECRET DOCTRINE.” issued by Annie Besant and G.R.S. Mead regarding a third edition to be published soon. “Every effort is being made to thoroughly revise the new edition, and the editors earnestly request all students who may read this notice to send in as full lists of ERRATA as possible. Verification of references and quotations, errors of indexing, indication of obscure passages, etc., etc., will be most thankfully received.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 9, Nov. 1891; pp.254-255</p> <p>p.261</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 6, Dec. 1891; p.296</p>

<p>Nov. 18, 1891</p>	<p>“Visit of Mrs. Besant.” “A telegram from Mrs. Annie Besant announcing her sudden sailing for America . . . Reaching New York on the 27th or 28th . . . sailing for England on Dec. 9th.”</p> <p>NOTE: For information regarding why Mrs. Besant went to see Mr. Judge at this time, see Dec. 1895 for “The Resignation Mystery, 1892.” See Jan. 1906 entry for NOTE in Miss Müller’s biographical sketch for further details.</p> <p>NOTE: Olcott visited America after H.P.B.’s death. He left Liverpool on Sep. 16th and then sailed from San Francisco for Japan on Oct. 8th. He sailed for Colombo, arriving on Nov. 29th from Japan (at the same time that Besant reached New York). He arrived at Adyar on Dec. 13th, 1891.</p> <p>NOTE: See July 4th, 1891 regarding Olcott’s arrival in London.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, Dec. 1891; p.296</p> <p>The Vahan , Vol. 1, Jan. 1892; pp.7-8</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1925, pp.326-333</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 9, Oct. 1921; pp.371-377</p> <p>Hammer on the Mountain, p.330</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 1, Jan. 1892; p.7</p>
<p>Nov. 21, 1891</p>	<p>“Theosophical News.” “Wm. Q. Judge reached home November 21st. The long trip has been more or less a strain upon his constitution.”</p> <p>NOTE: Mr. Judge left Sep. 8th for his western tour. See Sep. 8, 1891 entry.</p>	<p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 1, No.2, Dec. 1891; p.8</p>
<p>Nov. 27, 1891</p>	<p>“Visit of Mrs. Annie Besant.” “Mrs Besant’s visit to the States lasted only 12 days, for she arrived on November 27th and left Dec. 9th. . . . “On Tuesday evening, Dec. 8th, Mrs. Besant attended the Aryan meeting. . . . on Sunday evening, scores asked the honor of touching her hand.”</p> <p>“Annie Besant lectured twice in New York once at Philadelphia and once at Fort Wayne, Ind. . . . A fifth lecture was delivered on the S.S. ‘City of Paris’ on the return journey. . . .” [She arrived back in London on Dec. 16th.]</p> <p>“Annie Besant’s Indian Tour. — Annie Besant has been compelled to postpone her visit to India for this season, her physician having forbidden her to make the visit this year, and recommended a brief holiday; she has utilized this by a brief visit to New York.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 1895 entry for the actual reason for Besant’s urgent visit to New York.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, Jan. 1892; p.325</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 1, Jan 1892; pp.7-8</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 9, Dec. 1891; p.344</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 1, Dec. 1891; p.8</p>

Dec. 1891	<p>“GENERAL REPORT OF THE SIXTEENTH CONVENTION AND ANNIVERSARY OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.”</p> <p>“In his address H.S. Olcott warns against any idolatry of H.P.B.: “If she had lived, she would have undoubtedly left her protest against her friends making a saint of her or a bible out of her magnificent, though not infallible writings. I helped to compile her ‘Isis Unveiled’ while Mr. Keightley and several others did the same by ‘The Secret Doctrine.’ Surely we know how far from infallible are our portions of the books, to say nothing about hers.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Mar. 27, 1895 entry for more on H.P.B. by Olcott. NOTE: See Dec. 15, 1893 entry for references to “Blavatskianism In and Out of Season” by W.Q. Judge.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 13, Jan. 1892; Supp. pp.3-4</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.167</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 10, Apr. 1892; p.96</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.53-58</p>
Dec. 6, 1891	<p>Mrs. Besant attended an E.S.T. meeting at Astor House in New York. Present were Robert Crosbie, Henry Turner Patterson, Thaddeus P. Hyatt and William Main. All four gentlemen testified afterwards that: “Mrs. Besant ‘stated in the most positive and unqualified manner that the message from the Master which she found at a meeting of the Council of the E.S. [May 27, 1891] in London amongst other papers, <i>could not have been placed there by Mr. Judge or anyone else</i>’.”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 27, 1891 and July 6, 1891 entries for Mrs. Besant’s letter and declaration to Mrs. Julia Campbell VerPlanck (Mrs. Julia Keightley). Also see Appendix A, No. 10.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Oct. 1922; pp.402-403</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1925, pp.646-647</p>
Dec. 9, 1891	<p>Mrs. Besant “embarked on the ‘City of Paris’” to return to England, (arriving on Dec. 16th).</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, Jan. 1892; p.325</p>
Dec. 10, 1891	<p>“Col. Olcott returns to Adyar, after ten days in Ceylon”</p> <p>NOTE: A Short History of the T.S. p.284, has Olcott arriving in Adyar on Dec. 12th.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 13, p.xxvii</p>
1891, Late	<p>Claimants to being H.P.B.’s “successor”: <i>Madame Marie Caithness, Duchess of Pomar.</i> “Within a week from the death of H.P.B. the Paris press announced that Madame Marie Caithness, Duchess of Pomar, had been ‘chosen’ by H.P.B. as her successor. The Duchess had been a long time friend of H.P.B., who had been her guest during the stay in Paris in 1884; she was ‘psychic’; she was greatly interested in the ‘occult’.”</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Jan. 1922; pp.79-80</p>
1891, Late continued	<p><i>Mr. Henry B. Foulke.</i> “A rubbishing report is circulating to the effect that H.P.B. chose Mr. Foulke of Philadelphia as her ‘Successor’, and ratified her act by appearing in a Spiritualist circle and painting for him her portrait.”</p> <p>Letter by William Q. Judge to “Editor Times”, where this claim first appeared in which he stated: “Madame Blavatsky has no ‘successor,’ could have none, never contemplated, selected, or notified one.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, June 1892; p.91</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 11, Nov. 1892; pp.182-183</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 10, Mar. 1892; pp.81-83</p>

1891, Late continued	<p><i>Mrs. Annie Besant.</i> [i.e. after H.P.B.'s death] “Not till nearly four years later did Mrs. Besant make her assertion of ‘successorship,’ and then only after Mr. Judge, in fulfilment of H.P.B.’s circular of August 9, 1890 — ‘and any member acting on any other sort of order (i.e. than ‘through William Q. Judge or those which I myself sign my name to with my physical hand’) will be expelled from the Section’— had, under Master’s direction, declared Mrs. Besant’s headship in the E.S.T. at an end.”</p> <p>“Early in 1895 the Countess Wachtmeister issued a circular entitled, ‘H.P.B. and the Present Crisis in the Theosophical Society’ in which she attempted to bolster Annie Besant's claim of ‘successorship’ . . .” NOTE: Annie Besant had been appointed only as Chief Secretary of the Inner Group of the Esoteric Section and Recorder of the Teachings, on April 1, 1891, only one month before H.P.B.’s death.</p> <p>“It is upon such statements written by H.P.B. privately to individuals, and alleged verbal statements to others that Mrs. Besant’s claim to be the occult successor to H.P.B. is based.” Quotes from H.P.B. about Besant: “She is a most wonderful women, my right hand, my successor. . . .” NOTE: See Mar. 27, 1891 entry.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, Apr. 1915; p.279</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, May 1915; pp.323-325</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, Apr. 1915; p.279</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, May 1915; p.324</p>
1891, Late continued	<p><i>William Q. Judge:</i> “In America . . . Mr. Judge was considered the foreordained ‘successor.’ But when . . . reporters sought to interview him, he received them in a body and made them the succinct statement: ‘Madame Blavatsky was <i>sui generis</i>. She has and can have no ‘successor’ .”</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Jan. 1922; p.80</p>
1892	<p>Cleather stated that Annie Besant visited mediums to try to communicate with H.P.B. “In 1892, only one year after her [H.P. Blavatsky’s] death, my colleague Mr. Basil Crump, Barrister-at-Law, was investigating the phenomena of a certain trance medium shortly before he joined the T.S. He was present at a private sitting with this medium in the studio of an artist friend, to which Mrs. Besant came with another Member of H.P.B.’s Inner Group, Miss Emily Kislingbury, in order to speak with her deceased teacher. An intelligence calling itself ‘Madame Blavatsky’ controlled the medium, and Mrs. Besant held a conversation with it.”</p>	<p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, pp.57-58</p>
1892 continued	<p>Theosophy magazine examines “MASTERS AND THEIR MESSAGE”, THE CAUSES OF THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST WM. Q. JUDGE.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, June 1915; pp.369, 374-375 July 1915; pp.422-423, 426</p>

1892 continued	<p>On H.P.B.'s "seal", and Masters' messages.</p> <p>"H.P.B. used the seal . . . upon her letter paper and envelopes as early as June, 1875. The Society was founded in November, 1875, so that she was using the symbol for four months before we adopted it. . . . her private symbol became our public corporate seal. . . . the symbol precisely as printed in February Path. . . ." [p.387]</p> <p>Summarizes "Panjab seal" controversy and Judge's statement (April 1893) that he knew nothing about the seal — meaning thereby the "Panjab seal" but interpreted by Olcott as denial as he believed Judge had in fact been using it on bogus messages. [pp.401-402]</p> <p>NOTE: See Mar. 20, 1895 entry for Countess Wachtmeister and Wm. Lindsay on "H.P.B.'s seal"</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Feb. 1893; pp.343-344, 358 Mar. 1893; p.387</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Oct. 1922; pp.400-403</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Apr. 1922; p.174</p> <p>English Theosophist, Vol. 3, Nov. 1899; pp.161-165</p> <p>The Lamp, Vol. 3, Dec. 1899; p.157</p>
1892 continued	<p>Footnote by C. Jinarajadasa, referring to H.P.B.'s ring.</p> <p>"The Rosicrucian Jewel of the 18th Degree, which H.P.B. possessed, and which is now the property of Dr. Annie Besant. It is said to have belonged to Cagliostro."</p>	<p>Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom, (1973), 2nd series; p.46</p>
1892 continued	<p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by Annie Besant References to the "seal"</p>	<p>Pamphlet (1895), (88 pages), pp.12, 19, 30-31, 41, 43-44, 46, 53, 63, 69-77, 83-84</p>
Jan. 21, 1892	<p>"RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENCY T.S. BY COL. OLCOTT."</p> <p>H.S. Olcott resigned as President in a letter to W.Q. Judge, Vice-President of the Theosophical Society:</p> <p>"I have obtained permission to carry out the wish — expressed by me in the convention of 1886 and reiterated in that of 1890 — and retire from the Presidency. My health is now too uncertain for me to count upon having the ability to travel and work as I have done until now. . . .</p> <p>"In parting with my colleagues, I beg them to regard me, not as a person worthy of honor, but only as a sinful man, erring often but always striving to work his way upward and to help his fellow-men."</p> <p>NOTE: Olcott's letter, which also appeared in the Theosophist, was dated January 1st, 1892.</p> <p>NOTE: See Mar. 9, 1892 and Sep. 1910, and Oct. 7, 1890 entries.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, Mar. 1892; pp.406-407</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 10, Mar. 1892; pp.1-3</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 13, Mar. 1892; Supp. p.xliv</p>

Jan. 21, 1892 continued	<p>“While Col. Olcott attributed his retirement to ill-health, the real reason came to light several years later, in a letter by Herbert Burrows to the <i>English Theosophist</i> for November, 1895. . . . Mr. Burrows referred to the ‘accusations of grave immorality against Col. Olcott, laid before him by Mrs. Besant and Mr. Judge, and in consequence of which the Colonel resigned his presidency’.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 23, 1894, Jan. 11, 1896 and Oct. 2, 1895. NOTE: See Oct. 2, 1895 for “Mr. Herbert Burrows and the T.S.”</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.190</p> <p>English Theosophist, Vol. 1, Nov. 1895; p.22</p>
Jan. 21, 1892 continued	<p>“In California the newspapers last month chose to inform the public that although Colonel Olcott had resigned the Presidentship of the Theosophical Society on the plea of ill-health, yet his real reason was his dislike for the idolatry of H.P.B. practised by its members.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 10, Apr. 1892; p.169</p>
Jan. 21, 1892 continued	<p>“Col. Olcott’s retirement has stirred up no bitter comments from the press, but the <i>Chronicle</i> printed his letter <i>in extenso</i> with a tolerably complete notice of his career. Other papers printed paragraphs. The best wishes of all will go with Col. Olcott in his retirement from official cares.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Apr. 1892; p.30</p>
Jan. 21, 1892 continued	<p>“Explanation by William Q. Judge of Charges About Messages.” (at the Boston Convention)</p> <p>“He went into the question of the real reason for Olcott’s resignation, showing that Mrs. Besant was the person most involved in the demand for that, and then, referring to the ‘poison interview message’ showed that charges of that sort had been circulated against Olcott in London and not by Mr. Judge. . . .”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, May 1895; p.68</p>
Jan. 21, 1892 continued	<p>Note and Comments by the Editor.</p> <p>“We have here an important contribution towards the clearing up of the ‘Resignation Mystery’ of 1892. It dovetails exactly into the statement made by Mr. Judge, which was confirmed by Mr. Neresheimer, supported by Mr. Burrows, and denied by Mrs. Besant.”</p> <p>Comment re: “Notes and Comments” in The English Theosophist dealing with Col. Olcott’s resignation in 1892.</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 11, 1896 entry. In the Indian Mirror for Jan. 11th Mrs. Besant “replies” to Herbert Burrows. Also see Dec. 1895 for “The Resignation Mystery, 1892”</p>	<p>English Theosophist, Vol. 1, Mar. 1896; pp.51-52</p> <p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, Apr. 1896; p.29</p>
Feb. 1, 1892	<p>“To The Fellows of The Theosophical Society.”</p> <p>Letter by H.S. Olcott advising members of his resignation and “bidding you an official farewell. . . .”</p> <p>Circular included vote slip which read:</p> <p>“Having read the official documents connected herewith, I am of the opinion that _____ should be elected to succeed Col. H.S. Olcott as President of the Theosophical Society.”</p>	<p>Circular, 5 pages</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 10, Mar. 1892; pp.3-5</p>

Feb. 1892	<p>“<i>ASCETICISM.</i>” by H.S. Olcott “No delusion is more common among aspirants to the higher knowledge than that the end can be attained with reasonable certainty by physiological restraint.” Gave an example given him by H.P.B. of how the external habits of a person do not necessarily reflect their inner-self.</p> <p>mentioned . . .</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 13, Feb. 1892; pp.257-261</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 7, Apr. 1892; pp.27-28</p>
Feb.11, 1892	<p>“EXECUTIVE CIRCULAR.” by Olcott. “In January last . . . I carried out a purpose long entertained and sent the Vice-President my resignation of Presidentship. . . . “On the 11th February, however the familiar voice of my Guru chided me for attempting to retire before my time, asserted the unbroken relation between Himself, H.P.B. and myself and bade me prepare to receive further and more specific orders by messenger, but without naming time or place.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 21, 1892 and Nov. 1892 entries.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 2, Oct. 1892; p.6</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Nov. 1921; pp.22-24</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 13, Sep. 1892; p.xci</p>
Feb. 22, 1892	<p>Letter from W.Q. Judge to Col. Olcott in response to Olcott’s resignation. “I beg to acknowledge the receipt, on the evening of the 19th of February, 1892, of your resignation of the office of President of the Theosophical Society, to take effect on the first of May, 1892. . . . Having received this from you it is my duty, as Vice-President, to notify the various sections of the Society of the fact of your resignation and of its cause. This I will do at once.”</p> <p>NOTE: This is the third time that Col. Olcott attempted to resign his office as President of the Society. In Judge’s letter to Olcott he states, “. . . have compelled you to carry out the wish for retirement which you expressed in 1886 and repeated in 1890.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, Mar. 1892; p.407</p>
Mar. 1892	<p>H.S. Olcott begins his critiques of H.P.B in “Old Diary Leaves”, in “The Meeting of H.P.B. and Myself.”</p> <p>Comments from “Old Diary Leaves”: “Olcott . . . was proclaiming that H.P.B. was the ‘subject of distinct mental evolution’; that she knew nothing of reincarnation until 1879, when she was instructed in this doctrine in India.”</p> <p>NOTE: See entry for June 1895, “H.S. Olcott vs H.P.B.”</p> <p>[Continued in next cell.]</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 13, Mar. 1892; pp.323-336</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.202-203</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Jan. 1922; pp.82-87, 105</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, June 1915; pp.375-378, July 1915; pp.418-419</p>

Mar. 1892 continued	<p>“VERY IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT has been made by circular . . . that Col. Olcott will begin in March <i>Theosophist</i> a series of articles entitled ‘Old Diary Leaves’, being reminiscences of the origin and vicissitudes of the Theosophical Society, and personal anecdotes and recollections of Madame H.P.Blavatsky, her phenomena and friends, collected during the past seventeen years.” [April 1892]</p> <p>“Appended to ‘Old Diary Leaves’ [May 1892] is this request: “I shall be under great obligations to any friend who wishes well to this historical sketch, if he (or she) will give or lend me for reference any interesting documents, or any letters written them during the years 1875, 6, 7, and 8 by either H.P.B. or myself, about phenomena, the occult laws which produce them. . . . One ought not, at the age of 60, to trust too much to one’s own memory, although mine seems not to fail me as yet.” [July 1892, p.126]</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Apr. 1892; p.28 May 1892; p.57 July 1892; p.126</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; p.2</p>
Mar. 9, 1892	<p>Pamphlet issued from the General Secretary’s Office of the Theosophical Society, European Section.</p> <p>The President’s Resignation issued by G.R.S. Mead, Includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Letter of Resignation from the President-Founder to the Vice-President [Jan.21, 1892] 2. The Vice-President’s reply [Feb. 22, 1892] 3. Letter from the Vice-President to the G.S. of the European Section (G.R.S. Mead), stating facts and procedures according to the Constitution. [Feb. 22, 1892] 4. Letter from the V.P. to the G.S. of the European Section with further information as to procedure according to the Constitution. [Feb. 22, 1892] <p>G.R.S. Mead concludes: “It is therefore necessary that every member of the Theosophical Society should record his or her opinion as to who is the fitting person to succeed Colonel H.S. Olcott as President of the Theosophical Society.”</p>	Pamphlet, 7 pages
Mar. 10, 1892	<p>Annie Besant “[h]aving put pressure on Mr. Judge to request Olcott to resign, she returned to London and there advocated the election of Mr. Judge to the Presidency. On March 10, 1892, she sent to all members of the Esoteric Section a circular letter urging the choice of Judge as Olcott’s successor. She did this without Mr. Judge’s knowledge. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See modified circular to E.S. dated Aug. 1, 1892.</p>	Theos. Movement 1875-1950 , p.192
Mar. 11, 1892	<p>To The Members of the Blavatsky Lodge. Annie Besant issues an E.S. Circular as President of Blavatsky Lodge. “I . . . frankly say to you that, in my view, the present Vice-President, and remaining co-Founder of the Society, William Q. Judge, is the most suitable person to guide the Society, and the one who cannot with justice be passed over. He is not only the Vice-President and a Founder, but he was the trusted friend and colleague of H.P. Blavatsky from 1875 until she passed away.”</p>	Circular, 1 page

<p>Mar. 25, 1892</p>	<p>“Appointment and Order.” Letter signed by W.Q. Judge as “Vice-President, Acting President of T.S.” sent “To The Various Sections T.S. :” “I hereby appoint as my representative at the Headquarters in Adyar Brother Bertram Keightley, now General Secretary of the Indian Section, and in case he cannot serve by reason of absence, I appoint Brother Sydney V. Edge; said appointments to take effect from and after the 1st of May, 1892.”</p> <p>“NOTICE BY VICE-PRESIDENT T.S.” W.Q. Judge explained that: “In May PATH a document was published by me, appointing a representative at Adyar, India, and referring to other matters arising upon the then contemplated retirement of President H.S. Olcott Its appearance together with the resolution of the American Convention refusing Col. Olcott’s resignation. . . . the said appointments must remain in suspense . . . until the President replies definitively to the American resolution. If he [HSO] does not retire, the appointment falls; if the contrary, then it stands with full effect.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, May 1892; p.59</p> <p>The Path , Vol. 7, June 1892; p.97</p>
<p>Apr. 2, 1892</p>	<p>“In a letter from Mr. [Kavasji] M. Shroff to Annie Besant . . . Mr. Shroff says that Brother W.Q. Judge is ‘strongly suspected of having forged all along letters in the name of the Masters after H.P.B.’s departure. “In Mrs. Besant’s reply of April 22nd, she says, ‘I know that Col. Olcott has made random statements to that effect (that Judge forged the letters), as he made random statements about H.P.B. committing frauds.’ In Mr. Judge’s reply to Mr. Shroff, . . . he says that Olcott should be asked for the proof of the charges against him (Judge), ‘for he is the one who has given them out and is their sole author’.”</p> <p>NOTE: Theosophy Exposed by J. Murdoch. Murdoch includes William Emmette Coleman’s paper, “Critical Historical Review” (pp.21-37) which was read at the Chicago Psychical Science Congress of 1893, which was officiated by Elliott Coues. It is from Coleman’s paper that the above quote is taken. [See Works Cited section.]</p>	<p>Theosophy Exposed by J. Murdoch, Dec. 1893; p.34</p>

<p>Apr. 24, 25, 1892</p>	<p>Sixth Annual Convention of the American Section — Chicago</p> <p>“Annual Convention, American Section.” “The Annual Convention will be held April 24 and 25, Sunday and Monday, at the Palmer House Assembly Rooms, in Chicago, Ill. The program will include resolutions regarding H.P. Blavatsky, and also in respect to Col. H.S. Olcott’s resignation of the Presidency.”</p> <p>Col. Olcott’s resignation as President of the Society was read as well as the reply of the V.P., together with H.S. Olcott’s circular to the Society.</p> <p>G.R.S. Mead received a letter from W.Q. Judge giving details of the action taken at the American Convention on the resignation of Colonel Olcott. [Quoted from Lucifer]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Refusal of Colonel Olcott’s resignation. b. Declaration that Colonel Olcott should remain President, even if not working. c. Declaration that William Q. Judge should be chosen as President for life to succeed to the Presidency when it ultimately becomes vacant. d. Request to Colonel Olcott to suspend his action and revoke his resignation. e. Direction to William Q. Judge to notify Colonel Olcott and the other Sections of these Resolutions. f. Reëlection of William Q. Judge as General Secretary of the American Section. <p>“No detailed report of the proceedings at the American Convention has yet been received, but the General Secretary of the American Section has forwarded copies of the following resolutions for publication: — ” regarding <i>The President’s Retirement</i>.</p> <p>“Judge, declining the Presidency by securing revocation of Olcott’s resignation. . . .”</p> <p>In a letter from Col. Olcott (through the Recording Secretary, S.E. Gopalacharlu) read at the Convention: “The President Founder requests you to enter the text of his resignation and explanatory letter in the Official Report of your Convention, and to kindly say to his American brothers that the withdrawal from office is merely the relinquishment of an official position which, for reasons public and private, he felt he had no longer the moral right to retain.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Apr. 1892; p.32</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 7, May 1892; pp.65-68</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 10, May 1892; pp.181-182</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.191</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.149-150</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 13, June 1892; Supp. pp.lxviii-lxix</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; p.149</p> <p>Report of Proceedings, (1892), pp.39-40</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Nov. 1921; pp.10-16</p>
<p>Apr. 24, 25, 1892 continued</p>	<p>Letter from W.Q. Judge to H.S. Olcott. “The reason for my work against your resignation is found in Master’s order and naught else.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 30, 1893 entry</p>	<p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); p.32</p>

Apr. 27, 1892	<p>“The President’s Retirement. EXECUTIVE ORDERS.” H.S. Olcott delaying his retirement. “Notice is therefore given that without again vainly trying to fix an actual date for my vacating office, I shall do my utmost to hasten the completion of all legal business, so that I may hand over everything to Mr. Judge, my old friend, colleague, and chosen successor.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, July 1892; pp.128-130</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 10, June 1892; pp.333-334</p>
May 1, 1892	<p>“The New Headquarters.” “After May 1st all letters to the General Secretary, the PATH, the editor of the <i>Forum</i>, the Aryan Press, and ‘F.T.S.’ should be addressed to 144 MADISON Ave, New York City, P.O. Box 2659 and the rooms at 132 Nassau St. being then vacated. “The <i>Aryan T.S.</i> has purchased the house, 144 Madison Avenue between 31st and 32nd streets, which is built of brown stone and four stories.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Apr. 1892; p.32</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 1, Mar. 1892; p.8, July 1892; p.2</p>
May 8, 1892	<p>“In the address at Adyar on White Lotus Day, and in a slip affixed to the June issue [of The Theosophist], the way is cautiously, and somewhat dexterously, opened for the withdrawal of the Presidential resignation. If Col. Olcott[‘s] . . . Teachers should order him to cancel his resignation and remain in office till the end of his life, he will obey, health or no health.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Aug. 1892; p.163</p>
May 13, 1892	<p>“A LETTER FROM DR. F. HARTMANN TO W.Q. JUDGE.” “I have just been informed of Your election to the presidency of the T.S. as successor to Col. Olcott, and I wish to congratulate You.”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 4, Jan. 1933; pp.131-132</p>
May 24, 1892	<p>“MR. JUDGE’S REPLY” to Dr. Hartmann. “H.S.O. has offered his resignation and the Society has practically declared me as successor, but the U.S. has asked him to revoke, India asks him to remain in action as Prest with me as Actg. P., and Europe is to be asked in July what it has to say. However it remains suspended. “For myself I would never wish this office as it is very troublesome and thankless, but H.P.B. — in whom I never lost faith — asked me to take it if O. went out or died.”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 4, Jan. 1933; pp.131-132</p>
May 25, 1892	<p>“NOTE FROM COL. OLCOTT TO THEOSOPHISTS” Issued from Gulistan, Ootacamund, (in the Nilgherry Hills) India. “I have just received a digest of the Resolutions passed by the American Convention relative to my retirement. . . . As my resignation was not thoughtlessly offered nor without sufficient reasons, I shall not cancel it . . . until a long enough time has been given me to see what effect the invigorating air of these lovely mountains will have upon my health, and I become satisfied that a return to executive work is essential to the welfare of our movement.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 24-25, 1892 re: Olcott receives copies of resolutions.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Aug. 1892; pp.167-168</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Nov. 1921; p.16</p>

June 15, 1892	<p>“William Q. Judge, one of H.P. Blavatsky’s oldest and most trusted friends, will be among us on English soil once more . . . [H]e is to be the Society’s next President, and, if the past may count for anything in judging of the future, no hands could be found to which to confide its destinies more loyal, more strong, and more true. . . . He will reach England . . . the first week of July, so as to be present at the Second Annual Convention of the European Section.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 10, June 1892; pp.271-272</p>
July 14, 15, 1892	<p>“The Theosophical Society, European Section.” “Second Annual Convention . . . Agenda”</p> <p>“European Section Convention.” “On motion of Mrs. Besant, Bro. William Q. Judge was elected chairman. “The chairman . . . explained the American resolutions about Col. Olcott. . . . “Bro. Mead took the chair at 11:50 a.m. and put the vote on the succession to the presidency of the Society, which was unanimous for William Q. Judge.” [to succeed H.S. Olcott]</p> <p>“Convention of the European Section.” Detailed report . . .</p>	<p>Notice, 4 pages</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 7, Aug. 1892; pp.169-172</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 10, Aug. 1892; pp.509-515</p>
July 14, 15, 1892 continued	<p>“A letter of greeting from the American Theosophists, signed by Mr. Judge, was presented to the European Section . . . This letter referred to Col. Olcott’s resignation: “At our Convention in April last we asked to unite with us in a request to Colonel Olcott to revoke his resignation. This we did in candour and friendship. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: Also included in Apr. 24,25, 1892]</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.191</p>
July 14, 15, 1892 continued	<p>An article from Mr. Judge’s address at the close of the Convention “The Promulgation of Theosophy”.</p>	<p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 1, pp.73-76</p>
July 21, 1892	<p>Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden on the Master’s Certificates as to their part in the authorship of The Secret Doctrine — received by him from Them independently. “On the night of my last parting from H.P.B., the two <i>certificates</i>, which were printed for the first time in the last April number of <i>The Path</i>, page 2, were given to me. At least I found them in my copy of Hodgson’s S.P.R. Report after I had left Her. <i>I</i> am the person who showed them to Mr. Judge in London last August. From the advice given me in the one signed K.H. I was not to publish them, but Mr. Judge was authorised to do so by the instructions which <i>he</i> received.”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 1893 entry on AUTHORSHIP OF SECRET DOCTRINE by W.Q. Judge. NOTE: See Oct. 1893 entry on Masters’ influence on writing of The Secret Doctrine</p> <p>NOTE: The date of this entry is originally from Judge’s diary.</p>	<p>Reminiscences of H.P.B. by C. Wachtmeister; p.113</p> <p>Rebirth of The Occult Tradition by B. de Zirkoff; pp.12-23, incl. photos, plates, etc.</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, pp.324-326, 329</p>

<p>Aug. 1, 1892</p>	<p>Failure by the European Section to ask Col. Olcott to reverse his decision regarding his resignation led to suspicion “of a political maneuver by Mr. Judge to gain the Presidency. Mrs. Besant’s E.S. circular of March 10th, urging that Judge be elected, seemed to confirm this supposition. . . . Another Circular issued by Mrs. Besant, and signed also by Mr. Judge, was sent to all E.S. members on August 1, 1892 in which Mrs. Besant affirmed that her previous Circular (of March 10), expressing the hope that ‘the choice of the Society would fall upon William Q. Judge, as President,’ had not been made by her as ‘one of the Outer Heads, of the E.S.’”</p> <p>NOTE: See Mar. 10, 1892 on E.S. Circular issued by A. Besant.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.193-194</p>
<p>Aug. 21, 1892</p>	<p>“EXECUTIVE ORDERS.” From H.S. Olcott, P.T.S. to W.Q. Judge, Esq. Vice-President T.S. “The restoration of my health and other important considerations induce me to revoke my letter of resignation of office, and I beg to hand you herewith an Advanced Copy of the Executive Circular notifying the fact, which will appear in the September number of the <i>Theosophist</i>.”</p> <p>“EXECUTIVE CIRCULAR.” From H.S. Olcott, P.T.S. “The Indian Section had, as early as February last, unanimously agreed to recommend that if I were really compelled to retire the Presidential office should not be filled during my lifetime, but my duties performed by the Vice-President, acting as P.T.S. . . . “The London Convention of the American Section, held in July, also unanimously declared its choice of Mr. Judge as my successor, and adopted complimentary Resolutions about myself, but abstained from passing upon the question of my retaining office under the misapprehension — how caused I know not — that I had definitively and finally refused to revoke my January letter of resignation. The fact being that the terms of my May note upon the subject (printed with the June <i>Theosophist</i>) left the question open and dependent upon the contingencies of my health and the proof that my return to office would be for the best interest of the Society. “. . . I hereby give notice that I revoke my letter of resignation and resume the active duties and responsibilities of office; and I declare William Q. Judge, Vice-President, my constitutional successor and eligible for duty as such upon his relinquishment of any other office in the Society which he may hold at the time of my death.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 11, Oct. 1892; pp.165-167</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 13, Sep. 1892; Supp. p.xci</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 7, Oct. 1892; pp.235-236</p>
<p>Aug. 21, 1892 continued</p>	<p>Summary explanation of H.S. Olcott’s resignation and revocation.</p> <p>More detailed information on the “RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENCY T.S. BY COL. OLCOTT.”</p> <p>NOTE: See also Sep. 26, 1892 entry “<i>Two Theosophical Events.</i>”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Nov. 1892; pp.249-250</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1925, pp.326-333, 646-647</p>

Aug. 30, 1892	<p>“Col. Olcott’s Revocation.”</p> <p>Together with his letter addressed “<i>To the Members and Branches of T.S. in U.S.</i>”, Judge publishes an “EXECUTIVE CIRCULAR” (dated 21st Aug., 1892) from Olcott in which Olcott revokes his letter of resignation. Judge had received a telegram to this effect on August 30th, advising him to expect an official letter (which was received September 24th).</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Oct. 1892; pp.235-236</p>
Sep. 26, 1892	<p>New York Sun repudiates Coues articles attacking H.P.B. Retraction issued. “<i>The Esoteric She</i>” of W.Q. Judge published. The retraction reads:</p> <p>“We print on another page an article in which Mr. William Q. Judge deals with the romantic and extraordinary career of the late Madame Helena P. Blavatsky, the Theosophist. We take occasion to observe that on July 20, 1890, we were misled into admitting to the <i>Sun</i>’s columns an article by Dr. E. F. Coues, of Washington, in which allegations were made against Madame Blavatsky’s character, and also against her followers, which appear to have been without solid foundation. Mr. Judge’s article disposes of all questions relating to Madame Blavatsky as presented by Dr. Coues, and we desire to say that his allegations respecting the Theosophical Society and Mr. Judge personally are not sustained by evidence, and should not have been printed.”</p> <p>“The Libel on H.P. BLAVATSKY.”</p> <p>“On Sep. 26th the <i>New York Sun</i> published a general retraction of the libel emitted by it in July, 1890, which was written by Dr. E. Coues”.</p> <p>NOTE: See the article “<i>The Esoteric She</i>” written by Mr. Judge and published in the New York Sun, September 26, 1892. This article was reprinted in Echoes of the Orient Vol. 3, pp. 207-214; also in Theosophical Articles (ULT) Vol. 2, pp.27-36; and included in a booklet, The Esoteric She, by Point Loma Publications.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.154</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 11, Oct. 1892; pp.95-96</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 7, Oct. 1892; p.236</p>
Sep. 26, 1892 continued	<p>“The importance of this case lies in the fact that it constituted an absolute vindication of H.P.B., for every slander ever circulated directly or indirectly was covered by it.”</p>	<p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, p.59fn.</p>
Sep. 26, 1892 continued	<p>“Two Theosophical Events.”</p> <p>“A LIBEL RETRACTED — COL. OLCOTT STILL PRESIDENT.”</p> <p>“Two events of importance occurred, the one removing a cloud, [Judge’s article “<i>The Esoteric She</i>”] the other reassuring the Society that its President Founder [H.S. Olcott] would remain in office.</p> <p>“In July, 1890 the <i>Sun</i> . . . published a news article in which gross charges were made against the character of H.P. Blavatsky . . . and charging also Col. Olcott, William Q. Judge, and many others with assisting her in fraud and with living upon the Society.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 21, 1892 on Olcott’s resignation.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Nov. 1892; pp.248-249</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.189-190</p>

Sep. 26, 1892 continued	<p>“<i>The Esoteric She</i>, THE LATE MME. BLAVATSKY—A SKETCH OF HER CAREER.”</p> <p>“The article written by Mr. Judge . . . at the invitation of the <i>New York Sun</i>, received editorial sanction from the words, ‘Mr. Judge’s article disposes of all questions relating to Madame Blavatsky as presented by Dr. Coues’.”</p> <p>[New York Sun, September 26, 1892]</p>	Theos. Movement 1875-1950 , p.154
Oct. 21, 1892	<p>A. Besant explains why she did not travel to India in 1891/1892.</p> <p>“Last year I promised to visit India, if possible, but there were two conditions necessary of fulfilment: (1) That my health would bear the climate; (2) that . . . enough money be raised in India to cover the cost of the tour, and to pay towards the maintenance of Headquarters that which I should have paid out of my earnings if I were working in Europe or America. Neither of these conditions was fulfilled”.</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 27, 1891 for “ANNIE BESANT’S INDIAN TOUR” and Dec. 1895 “The Resignation Mystery, 1892.”</p>	Lucifer , Vol. 11, Nov. 1892; pp.251-252
Nov. 1892	<p>“Tribute from Col. Olcott to Mr. Judge:”</p> <p>“Though so very much my junior in both age and experience, I liked him from the first; and have always fully appreciated his excellent qualities, as they developed themselves in the course of time. The crowning proof of my regard has just been given in my accepting him as my successor in office; which I hope he may fill even more acceptably than I have.”</p> <p>NOTE: Originally published in The Theosophist as a series, titled “Old Diary Leaves.”</p> <p>NOTE: See also Feb.11, 1892 and Aug. 21, 1892 entries.</p>	The Theosophist , Vol. 14, Nov. 1892; p.73 Report of Proceedings T.S. in America, 1895 ; p.23
Nov. 1892 continued	<p>“Walter Old . . . goes to our Masters’ Motherland to serve its peoples.”</p> <p>He joined Sidney V. Edge in India who had left with Bertram Keightley on Aug. 21st, 1891. Both Old and Edge were members of the Esoteric School. Old had joined while H.P.B. was alive and Edge after she died.</p> <p>“Both . . . entered at once into the work of the Indian Section and the affairs at Headquarters, and were active contributors to the pages of the ‘Theosophist’ . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See entries: Apr. 15, 1893, June 15,1893, Aug. 1893 and see Dec.21, 1892 for Notice of Old’s arrival at Adyar.</p>	Lucifer , Vol. 11, Nov. 1892; p.184 Theosophy , Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.139, 172-175

Nov. 30, 1892	<p>Mrs. Besant arrived in New York City from London for her American Tour. Her tour included speaking engagements in New York, Toledo, Fort Wayne, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Minneapolis (where she found the cold intense), Sioux City, Omaha, Portland, Oregon; Tacoma, Seattle and San Francisco.</p> <p>Judge showed Besant his correspondence with H.S. Olcott including the letter concerning the August 1891 Jasper Niemand article in The Path. [see Aug. 1891 entry]</p> <p>NOTE: This was Mrs. Besant's third visit to America. See February 25, 1893, entry, the date she departed.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Jan. 1893; p.329</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; p.139</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.200</p>
Dec. 21, 1892	<p>“NOTICE.” from H.S. Olcott, P.T.S. Mr. Walter R. Old arrived at Headquarters, Madras. He “reported for duty with Head-quarters Staff . . . and detailed to the Indian Section as an Assistant Secretary.”</p> <p>“Almost immediately there was an interchange of confidences between us, which for the first time opened my eyes to the treacherous policy that Mr. Judge had been following up with regard to the Society and myself in the matter of his relations with the Masters.”</p>	<p>Prasnottara, Vol. 1, No. 24, Dec. 1892; p.192</p> <p>Old Diary Leaves, Fourth Series, p.507</p>
1893	<p>“H.S. Olcott and The Esoteric School, 1888.” In an 1893 letter to W.Q. Judge H.S. Olcott expressed his hostility and his suspicions about the Esoteric School and its influence. “My position . . . is this. (1) The E.S. and especially the I.G.[Inner Group], Svastika and other rings within rings I consider a danger and a possible source of great wrong and evil. . . . So long as the E.S. does not work against the Const[itution] of the T.S. I shall not oppose it, but when it does then I fight. “. . . I have said I preferred Annie to you as my successor because (1) of her superior education; (2) of her splendid public record; (3) of her literary and forensic ability; (4) of her ardent, martyr-like devotion to truth.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 53, Aug. 1932; p.608</p>
1893 continued	<p>“While a member of the E.S. and one of it's Co-Heads, Mrs. Besant joined the London Lodge and took part in the experiments of Messrs. Sinnett, Leadbeater and the rest of their <i>coterie</i> thus violating her pledges and pursuing two absolutely antithetical systems of ‘occult development’.”</p> <p>NOTE: It is doubtful that Besant joined London Lodge at this time because she was still President of Blavatsky Lodge. I have not seen any other references to support that she did join but she certainly had close relations, and more than likely engaged in various psychic practices with Leadbeater. Besant did give a lecture at the London Lodge on June 5th, 1894. Her lecture was “The Culture of the Soul” on Indian Methods of Spiritual Self Culture. [See Sep. 30, 1890]</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.261</p> <p>Transactions of the L.L., No. 22, June 1894</p>

Jan. 1893	<p>In “Mr. Bertram Keightley’s Reply” (December 23rd, 1894, Lucifer), to “The Clash of Opinion”, he refers to evidence being collected against W.Q. Judge by Annie Besant and H.S.Olcott: “In January, 1893, thanks largely to additional facts supplied by Mr. W.R. Old, I felt that sufficient evidence was available upon which to take public action, and I very strongly urged upon Colonel Olcott the duty of doing so.”</p> <p>“Mr. Keightley and Mr. Edge were taken into our counsels, and helped to compare the documents mutually submitted by Mr. Old and myself. On the arrival of the Delegates to the Convention [Dec.27, 28, 29, 1892] at the usual time, we submitted the papers to our respected colleague Judge Khandalavala, of Poona, who decidedly advised me to prosecute the case, as it was too serious a menace to the Society’s prosperity to allow it to go on.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix A for the complete letter by B. Keightley.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.505-507</p> <p>Old Diary Leaves, Fourth Series, p.508</p>
Jan. 1893 continued	<p>“Mrs. Annie Besant in San Francisco.” “Mrs. Besant arrived in San Francisco on Jan. 1st. . . . “Mrs. Besant left San Francisco for Southern California Jan. 8th.”</p> <p>“Annie Besant declared in San Francisco, that she could and would believe no ill of Brother Judge, and that if he were to be accused she would await his explanation before attempting to act.” [Editorial by Jerome Anderson]</p>	<p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 2, Feb. 1893; p.4</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, Apr. 1895; p.149</p>
Jan. 22, 1893 (circa)	<p>“Faces of Friends.” In his biography about Bertram Keightley, Mr. Judge mentions that Mr. Keightley left Adyar in January 1893.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Aug. 1893; pp.143-144</p>
Jan. 26, 1893	<p>Major General Abner Doubleday died of heart failure at his home in Mendham, New Jersey. (Born on June 26, 1819 at Ballston Spa, New York.) He entered West Point as a cadet in 1838 and graduated in 1842. He was commissioned in the artillery and served through the Mexican war and later in the Seminole campaign. He was promoted to first lieutenant in 1847 and captain in 1855, then to general in 1862. He also took part in the battle of Gettysburg. He was given a series of promotions up to Brevet Major General on March 13, 1865. On Dec. 11, 1873 he was retired from the active list of the U.S. Army at his own request. Almost immediately after the Theosophical Society was formed, in New York, he joined its ranks, attending meetings regularly, often meeting with Mme. Blavatsky, Col. Olcott and W.Q. Judge. He was made President <i>pro tem</i> in America on the arrival of Olcott and H.P.B. in India in 1879. A letter from H.P.B. dated April 17, 1880 informed him of his election as Vice-President of the T.S. Doubleday translated into English, Eliphas Lévi’s Dogma and Ritual of High Magic and Fables and Symbols.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Mar. 1893; pp.372-374</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.454-456</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, Mar. 1893; p.82</p> <p>Sunrise, Vol. 40, April/May 1991; pp.151-157</p>

<p>Feb. 25, 1893</p>	<p>Mrs. Besant departed on Saturday from New York, on the “<i>New York</i>”, for London.</p> <p>“<i>Theosophical Activities: American Section; Annie Besant’s American Tour.</i>”</p> <p>“Speeding the Message” by Annie Besant, detailing her American tour.</p>	<p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 2, Apr. 1893; p.4</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.139-140</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, Mar. 1893; pp.81-82</p> <p>Apr. 1893; pp.104-108</p>
<p>Mar. 1893</p>	<p>“H.P. Blavatsky on Precipitation and Other Matters.”</p> <p>“The following is the greater part of a letter written by H.P. Blavatsky some years ago at a time when, subsequent to the Psychical Research Society’s Report on Theosophical phenomena, not only the public but fellow members of the Society were doubting her, doubting themselves, doubting the Adepts.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 7, Mar. 1893; pp.381-385</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, Jan. 1915; pp.161-164</p>
<p>Mar. 23, 1893</p>	<p>“Col. H.S. Olcott’s Letter.”</p> <p>Letter from H.S. Olcott President of the Theosophical Society to “<i>The Delegates of the American Section in Convention Assembled</i>” “We have but one danger to dread and guard against. This is the subordination of general principles to hero-worship, or admiration of personalities.”[Read at the Seventh Annual Convention in New York, April 23-24, 1893.]</p> <p>“This was the second formal pronouncement by the President-Founder with all the authority of his official sanction, ostensibly to warn the members of the Society against dogmatism, authority, and hero-worship; actually, to reduce H.P.B. to the level of a dead person in place of a still potent and vital factor as the Teacher of Theosophy.”</p> <p>Olcott’s first attempt in this direction was at the Annual Anniversary at Adyar in Dec. 1891, in his President’s Address where he stated: “I deplore our intolerance, counting myself a chief offender, and I do especially protest against and denounce a tendency which is growing among us to lay the foundations of new idolatry.”</p> <p>NOTE: Olcott’s concerns may have been directed more towards W. Q. Judge than to other members of the Society. He also adds that “Not one word was ever spoken, transmitted or written to me by the Masters that warranted such a course. . . .” [Also see April 23-24, 1893 entry.]</p>	<p>Report of Proceedings, (1893), p.4</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.140-141</p> <p>General Report of the 16th Anniversary of the T.S., Dec. 1891; p.3</p>

Apr. 1893	<p>W.Q. Judge published, AUTHORSHIP OF SECRET DOCTRINE which included letters from the Masters. It is attributed to "ONE OF THE STAFF."</p> <p>NOTE: See July 21, 1892 entry.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Apr. 1893; pp.1-3</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, pp.321-329</p>
Apr. 5, 1893	<p>"TO THE BRAHMINS OF INDIA."</p> <p>An open letter by W.Q. Judge in response to an article by Rai B.K. Laheri in Lucifer, Feb. 1893.</p> <p>"[A] suspicion is spreading through the Brahmin community that the Theosophical Society is losing its impartial character as the equal friend to all religions and is becoming distinctly Buddhistic in its sympathies and affiliations."</p> <p>"India. A TRUMPET CALL AT A CRISIS." by W.Q. Judge. Article similar to above.</p> <p>"The Letter to the Brahmans." by W.Q. Judge.</p> <p>Further to the letter in The Path of May 1893, Judge stated: "Rai B.K. Laheri . . . himself a Brahman and an F.T.S., went to . . . Delhi in November 1893 . . . and laid before them [orthodox Brahman pandits] the letter referred to. They discussed it and the T.S., and he reports that they passed a resolution to help the T.S., and showed they were satisfied that the Society is not a Buddhist propaganda".</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, May 1893; pp.52-56</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, Apr. 1893; pp.143-147</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Mar. 1894; pp.72-74</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, p.274</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, pp.403-404</p>

Apr. 15, 1893	<p>“An Interesting Letter.” (“<i>Written to an Indian Brother</i>”) [Olcott] by W.Q. Judge. In Aug.1891 Jasper Niemand’s article “A Theosophical Education” appeared in The Path, preceded by a quote from the Master. Olcott questioned this message. W.Q. Judge’s letter was published in Lucifer Apr. 1893. W.Q.J. states: “I find it perfectly proper for me to assert, as I do, in accordance with my own knowledge and belief, that our true progress lies in fidelity to Masters as ideals and facts”. Regarding Jasper Niemand, W.Q.J. wrote: “<i>I did not write</i> the article you quote. I am not Jasper Niemand. Hence I did not get the message he printed a <i>part of</i> in his article. Jasper Niemand is a real person and not a title to conceal my person”. In reply to questions on the Master’s Seal: “Whether He has a seal or uses one is something on which I am ignorant. In my experience I have had messages from the Master, but they bear no seal and I attach no significance to the point. A Seal on other messages of His goes for nothing with me; the presence or absence of a seal is nothing to me; my means of proof and identification are within myself and everything else is trumpery”.</p> <p>NOTE: See comments and criticism by W.R. Old and S.V. Edge — “<i>THEOSOPHIC FREETHOUGHT</i>”. July 1893 entry</p> <p>NOTE: See “<i>THEOSOPHY IN THE WEST</i>” comments by Navroji Dorabji Khandalvala [N.D.K.]. July 1893 entry</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, Apr. 1893; pp.101-104</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Apr. 1922; pp.180-183</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, pp.43-47</p>
Apr. 15, 1893 continued	<p>Article by Jasper Niemand in The Path, titled: “<i>A THEOSOPHICAL EDUCATION</i>” and which begins:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">△</p> <p>“Ingratitude is not one of our faults. . . .”; referred to in above article by Judge.</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 1891 entry.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 6, Aug. 1891; pp.137-141</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.169-170, 200</p>
Apr. 15, 1893 continued	<p>“An Indian Brother” was Olcott . . . “This letter was, according to the restriction imposed by Mr. Judge, not published as to Col. Olcott, but as to ‘An Indian Brother,’ and was given by Mrs. Besant the caption, ‘An Interesting Letter’.”</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; p.171</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1925, p.426</p>
Apr. 15, 1893 continued	<p>“Mr. Judge declares that ‘Whether He’ (the Master) ‘has a seal, or uses one, is something on which I am ignorant.’ “It was on this statement—which involves a total lapse of memory on Mr. Judge’s part of events narrated . . . that he was challenged in <i>The Theosophist</i> of April [actually July]1893, in an article [Theosophical Freethought] signed by Messrs. W.R. Old and S.V. Edge. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 1893 entry for article by Old and Edge.</p>	<p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, 2nd ed., p.57</p>

Apr. 15, 1893 continued	<p>Further comments on Masters' messages after H.P.B.'s death: Annie Besant [August 30, 1891]: "... 'since Madame Blavatsky left, I have had letters in the same writing and from the same person,' i.e., from the 'Mahatma' from whom the 'messages' transmitted by H.P.B. during her life-time had been believed by Theosophists to emanate'."</p> <p>"'N.D.K.' [N.D. Khandalava] objects very strongly to Mr. Judge's saying that he 'knows out of his own experience' of the existence of Masters and suggests that Mr. Judge 'systematically and exhaustively bring forward his experience for the benefit of us all. . . . There is no virtue whatsoever in boldly making an assertion, and withholding the evidence upon which the assertion has been based.' Most objectionable of all to 'N.D.K.' is Mr. Judge's statement that his means of identifying a 'message' is 'within himself,' and not by means of external evidences such as signatures, seal, etc."</p> <p>"<i>THEOSOPHY IN THE WEST, THE TENDENCY TOWARDS DOGMATISM.</i>" by N.D.K.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.148-149</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol.10 Apr. 1922; pp.170-171</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, July 1893; pp.623-628</p>
Apr. 15, 1893 continued	<p>Annie Besant praises W.Q. Judge after her return from her American Tour.</p> <p>"I want to place on record here my testimony to the splendid work done in America by the Vice-President of our Society, the General Secretary of the Section, WILLIAM Q. JUDGE. H.P.B. knew well what she was doing when she chose that strong quiet man to be her second self in America. . . ."</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, Apr. 1893; p.89</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol.10, Mar. 1922; p.140</p>
Apr. 23-24, 1893	<p>"Col. H. S. Olcott's letter."</p> <p>Read at the Seventh Annual Convention T.S. American Section to <i>The Delegates of The American Section in Convention assembled</i>:</p> <p>"We have but one danger to dread and guard against. This is the subordination of general principles to hero-worship, or admiration of personalities. I shall not excuse myself for frequent recurrence to this theme, for I am convinced that, if the Society should ever disintegrate, this will be the cause. The Masters wrote in <i>Isis</i> that 'men and parties, sects and schools are but the mere ephemera of the World's day'; and following the precedent of their great recognized exemplar, Buddha Sakyamuni, they taught me to believe <i>nothing</i> upon authority, whether of a living or a dead person. I pray you to keep this ever in mind. . . ."</p>	<p>Report of Proceedings, held at New York Apr. 1893; p.4</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.140-141</p>

<p>Apr. 23-24, 1893 continued</p>	<p>“THE PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS. Incidents of the Congress.”</p> <p>In a letter to Mr. George Wright in September 1892, W.Q. Judge had hinted:</p> <p>“‘Why can’t we be represented at the World’s Fair?’ Acting upon this suggestion I [George Wright] immediately sought an audience with Mr. Charles C. Bonney, President of the World’s Congress Auxiliary. . . . Meanwhile Mr. Judge had forwarded a statement of the Society’s condition and aims, which I enclosed to Mr. Bonney, together with a formal application signed by myself as President of the Chicago Branch.”</p> <p>In reply to Judge’s telegram, the European Section gave its support and that “Mrs. Annie Besant will attend on her way to India.”</p> <p>Mr. Judge also received a letter of “endorsement, cooperation and concurrence” from Bertram Keightley, General Secretary Indian Section T.S., on behalf of that section.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Oct. 1893; p.160</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 8, May 1893; p.61</p> <p>Report of Proceedings, held at New York Apr. 1893; p.17</p>
<p>Apr. 27, 1893</p>	<p>Notice of Annie Besant’s plans to travel to India, by letter to Col. Olcott.</p> <p>“As I regretted sincerely that I was prevented from going to India under our previous agreement, I have much pleasure now in saying that, barring unforeseen accidents, I shall be able to make the Indian tour this autumn.”</p> <p>NOTE: Mrs. Besant’s decision to go to India was confirmed only after Bertram Keightley’s arrival in London sometime at the end of Feb. or beginning of March 1893. [See Jan. 22, 1893 (circa).]</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, June 1893; p.272</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, June 1893; Supp. p.lix</p>
<p>May 1893</p>	<p>Theosophy at The World’s Fair, September 15-16, 1893. INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE T.S..</p> <p>Outlined the steps “to procure an assignment of the Society to a date in the PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS SO AS TO PRESENT THE SUBJECT OF THEOSOPIY. . . .” It included the proposed program.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 8 pages</p>
<p>May 17, 1893</p>	<p>Letter from H.S. Olcott to W.Q. Judge.</p> <p>“‘If you want separate T.S. Societies made out of Sections, have them by all means: I offered this years ago to H.P.B., and even to A.P. S[innett]’.</p> <p>“In July, 1894, at London, he enunciated the same idea and plan to W.Q. Judge and Dr. Buck, after the dismissal of the Committee”.</p> <p>NOTE: From April 23 to Oct. 28, 1893 Olcott was at Adyar.</p> <p>NOTE: See May 15,1895.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, May 1895; p.59</p> <p>Report of Proceedings T.S. in America, 1895; p.23</p> <p>The Lamp, Vol. 1, May 1895; p.150</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 4, Mar. 1923; p.11</p>

<p>May 27, 1893</p>	<p>“EXECUTIVE NOTICES.” by H.S. Olcott. “[T]he undersigned . . . hereby deposes W.Q. Judge Vice-President, T.S., to represent him [at the World’s Parliament of Religions]. . . . “The undersigned also deposes Mrs. Annie Besant as a special Delegate from the President, to address the meetings in question on behalf of the whole Society. . . .” Olcott also stipulated, on T.S. neutrality: “Of course, it is to be distinctly understood that nothing shall be said or done by any Delegate or Committee of the Society to identify it, as a body, with any special form of religion, creed, sect, or any religious or ethical teacher or leader; our duty being to affirm and defend its perfect corporate neutrality in these matters.”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 23-24, 1894. Comments by Judge on H.S.O.’s statement on: T.S. neutrality: “This goes directly to the point, and was meant, as intimated to me by the President, to cover precisely the existence of the Mahatmas under the word ‘teacher’ and to prevent any fixing of the T.S. to H.P. Blavatsky by means of the use of the word ‘leader’.” [To which Mr. Judge concurs.]</p> <p>NOTE: See March 12 and 14, 1894.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, June 1893; Supp. p.lix</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 8, July 1893; p.128</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, July 1893; p.517</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, June 1894; pp.99-100</p>
<p>June 1893</p>	<p>Annie Besant published H.P. Blavatsky’s letter of Oct. 23,1889 re: W.Q. Judge [“W.Q. Judge is the <i>antaskarana</i> . . .”] “[T]he document of October 23, 1889 . . . was published to the members of the E.S. by Annie Besant in her <i>Answers to Correspondence</i> for June, 1893.”</p> <p>“In April ‘Lucifer’ Mrs. Besant says referring to W.Q. Judge: ‘H.P.B. knew well what she was doing when she chose that strong quiet man to be her second self in America. . . . In him we find the rare conjunction of business quality of the skilful organizer and the mystical insight of the Occultist’. . . .”</p> <p>Annie Besant’s Autobiography quoted H.P.B.: “‘Child’. . . ‘your pride is terrible; you are as proud as Lucifer himself’.”</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, June 1915; pp.371- 372, Apr. 1915; pp. 276, 279</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 1, Aug. 1893; p.119</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, May 1915; p.323</p>
<p>June 1893 continued</p>	<p>“Countess Wachtmeister is busily engaged on a book that is to be issued in the early Autumn, <i>How the Secret Doctrine was Written</i>.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 1893. The Path printed a short biography of Countess Wachtmeister, “Faces of Friends”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, June 1893; p.92</p> <p>Nov. 1893; pp.246-247</p>

June 15, 1893	<p>“At Taplow, England, on the evening of June 15, 1893, Mrs. Besant met and talked with Dr. and Mrs. Keightley on the subject of this [E.S. Advisory] Council meeting. . . . No action had as yet been taken in the E.S.T. on Mr. Old’s and Mr. Edge’s actions [<i>THEOSOPHIC FREETHOUGHT</i> article in The Theosophist]. In discussion they asked Mrs. Besant ‘what she had done with the parcel of letters between the time when she read and tied them together (in the afternoon) and the moment of taking them into the Council with her (in the evening).’ She replied that ‘she had locked them in a drawer in her room, where no one could have access to them, and took them from there into the Council Meeting, and that they were not out of her possession for a moment’.”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 27 and July 6, 1891 entries.</p>	Theos. Movement 1875-1925 , p.647
June 17, 1893	<p>“The General Secretary.” Mr. Judge “sailed for England in the <i>City of New York</i> on June 17th, purposing to attend the Annual Convention of the European Section on July 6th and 7th. . . . Towards the close of July Mr. Judge will return to the States.”</p>	The Path , Vol. 8, July 1893; p.125
June 24, 1893	<p>“The American General Secretary, Bro. Judge, arrived at Southampton June 24th, where Dr. and Mrs. A. Keightley met him, and he got to Headquarters on the evening of the same day.”</p>	The Path , Vol. 8, Aug. 1893; p.155
July 1893	<p>H.S. Olcott on M’s handwriting resembling H.P.B.’s. stated: “I think that . . . an inquiry will result in proving that such writing, when as closely analyzed as were the alleged Mahatma’s writings by the S.P.R., <i>always</i> resembles that of the intermediary to a greater or lesser extent, and without carrying the implication of bad faith on his or her part.”</p> <p>Jasper Niemand (Julia Keightley) made reference to Olcott’s description of the handwriting of letters received by H.P.B. (in the Theosophist for July 1893.), “. . . where he says that communications from high occult sources received through H.P.B. always resembled her handwriting”.</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix A for “Reply by William Q. Judge To The Charges. . . .” under sub-section “Precipitation” where Mr. Judge quotes more of Col. Olcott’s own words describing his observations on the subject.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, July 1893; pp.577-578 fn</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Apr. 1894; p.16</p>

July 1893	<p>“<i>THEOSOPHIC FREETHOUGHT.</i>”</p> <p>Comments and criticism by W.R. Old and S.V. Edge in response to W.Q. Judge’s statements in “An Interesting Letter”: “As to ‘Master’s seal,’ about which you put me the question, I do not know. Whether he has a seal or uses one is something on which I am ignorant,” they wrote in a footnote:</p> <p>“In regard to this statement we can only remark that Mr. Judge’s memory must be seriously defective. We must therefore remind him that a very important step in connection with the re-organization of the Esoteric Section of the T.S. was taken, after the death of H.P.B., on the authority of a certain message, purporting to come from one of the Mahatmas, and which bore, as Mr. Judge will now remember, a seal-impression, said by him to be that of ‘the Master.’ No doubt Mr. Judge will take the opportunity of either rectifying his statement or of showing how his acting upon the authority of ‘the Master’s’ seal at one time, and professing ignorance of it at another, may be regarded as consistent.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 15, 1893 entry for Judge’s remarks which generated this article from Old and Edge.</p> <p>“<i>THEOSOPHY IN THE WEST. THE TENDENCY TOWARDS DOGMATISM..</i>”</p> <p>Comments by N.D. Khandalavala on Judge’s article “An Interesting Letter”:</p> <p>“Mr. Judge asserts that ‘our true progress lies in fidelity to Masters as ideals and facts; that a constant reliance on Masters as such ideals and facts — or either — will lead the T.S. on to greater work. . . .”</p> <p>N.D.K. stated:</p> <p>“Does not the Christian missionary come canting after us with exactly the same words?”</p> <p>Most objectionable of all to N.D.K. is Mr. Judge’s statement that “[H]e does not care one iota for all the external evidence. . . . He informs us that the ‘means of proof and indication <i>are located within himself.</i>”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, July 1893; pp.606-611</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, July 1893; pp.623-628</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Apr. 1922; p.171</p>
July 1893 continued	<p>“A PLOT AGAINST THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.”</p> <p>Describes the current plot to erode H.P.B., to minimize her writings, and to question her position as a Messenger of the Mahatmas.</p> <p>William Kingsland explores various authors’ analyses and critiques on how they perceived Mme. Blavatsky obtained both her theories and her unacknowledged information.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, July 1893; p.111 Feb. 1894; p.352</p> <p>The Real H.P.B. (1928) by Wm. Kingsland, pp.168, 173</p>
July 6-7, 1893	<p>“CONVENTION EUROPEAN SECTION.”</p> <p>“The Third Annual Convention of the European Section assembled in the Hall of the Blavatsky T.S. in London at 10 a.m., July 6th. Bro. G.R.S. Mead as General Secretary called the meeting to order. . . .</p> <p>“Bro. William Q. Judge, Vice-President T.S., was elected Chairman of the Convention.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Aug. 1893; pp.156-157</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 1, July 1893; p.106</p>

July 6-7, 1893 continued	<p>“Closing Speech of William Q. Judge.” As Chairman of the European Convention, Mr. Judge in his closing speech addressed the fear of a dogmatic tendency. “But those who have spoken of dogmatism, have mistaken energy, force, personal conviction and loyalty to personal teachers and ideals for dogmatism. Such are not dogmatism. One has a perfect right to have a settled conviction, to present it forcibly, to sustain it with every argument, without being any the less a good member of the Society.”</p> <p>“Dogmatism in the T.S., SOME OPINIONS OF ITS MEMBERS” Letters to the Editor of The Path by J.D. Buck, Jerome A. Anderson, Wm. Main, J.C. Keightley, George D. Ayers, E. Aug. Neresheimer, Alexander Fullerton, Geo. E. Wright, Robert Crosbie, Edward B. Rambo and A.P. Buchman in reply to the question: “To what extent, if any, is there in our literature or in the words of Theosophical leaders a dogmatic spirit or a tendency to demand a belief in any writer’s or teacher’s views?”</p> <p>NOTE: Annie Besant made an editorial note to Mr. W.F. Kirby’s article “French Spiritism” in Lucifer May 1893 and again in the “Watch-Tower” in Lucifer August 1893, where she reiterated her own convictions: “The keynote of the work for each of us is that of devotion to the MASTERS, as the great Servants of Humanity. . . .” NOTE: See also Aug. 15, 1893 and Oct. 1893 entries.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 9, July 1921; pp.257-259</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 7, Nov. 1892; pp.251-254</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.143-145</p>
July 6-7, 1893 continued	<p>A. Cleather’s report on the third Convention dated from London, July 1893, praised Judge: “Short though the time has been during which he was able to be with us, it has been unusually profitable; his presence always brings with it such a strong sense of solidarity and loyalty; and the feeling of unity and harmony was exceedingly strong this year. . . .”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, Sep. 1893; pp.763-766</p>
July 15, 1893	<p>“THE OCEAN OF THEOSOPHY.” Notice of publication of The Ocean of Theosophy by W.Q. Judge. “This little volume forms the most concise and clear statement of Theosophic teachings yet given to the world, and we heartily commend it to all who are seeking for an elementary book to place in the hands of the would-be student.” NOTE: See Sep. 1893.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, July 1893; p.516</p>
July 15, 1893 continued	<p>Mr. Judge “was obliged to leave for New York on the 15th. . . .”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, Sep. 1893; p.764</p>

<p>July/Sep. 1893</p>	<p>Sinnett claimed independent communication with the Masters “within the last few months” vindicating him regarding Mars and Mercury controversy.</p> <p>W.Q. Judge in a letter to H.S. Olcott: “[Y]ou have erred in saying in print that once H.P.B. gone, the precipitated writing must alter. That is incorrect, as can be shown from precipitation by mediums. . . . Why even Sinnett now has a medium or clairvoyant he calls ‘K.H.’s chela’ who gives him new so-called instruction in the old hand of K.H.”</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.196-197</p> <p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); p.30</p>
<p>Aug. 1893</p>	<p>Circular, To All members of E.S.T. (dated July 14, 1893, London) from A. Besant and W. Q. Judge suspending Walter R. Old and Sidney V. Edge “from their membership in the E.S.T.” for violating their pledge of secrecy in the footnote of their article, “THEOSOPHIC FREE-THOUGHT,” which criticized Judge’s “An Interesting Letter.” [See April 15, 1893 entry] NOTE: See July 1893 entry.</p> <p>“And as on messages from the Master received by Brother Judge himself the seal does not appear, the seal-impression added to the message to the Council was regarded by him as not increasing the validity of the communication nor detracting from it. . . .”</p> <p>Letter from W.R. Old regarding his suspension and A. Besant’s reaction to the evidence he showed her in the winter of 1893 regarding the Judge Case. “For this act of mine, I was suspended from my membership in the Esoteric Section, under the authority of the joint signatures of William Q. Judge and Annie Besant, Outer Heads of the E.S.T., and my name was dishonourably mentioned before the members of the E.S., among whom I numbered many an old colleague and friend. The mandate somehow found its way into the public Press. However, there was one advantage. After her official action in suspending me from membership Mrs. Besant was, of course, bound to hear my justification. This happened at Adyar in the winter of 1893. Mrs Besant’s first remark to me after reading the case and examining the documents was, ‘You were perfectly justified by the facts before you’.”</p>	<p>Circular, dated London July 14, 1893, included in To All Members of E.S.T., 4 pages</p> <p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, 2nd ed., pp.57, 85</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.237-238</p>

<p>Aug. 15, 1893</p>	<p>Mrs. Besant published “Gurus and Chelas”, an article by Mr. Sturdy in which he was taking aim at Mr. Judge’s belief in the Masters and the communication of letters. Besant took exception to a few paragraphs and printed the article excluding them.</p> <p>“On The Watch-Tower” [in this same issue]: “It may be as well to remind the readers of LUCIFER that one of the lines laid down by H.P.B. for the conduct of this magazine — and she would not have adopted and carried on a policy in antagonism to the wish of her MASTER — was the admission to its pages of articles with which she totally or partially disagreed, where the articles raised questions bearing on Theosophical teachings or interests.” Mrs. Besant then quoted H.P.B.: “Keeping strictly in its editorials, and articles by its individual editors, to the spirit and teachings of pure Theosophy, it (LUCIFER) nevertheless frequently gives room to articles and letters which diverge from the Esoteric teachings accepted by the editors. . . .” She then continued: “This is the policy followed still by LUCIFER, and it should be understood that the publication of such articles, say, as those of Mr. Sinnett [‘Esoteric Teaching’] and of Mr. Sturdy [‘Gurus and Chelas’] in the present issue, by no means implies any agreement with the views put forward on the part of my colleague G.R.S. Mead or of myself.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Oct. 1893. Olcott reprinted the same article in The Theosophist with the insistence from Mr. Sturdy that the expurgated paragraphs be added.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, Aug. 1893; pp.550-555</p> <p>p.531</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.145-148</p>
<p>Aug. 26, 1893</p>	<p>Annie Besant left England “for her fourth trip to the United States in a little over two years. . . .”</p> <p>“Mrs. Annie Besant’s passage for the States has now been taken in the <i>City of Paris</i>, which leaves Southampton Aug. 26th.”</p>	<p>First Five Lives of Annie Besant, p.391</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 8, July 1893; p.125</p>

<p>Aug. 30, 1893</p>	<p>Personal letter from W.Q. Judge to Col. Olcott quoted in full by A. Besant in The Case Against W.Q. Judge. [pp.29-35] In this letter Judge deals with his relations with Masters and happenings in the T.S. of which he was made aware by Master. The work and position of the E.S. holding the T.S. together after the death of H.P.B. is also included.</p> <p>Re: “seal” and “passwords”, Judge quoting from Master: “Yes, Olcott made it as a joke and a very childish one, but we have the right to adopt the seal if we like and to use it; and it has been used even on a letter to him not as validating the message but to show him if he wants to see that we have the object now.”</p> <p>Re: H.P.B.’s Rosicrucian Jewel . . .</p> <p>Use of the seal by Mr. Judge . . .</p> <p>W.Q. Judge on H.S. Olcott’s resignation: “The reason for my work against your resignation is found in Master’s order and naught else.” [NOTE: See Apr. 24-25, 1892]</p> <p>Revoking of resignation mentioned.</p> <p>On Masters’ plans . . .</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix A for “The Case Against W.Q. Judge.” NOTE: See Sep. 28, 1893 for Olcott’s reply to Judge’s letter.</p>	<p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); pp.29-35,48-54</p> <p>pp.30-31, 32</p> <p>pp.44-46</p> <p>p.53. . .</p> <p>pp.32, 48</p> <p>p.46</p> <p>p.33</p>
<p>Sep. 1893</p>	<p>“INDIA AND HER THEOSOPHISTS.” W.Q. Judge called on the Brahmins to work for the spiritual regeneration of India. “Have those Indian Theosophists who believed that the Mahatmas are behind the Theosophical movement ever asked themselves why those Masters saw fit to start the Society in America and not in India, the home of the Adepts?” Footnotes by H.S. Olcott opposing certain of Judge’s views: “Mr. Judge should not convey the false impression that the Mahatmas find the spiritual aura of India <i>worse</i> than those of Europe and America. . . .”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, Sep. 1893; pp.723-725</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, pp.267-279</p>
<p>Sep. 1893 continued</p>	<p>Olcott reviewed The Ocean of Theosophy. “I wish I could unqualifiedly praise his present work; but I cannot. It contains some errors that are flagrant.”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 15, 1893.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, Sep. 1893; pp.762-763</p>
<p>Sep. 2, 1893</p>	<p>“PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS, ARRIVAL OF THE FOREIGN DELEGATES.” “Mrs. Besant, Prof. Chakravarti, Mr. Dharmapala, and Miss Müller reached New York in the <i>City of Paris</i>. . . .”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Oct. 1893; pp.223-228</p>

<p>Sep. 15-16, 1893</p>	<p>Annie Besant in Chicago for World's Fair, Parliament of Religions, Theosophical Congress. Included in the party was G.N. Chakravarti, a Brahmin member of the T.S. from Allahabad, and a Hindu scholar.</p> <p>“INCIDENTS OF THE CONGRESS” by Geo. E Wright. Mr. Wright “had been appointed Chairman of the Committee of Organization” by the Parliament's Religious' Committee to organize a separate T.S. “Congress of our own, with facilities and opportunities equal to those enjoyed by any of the great religious denominations.”</p> <p>NOTE: Some years later Leoline Leonard Wright wrote “Vignettes from the World's Congress of Religions” which gives insight on some of the individuals attending the Congress. [See Dec. 1938 entry]</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.202</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Oct. 1893; pp.160-164</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 8, Nov. 1893; pp.239-245</p>
<p>Sep. 15-16, 1893 continued</p>	<p>The Theosophical Congress at World's Fair. Mentioned at the SEVENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION of American Section. PROGRAM AND OUTLINE OF TOPICS. “The sessions will be held in the Art Memorial Building in the Park on the Lake Front, September, 15-16, 1893”.</p> <p>“THEOSOPHY AT THE WORLD'S FAIR”</p> <p>CONVICTION AND DOGMATISM by Annie Besant and A WORD ON THE “SECRET DOCTRINE” (a letter by K.H.) relating to conduct and expectations at the Parliament. FACES OF FRIENDS (Chakravarti at the Parliament) Summary of sessions Account of events at the Parliament of Religions.</p> <p>NOTE: Mrs. Besant left New York, on Sep. 27th, for London on “<i>City of Paris</i>”.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, May 1893; p.62</p> <p>Aug. 1893; pp.158-159</p> <p>Sep. 1893; pp.191-192</p> <p>Oct. 1893; pp.199-204</p> <p>pp.204-206 pp.223-229 Nov. 1893; pp.247-249, 259</p>
<p>Sep. 15-16, 1893 continued</p>	<p>“On the Watch-Tower” Unofficial programme of topics and presenters at the Parliament of Religions.</p> <p>“THEOSOPHY AT THE PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS.” “It was described in one of the Chicago papers as a rival to the Parliament itself, so great was the interest excited.”</p> <p>NOTE: For all the Lectures, Report and Documents; see The Theosophical Congress held by the Theosophical Society at the Parliament of Religions, World's Fair of 1893, at Chicago, ILL., Sep. 15,16,17. Report and Documents. 195 pp. [Reprinted by Edmonton Theosophical Society, 1988]</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Sep. 1893; pp.1-2.</p> <p>Oct. 1893; pp.95-96</p>

<p>Sep. 15-16, 1893 continued</p>	<p>“I went to America in September, 1893. Some words and acts of Mr. Judge awoke again in me a fear, for he spoke in a veiled way that seemed to imply that he was going to use Master’s authority where no such authority had been given. The result was that I made a direct appeal to the Master, when alone, stating that I did feel some doubt as to Mr. Judge’s use of His name, and praying Him to endorse or disavow the messages I had received through him. He appeared to me as I had so often before seen Him, clearly, unmistakably, and I learned from Him directly that the messages were not done by Him, and that they were done by Mr. Judge.”</p>	<p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by Annie Besant (1895); p.13</p>
<p>Sep. 15-16, 1893 continued</p>	<p>Chakravarti’s influence on Annie Besant. “[W]hen she went to India in 1893, became an orthodox Hindu, and was induced to entertain . . . doubts of her teacher [H.P.B.] . . . Bound up with this failure — the doubt of the Teacher — was her attack on her fellow <i>chela</i>, Mr. Judge.</p> <p>“A REPLY FROM W.Q. JUDGE.” to the Editor of the Westminster Gazette. “But you were right when you say that Mrs. Besant made a remarkable change in respect to me. That is true, and Mr. Chakravarti whom you name is, as you correctly say, the person who is responsible for it. Before she met Chakravarti she would not have dreamed of prosecuting me. This is a matter of regret. . . .”</p> <p>The Passionate Pilgrim, A life of Annie Besant. By Gertrude Marvin Williams. Williams describes the influences that Chakravarti had over Annie Besant and as C. W. Leadbeater also had later.</p> <p>In a statement by Annie Besant written April 24th, 1895: “I am not able to produce documentary evidence; immediately after I learned from the Master, in Sept., 1893, that Mr. Judge had deceived me, in the shock of the disgust I felt, I destroyed the ‘messages,’ except those written on the margins of letters. Nearly a year later . . . I destroyed all the letters I had received from Mr. Judge, as I could not carry them with me round the world, and would not risk their falling into the hands of others, in case of my death.”</p>	<p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, p.70</p> <p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, 2nd ed., p.124</p> <p>Passionate Pilgrim, pp.210-214, 236-255</p> <p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); p.82</p>
<p>Sep. 15-16, 1893 continued</p>	<p>Archibald Keightley on Annie Besant. “Mrs. Besant told us at Richmond that she had had no order from the Master except ‘take action.’ That she took orders through Mr. Chakravarti as coming from the Master. That it was Mr. Chakravarti who told her Master ordered her to mail the letter requesting Mr. Judge to resign. And she admitted occult ties with a group of Brahmins in India, such ties being prohibited by the rules of a private body to which we and she then belonged.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; p.98</p>
<p>Sep. 27, 1893</p>	<p>Mrs. Besant, Prof. Chakravarti, Mrs. I. Cooper-Oakley, and Miss F.H. Müller, who had all been delegates at the Parliament of Religions in Chicago, boarded the <i>City of Paris</i> on the evening of the 26th, and left New York early on the 27th for England.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Oct. 1893; p.224</p>

Sep. 28, 1893	<p>Letter from Olcott in response to Judge's letter of August 30th, 1893. Olcott outlined his perspective on the points put forward in Judge's letter, among them: Judge's occult training, Elliott Coues, the E.S., precipitated writings, the Seal, the presidency, religion. He expressed his suspicions on various points and stated:</p> <p>“I have not and do not believe you to be in any such relation with the ^ as H.P.B. was . . . but am ready for the proof, which the Masters can give me if they choose any day or hour.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 30, 1893.</p>	<p>Theos. History, Vol. 10, No. 1, Jan. 2004; pp.39-42</p>
Oct. 1893	<p>“A WORD ON THE ‘SECRET DOCTRINE’, AN OLD LETTER REPUBLISHED.”</p> <p>Reprint of a letter from K.H. “received in mid-ocean by Col. Olcott, P.T.S. and was originally published with his consent in a small pamphlet entitled ‘An Explanation Important to all Theosophists’ issued by H.P.B.” in 1888, regarding the influence of the Mahatmas in the writing of The Secret Doctrine.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8; Oct. 1893; pp.202-204</p>
Oct. 1893 continued	<p>Olcott reprinted “<i>Gurus and Chelas</i>” by E.T. Sturdy but with the three expurgated paragraphs included, and which stated in part:</p> <p>“Of concrete things and persons we need concrete proofs. Of concrete letters and messages from living men, we need concrete evidence; not metaphysical or mere argumentative proof. . . .</p> <p>“All such is glamour: there is no false mystery in chelaship; all nonsense about ‘developing intuition’ is merely making excuses for what cannot be proven and is the same in the end as the Christian ‘faith’.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 15, 1893 entry. See also July 6-7, 1893.</p> <p>In October Lucifer, “Mrs Besant writes over her signature an article in reference to ‘<i>Gurus and Chelas</i>’ and took a strong stand against the spirit and logic of Mr. Sturdy’s article”.</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 15, 1893 for Mrs. Besant’s editorial comments where she quotes H.P.B. on editorial policies.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15; Oct. 1893; pp.27-32</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.145-148</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Oct. 1893; pp.147-149</p>
Oct. 6, 1893	<p>In Oct. and Dec. 1893 Lucifer published “Some Modern Failings” by Chew-Yew-Tsang (E.T. Hargrove).</p> <p>In Mr Hargrove’s letter of May 14, 1895 he stated that the meeting mentioned by Dr. Keightley in “Luciferian Legends” and Mrs. Besant’s version of that same meeting, where she discovered the identity of Che-yew-Tsang (E.T. Hargrove’s pseudonym), was held on Friday Oct. 6th, 1893.</p> <p>[See May 1, 1895 entry for Besant’s version.]</p> <p>NOTE: “Luciferian Legends” is part of the text in The Plot against the Theosophical Society pages 44-62. [See April 3, 1895]</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix E Mr. Hargrove’s letter.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, June 1895; p.160</p>

<p>Oct. 19, 1893</p>	<p>“THEOSOPHICAL CORRESPONDENCE CLASS: PRELIMINARY PROSPECTUS AND NOTICE..” W.Q. Judge “decided to start a CORRESPONDENCE CLASS as part of the work of the American Section T.S., to enable those members desiring to avail themselves of it to pursue their studies in Theosophy more systematically. . . .”</p> <p>Also published in Lucifer.</p> <p>NOTE: After the successes from the Parliament of Religions, World’s Fair of Sep. 1893, Mr. Judge saw a need to help newcomers who wanted to join the T.S. get a proper, systematic Theosophical education. The American Section already published the Branch Papers, The Theosophical Forum and The Path but he felt that these were limited in area of influence, so a <i>Theosophical Correspondence Class</i> was started. “Very soon after the first notice was given members began to come in, and at this date, December, one hundred and forty-six persons have joined, coming from all parts of the Section.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 1, 1894 entry.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Nov. 1893; pp.263-264</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Dec. 1893; pp.347-348</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 8, Jan. 1894; p.320</p>
<p>Oct. 20, 1893</p>	<p>Annie Besant departed for her first visit to India. “Mrs. Besant . . . left London . . . and dashed across France to catch the mail steamer ‘Kaiser-i-Hind’ at Marseilles; the Countess Wachtmeister had used her title and influence to delay the vessel till her friend could get there.”</p>	<p>First Five Lives of Annie Besant, p.395</p>
<p>Oct./Dec. 1893</p>	<p>“Some Modern Failings.” By Chew-Yew-Tsang (E.T. Hargrove).</p> <p>“Some Modern Failings (Part 2)”</p> <p>NOTE: See March 1895 for Besant’s comments on the above article and his later pamphlet, A Forgotten Pledge. See Oct. 6, 1893 and also Feb. 3, 1895.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Oct. 1893; pp.97-100</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Dec. 1893; pp.321-327</p>
<p>Nov. 1893</p>	<p>The Path, Nov. 1893, printed a short biography of Countess Wachtmeister, in “FACES OF FRIENDS”</p> <p>Announcement: “Reminiscences of H.P. BLAVATSKY and <i>The Secret Doctrine</i>” by Countess C. Wachtmeister is now out.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov./Dec. 1893 entry for book reviews.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Nov. 1893; pp.246-247</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 8, Nov. 1893; p.259</p>

<p>Nov. 10, 1893</p>	<p>“ANNIE BESANT’S TOUR.” “Mrs. Besant, accompanied by Countess Wachtmeister, arrived in Colombo on the 10th November and at once commenced the work of her tour. . . . “On the 15th we sailed for India. . . . “. . . Mrs Besant set foot on Indian soil on the 16th Nov. at 10h. 24m. A.M.”</p> <p>“The tour will conclude at Bombay on or about March 10th [1894]”. NOTE: See Dec. 1893-Dec. 25 entry for her itinerary and March 13, 1894 entry.</p> <p>“We are looking forward to welcoming back [to London] some of our delegates to the Parliament of Religions next week. . . . [N]ext Wednesday, October 4th . . . Mrs. Besant and our brother G.N. Chakravarti are only birds of passage, <i>en route</i> for India. . . .” NOTE: Chakravarti left for India a week before Mrs. Besant who left on October 20th. Countess Wachtmeister was to join her at Marseilles.</p> <p>“Mrs. Besant, accompanied by Countess Wachtmeister, arrived in Colombo on the 10th November.” They met H.S. Olcott in Colombo who had been waiting there since Oct. 30th. They sailed for India on the 15th and “Mrs. Besant set foot on Indian soil on the 16th Nov. . . .”</p> <p>Col. Olcott “returned from Ooty to Adyar, and after taking a week’s rest left for Colombo on October 28th . . . to meet Mrs. Besant and Countess Wachtmeister. . . .”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, Dec. 1893; Supp. p.xiii.</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, Aug. 1893; Supp. p.lxxix</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, Nov. 1893; p.121</p> <p>Vol. 15, Dec. 1893; p.194</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, Dec. 1893; Supp. p.xiii</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Dec. 1893; pp.341-342</p>
<p>Nov. 15, 1893</p>	<p>“On the Watch-Tower, OUR POLICY. ” Annie Besant and G.R.S. Mead on Lucifer’s policy towards personal attacks “levelled against the leaders, both dead and alive. . . . [W]e are ready to defend our principles but we have not time to be continually rebutting personal attacks.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Nov.1893; p.177</p>
<p>Nov. 23, 1893</p>	<p>“WHAT PROOF HAVE WE? ADDRESS TO THE BLAVATSKY LODGE, T.S. BY MRS. J. C. KEIGHTLEY.” “For the proof of a man is his life. The proof of an Ideal is its life in the soul.”</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 8 pages</p>
<p>Nov./Dec. 1893</p>	<p>“Reviews, REMINISCENCES OF H. P. BLAVATSKY.”</p> <p>Book Review: “Reminiscences of H.P. BLAVATSKY and ‘THE SECRET DOCTRINE’ by Countess C. Wachtmeister, is the little book so eagerly awaited by the Theosophic world.”</p> <p>NOTE: See March (Late) 1895 entry. C. Wachtmeister wrote to Claude F. Wright and suggested that he write a follow-up book on H.P. Blavatsky since he was there at her last moments.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Nov. 1893; pp.248-249</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 8, Dec. 1893; pp.285-286</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 2, Nov. 1893; p.155 (s/b p.23 — pagination error by editor)</p>

Nov./Dec. 1893 continued	In “Reminiscences of H.P. BLAVATSKY and THE SECRET DOCTRINE.” “Those who were H.P.B.’s untiring and unflinching helpers in the preparation of <i>The Secret Doctrine</i> for the press in 1887-88, Dr. Archibald and Mr. Bertram Keightley, have, fortunately for posterity, put on record their experiences of those days.”	H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, p.75
Dec. 15, 1893	“Blavatskianism In and Out of Season” W.Q. Judge writing in response to some theosophists wanting to separate the name of Blavatsky from the T.S.: “Ingratitude is the basest vice of which man can be guilty, and it will be base for them to receive the grand message and despise the messenger.”	Lucifer , Vol. 13, Dec. 1893; pp.303-308 Echoes of the Orient , Vol. 2, pp.53-58 WQJ T. Articles , Vol. 2, pp.19-26
Dec. 20, 1893	“When Mrs. Besant arrived in Adyar, 20 December, 1893, she was called by the President into consultation with himself, Countess Wachtmeister, Sturdy, Edge, Old, and Judge Khandalavala. After many anxious talks, and at the President’s request, Mrs. Besant undertook to formulate demands that the accusations against Judge ‘with reference to certain letters and in the alleged writings of the Mahatmas’ should be dealt with by a Committee, as provided by the Rules which had been specially altered at the Convention (1893), to meet this or any similar case. They provided for a Judicial Committee ‘which, by three-fourths majority vote,’ could deprive the President or Vice-President ‘of office at any time for cause shown’.”	Ransom , pp.298-299
Dec. 1893, Dec. 25 th .	“Mrs. Besant returned to London [from America] with Chakravarti and a little later followed him to India. [Mrs. Besant and Countess Wachtmeister arrived in Colombo Nov. 10, 1893] After the December Convention she toured India until March 1894, when she set sail for England.” “He [Judge] claimed to have given sixteen years (from 1875 to 1891) of unbroken service to the T.S. and the Masters. . . . It was not until Christmas, 1893, that I learned that the ‘sixteen years’ were illusory, that for the greater part of them little work was done . . .” [p.9] “At Adyar I looked over the incriminating documents, and was startled by the . . . trivial and impossible character of the supposed ‘messages’; it was at once clear why he had steadily opposed my going to India. . . .” [p.14] While in India, Mrs. Besant changed her mind about Judge. She became convinced “that she had been deluded [and] that Judge had himself written the missives to which she had pinned her faith — written them all with his own hand.” NOTE: Annie Besant went to India against W.Q.J.’s advice (relates to Oct.1891 warning from J. Jelihovsky) See Feb.23, 1895 entry.	Theos. Movement 1875-1950 , p.203 The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); pp.9, 11, 14 Isis Very Much Unveiled , 2 nd ed., p.58

<p>Dec. 1893, Dec. 25th. continued</p>	<p>A. Besant formulated The Case Against W. Q. Judge with H.S. Olcott and G.N. Chakravarti while she was in India. Mrs. Cleather's comments on that period: "In fact, from this date (1889) would seem to have begun the fatal and treacherous process which led, after H.P.B.'s death, first to the Besant-Judge 'Split' in the T.S., in 1895, and then to the steady alteration, perversion, and degradation of her teachings by the leaders of both factions, especially on the Besant side under the guidance, first of Chakravarti, and then of Leadbeater. A notable fact in this connection is revealed here by Mr. Sinnett, which supplies the key to Mrs. Besant's subsequent policy and close association with Leadbeater. He relates that, after Mrs. Besant's first visit to India in 1893, where with Chakravarti and Olcott the <i>Case Against W.Q. Judge</i> was formulated, she joined his circle, having 'realised the importance' of his 'private methods of communicating with the Master K.H.' then 'in full progress'."</p> <p>NOTE: See Oct. 1891 entry for Vera Jelihovsky's warning against Besant going to India that year.</p>	<p>H.P.B. As I Knew Her by A. Cleather, p.57</p>
<p>Dec. 1893, Dec. 25th. continued</p>	<p>"ANNIE BESANT'S INDIAN TOUR." While in India there were reports in current newspapers that Mrs. Besant had converted and was now a devout Hindu. In Lucifer April 1894, H.S. Olcott wrote: "[T]here is no foundation whatever for the current newspaper story that Mrs. Besant bathed daily — or even once — in the Ganges at the late <i>Khumbha Mela</i> at Allahabad."</p> <p>Olcott also sent The Path a CARD, denying the same, which was published as a NOTICE titled "A MISTAKE CORRECTED"</p> <p>NOTE: See April 1894 for more on Besant's Lecture tour in India. A complete itinerary of her lecture tour in India was posted as a Supplement to Prasnottara Vol. 3, No. 34, Oct. 1893, pp. v to vii. [which appears to be accurate.]</p> <p>Besant lectured "for an hour and a half" at Allahabad, on January 31, 1894, where she "was met by Professor G.N. Chakravarti, and lodged at a bungalow in his compound." (Lucifer March 1894, p.81) According to her schedule Besant stayed or was with Chakravarti for the most part from January 26 or 27 to February 1st, 1894.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Jan. 1894; pp.429-432</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Mar. 1894; pp.79-82 Apr. 1894; pp.96, 166-171</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, Apr. 1894; pp.442-449</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, May 1894; p.65</p> <p>Prasnottara, Vol. 3, No. 34, Oct. 1893; p.vi</p>

<p>Jan. 11, 1894</p>	<p>Annie Besant wrote to W.Q. Judge threatening exposure of abuse of Masters' names if he did not resign from the Vice-Presidency and Co-Headship of the E.S.</p> <p>A. Besant's letter quoted in "THE PERSECUTION OF WILLIAM Q. JUDGE, THE OBJECT IN VIEW" by W.Q. Judge. "You must resign the outer headship (of E.S.T.) held jointly with myself, or the evidence which goes to prove the wrong done must be laid before a committee of T.S. . . . And you must resign the position of President-elect."</p> <p>Mr. Judge denied the charges and refused to resign. NOTE: See March 1895 (late) entry.</p> <p>Letter to the Editor by Archibald Keightley detailing his observations regarding Besant and Chakravarti: "It is with sincere regret that I find myself obliged to make public denial of the truth of Mrs. Besant's statement that she told me that the Master had informed her of Mr. Judge's guilt. Mrs. Besant never so told me."</p> <p>Besant: "I wrote to Mr. Judge . . . privately, so that by a voluntary resignation he might free the Society, and thus prevent the necessity of taking public action against him."</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.231</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; p.432</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1893; p.104</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, July 1915; p.428</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; pp.98-100</p> <p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); pp.14, 18</p>
<p>Jan. 12, 1894</p>	<p>Letter by Annie Besant (in Calcutta) to a committee of five: "Last summer it came to my knowledge that certain letters, and comments on letters, in M.'s writing, were not His. To prevent mistaken judgement let me here say to you — but in strictest confidence — for if this matter should become public, I will not have Master's name bandied about in controversy, but will take the responsibility of my judgement on my own shoulders — that the fact itself rests to me on Master's own communication, made when no third person was present, but He and I only were face to face. <i>The details were not given to Him directly. . . .</i>"</p> <p>Dr. A. Keightley commented after quoting this letter in a letter to the Editor of Path: "I ascertained that this interview with Master was said to have taken place in Mr. Judge's own room in the New York Headquarters and that Mr. Chakravarti was the giver of the 'details' [. . . Just as H.P.B. had helped Mrs. Besant to see the Master during her life-time (when Mrs. Besant had 'no psychic or spiritual qualities') so I believe Mr. Chakravarti made visible to Mrs. Besant the image she had herself formed in her own aura; this is one kind of evocation.]"</p> <p>NOTE: See June 1895.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; pp.98-100</p>

Feb. 1894	<p>W.Q. Judge cabled A. Besant refusing to resign as Vice-President. “I [Annie Besant] wrote to Mr. Judge first privately, in January, 1894, asking him to retire, otherwise the charges must be officially made. He telegraphed refusal in February and I then applied to Colonel Olcott for a Committee of Enquiry. . . .”</p>	<p>The Theosophical Society and The Westminster Gazette, p.11</p>
Feb. 1, 1894	<p>G.R.S. Mead, as General Secretary of the European section, attempted to follow the “NEW CORRESPONDENCE SCHEME” as inaugurated in the American Section, however, “As scarcely a dozen members have replied to this announcement the scheme will not be adopted in this section. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See Oct. 19, 1893 entry.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 3, Feb. 1, 1894; p.5</p>
Feb. 6-7, 1894	<p>“On February 6th last [1894], while at Allahabad, Mrs. Annie Besant handed the undersigned [Col. Olcott] a written demand that certain accusations ‘with reference to certain letters and in the alleged writings of the Mahatmas,’ injurious to the public character of Mr. W. Q. Judge, Vice-President of the Society, should be dealt with by a Committee as provided by Art. VI, Secs. 2, 3 and 4.”</p> <p>Annie Besant had written: “As it is to the detriment of the whole Society that such accusations — believed to be true by reputable members of the Society — should be circulated against a prominent official without rebuttal and without investigation, I ask you, as the President of the Society, to direct that the charges made shall be formulated and laid before a Committee, as provided by Art. VI, Secs. 2, 3 and 4.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 27, 1894 entry, re: Olcott’s EXECUTIVE NOTICE.</p> <p>February 7th letter from H.S. Olcott (from Agra, India) to W.Q. Judge: “I enclose herewith a certified copy of Annie Besant’s formal letter to me, dated Allahabad, Feb. 6th inst. In it she demands an official enquiry, by means of a Committee, into the matter of your alleged misuse of the Mahatmas’ names and handwriting. “By virtue of the discretionary power given me in Art. VI of the Revised Rules, I place before you the following options: (1.) To retire from all offices held by you in the Theosophical Society and leave me to make a merely general public explanation; or— (2.) To have a Judicial Committee convened . . . and make public the whole of the proceedings in detail.”</p> <p>G.R.S. Mead and B. Keightley wrote to H.S. Olcott warning that he was not following Constitutional procedure. [See Mar. 27, 1894 entry]</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, May 1894; Supp. p.xxvii</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 3, July 1894; [insert]</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.204-205</p>

Feb. 6-7, 1894 continued	<p>“Circular letter from Wm. Q. Judge.” W.Q. Judge’s answer to H.S. Olcott [Official 4-page letter by W.Q. Judge to Olcott, dated March 15, 1894] [See: Mar. 10, 1894 and Mar. 15, 1894 entries]</p> <p>H.S. Olcott to the Judicial Committee, July 10, 1894: “Upon the receipt of a preliminary letter from myself, of date February 7th, 1894, from Agra, India, Mr. Judge, erroneously taking it to be the first step in the <i>official inquiry</i> into the charges, from my omission to mark the letter ‘Private’, naturally misconceived it to be a breach of the Constitution and vehemently protested in a public circular addressed to ‘the members of the Theosophical Society.’ . . .”</p>	<p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 4, Apr. 1894; pp.129-133</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; pp.159-160</p> <p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, p.85</p>
Feb. 6-7, 1894 continued	<p>H.S. Olcott to the Judicial Committee, July 10, 1894: “It having been made evident to me that Mr. Judge cannot be tried on the present accusations without breaking through the lines of our Constitution, I have no right to keep him further suspended, and so hereby cancel my notice of suspension, dated the 7th February, 1894, and restore him to the rank of Vice-President.”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 10, 1894 entry. NOTE: As the February 7th letter does not contain any “notice of suspension”, Olcott may have meant the March 20th letter. (See March 20, 1894 entry)</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; pp.162 [158-168]</p>
Feb. 8, 1894	<p>Annie Besant’s personal letter (from Agra) to W.Q. Judge. “As you know, I refused the offer to nominate me as President; since then I have been told ‘not to oppose’, so I remain passive and wait.” [Judge asks: “by whom?”]</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb.14, 1894, March 1895 (late), June 1895 entries.</p> <p>Dr. A. Keightley quotes part of this same letter of Mrs. Besant to Judge: “My one hope is, my very dear brother, that you will have the heroism to say frankly the wrong has been done under a mistaken view, UNSELFISHLY SAYING WHAT YOU KNEW WAS MASTER’S WILL THOUGH NOT DIRECTLY WRITTEN BY HIM, and that you may thus make it possible for us to remain co-workers.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; p.432</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; p.104</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; pp.98-99</p>
Feb. 14, 1894	<p>Excerpts from letters by Annie Besant (in Delhi) to W.Q. Judge. “He [Chakravarti] endorsed the idea that I should take sole charge of the School. . . . Indeed, he told me last summer . . . that it had to be so presently.” . . . “That you had made an intellectual blunder, misled by a high example.” [Judge indicates that this meant H.P.B.]</p> <p>NOTE: See March (late) 1895 entry for Judge’s comments on this.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; p.432</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; p.104</p>

Mar. 8, 1894	Letter by Annie Besant regarding the note “Judge’s plan is right” found by her at the May 27 th Meeting in London in 1891: “Master’s approval in the message is just one of the very things challenged as <i>not</i> Master’s. From my standpoint, no tie was made by <i>Them</i> in this matter.” [Very different from what she wrote on July 2, 1891]	The Path , Vol. 10, June 1895; p.100
Mar. 10, 1894	In response to Olcott’s letter of February 7 th , 1894, Judge cabled: “Charges absolutely false. You can take whatever proceedings you see fit; going [to] London [in] July. NOTE: See Mar. 15, 1894 entry.	Charges Against William Q. Judge. 4 pages
Mar. 12, 1894	Letter addressed to W.Q. Judge, General Secretary, American Section T.S., from Elliott B. Page (as a member of the Council of T.S.). Letter stated that the Society should not have an investigation to determine whether “the sending of messages purporting to come from a Master, or Masters, is untheosophical” and that to do so “would only tend to raise a dogma in the Society. . . .” NOTE: See replies by Judge April 23-24, 1894 and May 27, 1893.	The Path , Vol. 9, June 1894; pp.98-100
Mar. 13 to 17, 1894	“ANNIE BESANT’S TOUR.” Annie Besant arrived in Poona and spent a few days there then left for Bombay on the 15 th or 16 th . She sailed for England on the 17 th . “On the 20 th (March). . . . embarked on the ‘Peninsular’. . . . At 5 p.m. the ship sailed and bore away dear Annie Besant and with her the heart of all India.”	Prasnottara , Supp. Vol. 3, No. 34, Oct. 1893; p.vi Old Diary Leaves , Fifth Series, pp.149- 150
Mar. 14, 1894	Letter from Judge in response to Elliott Page’s March 12 th letter. Judge stated that, it is not possible under its constitution for the T.S. to do this. It is a personal matter as in the case of H.P.B., Olcott, Besant or Sinnett stating they had communications from the Masters, and violates no clause of the T.S. Constitution or Rules. If a judicial decision is made, then it would be fixing a dogma on the T.S., which is prohibited. Judge quoted from the “EXECUTIVE NOTICE” of May 27, 1893 by Col. Olcott where he stated the word “teacher” could not be attached to “Mahatma” nor could the word “leader” be used to attach the T.S. to H.P.B. NOTE: See April 23-24, 1894 and May 27, 1893 entries.	The Path , Vol. 9, June 1894; pp.99-100

<p>Mar. 15, 1894</p>	<p>W.Q. Judge issued 5,000 copies of his printed statement “<i>To all Members of the Theosophical Society:</i>” giving all details and copies of letters exchanged so far. (Pamphlet called Charges Against William Q. Judge) NOTE: See Feb. 6-7, 1894 entry. “The charge is made against me as Vice-President: I have replied as an individual and shall so continue, inasmuch as in my capacity of Vice-President my duties are nominal. . . . The only charges that could be made against the Vice-President would be those of failing to perform his duties, or misusing the office. . . . On the face of this very vague charge, then, it is evident that there is nothing in it relating to the official Vice-President”. Judge objected to making the question of the Mahatmas a matter for judicial decision in the TS: “The Society has no dogma as to the existence of such Masters; but the deliberations of an official committee of the Society on such a question . . . would mean that the Theosophical Society . . . is determined to . . . affix it to the Constitution of the Society. To this I will never consent. . . .” He reasserted that he had personal communications from the Masters: “[N]ot only have I received direct communications from Masters during and since the life of H.P. Blavatsky, but that I have on certain occasions repeated such to certain persons for their own guidance, and also that I have guided some of my own work under suggestions from the same sources, though without mentioning the fact.” NOTE: See April 1894 for Editorial notes on “DO MAHATMAS EXIST? MR. JUDGE’S DECLARATION”</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.206</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, p.299</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 4, Apr. 1894; pp.129-133</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.159-160</p> <p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, 2nd ed., p.85</p>
<p>Mar. 19, 1894</p>	<p>Letter from Robert Crosbie, President of Boston T.S., George D. Ayers, President of Malden T.S., and M.L. Guild, President of Cambridge T.S. (and the Secretaries), to President H.S. Olcott deploring his illegal actions. They list eleven points stating H.S.O.’s actions violate sections of the T.S. Constitution, are “unconstitutional, ill-advised, injudicious, and unfair”.</p>	<p>New England Theosophical Corporation, 2 page circular</p>

<p>Mar. 20, 1894</p>	<p>Two letters issued by H.S. Olcott, President Theosophical Society:</p> <p>1.) <i>“To the General Secretary American Section T.S.”</i> “I enclose herewith a copy of certain charges preferred against [Judge] by Mrs. Annie Besant F.T.S.; which charges will be laid before a Judicial Committee, to be convened at our London Headquarters on the 27th June next. . . .” “Upon receipt of this you will kindly take the orders of your Executive Committee for the nomination of two members of the said Judicial Committee, to sit as representatives of the American Section. . . .”</p> <p>2.) <i>“To William Q. Judge, Esq., Vice President T.S.”</i> “I have to request that you will nominate to me the two additional members of the Committee whom you wish to sit and adjudge the case as your personal representatives. . . .” “Pending the decision of the Judicial Committee, I hereby suspend you from the office of Vice President T.S. as required by our Revised Rules”.</p> <p>NOTE: See also February 6-7, 1894.</p>	<p>Report of Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Convention Apr. 22-23, 1894; p.23</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.221</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, July 1922; p.275</p>
<p>Mar. 24, 1894</p>	<p>“CHARGES AGAINST WILLIAM Q. JUDGE V.P., T.S.” While on the “S.S. <i>‘Peninsular’</i>, Indian Ocean”, Annie Besant signed and dated her “paper of so-called charges”. She left Bombay on Mar. 20th for England. NOTE: See Mar. 13 to 17, 1894 entry.</p>	<p>Reply by William Q. Judge, p.6</p>
<p>Mar. 26, 1894</p>	<p>TO THE FELLOWS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY by George W. Russell.</p> <p>“Replying to Besant’s charge that Judge wrote the letters from the Masters, Russell queries ‘Who can say what was behind the hand that wrote, the will of the Adept or the will of Mr. Judge?’ Calls the motion by the Indian Section for Judge’s explanation or expulsion ‘a violation of the principles of freedom in our ranks, and I call upon all true men and women to rise up and protest against it’.”</p> <p>NOTE: Reprinted as Appendix A in The Descent of the Gods, edited by Raghavan & Nandini Iyer, pp.659-664.</p>	<p>Circular, 8 pages</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 1995, p.546</p>

<p>Mar. 27, 1894</p>	<p>G.R.S. Mead and Bertram Keightley (as General Secretaries for the Europe and Indian Sections respectively) issued a circular, <i>For the information of the Members of the European and Indian Sections of the Theosophical Society</i>. Both commented on Olcott's letter of Feb. 7th, 1894, to W.Q. Judge and warned that H.S. Olcott was not following the procedure as laid out in the Constitution for charges against the Vice-President.</p> <p>"It appears to us that such an attitude is inconsistent with that strict impartiality and justice which ought to characterize at least the official actions of the President of the T.S., and that it is calculated to bring discredit upon the Society by laying its chief executive officer open to the charge of condemning a colleague without even giving him a hearing."</p> <p>[Answered from Adyar by H.S. Olcott on May 13, 1894 and circulated to members from London on June 15, 1894]</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 27, 1894 for further observations from Colonel Olcott found in Austral Theosophist.</p>	<p>Theosophical Society, European Section, 4 pages</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.209-211</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, May 1894; pp.65-67</p>
<p>Mar. 31, 1894</p>	<p>"Mirror of the Movement."</p> <p>"The Countess Wachtmeister and Mr. Ernest T. Hargrove, representing respectively the Indian and the European Section, arrived in New York by the <i>Lucania</i> on [Saturday] March 31st. The Countess became the guest of Mrs. Eliz. C. Mayer, and Mr. Hargrove of Mr. Alex. H. Spencer. On the following Tuesday both spoke at the regular meeting, the Countess giving an account of her late tour in India, and Mr. Hargrove discussing Theosophical topics. Great pleasure was given to the large audience by both addresses. On Thursday the 5th the General Secretary's party started for San Diego."</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, May 1894; p.60</p>
<p>Apr. 1894</p>	<p>Letters to "Jasper Niemand" published in Letters That Have Helped Me. "They [the <i>Letters</i>] were written for me and Dr. Keightley — and for the use of others later on — by W.Q. Judge, at the express wish of H.P. Blavatsky".</p> <p>The recipient of the <i>Letters</i>, Jasper Niemand (Mrs. Julia Keightley) is featured in "FACES OF FRIENDS" in The Path.</p> <p>Announcement that authorship of Letters That Have Helped Me is now made public.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Apr. 1894; p.16</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Apr. 1894; p.95</p>

Apr. 1894 continued	<p>H.S. Olcott warned delegates to the World’s Parliament of Religions not to identify the T.S. with any form “of religion, creed, sect, or any religious or ethical teacher or leader; our first duty being to affirm and defend its perfect corporate neutrality in these matters.” [May 27, 1893]</p> <p>In “ANNIE BESANT’S INDIAN TOUR” H.S. Olcott wrote: “True, she has declared herself virtually a Hindu in religion almost from the beginning of the Indian part of her tour. What of that?” [See Dec. 1893, Dec. 25th entry]</p> <p>“MRS. BESANT AND INDIAN CIVILISATION.” Wm. Emmette Coleman (San Francisco, CA) wrote: “Mrs. Besant has publicly embraced the Hindu religion as a whole, and requested that she be called by her new Hindu name of Anna or Ani Bai, instead of her European one. She tells the people that she was and is a Hindu, — that in her prior incarnation she was an Indian pandit, and she is now ‘visiting her own land after a sojourn in the West, where she was re-incarnated to know the nature of the materialistic civilisation of those regions’.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, July 1893; p.517</p> <p>Apr. 1894; p.167</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, Apr. 1894; pp.442-449</p> <p>Light, Vol. 14, Apr. 14, 1894; pp.176-177</p>
Apr. 1894 continued	<p>“ANNIE BESANT’S INDIAN TOUR.” “In the story as to Mrs. Besant’s bathing in the Ganges there was not a word of truth; it was a pure invention of hostile Anglo-Indian newspapers. Nor has Mrs. Besant appeared anywhere in Hindu dress. Nor has she been converted to Hinduism since she came to India, nor changed her position towards it. The story of the festival over her conversion is also a myth. Dinners were given to us as in many other places, and as in every Hindu house <i>Prasad</i> — sandalwood paste, rose-water and betel leaves — was invariably offered to the guests after the repast. . . .” [fn. p.443]</p> <p>In an interview by “The Westminster Budget” on May 3rd, 1895, in “the private room in Avenue-road, where in years gone by Madame Blavatsky received the privileged visitor” Mrs. Besant presented herself in “[c]reamy white silken stuffs and a pearly grey shawl of the East enwrap the slender figure of Mrs. Besant. . . .” [The article, titled “MRS. BESANT AND THE MAHATMAS, HOW THEY LOOK AND HOW THEY ARE SCENTED:”, has a picture of Mrs. Besant dressed with what appears to be a shawl wrapped around her in an eastern way. The photo is by O Shannessy and Co., Melbourne and is reprinted in Fohat Vol. IV, No. 4, Winter 2000, p.83.]</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, Apr. 1894; pp.442-449</p> <p>The Westminster Budget, May 3, 1895; p.14</p>

<p>Apr. 1894 continued</p>	<p>“DO MAHATMAS EXIST? MR. JUDGE’S DECLARATION.”</p> <p>Editorial notes:</p> <p>“A belief in the existence of the Mahâtmas is supposed by many to be the corner-stone of the Theosophical Society. To such persons it will be somewhat of a surprise to learn on the authority of Mr. W. Q. Judge, . . . that a belief in the existence of Mahatmas has never been a dogma of the Theosophical Society.”</p> <p>And, on “THE ACCUSATION AGAINST MR. W. Q. JUDGE”:</p> <p>“It seems that some persons in India have accused Mr. Judge to Col. Olcott of being guilty of writing the names and handwriting of the Mahatmas. Col. Olcott thereupon called Mr. Judge either to resign or demand a judicial committee in order to have an official inquiry into the whole subject. Mr. Judge refused to do either. He states his unqualified, explicit, exhaustive denial of the charges and asserts most unreservedly that it has no foundation. He states his readiness to be tried by a judicial committee in London next July, but he refuses to demand a committee, for by making such a demand he would pave the way to the formulating of a dogma as to the existence of the Mahatmas.”</p> <p>Article continues with headings: “WHY HE OBJECTS TO THE INQUIRIES”; “MAHATMAISM NOT A DOGMA”; “THE SOCIETY AGNOSTIC ON THE QUESTION”; “I BELIEVE IN THE MASTERS”; “BECAUSE THEY HAVE GUIDED ME”.</p> <p>NOTE: See March 15, 1894.</p>	<p>Borderland, Vol. 1, Apr. 1894; p.356</p>
--------------------------------	--	--

<p>Apr. 23-24, 1894</p>	<p>Eighth Convention of The T.S. American Section in San Francisco.</p> <p>Dr. Anderson proposed to submit resolutions in support of Judge and that H.S.O.'s actions were "uncalled for, unconstitutional, illegal, and improper."</p> <p>Olcott's comments [July 10, 1894] . . .</p> <p>Letter from E. Page to Judge read. Stated that the Society should not have an investigation to determine whether "the sending of messages purporting to come from a Master, or Masters, is untheosophical" and that to do so "would only tend to raise a dogma in the Society."</p> <p>NOTE: For W.Q. Judge's reply on T.S. neutrality see May 27, 1893.</p> <p>NOTE: See entries of March 12 and 14, 1894 for more details.</p> <p>Resolutions were passed at the Convention. One read: "That, in the opinion of this Convention, the action of the President, Col. Olcott, in calling a judicial Committee to consider such charge was uncalled for, unconstitutional, illegal and improper." Another read: "That this convention hereby declares its unswerving belief in the integrity and uprightness of the Vice-President of the T.S., — Wm. Q. Judge — and expresses to him the most cordial thanks of the Section for his unrecompensed and self-sacrificing years of labor on behalf of the T.S. as a whole."</p> <p>Confidence in W.Q. Judge was expressed by several west coast lodges.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.213-215</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, May 1894; pp.64-66 Aug. 1894; pp.160-162</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9 June 1894; pp.98-100</p> <p>Report of Proceedings of the T.S. American Sec., Apr. 1894; pp.21-25</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 4, May 1894; pp.150-151</p> <p>Vol. 4, Apr. 1894; pp.141-144</p>
<p>Apr. 23-24, 1894 continued</p>	<p>"Countess Wachtmeister then addressed the Convention on behalf of the Indian Section. . . . She described the coming removal of Indian Section Headquarters from Adyar to Allahabad, which she said would practically get rid of Adyar which was really useless in her opinion except for one week during Convention. She also proposed that America send William Q. Judge as General Secretary to India to next Anniversary. Applause greeted her remarks, and in reply to a question as to what she thought her proposal would lead to she said, 'Well, to get rid of Adyar' (laughter)."</p> <p>She "then further explained that Col. Olcott had agreed to transfer of Indian Headquarters to some other place."</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, May 1894; p.65</p> <p>July 1894; pp.135-136 Sep. 1894; pp.194-195</p> <p>p.65</p> <p>p.66</p>

<p>Apr. 27, 1894</p>	<p>H.S. Olcott issued an EXECUTIVE NOTICE. Detailed steps taken to date regarding the charges against W.Q. Judge: “Mr. Judge having cabled a denial of his guilt, the first prescribed by the Constitution for such cases was then taken, viz., the ordering of a ‘Judicial Committee’ as provided for under Art.VI; the official notification of the same to the accused and the members of the General Council; and the serving upon each of a copy of the detailed charges and specifications, then drafted by Mrs. Annie Besant as Accuser. . . . “The Judicial Committee is notified to meet in London on June 27th and the undersigned finds himself compelled to attend, contrary to his wishes and expectations. . . .” [H.S. Olcott left Adyar for London on May 14.] NOTE: See Feb. 6-7, 1894 entry. Both Col. Olcott and Mrs. Besant were in Allahabad. NOTE: Judicial Committee postponed to July 10, 1894, see July 7th, 1894 entry. Light published Olcott’s EXECUTIVE NOTICE, issued from Adyar, dated April 27, 1894, under the title “MRS. BESANT’S CHARGE AGAINST W. Q JUDGE.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, May 1894; Supp. p.xxvii Theosophy, Vol. 3, July 1915; p.428 The Vahan, Vol. 3, July 1894; p.11 Irish Theosophist, Vol. 2, June 1894; p.121 Light, Vol. 14, May 26, 1894; p.245 Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.220</p>
<p>Apr. 27, 1894 continued</p>	<p>Quotes from Executive notice issued by Olcott which give a brief outline of affairs to this point, including: “Colonel Olcott observes that he ‘Deplores that his colleagues, Mr. Mead and Mr. Keightley, should have acted in such haste as to have committed the indiscretion of censuring him for breaches in procedure and a violation of Constitution of which he was not guilty. He regrets also that the fact of Mrs. Besant being the accuser of Mr. Judge should not have been mentioned, if the public was to be taken into confidence at all at this preliminary stage’.” NOTE: See March 27, 1894 entry</p>	<p>Austral Theos. Vol. 1, July 1894; p.97</p>

<p>May 1894</p>	<p>Circular titled “COUNTESS WACHTMEISTER REFUTES HERSELF.” Letter dated June 2, 1895 from L.A. Russell, Secretary, Santa Cruz T.S. to Dr. Buck in which she gave her testimony. “In May, 1894, during the lecture tour the Countess Wachtmeister made though California, I had the pleasure of accompanying her from Santa Cruz to Watsonville.” She claimed Wachtmeister said: “Do you not know that <i>W.Q. Judge is the greatest living occultist known to the Western world since H.P.B.’s death?</i>”</p> <p>NOTE: See June 2, 1895 entry and June 10, 1895 for Dr. Gamble’s letter of April 16, 1894 (Gamble’s letter should be dated 1895) to J.D. Buck.</p> <p>C. Wachtmeister denied having said that.</p> <p>NOTE: C. Wachtmeister apparently admitted to a friend that she had made a mistake in following Annie Besant after H.P.B.’s death and had subsequently left the Society. On her death-bed she stated she “had wept long and bitterly over ‘the ruin which Mrs. Besant had wrought to H.P.B.’s work’.”</p>	<p>Circular, dated June 10, 1895, by J.D. Buck, 1 page</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; p.129</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, July 1895; pp.181-182</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Dec. 1895; pp.291-292</p> <p>H.P.B. As I Knew Her by A. Cleather, p.22</p>
<p>May 13, 1894</p>	<p>“<i>For the information of the Members of the European Section of the Theosophical Society</i>”, from H.S. Olcott to G.R.S. Mead (General Secretary, European Section) and B. Keightley (General Secretary, Indian Section) re: their letter of protest dated March 27, 1894. [H.S. Olcott attempts to justify his position re: W.Q. Judge, and his letter of Feb.7, 1894 to Judge]. Also included a comment by Mead and Keightley “that exception may be taken to several important points in [the President-Founder’s reply.]”</p> <p>NOTE: “The ‘detailed reply to Messrs. Mead and Keightley’s letter,’ that the Notice [of April 27th, 1894] states is ‘in preparation and will be circulated to all Branches’ was never, so far as we know, either ‘prepared’ or ‘circulated’. All that Olcott issued was a ‘plea in extenuation,’ similar to the above quoted Notice.”</p> <p>“Resolutions” were passed by an unanimous vote “They voice in no uncertain tones the united protest of American Theosophists against the introduction of dogmas into Theosophy and their faith in and loyalty to our beloved General Secretary, Wm. Q. Judge.”</p>	<p>Theosophical Society. European Section. No. 2, 2 pages</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1925, pp.502-504</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 4, May 1894; pp.150-152</p>

<p>May 20, 1894</p>	<p>“Illness of G.R.S. Mead.” By H.T. Edge, <i>Asst. Sec. European Sec.</i> “We much regret to announce that our able and energetic editor has been very ill. An attack of influenza has been followed by complete prostration. He has been over-working himself for many months, and Mr. Herbert Coryn now forbids any letters or communications being received by him. Mr. Mead was moved down to the country on May 20th, and it is hoped that the change may speedily restore him.”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 7, 1894 and March/April 1964 entries.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 3, June 1894; p.6</p>
<p>June 1894</p>	<p>W.Q. Judge (as General Secretary, American Section T.S.) gave an official answer on the authentication of “Messages from Masters” in a letter dated March 14, 1894 to Elliott B. Page (in response to his letter of March 12, 1894). NOTE: See March 12 and 14, 1894 entries.</p> <p>Olcott on same, in “PROCEEDINGS OF THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, June 1894; pp.98-100</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.161-162</p>
<p>June 1894 continued</p>	<p>“Trouble at Headquarters. JUDGE NOT THAT YE BE NOT JUDGED.” By H.W. Hunt. He provided a summary, to date, of the “Judge Case” including a letter from Annie Besant in Allahabad, dated February 6, 1894, based on a private letter received from W.Q. Judge. “The trouble began in India, by the publication in the <i>Theosophist</i> [see July 1893 entry] of certain statements by two members of the Indian Section, sharply criticising a private letter from Mr. Judge to one of them in which the Mahatmas were referred to, and Mr. Judge was there by implication charged with inconsistency in certain statements he made in that letter, compared with statements he had on some other occasion made (or was alleged to have made) in the presence of these two members.”</p> <p>“Trouble at Headquarters. <i>To the Editor of the ‘AUSTRAL THEOSOPHIST’.</i>” by C.F. Langier. “I fail to find evidence anywhere that Mr. Judge has been prejudged, Messrs. Mead and Keightl[e]y to the contrary notwithstanding.”</p>	<p>Austral Theos. Vol. 1, June 1894; pp.89-90</p> <p>Austral Theos. July 1894; pp.97-98, 104</p>
<p>June 12, 1894</p>	<p>“The President-Founder arrived in Paris, where he met Annie Besant and Miss H.F. Müller, on June 12th, and presided at the lecture given by the former in the beautiful hall of the residence of the Duchesse de Pomar on June 13th. The party then returned to England and after a brief stay in London the President-Founder left for Germany to endeavour to found there a Lodge of the T.S. in concert with Dr. Hubbe Schleiden. He returned to London on July 4th, to arrange with the secretaries of the Indian, European and America Sections for the holding of the Judicial Committee on July 8th.” NOTE: See July 7, 1894, for more details on delays in reaching a compromise. The General Council of the T.S. met on July 7 and the meeting of the Judicial Committee was actually held on July 10, 1894.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, July 1894; p.432</p>

<p>July 1894</p>	<p>B. Keightley claimed in a letter “To the Members of the Indian Section” that the American Section has made a proposal to move the Headquarters from India. “I shall then also ask you to record a most emphatic protest against the proposal of the American Section to remove the Head-Quarters of the Theosophical Society as such, away from the sacred soil of India, the motherland of spiritual science and philosophy. . . . and I shall ask you to support me in strenuously resisting any such proposal.”</p> <p>Denied by W.Q. Judge in letter of Aug. 3, 1894 to the Editor of The Theosophist, in which he explained the proposal was made by C. Wachtmeister.</p> <p>In a letter by C. Wachtmeister dated Aug 7, 1894, she wrote: “Take away the words ‘American Section’ replace them by ‘the Countess Wachtmeister’ and the paragraph is correct. “It is quite true that I made this suggestion to the American Convention [San Francisco in April 1894], because I think that Adyar is useless to the Society as a whole, being in such a remote corner of the globe.”</p> <p>NOTE: See entry for April 23-24, 1894.</p> <p>Letter from William Q. Judge, Gen. Sec. American Section, to B. Keightley, Gen. Sec. Indian Section, T.S., August 3rd, 1894 regarding “the ‘proposal of the American Section to remove the Head-quarters of the Theosophical Society as such, away from the sacred soil of India.’ Permit me to say that the American Section has not proposed anything of the kind. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 3, 1894 entry for letter and Sep. 9, 1894 for Bertram Keightley’s retraction and apology.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, July 1894; Supp. pp.xxxvi- xxxvii</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Sep. 1894; pp.194-195</p> <p>Prasnottara, Vol. 4, Sep. 1894; p.149</p>
<p>July 4, 1894</p>	<p>W.Q. Judge arrived in London. “and at once demanded, first, copies of letters, and second, an inspection of all the evidence. Mrs. Besant promised these but did not perform.”</p> <p>Only Dr. J.D. Buck accompanied Judge to England. Later Dr. A. Keightley also was witness with them.</p> <p>E.T. Hargrove stated: “He arrived at Southampton, accompanied by Dr. J.D. Buck of Cincinnati, several days before the Committee was due to assemble. Dr. Archibald Keightley and I met them at the dock and travelled with them to London. Judge was obviously very tired and frail.”</p> <p>NOTE: See March 1895 (Early) and July 19, 1894 entries.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; pp.433-434</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; p.65</p> <p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 29, Oct. 1931; p.107</p>

July 7, 1894	<p>General Council of the T.S. meets in London: Present were Olcott, who presided, Mr. Bertram Keightley, who was chosen as Secretary of the Council meeting, W.Q. Judge, Mr. G.R.S. Mead. “The President-Founder arrived promptly in London, but the Enquiry was not held on the date set, June 27. The time until July 7 was occupied in various abortive attempts to reach a compromise that would obviate official disposition, but Mr. Judge insisted that since the whole procedure up to date had been taken officially by the President-Founder, with himself as defendant against charges of dishonorable conduct, and with issues raised prejudicial to the Society as well as himself, it could only properly be disposed of by formal official action. Accordingly, Col. Olcott summoned a meeting of the General Council on July 7.”</p> <p>NOTE: A report of the July meeting of the General Council is contained in the pamphlet, THE NEUTRALITY OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY. The text of which was published in Lucifer (August, 1894), Vol. 14, p.449, and in The Path (August, 1894), Vol. 9, p.158. [See July 10, 1894; July 21, 1894; Aug. 15, 1894.]</p> <p>NOTE: G.R.S. Mead had just “returned to work after his enforced absence. . . .” [See May 20, 1894 and March/April 1894 entries for more on Mead’s health.]</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.218</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, July 1894; p.432</p> <p>Neutrality of the T.S., pp.8-10</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, July 1894; p.433</p>
July 7, 1894 continued	<p>“THE NEUTRALITY OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.” (Highlights were reprinted in The Path.) “The President read a letter from William Q. Judge, stating that in his opinion he was never elected Vice-President of the T.S., and was not therefore, Vice-President of the T.S., whereupon the President informed the Council that at the General Convention at Adyar, in 1888, he then, exercising the prerogatives which he then held, appointed William Q. Judge as Vice-President of the T.S. . . .”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.158-159</p>
July 7, 1894 continued	<p>“Mr. Judge’s defense is that he is not guilty of the acts charged; that Mahatmas exist, are related to our Society and in personal contact with himself; and he avers his readiness to bring many witnesses and documentary proof to support his statements.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.161-162; Mar. 1895; pp.433-434</p>
July 7, 1894 continued	<p>“PROCEEDINGS OF THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, OPENING ADDRESS AND OPINION OF THE PRESIDENT-FOUNDER.” “The meeting was worth holding for several reasons. . . . because we have come to the point of an official declaration that it is not lawful to affirm that belief in Mahatmas is a dogma of the Society, or communications really or presumably from them, authoritative and infallible. . . . under our Rules, an officer or member cannot be impeached and tried. . . . the successorship to the Presidency is again open . . . and at my death or at any time sooner liberty of choice may be exercised in favor of the best available member of the Society.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.161-162</p>

July 7, 1894 continued	<p>[Olcott] “It having been made evident to me that Mr. Judge cannot be tried on the present accusations without breaking the lines of our Constitution, I have no right to keep him further suspended, and so hereby cancel my notice of suspension, dated the 7th February, 1894, and restore him to the rank of Vice-President.</p> <p>NOTE: Also found in <i>The Neutrality of the Theosophical Society. AN ENQUIRY Into Certain Charges Against The Vice-President, Held in London July, 1894</i> published July 21, 1894.</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 6-7, 1894 and Mar. 20, 1894 entries.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; p.162</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; p.454</p>
July 7, 1894 continued	<p>“The question was then raised whether the charges against Mr. Judge should be included in the printed report. . . . However, when the assembled delegates came to see the full iniquity of officially spreading broadcast a series of charges after having denied the accused the opportunity of meeting and rebutting them, this motion was too much for even the most prejudiced to be responsible for. The report says: ‘On being put to the vote the resolution was not carried’.”</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.226</p>
July 10, 1894	<p>Judicial Committee met, 11 members present.</p> <p>“Col. Olcott as President-Founder, in the chair; Messrs. G.R.S. Mead and Bertram Keightley as General Secretaries of the European and Indian Section; Messrs. A.P.Sinnett and E.T. Sturdy as delegates of the Indian Section; Messrs. Herbert Burrows and Wm. Kingsland as delegates of the European Section; Dr. J.D. Buck and Archibald Keightley as delegates of the American Section; Messrs. Oliver Firth and E.T. Hargrove as special delegates representing the accused — all as provided for under the ‘revised Rules’ adopted at the Adyar Convention in December preceding.” Also present were Mr. Judge as the accused and Mrs. Besant as the accuser.</p> <p>In view of the fact that the General Secretary of American Section (W.Q.J.) could not vote, an extra delegate was appointed (James M. Pryse).</p> <p>Highlights of the Meetings of July 7, 10 and 12 (Evening session)</p> <p>Summary of events and evidence produced.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.220-221</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.158-163</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, July 1915; pp.428-429</p>
July 10, 1894 continued	<p>Three protests were made by W.Q. Judge and submitted to H.S. Olcott:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That W.Q.J. was never elected to office of Vice-President. 2. If he were V.P., tribunal can only try charges as V.P. 3. “The principal charge . . . cannot be tried without breach of the constitutional neutrality of the Society in matters of private belief . . . and especially as to belief in the ‘existence, names, powers, functions or methods of Mahatmas or Masters’.” 	<p>Neutrality of the T.S., pp.4-5</p>

July 10, 1894 continued	<p>Resolutions moved at the conclusion of the Judicial Committee:</p> <p>“Having heard the above statements, the following resolution was moved by Mr. Bertram Keightley, seconded by Dr. Buck, and carried <i>nem. con.</i></p> <p><i>Resolved:</i> that this meeting accepts with pleasure the adjustment arrived at by Annie Besant and William Q. Judge as a final settlement of matters pending hitherto between them as prosecutor and defendant, with the hope that it may be thus buried and forgotten, and —</p> <p><i>Resolved:</i> that we will join hands with them to further the cause of genuine Brotherhood in which we all believe.”</p>	Neutrality of the T.S. , p.16
July 10, 1894 continued	<p>Dr. A. Keightley in “TRUTH AND OCCULTISM” stated:</p> <p>“[T]he action of Mr. Mead in canvassing the European Section, and that of Mrs. Besant in <i>Lucifer</i> publications . . . together with personal attacks, by letter and otherwise, upon almost all those who openly express belief in Mr. Judge’s innocence, compel me to break . . . my silence before the general public.” [p.97]</p> <p>After details regarding 78 vs 12 pieces of evidence, he states:</p> <p>“Mr. Judge has not even <i>seen</i> all the evidence. None of that which is the property of Mr. Bertram Keightley was even shown to him!” [p.94]</p> <p>“Mrs. Besant . . . promised Mr. Judge, in the presence of Mr. Mead, Dr. Buck, Mr. B. Keightley, Mrs. A. Keightley and myself, that he should have copies of all the evidence. Why did she so promise if, as is now [1895] said, Mr. Judge had knowledge of every document and copies of the evidence before leaving America?” [p.94]</p> <p>“Mr. Judge is being asked to reply to charges based upon letters and telegrams beginning 1875 down to the present day, often very vaguely specified . . . part of which he has not even seen. And when he makes his very natural and necessary demand, untrue statements are made in regard to him. [p.95]</p> <p>“Everyone must know that carefully selected extracts can be made to prove almost any villainy. It is significant that Mrs. Besant admitted to many persons in July, 1894, that she was aware these charges could not be actually proven against Mr. Judge”. [p.95]</p>	Irish Theosophist , Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; pp.94-95, 97-98
July 10, 1894 continued	<p>W.Q. Judge compelled H.S. Olcott to show him the evidence before he left London. He was shown it July 19th, 1894, in J.D. Buck’s presence, but was not given time to copy it.</p> <p>Mrs. Besant stated:</p> <p>“He made no complaint at the time that he was hurried in his inspection. As to copies, no duty lies on me to supply Mr. Judge with copies, still less with copies of long letters on various subjects, in which perhaps only a few sentences are cogent to the charges made. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: Reprinted in The Case Against W.Q. Judge, April 1895. See also July 4 1894, July 19, 1894 and March 1895 (Early).</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; p.434</p> <p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); p.9</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; p.65</p>

July 10, 1894 continued	<p>W.Q. Judge gave an official view of decisions about the authenticity of “messages” and the position of the T.S.</p> <p>NOTE: See June 1894, Mar. 12, 14, 1894 for letters from and to Elliott B. Page.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, June 1894; p.99</p>
July 10, 1894 continued	<p>Correspondence from The Path: “COL. OLCOTT AND ‘SUB JUDICE’.” “Dear Sir: — What does Col. Olcott mean by talking of the ‘Judge Case’ as <i>Sub judice</i>?” W.Q.J. Answered: “Do not know what he means, but it is certain that what he says about it means nothing. The case is <i>not sub judice</i>. It was settled and disposed of last July by decision of Council and Committee. <i>Sub judice</i> means that the case is alive and under consideration by the court, and that is not the fact here. If Col. Olcott had said that the case was <i>sub judex</i> or ‘under Judge,’ he would have been right, for all the bad Latin.” NOTE: <i>Sub judice</i> means under or before a judge or court.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; p.128</p>
July 10, 1894 continued	<p>“TRUTH BEFORE AND IN ALL THINGS.” Annie Besant in editorial, Lucifer, accused W.Q. Judge. “The following declaration is aimed at an opinion too often finding expression among would-be Occultists of an untrained type, that what is falsehood on the material plane may in some ‘Occult’ way be truth on a higher plane, and that the plea of ‘Occultism’ excuses conduct inconsistent with a high standard of righteous living. The spread of such views would demoralize the Society, and would tend to degrade the lofty ideal of Truth and Purity which it has been the effort of every great religious teacher to uphold and to enforce by example.” This is followed by a statement “<i>To Students of Occultism</i>” titled “OCCULTISM AND TRUTH” signed by “H.S. Olcott, A.P. Sinnett, Annie Besant, Bertram Keightley, W. Wynn Westcott, E.T. Sturdy, C.W. Leadbeater.” A. Besant in her July editorial of Lucifer stated: “I shall have a few words to say on the accusations against Mr. Judge, which . . . will have been laid before a Judicial Committee of the T.S. The Committee will have spoken, and then my lips will be unsealed. Ever since I took the initial steps in this matter — now six months ago — I have kept silent, save to a few who had a right to some explanation of my action, and excepting two brief letters to the press defending my colleagues — Colonel Olcott in one case, Messrs. Keightley and Mead in another.” <i>The Neutrality of the T.S. An Enquiry</i> — published in Lucifer. NOTE: See July 21, 1894, Aug. 11 and 15, 1894. Pamphlet by A. Besant: “[W.Q.J.] claimed that the Masters wrote through him, using him as Their medium for writing, and dictating letters to him which he then wrote down.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1895; pp.441-443</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, July 1894; p.353</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; pp.449-463</p> <p>Pamphlet, published by the Women’s Printing Society, (Date and page number unknown)</p>

July 10, 1894 continued	NOTE: See Dec. 15, 1894 and Feb. 1895 entries — Lucifer , Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.500-514 [Statements by G.R.S. Mead, Bertram Keightley, Alexander Fullerton, and various lodges: “The Clash of Opinion”, To the Editor of Lucifer]	
July 10, 1894 continued	<p>“THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.”</p> <p>W.Q. Judge raised the point that he had never been “elected” but only <i>appointed</i> Vice-President by H.S. Olcott:</p> <p>“An examination of the records from the beginning to the end of 1893 shows that there is no record whatever of the election of William Q. Judge as Vice-President of the T.S. In July, 1894, at London, Col. Olcott and the Indian General Secretary [B. Keightley] upon Judge’s raising the point, decided that they would assert that the record was defective and could be cured by stating the fact that such Vice-President had been elected in India many years before, and it was so ordered in Council. But as the meeting at which said election took place — if it ever did — was not one participated in by those who could bind the whole Society, and as the real T.S. existed in New York, if anywhere, it follows that William Q. Judge was not regularly elected Vice-President. . . .</p> <p>“The Theosophical Society was formed at New York in 1875, never had any legal existence outside of the United States and cannot have except upon amendment of the By-Laws.”</p> <p>NOTE: See entry for Aug. 15, 1894 for <i>The Neutrality of The Theosophical Society. AN ENQUIRY Into Certain Charges Against The Vice-President. Held at London, July 1894</i> (Condensed version).</p> <p>NOTE: Also see July 21, 1894, <i>The Neutrality of the Theosophical Society. AN ENQUIRY Into Certain Charges Against The Vice-President</i> (date released). Provides an account of the Judicial Committee’s proceedings held July 10, 1894.</p>	The Path , Vol. 10, May 1895; p.59
July 10, 1894 continued	<p>Ernest T. Hargrove’s Letter “<i>To the Editor of The Irish Theosophist</i>” (dated April 17, 1895) disputed Bertram Keightley’s article on facts and statements which he used to disqualify Dr. Archibald Keightley’s letter in Lucifer (Vol. 16, April 1895):</p> <p>“But Mr. B. Keightley, in his letter to <i>Lucifer</i>, is particularly careful to controvert nothing. He vaguely disputes Dr. Keightley’s account of the legal procedure which Mrs. Besant did <i>not</i> follow, but does not say which item set forth by Dr. Keightley — who had been professionally advised in regard to what he wrote — is, in his own opinion, incorrect; nor does he give what he considers to be the proper procedure.”</p> <p>NOTE: See entry for April 17, 1895.</p>	Irish Theosophist , Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.137-140

July 12, 1894	<p>Mrs. Cleather wrote: “I practically lost all faith in Mrs. Besant when she dissimulated and tried to mislead the Inner Group Council on her return from her first visit to India in 1894. She then informed us that she had been ‘ordered by the Master to accuse Judge’. On being closely cross-examined, however, she finally admitted that she had not received this ‘Order’ <i>direct</i>, as she would have had us believe, but <i>through</i> the Brahmin whom she then followed blindly. . . .”</p> <p>Cleather compared A. Besant’s handling of “The Case Against W.Q. Judge” vs her handling of the evidence against C.W. Leadbeater in 1907 [i.e., no confession = acquittal for C.W.L. vs no confession = assumption of wrongdoing for W.Q.J.]</p>	<p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, pp.55-56</p>
July 12, 1894 continued	<p>At the time of the London Convention of the European Section of the Society [July 12-13]: “Mrs. Besant proposed to Dr. J.D. Buck that a ‘Jury of Honour’ be impaneled to pass on the ‘charges.’ She suggested the names of Messrs. Sinnett, Bertram Keightley, Sturdy, Burrows, and Firth for membership on such a jury. This was declined on the grounds that Mr. Judge had not yet been supplied with certified copies of the documents alleged to contain the ‘evidence’ against him; that he would need time to produce witnesses and documents in rebuttal; finally, that the majority of the names submitted were those of men known to be already prejudiced against him. . . .”</p> <p>Annie Besant stated that Burrows proposed the Jury of Honour. [Also mentioned by Thomas Williams in his letter to Light, Feb. 16, 1895.]</p> <p>“MRS. BESANT’S STATEMENT, Read by herself”, at the Evening Session of the Convention. [Path p.164] “As this left the main issue undecided, and left Mr. Judge under stigma of unproved and unrebutted charges, it was suggested by Mr. Herbert Burrows that the charges be laid before a Committee of Honour.” [Neutrality of The T.S., Appendix, statement by Annie Besant.]</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.228</p> <p>The Theosophical Society and The Westminster Gazette, p.12</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.163-166</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; p.459</p>
July 12, 1894 continued	<p>Annie Besant stated that certified copies of the evidence and charges were not supplied to W.Q.J. Added he was shown them July 19th (after meetings of July 7, 10, and 12).</p> <p>W.Q. Judge asked for the ‘evidence’ every day, from July 4th or 5th to 19th. [Two different dates are recorded as to when W.Q.J. arrived in London; Lucifer has the former and The Path has the latter date.]</p> <p>NOTE: See also: July 19, 1894 entry.</p> <p>“WILLIAM Q. JUDGE’S STATEMENT, Read by himself”, at the Evening Session of the Convention. “I repeat my denial of the said rumored charges of forging the said names and handwritings of the Mahatmas or of misusing the same.”</p>	<p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); p.9</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; p.65</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; pp.432-434</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.166-167</p>

July 12, 1894 continued	<p>Annie Besant's editorials in Lucifer:</p> <p>“Ever since I took the initial steps in this matter — now six months ago — I have kept silent, save to a few who had a right to some explanation of my action. . . .”</p> <p>“Had Mr. Judge succeeded to the Presidency, according to the election of 1892, with these charges hanging over him, India would have rejected him and the Society would have been rent in twain. . . .”</p>	<p>Lucifer ,Vol. 14, July 1894; p.353</p> <p>Lucifer ,Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; p.441</p>
July 12, 13, 1894	<p>“The Convention of the European Section was held at 19 Avenue Road, London, in the Blavatsky T.S. hall on July 12th and 13th, 1894.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; p.167</p>
July 12, 13, 1894 continued	<p>“WILLIAM Q. JUDGE’S STATEMENT” at the Evening session of the Convention.</p> <p>“All this has been causing great trouble and working injury to all concerned, that is, to all our members. It is now time that this should be put an end to once for all, if possible.”</p> <p>Resolution by B. Keightley:</p> <p>“That this meeting accepts with pleasure the adjustment arrived at by Annie Besant and William Q. Judge as a final settlement of matters pending hitherto between them as prosecutor and defendant with the hope that it may be thus buried and forgotten.”</p> <p>“The apparent trouble in the Society, of which our enemies have made so much, all disappeared, as every one thought it would, when the leaders of the Society came together face to face.”</p> <p>“A resolution was moved and carried without dissenting voice by the Convention, accepting with pleasure the adjustment arrived at as a final settlement of the matter, with the ‘hope that it may be thus buried and forgotten’ .”</p> <p>“On all sides those who had been rent by partisan emotions, those who had endeavored to remain neutral and impartial, leaders and followers alike joined in mutual congratulations and felicitations over what seemed to be a complete restoration of unity”.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.158-168 p.166</p> <p>p.167</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; p.463</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, Aug. 1894; pp.10-11</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, July 1915; p.430</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.237</p>

<p>July 12, 13, 1894 continued</p>	<p>“The statement of Mrs. Besant recited in effect that she had only brought the charges in an effort to destroy injurious rumors regarding Mr. Judge that were afloat; that she believed him to be in communication with Masters; that the rumors of the charges had greatly exaggerated their actual nature; that accusations were largely inspired by persons actuated by hatred for Mr. Judge; that the actual issue involved was that she thought that Mr. Judge had ‘given a misleading material form to messages received psychically from the Masters in various ways, without acquainting the recipients with this fact.’ Mrs. Besant closed her public statement with these words: ‘For any pain that I have given my brother, in trying to do a most repellant task, I ask his pardon, as also for any mistakes that I may have made’.”</p> <p>Statement by Wm Q. Judge: “It is now time that this should be put an end to once for all if possible. I repeat my denial of the said rumoured charges. . . . I admit that I have received and delivered messages from the Mahatmas and I assert their genuineness.”</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, July 1915; pp.429-430</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.163-166 [see above]</p>
<p>July 12, 13, 1894 continued</p>	<p>“The Annual Convention” by C. Corbett. [Summary of events and proceedings at the Fourth Annual Convention of the European Section, T.S.]</p> <p>“NOTES BY THE WAY.” “What seems to stand out clearly above everything else is the fact that Mrs. Besant starts out on a long fatiguing tour, saying, their [sic] is no price too high to pay to serve the Great Ones of the White Lodge, and W.Q. Judge, from the day he held Lodge meetings by himself in New York, till to-day, when Theosophy, mainly by his exertions, stretches across the whole American Continent, has served these Great Ones in the same devoted spirit.”</p>	<p>Northern Theos. Aug. 1894; pp.67-68</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 2, Aug. 1894; p.153</p>
<p>July 18, 1894</p>	<p>E.S. circular issued by Annie Besant and W.Q. Judge as “Co-Outer Heads” quoting H.P.B.’s statement of Oct.23, 1889: “The Esoteric Section and its life in the U.S.A. depends upon W.Q.J. remaining its agent and what he is now. The day W.Q. Judge resigns H.P.B. will be virtually dead for the Americans. W.Q.J. is the Antaskarana between the two <i>Manas(es)</i>, the American thought and the Indian — or rather the trans-Himâlayan esoteric knowledge. <i>Dixi</i>. H.P.B.</p>	<p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, p.87</p>

<p>July 19, 1894</p>	<p>“LETTER TO EUROPEAN GENERAL SECRETARY.”</p> <p>This is the date on which W.Q.J. managed to be shown “evidence”. In a letter to G.R.S. Mead, G.S., European Section, Judge wrote: “I arrived in London July 5th, 1894, and at once demanded, first copies of letters, and second, an inspection of all the evidence. Mrs. Besant promised these, but did not perform. . . . Each day until the second day before departure I made the request and met the same promise followed by failure to perform. The Judicial Committee met and I then made the same demand, and at the meeting Mrs. Besant and others said, ‘Oh, of course Mr. Judge should have copies of the proposed evidence’. But the papers were neither copied nor shown me up to July 19th, almost a week after Convention, and when I was packing my trunk. All this time until the 19th Mrs. Besant had the papers. On the 19th I formally and peremptorily demanded them. She said she had given them to Col. Olcott, who said they had been just sent off to the mail to go to India; this I repeated to Mrs. Besant and said I would publish the fact to the public. She hastened to Col. Olcott, and he said he had made a mistake, as the papers were in his travelling case. He then, in Dr. Buck’s presence, in a great hurry, as I sailed on the 21st, allowed me a hasty look at the papers on July 19th, I taking a copy of one or two short ones. But several being lengthy, and especially the one by which they hoped to destroy my general credibility, I could not copy them. Col. Olcott then promised to send copies; Mrs. Besant declared herself quit of the matter. Up to this date the promises made have not been fulfilled. I am without copies of the documents on which the charges are based.</p> <p>“Mrs. Besant, as prosecutor, never fulfilled her promise nor her duty. I then believed and still believe that they never intended to give me copies nor to permit inspection, but hoped to hurry me into a trial unprepared in every respect.”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 4, 1894 and March 1895 (Early) entries.</p> <p>NOTE: The above letter dated Jan. 25, 1895 from Mr. Judge is printed in part in the Jan. 25, 1895 entry. Summary of events in Editorial “THE PARTING OF THE WAYS” by J.A. Anderson re: evidence not given to W.Q. Judge.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; pp.432-434</p> <p>The Plot Against The Theosophical Society (pamphlet) by A. Keightley et al, pp.3-4</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; p.65</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, Jan. 1895; pp.111-112</p>
--------------------------	--	---

<p>July 19, 1894 continued</p>	<p>Besant: “The complaints of Mr. Judge that he has been refused copies of the documents are not true, nor is it true that I promised him copies of the documents. I refused to show him the documents because he had copies in the statement of those I was going to use, and I did not care to run any risks with the originals. These were, however, shown to him afterwards by Colonel Olcott at my request, and he took his own time in scrutinising them; all the more important ones bear his own endorsement, ‘Seen, July 19th, 1894, W.Q.J.’ He made no complaint at the time that he was hurried in his inspection. As to copies, no duty lies on me to supply Mr. Judge with copies, still less with copies of long letters on various subjects, in which perhaps only a few sentences are cogent to the charges made; I have not the time to make copies, nor am I inclined to undertake the cost of having them transcribed; if Mr. Judge chooses to appoint a trustworthy copyist, such a person can come and make copies of all the documents, used and not used. Since the Spring of 1894, he has had, as given in the appended presentment of the case, a copy of all the written evidence I was going to use. What he has not had is a copy of all the irrelevant parts of the letters from which the relevant passages are taken.”</p> <p>“His attempts to get rid of the evidence, first to browbeat me into handing it over to him, and then to persuade me to destroy it, compelled me to think that he had no defence and feared the future publication of the documents. The efforts made to win over Colonel Olcott, flagrantly in face of former conduct by Mr. Judge’s friends, roused my suspicions, and when Mr. Judge left England, refusing to the last all explanation, not only to me, with whom he was grimly angry, but to those who had stood by him throughout, I felt that the obvious judgment arising on the <i>prima facie</i> case was the only one possible, and that the darker charges of fraud and forgery were true.”</p> <p>In “Statement of Annie Besant, Written April 24th, 1895.”: “I am not able to produce documentary evidence; immediately after I learned from the Master, in Sept., 1893, that Mr. Judge had deceived me, in the shock of the disgust I felt, I destroyed the ‘messages,’ except those written on the margins of letters. Nearly a year later, just ere leaving for Australia, I destroyed all the letters I had received from Mr. Judge as I could not carry them with me round the world, and would not risk their falling into the hands of others, in case of my death.”</p>	<p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); pp.8-9</p> <p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); p.20</p> <p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); p.82</p>
<p>July 19, 1894 continued</p>	<p>In letter to the Editor Irish Theosophist: “THE CHARGES AGAINST WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.” dated Jan.25, 1895, Judge stated: “I have not been furnished with copies of the documentary evidence by which the charges are said to be supported. These documents — being letters written by myself and some of them ten years old — have been in the possession of Mrs. Besant from about February, 1894 to July 19th, 1894, and open enemies of mine have been allowed to make copies of them, and also to take facsimiles, but they have been kept from me, although I have demanded and should have them.”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; pp.85-86</p>

<p>July 21, 1894</p>	<p>William Q. Judge sailed for New York.</p> <p>“<i>Theosophical Activities.</i>” by Mrs. Alice Cleather. “Mr. Judge and Dr. Buck left for New York last Saturday. . . .”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; pp.432-434</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, Sep. 1894; p.777</p>
<p>July 21, 1894 continued</p>	<p><i>The Neutrality of the Theosophical Society. AN ENQUIRY Into Certain Charges Against The Vice-President, Held in London, July, 1894.</i> [Published on this date]</p> <p>[Provides an account of the Judicial Committee’s proceedings held July 10, 1894. It was decided that the whole matter would be dropped as there could be no jurisdiction over the private acts of an individual. Olcott rescinded his suspension of W.Q.J. as Vice-President as it was found he had not acted as such in this matter. Resolution of accord and settlement passed. Harmony between Mrs. Besant and Mr. Judge restored and noted.]</p> <p>[Mr. Judge’s statement is given on pp.15-16]</p> <p><i>The Neutrality of the Theosophical Society. AN ENQUIRY Into Certain Charges Against The Vice-President, held in London, July, 1894.</i> Minutes of the July 10th, 1894 Judicial Committee Meeting.</p> <p><i>The Neutrality of the Theosophical Society. AN ENQUIRY Into Certain Charges Against The Vice-President, held at London, July, 1894.</i> NOTE: See July 7, 1894 entry.</p> <p>Supplement to The Theosophist, September 1894. EXECUTIVE NOTICE. <i>Minutes of A Judicial Committee of The Theosophical Society, Held at 19, Avenue Road, London, on July 10th, 1894.</i></p> <p>NOTE: See July 10, 1894.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 16 pages</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; pp.449-464</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.158-168</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, Sep. 1894; Supp. pp.xlii-liii</p>
<p>July 22, 1894</p>	<p>Walter R. Old wrote a letter to Col. Olcott, which H.S. Olcott requested be published in Lucifer, regarding Old’s objection to A. Besant’s statement that because of personal hatred for Mr. Judge and the T.S., Messrs. Old and Edge had repeated charges against Judge.</p> <p>NOTE: Brief background explanation of events: “Old had been under suspension from the E.S. . . . since August 1893, because of a statement in the ‘Freethought’ article [published in The Theosophist attacking Mr. Judge], violating the rule of occult secrecy to which he was pledged.”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 15, 1893 entry.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; pp.463-464</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.237-238</p>

July 22, 1894 continued	<p>Cheiro mentioned that Madame Blavatsky had introduced Annie Besant to him and that he took impressions of her hands on July 22nd, 1894.</p> <p>NOTE: For a study of Annie Besant's palm print and delineation see Fohat Vol. IV, No.4, Winter 2000 and Vol. V, No. 1, Spring 2001 for "ANNIE BESANT: HER PASSIONS AND HER RELATIONSHIPS."</p>	Greatest Occultists by Cheiro, p.181
July 25, 1894	<p>"<i>Theosophical Activities.</i>" by Alice Cleather, "and today (25th) Mrs. Besant leaves us again for her projected lecturing tour at the antipodes, going on to India for the Adyar Convention."</p> <p>"Mrs. Besant leaves England for Australia. . . . The tour will last about three months altogether. . . ."</p> <p>"Mr. Bertram Keightley, the General Secretary of the Indian Section, is expected to arrive in India . . . He is a passenger in S.S. 'Peshawar' with Mrs. Besant, who goes to visit the Australasian branches. . . ."</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 15, Sep. 1894; p.777</p> <p>Austral Theos. Vol. 1, July 1894; pp.97-98</p> <p>Prasnottara, Vol. 4, July 1894; p.122</p>
July 28, 1894	<p>"THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND MR. WILLIAM Q. JUDGE." "The threatened inquiry into certain charges against Mr. Judge, the Vice-President of the Theosophical Society, has ended in a fiasco." [Extracts from statements by Mr. Judge and Mrs. Besant at the inquiry are noted. The article seems to entice reproach by the membership of the T.S. by concluding:] "We have no wish to add to the pain which a noble-minded and truthful woman like Mrs. Besant must naturally feel at finding herself associated, even by proxy, with what she regards as 'illegitimate' methods; so we say no more beyond noting the gratifying fact that she had the courage to deliver her conscience by some plain speaking, and by the honest confession that she herself had in some instances been unwittingly deceived. As to Colonel Olcott, too, it must be admitted that his conduct all through seems to have been perfectly straightforward and honest. But it is difficult to believe that either Colonel Olcott or Mrs. Besant can be completely satisfied with so impotent a conclusion of a really serious matter."</p>	Light , Vol. 14, July 28, 1894; p.357

<p>Aug. 3, 1894</p>	<p>“CORRESPONDENCE.” Letter from W.Q. Judge as Gen. Sec., American Section, to Bertram Keightley, Gen. Sec., Indian Section, T.S. “I request you to give as much publicity to this letter as you have to your own.” In the July issue of Prasnottara B. Keightley had asked for a protest against the “proposal of the American Section to remove the Head-quarters of the Theosophical Society as such, away from the sacred soil of India.” Mr. Judge’s reply to this was: “Permit me to say that the American Section has not proposed anything of the kind and up to this date none of its workers, to my knowledge, has thought of doing so. The proposition to which you refer was made by your own delegate from India at the American Convention and was noted down in a resolution drawn by myself . . . and written in terms which would be most polite to your own delegate. We depreciate hasty statements like these in your paragraph, since they tend to raise unnecessarily questions and feelings which ought to have no existence.” NOTE: See July 1894 and Sep. 9 1894 entries.</p>	<p>Prasnottara, Vol. 4, No. 45, Sep. 1894; p.149</p>
<p>Aug. 4, 1894</p>	<p>“Letters from ‘the Masters’.” by F. W. Read. Referring to Annie Besant’s “sensational announcement at the Hall of Science”, F.W. Read insinuates deception on the part of Annie Besant, stating she “claimed to have received communications from ‘Mahatmas’ in some supra-normal way.” NOTE: See Aug. 30, 1891 for more on Annie Besant’s statement.</p>	<p>Light, Vol. 14, Aug. 4, 1894; p.370</p>
<p>Aug. 4, 1894 continued</p>	<p>“Colonel Olcott’s Judgement.” by Gilbert Elliot. In a letter to the Editor dated July 29, 1894, Elliot pointed to contradictions in Annie Besant’s teachings versus Colonel Olcott’s. He claimed “[Besant] once wrote: If there be no Masters, the Theosophical Society is an absurdity and there is no use keeping it up. But if there are Masters, and H.P.B. is their messenger, and the Theosophical Society their foundation, the Theosophical Society and H.P.B. cannot be separated before the world.’ Still Colonel Olcott assures us:[in a quote from The Neutrality of the T.S. p.7] ‘Nobody, for example, knows better than myself the fact of the existence of the Masters, yet I resign my office unhesitatingly if the constitution were amended so as to erect such a belief into a dogma.”</p>	<p>Light, Vol. 14, Aug. 4, 1894; p.372</p>

<p>Aug. 11, 1894</p>	<p>“The Charges Against Mr. W. Q. Judge.” by A.F.C., from Canterbury. A.F.C. gave a brief summary of the results from the judicial inquiry held on July 10, 1894 and wrote that: “Mrs. Besant has repeatedly stated in public that she has received Mahatmic letters since the death of Madame Blavatsky in the same script as those previously received, thus establishing to her satisfaction Madame Blavatsky’s <i>bona fides</i>. She now states that in those recent letters she has been mistaken, and ‘in turn misled the public’. ‘I now know that they were not written or precipitated by the ‘Master,’ and that they were done by Mr. Judge’.” A.F.C. also commented that: “[T]he Mahatma, or Mahatmas, implicated should themselves have been privately interviewed as to the genuineness or otherwise of the writings attributed to them by Mr. Judge . . . they might have cleared up much more satisfactorily the charges against the Vice-President.”</p>	<p>Light, Vol. 14, Aug. 11, 1894; p.383</p>
<p>Aug. 15, 1894</p>	<p><i>To Students of Occultism.</i> “OCCULTISM AND TRUTH.” Signed by H.S. Olcott, Annie Besant, A.P. Sinnett, Bertram Keightley, and four others. [London, July 1894] [A statement, without naming names, that shows suspicion against W.Q.J. has continued. It was as if the “settlement” at the Judicial Committee had settled nothing.]</p> <p>“APPENDIX.”[to The Neutrality of the T.S.]Statement by Annie Besant. READ FOR THE INFORMATION OF MEMBERS AT THE THIRD SESSION OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION OF THE T.S., JULY 12TH, 1894. “‘And now I must reduce these charges to their proper proportions, as they have been enormously exaggerated, and it is due to Mr. Judge that I should say publicly what from the beginning I have said privately. . . . “Further I wish it to be distinctly understood that I do not charge and have not charged Mr. Judge with forgery in the ordinary sense of the term, but with giving a misleading material form to messages received psychically from the Master in various ways, without acquainting the recipients with this fact. “I regard Mr. Judge as an Occultist, possessed of considerable knowledge and animated by a deep and unswerving devotion to the Theosophical Society.”</p> <p>NOTE: Also in <i>The Neutrality of The Theosophical Society</i>.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; pp.442-443</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; pp.459-460</p>
<p>Aug. 15, 1894 continued</p>	<p>“A THEOSOPHICAL TRIBUTE TO TRUTH. Mrs. Besant’s Last Manifesto.” “Before Mrs. Besant left for Australia she sent to the press for publication in Lucifer a remarkable but characteristic declaration directed against the practice of paltering with truth which had found a lodgment in some of the Theosophical lodges. . . . and it is almost admittedly prompted by the result of the inquiry into the charges made against Mr. W.Q. Judge, who was at one time regarded as the President Elect of the society.”</p> <p>NOTE: The Manifesto referred to is the Statement by Annie Besant READ FOR THE INFORMATION OF MEMBERS AT THE THIRD SESSION OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION OF THE T.S., JULY 12TH, 1894. See above cell for details.</p>	<p>Review of Reviews, Vol. 10, Oct. 1894; p.358</p>

Aug. 15, 1894 continued	<p>“OCCULTISM AND TRUTH” reprinted in The Path. Mr. Judge added comment: “The general propositions found in the above as to morality and the higher type of Occultism are so old and have been so widely spread, so often dwelt on in the work of the Theosophical Society, that one would hardly suppose any member was unacquainted with them; but a good thing cannot be too often repeated, and hence all must instantly concur. The circular was issued in London for distribution, and a copy having been sent to New York it is published according to the desire of the signers.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Sep. 1894; pp.184-185</p>
Aug. 15, 1894 continued	<p>J.D. Buck wrote a letter of objection to “OCCULTISM AND TRUTH”. “My contention is that the circular <i>Occultism and Truth</i> was not only unnecessary but was in its essential part untrue and was also a breach of good faith.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Jan. 1895; pp.320-321</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Jan. 1895; pp.66-68</p>
Aug. 15, 1894 continued	<p>“Onward.” An editorial by G.R.S. Mead. Mead believed the T.S. crisis has passed. “Had the fortress of the T.S. been built on sand, it would have been swept into ruins; fortunately for us it was built on rock, and the waves were sent back the way they came. . . .”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; pp.509-511</p>
Sep. 1894	<p>“A Memory of Old Days.” Annie Besant published a Note by H.P.B. to the Theosophical Publishing Company re: independence and authority of the Editors over Lucifer from the outset (1887). “The editors who have been chosen to conduct the new magazine wish to express to the Theosophical Publishing Company their conviction that they can only carry on their work if they are not interfered with in any way by members of the Company. . . . From the moment the work begins they alone must have the responsibility and authority.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Sep. 1894; p.6</p>
Sep. 1894 continued	<p>“T.S. SOLIDARITY AND IDEALS.” by H.S. Olcott. “I call upon every loyal member of the Society to do what he can to strengthen its solidarity.” [Article gives his view of the history and evolution of the T.S.; Plea for the centralization of Adyar as the heart of the T.S.; Constitution brought the T.S. through the recent crisis; Greater unity brought about; Each to work in unity with others where he is.] [Extract only in Lucifer]</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Oct. 1894; pp.201-207</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Sep. 1894; pp.26-30</p>
Sep. 1894 continued	<p>“Executive Notice.” From H.S. Olcott, P.T.S. “The undersigned . . . hereby appoints Mrs. Isabel Cooper-Oakley to the office of ‘Federal Correspondent,’ hereby created as a partial substitute for that of Corresponding Secretary, which was abrogated after the death of H.P.B.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Sep. 1894; p.81</p>

Sep. 9, 1894	<p>Bertram Keightley published a retraction and an apology for an earlier article in Prasnottara in which he stated that the American Section had made a proposal to move the Head-Quarters from the sacred soil of India to America.</p> <p>“I regret extremely that the mistake should have arisen and desire sincerely to apologise for the same and especially for the delay in its correction.”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 1894 and Aug. 3, 1894 entries.</p>	Prasnottara , Vol. 4, Sep. 1894; p.150
Sep. 18, 1894	Mrs. Besant arrived in Sydney, Australia.	The Theosophist , Vol. 16, Jan. 1895; p.39
Sep. 19, 1894	The President-Founder, H.S. Olcott, arrived in Adyar in the morning, via Bombay.	Prasnottara , Vol. 4, No. 45, Sep. 1894; p.154
Sep. 27, 1894	<p>“EXECUTIVE NOTICES.”</p> <p>“Adyar, 27th <i>September</i>, 1894.” Issued by H.S. Olcott.</p> <p>“Mr. Walter R. Old notifies the undersigned officially that, being ‘unable to accept the official statement in regard to the enquiry held upon the charges preferred against the Vice-President of the T.S.’, he resigns the offices of Treasurer and Recording Secretary. He will continue working, but in the private capacity of a member of the Birmingham Lodge. [We] regret to lose Mr. Old’s agreeable and profitable companionship in India. . . .”</p>	The Theosophist , Vol. 16, Oct. 1894; Supp. p.ii
Oct. 1894	<p>Westminster Gazette began publishing a series of articles by Edmund Garrett, entitled Isis Very Much Unveiled: The story of the Great Mahatma Hoax. The material for these articles was supplied by W.R. Old who had copies of the evidence. Mr. Judge replied to these attacks in the New York Sun.</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 25, 1894 entry.</p> <p>It was published as a pamphlet before Mr. Judge’s response had been received, “But that reply was printed in full by the <i>New York Sun</i>. The pamphlet is a monument of assumption, presumption, and ignorance, combined with malice and falsehood.”</p>	The Path , Vol. 9, Jan. 1895; p.322
Oct. 1894 continued	<p>In Isis Very Much Unveiled, 2nd edition, Old states:</p> <p>“It will, therefore, be clear to all members of the T.S. and the public generally that I am responsible for the facts occurring in Mr. Garrett’s articles only so far as they apply to the charges against Mr. Judge, and for these I have documentary evidence produced under a legal hand, and duly witnessed.”</p>	Isis Very Much Unveiled , 2 nd , ed., p.87

Oct. 1894 continued	<p>NOTE: See Dec.25-28, 1894 for a reply by Walter R. Old to Annie Besant's speech given at the Nineteenth Anniversary of the Theosophical Society in Adyar on December 25, 1894.</p> <p>In a letter to the Editor of Lucifer Mr. Old wrote: "The published facts are just those which came into the evidence of Col. Olcott and Bertram Keightley, and upon which the charges were based and action taken; and they are, moreover, part of a body of evidence, which, from the outset, it was decided to publish. "I take the whole Karma of my own action, and I affirm that it is wholly independent of connivance or instigation on the part of anyone."</p> <p>NOTE: Such copies in detail had not been given to Mr. Judge as the accused in the case.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Dec. 1894; p.338</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.238-239</p>
Oct. 1894 continued	<p>Annie Besant and B. Keightley replied Dec. 23, 1894 in pamphlet: The T.S. and the Westminster Gazette NOTE: See Dec. 23, 1894 entry.</p>	
Oct. 1894 continued	<p>New York Sun published an Editorial on Mr. Judge. NOTE: See Nov. 25, 1894 entry.</p> <p>Mr. Judge's reply to the Editor of The Sun. NOTE: See Nov. 26, 1894 and Dec. 3, 1894 entry.</p>	
Oct. 13, 1894	<p>Mrs. Tingley joined the Theosophical Society. She was accepted into the Esoteric Section a few weeks later.</p> <p>It appears to be at about this time that Mr. Judge and Mrs. Tingley visited Cheiro for a palm reading. Cheiro wrote briefly about the attack on W.Q.J.'s reputation then stated: "At about the time of this dispute, I was living in New York, when one afternoon William Q. Judge accompanied by a remarkably handsome woman appeared in my waiting room and requested an interview. . . . "I was, however much struck by his magnetic dominant personality and pleased him by stating that at that period of his life he had reached the climax of whatever his ambition was; . . . 'you have already reached the last chapter in your life'." Cheiro stated about Mrs. Tingley: "If it should be that this lady is in any way associated with whatever your work is, she will take your place and carry on that work to even greater success than you could do. She will also live to a very great age."</p> <p>NOTE: Cheiro claims Katherine Tingley left impressions of her hands with him, at his request. She consented and apparently signed and dated the copies on May 30, 1896. This does not appear to match the timing of the above mentioned visit to his office in New York.</p>	<p>Sunrise, Special Issue, Apr./May 1998; p.101</p> <p>Greatest Occultists by Cheiro, pp.185-189</p>

Oct. 25, 1894	<p>“THE VERACITY OF MR. W.Q. JUDGE.”</p> <p>Letter to Editor of Review of Reviews by Archibald Keightley and E.T. Hargrove regarding an article, “Theosophical Tribute to Truth” (which dealt with the ‘Manifesto’), correcting what led W.T. Stead “into unconsciously committing an injustice.”:</p> <p>“You there associate the issuing of a circular entitled ‘Occultism and Truth’ with the result of the inquiry into certain charges brought against Mr. Judge.</p> <p>“Mrs. Besant who originated the circular, was asked directly whether it was connected with the charges or whether it was in any way aimed at Mr. Judge. She gave an emphatic denial to both questions to many who took the same view expressed by you.”</p> <p>Signed by Ernest T. Hargrove (Member of Committee of Investigation.) and Archibald Keightley (Member Executive Committee European Section T.S., and of Investigation Committee.)</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 15, 1894.</p>	Review of Reviews , London, Nov. 1894; p.468
Oct. 29, 1894	<i>Isis Very Much Unveiled: The Story of the Great Mahatma Hoax.</i> Was published initially in the Westminster Gazette of Oct. 29, 1894 and nine succeeding issues.	132 pages, 2 nd ed., (1895)
Nov. 1894	W.Q.J. issued Minutes of Council E.S.T. held in London, May 27, 1891.	Pamphlet, 8 pages
Nov. 3, 1894	<p>“STRICTLY PRIVATE AND ONLY FOR E.S.T. MEMBERS., E.S.T., from William Q. Judge.”</p> <p>By Master’s Direction. A private pamphlet issued by W.Q. Judge, New York, to the members of the E.S.T.</p> <p>“Declares Mrs. Besant’s co-headship of the E.S. at an end ‘under Master’s direction’ and himself sole head. Gives a brief history of the E.S., and warns of a plot by Black Magicians against the T.S. and E.S.T. working through certain Brahmans of India.”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 18, 1887 entry.</p> <p>“[Judge] issued an E.S. circular letter, headed ‘By Master’s Order,’ in which he deposed Annie Besant from her Co-Headship in the Esoteric School” because of her breach of secrecy that she was pledged to.</p> <p>NOTE: See Mar. 19, 1887 entry.</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan.-Mar. 1938 for “CONCERNING BOOKS”.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 12 pages</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 1968, p.540</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.241, 243, 245</p>

Nov. 3, 1894 continued	<p>“I declare Mrs. Besant’s Headship at an End!”</p> <p>“The pamphlet closes with the following ‘E.S.T. ORDER’, dated November 3, and signed in manuscript:—</p> <p>“I now proceed a step further than the E.S.T. decisions of 189[1], and solely for the good of the E.S.T. I resume in the E.S.T., in full, all the functions and powers given to me by H.P.B. and that came to me by orderly succession after her passing from this life, and declare myself the sole head of the E.S.T.” Signed by William Q. Judge</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix B for reprint of the full text of By Master’s Direction, and details re: correction from 1894 to 1891. Also see May 27, 1891 entry.</p>	Isis Very Much Unveiled , 2 nd ed., p.115
Nov. 3, 1894 continued	<p>A Commonsense View of Mr. Judge’s Circular of November 3, 1894 issued by Bertram Keightley in London</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 1895 and Apr. 1895 entries.</p>	
Nov. 3, 1894 continued	<p>Comments on B. Keightley’s circular, A Commonsense View of Mr. Judge’s Circular of November 3, 1894 by Kalekamiyuen in Atma’s Messenger</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 1895, and April 1895 entries.</p>	

<p>Nov. 3, 1894 continued</p>	<p>Annie Besant under the influence of Chakravarti. “The record shows, instead, that her suspicions against Judge dated from her meeting with Chakravarti, in the summer of 1893; that it was <i>he</i>, as described by Dr. Archibald Keightley in the <i>Path</i> (June 1895), who was responsible for Mrs. Besant’s new-found intimacy with the ‘Master,’ and that, finally, the charges against Judge were outlined, and the first accusing letter of Olcott, dated Feb. 7, 1894, to Judge, was written, in Allahabad — Chakarvarti’s home.”</p> <p>Annie Besant: “[T]he unprovoked attacks on Mr. Chakravarti in the circular of Nov. 3rd, 1894, and since, and the pretence of ‘inner knowledge’. . . The attacks are the more unworthy in that Mr. Chakravarti did nothing to invite them, and had only stepped out of his quiet and silent life for the sake of doing a great service to the T.S. as its delegate at a very heavy cost to himself.”</p> <p>A. Keightley: “[S]he admitted occult ties with a group of Brahmins in India, such ties being prohibited by the rules of a private body to which we and she then belonged. . . . “Mr. Chakravarti intoned a mantram, made sweeping passes in the air, then fell into a semi-trance, when a message on ‘Peace’ was given through him apparently by audible telepathy. Mrs. Besant claimed . . . that the voice was the Master’s and that she saw his presence. She was the only one who did so.”</p> <p>Edmund Garrett: “Mr. Judge, Mrs. Besant, Mr. Chakravarti, and others, giving the most contradictory messages from the same Tibetan source. . . .”</p> <p>“Mr. Bertram Keightley’s Reply” in “The Clash of Opinion” where he corrects some facts published by Garrett in The Westminster Gazette.</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec 23, 1894 and Feb. 1, 1895 entries.</p> <p>B. Keightley in “The Clash of Opinion. A COMMON-SENSE VIEW OF MR. JUDGE’S CIRCULAR OF NOVEMBER 3RD, 1894” criticized Judge for publishing his Nov. 3rd E.S.T. circular By Master’s Direction</p> <p>NOTE: See March 15, 1895.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.249</p> <p>The Case Against W.Q. Judge by A. Besant (1895); p.16</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; pp.98-99</p> <p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, 2nd ed., pp.109, 115</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.505-507</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; pp.58-64</p>
<p>Nov. 15, 1894</p>	<p>Lucifer started a series of articles by Vera Jelihovsky (H.P.B.’s sister) called “HELENA PETROVNA BLAVATSKY”</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 1894 entry, The Path publishes Letters that were written by Blavatsky to her family.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Sep. 1894; pp.202-208, 273-279, 361-364, 469-477</p> <p>Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; pp.44-50, 99-108</p>

Nov. 19, 1894	<p>A circular by Laura M. Cooper and Herbert Burrows to (G.R.S. Mead). “A considerable number of the members of the T.S. feel very deeply the absolute necessity of some reply being made by Mr. W.Q. Judge, the Vice-President of the Society, to the series of charges which have lately appeared against him in <i>The Westminster Gazette</i>. Those members do not of course express the slightest personal opinion as to Mr. Judge’s innocence or guilt; but for his own sake as well as for the sake of the Society of which he is Vice-President, they strongly feel that he should be invited to make such a reply, or to state his reasons for not so doing.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 27, 1894 re: letter enclosed with this circular.</p>	The Vahan , Vol. 4, Jan. 1895; p.1
Nov. 20, 1894	<p>“THE CHARGES AGAINST WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.” Letter from W.Q. Judge to the Editor dated November 20th 1894. “The matter of charges against me seems not yet to be at an end, as I am informed that <i>The Westminster Gazette</i> has made a long story of this whole thing. . . . “When the true moment comes I will be able to speak, and then facts and circumstances will join in speaking for me.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 25, 1895 “THE CHARGES AGAINST WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.”</p>	Irish Theosophist , Vol. 3, Dec. 1894; pp.47-48,
Nov. 25, 1894	<p>“Hunting Down the Mahatmas.” New York Sun published 4 columns on Mr. Judge and the Theosophical Society on the Editorial page. NOTE: See Appendix A for their analytical description of the events concerning “The Brass Seal”.</p>	New York Sun , Nov. 25, 1894
Nov. 26, 1894	<p>Isis and the Mahatmas. A Reply by William Q. Judge. Issued in 1895 by W.Q.Judge, with correspondence, original articles and portrait. [Contains letter from W.Q.J. dated Nov. 26,1894 to the editor of The N.Y. Sun published on Dec. 3, 1894. Also includes Judge’s reply to the attack which appeared Dec. 8 and 10 in the Westminster Gazette under the title Isis Very Much Unveiled] [See Dec. 23, 1894]</p> <p>“I have never denied that I gave Mrs. Besant messages from the Masters. I did so. They were from the Masters. She admits that, but simply takes on herself to say that the Masters did not personally write or precipitate them.” [p.6 — Isis]</p> <p>“Now I can do no more than deny, as I hereby do absolutely, all the charges you have been the means of repeating against me. I have denied them very many times. . . .” [p.10 — Isis]</p>	Isis and the Mahatmas , 30 pages Two Replies by William Q. Judge , published by ULT, pp.5-16

Nov. 26, 1894 continued	<p>“Isis Very Much Unveiled. A REPLY FROM MR. WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.”</p> <p>To the editor of the Westminster Gazette. Includes Judge’s reply dated from “New York, Nov. 26” and a letter by Abbot B. Clark (Apr. 21, 1894) correcting some facts about the circumstances surrounding a letter he wrote to H.S. Olcott in 1891.</p> <p>NOTE: See April 29, 1895 entry, W.Q.J.’s Reply To Charges, Pamphlet issued April 29, 1895. Mr. Clark’s statement is included in Appendix A along with the Reply by William Q. Judge To Charges of Misuse of Mahatmas’ Names and Handwritings.</p>	<p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, 2nd ed., pp.121-132.</p>
Nov. 27, 1894	<p>A letter by Laura M. Cooper and Herbert Burrows addressed “<i>To The General Secretary of the European Section, T.S.</i>” (G.R.S. Mead)</p> <p>“The enclosed circular has been sent by us to a large number of the members of the European Section, T.S., and, with not more than half a dozen exceptions, they have expressed their desire that the different Lodges should be invited by you to express their opinions, as soon as possible, as to whether Mr. Judge, Vice-President of the Society, should be requested to reply to the charges lately brought against him in <i>The Westminster Gazette</i>.” [See Nov. 19, 1894 for circular.]</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan 5, 1895 and Jan. 11, 1895.</p> <p>NOTE: Also see Dec. 1, 1894 for a list of names supplied by Mr. Smythe of persons who had indicated their opinion on the matter.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Jan. 1895; p.1</p>
Nov. 28, 1894	<p>A communication from Archibald Keightley as a member of the Executive Committee of the European Section.</p> <p>“It is impossible to take action on the vague assertion that a memorial has been signed by ‘a large number of members.’ . . . To my personal knowledge only one of Mr. Judge’s friends out of thirteen prominent workers have seen it. . . .</p> <p>“My opinion is that while we are constituted as at present it is not possible for the Executive Committee under its present powers to take such action as the memorialists request.”</p> <p>He listed 6 reasons why and concluded:</p> <p>“I may conclude by saying that it seems to me strange that officials of a Society with such aims as ours should take the position of requesting its Vice-President to reply to attacks printed in a minor newspaper, founded on information supplied by a man confessedly perjured in so doing. It would appear that we are to be asked to suggest that Mr. Judge go before an outside, self-constituted tribunal, there to try a case which we ourselves refused to hear on the ground that such hearing was illegal when he came from America to defend himself before the Judicial Committee.”</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Jan. 1895; p.2</p>

Nov. 29, 1894	<p>On Nov. 29 Mr. Mead was asked by Mr. H. T. Edge to read the Dublin Lodge circular at the Blavatsky Lodge. Mr. Mead explained: “I replied that that would be out of order, and on taking the chair I stated to the Lodge that I had been requested to read the Dublin Lodge circular, but that I could not do so unless I read all communications also from other Lodges, and if I did so, I would prevent debate on the subject. This would be improper at an ordinary public meeting and without notice, and therefore I would call a special meeting for that purpose. . . .”</p> <p>Dec. 15 was then called as the date for that special meeting.</p> <p>Mead continues: “Nevertheless, in spite of my ruling, the lecturer of the evening, Mr. E. T. Hargrove, began to quote the circular in his speech and I had to rule him out of order”</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 15, 1894 for Mead’s ruling at that meeting.</p>	The Vahan , Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; p.2
Nov. 30, 1894	<p>From Fred J. Dick, Circular of support for W.Q.J.:</p> <p>“It has been suggested that the enclosed circular (sent by some members of the Dublin Lodge to all the Lodges and Centres in the European Section) should be signed as extensively as possible, and sent, one copy to the forthcoming Convention at Adyar, the second to Bro. W.Q. Judge.”</p>	The Vahan , Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; p.3
Dec. 1894	<p>NOTE: The Path started a series of articles [thirteen parts] by Vera Jelihovsky (H.P.B.’s sister) called “Letters of H.P. Blavatsky”. William Q. Judge added footnotes to some of the Letters.</p> <p>NOTE: These letters were written by H.P. Blavatsky to her family. These letters provide the reader with an occult perspective on the personal life of an occultist.</p>	The Path , Vol. 9, Dec. 1894, pp. 265-270; Jan. 1895, pp.297-302; Feb. 1895, pp.329- 385; Mar. 1895, pp.411-415 Vol. 10, Apr. 1895, pp.6-8; May 1895, pp.33-37; June 1895, pp.73-78; July 1895, pp.105-108; Aug. 1895, pp.139-142; Sep. 1895, pp. 169- 174; Oct. 1895, pp.203-206; Nov. 1895, pp.235-240; Dec. 1895, pp.267- 270
Dec. 1894	<p>“On The Watch-Tower.” G.R.S. Mead accuses The Path of hero-worshipping of H.P.B.</p> <p>Noted in The Path.</p>	Lucifer , Vol. 15, Dec. 1894; pp.265-268 The Path , Vol. 9, Feb. 1895; p.405

Dec. 1894 continued	Referring to the allegations against W.Q. Judge in The Westminster Gazette the editor, E.A. Bulmer, remarks: “A clever barrister could throw discredit upon the doings of a saint, and a skilful journalist can so manipulate facts with his own inferences and suggestions as to blacken the character of an archangel.”	Northern Theos. Vol. 2, Dec. 1894; p.1
Dec. 1894 continued	Circular “issued by members of the T.S. in New York and Brooklyn, through Henry T. Patterson, F.T.S. and is submitted for the signatures of those members desiring to so express themselves.” “American members have generally believed that Mr. Judge could and did have communication with Mahatmas, but that belief is not due to claims made by him. . . . “We do not think the charges can be proved or disproved. We think that if we have any confidence in our brother, due to his nineteen years of service, we must accept his statement that he has never misused the names and handwritings of the Mahatmas; has never attempted to mystify anyone; has never used any ‘wrong methods.’ . . . “And, finally, we believe that Brother Judge was selected for the work he has done and is doing, by some Power or Intelligence greater than ours. . . .” [Review of charges and events] NOTE: See January 1 st 1895 for the reprinted Circular (8 pp.), “TO THE MEMBERS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY”, signed by 121 American members.	Circular Letter, 3 pages

<p>Dec. 1, 1894</p>	<p>Circular from the General Secretary (G.R.S. Mead) to the members of the [Executive] Committee.</p> <p>“I herewith enclose you a copy of the names of the memorialists for your information. You will at once see that it includes names that give it great weight. . . .</p> <p>“ . . . The memorialists do not demand a trial, they simply ask whether or not the Lodges wish to invite Mr. Judge in the interests of the Society to make some reply or state why he cannot. If the Lodges do not wish it, the matter can then drop. “If the Lodges wish it, then their voice is paramount and the officials of the Section must give ear to it.</p> <p> . . .</p> <p>“ . . . It is certainly impossible, according to the finding of the President, General Council and Judicial Committee, to try the Vice-President on the charges formulated against him in July, but it is possible for the Lodges of the Section and the Sections of the Society to say whether or not they are prepared to stand or fall by their Vice-President in the public estimation, without raising a finger of protest against such a dangerous precedent. This we may be sure they will state sooner or later, and it is better they should do so in order than in disorder.”</p> <p>Mead explained the purpose for the “List of Memorialists” in his NOTICE of Dec. 31, 1894. He stated:</p> <p>“I should also have been compelled to add that one of the express purposes for which these signatures were obtained was to memorialize the late Convention of the Indian Section.”</p> <p>NOTE: Mr. Mead obviously took exception to Archibald Keightley’s Nov. 28th, 1894 letter and decided to take action by sending eighty circulars.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Jan. 1895; pp.3-4</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; p.1</p> <p>Light, Vol. 15, Jan. 12, 1895; p.21</p>
<p>Dec. 1, 1894 continued</p>	<p>Albert Smythe, Editor, listed only the English Theosophists who had expressed their opinions as to whether Mr. Judge, Vice-President of the Society, should be requested to reply to the charges recently brought against him in the Westminster Gazette.</p> <p>“Among prominent English Theosophists who want an explanation from Mr. Judge are Herbert Burrows, Laura M. Cooper, Miss Müller, Dr. Wynn Westcott, W. Kingsland, Hon. O. Cuffe, Dr. Carter Blake, M.U. Moore, Oliver Firth, Thomas Williams, and Sydney Old. Of those who consider an explanation unnecessary Dr. Archibald Keightley, Mrs. J.C. Keightley, Dr. H.A.W. Coryn, F.J. Dick, G.W. Russell, W.A. Bulmer, E.T. Hargrove, Basil Crump, T. Green, H.T. Edge, and Alice Cleather are well-known. Others await the acrobatic feline.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 27, 1894 entry.</p>	<p>The Lamp, Vol. 1, Feb. 1895; pp.108-109</p>
<p>Dec. 3, 1894</p>	<p>“To The Members of the E.S.T.” from W.Q.J.</p> <p>“In accordance with order received from Master, I hereby declare that Instructions I, II, III of this School are no longer secret, with the following exceptions: . . .”</p>	<p>E.S.T. Order No. II of 1894, 1 page</p>

<p>Dec. 3, 1894 continued</p>	<p>The New York Sun printed in full Judge's reply to the accusations against him. In <i>Literary Notes (The Path)</i>: "WESTMINISTER GAZETTE, hastening to try and gather the pecuniary profits of its long attack on the T.S., at once, before the reply made by Mr. Judge had reached it, got out the whole thing in the form of a pamphlet in which it assumes on what it calls foreknowledge that no reply would be made. Mr. Judge's reply was about 5,000 words long, and will call for a new edition if the thing is to be printed complete. But that reply was printed in full by the <i>New York Sun</i>. The pamphlet is a monument of assumption, presumption, and ignorance, combined with malice and falsehood. It may be put on the shelf with the S.P.R. Report on H.P.B. It is not sold by the PATH."</p> <p>In a letter dated Jan. 25, 1895 to George R.S. Mead, W.Q. Judge stated: "I have replied to the public newspaper in the only way it deserves. I have still under consideration a full reply to the T.S. respecting the real charges, but I have refused to be hurried until the right time. . . . I have additional reasons for waiting until all possible innuendos and distortions shall have come forth. . . ."</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 26, 1894 and Dec. 23, 1894 entries.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Jan. 1895; p.322</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; p.433</p>
<p>Dec. 9, 1894</p>	<p>"The Clash of Opinion." <i>To the Editor of LUCIFER.</i> Letter from F. Hartmann in Hallein, Austria. "Mr. Garrett seems to think that Theosophy consists in believing what this or that person says, and that we must therefore be exceedingly careful to examine into the credibility of such a person, so as not to fall into the error of believing in the words of the wrong person; but always take good care to believe only what a person says in whose veracity we have good reasons to trust. This is, however, just what Theosophy does <i>not</i> teach; for it teaches that we should seek our refuge in nothing else but in light of the eternal truth. We ought to cling for attainment of self-knowledge neither to the turban of a Mahatma, nor to the coat-tail of Mr. Judge, nor to H.P. Blavatsky's or Mrs. Besant's apronstrings. . . ."</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 15, 1894 for more detail.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Jan. 1894; pp.427-428</p>
<p>Dec. 10, 1894</p>	<p>William Q. Judge, <i>Outer Head of the E.S.T.</i> "The Council for the Eastern Division of the E.S.T., made up by Mrs. Annie Besant at London, having met and the majority having formally notified me that they do not accept the Master's Order, issued by me Nov. 3rd, 1894; Dr. H.A.W. Coryn, Mrs. A. L. Cleather and James M. Pryse voting in the minority and accepting said Order; I am compelled to dissolve the said Council, which I hereby do, and from this date said Council ceases to exist or to have power."</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 3, 1894, By Master's Direction issued by W.Q.J.</p>	<p>E.S.T. Order No. III of 1894, 1 page</p>

<p>Dec. 15, 1894</p>	<p>“The Clash of Opinion” re: Westminster Gazette articles. G.R.S. Mead inserted: “I consider it my duty to insert with rigid impartiality the resolutions of Lodges or expressions of opinion of groups of members, or the letters of members immediately concerned in the present state of affairs.” Printed letters and resolutions.</p> <p>“The Clash of Opinion. <i>To the Editor of LUCIFER</i>” By Franz Hartmann. Stated he found Garrett’s pamphlet ‘amusing’, “however, appears in quite another aspect, if we regard it is an attack upon the T.S. as a whole.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 9, 1894 entry.</p> <p>Includes letters from T. Green, Julia and Archibald Keightley, and others.</p> <p>“The Clash of Opinion. A LETTER TO THE EUROPEAN SECTION”. Letter by G.R.S. Mead, Feb. 1, 1895, London. “Rightly or wrongly, I have until now considered it my duty to keep silent on the present condition of affairs in the Theosophical Society. . . . “I have hoped against hope that Mr. Judge would, of his own free will, resign his office and relieve us from all this turmoil. . . .”</p> <p>MR. BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY’S REPLY. (to the Westminster Gazette).</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 23, 1894.</p> <p>Letter from Alexander Fullerton in which he stated that he had felt an investigation was imperative, then mentioned that he had received communications in two parts from the Masters and “I now support Mr. Judge’s policy. . . .” NOTE: See Jan. 16, 1895.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Dec. 1894; pp.337-342</p> <p>Jan. 1895; pp.427-428</p> <p>pp.429-434</p> <p>Feb. 1895; pp.500-505</p> <p>pp.505-507</p> <p>pp.508-509</p>
<p>Dec. 15, 1894 continued</p>	<p>Blavatsky Lodge report by the Secretary, S.M. Sharpe. “A special meeting of this Lodge was held on Dec. 15th to hear and consider various resolutions and communications concerning the present crisis in the T. S. The business not concluded, the meeting stands adjourned until Saturday evening Jan. 5th, at 8 p.m.”</p> <p>Mead’s explanation as to why he delayed the meeting again until Jan. 5, 1895. “The Lodge met to consider the matter on December 15th; my ruling on that occasion was of such a nature that I was informed by several of the representatives of the majority of the Lodge, who were for discussing the matter and moving resolutions, that I had given the meeting away.”</p> <p>NOTE: See January 5th, 1895 entry regarding Mead ruling proxy votes out of order and the resolution moved by Herbert Burrows that the Blavatsky Lodge ask W.Q. Judge to resign.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Jan. 1895; p.14</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; p.2</p>

Dec. 19, 1894	<p>Mrs. Besant arrived in Colombo from Australia on Dec. 18, 1894. On landing she was met with the series of articles in the Westminster Gazette, bringing various serious charges against prominent members of the Theosophical Society. She wrote a letter on the 19th addressed to the Editor of the Daily Chronicle. In this letter she stated that she was too busy to reply at that time. “Nor can I even now, at this distance, take up the matter, since anything I say can be contradicted on the morrow with the certainty of a month’s interval ere I can again be heard. Such a struggle is too unequal.”</p> <p>NOTE: Besant did provide a lengthy reply to the Westminster Gazette in a letter dated Dec. 23, 1894, thereby contradicting her earlier position as to her defence. See letter of Dec. 19th in Appendix A.</p>	<p>Prasnottara, Vol. 4, Nov./Dec. 1894; p.204</p> <p>Light, Vol. 15, Jan. 12, 1895; pp.21-22</p>
Dec. 19, 1894 continued	<p>Annie Besant was in Australia at the time that Judge issued his Nov. 3rd, 1894 E.S.T. circular. She arrived at Colombo, Ceylon, on December 18th, on her way to attend the Adyar Convention. In response she issued a counter-circular “For E.S.T. Members Only” from Colombo. In it she stated:</p> <p>“The ‘E.S.T. Order’ . . . I reject. I shall pursue my work quietly, with such of the Council left by H.P.B. as think it right to work with me. Mr. Judge thinks it right to rent the School in twain, and I can only go on steadily as I have learned. We have come to the parting of the ways. I recognize no authority in Mr. Judge. Not from his hands did I receive my work; not into his hands may I surrender it.” She closed by stating members must choose between her and Judge and added: “No member can belong to both schools”.</p> <p>“On her way to India . . . she prepared a long article on the <i>Westminster Gazette</i> attack, which she gave to the <i>Madras Mail</i> upon arriving at Adyar. This article contained a defence of herself and accusations of Judge.”</p> <p>This public reply by Annie Besant to W.Q.J.’s E.S.T. circular of November 3rd, 1894, By Master’s Direction, violated the pledge of secrecy and privacy within the E.S. Judge wrote:</p> <p>“The charge is made publicly and privately, as well as in a set of resolutions offered by Mrs. Besant and passed at a meeting in India in December. It is based the fact that in a circular issued by me privately in the E.S.T. I stated that the spiritual crest, the center, of the wave of evolution is in the West and not in the East.”</p> <p>Annie Besant declared it to be public since part of Judge’s E.S. circular was published in The Westminster Gazette.</p> <p>A Commonsense View of Mr. Judge’s Circular of November 3rd, 1894 by Bertram Keightley. [printed in Feb. 1895]</p> <p>[Reprinted in] The Prasnottara.</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 1895 also Dec. 23, 1894.</p>	<p>Eastern School of Theosophy, 4 page circular</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.245-249</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; p.1</p> <p>The Theosophical Society and The Westminster Gazette, p.13</p> <p>Pamphlet, 8 pages, p.1</p> <p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, No. 52, May 1895; pp.39-49</p>

Dec. 19, 1894 continued	<p>Mr. Bulmer's remarks on Judge's Nov. 3rd, 1894 Circular which "declared Annie Besant's headship in the E.S.T. at an end."</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 3, 1894 entry.</p>	<p>Northern Theos. Vol. 2, Mar. 1895; pp.25-26</p>
Dec. 21, 1894	<p>"TRUTH AND OCCULTISM." Letter from Constance Wachtmeister to Dr. Buck. "Do you remember telling me that I was right in believing that W.Q. Judge had acted in a fraudulent and deceitful manner in sending out spurious orders and messages, that you intended to pull him through the convention at whatever cost to honour, but that afterwards you would give him a piece of your mind, telling him that messages must cease for the future."</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 21, 1895 for Dr. Buck's reply.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; pp.89-90</p>
Dec. 22, 1894	<p>Letter to the Editor of The Vahan from Julia C. Keightley and Archibald Keightley. "A rumour having arisen that William Q. Judge is not himself the author of <i>Letters that have helped me</i>, we ask your fraternal assistance in contradicting this report. It is false. "The true account of the authorship of the <i>Letters</i> by Mr. Judge will be found in the <i>Irish Theosophist</i> for January 1895." NOTE: The correction appeared in the Feb. 1895 issue of The Irish Theosophist, pp.87-88. See Jan. 13, 1895 entry.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; p.13</p>
Dec. 23, 1894	<p>A. Besant's and B. Keightley's replies to the Westminster Gazette's article about the Judge Case. [Pointed out discrepancies as to facts in Isis Very Much Unveiled by E.Garrett] See also entries for Jan. 16 and 19, 1895.</p> <p>Bertram Keightley's reply criticized Mr. Garrett: "Though I regret the breach of faith and gentlemanly feeling to which it is due, yet I do not regret in the least the fact that these matters have been made public. . . . as to publish confidential documents obtained by breach of faith, to assail the absent where no reply can be made for months, and to give publicity to such malicious slander as the statements of Mr. Judge concerning one so universally honoured and respected in all circles as Mr. G. N. Chakravarti, yet I for one am thankful that matters have been brought to a definite issue and that the members of our Society can decide for themselves on which side lies the right." Also published in "The Clash of Opinion. A LETTER TO THE EUROPEAN SECTION." NOTE: See Nov. 3, 1894 and Feb. 1, 1895 entries.</p>	<p>The Theosophical Society and The Westminster Gazette, 16 page pamphlet</p> <p>Daily Chronicle, Jan. 16, 1895</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.505-507</p>

<p>Dec. 23, 1894 continued</p>	<p>Letter From “MR. HERBERT BURROWS: A REPLY WE MUST HAVE OR I LEAVE THE SOCIETY.”</p> <p>“I am a sceptic by nature, and I was then a materialist, and the honest conclusion that I came to was that the case for the prosecution was far too weak to warrant a conviction. That opinion I still hold. If I thought differently I should be outside the Theosophical Society instead of in it.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Oct. 2, 1895 entry.</p>	<p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, 2nd ed., pp.80-84</p>
<p>Dec. 25-28, 1894</p>	<p>Annual Convention of the Indian Section, and Nineteenth Anniversary of the T.S.</p> <p>“The Resolution at the Anniversary Meeting at Adyar.”</p> <p>Resolution passed at the Convention:</p> <p>“That the President-Founder be and hereby is requested to at once call upon Mr. W.Q. Judge, Vice-President of the Theosophical Society, to resign the office of Vice-President; it being, of course, open to Mr. Judge, if he so wishes, to submit himself for re-election, so that the Society may pass its judgement on his position.</p> <p>“Resolutions of the Indian Section.”</p> <p>“The following resolution, being duly proposed and seconded, was unanimously adopted by the Convention of the Indian Section T.S., on December 26th, 1894.”</p> <p>In his President’s Address, Olcott compared Judge’s position with that of H.P.B.’s during the 1884 Coulomb crisis to “see how an individual accused of the immoral act of deception usually behaves.” [p.9]</p> <p>Olcott also remarked, “My objective intercourse with the Great Teachers ceased almost entirely on the death of H.P.B. . . .”</p> <p>In comments on the Convention at Adyar Mr. Judge wrote: “The untheosophical exhibition ended by the passage of a resolution offered by Mrs. Besant that the President-Founder be asked to request the Vice-President to resign. The Indian Section passed a like resolution. “But the Anniversary Meeting and resolution are illegal. There is no such thing known to the Constitution. The resolution is therefore void and ineffective. . . . The so-called Anniversaries are simply social or courtesy meetings when the President, taking advantage of the Indian Section Convention, read and had read general reports”.</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix A, No. 5, for Olcott’s address.</p> <p>“On the following day the Indian Section held its Annual Convention, and the following Resolution, moved by Tookaram Tatya of Bombay and seconded by Mr. A. Nilakata Shastri, was unanimously carried. . . .” [p.62]</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 26, 1895 entry for editorial comments from Light.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; pp.9-10</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, Jan. 1895; pp.8-11</p> <p>p.10</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Feb. 1895; p.410 Mar. 1895; pp.438, 442</p> <p>General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S., 62 pages</p>

Dec. 25-28, 1894 continued	Amendment to Annie Besant’s Resolution requesting Olcott to call upon William Q. Judge to resign the office of Vice-President of the T.S. “An amendment was moved by Captain Banon and seconded by Miss Müller, calling on the President-Founder to take steps to expel Mr. Judge from the Theosophical Society. [p.51] “The President then put the first amendment, that of Captain Banon, to the meeting and it was lost.” [p.61]	General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S. , 62 pages
Dec. 25-28, 1894 continued	Should Mr. Judge Resign? Speeches by Annie Besant and Bertram Keightley held at the Anniversary Meeting of the T.S. In her address at the meeting, Mrs. Besant speaking about Mr. Judge stated: “[W]hile Australasia may be unanimous against Mr. Judge, you ought to discount it by the fact that I have been lecturing everywhere with enormous success, and that influenced many people; and therefore it may be a momentary rush and not a permanent resolution.” [Reprinted in Lucifer as part II of “THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THE PRESENT TROUBLES” (p.461).] NOTE: See Apr. 1895, regarding the vote taken by the Australians. NOTE: See Nov. 25, 1894; Nov. 26, 1894 and Feb 7, 1895 for related articles in New York “Sun” .	Pamphlet, 15 pages, p.8 General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S. , p.45 Lucifer , Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.454-468
Dec. 25-28, 1894 continued	From Annie Besant’s speech against Mr. Judge, at Adyar, Dec. 25, 1894. “I lay before you exactly the facts of the division in Europe and I tell you my own personal opinions. <i>When I return</i> , there will be a very strong if not an overwhelming party in favor of the policy of truth, of absolute honor and uprightness, and unless something is done, some of our best people will immediately leave the Society and public propoganda will be rendered well-nigh impossible.” NOTE: See Jan.1, 1895 for W.Q. Judge quoting H.P.B..	New England Notes , Vol. 1, Jan. 1, 1895; p.4
Dec. 25-28, 1894 continued	From Annie Besant’s speech against Mr. Judge. As part of Annie Besant’s “reasons for submitting that resolution” she mentioned a comment made by Mr. Judge: “Mr. Judge further takes on himself to say that there are no true Initiates in India.” This statement by Judge does not seem to contradict H.P. Blavatsky’s position, in 1888, for she stated in Lucifer : “We lived in India for many years, and have never yet met with a ‘Sanskrit Pundit’ — officially recognized as such — who knew anything of Occultism. We met with several occultists in India who will not speak; and with but one who is a really learned Occultist (the most learned, perhaps of all in India), who condescends occasionally to open his mouth and teach. This he never does, however, outside a very small group of Theosophists.”	New England Notes , Vol. 1, Jan. 1, 1895; p.4 Lucifer , Vol. 2, Apr. 1888; p.141 BCW , Vol. 9, pp.140-141

Dec. 25-28, 1894 continued	<p>“<i>To the Editor of LUCIFER.</i>”</p> <p>Reply by W.R. Old to Annie Besant’s speech in which he claimed that Judge did indeed see the documents or even had copies of them. Then admitted</p> <p>“I am the only person who holds certified copies of the documents.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Oct. 1894 entry.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; p.67</p>
Dec. 27, 1894	<p>“THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY CHRONICLE.”</p> <p>H.S. Olcott sent “advanced proofs of the text of so much of my Annual Address for Convention 1894 . . . as relates to the case of Mr. W.Q. Judge. Upon the merits of the charges of forgery and deception as regards alleged Mahatmic writings, I am not free to express my belief, the quasi-judicial function of my office demanding that I should observe absolute neutrality in all questions in controversy which may come before me for decision as, so to say, court of appeal. It goes without saying that if an official who has uttered false documents should be proved an irresponsible psychic, he or she would be morally disqualified for continuance in office. But we are not at that stage of this case at present.”</p>	<p>Daily Chronicle, Jan. 16, 1895</p>
Dec. 30, 1894	<p>To E.S.T. Members in Europe. from W.Q. Judge.</p> <p>“I have appointed as my agent in the Eastern Division of the E.S.T. an Advisory Council. It has elected as its Secretary Dr. A. Keightley. . . .”</p>	<p>E.S.T. circular from the London office, 1 page</p>
Dec. 31, 1894	<p>“NOTICE” from The General Secretary’s office, by G.R.S. Mead.</p> <p>Claimed H.T. Edge, the assistant secretary of the section, copied the list of names of members of the European Section for “Mr. Judge’s party”, for which he was let go from Mead’s office; stated J. M. Pryse refused to issue The Vahan. [p.1]</p> <p>Mead also stated:</p> <p>“On the 27th of the month I received a copy of some 120 additional signatures to the circular of the Dublin Lodge. Seeing that THE VAHAN was already late and that I could not obtain any direct information for what special purpose the signatures were obtained or who obtained them, I added a note acknowledging the receipt of the signatures and promising full publication in the next issue.”</p> <p>NOTE: “Additional Signatures to the Dublin Lodge Circular” was published by Mead in the Feb. 1st, 1895, issue of The Vahan. [p.12]</p> <p>The same circular by G.R.S. Mead appeared in Light under title: “THE DIFFERENCES IN THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.”</p> <p>Replies by H.T. Edge, J.M Pryse, Thomas Green, A. Keightley, H. Coryn, and “A PROTEST.” <i>To Members of the Theosophical Society in Europe.</i>” by Julia Keightley with 23 others.</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 1, 1895.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; pp.1-9</p> <p>Light, Vol .15, Jan. 12, 1895; p.21</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; pp.6-7</p>

Dec. 31, 1894 continued	<p>Letter from James M. Pryse, manager of the H.P.B Press, to G.R.S. Mead. “As you refuse to insert full list of signatures to Dublin circular, I must therefore insist that all circulars and other matter on the same subject be stricken from THE VAHAN. As co-editor I refuse to agree to the publication of the paper in its present falsified and misleading form, which purports to be an impartial representation of opinions, when in fact it is only a partizan sheet which excludes one side from a fair hearing. “Until both sides are published or none, I cannot consent to its publication.” In a letter of reply to Mr. Mead’s response to the above: “Further, you announced your intention of breaking your contract with the H.P.B. Press for no apparent reason.”</p>	The Vahan , Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; p.5
1895[Early] Est. Date	Garrett published 3 rd edition of Isis Very Much Unveiled, Being the Story of the Great Mahatma Hoax . 136 pp. This edition omitted the letters from Theosophists with Besant’s reply in the Jan. 15, 1895 Daily Chronicle .	T.N.C.A.B. Item 1960, p.538
Circa 1895	Circular titled Fellow Theosophists . by “A Fellow of The Theosophical Society. Issued on my own responsibility”. “In view of this constant labor in a cause which brings him no pecuniary or social advantages, no personal gains . . . is it conceivable that such a man, as Mr. Judge’s conduct for over 19 years which stands open to public inspection proves him to be, should stoop to deception and fraud, — which said deception and fraud could be no gain to him. . . .”	Circular, 3 pages
Jan. 1895	<p>“DEAR EDITOR” Letter from Thos. Green dated January 1st, 1895. “The order came from Mrs. Besant and Bertram Keightley [in India] this morning to close the [H.P.B.] Press [in London]. Accordingly it is closed, and now regretfully we return the copy of the <i>I.T.</i>”</p> <p>“[T]he ‘H.P.B. Press’ converted into the ‘<i>Irish Theosophist</i> Press’.” Pryse goes to Dublin. [see Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Apr. 1895; p.88]</p> <p>[The H.P.B. Press was set up in 1891. T. Green was in charge along with James M. Pryse who was the supervisor; managers were Countess Wachtmeister, Annie Besant, G.R.S.Mead, and E.T. Sturdy.]</p> <p>At the Fifth Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in England, August 7th, 1889, “Mr. Green spoke of the work of the H.P.B. Press, which, although not an official activity of the Society, and quite independent of the Society’s funds, existed solely to help the T.S. The printing-press belonged to Dr. Keightley, and was lent by him, and the rest of the plant was provided by two members of the Society.”</p> <p>NOTE: The H.P.B. Press printed most of the theosophical literature. The closing of the Press may have been intended to cause financial harm to Dr. Keightley who was a strong supporter of W.Q. Judge. See “An Introduction” to Appendix F for more details about the Press.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Jan. 1895; p.68</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; p.28</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 9, Nov. 1891; pp.254-255</p> <p>English Theosophist, Vol. 3, Sep. 1899; pp.120-124</p>

<p>Jan. 1895 continued</p>	<p>H.P.B. and the Present Crisis in The Theosophical Society by Countess Wachtmeister: “[H.P.B.] called me into her room and showed me a letter, written by W.Q. Judge to her. It began with his own handwriting, which suddenly changed into the handwriting of H.P.B., and so perfect was the imitation, that I could not detect a single flaw; then he went on with his own handwriting again to the end of the letter. I looked at H.P.B. aghast and said, ‘But surely this is a very dangerous power to possess,’ to which she replied, ‘Yes, but I do not believe Judge would use it for wrong or evil purposes.’ . . . “H.P.B. always told me that her successor would be a woman, long before Annie Besant had become a member of the T.S.” C. Wachtmeister concluded: “W.Q. Judge has been mainly prompted by personal ambition and desire to get the whole of the Theosophical Society into his own hands. . . .”</p> <p>Brief excerpts were printed in the Theosophic Messenger, Mar. 1905, pp.120-121, and The Messenger, May 1915, pp.467-768.</p> <p>In letters to the Editor, J. Keightley, E.T. Hargrove, and Roger Hall [May 25, 1895] repudiate some of the alleged facts. Roger Hall wrote: “[H.P.B.] said she knew she must soon leave us. I asked her about the filling of the void. . . . She answered that W.Q. Judge was her favorite pupil and would worthily bear her mantle when she was gone. Shortly after he came over on a visit and she introduced me to him, saying distinctly that he was her destined successor. After he had gone back to America she always spoke of him in the same way to me and, I have no doubt, to others who were seeing her nearly every day.” NOTE: Mme Blavatsky knew she was to die soon. See End of March 1889 entry for details.</p> <p>NOTE: See May 25, 1895 for more on Roger Hall’s letter.</p>	<p>H.P.B. and the Present Crisis in the T.S., 12 pages (Jan. 1895, est.)</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 1999, p.548</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, June 1895; pp.158, 163-165</p>
<p>Jan. 1895 continued</p>	<p>“The Editor’s Remarks.” By W.A. Bulmer about the latest development of the case against W.Q. Judge. “The wisest course to adopt when evidence is conflicting is to suspend judgement. . . . “. . . in this case heart pleads against head.” Heart says “he is not and cannot be the common fraud which a biassed writer, chosing [sic] and manipulating facts, attempted to make him out to be.” Head says “I don’t want to take my chances on instinct, I want to <i>know</i>. . . . “. . . As far as average humanity goes, I believe Brother Judge is far ahead of most of us. . . .”</p>	<p>Northern Theos., Vol. 2, Jan. 1895; pp.9-10</p>

Jan. 1895 continued	Article by W.Q. Judge warning against “BOGUS MAHATMA MESSAGES”	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Jan. 1895; pp.302-303</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, pp.446-448</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 1, pp.369-370</p>
Jan. 1895 continued	<p>“A Word to the Wise” By T. Green quoted testimonials by H.P.B. and A. Besant to the work done by W.Q. Judge. [Besant quoted from Lucifer, Vol. 12, Apr. 1893, pp.89-90]</p> <p>NOTE: See Oct. 26, 1895 for Herbert Burrows’ comments regarding T. Green’s “time for pruning is at hand.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Jan. 1895; pp.429-431</p>
Jan. 1, 1895	<p>Circular, “TO THE MEMBERS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY”, by H.T. Patterson defending W.Q. Judge. and signed by 121 American members.</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 1894 for Patterson’s first unofficial and individual declaration of views.</p>	Circular, 8 pages
Jan. 1, 1895 continued	<p>A rebuttal by the editor of New England Notes to Besant’s speech, against W.Q. Judge, which she gave at Adyar on Dec. 25, 1894, regarding her statement: “Mr. Judge further takes on himself to say that there are no Initiates in India.”</p> <p>“In <i>Lucifer</i> for April 1888, p.141, H.P.B. says: We lived in India for many years, and have never yet met with a ‘Sanskrit Pundit’ — officially recognized as such — who knew anything of Occultism. We met with several occultists in India who will not speak; and with but one who is a really learned Occultist (the most learned, perhaps, of all in India), who condescends occasionally to open his mouth and teach. This he never does, however, outside a very small group of Theosophists.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 25-28, 1894.</p>	<p>New England Notes, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan. 1895; p.4</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 2, Apr. 1888; p.141</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 9, pp.140-141</p>

Jan. 4, 1895	<p>Letter of Jan. 4, 1895 to A. Keightley from W.Q. Judge. Judge enclosed an exact transcript of the "Jany 3, 1895" message said to have been received by him from H.P.B. nearly four years after her death: "Dr. A. Keightley (for Councillors etc.) Comrades Enclosed is an exact transcript of what HPB said to me Jany 3, prematurely ended by a visitor — as usual & as results from European continual nagging at me. It is word for word. More will be said later. You can let all worthy & devoted loyalists read this — It may be read in a proper group. Copies not to be made. This is to be with Council papers.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Fraternally William Q. Judge</p> <p>Go to no extremes in thought or act hereupon."</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix G, No. 7, for the Jany 3 [January 3rd] document and notes by Dr. Stokes on this matter. "This Jany 3" document was written in Judge's own handwriting and verified and declared to be a copy of the original document, and to be accurate in every respect. Signed by Joseph H. Fussell, Elsie V. Savage, Margherita Siren, Helen Harris. Also see March 29, 1896 entry.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Nov. 1932; pp.6-8</p>
Jan. 5, 1895	<p>Meeting of The Blavatsky Lodge (which had been adjourned from December 15, 1894). Mr. Mead: "On Jan. 5th, when an adjourned meeting met to complete the business, I ruled proxy votes out of order. I have since been taken to task in an official letter to the Secretary of the Lodge from one of the objectors to the resolutions, who writes: 'The refusal of the Vice-President [myself] to accept my proxy was, in my opinion, an arbitrary, unjustifiable proceeding for which he had no authority.'</p> <p>NOTE: [myself] refers to G.R.S. Mead.</p> <p>"Now the fact is, that I held in my hands twenty-one proxy votes for the resolutions and three against them. Mr. Burrows also held five proxy votes for the resolutions. I would not allow these votes because notice had not been given to the Lodge (consisting of upwards of 300 members) that proxy votes were in order. I leave my Section to decide what truth there is in these unjustifiable accusations against my honour, and in which direction partisanship lies."</p> <p>NOTE See next entry for the results of that meeting.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; pp.2-3</p>

<p>Jan. 5, 1895 continued</p>	<p>AT A SPECIAL ADJOURNED MEETING. <u>FOR MEMBERS ONLY</u>. Resolution moved by Herbert Burrows that the Blavatsky Lodge (London) ask W.Q. Judge to resign and reply to the charges. Three Resolutions were passed. A copy of these Resolutions was sent to every Lodge in the Theosophical Society.</p> <p>“A special meeting of the Blavatsky Lodge was held on Saturday last, when, on the motion of Mr. Herbert Burrows, it was resolved that, in the interests of Theosophy, Mr. Judge ought definitely to reply to the charges which had been brought against him, and till he had done so should cease to hold the office of Vice-President.”</p> <p>“Mr. T. Green issued a circular at the door inviting those who did not agree with the action taken to unite in forming a new Lodge. . . . “H.P.B. Lodge is a new Lodge formed in London . . . in consequence of the foregoing. . . . Some twenty persons signed for the Charter”.</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 11, 1895.</p>	<p>The Blavatsky Lodge of the T.S., 1page circular</p> <p>Light, Vol. 15, Jan. 12, 1895; p.22</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Feb. 1895; pp.408-409</p>
<p>Jan. 5, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“A letter from W.Q. Judge to Katherine Tingley.” W.Q. Judge wrote a letter on Jan. 5, 1895 (estimated), addressed to “Purple” (Mrs. Tingley) while on the train from New York City to Chicago. Editor, H.N. Stokes, wrote: “This letter not only shows Judge’s belief in the supposed H.P.B. communications, [obviously refers to the letter of Jan 3, 1895] but indicates an intimate friendship with and confidence in Mrs. Tingley.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix G, No. 6, for Judge’s letter to Katherine Tingley. Also see Jan. 4, 1895 entry for Judge’s letter to A. Keightley and Appendix G, No. 7, for the Jan 3, 1895 document.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Oct. 1932</p>
<p>Jan 11, 1895</p>	<p>The formation of the H.P.B. Lodge, a new Lodge in London as a result of the passing of resolutions by the Blavatsky Lodge. NOTE: see Jan. 5, 1895 entry.</p> <p>Announcement by G.R.S. Mead, General Secretary: “I . . . announce the issue of a Charter, under date, January 11th, 1895, to [list of names] . . . to be known as the H.P.B. Lodge of the Theosophical Society.” Archibald Keightley (Pres.), Thomas Green (Vice-Pres.), Henry T. Edge (Sec.), Basil Crump (Treas.), Mary E. Cuer (Libr.). First meeting was held on Jan. 14th. NOTE: See Jan. 15, 1895 regarding the first meeting of the H.P.B. Lodge.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Feb. 1895; pp.408-409 Apr. 1895; p.31</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; pp.14,16</p>

Jan. 12, 1895	<p>A. Keightley stated that W.Q. Judge wrote The Book of Rules. “To my knowledge, Mr. Judge wrote <i>The Book of Rules</i> under the guidance of Master M. and H.P.B. E.T. Hargrove and myself have both seen the original manuscript in Mr. Judge’s handwriting, with written additions in H.P.B.’s handwriting. . . . I have seen letters from H.P.B. to Mr. Judge which show that he originated the idea of E.S.T.” [p.11]</p> <p>“Calls on members of the Eastern School of Theosophy to stand by Judge. Replies to Mrs. Besant and describes her relations with G. Chakravarti.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 27, 1894 and Jan. 5, 1895 entries for contrary point of view.</p>	<p>E.S.T. circular by A. Keightley, 17 pages</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, p.xxxii</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 1975, p.542</p>
Jan. 13, 1895	<p>Letter to the Editor from Julia and Archibald Keightley correcting rumours that Master “Hilarion” wrote the letters in Letters That Have Helped Me. “Those of us to whom the Master Hilarion is objectively, as well as psychically known, have the best of reasons for asserting that these letters were not from him, and we do so state now and here.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 22, 1894 entry.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; pp.87-88</p>
Jan. 15, 1895	<p>J.D. Buck’s letter to the Editor with his objections to the article: “OCCULTISM AND TRUTH” which had been published in Lucifer (Aug. 1894, pp.442-443) and reprinted in The Path (Sep. 1894, pp.184-185).</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 15, 1894 for W.Q. Judge’s added comments in The Path.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Jan. 1895; pp.66-68</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Jan. 1895; pp.320-321</p>
Jan. 15, 1895 continued	<p>A special meeting of the Aryan T.S. was held in New York while Mr. Judge was in Cincinnati. Considered resolutions passed at Adyar at the Annual Convention of the T.S. in India requesting the resignation of Mr. Judge.</p> <p>The Aryan T.S. passed a resolution requesting “William Q. Judge not to resign from the office of Vice-President of the T.S.” and further resolving that “there is no necessity for the further investigation of the charges made against William Q. Judge”. It was further “<i>Resolved</i>, that the Trustees sign these relations on behalf of the Aryan Branch as having been unanimously passed by a called meeting of the Branch, notice of which was sent to every member; and that they be sent to all the Branches of the Theosophical Society.”</p> <p>It was signed by all Trustees except Mr. Judge. [Under Rules and By-Laws of the T.S., a member was responsible <u>only to his local Branch</u> and ‘tryable’ <u>only by that Branch.</u>]</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Feb. 1895; pp.409-410</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; p.29</p>

<p>Jan. 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“To Each Branch of the Theosophical Society Throughout The World.” John M. Pryse, Clerk of Meeting. Mr. E.A. Neresheimer had offered the resolutions in total support of W.Q. Judge. Another resolution by Neresheimer requested the Sec. of the Aryan Branch [A. Fullerton] to draft a letter to accompany the resolutions passed that evening, and send it together with an abstract of the minutes to all Branches of the T.S., signed by the Trustees.</p> <p>Resolutions unanimously endorsed by the Pacific Coast Committee and several branches (list).</p>	<p>Circular, 1 page</p> <p>Letter from the Board of Trustees of the Aryan T.S. 1page Dated Jan. 18, 1895</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, Feb. 1895; pp.112-113</p>
<p>Jan. 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“The H.P.B. Lodge [London], at a meeting held on the 11th ult., unanimously passed a resolution expressing its entire concurrence in the ‘decision concerning Mr. Judge’ recorded by the Aryan Lodge of New York. [and] also passed other resolutions . . . expressive of its entire confidence in Mr. Judge. . . .” List of Resolutions passed by the H.P.B. Lodge.</p> <p>Four Dutch members “wish to declare that they are in perfect sympathy with the decision of the Aryan Lodge of New York concerning Mr. Judge.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; p.31</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Mar. 1895; pp.5-6</p>
<p>Jan. 16, 1895</p>	<p>TO MY FELLOW-MEMBERS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY. Alexander Fullerton wrote about having received a letter from a Master which changed his views about having the charges against W.Q. Judge investigated. “Only one consideration could reconcile me to vacating the position I believed true, — <i>the certainty that the message enjoining this was genuine</i>. . . . “I now support Mr. Judge’s policy . . . avowedly on the ground of this message. . . . assuming its authenticity, the message gives precisely the one fact needed to acquit Mr. Judge . . . the Master’s approval”. NOTE: See May 1895 and Apr. 27, 1895 entries.</p> <p>“Mr. Fullerton of New York has issued a circular in which he states that in consequence of a message he has received, believed by him to be from the Master, he has surrendered his own ideas as to the necessity of Mr. Judge meeting the charges, and accepts Mr. Judge completely.”</p>	<p>Circular, 1 page</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.508-509</p> <p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, Mar. 1895; p.12</p>
<p>Jan. 16, 1895 continued</p>	<p>Bertram Keightley’s letter “THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY” to the Editor of the Daily Chronicle pointed out discrepancies as to facts in Isis Very Much Unveiled by E. Garrett. NOTE: See Dec. 23, 1894 and Dec. 27, 1894 entries.</p> <p>NOTE: On Jan 15, 1895, The Daily Chronicle published Mrs. Besant’s Dec. 23, 1894 reply from Adyar, Madras. Both Bertram Keightley’s and Mrs. Besant’s replies were later published as a 16 page pamphlet, “The Theosophical Society and The Westminster Gazette.” See Jan. 19, 1895 for more on Mrs. Besant’s reply to the Westminster Gazette.</p>	<p>The Daily Chronicle, Jan. 16, 1895</p>

<p>Jan. 17, 1895</p>	<p>Mr. Judge returned to New York after a lecture tour to Fort Wayne on the 6th and 7th of January, Chicago on the 8th and 9th, Cincinnati on the 12th to 15th. Hargrove commented that: “In 1881, and again in the summer of 1882, he [Mr. Judge] had spent some time in Carupano, Venezuela, on business, and had suffered severely from Chagres fever, a malignant type of malarial fever which often leaves a predisposition to tuberculosis in its trail; but he could have continued to repel that physical attack with ease, as he had done for years, if it had not been for a far worse strain on his vitality, namely, the strain of his resistance to the efforts of the Dark Powers to kill him, — the venomous hatred of his persecutors and slanderers, <i>once his close associates</i>, supplying the lines of contact for the major onslaught. These efforts culminated during the winter preceding the Boston Convention.”</p> <p>On May 20th, 1895 from Cincinnati, Mr. Judge wrote: “I am away from home for my health (which is) much hurt by others’ hate. * * * “Besant has had what ought to be her last say, and I read to the delegates at our Conv’n my explan’n of the charges — my last word. It will soon be published”.</p> <p>NOTE: See June 14, 1895 for more on Judge’s stay with Dr. Buck.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Feb. 1895; p.407</p> <p>Letters from Judge to Hargrove, See Appendix D</p> <p>Letters That Have Helped Me, p.185</p>
<p>Jan. 18, 1895</p>	<p>On Jan. 18th Mr. Judge wrote to E.T. Hargrove: “I am so sick just now that I cannot send any letters. . . . My Chicago trip was all right and useful, but this is my ordinary death year, and hence I am just waiting until the Rubicon in passing.”</p> <p>NOTE: For more on Judge’s health see Feb. 13th, 1895, also see June 14th, 1895.</p>	<p>Letters from Judge to Hargrove, See Appendix D</p>

<p>Jan. 19, 1895</p>	<p>“MRS. BESANT AND THE “WESTMINSTER GAZETTE.”</p> <p>The Editor of Light published part of Mrs. Besant’s Dec.23rd reply to the series of articles which appeared in the Westminster Gazette, in relation to “certain frauds in the Theosophical Society.” Mrs. Besant’s reply was printed by the Daily Chronicle on Jan. 15, 1895. The Editor prefaced Mrs. Besant’s article by stating:</p> <p>“Mrs. Besant points out a number of error ‘on minor matters’ into which Mr. Garrett has fallen, and suggests that ‘perhaps when he sees how he has blundered on minor matters he may realise that inaccuracy,’ on the part of others, ‘does not always mean wilful and malignant deception.’ On the more important questions affecting the trustworthiness of Mr. Judge, Mrs. Besant virtually concedes the point which Mr. Garrett had raised:—”</p> <p>The Editor of Light then concluded with:</p> <p>“This is all very charming, but is it not a little bit <i>too</i> chivalrous on the part of Mrs. Besant? Nobody doubts her own perfect honesty and integrity in this, as in all other matters; but is she not here making a somewhat ostentatious parade of her righteousness at the expense of the best interests of the Society which she desires to serve? In her position as one of the ‘heads’ of the Theosophical Society she needs, not goodness alone, but wisdom as well; and it is a serious question whether it is wise, under any circumstance whatever, that she should be associated with another ‘head’ whom she believes to have been guilty of deceit. The reputation of all the ‘heads’ of the Society, without exception, should be, like her own, not only without reproach but beyond suspicion.”</p>	<p>Light, Vol. 15, Jan. 19, 1895; pp.33-34</p>
<p>Jan. 20, 1895</p>	<p>Letter from A. Besant, written from Benares, to H.S. Olcott asking for the documents on which the charges against W.Q. Judge were based:</p> <p>“I have to request that you will furnish me with the documents on which were based the charges preferred by me last July against Mr. W.Q. Judge.</p> <p>“A proposal has been made to call a Special Convention of the European Section T.S. on my return to Europe, for the purpose of discussing the attitude to be taken by the Section towards this case, and there is a general demand for the production of these papers for the information and guidance of Members. I therefore request you to again place them in my care.”</p> <p>Olcott replied from Ootacamund, India, Feb. 21st, 1895, consenting to furnish Besant with the documents, with conditions.</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 21st, 1895 entry for Olcott’s response.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; pp.163-164</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; Supp. p.xx</p>
<p>Jan. 21, 1895</p>	<p>“NOTICE TO MEMBERS.”</p> <p>“Mrs. Besant, Countess Wachtmeister and the General Secretary [Bertram Keightley], took up residence in the new Head-quarters of the Section at Benares on January 21st [1895].”</p>	<p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, Feb. 1895; p.2</p>

<p>Jan. 21, 1895 continued</p>	<p>In "TRUTH AND OCCULTISM." Dr. Buck denied the accuracy of Constance Wachtmeister's quote in her letter of Dec.21, 1894. She wrote: "Do you remember telling me that I was right in believing that W.Q. Judge had acted in a fraudulent and deceitful manner in sending out spurious orders and messages. . . ."</p> <p>In his response (Jan. 21, 1895) Dr. Buck stated: "Aside from the insulting tone of the letter, which I pass by, I hereby declare upon my honour that the above statements are from beginning to end fabrications. There is not a word of truth in any single statement therein contained."</p> <p>"Mrs. Besant having written Dr. Buck under date of Dec. 25th, 1894, from Adyar: 'My poor friend, you told me you would take the karma of defending Judge even at the cost of truth.' Dr. Buck replied, drawing a line under the words, '<i>even at the cost of truth</i>': 'The underlined portion is not mine, as you will see by referring to my letter. . . . That means, if words have meaning, that I would disregard known truth or wilfully prevaricate to uphold Judge. I never knowingly did such a thing, or said it, or thought it'."</p> <p>Dr. Buck closed with: "America will disregard all these <i>accusations</i> (not 'disregard truth and honour') and support Judge for his splendid work and character as we know it. The evidence we have for him is far stronger than the evidence yet brought against him. . . ."</p> <p>Note: See Dec. 21, 1894, Feb. 15, 1895, and Mar. 15, 1895</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; pp.89-90</p>
<p>Jan. 25, 1895</p>	<p>"LETTER TO EUROPEAN GENERAL SECRETARY" from W.Q. Judge, Vice-President T.S. to G.R.S. Mead, General Secretary of the European Section. Discussed the accusations made against him, the request made for him to resign as Vice-President, and commented on the evidence not being provided to him by Besant.</p> <p>"In reply to the request that I shall resign the office of Vice-President. . . . If it is proper I should now resign, it was just as much so in July when your leading prosecutors had all the alleged evidence in their possession. I regard resignation as evidence of guilt. If I resigned that office I could not be in any way tried on any charges, and very soon after a resignation the same might say I resigned to evade responsibility. . . ."</p> <p>"I cannot make a proper reply to the charges until I have in my possession a copy of the documentary evidence which it was, or is, proposed to use in support of the charges."</p> <p>"A Letter from Mr. Judge, with a Reply." [from G.R.S. Mead, dated February 5th, 1895.]</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 5, 1895 for Mead's reply.</p> <p>+ other letters from various Lodges</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; pp.433-434</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, May 1895; p.61</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, Mar. 1895; pp.126-128</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; p.65</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Mar. 1895; pp.1-12</p>

Jan. 25, 1895 continued	<p>“THE CHARGES AGAINST WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.”</p> <p>Letter by W.Q. Judge to the editor of the Irish Theosophist and Lucifer:</p> <p>“I have not been furnished with copies of the documentary evidence by which the charges are said to be supported. These documents — being letters written by myself and some of them ten years old — have been in the possession of Mrs. Besant from about February, 1894, to July 19th, 1894, and open enemies of mine have been allowed to make copies of them, and also to take facsimiles, but they have been kept from me, although I have demanded and should have them.”</p> <p>“THE JUDGE CASE, FINAL REFUSAL TO GIVE COPIES OF DOCUMENTS TO ACCUSED.”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 15, 1895 and Feb. 26, 1895 entries.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; pp.85-86</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; p.65</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May. 1895; pp.132-133</p>
Jan. 25, 1895 continued	<p>Rebuttal to Judge’s letter to the Irish Theosophist by Walter R. Old.</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 16, 1895.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; pp.66-67</p>
Jan. 26, 1895	<p>Editorial notes, from Light, regarding Olcott’s address at the Nineteenth Anniversary of the T.S.:</p> <p>“The rift in the Theosophical lute goes on widening. Mrs. Besant’s long manifesto in the ‘Daily Chronicle’ only makes it more clear that Mr. Judge has been playing Mahatma. But the next day Colonel Olcott came to the rescue in a very remarkable way. He, too, seems to imply that Mr. Judge is guilty, but he opens a gate which promises to lead into some very curious pastures at which also Mrs. Besant hints. The suggestion is that Mr. Judge is a psychic or medium, and that he was only <i>used</i> to produce forged papers. It is a dangerous doctrine, but we shall hear much of it in the future, and society will have to add this to its burdens and its puzzles.”</p> <p>NOTE: Mrs Besant’s long manifesto is found in The Theosophical Society and the Westminster Gazette, (16 page pamphlet — See Dec. 23, 1895 and Jan. 16, 1895 entries).</p> <p>NOTE: Also see Dec. 25-28, 1894 for more on Olcott’s address or see Appendix A, No. 5, for his entire address.</p>	<p>Light, Vol. 15, Jan. 26, 1895; pp.37-38</p>

Feb. 1895	<p>“THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THE PRESENT TROUBLES.” By Annie Besant. In her opening comments she stated: “Rightly or wrongly — I am inclined to think wrongly — I did not feel justified in saying that I regarded some of these other messages as deliberately written by Mr. Judge in pursuance of objects he regarded as desirable for the T.S. and for himself, without a shadow of authority from any higher source. Debarred from producing the evidence which would have substantiated the assertion, I shrank from making in public on my unsupported word a statement so damaging to the reputation of another; that which I was prepared to prove before the Committee, I was not prepared to state in public without the right to substantiate by evidence an assertion so grave. As much of the evidence has now been published, I feel at liberty to mention the opinion I formed from it at the time”.</p> <p>NOTE: In Mrs. Besant’s “The Case Against W.Q. Judge”, p.82, she stated that she was “not able to produce documentary evidence” as she had destroyed it. [See Sep. 15-16, 1893]</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.441-467</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.247</p>
Feb. 1895 continued	<p>“THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THE PRESENT TROUBLES.” Includes: I. “THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THE WESTMINSTER GAZETTE” by Besant and B. Keightley, II. “Should Mr. Judge Resign?” and III. “LETTER TO THE E.S.T. COUNCIL, EASTERN DIVISION.” Also included is her address, with the proposed resolution for Judge’s resignation, at the Nineteenth Anniversary, Dec. 1894.[See Dec. 25-28, 1894]</p> <p>A. Besant commented on the resolution of the Dublin Lodge “Never to listen without protest to any evil spoken against a brother”. She added: “But the rule set up by the Dublin Lodge is distinctly mischievous. . . .”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.441-467</p> <p>pp.467-468</p>
Feb. 1895 continued	Resolutions from the Indian Section asking W.Q. Judge to resign and from some European Lodges asking him to reply to the charges made against him.	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.509-514</p>
Feb. 1895 continued	<p>“THE PARTING OF THE WAYS.” Editorial by Jerome A. Anderson. “Many, if not all, of these so-called ‘charges’ against Wm. Q. Judge rest upon the evidence of private letters, said to have been written by him, or by others, into which he had injected fraudulent messages, etc.” He listed a few “square FACTS” about these supposedly fraudulent messages found in private letters. He closed with a plea “to ‘keep the links unbroken’ until this strange frenzy of madness passes away, and our mistaken brothers once more see clearly the great wrong they are attempting to do to Wm. Q. Judge, and the infinitely greater one they are doing to humanity.”</p>	<p>Pacific Theos., Vol. 5, Feb. 1895; pp.111-112</p>

Feb. 1895 continued	<p>A Common-sense View of MR. JUDGE'S CIRCULAR OF NOVEMBER 3RD, 1894, issued by Bertram Keightley in London.</p> <p>Bertram Keightley stated: "Mr. Judge's circular of November 3rd, 1894, to the members of the E.S.T., is now a public document, both because it has been published in full in the press of India and of England, and because it has been formally declared public by Mrs. Besant, the official head of that body outside of America. Hence there need be no hesitation in discussing it in public; and therefore, since much confusion seems to exist in many minds regarding the character of its contents, it may be desirable to put before our members some purely common-sense considerations bearing upon it, which, when clearly and plainly stated, may help to clear away some of that confusion." Included arguments against various statements made. [Keightley claimed that Judge was guilty.]</p> <p>[Mr. B. Keightley seems to have forgotten that it was Mrs. Besant who violated her pledge of secrecy when she replied publicly to the E.S. circular of Nov. 3, 1894 which caused the press of India and England to publish the documents.]</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 8 pages</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; pp.58-64</p> <p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, May 1895; pp.39-48</p>
Feb. 1895 continued	<p>Comments on B. Keightley's circular A Common-Sense View of Mr. Judge's Circular of November 3rd, 1894. From Atma's Messenger "The Point of View" by Kalekamiyuen</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 3, 1894 and Apr. 1895.</p>	<p>Atma's Messenger, Apr. 1895; p.3</p>
Feb. 1895 continued	<p>In a letter from Alice Cleather in England, she stated: "Some of us are getting out an antidote to the <i>Westminster Gazette</i> pamphlet in the shape of a reprint of Mr. Judge's New York <i>Sun</i> 'Reply', with a good deal of additional matter. Our pamphlet is divided into four parts, as follows: 1, Mr. Judge's Reply; 2, Correspondence; 3, Comments and Criticisms; 4, A Final Word. It will contain a reproduction of one of Mr. Judge's recent photographs, and is being very well gotten up, with a yellow cover." NOTE: See Nov. 26, 1894.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Feb. 1895; p.409</p>
Feb. 1, 1895	<p>"A LETTER TO THE EUROPEAN SECTION." A Circular issued by G.R.S. Mead on W.Q. Judge stating his position that he had maintained neutrality up to this point, that he was now speaking and had decided to go against W.Q. Judge. Mead stated that W.Q.J. would have no authority in the E.S. in Europe.</p> <p>[Issued privately, not as General Secretary, at his own expense]</p> <p>Published in Lucifer under "The Clash of Opinion. A Letter to the European Section."</p>	<p>A Letter to The European Section (circular) by G.R.S. Mead, 6 pages</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.500-505</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 15, July 1927; p.391</p>

Feb. 1, 1895 continued	<p>Letter from Mr. Fred J. Dick, of Dublin, to Branch Presidents of Lodges, submitted corrections of dates and facts that were posted by Mead in Feb. issue of The Vahan. Criticized Mead for not posting the list of names from the Dublin Lodge in support of W.Q. Judge. He claimed that Mead had the list and refused to publish it. Olcott also refused to bring the matter up at the Annual Convention at Adyar.</p> <p>“It was an expression of the convictions of many European Fellows of the T.S. on matters before the Adyar Convention, and which Colonel Olcott was, in my opinion, bound in honour to read to them.”</p> <p>Mead’s reply: “I have simply to state that I received <i>none</i> of the copies of the documents Mr. Dick refers to.”</p>	The Vahan , Vol. 4, Mar. 1895; pp.3-4
Feb. 1, 1895 continued	Brixton Lodge unanimously carried resolutions for W.Q. Judge not to resign and expressing “its fullest confidence in William Q. Judge”.	Irish Theosophist , Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; p.85
Feb. 1, 1895 continued	<p>“A PROTEST. <i>To Members of the Theosophical Society in Europe.</i>” signed by Julia Keightley, A.L. Cleather, and others (24 in total). Re: G.R.S. Mead’s Notice of Dec. 31, 1894.</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 31, 1894.</p>	The Vahan , Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; pp.6-7
Feb. 1, 1895 continued	“Resolutions, etc., from Lodges and Centres” as to what to do regarding the accusations against Mr. Judge as well as “Additional Signatures to the Dublin Lodge Circular.” Formation of the new H.P.B. Lodge was announced (p.14) and officers list (p.16).	The Vahan , Vol. 4, Feb. 1895; pp.10-16
Feb. 1, 1895 continued	<p>J.D. Buck to E.S.T. members.</p> <p>“I have requested and obtained permission to send this to the E.S.T. members, inasmuch as so much bitterness and constant aggressiveness have been shown by those who are opposed to Mr. Judge, it seemed likely that important issues and facts might be overlooked, and also, as, so far, Mr. Judge does not seem inclined to take active steps himself.”</p> <p>He concludes with:</p> <p>“I will add some first-hand evidence. In London, in July, 1894, Mrs. Besant made these assertions to me, not casually, but definitely, and several times.</p> <p>(1) That she believed that Mr. Judge was in communication with the Masters.</p> <p>(2) That she believed the messages he gave her were from the Masters, but that she did not think the Master precipitated them.</p> <p>(3) That she had seen the Master come into the body of W.Q. Judge, he being conscious, and speak to her.”</p> <p>[J.D. Buck was one of the Judicial Committee that met July 10th, 1894 and had witnessed all the proceedings]</p>	Circular Letter , 2 pages
Feb. 1, 1895 continued	W.A. Bulmer received many letters in reply to his Jan. 1895 editorial on Judge. “Letters eulogistic, letters condemnatory, letters pitying, blaming, and praising me.”	Northern Theos. Vol. 2, Feb. 1895; pp.17-18

Feb. 3, 1895	<p>A Forgotten Pledge by Che-Yew-Tsang (E.T. Hargrove). Written without Mr. Judge's knowledge or consent, in which he revisited "The Meaning of a Pledge" an article said to have been written by Dr. Archibald Keightley which had appeared in Lucifer Vol. 3, pp.63-67. Mentioned that Mr. Judge had endured similar attacks by Theosophists as H.P.B. did.</p> <p>"Who was the centre of the attacks levelled some years ago? That centre was H.P.B. And as that great conductor of the Society's Karma is no longer visible here . . . another has to fill the office of scapegoat. That scapegoat is William Q. Judge. If befoulment is necessary from without, let it not come from within! The wise bird does not soil its own nest."</p> <p>NOTE: See H.P.B. letters to Judge Mar. 19, 1887 and Feb. 15, 1895 entries. See next cell for "The Meaning of a Pledge."</p>	Pamphlet, 14 pages
Feb. 3, 1895 continued	<p>In "A FORGOTTEN PLEDGE" by Che-Yew-Tsang, he quoted from "The Meaning of a Pledge."</p> <p>(1) I pledge myself to endeavour to make theosophy a living factor in my life.</p> <p>(3) I pledge myself never to listen, without protest, to any evil thing spoken of a Brother Theosophist, and to abstain from condemning others.</p> <p>(4) I pledge myself to maintain a constant struggle against my lower nature, and to be charitable to the weaknesses of others.</p> <p>NOTE: Only three clauses were quoted in Hargrove's pamphlet. For all the clauses see "The Meaning of a Pledge" in Blavatsky: Collected Writings, Vol. 12, p.506.</p>	Pamphlet, 14 pages
Feb. 3, 1895 continued	<p>Rebuttal by G.R.S. Mead, "The Legend of Che-Yew-Tsang": "The pamphlet is a violent attack on Mrs. Besant. . . . These articles were powerfully written and attracted wide notice. . . ."</p> <p>NOTE: See Mar. 1895 (early) Letter by A. Keightley on Mead's rebuttal. Mentioned that Mead: "[Y]ou deliberately and obstinately deceived yourself, asserting that Che-Yew-Tsang must be an Adept, although Mr. Hargrove was careful to write you that he spoke without the least authority." He also defended Mrs. Keightley's name — that she did not know the identity of Che-Yew-Tsang when Mead had asked her.</p> <p>NOTE: See The Plot Against the Theosophical Society by Dr. A. Keightley, Apr. 3, 1895 and Oct./Dec. 1893.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; pp.1-5</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; pp.160-161</p>
Feb. 4, 1895	<p>Letter from E.A. Neresheimer addressed to "My Dear Lucifer," "The attitude of the members of the T.S. in America, as far as has been ascertained and expressed, is decidedly and absolutely averse to a spirit of further persecution. The charges cannot be proved nor disproved. "Mr. Judge has stated that they were false; our belief in his integrity is unquestioned, his character and record being beyond reproach — we will not consent to the re-opening of the charges nor to his resigning the office of Vice-President. . . ."</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; p.68</p>

Feb. 4, 1895 continued	<p>“The Theosophists and Mr. W.Q. Judge.”</p> <p>Mr. H. T. Edge takes issue with an article on the Adyar Convention, by Thomas Williams, published in Light, Feb. 2, 1895. Edge defended W.Q. Judge as a “teacher of truth”, and stated that Williams had: “fallen a victim to the latest plot to destroy the Theosophical Society, and become a tool of the plotters — whoever they are. . . . You sir, as a Spiritualist, should be able to sympathise with one who has fallen a victim to the ruthless and unprincipled tactics followed by outraged materialism and bigotry, to discredit and destroy a power that menaces their very existence. . . .</p> <p>“ . . . No shred of <i>proof</i> can we obtain as to Mr. Judge’s guilt from his accusers; yet we are asked to assume him guilty until he is proved innocent.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 16, 1895 for Mr. Thomas Williams reply on other matters mentioned in H.T, Edge’s letter in defence of Mr. Judge.</p>	Light , Vol. 15, Feb. 9, 1895; p.71
Feb. 5, 1895	<p>Letter from G.R.S. Mead, Gen. Sec. European Section T.S. to W.Q. Judge in response to Judge’s letter of Jan. 25, 1895. Accused Judge of “publishing shameful attacks on others”.</p> <p>“It certainly would have been proper for you to resign in July until you had fulfilled the promise made in your first circular of March 15th, 1894, that you would be willing to have the matter investigated, though not officially by the Judicial Committee. In July you argued that the charges did not lie against Vice-President, and now you argue the exact contrary. The reason for resignation is to avoid friction and stress in the Society and does not fix guilt upon you. Such resignation is the invariable custom.”</p> <p>Claimed that Judge was not satisfied with “an exact copy of every word she would have used before the Judicial Committee” but that he wanted the “original letters” handed over to him.</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 25, 1895 for W.Q. Judge’s letter.</p>	The Vahan , Vol. 4, Mar. 1895; pp.2-3
Feb. 6, 1895	<p>Letter from the Secretary, Fred J. Dick, of The Dublin Lodge to the Executive Committee of the European Section T.S.</p> <p>“At a meeting convened for the purpose of considering a Voting Paper issued by Mr. Mead . . . held this evening, it was <i>Resolved</i>: That this Lodge declines to take action by voting either for or against the suggested “Resolution” for the following reasons, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Mr. Mead has exceeded the duties of his office in issuing such Voting Paper: 2. That the vote would be Unconstitutional: 3. That it calls in question the decision of the Judicial Committee appointed under the Constitution: 4. And therefore that this Lodge declines to be bound by the result of any such vote.” <p>NOTE: See Feb. 1, 1895.</p>	Irish Theosophist , Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; p.85

Feb. 7, 1895	<p>Article to The “Sun”(New York):</p> <p>“W.Q. Judge Asked to Go. The Theosophical Convention at Madras Rules Against Him” by Axel Wachtmeister, who was present at the Nineteenth Anniversary of the T.S., Madras. Wachtmeister stated how:</p> <p>“[Mrs. Besant] described the reasons why she had first of all felt convinced that the messages from Mr. Judge under the Master’s name were not what they purported to be; how she had sued the President to take steps toward holding an official inquiry in London; how at that inquiry she had been checkmated by Mr. Judge through what is called a ‘demurrer’ . . . ; how she then returned the documents pertaining to the case to their official owner, the President, Col. Olcott, and also written a protest and declaration to the leading papers; how she had been impeded in taking further action at the time, because she had the very next morning to leave England en route for Australia in order to be in time to keep her lecturing engagement there; how the evidence in the <i>Westminster Gazette</i>, distorted and vulgarized, but in the main based on facts, had reached her on her arrival at Colombo . . . and how she now felt compelled to move a resolution to request the President to call on Mr. Judge to resign his office of Vice-President until he had cleared himself from the charges. . . .</p> <p>“This resolution was carried unanimously. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 25, 1894; Nov. 26, 1894; and Dec.25-28, 1894.</p>	<p>The “Sun” Feb. 7, 1895; p.6</p>
Feb. 13, 1895	<p>Mr. Judge “whose health has utterly broken down, left New York on the 13th for a month’s rest and treatment. It is hoped that change of air and relief from work will enable him to rally.”</p> <p>“Early in 1895, Mr. Judge went to Mineral Wells, Texas, trying to regain his health. Katherine Tingley had rented a house for him, and by taking care of him and acting as his amanuensis when he was too ill to write himself. . . .”</p> <p>He later returned to New York to prepare for the Boston Convention.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; p.439</p> <p>WQJ T. Pioneer, p.34</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, p.liii</p>
Feb. 15, 1895	<p>“THREE GREAT IDEAS.” By W.Q. Judge “which should never be lost sight of.”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; p.73</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 1, pp.242-243</p>

Feb. 15, 1895 continued	<p>“HISTORY REPEATED”</p> <p>A “letter of H.P. Blavatsky, dated Ostende, March 19th, 1887, seems so applicable to the present hour that we have permission to repeat it thus in print. — Ed.”</p> <p>“Having heard from my dear old W.Q. Judge how kindly disposed you are toward me, and having received from him several messages on your behalf, let me tell you how grateful I feel for your kind expressions of sympathy.</p> <p>“Yes, the work has brought upon me contumely, ignominy of all kinds, hatred, malice and slander. Were it only from the outsiders I would mind very little. But, sad to say, it is the ‘Theosophists’ chiefly who tear me to pieces. . . .</p> <p>“Dear and far distant friend, that is private and strictly confidential. I open my poor old aching heart before you. If Judge has such a great esteem for you, <i>you must be</i> worth all that <i>he</i> thinks.”</p> <p>NOTE: See March 19, 1887.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; pp.76-77</p>
Feb. 15, 1895 continued	<p>“ON THE SPUR OF THE MOMENT.” By Æ (George Russell)</p> <p>“The intuitive trust which so many members of the T.S. have in William Q. Judge, to my mind shows that he is a real teacher. . . . When a clamour of many voices arises making accusations, pointing to time, place and circumstance; to things which we cannot personally investigate, it is only the spirit within us can speak and decide.”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; pp.77-79</p>
Feb. 15, 1895 continued	<p>“A REMINISCENCE” of W.Q. Judge and A Keightley’s visit to Dublin Lodge on Nov. 27, 1888.</p> <p>W.Q. Judge stated:</p> <p>“The first and <i>vital</i> object of the Society was the establishment of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity.”</p> <p>Dr. Keightley in the course of his remarks added:</p> <p>“He was glad to see that the Dublin Lodge had recognized the fact by placing the notable quotation from <i>Lucifer</i> (November 1887) — which was the utterance of a Master — upon its walls.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 27, 1888.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; pp.79-81</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 3, Mar. 1889; p.393</p>
Feb. 15, 1895 continued	<p>“AN OLD MESSAGE FROM THE MASTER” by W.Q. Judge.</p> <p>Re: a letter received Nov. 1, 1891 while Judge was in Wyoming:</p> <p>“This is meant for A.P.S. Have you the courage to send it. [‘Signed by M.’]</p> <p>“I had the courage, copied it at the time it was received, and sent the original to Mr. Sinnett by mail from Wyoming. . . .</p> <p>“Very probably Mr. Sinnett will not contest the genuineness of the message because he sent me, nearly about that time, a letter from himself addressed to the Master, requesting me to transmit it and procure the answer, if any.”</p> <p>Rebuttal by A.P. Sinnett dated Feb. 26, 1895:</p> <p>“The letter in question was merely a reply to the ‘message’ spontaneously sent. At the time I merely <i>doubted</i> its authenticity and thought it best to send a reply on the hypothesis that there might be some genuine origin for the message, however it might have been distorted.”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895; pp.84-85</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, pp.309-310</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; pp.106-107</p>

Feb. 15, 1895 continued	<p>“<i>To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST</i>” from J.D. Buck.</p> <p>“Much has been said in regard to a ‘committee of honour,’ and Mr. Judge has been charged with evading it. I declare and can prove that this is not true. He evaded it no more than did those arrayed against him, for all agreed that it would be <i>useless at that stage of the proceedings</i>, as the result in any case would be accepted by one party only. . . . The <i>methods</i> employed from the beginning have been the most mistaken that could have been suggested. My object in saying this is not to locate blame . . . but to suggest whether it be wiser to continue in evil lines fraught already with so much bitterness, or to let wiser counsels prevail.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 1, 1895.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Apr. 1895; pp.126-128</p>
Feb. 15, 1895 continued	<p>“THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THE PRESENT TROUBLES.”</p> <p>Mrs. Besant commented:</p> <p>“Before I left England in July I had received from Dr. Buck the assurance of his conviction — reiterated by him to Countess Wachtmeister in America — that Mr. Judge had received so severe a lesson that there would be no more of these red pencil missives. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See March 15, 1895 for comments by Dr. J.D. Buck</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; p.442</p>
Feb. 16, 1895	<p>“The Theosophists and Mr. W. Q. Judge.”</p> <p>Letter from Thomas Williams in Light. Williams refuted H. T. Edge’s Feb. 4th letter and claimed, that before Mr. Judge came to England, Mrs. Besant did send him “an exact copy of the whole statement she was going to make before the Judicial Committee, including a copy of every document she was going to use and every argument she was going to employ. This most unusual course she took because she was determined not to take even the advantages the law allows the accuser in such a case. It is, therefore, more quibbling for Mr. Judge to say that up to date he has received no copies of the alleged forgeries; nor is it straightforward to say that ‘he entreated daily to be shown copies of these letters, but his demands were continually ignored,’ when, as matter of fact, he did not confine his demand to copies only, but required <i>that the originals be entirely handed over to him.</i>”</p> <p>NOTE: See March 1895 (Early) entry regarding demands for W.Q.J.’s explanation; Mr. Judge maintained that he still had not received copies of the documentary evidence. See also Feb. 4, 1895 and July 10, 1894 entries.</p>	<p>Light, Vol. 15, Feb. 16, 1895; pp.82-83</p>

Feb. 16, 1895 continued	<p>“<i>To the Editor of LUCIFER.</i>”</p> <p>A rebuttal by Walter R. Old to Mr. H.T. Edge’s Feb. 4th letter in Light and to Mr. Thomas Williams letter of Feb 16th . He stated: “Not content with this exceptional consideration at Mrs. Besant’s hands, it would appear that Mr. Judge’s request extended to the entire handing over to him of <i>the original documents</i>, not copies merely.” Quoted Besant as saying she gave Judge “<i>a copy of every document she was going to use</i>, and of every argument she was going to employ.” Also denied that Judge’s “open enemies” have been allowed to make copies of the evidence. Old added: “I am the only person who holds certified copies of the documents. I was not <i>allowed</i> to take such copies; I secured such in self-defence at the time of my handing over the originals to Mrs. Besant; for it must be remembered that I had already brought charges against Mr. Judge, which at that date I had not had an opportunity of proving, and I was determined that if the charges were preferred, the evidence, so far as I held it, should go along with them, as is only just and right.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 23, 1895 for Judge’s reply. Also see Feb. 21, 1895 for H.S. Olcott’s reply to Annie Besant’s request to return to her the documents on which the charges against Judge were based.</p>	Lucifer , Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; pp.66-67
Feb. 16, 1895 continued	<p>Letter from George W. Russell re: Besant’s implication “that the ethical principle on which the defence of Mr. Judge was based is contradicted by the teaching of the Master.”</p> <p>NOTE: Refers to “Some Words on Daily Life” [see Sep. 15, 1891 entry] and “WHY I BECAME A THEOSOPHIST” [see Sep. 15, 1889 entry].</p>	Lucifer , Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; pp.68-69
Feb. 17, 1895	<p>Letter of Wm. Lindsay to Countess Wachtmeister from London, (posted March 1st). Countess Wachtmeister had “thought fit to publish in <i>Lucifer</i>” part of Wm. Lindsay’s letter to her. He therefore sent a copy of the full text to the Irish Theosophist with a request to publish it. It read in part: “‘What you told me was, that before H.P.B. died she showed you a box wherein was Master’s seal, and that immediately after H.P.B.’s death you took the box with the Master’s seal in it into your keeping, and that the box was not in <i>anyone</i> else’s hands till given over by you to Annie Besant on her return from America. When the box was opened by Annie Besant the <i>Master’s seal was not to be found in it</i>, and all that took place <i>before</i> Mr. W.Q. Judge came to England [May 21, 1891].”</p> <p>NOTE: Refer to Mar. 20, 1895, letter of Countess Wachtmeister and to April 23, 1895 for letter from William Lindsay.</p> <p>NOTE: See also May 9, 1891 (est.); May 28-29, 1891; 1892; May 14, 1895 entries.</p>	Irish Theosophist , Vol. 3, May 1895; p.141

Feb. 18, 1895	<p>“DR. HARTMANN ON THE CRISIS.” Franz Hartmann wrote to W.Q.J.: “My conviction is that the T.S. needs a leader who has obtained a certain amount of Self-knowledge. My conviction that you have found the Master, the Self, is not based upon any external evidence, but upon direct recognition of a truth that has been shown to me, and I therefore say: <i>Do not resign!</i>” [Refers to Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895, pp.500-514.]</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; pp.17-19</p>
Feb. 21, 1895	<p>Letter from H.S. Olcott, from Ootacamund, in response to Annie Besant’s request to return to her “the documents on which the charges preferred by me last July against Mr. W.Q. Judge”. Olcott wrote: “After mature reflection, I have decided to comply with the request contained in your letter of the 20th ultimo, as it seems reasonable that the Delegates in the approaching Special Convention of the European Section should be allowed the opportunity of knowing the evidence upon which your charges against the Vice-President T.S. were based, before committing themselves by formal vote to a recommendation to me of specific official action in the case. I wish it known at the same time that, since they came into my possession after the abortive meeting of the Judicial Committee, I have had them under lock and key and nobody has been allowed to copy or even read them; furthermore, that the copies and facsimiles made by Mr. Old were taken while they were in his custody, in the earliest stages of the inquiry, and published without my consent or by lawful authority. The issue not having been tried, I considered it improper to give them publicity unless new and imperative contingencies should arise. Such is now the fact; and, as it is evident that the case can never be equitably settled without the circulation of these papers, and as Mr. Judge complains that he was not permitted to see them, my present decision is reached. “Before you sail, I shall confide the documents to your custody once more, on the conditions of their return to me intact on my arrival in London in June, of your placing your statement and the evidence in the hands of the General Secretary of the European Section for distribution to Branches and Members, and of his supplying a certified copy of the evidence to Mr. Judge for his information and use.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 20, 1895</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; Supp. p.xx</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; pp.163-164</p>

<p>Feb. 23, 1895</p>	<p>“A Further Communication from Mr. Judge.” Letter from W.Q. Judge to G.R.S. Mead, General Secretary of the European Section. “On January 25th, I sent to you as General Secretary of your section, a general letter replying to several communications from some of your Lodges, so that you, as the proper officer, might communicate it. But instead of pursuing the impartial course as required by your office, you have taken up the position of prosecutor, attorney, and pleader against me, making a long argumentative reply, full of assertions and conclusions of your own, and signed officially, so that you might print it, as you say, with my letter, in THE VAHAN. . . . “You refer me to the fact that Mrs. Besant sent me a copy of what <i>she</i> meant to say to the Committee, and you attempt to make it appear that that very amateur attempt at a legal brief contained the testimony and the documents I require. It did not and does not. I have it. It is a special plea full of distortions, devoid of evidence, containing scraps of documents, devoid of documents referred to, and wholly incompetent. Mrs. Besant’s intentions as to what she would say, do not settle matters. . . . Furthermore, I am entitled to have the entire contents of letters used in evidence, though she sought to introduce disjointed scraps only. “You say I demanded that my letters be handed over to my possession. This I could have done but did not. . . . But it is useless for you and others to try to obscure the fact that no inspection of the documents was given me until July 19th, nearly six days after the Convention, and that no copies have been given; and you yourself heard Mrs. Besant promise in Committee the copies to me. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 25, 1895 entry.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Apr. 1895; pp.1-2</p>
<p>Feb. 23, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“FROM MME. BLAVATSKY’S SISTER.” Letter from Vera P. Jelihovsky (H.P.B.’s sister) claiming that around 1891 she had a “very vivid” feeling “<i>that Mrs. Besant must not go to India</i>, because the results of her voyage would be bad, dangerous, harmful, and disastrous to the extreme. . . . “. . . So I resolved to write to my daughter, Mrs. Vera Johnston, in London, asking her to transmit to Mrs. Besant my profound conviction that it would not be safe for her to go over to India, or to interfere with any other branch of the Theosophical Society elsewhere than in England, for <i>I knew</i> for sure <i>that my sister Helen was against it.</i>” Said she warned Besant but Besant said “<i>I am ordered to go.</i>” Vera “thought then and there that she [Besant] was mistaken (now I am sure of it!); that if she was really to perform the will of One whom my sister loved and venerated so devotedly, I would not have received so deep an impression to contradict her intention.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 1893, Dec. 25th entry and Oct. 1891. See also May 5/ 18, 1896.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; pp.25-26</p>

Feb. 26, 1895	<p>“FINAL REFUSAL TO GIVE COPIES OF DOCUMENTS TO ACCUSED.”</p> <p>W.Q. Judge quoted a letter from H.S. Olcott.</p> <p>“. . . I don't know where you get your law from, but hang me if I ever heard of an accused who has been furnished with a copy of the charges pending against him, expecting that the documentary proofs in the hands of the prosecuting attorney shall be given him before the issue is on for trial. . . . I have given copies to nobody.”</p> <p>Mr. Judge added: “The <i>law</i> requires inspection and copies of letters if demanded by the accused; Theosophy and brotherhood would not require less than law.”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 15, 1895.</p> <p>NOTE: Old had made unauthorised copies before Olcott was in possession of the evidence. See Dec. 25-28, 1894; also see Oct. 1894 and Jan. 25, 1895 entries.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.132-133</p>
Feb. 26, 1895 continued	<p>Letter from Sinnett to The Irish Theosophist.</p> <p>“In reference to an article by Mr. Judge in the last number of <i>The Irish Theosophist</i> [“AN OLD MESSAGE FROM THE MASTER”], I feel reluctantly compelled to deny that I regard the message he sent me as genuine.”</p> <p>NOTE: See notes of Feb. 15, 1895.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; pp.106-107</p>
Feb. 27, 1895	<p>“<i>To the Editors of LUCIFER.</i>”</p> <p>Letter from J.D. Buck correcting a statement that Annie Besant had made concerning him and his attitude on the Judge Case.</p> <p>“I am made to express the conviction that Mr. Judge is guilty as charged by Mrs. Besant, and that he has been so severely punished that he will ‘do it no more.’ I never had, nor have I now, any such conviction of Mr. Judge’s guilt, but on the contrary, I believe him entirely innocent of wrong-doing and the subject of a relentless persecution, conceived through misapprehension, but followed by a zeal that is blind and unreasoning, and therefore full of all uncharitableness.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 1895 entry. “THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THE PRESENT TROUBLES.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; pp.159-160</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; p.23</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, Apr. 1895; p.151</p>
Mar. 1895 (Early)	<p>“THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE JUDGE CASE.”</p> <p>“The Indian Section has demanded his resignation of the office of Vice-President, and has further requested the President-Founder to seek at Mr. Judge’s hands a satisfactory explanation of the charges against him, and failing such explanation to take steps for his expulsion from the T.S.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 25-28, 1894 entry.</p>	<p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, No. 50, Mar. 1895; pp.10-13</p>

<p>Mar. 1895 (Early) continued</p>	<p>“CORRESPONDENCE.”</p> <p>Letter from E.T. Hargrove explaining why the identity of Che-Yew-Tsang wasn’t revealed in the February issue of The Path as promised in the circular A Forgotten Pledge.</p> <p>“The reason for this silence was that I had intended the article on ‘<i>Our Overwhelming Virtues</i>’ to appear in the same number as the letter to ‘<i>Julius</i>’, if the editor would allow it. The article was to have been signed Che-Yew-Tsang, with the name Ernest T. Hargrove in brackets beneath. If that arrangement had been carried out there would have been no need to give the latter name in the letter to which I refer. I wrote accordingly to the editor before the arrival here of the January issue. When this arrived I found in it ‘<i>Our Overwhelming Virtues</i>’, but owing to great pressure of work I failed to catch the February issue in time to make the necessary alteration and arrange for the insertion of the name in the letter to ‘<i>Julius</i>’. That is all.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 3, 1895 A Forgotten Pledge. Also see in The Path, for the letter to “Julius.” Vol. 9, Feb. 1895, pp.401-402</p> <p>NOTE: See May 1, 1895. A. Besant’s version on how she came to know of the identity of the “Chinaman.” Also see May 21, 1895.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; p.434</p>
<p>Mar. 1895</p>	<p>“The Legend of Che-Yew-Tsang.” By G.R.S. Mead.</p> <p>“On receiving the first article I was struck by the intimate knowledge possessed by the writer concerning the inner lines of thought of our intimate circle, and as Mrs. Keightley and all at Headquarters then expressed the same ignorance of the source of the article, and as I had implicit confidence in <i>all</i> on such matters, I concluded that the writer had a knowledge which was not derived by physical contact with us, and that he was what he claimed to be. . . . a <i>bonâ fide</i> oriental with a most intimate knowledge of the Society.”</p> <p>Includes comments on the above articles by E.T. Hargrove and his later pamphlet, A Forgotten Pledge.</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb.3, 1895 and Mar. 1895 (early) entries.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; pp.1-5</p>

Mar. 5, 1895	<p>According to Mr. Neresheimer, at 10 o'clock a.m., this date, instructions were received through Mrs. K. Tingley (then anonymous as "Promise") from the Masters. ". . . it was through this person that the instruction was given to us. . . . in the following words:</p> <p>"March 5th, 1895. This course should be adopted at the Convention; it cannot be avoided. If any time is wasted much will be lost; a <i>split</i> should be declared in such a way that it will leave the door open for the others when they wish to restore harmony. America must insist that it can no longer submit to such <i>friction, intolerance</i> and untheosophical work.</p> <p>"It declares itself independent until the disrupting forces bring the fight to a close. Unless this is done another year will pass in turmoil and strife and the chief aims of the Master's work retarded.</p> <p>"You must fix it so that it will be well planned and no mistakes.</p> <p>"Consult with _____ at once.</p> <p>"San Francisco and Boston will join heartily; others will follow.</p> <p>"Under no circumstances must Mr. Judge know of this."</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov.25, 1931 entry.</p>	<p>To the Members of the E.S.T. Apr. 3, 1896; p.16</p>
Mar. 5, 1895 continued	<p>A Circular letter to Fellow Theosophists by Robert B. Holt from London. Claimed that:</p> <p>"Two things seem to be forgotten by some of us. First that our allegiance is due to Truth only; secondly, that all pledges are given to the moral law.</p> <p>"It is because I cannot reconcile these duties with the pretensions of Mr. Judge that I am compelled to renounce his leadership. . . .</p> <p>"When grave charges were reluctantly formulated against him [Mr. Judge], instead of meeting them with the frankness proper to a man conscious of his integrity, he endeavoured to stifle all enquiries with legal technicalities."</p>	<p>Circular letter, 1 page</p>
Mar. 11, 1895	<p>"<i>To Editor of the Pacific Theosophist:</i>" by Alice Cleather.</p> <p>She expressed her confidence in W.Q. Judge and called attention to the wording of the notice sent out by Count Leiningen. He was sending out voting papers to the Vienna Lodge members with the object of getting votes in favour of forcing Mr. Judge to resign the office of Vice-President.</p> <p>"It runs as follows: (Translated by Dr. Hartmann.)</p> <p>'W.Q. Judge having been convicted of having practiced cheating for many years, the matter has become public, and it is our duty to force him to resign, Please fill out the enclosed voting-blank.' . . .</p> <p>"I may add that I have sent an exact copy of the above to the <i>Theosophist, Lucifer</i> and the <i>Vahan</i>, for insertion in their columns." [Her letter was never published by these magazines.]</p>	<p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, Apr. 1895; pp.151-152</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; pp.23-24</p>

Mar. 15, 1895	<p>“A Common-Sense View of MR. JUDGE’S CIRCULAR OF NOVEMBER 3RD, 1894.” Bertram Keightley’s criticism of Mr. Judge’s E.S.T. circular, By Master’s Direction, of Nov. 3, 1894. Claimed that Judge was suffering from “self-assertion and self-glorification” and that “this circular claims to be written ‘by Master’s direction’ and invokes His authority on every page!”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov.3, 1894; Jan. 11, 1894 and Feb.1895 entries.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; pp.58-64</p>
Mar. 15, 1895 continued	<p>Dr. A. Keightley’s reply to Besant’s article “THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THE PRESENT TROUBLES.” [See Feb. 1895 entry] He stated that “evidence” was not sent, that a “brief” only has been sent to W.Q.J. “I am told by three persons who have seen this brief that there are under a dozen pieces of evidence given. . . . It cannot be denied that Mrs. Besant intended to use against him all the seventy-eight or more pieces of evidence quoted. . . . “Moreover, Mr. Judge has not even <i>seen</i> all the evidence. . . . “Furthermore, Mrs. Besant at Richmond, in July, 1894, promised Mr. Judge in the presence of Mr. Mead, Dr. Buck, Mr. B. Keightley, Mrs. A. Keightley and myself, that he should have copies of all the evidence.” [p.94] “Mrs Besant then agreed that the copies should be given. Four of the seven persons present remembered this as here set forth. The copies NEVER have been given, and the statement made by Mr. Judge in his letter, published by Mr. Mead in <i>The Vahan</i>, and in <i>The Irish Theosophist</i> for February, 1895, is in every particular correct.”[p.95]</p> <p>Mr. A. Keightley also contradicted Besant’s views about how Judge’s E.S.T. circular of Nov. 3, 1894, By Master’s Direction, could have been published in The Westminster Gazette. “[C]opies of a circular sent to Mrs. Besant’s E.S.T. Council (ten, I think, in number) and the I.G. . . . These were the only copies signed — and in an unusual manner — by Mr. Judge. One of these <i>signed</i> copies was published in part . . . by <i>The Westminster Gazette</i>, and the exact signature reproduced. These were <i>the only signed copies</i> except my own. . . . Therefore one of the remaining members of Mrs. Besant’s own E.S.T. Council published the circular to which she refers.” [p.95-96]</p> <p>B. Keightley’s comments “I was present at Richmond in July, 1894, on the occasion referred to by Dr. Keightley. Mrs. Besant did <i>not</i> ‘promise Mr. Judge that he should have copies of all the evidence’ in the sense of any undertaking to provide him with such.”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; pp.89-98</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; pp.161-162</p>

<p>Mar. 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“TRUTH AND OCCULTISM.” Dr. Buck denies the accuracy of Annie Besant and C. Wachtmeister in regard to quoting him. NOTE: See Dec. 21, 1894 and Jan. 21, 1895 for C. Wachtmeister letter and Dr. Buck’s reply.</p> <p>In his response to A. Besant’s letter of Dec.25, 1894 (and enclosing a copy of C. Wachtmeister’s letter), he wrote: “. . . See how these things go. When will we come to an end of them? This statement by the Countess is without a single fact to stand on, but taken with yours will be believed and go against Judge. . . . I never said to anyone that Judge was guilty or I believed him guilty; but always ‘I do not know,’ and defended him solely from what I do know, viz., his great work and general character, leaving the rest without prejudice one way or another. It seems to me that you might understand this position whether you approve it or not.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 15, 1895 and Dec. 21, 1894; and Jan. 21, 1895.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; pp.89-92</p>
<p>Mar. 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THE PRESENT TROUBLES.” A. Besant’s long editorial comments on the “Judge Case”. Includes alleged comments by Dr. Buck regarding red pencil missives by W.Q. Judge, as well as resolutions carried at Anniversary Meeting held at the Headquarters, Adyar, Madras.</p> <p>NOTE: See issues of the Annual Convention of the Indian Section Dec. 25-28, 1894 and Feb. 15, 1895 and Feb. 1895 for outline of contents.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Feb. 1895; pp.441, 456 [441-468]</p>
<p>Mar. 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“THE T. S. CONSTITUTION.” By Fred J. Dick. “There are a few points in March <i>Vahan</i> . . . it is well to note the admission of our General Secretary [G.R.S. Mead] that last year’s Judicial Committee ‘proved the disability of the Constitution to grapple with the difficulty.’ The obvious inference . . . is that we have to go <i>outside</i> the Constitution ‘to grapple with the difficulty’ (of keeping up the hue and cry?). This agrees well with Mr. H. Burrows’ recent declaration to the Blavatsky Lodge that ‘we make a mistake in applying theosophical principles to the present crisis.’”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; p.100</p>

Mar. 15, 1895 continued	<p>“A MAHATMA’S MESSAGE TO SOME BRAHMANS.”</p> <p>Text of the “Prayag Letter” with comments by W.Q. Judge published (Mahatma Letters, 2nd ed., pp.461-463, Nov. 4th, 1881; Reader’s Guide to Mahatma Letters, 2nd ed., 1988, pp.90-91). [Message from the Masters through H.P.B. to the Prayag (Allahabad) Branch of the T.S., of which Chakravarti was a member.]</p> <p>Annie Besant denied the authenticity of the Prayag Letter: “I do not regard the letter as genuine, <i>but I have never attributed it to H.P.B.</i> . . . “The publication of the letter, if it should be regarded as from H.P.B., may do some harm to the Theosophical Society in India, and will certainly injure her memory, as it is in flagrant contradiction with her definite and published teachings. The recipients of it wisely kept it to themselves, and thus little harm was done by it, beyond the shutting out of the Theosophical Society of a few men who would have been useful members.”</p> <p>Included are three of W.Q. Judge’s letters re: the Prayag letter. [Letters dated London, July 4, 1893; NY, Sep. 28, 1893; NY, Jan. 12, 1894]</p> <p>NOTE: See Besant’s comments in March 1895 (late) and Feb. 14, 1894.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; pp.430-431</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, p.448 [448-454]</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, July 1895; pp.375-379</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.49-52</p>
Mar. 15, 1895 continued	<p>“PERSONAL NOTES.”</p> <p>“Mr. Judge’s ill-health has rendered a month’s absolute rest imperative.”</p>	<p>The Lamp, Vol. 1, Mar. 1895; p.125</p>
Mar. 15, 1895 continued	<p>Note by D.N. Dunlop that “in 1889 H.P.B. gave Mr. Judge a photo, on which are the following words: ‘To my dear and loyal colleague, W.Q. Judge.’ This bears the Master’s signature. I believe Mrs. Besant has seen it, and declared it to be genuine.”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; p.108</p>
Mar. 19, 1895	<p>Letter by A. Keightley to G.R.S. Mead defending Dr. Zander, H. Coryn and himself against allegations made by Mead that they accepted Judge “unqualifiedly” and they therefore “have no choice” but to “support Mr. Judge in all his policy.”</p> <p>Also commented on Mead advocating that Besant publish the “prosecutor’s brief” against Judge which is “incomplete and one-sided” while still refusing to furnish Judge with copies of the evidence.</p> <p>Mead’s reply: “It is time for all of us to have this document before us. If it is so unfair, so weak, so paltry, it will be all the easier for Mr. Judge to refute it.”</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Apr. 1895; pp.4-5</p> <p>p.6</p>

<p>Mar. 20, 1895</p>	<p>Letter by C. Wachtmeister in response to a letter from William Lindsay to her. She stated: “H.P.B. never shewed me the seal above named. I did not even know of its existence. I had seen the impression of the seal during H.P.B.’s life-time, but not the seal itself, and I believed these impressions to be from a genuine seal belonging to the Master.” Followed by endorsements of Wachtmeister’s denial by Isabel Cooper-Oakley and Laura Mary Cooper, and B. Keightley.</p> <p>Reply by W. Lindsay, dated Apr. 23, 1895, to the above including his original letter to Countess Wachtmeister dated Feb. 17, 1895 in which he advised her he was planning to use her statement which she had given him “<i>for use if at any time required.</i>”[See April 23, 1895.]</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 17, 1895; May 14, 1895; also see May 28-29, 1891, Re: Beginning of troubles with Master’s seal or H.P.B.’s seal.</p> <p>“Mr. Lindsay’s letter is scarcely less interesting, recounting as it does the Countess Wachtmeister’s various renderings of the story of the Master’s seal.”</p> <p>NOTE: See 1892 entry for more on “H.P.B.’s seal.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; pp.164-165</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.141-142</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; p.131</p>
<p>Mar. 20, 1895 continued</p>	<p>To Fellow Theosophists, by Robert B. Holt. “Mrs. Besant gave her entire confidence to Mr. Judge and he betrayed it. . . . “Think what it must have cost a woman of her ability and reputation to have to add, ‘I now know they were not written or precipitated by the Masters, and that they were done by Mr. Judge.’ This was publicly acknowledging herself to be a duped simpleton. But Truth demanded the avowal and she unhesitatingly made it.”</p> <p>“Defends Besant’s honor, maintaining that she was sincere in bringing charges against Judge.”</p> <p>NOTE: See also Mar. 5, 1895 for Robert B. Holt’s first Fellow Theosophists circular.</p>	<p>Circular, 2 pages Mar. 20, 1895</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 1964, p.539</p>

<p>Mar. 27, 1895</p>	<p>“POSTSCRIPT” H.S. Olcott’s rebuttal to Judge’s publication of the Prayag Letter. “[Olcott] pronounces the message a false one and if this is likely to shatter H.P.B.’s oft-declared infallibility as the transmitter of only genuine messages from the Masters, so let it be: the sooner the monstrous pretence is upset the better for her memory and for a noble cause. . . . [T]he writer . . . reiterates, for the hundredth time, that H.P.B. was as human and fallible as either one of us, and that what she wrote and taught, and what was written through her, should be judged strictly on its intrinsic merits and by no standard of presumed authority. . . . “. . . Is it not absurd, then, to imagine that any Master, in even the most casual relations with the Society, would indulge in this insulting attack upon Brahmanic philosophy. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See Mar. 15, 1895 entry.</p> <p>“H.S. OLCOTT VS. H.P.B.” by W.Q. Judge. “Olcott does not like [the Prayag Letter] because he lives in India, and it is too gallingly true. . . . “The message condemns bigotry. The persons to whom it was sent were then of the most theologically bigoted families. . . . [T]o their superstitions, to their upholding idolatry, to the horrors of caste, the letter adverts. The whole letter rings true and strong.”</p> <p>“DR. HARTMANN READS THE ‘POSTSCRIPT’.” “It seems almost incredible how anybody, to say nothing of a president-founder, could misconstrue and confound that message [the Prayag Letter]. . . in which the Master asks them to strive to <i>outgrow</i> their orthodox beliefs and superstitions, faith in gods, or a (separate) god, and to attain <i>real knowledge</i>. “Great must be the power of Mr. Chakravarti and his orthodox colleagues, if they can spread so much darkness over Adyar. The very air in that place seems to be reeking with envy, jealousy, conceit and above all ingratitude.”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 15, 1895 entry.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; pp.475-476</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; pp.81-83</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.203-204</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, pp.332-334</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, June 1915; p.374</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; pp.96-97</p>
<p>Mar. 1895 (Late)</p>	<p>“A Common-Sense View of MR. JUDGE’S CIRCULAR OF NOVEMBER 3RD, 1894.” By Bertram Keightley.</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 1895 entry.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; pp.58-64</p> <p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, No. 52, May 1895; pp.39-48</p>

<p>Mar. 1895 (Late) continued</p>	<p>“THE PERSECUTION OF WILLIAM Q. JUDGE. The Object in View.” By W.Q. Judge. “The design from the beginning was to get me out of the way to the Presidency of the T.S. Mrs. Besant was to demand my resignation, after that Col. Olcott was to resign his office, then Mrs. Besant was to be nominated as President; Vice-Presidency probably to go to Bert. Keightley, though on that the outer proofs are not yet definite. In London last July Mrs. Besant said several times that the object of the proceeding was to prevent me succeeding to the Presidency. But here are a few samples from her letters:” He quoted from a Feb. 14, 1894 letter: “He (Chakravarti) endorsed the idea that I [Annie Besant] should take sole charge of the school. . . . Indeed he told me last summer (about Aug. 1893. — J. [Judge]) that it had to be so presently.”</p> <p>NOTE: See also Feb. 8 and 14, 1894 and June 1895 entries.</p> <p>Judge commented on A. Besant’s accusation in her Feb. 14th, 1894 letter that he was “misled by a high example.” “In July she told me . . . that her theory was <i>first</i>, that H.P.B. had committed several frauds for good ends and made bogus messages; <i>second</i>, that I was misled by her example; and <i>third</i>, that H.P.B. had given me permission to do such acts. She then asked me to confess thus and that would clear up all. I peremptorily denied such a horrible lie, and warned her that everywhere I would resist such attack on H.P.B. These are facts, and the real issue is around H.P.B.”</p> <p>Cleather’s comments on Besant’s claims that Judge was “misled by a high example” [H.P.B.].</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; p.432</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, p. 313</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, Mar. 1895; pp.125-128</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; pp.103-104</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, May 1895; p.61</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; p.432</p> <p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, p.66</p>
<p>Mar. 1895 (Late) continued</p>	<p>“<i>To the Members, Branches and Sections of the Theosophical Society:</i>” By J.D. Buck. Buck summarized the history of the American Section, and the attack on W.Q. Judge. He closed by stating: “I therefore urge the American Section to pass unanimously a vote of separation, and declare their entire autonomy, and to proceed to organize this Section on this basis, and make it effectual in the best sense for the promotion of the real brotherhood of man on the lines laid down by the Master and H.P.B.”</p>	<p>Circular, 2 pages, [date estimated March 1895 from Albert Smythe’s notes]</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 1949, p.536</p>
<p>Mar. 1895 (Late) continued</p>	<p>“THE LAST THREE YEARS OF THE LIFE OF MADAME BLAVATSKY.” Countess Wachtmeister wrote to Claude F. Wright: “As my book, the <i>Reminiscences of H.P. Blavatsky and the Secret Doctrine</i>, has been read with such interest all over the world, it seems to me that it would be an admirable plan to follow it up by carrying on the threads from where I dropped them, through to the end of her life.”</p> <p>“<i>To the Readers of the PATH:</i>” By C.F. Wright. “Acting on the suggestion contained in the letter from Countess Wachtmeister, I am at present actively engaged in collecting reminiscences, personal and otherwise, of H.P.B. during the last three years of her life. . . .”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, Mar. 1895; p.435</p>

Apr. 1895	<p>“The Point of View.”</p> <p>Comments by Kalekamiyuen on B. Keightley’s article A Commonsense View of Mr. Judge’s Circular of November 3, 1894.</p> <p>“This article is neither a review of Mr. Keightley’s circular nor an answer thereto. It is simply the views (upon three apparently disputable points raised by Mr. Keightley) of a member who believes in and reveres the Masters and Their agents, and who has received indubitable personal proofs that Mr. Judge <i>is</i> Their accredited Agent. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 3, 1894 and Feb. 1895 entries.</p>	<p>Atma’s Messenger, Apr. 1895; p.3</p>
Apr. 1895 continued	<p>Isis and the Mahatmas: A Reply by William Q. Judge (approximate date). Includes W.Q.J.’s reply to the New York Sun (Nov. 26, 1894), also To the Editor of the The Westminster Gazette, and other correspondence relating thereto and lastly, “A FINAL WORD TO THOSE WHO DEMAND MR. JUDGE’S RESIGNATION PENDING HIS DETAILED REPLY.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 26, 1894.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 30 pages</p>
Apr. 1895 continued	<p>“LUCIFER for April continues the persecution of Mr. Judge and his friends. . . .”</p> <p>“The Clash of Opinion.”</p> <p>Letters from B. Keightley, Annie Besant, H.S. Olcott, J.D. Buck, A. Keightley, and others published.</p> <p>NOTE: See March 1895 (Early) regarding demands by the Indian Section for explanations from W.Q. Judge.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; p.101</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; pp.159-165</p>
Apr. 1895 continued	<p>“THE JUDGE CASE.”</p> <p>Several Lodges and a number of influential Theosophists had been asking Besant to publish her evidence against W.Q. Judge, as soon as possible, “. . . ‘so that there may no longer be the slightest doubt what are the precise charges against Mr. Judge and the evidence in their support.’ In response to this Mrs. Besant will, on reaching England, publish the statement she drew up last July to lay before the Judicial Committee, and which contains the evidence establishing the charges.”</p>	<p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, No. 51, Apr. 1895; pp.23-24</p>
Apr. 1895 continued	<p>After her return to England on April 21st, 1894, Annie Besant issued The Case Against W.Q. Judge (88 pages) [See April 2, 1895 entry.] Detailed six charges against W.Q. Judge and reviewed events of the Judicial Committee Meeting and thereafter. [Published Apr. 29, 1895]</p> <p>NOTE: The charges and evidence Mrs. Besant advanced were reviewed in detail by a barrister, Mr. Basil Crump, who offered the opinion that the case was ill framed and quite inadequate. “From preface to conclusion it would be child’s play to pick to pieces and pulverise.” [See his pamphlet, May 5th, 1895. Also see Dec. 1894.]</p> <p>Mrs. M. Thomas’ comparison and analysis of The Case Against W. Q. Judge.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.248</p> <p>Theos. or Neo-Theos. by Margaret Thomas, pp.64-67</p>

<p>Apr. 1895 continued</p>	<p>“THE TRUTH ABOUT EAST AND WEST.” By W.Q. Judge, [regarding the “Prayag Letter”] in which he stated the Masters started the Theosophical Movement in the West because of the Spiritual degradation in India. “Had we waited for them to give us this, we never would have obtained it. . . . “Let those . . . who can calmly examine facts, see that the West is the advancing conqueror of human destiny; that the Eastern lands, both India and other places, are storehouses for the world, holding from the past treasures that the West alone can make avail of and teach the East how to use. Let sectional jealousy cease. . . .”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; pp.1-5</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, pp.284-289</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, pp.454-458</p>
<p>Apr. 1895 continued</p>	<p>“H.S. OLCOTT vs H.P.B.” by William Q. Judge. “In the April <i>Theosophist</i> Col. Olcott makes public what we have long known to be private opinion — a private opinion hinted at through the pages of <i>Old Diary Leaves</i>, — that H.P.B. was a fraud, a medium, and a forger of bogus messages from the Masters.” NOTE: See March 27, 1895 for more about H.P.B. by Olcott.</p> <p>“MRS. BESANT vs H.P.B.” “Mrs. Besant has sent an advance copy of an article to appear in <i>Lucifer</i> entitled ‘East and West’. . . . <i>She says the message is not genuine</i>, and thus walks beside Col. Olcott in abuse of H.P.B., for everyone with correct information knows that the message came through H.P.B.” NOTE: In one of his E.S.T. circulars to members, Mr. Judge issued a Subsidiary Paper in January 1895 which included a section subtitled “East and West” in which he comments “about the importance and destiny of the West”. NOTE: See letter (Prayag Letter) written from Dehra Dun by H.P.B. to A.P. Sinnett. The bulk of the letter apparently is a direct dictation of M. to H.P.B. See Appendix B, No. 1, for “Letter No. CXXXIV from Dehra Dun” from The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett 2nd edition pp. 461-464. Also see Mar. 15, 1895 entry.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; pp.81-83</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.203-204</p> <p>p.205</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, pp.332-334</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 3, pp.470-472</p>
<p>Apr. 1895 continued</p>	<p>“EAST AND WEST.” by Annie Besant. Rebuttal to W.Q.J.’s article. A MAHATMA’S MESSAGE TO SOME BRAHMANS. “For years Mr. Judge has been trying to get hold of India, but all his attempts have failed, and the failure has naturally embittered him against those he can neither win nor master. But this is a passing and trivial matter, whereas the spiritual destinies of Humanity are bound up with India.” [p.192]</p> <p>D.N. Dunlop published a letter “MRS. BESANT AS A PROPHET.” (Dated from Sydney, Australia, Feb. 17, 1895) from T.W. Willans: “In a few words, the whole situation is explained from A.B.’s present position, ‘I am Sir Oracle, and when I speak let no dogs bark’.” NOTE: See below for cablegram received on March 26th.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, May 1895; pp.185-194</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Apr. 1895; pp.122-123</p>

Apr. 1895 continued	<p>“Much indignation is being expressed by some Eastern Branches on account of the action of W.J. Walters, editor of <i>Mercury</i>, in securing lists of members for the purpose of sending <i>Mercury</i>, and then using these lists to send attacks upon Mr. Judge instead.”</p> <p>“In Refutation.” Letter to the Editor by W. J. Walters. Mr. William John Walters, Editor of Mercury, denied that he was collecting lists of members in order to send out attacks on W.Q.J. “About the beginning of February, I sent to the secretaries of the different branches asking for a list of their members, as I was desirous of sending them a copy of <i>Mercury</i>.”</p>	<p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, Apr. 1895; p.153</p> <p>Atma’s Messenger, Apr. 1895 (est.), p.8</p>
Apr. 1895 continued	<p>“On March 26th . . . the following cablegram, which, with other letters of the same [supportive] tenor from New Zealand and Australia, are in sufficiently amusing contrast with Mrs. Besant’s prophecy upon Australian matters as confidently expressed to the Adyar Convention last December. ‘Vigilate, London. Sydney Branch votes in confidence Judge.’ “Foregoing received from Sydney. — <i>Reuter</i>.”</p> <p>“SOME QUOTATIONS.” Pertaining to EAST AND WEST from K.H., H.P.B., M.M. Chatterji, and Damodar in contrast to Mrs. Besant’s prophecy.</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 25-28, 1894. Re: A. Besant’s assumption that she had gained the confidence of the Australian Theosophists by her influence.</p> <p>The Australian Section split after visit from Besant. In a letter from Mr. Willans, on behalf of twenty-three members in Australia and two Centres in N. Z., he detailed “the methods that were adopted to obtain the vote and influence of the Australian Section in favor of Mrs. Besant’s action in the ‘Case against W.Q. Judge.’ . . . a devoted group of workers in Australia and N. Z. . . have, through all, remained loyal to Mr. Judge, and who have upheld the principles of Theosophy.”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Apr. 1895; pp.123-124</p> <p>Sep. 1895; p.228</p>
Apr. 1895 continued	<p>“A PROPHETIC MESSAGE.” H.P.B. TO THE AMERICAN CONVENTION T.S. 1891.” D.N. Dunlop quoted H.P.B.’s message to the American Convention of 1891: “The critical nature of the stage on which we have entered is as well known to the forces that fight against us, as to those that fight on our side. No opportunity will be lost of sowing dissension, of taking advantage of mistaken and false moves, of instilling doubt, of augmenting difficulties, of breathing suspicions, so that by any and every means the unity of the Society may be broken and the ranks of our Fellows thinned and thrown into disarray.”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Apr. 1895; pp.125-126</p>

Apr. 1895 continued	<p>“MIRROR OF THE MOVEMENT.”</p> <p>“It is understood that Mr. Bertram Keightley, Mrs. Besant and others purpose presenting charges against Mr. Judge of slandering Mrs. Besant and Prof. Chakravarti, with view to his expulsion from the T.S.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; p.28</p>
Apr. 1, 1895	<p>“The Result of the Vote.”</p> <p>G.R.S. Mead as General Secretary gave results of the voting on the Resolution requesting Mr. Judge to resign or submit himself for re-election. “Aye - 578. No - 117.”</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Apr. 1895; p.1</p>
Apr. 2, 1895	<p>Mrs. Besant left for Bombay en route for England. She delivered two lectures in Bombay, April 4th and 5th, before leaving. She arrived in England on the 21st.</p> <p>“On April 2nd Mrs. Besant left [Benares] for Bombay en route for England and delivered two lectures there on April 4th and 5th. . . . She sailed April 6th.”</p>	<p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, Apr. 1895; p.31</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, May 1895; p.531</p>
Apr. 3, 1895	<p>The Plot Against the Theosophical Society by Dr. A. Keightley & others is published. Narrated the facts and the opinions concerning the period July 5th - 19th, 1894 using reprinted articles supporting Judge from the Irish Theosophist, The Path, and The Vahan, and E.T. Hargrove’s A Forgotten Pledge, as well as “Luciferian Legends”, by Archibald Keightley, which “appears for the first time”.</p> <p>“This pamphlet is issued in defence of various members of the Theosophical Society who have recently been attacked in <i>Lucifer</i> and <i>The Vahan</i>. Mr. W.Q. Judge, Vice-President of the Theosophical Society, has been, and still is, the outer object at which these attacks have been made, but all who have ventured to say a word on his behalf have also been singled out for calumny. H.P. Blavatsky is the inner centre of attack, but behind the Messenger there is the Message, and it is Theosophy which is really being assaulted.”</p> <p>NOTE: See notes for Apr. 6, 1895.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 89 pages, published in London</p>

Apr. 6, 1895	<p>Pamphlet with an introduction signed by 10 members from America supporting W.Q.J. “[I]f any of us desire to preserve even a remnant of a nucleus to carry out the principles of Theosophy as laid down by our founder H.P.B., it is necessary that the American Section shall take such decided action as will put an end to friction and intolerance.”</p> <p>Includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Some Words by H.P.B.” quoting from an article by H.P.B. titled “A PUZZLE FROM ADYAR” [Lucifer, Vol. 4, pp.506-509] - “Some Words on Daily Life” (written by a Master of Wisdom) [Lucifer, Vol. 1, pp.344-346] - A Forgotten Pledge by E.T. Hargrove [Feb. 3, 1895] - Letter from C. Wachtmeister to J.D. Buck claiming that he said that he agreed with her that W.Q.J. was guilty. - Reply by Buck denying that any such conversation occurred. - Letter by Buck to A. Besant correcting a statement attributed to him that he would defend W.Q.J. “even at the cost of truth.” <p>NOTE: See March 1895 (early) and Mar. 15, 1895 entries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter by A. Keightley on the evidence in the “Judge Case.” <p>NOTE: See Mar. 15, 1895 entry.</p> <p>NOTE: With the exception of: “Some Words by H.P.B.” and “Some Words on Daily Life” by a Master of the Wisdom, the material printed in this is the same as that found in The Plot Against The T.S. printed in England. Much condensed.[see Apr. 3, 1895 entry]</p>	<p>New York, Apr. 6th, 1895. Pamphlet, 34 pages</p> <p>p.3</p> <p>pp.4-8</p> <p>pp.9-22 pp.23-24</p> <p>p.24</p> <p>pp.25-27</p> <p>pp.27-34</p>
Apr. 17, 1895	<p>“Letter <i>To The Editor</i>.” by E.T. Hargrove. Point by point rebuttal to B. Keightley’s letter (in April Lucifer). Also commented on Olcott’s letter of Feb. 21, 1895 in which Olcott asked that Judge be supplied with a copy of the evidence against him: “And so Colonel Olcott recognizes the fact that up to the present day Mr. Judge has no such copies, and that Mr. Judge’s statement to that effect is correct.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 20, 1895 entry for Olcott letter; also Jan. 25, 1895 for letter from Judge to Mead.</p> <p>“LITERARY NOTES” Re: The Irish Theosophist: “‘Letters to the Editor’ has a striking contribution from Ernest T. Hargrove, which does not put Mr. B. Keightley in a very pleasant light. . . .”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.137-140</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Apr. 1895; pp.159-162</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; p.131</p>
Apr. 19, 1895	<p>“We hear from America that a movement is on foot among Mr. Judge’s supporters in the American Section for the purpose of getting Resolutions adopted at the coming American Convention, declaring that the American Section secedes from the Theosophical Society and no longer remains part of our world organisation.”</p>	<p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5 June 1895; pp.57-59</p>

<p>Apr. 19, 1895 continued</p>	<p>Alexander Fullerton turned against W.Q.J. Letter “<i>To the Editors of LUCIFER.</i>” The Editor, Mrs. Besant, commented following the letter: “Mr Fullerton has been the steady centre in Mr. Judge’s office. . . . It is of the first importance to show that honest men cannot continue to work with Mr. Judge, unless they are prepared to be betrayed behind their backs in the work of the Society, and that Mr. Judge’s own conduct and his continued deceptions, force us, however, reluctantly to say: ‘Mr. Judge must be expelled from the Society, for his methods are dishonest and he corrupts his fellow-workers.’ Unless America saves us from the necessity of demanding his expulsion, by seceding from the present Society, Europe must endorse the demand for expulsion coming from India and Australasia.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 16, 1895, Apr. 22, 1895 and Apr. 27, 1895 entries, also see Apr. 23, 1895 for Albert Smythe’s response.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, May 1895; pp.182-183, 252-254</p>
<p>Apr. 21, 1895</p>	<p>Mrs. Besant reached England from her tour in India.</p> <p>“She arrived in London on Sunday, April 21st, in the evening. . . .”</p> <p>“Since I left England in July, I have spent three months in Australasia, and three months in India; the rest of the time has gone in journeys.”</p> <p>NOTE: Mrs. Besant had left England for Australia on July 25th, 1894.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; p.104</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, May 1895; p.250</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, May 1895; p.6</p>
<p>Apr. 22, 1895</p>	<p>Letter to Miss A. Walsh from A. Fullerton stating he had changed his mind regarding the stand he had taken in his circular of Jan. 16th. He indicated he had withdrawn from the E.S.</p> <p>“You are quite right in saying that we, opponents of secession, are the real F.T.S., and that those who secede simply cut themselves off from the T.S. itself.”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 14, 1895.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 2 pages</p>
<p>Apr. 23, 1895</p>	<p>Letter from William Lindsay in which he re-affirmed his version of the facts and addressed Bertram Keightley’s endorsement (“With regard to the seal, I was present when the Countess denied having ever seen it. . . .”):</p> <p>“Of course I am not responsible for the truth of the statement made by the Countess, but only for the correct rendering of such, as told to me, which I maintain I have done and, after all, the principal point remains unchanged, viz., <i>that the seal was gone before W. Q. Judge came to England.</i>”</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix A for more information regarding the “Master’s seal” and some of the correspondence relating to it; also see Feb. 17, 1895, and Mar. 20, 1895.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.141-142</p>

<p>Apr. 23, 1895 continued</p>	<p>Albert Smythe replied to Alexander Fullerton's letter of April 20th. "I am practically on the outside of the movement here but it does seem to me that we have all been quite too acrobatic in jumping at conclusions and turning somersaults and generally giving the enemy occasion to blaspheme. . . . It does seem to me however that we are all inclined to break what I understand is one of the elementary rules for the guidance of students — 'To know, To will, To dare, And to be Silent.' So far from being silent, everyone seems inclined to publish all he knows on the first opportunity. Mrs. Besant commenced by bragging in public of her relations with Masters, when the Book of Rules distinctly says that any mention of occult experiences will be promptly followed by an entire severance of communication. Is this a rule or is it not? I feel inclined to adhere to it."</p> <p>NOTE: The letter of the 20th has not surfaced but all indications are that it is similar to, if not the same as Fullerton's letter to Miss A. Walsh (Apr. 22nd, 1895) and the letter to Lucifer dated April 19th, 1895. Apparently Fullerton was looking for support but did not receive it from Smythe; in fact Smythe was so disturbed by Fullerton's letter, as were the members of Toronto, that he went to the Boston Convention as an unexpected representative. A further probability is that Fullerton sent similar letters to all prominent members whose loyalty he thought he might be able to sway.</p> <p>NOTE: See Mar. 1938, "A Belated Exposure [Disclosure.]", regarding Smythe's first-hand experience with Besant during her visit to Toronto in October/November 1926.</p>	<p>Letter from Albert Smythe, 2 pages</p> <p>Report of Proceedings T.S. in America, 1895; p.30</p>
<p>Apr. 26, 1895</p>	<p>"LEGAL OPINION OF GEO. D. AYERS COUNSELLOR-AT-LAW, BOSTON, ON THE STATEMENT OF FACTS RELATING TO THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY." Mr. Ayers presented 13 facts supporting W.Q. Judge's position based on the records of the T.S. (presented by Mr. Wade at the Convention at Boston, Apr 28-29, 1895).</p> <p>NOTE: See June 3, 1895; What is the Theosophical Organization?</p> <p>NOTE: See June 5, 1895 and Aug. 23, 1895</p>	<p>New England Notes, Vol. 1, Apr. 27, 1895; pp.6-7</p> <p>What is the Theos. Organization? Pamphlet, 20 pages</p>
<p>Apr. 27, 1895</p>	<p>A.P. Sinnett's letter to A. Fullerton after Judge published the Prayag Letter (under title "A MAHATMA'S MESSAGE TO SOME BRAHMANS"), on his suspicions of H.P.B. ". . . I have known for a great many years that many letters in the Mahatmas' handwriting, coming through Madame Blavatsky herself were anything but what they seemed." (Originally printed by the Boston Herald on April 27th, 1895.)</p> <p>NOTE: See May 1895 and Jan. 16, 1895. General comments by the editors of Theosophy on Sinnett's views.</p> <p>Note: A detailed look at the Mars & Mercury & Earth Chain controversy which restarted in Feb. 1893 with a rebuttal in The Path by Judge to statements made by Sinnett.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.258</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 3, June 1915; pp.376-379</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Feb. 1922; pp.101-107,</p>

Apr. 27, 1895 continued	<p>“NOTICE.”</p> <p>“Mr. Alexander Fullerton, late Treasurer of the American Section and member of the Executive Committee, as well as volunteer assistant to the General Secretary and Editor of <i>The Theosophical Forum</i>, retires from all official positions at Headquarters upon April 27th.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 22, 1895 and May 14, 1895 entries.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, May 1895; p.65</p>
Apr. 27, 1895 continued	<p>Mrs. Besant delivered her first public lecture in St. James’ Hall, on “Mahatmas as Facts and Ideals”.</p> <p>The next day, Sunday April 28th. Mrs. Besant was to have a meeting with “[a] very strong Committee of the most earnest members in Europe . . . for the purpose of verifying the documentary evidence in her hands and attesting the accuracy of all extracts and the fact that no portion of the contest is omitted from the printed evidence which in any way bears upon the questions at issue.”</p>	<p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, June 1895; pp.57-58</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, May 1895; p.251</p>
Apr. 28, 1895	<p>“The Convention of the American Section of T.S. was held at Boston, April 28-29, 1895, with the 89 active Lodges all represented by delegates in person or by proxy.”</p> <p>The Convention was held at the new Headquarters in Boston.</p> <p>“Ninth Annual Convention of The American Section T.S. and First Convention Theosophical Society in America” held in Boston, Mass., April 28-29, 1895. “Resolved . . . that the American Section, consisting of Branches of the Theosophical Society in America, in convention assembled, hereby assumes and declares its entire autonomy and that it shall be called from and after this date ‘The Theosophical Society in America’.”</p> <p>“That William Q. Judge shall be President for life. . . .”</p> <p>Resolutions carried 191 for, and 10 against.</p> <p>“Mr. A. Fullerton took the floor against the resolutions and spoke for half-an-hour. . . . He concluded by asserting that the proposed change was only a personal matter around Mr. Judge, and that if they would only wait a month they would have all the evidence to prove him guilty.”</p> <p>NOTE: Fullerton’s speech can be read in Report of Proceedings for the Ninth Annual Convention, T.S. In America held at Boston Apr. 28-29, 1895, starting on p.25.</p> <p>NOTE: Full details in Report of Proceedings of the First Convention of T.S. in America.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.250</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Feb. 1895; p.406</p> <p>Pacific Theos., Vol. 5, May/June 1895; pp.155-161</p> <p>Circular, 2 pages</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, May 1895; pp.65-72</p> <p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 1, May 1895; pp.1, 15-16</p>
Apr. 28, 1895 continued	<p>“The following is the protest presented to the Convention by some of the minority, who remain loyal to the parent Society: . . .</p> <p>“We also put ourselves on record as deprecating the methods employed by Mr. William Q. Judge. . . .</p> <p>“ . . . we hereby solemnly protest against any such secession. . . .”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, May 1895; pp.253-254</p>

Apr. 28, 1895 continued	Judge quoted Olcott: “He declared it seemed as if all the best brain and energy of the American movement had gone with the vote and with that dreadful person — W.Q.J.”	The Path , Vol. 10, Dec. 1895; p.290
Apr. 28, 1895 continued	“HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.” <i>From the Records of the T.S., from 1875 to the present day.</i> (prepared by Judge and read by Mr. Wade) NOTE: See Sep. 7, 1895 and Dec. 27, 1896 for Olcott’s A Historical Retrospect .	Report of Proceedings T.S. in America , 1895; pp.18-24
Apr. 28, 1895 continued	NOTICES. “William Q. Judge’s Explanation of the charges made against him read to the delegates after the April Convention at Boston, is being printed, and will soon be accessible to all members.”	The Path , Vol. 10, June 1895; p.104
Apr. 29, 1895	The Case Against W.Q. Judge. Published by Annie Besant at the Offices of the Theosophical Publishing Society, London, Apr. 29, 1895. “Contains Besant’s ‘Statement’ prepared for the July 1894 Judicial Committee, along with a breakdown of the six main charges brought against Judge and evidence by Olcott and B. Keightley. Says if definite action on Judge is not taken at the July European Convention, she and G.R.S. Mead will put forth resolutions from Australian, Indian and European Sections asking Olcott as President to expel Judge from the Society. A variation of this pamphlet exists as 80 pp.” NOTE: See compiler’s Introduction to The Case Against W.Q. Judge , in Appendix A, for an explanation regarding this 80 page edition. NOTE: See June 1895 for replies by J.D. Buck and W.Q. Judge to a statement made by Besant on page 13 in The Case Against W.Q. Judge .	Pamphlet, 88 pages T.N.C.A.B. Item 1947, p.535
Apr. 29, 1895 continued	Second day of Annual Convention of T.S. in America Constitution for T.S. in America adopted	Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, May/June 1895; pp.155-161

Apr. 29, 1895 continued	<p>“EXPLANATION BY WILLIAM Q. JUDGE OF CHARGES ABOUT MESSAGES.”</p> <p>“The Hall was filled again at 3:30. . . . Mr. Judge said his health would not permit him to read the paper himself but that Dr. Keightley would do it for him, adding that the explanation had been purposely kept back until the final action of the Convention should be known. Dr. Keightley then read the paper, which occupied one hour and an half . . . The six charges made by Mrs. Besant were given in full and answered <i>seriatim</i>. Mr. Judge declared various messages and memoranda to be genuine, except one. . . .”</p> <p>Reply by William Q. Judge to Charges of Misuse of Mahatmas’ Names and Handwritings.</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov 26, 1894.</p> <p>“MR. JUDGE’S REPLY TO THE CHARGES.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, May 1895; p.68</p> <p>Pacific Theos. Vol. 5, May/June 1895; p.161</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; p.136</p> <p>Pamphlet, 29 pages</p> <p>Two Replies by W.Q.J., 53 pages, ULT Pamphlet</p> <p>New England Notes, Vol. 1, May 1, 1895; p.3</p>
Apr. 29, 1895 continued	<p>“MORE LIGHT ON THE ‘JUDGE CASE’.”</p> <p>“Owing to the vigilance, of one of its members, who picked it up out of a five-cent book box, Sydney Lodge has just come into possession of a most interesting historical pamphlet and memento connected with the ‘Judge Case’ and Countess Wachtmeister. It bears the Countess’ signature and was evidently her property. This is a copy of the ‘Reply by William Q. Judge to Charges of MISUSE OF MAHATMAS’ NAMES AND HANDWRITINGS.”</p> <p>Contains notes and some interesting points written by the Countess.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, May 1932; pp.67-68</p> <p>Pamphlet, 29 pages</p>
Apr. 29, 1895 continued	<p>Report of Ninth Annual Convention American Section T.S. and First Convention Theosophical Society in America.</p> <p>Includes the Constitution of the Theosophical Society in America.</p>	<p>New England Notes, Vol. 1, No. 5, Apr. 29, 1895; pp.1-4</p>
Apr. 29, 1895 continued	<p>“FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA”</p> <p>A brief summary of the T.S. in A. First Convention held in Boston on Apr. 28-29, 1895.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.147-148</p>
Apr. 30, 1895	<p>Letter from the Independent Theosophists of Boston criticizing the action taken at the Annual Convention of the American Section calling the members “Judgites.” Followed by a rebuttal by Kalekamyuen (A.W. Wadhame). [This article was to appear in Atma’s Messenger for May 1895.]</p> <p>“THE JUDGITES. A Theosophical Pope. Independent Theosophists Protest.” (from Boston Herald, Apr. 30, 1895)</p> <p>Issued from Boston, protesting the formation of the “T.S. in America”, election of W.Q. Judge as President thereof, and calling for responses from those of similar opinion.</p> <p>By The Independent Theosophists of Boston.</p>	<p>Circular, 1 page</p> <p>Boston Herald, Apr. 30, 1895</p> <p>Circular, 1 page</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, July 1895; p.659</p>

Apr. 30, 1895 continued	<p>“<i>Fellow Theosophists:</i>”</p> <p>“Hence the wish to secede is not unanimous. . . .</p> <p>“. . . For practical work, the American Section has always been virtually independent. Every Branch is, according to the Constitution, a self-governing body. Like our own United States Government, the T.S. is a federation of independent centres under one constitution and one head. Therefore, secession has not been declared for the sake of independence. Its true purpose is to shield Mr. Judge. . . .</p> <p>“. . . Remember, those who stand firm against secession form the real T.S.”</p> <p>Very much opposed to the pamphlet dated New York, April 6th, 1895, in support of W.Q. Judge, but support Mr. Fullerton’s actions against secession. Signed by Marie A. Walsh, William John Walters (Editors of Mercury) and Sven Ryder.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, July 1895; pp.660-661</p>
May 1895	<p>Letter from Annie Besant. (Just returned to England Apr. 21, 1895)</p> <p>“I hold out my hand to all who will stand in the Theosophical Society for straightforward dealing and honest work, and ask them for help and support.”</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, May 1895; p.6</p>
May 1895 continued	<p>“ONE MESSAGE TO COL. OLCOTT.” by Alexander Fullerton.</p> <p>“The Theosophical Society has now reached an epoch when it can boldly proclaim itself a <i>de facto</i> disseminator of Theosophy, and can distinctly announce the Master’s word that the Lodge looks with most interest on those Theosophists who are best sustaining its operations.”</p> <p>NOTE: See H.P.B.’s comments in “A PUZZLE FROM ADYAR” in Lucifer, Vol. 4, Aug. 1889, pp.506-509.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, May 1895; pp.37-41</p>
May 1895 continued	<p>“THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY. INSIDE FACTS AS TO ITS ORGANIZATION. –A <i>DE FACTO</i> BODY.–THE REAL T.S. IN NEW YORK.–THE PRESIDENT STILL A DELEGATE TO FOREIGN LANDS. AND HOLDING OVER IN OFFICE.”</p> <p>Article outlining the history of the T.S. by detailing events by dates. Extracts from a paper read at Annual Meeting (Apr. 28th, 1895) by Wade, prepared from historical documents and records.</p> <p>(Also published fully in New England Notes, Boston, Apr. 29, 1895)</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, May 1895; pp.55-60</p>
May 1895 continued	<p>“THE PAGEANT OF THE FIFTH ACT: A Study of Mrs. Annie Besant.” By Herbert Coryn.</p> <p>“Once a fervent Christian, glowing with emotional Christianity; once pupil of Bradlaugh, and fervent Freethinker; once Fabian Socialist; once devoted follower of H.P.B.; now Hindu; what next? . . .</p> <p>“After leaving Christianity she tried to destroy it. Then, becoming Socialist, she opposed herself to the Bradlaughites. Withdrawing from the next position she took shelter with H.P.B.; now, breaking the Theosophical Society into halves, she becomes Hindu. . . . A psychic vision which <i>she thinks</i> to have been the ‘thought-body’ of the Master, dissolves the faith in Judge that once was perfect. . . .</p> <p>“. . . She does what in the moment seems to her right, but a wandering comet can have no place in a system. Her genius is rather destructive than constructive.” [Footnotes have been omitted.]</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 4 pages</p>

<p>May 1895 continued</p>	<p>A. Cleather on her visit in New York. She stated that Judge introduced her to Mrs. Tingley for the first time at the Boston Convention in 1895 although Judge had known her for some time; that Mrs Tingley was a “well-known public medium,” that she had been told by Mrs. Tingley then that Mr. Judge was really the Master K.H.</p>	<p>H.P.B. Her Life and Work for Humanity, pp.121-122 fn</p>
<p>May 1, 1895</p>	<p>The “Chinaman.” Annie Besant’s version of her knowing of E.T. Hargrove’s pseudonym. “Mrs. Keightley sent word asking me to go up to her sitting-room, where I found her with Mr. Hargrove and Dr. Keightley; she said , ‘I have a present for you, here is a Chinaman who will do you any service.’ She then said she trusted to my honour not to mention to anyone that Mr. Hargrove had written under the above <i>nom de plume</i>, and only told me, trusting to my good faith.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 3, 1895; March 1895 (early); May 14, 1895, May 21, 1895 and June 1895. Also see Hargrove’s letter in Appendix E.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, May 1895; pp.4-5</p>
<p>May 2, 1895</p>	<p>“<i>To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.</i>” A letter from Gordon Rowe and Walter H. Box, Hon. Secs. (of the Bow Lodge in London). “We send you herewith the monthly report of this Lodge. . . . Unfortunately we are precluded from the pages of <i>The Vahan</i> by the censorship now being exercised by its editor; for this identical report was sent to <i>The Vahan</i> for insertion, only to be mutilated, by having every word that referred, in terms of trust and loyalty, to W.Q. Judge cut out. . . . “. . . It can no longer be said that <i>The Vahan</i> is an official organ of the European Section.”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 15, 1895 entry for more details.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; p.140</p>

<p>May 5, 1895</p>	<p>“THE CASE AGAINST W.Q. JUDGE. A REVIEW.” By Basil Crump, Barrister-at-Law. He found Mrs. Besant’s “evidence” superficial, unsubstantial, not based on solid evidence or facts, and therefore, inadmissible in any court, or before any unprejudiced group.</p> <p>“Poor Mrs. Besant, her ‘Prosecutor’s brief’ is a sad failure. . . . “. . . If this case were being tried before a proper tribunal, there would certainly be no defence required. But alas! it is being tried by lynch-law. And what <i>proof</i> have we in this ‘brief’? . . . THERE IS NO PROOF. . . From preface to conclusion it would be child’s play to pick to pieces and pulverise. . . . “. . . Of such flimsy arguments and ‘proofs’ this ‘brief’ is composed from cover to cover. Foolish, irrational, and utterly dumbfounding to those of us who once looked up to Mrs. Besant as one who then possessed an unusual degree of intellectual power. . . . “. . . No Court of Law would look at an extract, apart from the document as a whole. It is simply outrageous that these extracts should be put forward as ‘evidence.’ . . . [T]he various ‘messages’ and letters alleged by Mrs. Besant to have been received by her from Mr. Judge, have been destroyed by her! ‘I am not able to produce documentary evidence’ (p.82) ‘I destroyed all the letters I received from Mr. Judge.’ And Mrs. Besant cites these letters as ‘evidence’ against him! . . . Extracts have been preserved; <i>the letters themselves have been destroyed by the prosecutor.</i>”</p> <p>Mr. Crump stated that by 1895 W.Q. Judge had been a Chela for twenty years, then added: “Why <i>should</i> she be a judge in matters of Occultism? She has only been in the Theosophical Society for five years, before which she was an avowed Atheist and Materialist.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 29, 1895 The Case Against W.Q. Judge. London Published by Annie Besant.</p>	<p>Circular, 4 pages</p>
<p>May 8, 1895</p>	<p>Circular by W.Q.J., President, T.S. in America, to all Branches. “At the ninth Annual Convention of the American Theosophical Societies [Branches] held in Boston, on the 28th and 29th of April, 1895, the COMPLETE AUTONOMY of the said Societies was declared and the title ‘The Theosophical Society in America’ adopted together with a Constitution. . . . “Ratification of the Resolutions by the Branch is requested, after which you should at once notify me thereof.”</p> <p>Same information was published in The Vahan.</p>	<p><i>To . . . Dear Friends:</i> Circular, 3 pages</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, June 1, 1895; pp.1-2</p>

<p>May 8, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“Secession of Mr. Judge and his Adherents in America from the Theosophical Society.” Including Mr. Judge’s letter to Col. Olcott published as “Farewell Remarks . . .” [See next cell.]</p> <p>Col. Olcott supplied the summary of the convention: “The majority of delegates at the late Convention of the American Section of the Theosophical Society resolved themselves into a new society as follows: –” The Resolutions passed at the Boston Convention are then listed.</p> <p>W.Q. Judge, the President of T.S. in America, sent Colonel Olcott information of the action of the Boston Convention with copies of the Resolutions there passed and the “Historical Sketch.” On June 5th Olcott issued what he termed an EXECUTIVE NOTICE from Zumarraga, Spain, abolishing the American Section of the T.S. [See June 5, 1895 entry.]</p> <p>NOTE: Interestingly this Circular and letter from Mr. Judge to Col. Olcott appears to have been then forwarded by Olcott to The Vahan and signed by “Col. H.S. Olcott, [as] <i>President-Founder of the T.S. of New York.</i>” [What is interesting and may perhaps be important is why Olcott would choose to sign in this manner.] [See June 1st, 1895 for Olcott’s travel dates.]</p> <p>NOTE: See June 5, 1895 entry re: Olcott’s Executive Notice.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, June 1, 1895; pp.1-2</p>
<p>May 8, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“Farewell Remarks of Mr. Judge on the Vice-Presidency of the Theosophical Society.” The Vahan published a “Copy of a letter from Mr. Judge to Col. Olcott.” “Last June and July I laid before you the point that I was never elected Vice-President of the ‘Theosophical Society,’ consequently that office was then known to you to be vacant. . . . “A long and bitter fight has been waged by Mrs. Annie Besant and others, one of the objects of which is to compel me to resign the said office which I do not hold. I have refused to accede to their request, and would refuse even did I hold that I was legally the Vice-President. . . . “. . . I now beg to again point out to you that I do not hold and never have held the office of Vice-President of any Theosophical Society of which I am a member, and that you can consider this my declaration that I cannot and will not oppose your filling the said so-called office in any way you may see fit, either arbitrarily or otherwise. “. . . that my signing my name hitherto as ‘Vice-President’ was in ignorance of the important facts since ascertained. . . .”</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, June 1, 1895; p.2</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, June 1895; pp.157-158</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, pp.330-331</p>
<p>May 14, 1895</p>	<p>A Narrative by Alexander Fullerton. His description of events from 1890 to date including his experience with the “seal” and Mahatmic communications received through W.Q.J. Narrated his vacillations, back and forth, in favor of then against Mr. Judge’s position.</p>	<p>Circular, 4 pages “Not for Publication”</p>

<p>May 14, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“<i>To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.</i>”</p> <p>Two letters from Mr. Hargrove. In the first letter he dealt with the meeting of Oct. 6, 1893 and Mrs. Besant’s version of that event. [The Keightleys claimed Annie Besant did not want G.R.S. Mead to know the identity of Che-yew-Tsang; Annie Besant denied this.][See May 1st, 1895 entry.]</p> <p>In his second letter (dated May 31st, 1895):</p> <p>“I wrote a letter to the editor endorsing Dr. Keightley’s statement of fact. . . . Mr. Mead had not the common courtesy to acknowledge the receipt of this letter, nor, as I now see, did he insert it.”</p> <p>[This refers to The Plot against the Theosophical Society by A. Keightley (see April 3, 1895) and his letter in The Vahan, April 1, 1895.]</p> <p>Basil Crump (Barrister at Law)</p> <p>“I certify that I have seen the originals of all the letters quoted or cited by Mr. Hargrove, and that these quotations are correctly given.”</p> <p>NOTE: See also June 1895 entry.</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix E, No. 10, for the two Hargrove letters. The first letter (May 14, 1895) is too long for this format but quite informative; the other (May 31,1895) is short and was first sent to the editor of The Vahan but never acknowledged or printed.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist Vol. 3, June 1895; pp.160-164</p> <p>p.164</p>
<p>May 15, 1895</p>	<p>Notice of Resolution to expel W.Q.J. prepared by Annie Besant and G.R.S. Mead was sent to members of the T.S.</p> <p>“If some definite action with regard to Mr. Judge shall not have been taken by the European Section before the meeting of its Annual Convention in July, we the undersigned . . . shall propose and second at the Convention the following resolution:</p> <p>‘<i>Whereas</i> Mr. W.Q. Judge has been called on to resign the office of Vice-president of the Theosophical Society by the Indian, Australasian and European Sections, but has not complied with their request; and</p> <p>‘<i>Whereas</i> he evaded the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee of July, 1894, refused a Jury of Honour, and has since given no full and satisfactory explanation to the Society in answer to the charges brought against him;</p> <p>‘<i>Resolved</i> that this Convention of the European Section of the Theosophical Society unites with the Indian and Australasian Section in demanding his expulsion from the Society, and requests the President-Founder to immediately take action to carry out the demand of these three Sections of the Theosophical Society’.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, May 1895; p.183</p>

<p>May 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“THE JUDGE CASE.” FINAL REFUSAL TO GIVE COPIES OF DOCUMENTS TO ACCUSED.” W.Q. Judge’s reply to H.S. Olcott’s letter of Feb. 26, 1895 in which Olcott stated that Judge had no right to have copies of the evidence against him. Judge claimed otherwise: “The <i>law</i> requires inspection and copies of letters if demanded by the accused; Theosophy and brotherhood would not require less than law.” NOTE: See Feb. 26, 1895. Article mentioned. . .</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.132-133 WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, p.324 The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; pp.130-131</p>
<p>May 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>Editorial comments by D.N. Dunlop: “There seems to have been a deliberate and systematic refusal to furnish Mr. Judge with certified copies of the documents on which the charges against him are based. Colonel Olcott hands them to Mrs. Besant in order that she may publish ‘her indictment against Bro. Judge,’ stipulating that the General Secretary of the European Section shall furnish copies, and this after refusing them on Mr. Judge’s direct application. . . .”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.145-146</p>
<p>May 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“ADEPTS AND MEDIUMS.” by Basil Crump. “Colonel Olcott advances the theory, which both he and Mrs. Annie Besant have already applied to the case of Mr. Judge, that H.P.B. was a medium not always responsible for what was given through her.” Basil Crump included quotes on the value of “occult” letters and added: “Finally Colonel Olcott asserts that the question of this letter to the Brahmans does not bear upon the issues which (he thinks) he will have to judicially dispose of in London. I say that it is the fundamental and only issue, the complaint in both cases being identical at the root, and the step that the President has now definitely taken shows more clearly than ever that H.P.B. is the real centre of attack, and through her the movement she sacrificed so much to call into being.” NOTE: See March 27, 1895 for “POSTSCRIPT” by H.S. Olcott.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.133-136</p>

May 15, 1895 continued	<p>“LITERARY NOTES.”</p> <p>The editor, in summarizing the May issue of The Theosophist stated: “In the review of the <i>Path</i> we are told that H.P.B.’s letters ‘are inaccurate and misleading to a degree’.” [In reference to serialized Letters of H.P. Blavatsky in The Path, started in Vol.9, Dec.1894, p.265]</p> <p>In The Theosophist, under REVIEWS. MAGAZINES., in reference to The Path: “If we have the least influence with the Editor of our New York contemporary, we should beg him not to publish any more of H.P.B.’s letters without the most careful revision. They are inaccurate and misleading to a degree; trifling incidents of our early days being distorted and exaggerated beyond recognition.”</p> <p>NOTE: See June 1895, “H.S. Olcott vs H.P.B.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; p.131</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, May 1895; p.527</p>
May 15, 1895 continued	<p>Comparison by D.N. Dunlop in parallel columns of statements made by Annie Besant from time to time on W.Q. Judge Case.</p> <p>Also a comparison by E.T. Hargrove (dated Apr. 17, 1895)</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.143-144</p> <p>pp.137-140</p>
May 15, 1895 continued	<p>“THE BOSTON CONVENTION.”</p> <p>Brief summary of the Boston Convention in 1895 by Albert Smythe. Partial list of those present, including Mrs. Alice Cleather.</p> <p>“The main fact to be considered in connection with the convention and one, which it is to be feared many will not appreciate, lies in the action of the convention, being entirely one of organization on constitutional lines, and apart from any personal consideration whatever. This is in accordance with H.P.B.’s action when she last settled in Europe, founding ‘The Theosophical Society in Europe’ and with Col. Olcott’s idea expressed in 1893, ‘If you want separate T.S. Societies made out of Sections, have them by all means. I offered this years ago to H.P.B.’.”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 17, 1893.</p>	<p>The Lamp, Vol. 1, May 1895; pp.150-151</p>
May 15, 1895 continued	<p>Letter “<i>To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.</i>” from G. Rowe and W. Box of Bow Lodge T.S.</p> <p>“We send you herewith the monthly report of this Lodge and trust you will be able to find room for it in your magazine. Unfortunately we are precluded from the pages of <i>The Vahan</i> by the censorship now being exercised by its editor; for this identical report was sent to <i>The Vahan</i> for insertion, only to be mutilated by having every word that referred, in terms of trust and loyalty, to W.Q. Judge cut out.”</p> <p>The Bow Lodge T.S. report follows.</p> <p>NOTE: May 2, 1895 entry.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895; pp.140-142</p>

<p>May 20, 1895</p>	<p>Chicago Branch repudiated the action of the Boston Convention which formed the American T.S. In a letter dated May 20 signed by George E. Wright as President, he states: “We remain a regularly chartered Branch of the parent Theosophical Society”.</p> <p>“MIRROR OF THE MOVEMENT.” “Loyalty Branch T.S.” The Chicago branch split; those supporting American T.S. formed Loyalty Branch T.S.: “At a meeting of the old Chicago Branch to ratify the action of the recent Convention not all the members favored it, and to avoid friction and to have the opportunity of carrying on the work . . . the members favoring the resolutions . . . withdrew and reorganised themselves into a society under the above name. . . . A Preamble and Resolutions concerning the reorganization were adopted at the meeting. . . .”</p> <p>“<i>Theosophical Activities</i>”, under “AMERICA” detailed a “fraudulent” message ascribed to “M”, received by George Wright, which included: “The duty of the American group is cut off from the diseased parts (<i>sic</i>) so that itself can live. . . . “This document was written in the M. script, on heavy rice-paper, scented with sandal-wood, and was surreptitiously placed in the desk of Mr. G.E. Wright . . . who was opposed to secession. . . . Mr. Judge, Mr. Claude Wright and Dr. and Mrs. Keightley pronounced the letter ‘genuine’, and it promptly found its way to the press as having reached Mr. Wright ‘occultly’. . . . the fact being concealed that Mr. G.E. Wright repudiated the letter, and knew exactly the ‘occult’ means by which it had reached his desk.”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 5, 1895 and June 1895.</p>	<p>Chicago, May 20, 1895, Circular, 1 page</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; p.103</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, June 1895; pp.344-346</p>
<p>May 20, 1895 continued</p>	<p>William Q. Judge was staying in Cincinnati with Dr. Buck. In a letter to a friend he wrote about the state of his own health: “I am away from home for my health (which is) much hurt by others’ hate. * * * “Besant has had what ought to be her last say, and I read to delegates at our Conv’n my explan’n of the charges — my last word. It will soon be published.”</p> <p>NOTE: The letter is included, in chronological order, in Appendix D, Part V, — Letters from W.Q. Judge to E.T. Hargrove.</p>	<p>Letters That Have Helped Me, p.185</p>

<p>May 21, 1895</p>	<p>Julia C. Keightley [Jasper Niemand] in a letter <i>To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST</i> corrected Countess Wachtmeister on the matter of H.P.B.'s reincarnation.</p> <p>“[T]he Countess Wachtmeister has apparently misunderstood me to say that I believed H.P. Blavatsky to have reincarnated in a physical body. I never had and have not such belief. I have no <i>knowledge</i> upon the subject, one way or the other, but I always inclined and do still incline to the contrary belief. I also believe H.P.B. to be consciously working on the inner planes of Being.”</p> <p>In a letter (reprinted in The Irish Theosophist pp.158-159) to the Editor of The Vahan which appeared under title “The Legend of ‘Che-yew-Tsang.’”, Julia C. Keightley stated:</p> <p>“When working with or for Mrs. Besant, whether in America or in England, I always required from her her directions <i>in writing</i>, in order to guarantee myself against her constant forgetfulness and her characteristic inability to admit herself to be mistaken. . . . my experience inclines me to the belief that Mrs. Besant, when she changes her mental attitude, forgets much of what she thought and said under the influence of a prior state of consciousness.” Also clarified some facts on the “Chinaman” controversy.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, June 1895; pp.158-159</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, July 1895; pp.3-4</p>
<p>May 25, 1895</p>	<p>“<i>Letter to the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.</i>”</p> <p>Roger Hall on what H.P. Blavatsky had said of W.Q. Judge, namely “that he was her destined successor.”</p> <p>“[O]ne afternoon . . . I asked [H.P.B.] if she meant to reincarnate immediately; she answered that she would not do so but would be able to help in the good work better as a Nirmânakâya.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 1895 for more about W.Q. Judge by Roger Hall.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, June 1895; pp.164-165</p>
<p>May 25, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“Concerning Masters or Mahatmas.”</p> <p>On Mahatmas and their communication with others. In regards to The Judge Case”</p> <p>“The so-called Masters spoken of by Mr. Judge and Mrs. Besant are matters of no concern whatever, and moreover, matters on which they are incapable of forming any conclusion.</p> <p>“The Scottish Lodge stands consistently aloof from the whole question.”</p>	<p>Transactions of the Scottish Lodge, pp.164-168</p>
<p>June 1895</p>	<p>“H.S. Olcott vs H.P.B.” by William Q. Judge.</p> <p>“If for a moment we would accept this view of H.P.B. [that she ‘cooked up’, forged, and humbugged with, a long and important message to Brahmans at Allahabad in 1881] put forward by Olcott then there is, as she published herself, no certainty about any message. . . . He cannot tolerate the idea that H.P.B. was greater than himself, so he throws around her memory the dirty cloak of tricky and irresponsible mediumship.”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 15, 1895 — Under LITERARY NOTES. . . .</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; pp.81- 83</p> <p>WQJ T. Articles, Vol. 2, pp.332-334</p>

<p>June 1895 continued</p>	<p>Letter from J.D. Buck to the “EDITOR PATH” on Besant’s pamphlet, THE “CASE AGAINST W.Q. JUDGE.”</p> <p>“In referring to a message which she [Besant] says informed her that Master did not write certain messages and that Mr. Judge did, the following occurs in parenthesis: (‘I informed few people of this last year, but among the few were Mr. Judge, Dr. Buck and Dr. Keightley, so that they knew on whose authority my knowledge was based. . . .’)</p> <p>“Mrs. Besant’s memory is entirely at fault on the point; she never told me that Master made any such declaration to her.</p> <p>“In a conversation with Mrs. Besant in Richmond Park I asked her if Master ordered her to bring these charges against Mr. Judge. Her reply was, ‘He ordered me to take action.’ This is all she said on the matter. There was not the slightest reference to any previous message on the subject.”</p> <p>See p.13 of The Case Against W.Q. Judge, which is included in Appendix A, No. 8. [See April 29,1895.]</p> <p>NOTE: Also see Sep. 15-16, 1893; March 15, 1895, and Apr. 6, 1895.</p> <p>Denial by Judge. “Most emphatically I state that Mrs. Besant never said to me that which, on page 13 of the pamphlet Dr. Buck refers to, she asserts having informed me of last year: <i>i.e.</i> that she had learned from Master that the messages were not done by Him but by me!” [See April 29, 1895.]</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; p.97</p> <p>p.97</p>
<p>June 1895 continued</p>	<p>EDITOR PATH:—</p> <p>Dr. A. Keightley also addressed Annie Besant’s statement: “It is with sincere regret that I find myself obliged to make public denial of the truth of Mrs. Besant’s statement that she told me that the Master had informed her of Mr. Judge’s guilt. Mrs. Besant never so told me.”</p> <p>Detailed other incidents plus letters and statements including Mrs. Besant’s Co-Headship of the E.S. with W.Q. Judge, and concluded with: “These are a very few of the facts which prevent my accepting Mrs. Besant’s statements as I would like — as I would only be too happy — to do. The contradictions between her public and private statements, and between her letters, make it impossible.”</p> <p>NOTE: Also see Jan. 12, 1894 for Dr. A. Keightley’s comments.</p> <p>“Mrs. Besant told us at Richmond that she had had no order from the Master except ‘take action.’ That she took orders through Mr. Chakravarti as coming from the Master. That it was Mr. Chakravarti who told her Master ordered her to mail the letter requesting Mr. Judge to resign. And she admitted occult ties with a group of Brahmins in India, such ties being prohibited by the rules of a private body to which we and she then belonged.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 8, 1894 and Feb. 14, 1894 entries.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; pp.98-100</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.249</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; p.98</p>

June 1895 continued	<p>Editorial by Annie Besant re: "H.P.B.'s ring" Disputed Judge's claim that he had Blavatsky's ring. Besant claimed that she received H.P.B.'s ring after her death and that Judge had the duplicate ring that she had before.</p> <p>NOTE: For the full text of her explanation see Appendix A, No. 14. Also see June 18, 1896 entry.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, June 1895; pp.269-270</p>
June 1895 continued	<p>Mrs. J. Keightley, in her letter of May 21, 1895 on misstatements made by Annie Besant regarding the "Chinaman" episode, wrote: "Having read in <i>The Vahan</i> for May, 1895, the statement of Mrs. Besant in regard to the 'Chinaman' episode, I ask your editorial courtesy in order to say, definitely and clearly, that that statement, as such, is wholly incorrect."</p> <p>Mr. Hargrove's long letter of May 31st, 1895, regarding this subject follows Mrs. Keightley's. "As Mrs. Besant's article in the May <i>Vahan</i>, containing the above-mentioned incorrect assertions and accusations, required comment in the same journal, I wrote a letter to the editor endorsing Dr. Keightley's statement of fact. . . . Mr. Mead had not the common courtesy to acknowledge the receipt of this letter, nor, as I see, did he insert it."</p> <p>Basil Crump (Barrister at Law): "I certify that I have seen the originals of all the letters quoted or cited by Mr. Hargrove, and that these quotations are correctly given." NOTE: See May 15, 1895 for "ADEPTS AND MEDIUMS" by Basil Crump.</p> <p>NOTE: See also May 1, 1895, May 14, 1895 and May 21, 1895.</p> <p>Comments on letters from Mrs. Keightley and E.T. Hargrove in June Irish Theosophist.</p> <p>The Vahan printed Mrs. J. C. Keightley's letter of May 21st, 1895, under title "The Legend of 'Che-Yew-Tsang.'" Also included are a letter from H. Burrows, and comments by G.R.S. Mead. NOTE: See June 19, 1895 for H. Burrows' letter and Mead's comments.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, June 1895; pp.158-159</p> <p>p.164</p> <p>p.164</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Aug. 1895; p.161</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, July 1895; pp.3-5</p>
June 1895 continued	<p>Message from Master "M" to G.E. Wright is quoted: "The duty of the American group is cut off from the diseased parts (<i>sic</i>) so that itself can live." Wright repudiated letter.</p> <p>NOTE: See May 20, 1895 entry.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, June 1895; p.345</p>

June 1895 continued	<p>“MASTERS AND MESSAGES.” by J.D. Buck.</p> <p>“If a supposed message flatters one’s vanity or agrees with one’s preconceived notion of things, it is loudly heralded as ‘<i>genuine</i>’ and as conclusive evidence of the superhuman insight of the Masters; but if the reverse is the case, and the recipient <i>does not like</i> the message it is at once declared ‘spurious’, even when both messages are transmitted through the same source, and the messenger that in the first instance was accorded all praise is now accused of fraud or ‘mediumship’.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, June 1895; pp.78-80</p>
June 1, 1895	<p>H.S. Olcott arrived in Madrid, Spain. He left for Bombay on May 5th, and sailed for Marseilles on the 10th, he then left Marseilles for Madrid on the 30th.</p> <p>“But when he landed at Marseilles on May 30 he received the news, not altogether unexpected, that W.Q. Judge was no longer a part of the Society.”</p>	<p>Hammer on the Mountain, p.331</p> <p>p.274</p> <p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, Oct. 1895; p.130</p>
June 1, 1895 continued	<p>Letter “<i>From the Theosophical Society in America to the European Theosophists, in Convention Assembled as, ‘The European Section of the Theosophical Society’.</i>”</p> <p>Signed by William Q. Judge as President.</p> <p>“Therefore we come to you as fellow-students and workers in the field of theosophical effort, and holding out the hand of fellowship we again declare the complete unity of all theosophical workers in every part of the world.”</p> <p>Also signed by the “<i>Members of the Executive Committee.</i>” Elliott B. Page; A.P. Buchman; C.A. Griscom, Jr.; H.T. Patterson; Jerome A. Anderson; Frank I. Blodgett.</p> <p>“Mrs. Annie Besant . . . declared it a personal attack on herself and an insult to those upholding her. . . . [F]ully half the hall arose and protested against the purblind and fanatical attitude that had brought about the repudiation of a document intended to draw harmoniously together for the greater advancement of our cause all workers in the Movement.”</p> <p>NOTE: See also July 4, 1895.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; pp.135-136</p> <p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 1, June 1895; pp.30-31</p> <p>Northern Theos., Vol. 2, July 1895; p.74</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Aug. 1895; pp.164-165</p>
June 1, 1895 continued	<p>“Secession of Mr. Judge and his Adherents in America from the Theosophical Society.”</p> <p>“The majority of delegates at the late Convention of the American Section of the Theosophical Society resolved themselves into a new society as follows: —”</p> <p>Resolutions are listed.</p> <p>NOTE: See June 5, 1895, entry for Olcott’s “EXECUTIVE NOTICE” from Spain.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, June 1, 1895; pp.1-2</p>

June 2, 1895	<p>“CORRESPONDENCE.”</p> <p>Letter from Franz Hartmann arguing that T.S. in America is the original Society.</p> <p>“The <i>Vahan</i> states that the American Section has <i>seceded from the main body</i> of the T.S. This is not true in my opinion. I know of no other T.S. than the one started in America. . . . I acted as the Delegate of the <i>Parent body of the T.S.</i> to the Indian division at Adyar in 1883 at their anniversary meeting, and I reported back to New York. Thus the real T.S. in America has merely reasserted its original independence. . . .”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Aug. 1895; p.160</p>
June 2, 1895 continued	<p>Letter from Mrs. L.A. Russell quoting Countess Wachtmeister as having said:</p> <p>“Do you not know that <i>W.Q. Judge is the greatest living occultist</i> known to the <i>Western world</i> since <i>H.P.B.’s death</i>?”</p> <p>[Mrs. Lizzie Arthur Russell was the Secretary of the Santa Cruz T.S.]</p> <p>NOTE: See May 1894 for more details.</p> <p>Countess Wachtmeister in a letter to the “<i>Editor Path</i>”:</p> <p>“I absolutely deny having said that ‘<i>W.Q. Judge is the greatest living occultist. . . .</i>’”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; p.129</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, July 1895; pp.181-182</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Dec. 1895; p.292</p>
June 3, 1895	<p>What is the Theosophical Organization?</p> <p>By Fred. J. Dick included: Historical Sketch of the Theosophical Society — Inside Facts from the Records of the T.S., from 1875 to the Present day. (pp.1-14)</p> <p>“LEGAL OPINION BY GEO. D. AYERS, COUNSELLOR-AT-LAW, BOSTON, ON THE STATEMENT OF FACTS RELATING TO THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.” Boston April 26, 1895. (pp.14-17)</p> <p>“Constitution of The Theosophical Society in America. (pp.17-20)</p> <p>NOTE: See April 26, 1895 and Aug. 23, 1895 entries. See Appendix C, No.1.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 20 pages</p> <p>New England Notes, Vol. 1, Apr. 27, 1895; pp.6-7</p>

<p>June 5, 1895</p>	<p>“EXECUTIVE NOTICE.”</p> <p>Issued by H.S. Olcott from Zumarraga, Spain, regarding T.S. in America. Abolished American Section of T.S., cancelled all charters and diplomas, asked for all Sectional archives and other property and explained the legal status of the T.S.</p> <p>“The undersigned notes with regret that the American Convention was led into the adoption of the wholly false and misleading idea, that the Theosophical Society, now existing, is not <i>de jure</i> the continuation of the Society which was formed by H.P.B., the undersigned, and our colleagues, at New York in 1875, but an adventitious body, the growth of circumstances, and having no real corporate authority over its Sections and Branches. There is, however, at Adyar, the original Record Book of the proceedings of Council, in which, in Mr. Judge’s own handwriting, and signed with the name of Mr. A. Gustam, the then Recording Secretary T.S., is written the report of a meeting of Council, held early in 1878, at which the President was given full discretionary powers to establish Headquarters wherever he chose, to adopt whatever measures he might see fit in the Society’s interest, the Council ratifying in advance whatever he might do. This record is unfortunately in India at this moment, but it has been written for, and will be published at the earliest practicable date, for general information. It will then be seen how unsupported by facts is the record of the Society’s history which was laid before the American Convention and before the counsellor-at-law, whose professional opinion was obtained thereupon. . . . As President-Founder, therefore, the undersigned declares that the Theosophical Society has had an unbroken existence from the date of its foundation in 1875 to the present day, and that every charter and diploma issued by it under its seal and over the President’s signature, has been valid and of constitutional force. . . .</p> <p>“Finally, the undersigned gives notice that Mr. W.Q. Judge, having by his own act lost his membership in the Society, is no longer its Vice-President, and the said office is now vacant.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 23, 1895 for L.F. Wade’s analysis according to the By-laws. Also see Dec. 27, 1896 for A Historical Retrospect (1875-1896) of the Theosophical Society.</p> <p>NOTE: See April 26, 1895 and Sep. 7, 1895 for Olcott’s 4 page “EXECUTIVE NOTICE”.</p>	<p>Circular, 4 pages</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, July 1895; pp.421-425</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, Aug. 1895; Supp. pp.xlii-xliv</p> <p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, July 1895; pp.73-78</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, July 1895; pp.1-3</p> <p>Partial reprint in New England Notes, Aug 23, 1895; p.124</p>
<p>June 5, 1895 continued</p>	<p>NOTE: See May 8, 1895 entry, for letter from Judge to Olcott.</p> <p>In his EXECUTIVE NOTICE, H.S. Olcott “appoints . . . a special Committee . . . to have charge of all American Affairs pending the issue of a Section Charter, and as Presidential Agents to supervise the proper organisation of the new American Section of the Theosophical Society.”</p> <p>NOTE: Also see May 20, 1895 and June 1, 1895 entries.</p>	

June 5, 1895 continued	<p>“COL. H.S. OLCOTT ISSUES AN EXECUTIVE NOTICE”</p> <p>The Editor comments on Olcott’s June 5th, “EXECUTIVE NOTICE” from Zumarraga, Spain. He claimed that: “[Olcott] then goes on, somewhat illogically and absurdly, to declare as annulled all charters and diplomas of those who voted in favour of autonomy; to appoint a committee to represent himself, and to ask that all archives and property be turned over to the committee, saying he will issue a charter for a new American Section.”</p> <p>The Editor then added: “Neither Col. Olcott nor any other person has any right, title or interest in the property of the former Section, and never did have, his demand is ridiculous.”</p> <p>NOTE: Albert Smythe was in New York with Mr. Judge at the time that Mr. Judge received the letter from Col. Olcott rejecting autonomy. See July 15, 1929 entry for Albert Smythe’s recollection of the event.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 1, July 1895; pp.45-46</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Aug. 1895; p.164</p>
June 5, 1895 continued	<p>“Notes upon the President’s Executive Notice” by N.C.</p> <p>“The so-called Secession of the American Brethren is in no sense of the word a ‘Secession,’ but rather a re-organisation of the form or vehicle by means of which the real work of the T.S. as a movement can be carried on in their midst, and we shall easily see that with differing modes of expression, officers, rules, and the like, the <i>link</i> with the original T.S. can be kept <i>unbroken</i>, and ‘apostolic succession’ becomes but merely a matter of history but an actual fact in the life and experience of that which takes on or casts off its ‘Sthula’.”</p>	<p>Northern Theos. Vol. 2, July 1895; pp.73-74</p>
June 5, 1895 continued	<p>“Proposed Programme” for the European Convention of July 4th and 5th, 1895, and announcing that H.S. Olcott “will be in the chair”.</p> <p>Suggestion for the Reorganization of the T.S., including a Draft of a Proposed Constitution for The Theosophical Society in Great Britain and Ireland, following “the impending separation of the T.S. in Europe into two distinct bodies.”</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 7 pages, issued June 5, 1895</p> <p>Pamphlet, 4 pages (not dated)</p>
June 8, 1895	<p>Olcott arrived at Charing Cross.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, July 1895; p.353</p>
June 10, 1895	<p>“COUNTESS WACHTMEISTER REFUTES HERSELF”</p> <p>Dr. Buck printed a letter from Dr. Gamble, of Santa Cruz, CA.</p> <p>“The Countess’s attack on you and the statements contained in her letter I am convinced have no foundation in truth. While a guest at my house, shortly after the S.F. convention [April 23-24, 1894], I asked for her opinion regarding the charges against Bro. Judge, and she answered that she ‘had none’ and did not propose to take sides; that in the end truth would prevail, and it was our duty to go on with the work.</p> <p>“Now, unless she was untruthful at the time, she did not believe that W.Q. Judge had acted in a ‘fraudulent and deceitful manner’ . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 1894 entry.</p>	<p>Circular, 1 page, by J.D. Buck</p>

June 14, 1895	Letter from Olcott to the Presidents of Branches who have joined the T.S. in America asking them to return their Charters and all diplomas of members who were in favor of the “secession.”	Letter , 1 page
June 14, 1895 continued	Report by A. Cleather. “The agenda for the forthcoming [European] Convention is now out, and the policy of Mr. Judge’s persecutors is therein partially disclosed.” She commented regarding Olcott’s June 5 th EXECUTIVE NOTICE: “You are all cut off, root and branch, your diplomas cancelled, and your names erased ‘from the roll kept at the Society’s Headquarters, Adyar!’ It is a sorry document, this, to be issued by the man who could — had he so chosen — have kept the Theosophical movement one and undivided.”	The Path , Vol. 10, July 1895; pp.134-135
June 14, 1895 continued	Letter from Mr. Judge to E.T. Hargrove. “Claude [Wright] is now running the T.S. office in my absence, as it appears I shall have to stay away a considerable time. I am on the move like a pilgrim. But I am better a little each day. Been with Dr. Buck for a month.” NOTE: Judge often stayed in Cincinnati with his friend Dr. Buck. He would at times use Buck’s residence as his home base from which he could take short trips to establish new Theosophical Lodges in the Midwest or central US. After the Boston Convention Judge went to Cincinnati to relax and possibly get more Homeopathic treatments from Dr. Buck. [See Jan. 17, 1895 for Judge’s May 20 th letter, from Cincinnati, concerning his health.]	Letters from WQJ to Hargrove , <i>see</i> Appendix D, Part V.
June 15, 1895	Annie Besant attacked the formation of T.S. in America, called it a ‘secession.’ “The only comfort remaining to the disembodied ghosts of the thousands of self-imagined members of the non-existent Society, and to Colonel Olcott, their shadowy and illegal chief, is that he is graciously allowed to retain the ‘unique and honorary title of President-Founder,’ by the Theosophical Society of America — an honorary title truly, as he presides over nothing, and is founder of a non-existing organization.”	Irish Theosophist , Vol. 3, June 1895; p.166 Lucifer , Vol. 16, June 1895; pp.265-266

<p>June 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>Extracts of H.P.B.'s letters on W.Q.J. were published. The Editor states: “Some [letters] are written as late as 1890. . . . Two are . . . to Mr. Judge . . . who was prevailed upon to give them to friends on account of their prophetic nature. — ED.”</p> <p>“If knowing that W.Q.J. is the only man in the E.S. in whom I have confidence enough not to have extracted from him a pledge. . . . There is nothing I would not do for him and I will stick to him till death through thick and thin. . . . He has to be defended whether he will or not. . . .</p> <p>“I trust Judge more than anyone in the world. . . . He has numerous enemies who work against him underhand and openly too. . . .”</p> <p>H.P.B.'s comments on value of The Path magazine: “He <i>who does all and the best that he can</i> and knows how does ENOUGH for Them. This is a <i>message</i> for Judge. His <i>Path</i> begins to beat <i>The Theosophist</i> out of sight. It is most excellent. . . . <i>The Path</i> alone <i>is his certificate</i> for him in Theosophy.”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, June 1895; pp.154-157</p> <p>Letters That Have Helped Me, p.279</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, June 1895; p.154</p> <p>Theos. or Neo-Theos. by Margaret Thomas, p.56</p>
<p>June 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“Dr. J.D. Buck.” Profile of J.D. Buck who helped with the organization of T.S. in America.</p>	<p>The Lamp, Vol. 1, June 1895; p.161</p>
<p>June 19, 1895</p>	<p>Letter “<i>To the Editor of THE VAHAN.</i>” from Herbert Burrows. “Four people, Mrs. Besant, Mrs. Keightley, Dr. Keightley, and Mr. Hargrove, were present at a particular interview. Three of them flatly contradict the other, and that other flatly contradicts them, on a subject about which it seems there could be no possible mistake. . . . and I can only say that somebody comes perilously near lying.</p> <p>“Now this exceedingly unpleasant further fact has to be faced, that Mrs. Besant knew of this alleged duplicity. About that there is no dispute. But she held her tongue, and allowed Mr. Mead and others to hug to their hearts the delusion that ‘Che-Yew-Tsang’ was a great occultist.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 15, 1895 for Albert Smythe’s comments on this issue.</p> <p>Mead (as Editor) commented that: “It is perfectly absurd to try to make Mrs. Besant responsible for the floating of the Che-Yew-Tsang Legend, as she left England shortly after the appearance of the first article, Oct. 15th, 1893; in fact, she was only in England for a fortnight between her return from America and her departure for India.”</p> <p>NOTE: [This is an interesting comment from Mead, given the efficiency of the Post delivery in those days and Mrs. Besant’s ability to reply to other letters or articles on short notice — for example her quick and lengthy reply to the Westminster Gazette, Dec. 23rd, 1894, shortly after arriving at Colombo on Dec. 19th, 1894.]</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, July 1895; pp.4-5</p>

June 20, 1895	<p>“The Coming Convention.” W.A. Bulmer called attention to Annie Besant’s resolution “. . . which it seems to me to fall short of being satisfactory” and suggested amendments for consideration.</p> <p>“Our Rules and Constitution.” Suggestions for improvements to the Rules and Constitution of the T.S. by W.A. Bulmer.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, July 1895; Supplement</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 4, Apr. 1895; Supplement</p>
June 27, 1895	<p>European Section General Council Meeting.</p> <p>Summary of dissent encountered at opening of the fifth Annual Convention of the European Section of the T.S. NOTE: See June 1, 1895 entry.</p> <p>Olcott’s views on changing the Constitution of the T.S.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.253-54 [253-258]</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, July 1895; pp.358-359</p> <p>pp.415-421</p>
June 27, 1895 continued	<p>W.Q. Judge referred to his letter of May 2nd, 1895 to Olcott, and answered Olcott’s June 5th EXECUTIVE NOTICE — regarding the retention of property by T.S. in America.</p> <p>“The American Society became ‘The Theosophical Society in America’ and legally turned over to its successor its archives and property; and as the Section ceased to exist on April 28th; and as neither Col. Olcott nor any other person has any right, title or interest in the property of the former Section, and never did have, his demand is ridiculous.”</p> <p>NOTE: See June 5, 1895 entry, for Olcott’s EXECUTIVE NOTICE.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Aug. 1895; p.164</p> <p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 1, July 1895; pp.45-46</p>
June 27, 1895 continued	<p>“SECESSION OF MR. JUDGE’S SUPPORTERS.”</p> <p>“The supporters of Mr. Judge have (as we learn from the <i>Irish Theosophist</i>) seceded from the Theosophical Society and formed themselves into a new body under the Presidency of Mr. Judge. Lodges and members joining in this act of secession, <i>ipso facto</i>, cease to be members of the Theosophical Society.”</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 5, Aug. 1895; pp.1-2</p>
June 27, 1895 continued	<p>H.S. Olcott appointed “A.P. Sinnett, of London, to be Vice-President of the Society, to fill the present vacancy” created by W.Q. Judge.</p> <p>NOTE: See June 5, 1895 entry, for Olcott’s EXECUTIVE NOTICE where he declares the office of Vice-President vacant.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, July 1895; p.425</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, Aug. 1895; Supp. p.xliv</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 5, Aug. 1895; p.1</p>

July 1895	<p>“H.P.B. ON MESSAGES FROM MASTERS.” by W.Q. Judge. Parts of H.P.B.’s article “<i>Lodges of Magic</i>” are reprinted in which “the question of the genuineness or the opposite of such messages was dealt with. . . . It covers two matters. “<i>First</i> . . . ‘if one letter has to be doubted then all have’ to be doubted. . . . “<i>Second</i>, it applies precisely to the present state of affairs in respect to messages from Masters . . . such as the present agitators . . . might have something to show them how to use their judgement.” The selected portion is then printed.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; pp.125-127</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 3, Oct. 1888; pp.89-93</p> <p>HPB Theos. Articles, Vol. 1, p.287</p>
July 1895 continued	<p>Mr. Bulmer’s remarks: “The ‘governing spirit’ has been the evil genius of many a promising institution. . . It crept into the T.S. under the guise of judicial inquiry into the acts of a brother member. . . . “. . . It is not on official ties that the union of the T.S. depends, but on similarity of aim and object. . . . To my mind, the action of the American lodges was no breach of the Constitution T.S., it was a revolt against Rules which were being used to bring about a result they strongly objected to.” [Also: “The Coming Convention” p.68]</p>	<p>Northern Theos. Vol. 2, July 1895; pp.67-68</p>
July 1895 continued	<p>“ABSENCE OF WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.” “I am compelled to absent myself from Headquarters because of the state of my health, as the great amount of overwork during the past few years, and the terrific strain I have been subjected to for over a year, added to a bad cold contracted in Chicago last December while visiting the Branches have made great inroads on my physical health which must be repaired.”</p> <p>Extracts from Mrs. Tingley’s Private Notes: Published by Helen Harris with her [K.T.’s] permission. “After [18]95 Convention, when Mr. Judge was quite ill, he called to see me before starting on his trip South, and in conversation gave me the names of E.A. Neresheimer, H.T. Patterson, J.H. Fussell, James M. Pryse, and C.A. Griscom Jr., as the persons who might be called quickly in case anything should happen to him, that they might act as a Council to assist me in anything I wished to undertake for the protection of the E.S.T., the T.S., and the general work. He defined most carefully the fitness of these people and how each one could aid. He also named others in England and Ireland, two of whom, D.N. Dunlop and Wm. Lindsay, are now in this country, but he did not name Mr. E.T.H. [Hargrove].” NOTE: See July 11, 1929 entry, re: Katherine Tingley.</p> <p>NOTE: Mr. Hargrove was in Barmouth, England when he wrote to Judge on July 20th, saying that he “had arranged matters with my parents, and was sailing for New York at an early date.” He left London on Aug. 24th, 1895. Mr. Hargrove arrived on Aug. 30th. [See Aug. 30th 1895.]</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 1, No. 3, July 1895; p.48</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Aug. 1895; p.168</p> <p>The Formation of The Council, 1 page</p> <p>The Search Light, Apr. 1898; p.29</p> <p>Letter from W.Q.J. to Hargrove, Aug. 5, 1895 and Aug. 23, 1895</p>

July 1, 1895	<p>OPEN LETTER TO COL. H. S. OLCOTT.</p> <p>“In the ‘General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S.’ held at Adyar, Dec. 25, 1894, it is reported that Miss F. Henrietta Müller made use of the following language: ‘We have once had before a specimen of this policy of Mr. Judge. Do we not remember at the time of my first visit, in 1891 or 1892, that Mr. Judge brought some very serious charges against Col. Olcott?’</p> <p>“According to the same report you were Chairman of the meeting where and when this was said, and Mrs. Besant and Mr. Bertram Keightley were also present.</p> <p>“As you all knew the absolute falsity of the statement, we assume that your prompt denial of it, on the spot, was overlooked, owing to the hurry and excitement which prevailed at the time. Our belief in your desire for fairness also compels us to assume that you were not responsible for the printing of Miss Müller’s remarks, verbatim, in the <i>Theosophist</i> and ‘General Report’, without correction of the misstatement.</p> <p>“The same reason compels us to the further assumption that it is only necessary to bring the oversight to your attention to have you do all that is possible to correct the error.</p> <p>“It is gazetted that you are to preside at the Convention of the European Section which will be held at London, July 4. It will no doubt be peculiarly gratifying to you to have the opportunity of making the correction in as public a manner as the original error was committed, and at a similar gathering.</p> <p>“The statement of Miss Müller has provoked considerable enquiry in this country as to what the real reasons were that led to your resignation in 1892, and it is for the interests of all that no injustice should be done.”</p> <p>Trustfully yours, Leoline Leonard, Mary H. Wade, George D. Ayers, L.F. Wade.</p> <p>NOTE: See General Report of the Nineteenth Anniversary of the Theosophical Society, Dec. 25-28, 1894, pp.51-53 for Miss Müller’s comments.</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 1906 for biographical sketch on Miss Müller.</p>	<p>New England Notes, Vol. 1, July 1, 1895; p.2</p>
July 4, 1895	<p>Convention of the European Section Meeting.</p> <p>“Olcott informed the delegates of Mr. Judge’s letter, but declined to present it on the grounds that its ‘discourteous form of address’ constituted an ‘insult’ to the Society.”</p> <p>Copy of the official letter sent to be read at the European Convention from W.Q Judge and the Executive Committee in America.</p> <p>NOTE: See next cell for more details of the First Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in Europe held in London.</p> <p>Also see June 1, 1895 entry.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.253</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, July 1895; pp.134-136,</p>

<p>July 4, 1895 continued</p>	<p>Fifth Annual Convention of the European Section T.S. held at London, July 4th and 5th, 1895. Report of Proceedings up to Noon on July 4th. First Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in Europe, held at London, July 4th and 5th, 1895. Report of Proceedings.</p> <p>“Mr. Dick (Dublin): I beg to rise once more to a point of order. A communication from the Society in America has been received, I understand, by the officials here. Some of us have also received copies of the official letter, and we certainly think that it would be a matter of ordinary courtesy both to read the letter and propose some reply thereto.”</p> <p>“Dr. Archibald Keightley, President of the H.P.B. Lodge, then asked that a resolution of Mr. Coryn’s challenging the <i>de jure</i> existence of the Society, should be taken before the election of officers. The president ruled that the motion was out of order. . . .”</p> <p>“Mrs. Annie Besant: . . . the preamble of the letter is meant to prejudice the case. . . . It is in inverted commas, and meant to point to the fact that we are a non-existent body. . . . I would pray you not to indorse it, for to accept it in any way would be to deny your own existence, which is an absurdity. . . . I would ask . . . to allow the letter to be read, and then let it lie on the table, passing it over in absolute silence so to speak — (‘No’); because if we indorse it, we condemn a large number of our brothers; if we accept it, we also condemn others. . . .”</p> <p>“The Chairman then read the letter which had been received from the Society in New York, which was received with loud applause.”</p> <p>“At 2:45 p.m. a large meeting was held by those holding to the principles of Theosophy . . . for the purpose of organizing the T.S. in Europe.”</p> <p>“On the motion of Dr. Coryn, William Q. Judge was unanimously and with acclamation elected President of the T.S. in Europe.”</p>	<p>Report of Proceedings European Section, Pamphlet, 46pages</p> <p>p.19</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, July 1895; pp.353, 358-360</p> <p>Report of Proceedings European Section, Pamphlet, 46pages, pp.23-25</p> <p>p.27</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Aug. 1895; pp.164-166</p> <p>p.166</p>
-----------------------------------	--	--

<p>July 4, 1895 continued</p>	<p>Mr. G. Mellis voiced a protest as to whether Olcott should chair the meeting “on the ground that the charges brought against him by Mrs. Besant had not been cleared up. . . .”</p> <p>Besant denied making any charges against Olcott. “I rise to say that I have brought no charges of any kind against Colonel Olcott.”</p> <p>This was apparently greeted with “Astonished silence among the members acquainted with the facts.”</p> <p>NOTE: See The Theosophical Movement (1875-1925) pp. 326-333 for a brief history of this incident.</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 1895 for “The Resignation Mystery, 1892.”</p> <p>“With reference to Mrs. Besant’s statement at the ‘European Section’ Convention, that she had ‘brought no charges of any kind against Colonel Olcott,’ Bro. E. A. Neresheimer of New York writes, ‘that in case some confusion should exist in the minds of those not acquainted with the facts,’ he thinks it right to state that Mrs. Besant went to the U.S. in 1892 expressly for the purpose of bringing accusations against Colonel Olcott, and that upon the strength of those accusations Colonel Olcott was asked to resign. He also states that the account given by Mr. Judge in his reply is correct.”</p> <p>Report from Alice Cleather: “The public withdrawal of Mr. Herbert Burrows from the T.S., news of which has doubtless reached you, seems to have created some little stir. He sent a letter of explanation to half the principal dailies in the kingdom apparently, so the public feel they know all about it. In his withdrawal he raises the question of Mrs. Besant’s denial of ever having brought charges against the President-Founder.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Oct. 2, 1895, for more information about Besant’s denial.</p>	<p>Report of Proceedings European Section, p.2</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Aug. 1895; p.165</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Sep. 1895; p.228</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Nov. 1895; p.264</p>
<p>July 5, 1895</p>	<p>Letter from H.S. Olcott to George E. Wright. “I am in receipt of your joint letter of June 1st, asking to be officially recognised as the <i>American Section of the Theosophical Society</i>, and expressing your wish to appoint Mr Alexander Fullerton as Acting General Secretary.”</p> <p>Olcott’s response: “I heartily approve of your choice. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 20, 1895 entry.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Aug. 1895; p.514</p>

<p>July 5, 1895 continued</p>	<p>Convention of European Section continued: “Olcott declared that the former American Section had seceded from the Theosophical Society, thereby abrogating its charter, and asserted that the T.S. in America, formed at Boston, was ‘an adventitious body, the growth of circumstances, and having no real corporate authority over its Sections and Branches’.”</p> <p>“FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN EUROPE. (ORGANIZED AUTONOMOUSLY AS SUCH.)”</p> <p>“Following the proceedings [of the Fourth Annual Convention of the European Section, July 4 & 5], the delegates, members of branches and unattached members who had found it necessary to protest against the actions of the ‘European Section T. S.,’ first, in rejecting the resolution of Dr. Coryn to consider the legal relation of the co-called ‘European Section T.S.’ to the Parent Society established at New York in 1875, and second, the refusal to send a fraternal reply to the letter of greeting sent by the T.S. in America, assembled. . . . Dr. Coryn was elected chairman, and D.N. Dunlop was elected secretary to the meeting. . . .</p> <p>“Dr. Keightley, having arrived, then took the chair. . . .</p> <p>“Dr. Coryn moved and G. Mellis seconded ‘that Mr. William Q. Judge be President of the T.S. in Europe. . . .</p> <p>“The Letter of Greeting from the ‘T.S. in America’ to the ‘European Section T.S.’ was then considered, and E.T. Hargrove read a draft reply thereto. This was agreed to and accepted, subject to the altered conditions, and was ordered to be sent. [The Letter was sent July 6th, 1895.] . . .</p> <p>“The representatives of the English group of Branches then proceeded to elect officers for current year as follows: Dr. Keightley, President; W.A. Bulmer, Vice-President; and H.T. Edge, Treasurer. . . .</p> <p>“The Irish delegates also met and proceeded to elect officers for their national division as follows: D.N. Dunlop, President; Geo. W. Russell, Vice-President; F.J. Dick, Treasurer.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Lucifer, Vol.16, July and August 1895; pp.358 and 415.</p> <p>NOTE: See July 4, 1895 Fifth Annual Convention of the European Section T.S. held at London, July 4th and 5th, 1895. Report of Proceedings. First Annual Convention of the T.S. in Europe, pp.39-46</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.254</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, July 1895; pp.182-188</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Aug. 1895; pp.165-166 Sep. 1895; p.198 Oct. 1895; pp.230-231</p>
-----------------------------------	--	---

<p>July 6, 1895</p>	<p>“GREETING FROM T.S. IN EUROPE.” Official greetings sent to T.S. in America from the newly formed Theosophical Society in Europe. Signed by A. Keightley, as “Chairman, First Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in Europe”.</p> <p>“REPLY TO THE T.S. IN EUROPE.” by William Q. Judge (Dated Sep.13, 1895.) W.Q. Judge acknowledged the letter and agreed to be President. “I now formally and officially accept, and send you also my congratulations.”</p> <p>The reorganized Theosophical Movement in Europe continued: “The Theosophical Society in Europe.” “This Society is an integral part of The International Theosophical Movement which began in New York in the year 1875.” Lists Branches of T.S. in Europe (England).</p> <p>“THIRD ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE ‘THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN EUROPE (ENGLAND)’.” This meeting was held in Liverpool on Sunday, Aug.1st, 1897.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Oct. 1895; pp.231-232</p> <p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 1, Sep. 1895; p.80</p> <p>The Grail, Vol. 1, May 1897; pp.61-62</p> <p>Aug/Sep. 1897; p.109</p>
<p>July 15, 1895</p>	<p>“THE PRAYAG LETTER.” Annie Besant published 3 letters of W.Q.J.’s on the “Prayag Letter which Judge had published in the Path under title ‘A MAHATMA’S MESSAGE TO SOME BRAHMANS’.” Besant stated: “I do not regard the letter as genuine, <i>but I have never attributed it to H.P.B. . . .</i> “The publication of the letter, if it should be regarded as from H.P.B., may do some harm to the Theosophical Society in India, and will certainly injure her memory, as it is in flagrant contradiction with her definite and published teachings.”</p> <p>NOTE: See March 15, 1895 and March 27, 1895.</p> <p>NOTE: This letter better known as the “Prayag Letter” was written by H.P.B. but incorporates a dictation by Master “M” for A.P. Sinnett, warning him of the <i>Shasters</i> and the dangerous forces surrounding superstitions.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, July 1895; pp.375-379</p>
<p>Aug. 15, 1895</p>	<p>“European Section” “Since [the Convention of the European Section], the members withdrawing from the meeting with their friends have formed a new society, to be known as the Theosophical Society in Europe. To prevent any misunderstanding as to the reason for this step, Mr. Judge has been elected President. . . .”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Aug. 1895; pp.512-513</p>

<p>Aug. 15, 1895 continued</p>	<p>On the expectation of Hargrove's visit to Toronto, Albert Smythe gives his comments on the Che-Yew-Tsang controversy.</p> <p>"Mr. Hargrove's literary ability has been the source of a notable controversy. Under the pseudonym or psychonym of Che-Yew-Tsang he addressed two articles entitled, 'Some Modern Failings,' to <i>Lucifer</i>, which that journal published in October and December, 1893. The Editor was made aware of the identity of the author, but the associate editor was not until some time subsequently, when, smarting under the impression that he had been 'had' somewhere, and by a Chinaman at that, he challenged the right of anyone to conceal himself under a <i>nom-de-plume</i>. If people rely on their own judgement and approve or disapprove of the utterances they meet with, not according to the source from which they may understand these utterances to emanate, but according to their intrinsic value as it appears to them they will avoid the necessity of untimely recantations."</p> <p>NOTE: See March 1895, May 1, 1895, May 14, 1895, May 21, 1895, and June 19, 1895 entries.</p>	<p>The Lamp, Vol. 2, Aug. 1895; p.1</p>
<p>Aug. 17, 1895</p>	<p>A Letter to Mrs. Annie Besant on The recent Crisis in the Theosophist Movement. From Amy Constance Morant.</p> <p>"Then came your letter of the 11th of June (in answer to mine reporting progress) in which you said, as you will remember, 'I have no intention, further, of entering into any platform controversy on the Judge question, having done all that I consider to be my duty about him' . . ."</p> <p>In her conclusion, Morant stated:</p> <p>"I am compelled now — as once before, many years ago, in a large Socialist meeting I was compelled — to act and speak in direct and uncompromising opposition to the course you are pursuing."</p> <p>Morant also "[e]xplains that the American Section had only voted for autonomy, but Olcott in his June 5 EXECUTIVE NOTICE had declared 'that by so doing, they had seceded.' Says she will follow Judge as Pres. of the T.S. in Europe."</p> <p>NOTE: Morant's pamphlet also includes a brief reply by A. Besant dated Aug. 22, 1895.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 4 pages</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 1986, p.544</p>

<p>Aug. 23, 1895</p>	<p>PRESIDENT OLCOTT'S EXPLANATION.</p> <p>The Editor, L.F. Wade, explained why Colonel Olcott's statements are wrong in his June 5th, "EXECUTIVE NOTICE". Wade quoted H.S. Olcott from Lucifer, July 1895, pp.423-424 as stating that:</p> <p>"1.) The Council (of the original <i>New York Society</i>), at a meeting in 1878, gave the President full discretionary powers to establish Headquarters wherever he chose, and to adopt whatever measures he saw fit in the Society's interest, thus ratifying in advance all that he did;</p> <p>"2.) The record of this act of the council is 'in Mr. Judge's own handwriting', although 'Mr. Gustam was the then Recording Secretary T.S.'</p> <p>"It is well known principle of law that <i>you cannot delegate to another a power you do not possess yourself</i>. It is a well known principle of common sense that <i>you cannot give to another what you haven't got</i>." He further explained these positions by stating that a mere inspection of the By-laws of the Society founded at New York in 1875 prove this.</p> <p>Wade concluded:</p> <p>"The fact is that H.S. Olcott and H.P. Blavatsky started a <i>new Theosophical Society in India in 1878</i>, and it had no legal connection with the one 'organized at New York, Oct 30, 1875'."</p> <p>NOTE: See April 26, 1895, also June 5 and 27, 1895.</p>	<p>New England Notes, Vol. 1, Aug. 1895; pp.2-3</p>
<p>Aug. 30, 1895</p>	<p>VISIT OF E. T. HARGROVE.</p> <p>"Mr. Ernest T. Hargrove arrived on the <i>St. Louis</i> from England on the 30th of August. Mr. Hargrove is coming to this country to lecture and aid in other fields of labour for the Cause. No definite tour has been mapped out for Mr. Hargrove so far, but further particulars of his work will appear in the PATH."</p> <p>NOTE: See July 1895 entry regarding Hargrove's departure from England.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Sep. 1895; p.199</p>
<p>Sep. 1895</p>	<p>"UNFOUNDED CHARGES"</p> <p>In a letter to the Editor, Claude Falls Wright wrote:</p> <p>"Mr. Alfred Faulding states that on a letter received by him from me some weeks ago, were written some words in another handwriting from my own. He therefore accuses me (to others, not to myself,) of having written the sentence or sentences in that other handwriting and of trying to make him believe these were written from Master. As I did not put the writing there, and as I did not cause anyone else to put the writing there, and as I was not aware until I thus heard through a third party of its existence on my letter, I have written to Mr. Faulding denying such charge and make this public statement in order that all friends may know the actual facts in the case. . . .</p> <p>". . . Certain it is that I did not put it on, and certain it is that Mr. Faulding has stated that the writing is there.</p> <p>"It seems to me that all have had lessons enough in accusing brothers of misdeeds."</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Sep. 1895; pp.191-192</p>

Sep. 1895 continued	The Northern Theosophist was discontinued “owing to some difference of opinion among its proprietors”. It was announced that The English Theosophist , which succeeded it “is an old friend with a new name but the same dress.”	The Path , Vol. 10, Nov. 1895; p.259
Sep. 7, 1895	<p>“EXECUTIVE NOTICE. THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.”</p> <p>H.S. Olcott issued an Executive Notice (from London), giving text of early Resolutions of July 16, 1877 and August 27, 1878 whereby the President received unrestricted powers over any and all aspects of the conduct of the TS anywhere and in any way.</p> <p>Also included is his explanation as to what happened after H.P.B. and he moved to India, the formation of New Branches, and the “comatose” state of affairs in New York. [last page]</p> <p>Same as in The Theosophist above.</p>	<p>Circular, 4 pages</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 17, Oct. 1895; Supp. pp.i-iii</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 16, Oct. 1895; pp.164-167</p> <p>Prasnottara, Vol. 5, Oct. 1895; pp.129-135</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 5, Oct. 1895; pp.1-3</p>

<p>Sep. 7, 1895 continued</p>	<p>“THEOSOPHICAL RECORDS AGAIN.”</p> <p>“Under date of September 7, 1895, Col. H.S. Olcott issued a circular intended to disprove the Boston claim of the <i>de facto</i> character of the T.S. under his rule. It consists of two documents, one signed by William Q. Judge and the other by A. Gustam. To these are added remarks by Col. Olcott. The two papers are to the effect that he may practically do as he likes while away, but they do not remove the centre from New York, nor do they support the Colonel’s claim or validate his acts. There are several reasons why this is so.</p> <p>“<i>First</i>, the papers are illegal, mere scribblings by himself and Mr. Judge in those old days.</p> <p>“<i>Second</i>, there never was a quorum present.</p> <p>“<i>Third</i>, they are not in any book as he says, for the original minute-book of the T.S. is in New York City, which it never left. Col. Olcott wrote Mr. Judge not so long ago asking him to send that minute-book. We can print his letter if he likes.</p> <p>“<i>Fourth</i>, in order to make the proceedings legal, so that subsequent acts under them would be legal, it was necessary to issue a call for a full meeting. This was not done; no one was notified, because then none would come, and Olcott wanted documents of some kind or another to show when he went abroad, intending afterwards to have everything made regular.</p> <p>“Hence, as shown at Boston, his subsequent orders and executive meetings, carried on without call in most cases, were all <i>de facto</i>. If he had issued a regular call, then the meetings at New York would have been regular and succeeding acts valid.</p> <p>“The two papers published in the circular were written at the flat occupied by H.P.B., in West 47th street, New York, and doubtless she was counted in as part of any proposed quorum; any chance visitor would also be counted. Nobody cared, for the real theosophical movement was then, as ever after, in the hands of H.P.B. and her unseen helpers. None of those cared for formalities but were looking for workers. And she, later, laughed at his forms, when in 1890 she declared herself ‘President of the Theosophical Society in Europe’.”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 1, Oct. 1895; pp.95-96</p>
<p>Sep. 7, 1895 continued</p>	<p>NOTE: What appears to be the Original Minute book is in the Archives of The Theosophical Society (International) Pasadena. Photos of this book and its first few pages hang on the walls of Edmonton Theosophical Society Library.</p> <p>See: Nov. 1950 for C. Jinarajadasa’s comments with regards to where the Minute Book of the Society was located.</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 28, 1895 and Dec. 27, 1896 entries.</p>	
<p>Sep. 7, 1895 continued</p>	<p>Summary of Olcott’s Executive Notice.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 17, Nov. 1895; p.119</p>

Oct. 1895 early	<p>William Q. Judge was quite ill and decided to leave New York and go to Asheville, South Carolina to find a better climate. By the end of October Mr. Judge went further south to Aiken, SC, where E.T. Hargrove spent two weeks with him during the Christmas season. Judge left Aiken on Jan. 9, 1896 for Cincinnati.</p> <p>NOTE: See "THE LAST DAYS OF W.Q. JUDGE." A copy can be found in Appendix F, No. 4.</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, May 1896; pp.34-37</p>
Oct. 1895	<p>"<i>OUR SEVENTEENTH YEAR.</i>"</p> <p>Olcott wrote: "The secession of the majority of the American Section, and the conversion of the <i>Path</i> into an adverse organ, seem to call for special effort on the part of loyal members to increase the circulation of the <i>Theosophist</i>, so that the Truth about the Society may be made known, and the sad misrepresentations, now too much resorted to, be in some measure counteracted."</p> <p>"We are told THE PATH has become an 'adverse organ' (!) whatever that may mean."</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 17, Oct. 1895; p.2</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Dec. 1895; p.293</p>
Oct. 2, 1895	<p>"MR. HERBERT BURROWS AND THE T.S. (ADYAR)."</p> <p>Herbert Burrows publicly resigned from T.S.: "The recent disclosures of fraud, which have split the Society, led me to further investigations . . . which have thoroughly convinced me that for years deception in the Society has been rampant — deception to which Mme. Blavatsky was sometimes a party. . . . ". . . To the charges of fraud brought by Mrs. Besant against Mr. Judge, the late vice-president, may be added accusations of grave immorality against Col. Olcott, laid before him by Mrs. Besant and Mr. Judge, and in consequence of which the Colonel resigned his presidency."</p> <p>Mr. W.T. Stead, Editor, examined the various charges which Mr. Burrows had "flung in the face of his colleagues". "Mr. Burrows' letter of resignation is a serious indictment of the Theosophical Society as it now exists."</p> <p>"Mr. Herbert Burrows deems it indispensable that he should come forward and publicly shake off the dust from his feet as a testimony, not against Mr. Judge or against H.P. Blavatsky, but against the Theosophical Society which has buried H.P. Blavatsky, and cast out Mr. Judge."</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 21, 1892, H.S. Olcott resigned as President.</p>	<p>English Theosophist, Vol. 1, Nov. 1895; p.22</p> <p>Light, Vol. 15, Oct. 5, 1895; p.482</p> <p>Borderland, Vol. 2, Oct. 1895; pp.344-345</p> <p>English Theosophist, Vol. 1, Nov. 1895; pp.19-20</p>

Oct. 2, 1895 continued	<p>Follow up letter from H. Burrows to the Editor of the English Theosophist.</p> <p>“Let me jog Mr. Sinnett’s memory by reminding him of one fact. He personally declared to me that Mr. Judge was trained in all his fraud by Madame Blavatsky. I may have to jog his memory on other matters, but that will do for the present. Mrs. Besant <i>knows</i> that both Col. Olcott and Mr. Sinnett believe Madame Blavatsky to have been fraudulent; but she has had as yet neither the moral courage nor the honesty to say so. On the contrary, she quotes them in <i>Lucifer</i> as the all-round staunch and firm upholders of H.P.B., while at the same time she upbraids those who wish the real truth known as besmirchers and practical traitors.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 23, 1894, H. Burrows on the “Judge Case.”</p>	<p>English Theosophist, Vol. 1, Dec. 1895; p.32</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Nov. 1895; p.264 Jan. 1896; p.328</p>
Oct. 21, 1895	<p>“The ‘Theosophical Society in Australasia’ will be an accomplished fact. . . . The Sydney Lodge had a very enthusiastic meeting, and drew up a draft constitution similar to that of Europe or America. W.Q. Judge was unanimously elected President. . . . In a week or two there will be a formal meeting in Sydney at which the New Zealand centres will be represented, and then the constitution will be finally adopted.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Jan. 1896; p.327 Feb. 1896; p.360</p>
Oct. 26, 1895	<p>“The Theosophical Society.” by Herbert Burrows.</p> <p>“Some months ago, Mr. Green, writing in ‘Lucifer,’ and speaking of Mr. Judge as ‘the greatest known occultist in the Theosophical Society,’ asked this general question of Theosophists: ‘Are <i>you</i> a rash and ignorant man ready to oppose your puny self to the mighty force of the Theosophical Society, in the person of its leader, W. Q. Judge?’ This question embodies the attitude of most of the Judgeites towards those who venture to offer any criticism, either of the views of the Judge section on Theosophy as they interpret it, or of any Theosophical leader. Already I have been asked by some of them how I ‘dare attack’ Madame Blavatsky. The quotation I give from Mr. Green contrasts strangely with that which he gives from Madame Blavatsky as to the inner self being prosecutor, defence, jury, and judge. Mr. Green blames Mrs. Besant, and I believe rightly, for her present attitude and teaching, but the real fact is that there is as much nonsensical popery in one section of the Theosophical Society as there is in the other, and the sooner both sections are rid of it the better for the best spiritual interests of all.”</p> <p>NOTE: Mr Burrows refers to Thomas Green’s article “A Word to the Wise” from Lucifer Jan. 1895. Also see Jan. 1895 entry.</p>	<p>Light, Vol. 15, Oct. 26, 1895; p.520</p>
Nov. 1895	<p>“THE STATE AND PROGRESS OF THINGS.”</p> <p>“The following is a list of all the branches now forming the T.S. in America, that is, of all those branches who have properly united with the T.S.A. and have their charters endorsed. There are other branches yet to come. . . .”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Nov. 1895; p.264</p>

<p>Nov. 15, 1895</p>	<p>“SPIRITUALISM AND THEOSOPHY: THEIR LIKENESS AND UNLIKENESS.”</p> <p>Mr. Herbert Burrows delivered an address at a meeting of the members and friends of the London Spiritualist Alliance. He claimed: “A good many Theosophists had arrived at their Theosophy by way of Spiritualism; that was partly his own case and also that of Mrs. Besant. . . . Roughly speaking, there were two classes of Theosophists on the one side, and two classes of Spiritualists on the other, and he might classify the two divisions, in each case, as the wise and the foolish. . . . He meant by foolish people those who were inclined to take a materialistic view of the higher truths. . . .</p> <p>“ . . . The wise Theosophist did not attempt to explain the meaning of Occultism in its widest sense in any mathematical way.”</p> <p>In W.T. Stead’s “CHARACTER SKETCH” of Mrs. Annie Besant, he mentioned that before she came to Theosophy, Mrs. Besant was writing reviews occasionally for the Pall Mall Gazette. “It was about this time that Mrs. Besant, with Mr. Herbert Burrows, began to investigate at regular seances the phenomena of spiritualism.”</p> <p>NOTE: See also Aug. 30, 1891.</p> <p>NOTE: Annie Besant mentioned in her 1875 to 1891 A Fragment of Autobiography, on page 10, that in 1889 “I had experimented, to some extent, then, and many years before, in Spiritualism, and found some facts and much folly. . . .”</p>	<p>Light, Vol. 23, Nov. 23, 1895; pp.562-563</p> <p>Review of Reviews, Vol. 4, Oct. 1891; pp.365-366</p>
<p>Dec. 1895</p>	<p>“The Resignation Mystery, 1892.”</p> <p>“In the interests of Truth and the Adyar T.S., the mystery which now surrounds the resignation of Col. Olcott in 1892 needs clearing up. . . . The beginning of the present state of uncertainty was the speech made in India by Miss Müller, who stated that Mr. Judge had made a serious charge against Colonel Olcott, with a view to getting him out of the Presidency of the T.S. It is stated that both Col. Olcott and Mrs. Besant were present and did not contradict the speaker.”</p> <p>Included is Mr. Judge’s reply to the charges and correcting the facts: “When no resignation was thought of and Olcott had just returned from India, from the United States and Australia, Mrs. Besant hurriedly took steamer for New York, previously cabling me an ominous message. She arrived here (N.Y.) and informed me (Judge) that she had come over in such haste in order to lay before me as Vice-President, and the only one she had confidence in, a very grave accusation against Colonel Olcott, which, if true, required his resignation. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 1, 1895 for more on Miss Müller’s comments.</p> <p>NOTE: See Oct. 21, 1892 for A. Besant’s explanation why she did not travel to India in 1891-1892.</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 18, 1891 and Nov. 27, 1891 entries. Also see Jan. 21, 1892 on Olcott’s resignation and July 4, 1895 for Neresheimer’s reply to Besant’s denials.</p>	<p>English Theosophist, Vol. 1, Dec. 1895; p.28</p>

Dec. 1895 continued	<p>“The Resignation Mystery, 1892.” (continued) Upon hearing of Mrs. Besant’s denial at the Adyar convention, Mr. Neresheimer wrote: “I beg to state that Mrs. Besant came to the United States in the year 1892 expressly for the purpose of consulting with Mr. Judge and others about certain charges against Colonel Olcott which resulted, after considerable pressure being exercised by her, in the request to Colonel Olcott to resign the Presidency of the Theosophical Society. This request was made by Mrs. Besant, Mr. Judge, and myself. The account of her visit to us, and her accusations against Colonel Olcott given by Mr. W.Q. Judge in his reply is correct, and those same accusations were repeated by her to me. It is quite true that Mrs. Besant made no written or legally framed charges against Colonel Olcott, but she made them to Mr. Judge and myself. “Herbert Burrows . . . ‘further investigations’, led him in October to leave the Adyar Society.” NOTE: See Oct. 2, 1895 for Burrows resignation. NOTE: See also Jan. 21, 1892, H.S. Olcott resigned as President.</p>	<p>English Theosophist, Vol. 1, Dec. 1895; p.28</p>
Dec. 1895 continued	<p>“On the Watch-Tower.” Mrs. Besant’s editorial comments. Annie Besant changed her teachings on Mars, Mercury and Earth. NOTE: See The Path Vol. 8, Dec. 1893, pp.270-271; Lucifer Vol. 13, Nov. 1893, p.206. “Those of us who are accustomed to Mrs. Besant’s rapid changes of mind will not be surprised to read in the ‘Watch Tower’ her latest self-contradiction.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 17, Dec. 1895; p.271 The Path, Vol. 10, Feb. 1896; p.355 Mar. 1896; pp.362-363</p>
Dec. 27-30, 1895	<p>“The Adyar Convention.” Indian Section of T.S. Convention, Adyar and Twentieth Anniversary of the Theosophical Society. Comments by Mr. Judge: “Mr. Fullerton, reporting his doings from the U.S., asserts that ‘the Section’ has suffered from the loss of its property; ‘its money, records, rolls, diplomas, charters, circulars, leaflets, seal and documents of every kind having been seized [which means stolen] by Mr. Judge’s Society. . . . He omitted to say that the T.S. in A. offered every malcontent a <i>per capita</i> repayment out of the funds, which most of them hastened to accept.” “General Report of the Twentieth Anniversary of the Theosophical Society, At The Head-Quarters, Adyar, Madras, December 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th, 1895.” “REPORT OF THE AMERICAN SECTION T.S.” by Alexander Fullerton, General Secretary.”</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 17, Feb. 1896; pp.516-517 The Path, Vol. 10, Mar. 1896; p.392 The Theosophist, Vol. 17, Jan. 1896; pp.1-5 pp.24-25</p>

1896	<p>Mrs. Cleather's comments on Mrs. Besant "Tampering with H.P. Blavatsky's writings." "The result of Mrs. Besant's first failure, through harbouring doubts of her Teacher's <i>bona fides</i> and esoteric knowledge, was soon manifested when she began to publish new editions of H.P.B.'s works. The first noteworthy example was her excision from <i>The Voice of the Silence</i> of passages and notes, presumably out of deference to Brahmin sentiment, which then governed her actions." Among others, Cleather gave the example of the passage and footnote regarding "Pratyeka Buddhas" (fn. p.47) having been omitted.</p>	<p>H.P.B. A Great Betrayal (1922) by A. Cleather, p.71</p> <p>Theosophic Isis, Vol. 1, June 1896; p.179</p>
Jan. 1, 1896	<p>The Theosophic Isis: A New Monthly magazine; Devoted to Universal Brotherhood, Theosophy, and The Occult Sciences. Edited by H.A.W. Coryn. Published for T.S. in Europe (England).</p> <p>In this, the first issue published, the Editor stated: "We stand in rivalry with no other of the existing organs or expressions of Theosophy but wish to each success in work as sincerely as we wish it for ourselves."</p>	<p>Theosophic Isis, Vol. 1, Jan. 1896; pp.1-3</p>
Jan. 11, 1896	<p>"Notes and Comments." by the Editor, W.A. Bulmer: "In the <i>Indian Mirror</i> for January 11th Mrs. Besant 'replies' to Herbert Burrows. . . . 'Colonel Olcott resigned the presidency not because he thought that he had acted in a way to require his resignation, but because there was danger that a false accusation made against him might become public, and he preferred to meet and rebut the accusation as a private person, and not as president of the T.S. "Assuming Mrs. Besant to be correctly informed as to Colonel Olcott's motives, we have here an important contribution towards the clearing up of the 'Resignation Mystery' of 1892. It dovetails exactly into the statement made by Mr. Judge, which was confirmed by Mr. Neresheimer, supported by Mr. Burrows, and denied by Mrs. Besant."</p> <p>NOTE: See Oct. 2, 1895, Sep. 1910 and Jan. 21, 1892.</p>	<p>English Theosophist, Vol. 1, Mar. 1896; pp.51-52</p>
Feb. 1896	<p>"On The Watch-Tower." "IF IT WERE ONLY POSSIBLE!" In G.R.S. Mead's editorial, reference is made to H.P.B. as the "old nurse" who made playthings for the Society, which it had now outgrown. He concluded: "Some foolish people call the old nurse a horrid old woman, but the parents of the child know how to reward her faithful services."</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 17, Feb. 1896; pp.444-445</p> <p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, Apr. 1896; p.30</p>

<p>Feb. 15, 1896</p>	<p>“WILLIAM Q. JUDGE” — A series of four articles by Jasper Niemand from February to June 1896.</p> <p>Noted in</p> <p>“This installment shows the close affection and understanding which existed unbroken between Mr. Judge and H. P. B. . . .”</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 4, Feb. 1896; pp.90-92, Mar. 1896; pp.112-116, May 1896; pp.141-145, June 1896; pp.165-168</p> <p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, Apr. 1896; pp.29-30 May 1896; p.62</p>
<p>Mar. 1896</p>	<p>In “THE SCREEN OF TIME”. “The Indian Section of the Theosophical section proposes to take away the first object of the Theosophical Society, to-wit, the attempt to form a nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood, and insert in its place some high-sounding phrases, derived from the Brahmans who now control that Section, about spirituality and identity.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 10, Mar. 1896; p.365</p>
<p>Mar. 21, 1896 (Saturday)</p>	<p>W.Q. JUDGE DIED. (Born in Dublin, Ireland, April 13, 1851.) Last words: “There should be calmness. Hold Fast. Go Slow.” [See Theosophy, Vol. 11, May 1896, p.40; Letters That Have Helped Me, 1946 ed., p.274]</p> <p>“DEATH OF WILLIAM Q. JUDGE” Announcement of Judge’s death.</p> <p>“DEATH OF WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.” and “THE CREMATION.” Judge’s last words “There should be calmness. Hold fast. Go slow.”[p.180]</p> <p>“NOTICE.” Tribute by J.D. Buck, Vice-President of T.S. in A.</p> <p>“Death of Mr. Judge.” “Mr. W.Q. Judge died at New York on Saturday, March 21st.”</p> <p>NOTE: For more details of the last days of W.Q. Judge see Appendix F and Appendix D, Part IX.</p> <p>NOTE: J.D. Buck, Vice-President, took over as Acting-President of T.S. in America.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.264</p> <p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, Apr. 1896; p.27</p> <p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 1, No. 12, Apr. 1896; pp.177-181</p> <p>No.11, Mar. 1896; Supplement to Theos. Forum, 1 page</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 5, Apr. 1896; p.3</p>

Mar. 22, 1896	<p>Handwritten letter from C.A. Griscom to Albert Smythe.</p> <p>“There is no panic here at all as we have been expecting it for months, and having been without his advice and help for so long it is not as if we were suddenly thrown on our own resources.</p> <p>“In view of the advice ‘go slow’ we here are taking no very important steps. A lot of E.S.T. who met at my house today, Hargrove, C.F.W.[Claude Falls Wright], Neresheimer, [James] Pryse etc etc have written Buck advising him to issue a manifesto declaring himself acting Pres. state the election of president will await the regular Convention, and that in the meantime C.F.W. will continue the office work as his agent. . . .</p> <p>“. . . It is not yet known whether his will leaves any directions with regard either to his successor, or the E.S. His papers will be examined tomorrow & Tuesday.”</p>	Letter from C.A. Griscom Jr. , 2 pages
Mar. 23, 1896	<p>“THE DEPARTURE.”</p> <p>Report on the funeral ceremony of William Q. Judge.</p> <p>“The funeral services were held at the head-quarters of the Aryan Theosophical Society, 144, Madison Ave, N.Y., City, on Monday, March 23rd, 1896. The services were very simple. . . .</p> <p>“. . . Mr. Wright then announced that Dr. J.D. Buck, Vice-President of the American Society would succeed Mr. Judge as President, until the next Annual Convention in Chicago on April 26th, and then he would probably be elected permanent President. . . .</p> <p>“. . . [T]he body was taken to the Fresh Pond crematory and there Incinerated. . . . The ashes will be buried in a cemetery plot owned by Mrs. Judge.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 17, May 1896; pp.509-510</p> <p>The Lamp, Vol. 2, Apr. 1896; pp.130-133</p>
Mar. 27, 1896	<p>EXECUTIVE NOTICE by H.S. Olcott on W.Q.J.’s death.</p> <p>“The undersigned has learnt by cable dispatch from New York, that Mr. William Quan Judge, late Vice-President T.S. and General Secretary of our American Section, died on the 21st instant in that city.</p> <p>. . .</p> <p>“The event is a catastrophe for the new society which the deceased formed less than one year ago.”</p>	The Theosophist , Vol. 17, Apr. 1896; Supp. p.xxv
Mar. 27, 1896 continued	<p>First Council Meeting held after Mr. Judge’s death, at Mrs. Tingley’s house at 7.45 p.m.</p> <p>NOTE: See “AFFIDAVIT” January 20th, 1898 for details.</p>	O.E. Library Critic , Vol. 22, No.3, Oct 1932
Mar. 27, 1896 continued	<p>E.S. Notice issued (Friday) announcing a “General Meeting of the E.S.T. at the Headquarters 144 Madison Avenue New York, to be held on Sunday March 29th.”</p>	Theos. Movement 1875-1950 , p.264

<p>Mar. 28, 1896</p>	<p>A letter handwritten by Mr. Fussell the day before the General Meeting of E.S.T. held at Headquarters, N.Y., to Rev. S.J. Neill of Auckland, New Zealand.</p> <p>“I know you will wish to hear concerning E.S.T. matters and the status of affairs since the passing away of the Outer Head of the E.S.T.</p> <p>“So far as is at present known W.Q.J. has left no directions in regard to carrying on the work of the School. Of course if he has done this, such directions will be followed.</p> <p>“An informal meeting was held last Sunday afternoon (Mar. 22) at the house of C. A. Griscom, Jr. to talk over matters relating to the work. There were present C. A. Griscom, Jr., E. A. Neresheimer, Jas. M. Pryse, E. T. Hargrove, C. F. Wright, H. T. Patterson, A. H. Spencer, E. B. Page and J. H. Fussell.</p> <p>“In regard to the E.S.T. the following plan was proposed. That in the event of there being no directions left by Mr. Judge, a circular letter be sent out, signed by the above named and other New York members of the School to all E.S.T. members in America, suggesting that a Council be formed to carry on the routine work of the School, such Council to be concerned solely with this and having no authority as teachers or in strictly <i>esoteric</i> matters. Members will be asked to sign and return a printed slip to the effect that they approve of the plan for organization, etc.</p> <p>“The above is only a rough statement of the idea, but its purpose is to get the members to hold together and to coordinate the efforts of all so that we may be kept in touch with one another.</p> <p>“As soon as such Council is formed we will have a basis from which to work and be able to cooperate with the Council in the Eastern Division appointed by Mr. Judge.</p> <p>“Of course nothing will be done in this matter until we are assured that no directions have been found among the Chief’s papers.</p> <p>“I will keep you informed of anything that may be done or that may turn up in regard to the work.</p> <p>With good wishes to you all, Fraternally yours, (Signed) Joseph H. Fussell”</p> <p>NOTE: This letter from Mr. Fussell corroborates Mr Hargrove’s letter dated Jan. 30, 1898. [The original of Mr. Fussell’s letter, March 28, 1896, to S.J. Neill was in the possession of the editor of The Theosophical Movement—1875-1950]</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan.30, 1898 for Hargrove’s Letter to Mrs. Tingley.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.272-273</p>
--------------------------	---	--

Mar. 29, 1896	<p>General Meeting of E.S.T. held at Headquarters, N.Y. Hargrove presided. He read an announcement signed, by eight members, that Mr. Judge's private papers showed "that the future of the School was not left to chance, nor to our mere judgement."</p> <p>Hargrove announced that Mr. Judge had assistance from someone who Hargrove designated as "Promise" [Mrs. Tingley]. "It should first be stated that in Mr. Judge's occult diary he has entered messages and communications received through this person in the same way as he has entered his own, as from Master; and this he has done in no other case showing that 'Promise' was the only person whom he placed on his level of reliability in this respect."</p> <p>NOTE: Mr. Hargrove quoted from the Jan'y 3rd, 1895 message which W.Q. Judge received through Katherine Tingley. See: Appendix G, No. 7, for entire message.</p> <p>NOTE: A "verbatim report" of this meeting was issued one week later in an E.S.T. circular, To the Members of the E.S.T. See April 3, 1896 entry.</p>	<p>To the Members of the E.S.T., 1 page</p> <p>To the Members of the E.S.T., Apr. 3rd, 1896, 19 pages</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.264-265</p>
Mar. 29, 1896 continued	Bombay Branch T.S. passed resolution expressing grief at the death of W.Q.J.	The Theosophist , Vol. 17, May 1896; Supp. p.xxix
Mar. 31, 1896	<p>"Neresheimer wrote to a fellow theosophist, Alice L. Cleather, an amazing account of how Katherine Tingley brought him and the others to acknowledge her leadership in the Society. The secrecy surrounding the meetings where this was accomplished is emphasized in the letter by the use of a symbol † to designate Katherine Tingley, although he occasionally referred to her as Purple, because of her fondness for the color."</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix G, No. 8, for contents of this letter and for more comments from Neresheimer.</p>	California Utopia , p.16
Apr. 1896	<p>The Path changed name (as planned) to Theosophy. "Commencing with the next, April, number, <i>The Path</i>, which has been published for ten years under that name, will drop the title and thereafter will be issued under the name of <i>Theosophy</i>."</p>	The Path , Vol. 10, Mar. 1896; pp.361, 390
Apr. 1896 continued	<p>"H.P.B. WAS NOT DESERTED BY THE MASTERS." Article by W.Q. Judge published after his death in which he defended H.P.B. against Sinnett's accusations and included comments on the Mars and Mercury controversy.</p> <p>Sinnett denied accusing H.P.B. of fraud or of saying that she was deserted by the Masters. Editor's Note claimed: "I am also well aware that Mr. Judge's authority for his original position was Mme. H.P. Blavatsky herself."</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, Apr. 1896; pp.14-18</p> <p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, July 1896; pp.122-123</p>

Apr. 1896 continued	<p>“NOTICE” by J.D. Buck regarding W.Q.J.’s death: “I tried last December to get him to stop work and use his waning strength to regain health — but in vain. And so he worked on to the last, and only desisted when he could neither walk nor stand; and when from choking cough and weariness he could scarcely lie down or sleep. He was indeed the <i>Lion-hearted</i> and worthy successor of his great teacher, H.P.B.” [Dr. J.D. Buck was Judge’s physician and close friend.]</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, Apr. 1896; pp.28-29</p>
Apr. 1896 continued	<p>Tributes to Judge from “J”, Æ, and F.J. Dick.</p> <p>[“J” was Jasper Niemand (Julia Keightley), “Æ”was famous Irish poet and writer George William Russell.]</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 4, Apr. 1896; pp.121-123</p>
Apr. 1896 continued	<p>Tributes to W.Q. Judge from J.D. Buck, E.T. Hargrove, Dr. J.A. Anderson and others.</p> <p>Tribute by Sidney G.P. Coryn: “It would be a needless task to remind ourselves of his most faithful friendship, of his unswerving loyalty, of the master force which was ever in his love for men and war for truth.”</p> <p>And by H.: “We all know that W.Q. Judge was the expression on this plane of a very high soul vowed for ever to the service of the Lodge.”</p>	<p>The Lamp, Vol. 2, Apr. 1896; pp.129-139</p> <p>Theosophic Isis, Vol. 1, Apr. 1896; pp.81-84</p>
Apr. 3, 1896	<p>E.S.T. (circular including a verbatim report of E.S.T. meeting of March 29, 1896). Signed by E.T. Hargrove, J.M. Pryse, J.H. Fussell, H.T. Patterson, C.F. Wright, G.L. Griscom, C.A. Griscom Jr., E.A. Neresheimer.</p> <p>“The papers left by him provided for the future management of the School. . . . [T]he name and identity of W.Q. Judge’s occult heir and successor is to remain unknown to the members in general for one year.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 25, 1932 entry. Some Reminiscences of William Q. Judge (Neresheimer Report). Neresheimer eventually repudiated this document. Mr. Neresheimer made a special deposition as to the events following Mr. Judge’s death. He was one of his executors and claimed he found the so-called “Occult Diary” and turned it over to Mrs. Tingley.</p> <p>NOTE: See 1922 entry. Notes by Basil Crump (5pp.)on EST Circular.</p>	<p>To the Members of the E.S.T., 19 pages</p>

<p>Apr. 26, 1896</p>	<p>“WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.” Boston Theosophists paid tribute. By Robert Crosbie, George D. Ayers, M.L. Guild, L.F. Wade and W.H. Somersall.</p> <p>“At the close of the regular meeting of the Boston T.S. on Thursday, April 26, a memorial meeting was held. . . .</p> <p>“The following testimonial was then proposed and passed: “Our beloved President, William Q. Judge, having left the body which for so many years served as his instrument, “We, the Boston Branch of the Theosophical Society in America, desire to place upon record the testimony of our recognition of the great work that he has done for humanity: — “As one of the three original founders of the Theosophical Society, he, ‘the greatest of the exiles,’ remained alone in ‘this land of the new race,’ striving to form a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood which shall in time bring ‘peace on earth, good will to men;’ for this he lived a life of self-sacrifice, setting us an example of unswerving loyalty to Masters, unfaltering devotion to the cause, untiring energy in the work: “As our teacher in the philosophy and in spirituality we owe him a debt of love and gratitude that we can only repay by doing our best to promote the Theosophical Movement and the Brotherhood of Man, by spreading Theosophy in the world, and by trying to realize it in ourselves. “This we declare our devotion.”</p>	<p>New England Notes, Vol. 2, Apr. 1896; 4 pages</p> <p>p.4</p>
<p>Apr. 26, 27 1896</p>	<p>“SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION OF T.S.A.” “In addition to the delegates many visiting members also were present, above 700 in all.”</p> <p>Buck refused Presidency but suggested Mr. Hargrove for office. E.T. Hargrove was unanimously elected President.</p> <p>Neresheimer elected Vice-President and re-elected Treasurer.</p> <p>Comments on the success of the Convention. “If any justification be needed of William Q. Judge’s life and work, it is to be found in the last annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in America.”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 1, Mar. 1896; pp.181-190</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 4, May 1896; pp.159-164</p> <p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, June 1896; pp.65-66</p>

<p>Apr. 27, 28 1896</p>	<p>Newspaper clippings on the Convention of T.S. in America. (From Albert E.S. Smythe's scrapbook.) "This is by far the largest Theosophical convention ever held. One hundred and eight branches were represented."</p> <p>Coverage included: Tributes, Addresses and Reports. Mrs. Cleather's Address on "Karma." Unveiling the Judge Bust.</p> <p>"At the evening meeting a bust of William Q. Judge was unveiled."</p> <p>Theosophists "took possession of the Madison Square Garden. . . ." Announcement that a school of occultism was to be built. The site of the school had not been determined.</p> <p>NOTE: All newspapers covered the convention with utmost attention and details.</p>	<p>Morning Advertiser Apr. 27 & 28, 1896</p> <p>New York Daily Tribune</p> <p>Mail and Express (New York)</p> <p>New York Press</p> <p>The Journal (New York)</p>
<p>May 1896</p>	<p>Commemorative issue on W.Q. Judge: "THE SCREEN OF TIME." By T. pp.33-34 "THE LAST DAYS OF W.Q. JUDGE." By E.T. Hargrove pp.34-37 "THE CREMATION." By C.F.W. pp.38-40 "HIS ONE AMBITION." By J.D. Buck pp.41-43 "W.Q.J. AS I KNEW HIM." By Elliott B. Page pp.43-46 "ONE OF THE IMMORTALS." By Jerome Anderson pp.46-48 "A FRIEND OF OLD TIME AND OF THE FUTURE." By R. Crosbie p.49 "THE GREATEST OF THE EXILES." By G. Hijo [C.A. Griscom] pp.50-52 W.Q.J. foresaw his death.* [p.52] "MAN AND TEACHER." By Edward B. Rambo pp.53-54 "W.Q. JUDGE AS ORGANIZER." By A.H. Spencer pp.54-55 "A FRIEND AND A BROTHER." By E. Aug. Neresheimer pp.56-58 "THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRESENT TIME." By C.F. Wright pp.58-61</p> <p>* NOTE: See Oct. 13, 1894. Judge was told by Cheiro that he had "already reached the last chapter of [his] life."</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, May 1896; pp.33-61</p>
<p>May 1896 continued</p>	<p>"The Passing of William Q. Judge." By the editor C.H. Collings. [Mentioned in The Theosophic Isis p.181 Vol.1, June 1896.]</p>	<p>Ourselves, Vol. 1, May 1896; pp.71-74</p>

May 1896 continued	<p>Claude Falls Wright made a public definite statement regarding Mr. Judge's past.</p> <p>"Mr. Judge's existence has been a conscious one for ages. . . . several years ago he arrived at the stage where he never afterwards lost his consciousness for a moment. Sleep with him merely meant to float out of his body in full possession of all his faculties, and that was also the manner in which he 'died' — left his body for good. In other bodies, and known under other names, he has played an important part in the world's history, sometimes as a conspicuous visible figure. At other times he has worked quietly behind the scenes, or, as in his last life, as a leader in a philanthropical and philosophical movement. He is a member of a great brotherhood of sages. . . ."</p>	<p>The Lamp, Vol. 2, Apr. 1896; p.132</p> <p>Theosophic Isis, Vol. 1, May 1896; p.142</p>
May 5/18, 1896	<p>Mme. Vera Petrovna de Zhelihovsky died. Born at Odessa, Southern Russia, April 17/29, 1835.</p> <p>H.P.B.'s younger sister. She was a writer of children's stories and a contributor to various Russian magazines.</p> <p>"To quote the words of one who knew her best of any [not identified]: 'Her affection to her sister was of the truest and the most steadfast. She had a great heart, and I do not think that there ever was a thing she ought to do that she left consciously undone.'"</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 1, pp.534-537</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 4, June 1896; p.182</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 18, June 1896; p.267</p>
May 7, 1896	<p>"W.Q.J., A SCULPTOR'S APPRECIATION."</p> <p>Phrenological assessment of W.Q.J.'s head, by the sculptor, August Lindstrom, who did the bust of W.Q.J. using his death mask. [Originally published in the New York Journal on May 7]</p> <p>"While making the death mask I was struck by the shape of Mr. Judge's head, which was utterly unlike anything I had ever seen. . . . I saw at once that Mr. Judge's head evidenced a high and uniform development of all the faculties, well-balanced throughout. This is the remarkable combination I found: — A tremendous will power, with an equal development of gentleness; thorough practicability and adaptability conjoined to a highly idealistic nature, and a gigantic intellect hand in hand with selflessness and modesty."</p>	<p>Theosophic Isis, Vol. 1, June 1896; pp.148-150</p>
May 8, 1896	<p>"AN INTERESTING LETTER." <i>To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST</i>" written by John M. Pryse on behalf of W.Q.J.'s "occult successor." Contains 7 positive points concerning the Society in Ireland.</p>	<p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 4, June 1896; pp.178-179</p>
May 14, 1896	<p>An Urgent Appeal, a circular to E.S.T. members by order of the Outer Head and Council.</p> <p>"A CRUSADE has been directed by the Master, and it is for the members to supply the material necessary in order to complete the plan."</p> <p>NOTE: This E.S.T. circular appears to have been delayed 3 days to include Hargrove's An Occultist's Life. [See May 17, 1896 entry]</p> <p>NOTE: See June 1896 entry.</p>	<p>Circular, 4 pages</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.268</p>

<p>May 15, 1896</p>	<p>“A WARNING.” Circular to E.S.T. members from the Council warning of “attacks and attempts at disintegration by the Black Powers. . . [E]ach opportunity made use of by the White Brotherhood also opens the doors to action by Dugpas and the evil side. . . . “. . . We are not yet quite ready to inform all of the identity of the Outer Head. . . .”</p> <p>Note: This circular was “kept back owing to a number of events”. (see May 21, 1896)</p>	<p>E.S.T. circular, May 21, 1896; pp.1-2</p>
<p>May 17, 1896</p>	<p>“An Occultist’s Life.” Hargrove issued a circular on K. Tingley to E.S.T. members prefacing it with the statement: “The paper should be read in careful connection with the E.S.T. Circular of April 3rd, 1896.” adding: “Issued with the consent and approval of the Council, unknown to the O.H., May 17th, 1896.” He claimed: “‘Promise’ reached Theosophy by degrees, and in the process of reaching it underwent a training and preparation even more rigid and comprehensive than that experienced by either H.P.B. or W.Q.J. Always guided by the Master, every event in her life had a meaning and a purpose: when the ‘moment of consummation’ came, several years ago, known and recognized by Mr. Judge, the meaning and the purpose became clear at last. ”</p> <p>NOTE: Neresheimer later claimed that W.Q. Judge never appointed her as his successor. See Feb. 25, 1932.</p>	<p>Circular, 7 pages</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.268, 279-288</p>
<p>May 18, 1896</p>	<p>“NO LONGER A MYSTERY. Identity of the Unknown Adept of the Theosophists Revealed.” “The mystery of the identity of the successor to the late W.Q. Judge in the leadership of the esoteric branch of the Theosophical Society is a mystery no longer. The secret was told yesterday morning in Chickering Hall by Ernest T. Hargrove, the exoteric president of the Theosophical Society in America.” Included a long authorized interview with Mrs. Tingley.</p>	<p>New York Daily Tribune, May 18, 1896; p.7</p>

May 21, 1896	<p>“THE SCREEN OF TIME.”</p> <p>“. . . with a view to shielding this person from the inevitable slander and persecution to which she would be subjected, as Mme. Blavatsky and W.Q. Judge had been when occupying the same position.* That year’s silence would now be broken on account of the Crusade. . . .”</p> <p>Under heading: “THE OUTER HEAD.”</p> <p>“Therefore we now have to tell you that the occult successor to W.Q. Judge, mentioned by him as such in his papers and previously referred to as ‘Promise’ is Katherine A. Tingley. . . .”</p> <p>Under heading: “IMPORTANT NOTICE.”</p> <p>“The Outer Head has appointed E. Aug[ust] Neresheimer . . . and Dr. J.D. Buck . . . as her special agents to whom they [members] should appeal in case of real difficulty arising in E.S.T. and outer work.”</p> <p>Under heading: “LETTER FROM DR. BUCK.”</p> <p>Dr. Buck endorsed K. Tingley as the new chosen agent of the Masters and urged E.S. members to “stand by all the changes that are occurring.”</p> <p>* NOTE: the “Outer Head” was never a position held by either H.P.B. or W.Q.J.</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, June 1896; pp.67-69</p> <p>E.S.T. circular 7 pages, p.3</p> <p>pp.5-6</p> <p>pp.6-7</p>
June 1896	<p>THEOSOPHICAL NEWS AND WORK. “AN URGENT APPEAL.”</p> <p>By committee composed of H.T. Patterson, E.A. Neresheimer, and C.A. Griscom, Jr. announcing the launch of “a most vigorous crusade on the other side of the ocean, reäwaken the flagging energies of those who have become indifferent. . . .” The Crusade was led by K. Tingley as Outer Head and E.T. Hargrove as President.</p> <p>NOTE: See also Feb. 11, 1897 entry.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 1, Apr. 1896; p.191</p> <p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, June 1896; p.96</p>
June 1896 continued	<p>Tributes to W.Q. Judge:</p> <p>“W.Q. JUDGE.” By Julia Keightley pp.70-72</p> <p>“HIS BALANCE.” By W. Main pp.73-74</p> <p>“THE LESSONS OF A NOBLE LIFE.” By Katharine Hillard pp.75-82</p> <p>“HIS LIGHT.” By Herbert Coryn p.82</p> <p>“IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.” By Alice Cleather pp.83-84</p> <p>“OUR FRIEND AND GUIDE.” By J.H. Connelly pp.85-88</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, June 1896; pp.70-88</p>
June 1896 continued	<p>“A TRIBUTE.”</p> <p>To Mr. Judge by G.L.G. (Genevieve Ludlow Griscom)</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, July 1896; p.106</p>

June 1896 continued	<p>“NOTICE.”</p> <p>“BUST OF WILLIAM Q. JUDGE. August Lindstrom, the noted Swedish sculptor who made the bust of W.Q. Judge which was unveiled at the Convention, has now completed a number of casts of the bust. It was made from a mask of his face taken after death and has received favourable criticism of everyone who knew Mr. Judge. Each one is made by hand and satisfactory in every way. They may be ordered from August Lindstrom, 1267 Broadway, N.Y. City, or from Theosophical Publishing Co., 144 Madison Avenue, N.Y. City. The price is \$10.00 each in the United States.”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 3, June 1896; p.32</p>
(date unknown)	<p>E.S.T. — Private. Circular listing some members’ names and their “signs.”</p>	Circular, 1 page
(date unknown)	<p>Katherine A. Tingley issued from 144 Madison Avenue, N.Y., the new Book of Rules, <i>Strictly Private and Confidential</i>.</p>	Circular, 20 pages
June 13, 1896	<p>“THE CRUSADE OF AMERICAN THEOSOPHISTS AROUND THE WORLD.”</p> <p>The Crusade of American Theosophists left New York for their world tour.</p> <p>NOTE: See April 4, 1897. The Crusaders completed their first world tour and reached New York.</p>	<p>Theosophy, (Path), Vol. 12, Oct. 1897; p.367</p>
June 18, 1896	<p>To Members of the Theosophical Society:</p> <p>Circular by Alexander Fullerton detailing “three incidents” involving Judge which made him side with Besant.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) That he had told Judge to tell the truth and Judge’s reply was “That it is not so easy a thing to do.” 2.) That Judge had told him that he had taken the original ring of H.P.B.’s and left the duplicate for Mrs. Besant. 3.) That in order to receive the documentation Judge allegedly asserted “I hypnotized her and made her do it.” <p>NOTE: See June 1895 entry for Annie Besant’s version of what happened.</p>	Circular, 3 pages
July 1896	<p>“THE SUCCESSOR OF THE LATE MR. W.Q. JUDGE.” by Bertram Keightley</p> <p>“We . . . refrain from passing any opinion whatever of our own regarding this lady of whom not much is known and but little is definitely asserted; and instead of speculating upon her aims and objects, we deem it proper to wait contentedly and allow the plot to develop itself until the <i>donoument</i> [sic] is pretty clearly seen. . . .</p> <p>“. . . What [the world] seeks . . . is . . . a . . . rational explanation of this panorama of Nature. . . .</p> <p>“If Mrs. Tingley can supply this need she is most welcome; she will everywhere be adored, be she a reincarnation of H.P.B. or of Joan d’Arc, or for the matter of that — even a soulless entity of mere flesh, blood and bone.”</p>	<p>Prasnottara, Vol. 6, July 1896; pp.139-140</p>

<p>Sep. 12, 1896</p>	<p>“To the Branch Presidents and Secretaries, and to the members of the American Section T.S.” From Alexander Fullerton Gen. Sec. American Section T.S. Procedures for a person or Branch previously a part of T.S. in America, now wishing to join the American Section T.S. “The two principles governing the matter are very simple. They are <i>first</i>, that Mr. Judge’s Society is an organization outside of and distinct from the Theosophical Society . . . and that membership in it can be no more a passport to the T.S. than can membership in [other] bodies; but that, <i>second</i>, sincere persons having entered it in ignorance or through delusion, persons really interested in Theosophy and work belonging to the T.S., it is only right that no unavoidable obstacle should be placed in their way when learning the facts and seeking union with the Society.”</p>	<p>T.S., American Section, Circular, 3 pages</p>
<p>Sept. 23, 1896</p>	<p>“LETTER TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.” From Archibald Keightley, President Theosophical Society in England. “Sir: Having read in your issue of Sunday, August 16th, a report to the effect that the Theosophists of England had ‘split’ with those of America, on a rumor that Mrs. Katherine A. Tingley is the reincarnation of Madame H.P. Blavatsky, I have to say, as President of the English Society, that such a report is entirely without foundation and to ask your courtesy in inserting this letter. . . . “These people who have circulated the story that Mrs. Tingley asserted herself to be a reincarnation of H.P. Blavatsky, — something utterly untrue. Mrs. Tingley positively denies ever having made any statement of the kind.”</p> <p>NOTE: See also Oct.7, 1896 for Charles Johnston’s comments on “Madame Blavatsky’s Successor”.</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, Nov. 1896; p.255</p>
<p>Oct. 7, 1896</p>	<p>“MADAME BLAVATSKY’S SUCCESSOR.” By Charles Johnston. This article was prefaced by: “[The following article appeared in the Madras Mail, Oct. 7, 1896, and was reprinted in nearly all of the Indian papers. It preceded by nearly three weeks the arrival in India of the Crusaders, who reached Bombay on October 26th.]” “As far as I know, neither she herself [Katherine Tingley], nor any of her friends have distinctly claimed that she is Mme. Blavatsky’s successor; she has chosen the better way, by straightway beginning to work, leaving it to time and the fruits of her labors to speak in her favor.”</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, Dec. 1896; pp.286-288</p>

Dec. 27, 1896	<p>“A Historical Retrospect (1875-1896) of the Theosophical Society. <i>Extract from the Twenty-first Address of the President-Founder of the Society.</i>”</p> <p>[A reply to the “Historical Sketch” delivered at the 1895 Convention of T.S. in America.]</p> <p>In the “Introduction” H.S.O. stated: “This document covers mainly the whole historical record of the Theosophical Society up to the time of the American Secession of ‘95. It is primarily intended for the information of those who are interested in Theosophy but who have never known the actual relation of the Society as a whole to the American Section and its Members.”</p> <p>“The Minute Book of the Council (still in my custody) opens with the report of the first meeting, held . . . November 4th, 1875, . . . until one of August 27th, 1878, . . . This is the last entry in the Council Minute Book in America. The proceedings of Council in India are recorded in a separate book.”</p> <p>NOTE: See: Nov. 1950 for C. Jinarajadasa’s comments with regards to where the Minute Book of the Society was located.</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 28, 1895 and Sep. 7, 1895 entries.</p>	Pamphlet, 32 pages p.3
Jan. 1897	<p>“The Theosophical Society and The Secession Therefrom.” Historical facts by Constance Wachtmeister and Alexander Fullerton explaining why there were now two Theosophical Societies. “Outlines the genesis of the Judge case from 1893 to the 1895 split. According to the authors the 1895 declaration of the American Section of the Society as an autonomous body was ‘simply to put beyond reach of expulsion a person charged with the grave offenses described, and who refused to submit to an investigation of their truth,’ as the Dec. 1894 Annual Convention at Adyar had passed the resolution of the Indian Section that Judge submit to an investigation of the charges raised against him or be forced to resign from the Theosophical Society.”</p> <p>NOTE: A copy of this circular is in the archives of Edmonton T.S.</p>	Circular, 4 pages T.N.C.A.B. Item 2000, p.548
Jan. 1897 continued	<p>“SCHOOL FOR THE REVIVAL OF THE LOST MYSTERIES OF ANTIQUITY” “In January, 1897, it became necessary to form a corporation in order to purchase and legally hold land at Point Loma, Calif., and a corporation was accordingly formed under the laws of the State of New York, entitled ‘School for the Revival of The Lost Mysteries of Antiquity.’” [S.R.L.M.A.]</p>	Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 4, No. 1, May 1898; p.13
Jan. 13, 1897	<p>“FROM AN AUSTRALIAN POINT OF VIEW.” Mr. T.W. Williams [Willans], President of the Sydney T.S., summarized activities in Australia, from the time “The Great Crusade reached Adelaide on Dec. 24, ‘96” to its departure for Auckland, N.Z. “on Jan.13, 1897.” At the Convention of the T.S. in Australia Mrs Katherine A. Tingley was elected as Corresponding Secretary and E.T. Hargrove as President.</p>	Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 11, Mar. 1897; p.172

Feb. 11, 1897	<p>“PROGRESS OF THE CRUSADE., SAN FRANCISCO.”</p> <p>The Crusaders arrived at San Francisco, CA., on board the Australian steamer, <i>Alameda</i>. Public and private meetings were held during the following week.</p> <p>“The Crusade arrived in San Diego, February 17th.”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 12, Apr. 1897; p.190</p>
Feb. 11, 1897 continued	<p>“THE CRUSADE OF AMERICAN THEOSOPHISTS AROUND THE WORLD - PRELIMINARY REPORT.” by Katherine A. Tingley.</p> <p>On June 13th, 1896, the Crusade left New York.</p> <p>The work began in Liverpool then on to London. From London they proceeded to Bristol, Clifton and so on to Glasgow and Edinburgh. From Scotland they travelled to Ireland, back to London, then Paris, Amsterdam, Berlin, Hamburg, Austria, Geneva, Interlaken, Zurich, Hallein, to Italy and Greece, Egypt and on to India and Ceylon then to Australasia, Samoa, and Hawaii, arriving in San Francisco on Feb. 11.</p> <p>The pamphlet, “THE CRUSADE OF AMERICAN THEOSOPHISTS AROUND THE WORLD”, included Mrs. Tingley’s and President Hargrove’s Addresses and the report of Feb. 24, 1897 from the San Diego Union, on the laying of the corner stone.</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 11, Mar. 1897; pp.378-385</p> <p>Pamphlet, 16 pages</p>
Feb. 23, 1897	<p>“CEREMONY.”</p> <p>The Laying of The Corner Stone S.R.L.M.A. BY THE FOUNDER-DIRECTRESS, KATHERINE A. TINGLEY, AT POINT LOMA, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY 23, 1897, ASSISTED BY MR. E. T. HARGROVE, MR. F.M. PIERCE, AND OTHERS. Synopsis of report. Some photos included.</p>	<p>Universal Brotherhood, (Path/Theosophy). Vol. 12, Nov. 1897; pp.44-50</p> <p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 12, Apr. 1897; pp.191-192</p>
Feb. 24, 1897	<p>A slightly abbreviated account of the ceremonies reported in The San Diego Union “CORNER STONE LAID.”</p> <p>“The corner stone was in the centre of a square, enclosed by ropes of cypress, with a large arch made of evergreen at the front, around which were inscribed the words, ‘Truth, Light, Liberation for Discouraged Humanity,’ in large letters of purple on a gold background. . . .</p> <p>“. . . The stars and stripes covered the stand, which was used as a pulpit. Upon it were life-size pictures of Madame Blavatsky, William Q. Judge, Katherine A. Tingley and E.T. Hargrove.”</p>	<p>The Grail Vol. 1, No. 4, June-July 1897; pp.88-90</p> <p>The San Diego Union, Wednesday Morning, Feb. 24, 1897</p>
Feb. 24, 1897 continued	<p>In a brief address by President Hargrove he said.</p> <p>“It might seem strange to the people of San Diego that the founder directress, Mrs. Tingley, should have selected this spot, never having seen it before, and only coming here after all the preliminary arrangements had been made. It should be clearly understood . . . that the school was under her supervision, and those who get to know her better will come to know why.”</p>	<p>The Grail Vol. 1, No. 4, June-July 1897; pp.89-90</p>

Apr. 4, 1897	<p>“THE CRUSADE OF AMERICAN THEOSOPHISTS AROUND THE WORLD.”</p> <p>Reprint of “PRELIMINARY REPORT” including introduction stating: “On April 4th, 1897, was completed the first Crusade of American Theosophists around the World. The Crusaders reached New York at 6.30 P.M. and held the concluding meeting of the Crusade in the Concert Hall of the Madison Square Garden. The party consisted of Mrs. Katherine A. Tingley, Leader of the Theosophical Movement throughout the World; . . . E.T. Hargrove, President of the T.S. in America, the T.S. in Europe and the T.S. in Australasia; H.T. Patterson, President of the Brooklyn T.S.; Mrs. Alice L. Cleather of London; F.M. Pierce, Representative of the School for the Revival of the Lost Mysteries of Antiquity; and the Rev. W. Williams of Bradford, England.”</p> <p>NOTE: See June 13, 1896, the Crusade left New York.</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 12, Oct. 1897; pp.366-374</p>
Apr. 26, 1897	<p>“T.S. in America. Third Annual Convention.”</p> <p>“The Third Annual Convention of the T.S. in America was held at Madison Square Garden Concert Hall. . . . Two hundred delegates from all parts of the world attended the Convention. . . .”</p> <p>In attendance were Dr. A. Keightley, Pres. of T.S. in England, and Mrs. Keightley, Dr. Franz Hartman, Pres. of T.S. in Germany.</p> <p>Following an account of the round the world Crusade, “Dr Buck proposed a resolution pledging those present to support Mrs. Tingley in carrying on the work of Madame Blavatsky and W.Q. Judge, which was unanimously carried with applause.”</p> <p>“Mr [E.A.] Nereshiemer was re-elected Vice-President, also Treasurer for the coming year, and the following were elected as Executive Committee: Dr. J.D. Buck, Dr. A.P. Buchman, Dr. J.A. Anderson, A.H. Spencer, and H.T. Patterson, E.A. Neresheimer.”</p>	<p>Magic, Vol. 1, June 1897; p.78</p> <p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 3, No. 1, May 1897; pp.1-16</p>
June 28, 1897	<p>Announcement: “PHOTOGRAPHS.”</p> <p>“Orders can now be placed for new photographs of KATHERINE A. TINGLEY, SUCCESSOR OF W.Q. JUDGE, AND LEADER OF THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, Which were taken at Los Angeles Calif, upon Mrs. Tingley’s arrival there on her return with the party which accompanied her on the Crusade.”</p>	<p>Theosophical News, Vol. 2, No. 2, June 28, 1897; p.5</p>
Aug. 1897	<p>“<i>To All Members of the Theosophical Society in America.</i>”</p> <p>From Katherine A. Tingley.</p> <p>“The rapid growth of the Movement and new lines of activity opening out make it necessary that a better system should be adopted in several departments of work. . . .</p> <p>“. . . I have therefore suggested Mr. James M. Pryse as the Superintendent of the Propaganda Bureau . . . to be established not later than the 27th of July. No one is better fitted to perform the work than Mr. Pryse. . . .”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 3, No. 4, Aug. 1897; p.63</p>

Aug. 16, 1897	<p>Edward Burroughs Rambo died that morning at San Francisco. He was one of the oldest and best known Theosophical workers on the Pacific coast. He was born in Cincinnati, April 5, 1845, of Quaker parents. He went to public school in the west, his father died when he was but thirteen. Later on, with money earned by himself, he attended the Quaker School, in Providence. He married in 1870 and was left a widower in 1888. Quaker teaching of the "light within" was the main cause of his coming to the T.S. In 1886, from studying the character of a friend, he was led to investigate spiritualism. The same year at a camp-meeting he first heard of Reincarnation and became convinced of it. Still seeking, he read Theosophical books, and in 1888 joined the Golden Gate Branch of the T.S.</p> <p>NOTE: Rambo signed his "Application for Fellowship" to join the T.S. on Feb. 28, 1889. His endorsers were Sarah A. Harris and Chas. H. Sykes. The application was signed by W.Q. Judge as Gen. Sec. American Section, T.S. and by Allen Griffiths Secretary for the Golden Gate Lodge of the T.S. on March 3rd, 1889. His "Obligation" is also included.</p>	<p>Theosophical News, Vol. 2, No. 10, Aug. 23, 1897; p.1</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 7, Feb. 1893; pp.354-356</p> <p>Application for Fellowship (see Appendix C)</p>
Aug. 29, 1897	<p>"RESIGNATION OF PRES. E.T. HARGROVE." Letter from Hargrove addressed, "<i>To the Members of the Theosophical Society in America.</i>" "On account of serious financial events in America, which concern me intimately, I shall be obliged to enter the business world and devote my energies to business occupations for some time to come. . . . My resignation as President will be formally submitted at the next annual Convention of the Society." Comments by Tingley on resignation.</p> <p>E.T. Hargrove: ". . . it has become necessary for me to resign the editorship of THEOSOPHY. . . ." NOTE: See Sep. 10, 1897.</p>	<p>Theosophical News, Vol. 2, Sep. 20, 1897; p.2</p> <p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 12, Oct. 1897; pp.377-379</p>
Sep. 1, 1897	<p>Letter from E.T. Hargrove addressed "To the Vice-President and members of the Executive Committee of the THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA." "I had intended to defer my resignation until April, in order to create as little inconvenience as possible; but thanks to the kindness and self-sacrifice of my friend and comrade, Mr. E.A. Nereshiimer, the Vice-President of the Society, . . . I am enabled to resign almost immediately. . . . My resignation will take effect on the 13th of September." Mr. Nereshiimer Vice-Pres. to take over his duties.</p>	<p>Theosophical News, Vol. 2, Sep. 20, 1897; p.2</p> <p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 12, Oct. 1897; pp.378-379</p>

Sep. 3, 1897	<p>Letter addressed to “Mr. E.T. Hargrove, President, THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA” and signed by Neresheimer on behalf of the Executive Committee. It was also signed by H.T. Patterson and A.H. Spencer.</p> <p>“We are in receipt of your communication of September 1, 1897, tendering your resignation as President of the T.S. in A., to take effect on the 13th inst.</p> <p>“It is with deep regret that we notify you of the acceptance of same. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: In Theosophy this letter is dated September 9, 1897.</p>	<p>Theosophical News, Vol. 2, Sep. 20, 1897; p.2</p> <p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 12, Oct. 1897; pp.378-379</p>
Sep. 3, 1897 continued	<p>To The Members of the E.S.T. from Katherine A. Tingley, ^, accepting Mr. Hargrove’s resignation.</p> <p>“When I first suggested Mr. Hargrove as President of the Theosophical Society, I knew at that crisis he was the only available man to fill the place. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: Parts of this E.S.T. circular were reprinted with K. Tingley’s permission in Theosophical News.</p>	<p>E.S.T. circular, 2 pages Signed with 3 dots.</p>
Sep. 10, 1897	<p>Letter from E.T. Hargrove. He resigned as Editor of Theosophy.</p> <p>“For the same reason as given in the first of the above communications, it has become necessary for me to resign the editorship of THEOSOPHY; . . . Mrs. K.A. Tingley and Mr. E.A. Neresheimer have kindly consented to act as co-editors, beginning with the November issue.”</p>	<p>Theosophy (Path), Vol. 12, Oct. 1897; pp.379-380</p>
Oct. 9, 1897	<p>“Executive Notice.” by H.S. Olcott: In response to further questions regarding secessionists who wish to rejoin the T.S.</p> <p>NOTE: Mercury, Edited by W.J. Walters, with Edith and Maria Walsh. A monthly publication out of San Francisco which quickly became the official organ of the American Section of T.S. The title changed to The Theosophic Messenger at the end of 1899.</p>	<p>Mercury, Vol. 3, p.?</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 19, Dec. 1897; Supp. p.xi</p>
Nov. 1, 1897	<p>“REPORT OF THE AMERICAN SECTION T.S.” by Alexander Fullerton.</p> <p>“One element of indescribable value in the results of Mrs. Besant’s tour is the rescue of Theosophy from popular opprobrium as a system of clap-trap. . . . The general contempt brought upon Theosophy by recent travesties of it has been greatly abated through her magnificent expositions of it.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 19, Jan. 1898; Supp. pp.13-14</p>

Nov. 17, 1897	<p>Dr. Archibald Keightley resigned as President of the Theosophical Society in Europe (England). <i>Notice sent to the Executive Council in England:</i></p> <p>“Owing to circumstances into which I shall not enter, I find it wisest, in the interests which we have most at heart, to hand you hereby my resignation. . . .”</p> <p>Letter to P —, (Esoteric name for Mrs. Tingley)</p> <p>“Herewith I hand to you my resignation of the offices of President of the Central Group, E.S.T. in London, and of presiding officer of the Council, E.S.T.</p> <p>“I wish to hold no official position, retaining only my simple membership in T.S., E.S.T. and Council. . . .</p> <p>“(An Acknowledgment of this letter was received from Mrs. Tingley. — A. K.)”</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 27, 1898 entry.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 3, No. 5, Feb. 1898; p.26</p> <p>pp.26-27</p>
Jan. 13, 1898	<p>Ten prominent and “influential members who had shown no signs of wavering” gathered at the home of Katherine Tingley.</p> <p>“A constitution for a new theosophical organization was presented. . . . The new organization was called The Universal Theosophical Brotherhood, which a month later was changed to the Universal Brotherhood. Among the signators were Basil Crump, E. August Neresheimer, Robert Crosbie, Joseph H. Fussell, and Arthur L. Conger Jr.”</p>	<p>California Utopia, pp.38-39</p> <p>Conger, p.7</p>
Jan. 18, 1898	<p>Letter from 15 members from Headquarters of the T.S. in America, New York, addressed to “DEAR CO-WORKERS:”</p> <p>“Statements have been circulated among the T.S.A. to the effect that there is discord among the members of the Headquarters Staff, and that its members do not work harmoniously with Mrs. Tingley and with Mr. Neresheimer. . . .</p> <p>“. . . We are a unit in our disapproval of the circular referred to.”</p> <p>Signed by Elliott B. Page, John M. Pryse, James M. Pryse, A.L. Conger, Jr., Joseph B. Fussell, and others.</p> <p>NOTE: The circular mentioned above was dated January 17, 1898. The circular was unsigned and included a list of nominations for officers to be elected at the upcoming Convention.</p>	<p>Circular, 1 page</p>
Jan. 18, 1898 continued	<p>“President’s Office.”</p> <p>“TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE T.S.A.”</p> <p>“In view of the fact that recently a circular letter has been sent to all Branches T.S.A. which was not authorized by me, canvassing support of a certain program for Officers and Executive Committee, to be elected at the next Convention on Feb. 18th and 19th, at Chicago, I deem it my duty to point out to the members that the offices of the Theosophical Society in America do not require preliminary canvassing like a political organization.”</p> <p>Signed by “E. Aug. Neresheimer, <i>President T.S.A.</i>”</p>	<p>Circular, 1 page</p>

<p>Jan. 20, 1898</p>	<p>“AFFIDAVIT” Signed by E.A. Neresheimer, Joseph H. Fussell, H.T. Patterson, and James M. Pryse, it stated: “We, the undersigned, who were present at the first Council Meeting held after Mr. Judge’s death, on March 27th, 7:45 p.m. at Mrs. Tingley’s house . . . hereby declare that we did not depend upon Mr. Hargrove’s statements or actions in our acceptance of Mrs. Tingley as Outer Head of the E.S.T. . . .”</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Oct. 1932; p.4 The Search Light, Vol. 1, Apr. 1898; p.30</p>
<p>Jan. 27, 1898</p>	<p>“FELLOW MEMBERS:” Letter from Archibald Keightley. “In the notice of my resignation of office as President T.S.E.(E.) you will remember that I said it was due to ‘reasons into which I will not enter.’ I desired to withdraw quietly and in silence. “In the January issue of <i>Universal Brotherhood</i> it is stated that I resigned because of ‘increasing medical practice.’ That was not my reason. . . . “. . . I resigned it [my office], because I found it impossible to fulfil my duties towards you as I conceived those duties.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 17, 1897 entry.</p> <p>NOTE: In the Dec. 1897 issue of Universal Brotherhood, the editor published a portrait of Dr. Archibald Keightley as president of Theosophical Society England after his resignation from office.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 3, No. 5, Feb. 1898; pp.25-26 Universal Brotherhood, Vol. 12, Jan. 1898; p.192 Universal Brotherhood, Vol. 12, Dec. 1897; p.93</p>
<p>Jan. 30, 1898</p>	<p>Letter of E. T. Hargrove to Mrs. Tingley. “Now, my dear friend, you have made an awful mess of it — that is the simple truth. <i>You were run in as O[uter] H[ead]</i> as the only person in sight who was ready to hand at the time. We were all of us heartily glad to welcome you, for you solved the problem which confronted us — who was to be O.H.; you were a sort of neutral centre around which we could congregate. And most of us fairly yelled with delight, for you solved our difficulty and we had ample proofs that some members of the Lodge were working through you and that you had high and rare mediumistic and psychic gifts and that you were a disciple of the Lodge. So things went swimmingly for a time. “Our enthusiasm and anxiety to see all go well carried some of us too far — carried me too far to the extent of . . . leading me to use my personal influence with people to get them to accept you as O.H. I thought it was for the good of the work, but since then I have learned better. (Italics added.) ”</p> <p>NOTE: See March 1, 1898 and March 28, 1896 entries. Also see April/May 1998 for Grace F. Knoche’s interpretation of the facts according to the historical records of The Theosophical Society, Pasadena, of which Miss Knoche is current Leader.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.271-272 Eirenicon, No. 105, Winter Solstice, 1952; p.8</p>

<p>End of Jan. 1898 est.</p>	<p>Esoteric School of Theosophy. By Katherine A. Tingley, <i>Outer Head</i>. “My object in preparing this circular is to call the attention of all worthy members of the School to the importance of the new cycle. “... We have Judases in our midst now, just as H.P.B. ^ and W.Q. Judge had them.” She quoted from H.P.B. to bolster support to carry on with the work started by H.P.B. and W.Q. Judge and stated in her conclusion: “I call upon you, for the sake of H.P.B., W.Q.J., and all that they worked and hoped for, to take at the beginning of this new cycle this precious golden opportunity — the door which will lead you to a higher plane of thought and action.”</p>	<p>Circular, 8 pages</p>
<p>Feb. 2, 1898</p>	<p>Letter from Robert Crosbie to “P” later known to be Katherine Tingley. [P— was the letter used to signify “Purple”.] “I remember that the day I first saw you, I recognized you as the O.H. [Outer Head] without hint or instruction as such, and in spite of the fact that I was not looking for a woman’s form in that connection.”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 1, 1901 and 1933 entries.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic Vol. 23, Nov./Dec. 1934; p.9</p>
<p>Feb. 18, 1898</p>	<p>“MISCELLANEOUS NEWS.” The Fourth Annual Convention of The T.S.A. “With the first day of the new cycle, February 18th, was ushered in before the world THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD founded by Katherine A. Tingley on January 13, 1898. . . . [T]he Convention adopted the Resolutions, Mrs. Tingley’s Proclamation, the Constitution of Universal Brotherhood and a new Constitution of the Theosophical Society in America.”</p> <p>The Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, Mr. Iverson L. Harris, read each of the above mentioned. Mrs. Tingley’s Proclamation included the following statement: “The work of each messenger necessarily differs in many respects. H.P.B. attracted the attention of the world to the philosophy. W.Q.J. simplified the teaching and solidified the organization which she founded. “And now it is my privilege and duty in carrying on that work so ably begun, to furnish an organization which shall be ‘the well-made tool’ by which the work can be carried forward into the next century on a grander scale than ever before, and adapted to the needs of the time — an organization which will be free, as far as possible, from the limitations hitherto existing, and which shall unify all branches of this great work: “I have, therefore, to announce that there has been established by me an organization called UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD or, THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY.”</p> <p>Note: Mr. Neresheimer was appointed President of T.S. in America.</p>	<p>Universal Brotherhood, Vol. 12, Mar. 1898; pp.313-320</p>

<p>Feb. 18, 1898 continued</p>	<p>“OFFICIAL NOTICE. TO THE BRANCHES AND MEMBERS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA.” “The Fourth Annual Convention of the Society which met at Handel Hall, Chicago on February 18th, came to an abrupt conclusion. . . . “Endeavor was made, in accordance with an elaborate and carefully prearranged plan to annul the Constitution of the Society and convert it into a literary annex to a new Society, established by Mrs. Tingley, and of which she was to be for life the sole director and source of authority. . . . “. . . The illegality of the action taken [proposed amendments to be brought to the membership two months in advance, which was not done in this case] made it null and void and left those delegates and members who disapproved of it, no other course than to hold their own meeting, whereat . . . [i]t was unanimously agreed to continue the T.S.A. as at present constituted. . . . (Signed) A.H. Spencer, Vice-President and Acting President” [J.D. Buck was a member of the Executive Committee.]</p> <p>Note: This “Official Notice” along with “MEMORANDUM OF PROCEEDINGS OF CONVENTION AT HANDEL HALL, CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 18TH, 1898”, as well as “MINUTES of a Meeting of Members and Delegates to the Fourth Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in America, held in Room W., Palmer House, Chicago, at 4:30 P.M., February 18, 1898” (i.e., of those opposed to the changes) were sent to members and Branches to advise them of the action taken.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New series), Vol. 3, No. 5, Feb. 1898; pp.1-2</p> <p>pp.3-4 pp.14-22</p>
<p>Feb. 18, 1898 continued</p>	<p>MINUTES of a Meeting of Members and Delegates to the Fourth Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in America, held in Room W., Palmer House, Chicago, at 4:30 P.M., February 18, 1898.” When the speaker nominated Mr. E.T. Hargrove as President, Mr. Hargrove spoke announcing that his previous announcement to resign as President of T.S. in A. still stood and that he would not accept any office in the T.S. even if it were offered to him. During his address, E.T. Hargrove stated: “Do the members of this Society, through their Branches, desire to elect officers who will support the Constitution of this Society as it may at any time exist? Or do they desire to elect officers who will over-ride the Constitution at any time, if bidden to do so by one whom such officers may regard as an occult expert?”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New series), Vol. 3, No. 5, Feb. 1898; pp.14-18</p>

Feb. 18, 1898 continued	<p>Esoteric School of Theosophy. “Strictly Private And Confidential.” “To the Members E.S.T.” Signed “Katherine A Tingley, Outer Head”; issued from New York. “You will soon hear of a new step taken at Chicago which is the outward aspect of a higher esoteric body of enormous importance, which all may aspire to through loyalty and devotion. . . . “Members will please note that I should disapprove of any documents or letters sent out to this School, unless indorsed by myself. Mr. Crump and Mrs Cleather still act as my agents in England. Miss Churchill, Sec’y. Acting Council of the E.S.T.: E.A. Neresheimer; H.T. Patterson; J.H. Fussell; Iverson L. Harris; F.M. Pearce; D.N. Dunlop; Wm. Lindsay; Clark Thurston. “All the above are perfectly reliable.”</p> <p>NOTE: While the Headquarters was still at 144 Madison Ave. New York, Mrs. Tingley had rewritten the E.S.T. Pledge on Apr. 3, 1896, before the formation of the “Lodge of Light”. This new “Lodge of Light” had a new “Pledge” and its own initiations based on Masonic Ritual.</p>	Circular, 1 page Based on notes copied by Helen Harris from the Archives at Point Loma.
Feb. 23, 1898	<p>SPECIAL CONVENTION OF THE T.S. IN EUROPE. Held on February 23rd, 1898 at 3 Vernon Place, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C. The Proclamation and the Universal Brotherhood Constitution originally adopted at the Convention held in Chicago on February 18th were presented.</p>	The Internationalist , Vol. 1, No. 6, Mar. 15, 1898; pp.112-120
Feb. 27, 1898	<p>The Future of the Theosophical Publishing Co. issued by Julia Keightley. Correspondence resulting from the difficulties between Neresheimer and herself regarding The Path magazine and the book business which were bequeathed to them by Judge. Includes W.Q.J.’s will.</p>	Pamphlet, 35 pages
Mar. 1898	<p>“THE FREEDOM OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY. AN EXPLANATION.” Letter from Hallein, Austria by Dr. Franz Hartmann. “When at the time of the unfortunate trial of W.Q. Judge. . . . The reason why I stood by his side is that this trial involved the question of belief in Mahatmaship as a dogma of the T.S. It was equivalent to a trial for heresy. . . . I took sides with those who, as I thought, could keep the constitution of the T.S. free from dogmatic belief, irrespectively of what each one might personally believe himself. . . . “. . . I only wish to state that the church of Mrs. Tingley never has been and is not now representing the real Theosophical Society, which has been established by H.P. Blavatsky, nor did the real W.Q. Judge ever resemble the caricature which the adherents of Mrs. Tingley have made of him and of which they have created an object of adulation and idolatry.”</p>	Theos. Forum (New series), Vol. 3, No. 7, Apr. 1898; pp.11-13 English Theosophist (New Series), Vol. 2, No.3, May 1898; pp.53-57

<p>Mar. 1898 continued</p>	<p>“THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD.” By Mr. E. A. Neresheimer. He stated: “As the ideal precedes the practical in all things so has it been in this great movement; . . . after the first two stages of inception and preservation. . . . “. . . Katherine A. Tingley, who has taken upon herself the responsibility and burden of guiding this spiritual movement forward into the ages to come has already touched the keynote to the third stage . . . <i>Practical application of the philosophy!</i> . . . “. . . It is quite certain that no one human being, except a high occultist of the white order, can be entrusted with the guidance of a spiritual movement such as this.”</p> <p>In “The Editor’s Remarks.” [W.A. Bulmer] stated that Mrs. Tingley was an autocratic person. “I oppose the pretensions of the so-called ‘Leader and Official Head of the Theosophical Movement’; a position which no person does or can hold. . . . To acknowledge the new Autocracy would degrade the T.S. below the meanest sect which flourishes on the credulity and moral slavery of its adherents.”</p>	<p>Universal Brotherhood, Vol. 12, No. 12, Mar. 1889; pp.309-310</p> <p>English Theosophist (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 1. Mar. 1898; pp.2-3</p> <p>Vol. 2, No. 2, Apr. 1898; p.35</p>
<p>Mar. 1, 1898</p>	<p>In what the Editor of “Theosophy” labelled his “E.S.T. Encyclical”, E.T. Hargrove restated to Mrs. Tingley: “You were run in as O.H. [Outer Head] as the only person in sight who was ready to hand at the time.” NOTE: See January 30, 1898 for Hargrove’s letter to Mrs. Tingley.</p> <p>Pamphlet “E.S.T.” of March 1, 1898 from Hargrove to K. Tingley.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 21, Oct. 1933; p.571</p> <p>[missing original pamphlet from Hargrove]</p>
<p>Mar. 1, 1898 continued</p>	<p>To All members of The Universal Brotherhood. Warned of circulars sent out “by J.D. Buck, A.H. Spencer, and others, which are incomplete, inaccurate and misrepresentative of the facts. “There was no alteration of the Constitution or amendment thereto, but an entirely new Constitution was adopted which was entirely legal and within the right of the Convention. . . also . . . no other body has the right to use the name of the T.S.A. . . . “. . . Branch Charters of the T.S.A. to be returned . . . for preservation in the archives of THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD and, on receipt of the same, new Charters of THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD will be immediately issued.” From: Katherine Tingley, E.A. Neresheimer, President, and Jerome A. Anderson, as Vice-President, of T.S. in A. “Endorsed by Acting Council of the E.S.T. and by the Cabinet of THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD.”</p>	<p>Circular, 1page</p>

<p>Mar. 10, 1898</p>	<p>“NOTES AND COMMENTS.”</p> <p>“Alexander H. Spencer, Vice-President and Treasurer of the Theosophical Society in America, entered an action in the Supreme Court of the City and County of New York against Katherine A. Tingley and E. August Neresheimer to recover the property of the T.S. in A., alleged to be wrongfully held by defendants, — they having severed their connection with that body.</p> <p>“The property in dispute, besides over 1000 dollars in money, consists of the lease of the premises in Madison Avenue, New York; the safe and office furniture; a library of over 500 very valuable books; the archives of the Society; and various other books, papers, documents, &c.”</p>	<p>English Theosophist (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 2, Apr. 1898; p.35</p>
<p>Mar. 13, 1898</p>	<p>“THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THE E.S.T.”</p> <p>(From <i>New York “Sun,”</i> March 13th, 1898.) E.T. Hargrove stated:</p> <p>“Since the formation of the Theosophical Society by Mme. H.P. Blavatsky and others in 1875, its history has been one of continued struggle. Aggression from without has been frequent, and dissensions within its own ranks. . . .</p> <p>“. . . After Mr Judge’s death in March, 1896, Mrs. K.A. Tingley became the Outer Head of the ‘Esoteric School of Theosophy,’ succeeding Mr. Judge in that department, while the undersigned was elected by the Theosophical societies in America, Europe, and Australasia, to follow Mr. Judge as President of those organizations. . . . And now, as a further evidence of internal discord, Mrs. Tingley widely announces in the New York press that I have attempted to depose her as the Outer Head; . . .</p> <p>“So far I have declined to say anything publicly concerning Mrs. Tingley’s present position, but I now state that Mrs. Tingley is no longer the Outer Head of the ‘E.S.T.’ . . .</p> <p>“. . . [A] pledge published in Mme. Blavatsky’s magazine <i>Lucifer</i> . . . reads as follows: ‘I pledge myself never to listen without protest to any evil thing spoken of a brother Theosophist, and to abstain from condemning others.’ . . .</p> <p>“In a printed paper, recently issued by Mrs. Tingley, . . . she makes a most significant alteration in the Pledge . . . [changed to] ‘I pledge myself never to listen without protest to any evil thing spoken of a worthy brother, and to abstain from condemning others. . . .</p> <p>“. . . Such an attitude is the very negation of the brotherhood. . . .</p> <p>“It should be evident . . . why Mrs. Tingley has ceased to be the agent of the masters. She has indulged in wholesale accusation, and has been obliged to defend her action by lowering the ethical standard it was her duty to uphold.</p> <p>“In occultism ‘men judge, condemn, and execute themselves.’ Her own actions deposed her.”</p>	<p>English Theosophist (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 2, Apr. 1898; pp.28-32</p>

Mar. 29, 1898	<p>Letter from Julia Keightley to the Editor of the Crusader, claiming that the statement, “Mr. E.T. Hargrove and Mrs. Keightley both attempted to gain a hearing when the resolutions had been carried, but an adjournment had already been moved” which had appeared in the Crusader (Nos. 7-8, p.75) “was erroneous” and requested “the usual courtesy of publication” of her correction. J. Keightley stated that when Mr. Spencer, Mr. Hargrove and herself each attempted to speak they were told they were out of order; and that when “Messrs. Spencer, Hargrove, Harter, and others unknown to me <i>again</i> endeavoured to be heard, [t]hey were played down by the organ, and loud cries from the platform, but not from the audience, were heard.”</p>	<p>English Theosophist (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 2, Apr. 1898; pp.37-38</p>
Apr. 1898	<p>“On page 64 of the <i>Crusader</i> Dr. Jerome A. Anderson is reported as giving, among other reasons, for ‘dropping the name (Theosophical Society)’ for Universal Brotherhood the necessity to get rid of certain people. He says of the T.S., ‘No one could be, or, perhaps, ought to have been expelled; but a new title and a new Constitution accomplished effectually the ‘sifting’ process necessary to the formation of a sound, healthy, harmonious nucleus’.”</p> <p>NOTE: Dr. Anderson followed Mrs. Tingley but “lost all confidence in the leader” and “returned to the original Theosophical Society of which Colonel Olcott was President.” See entry for Dec. 25, 1903.</p>	<p>English Theosophist (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 2, Apr. 1898; p.36</p>
Apr. 1898 continued	<p>Robert Crosbie in an article “The Sifting Process”, which appeared in The Search Light, April 1898, shortly after the Chicago Convention, was not only promoting the newly established organization [“Universal Brotherhood,” or “The Brotherhood of Humanity”] with Mrs. Tingley as the “third great Leader” but also supported the sifting out of a certain “small minority, as now, [which] held on to the shells of organizations, pursued the path of persecution, and assumed to have ‘overwhelming virtues’.” Mr. Crosbie was referring to the re-established Theosophical Society in America and mentioned some of the members by name, saying “but they were not part of the staff, nor were they workers in the true sense. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: Mr. Crosbie left Mrs. Tingley’s Point Loma group in 1904 and later formed the United Lodge of Theosophists in 1909. See Feb. 18, 1909.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Mar. 1933; pp.9-10</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 3, Aug. 1932; pp.253-255</p>

May 1898	<p>“MRS. KEIGHTLEY’S STATEMENT.”</p> <p>Statement made in 1896 by Julia Keightley and certified by Councillors of the E.S.T., Herbert Coryn and Basil Crump, as correctly copied from her manuscript.</p> <p>“Now in regard to the present Outer Head [Mrs. Tingley]. . . . For myself, I may say that as early as June, 1894, Mr. Judge told me of the standing of the present Outer Head in the School, and spoke of her work at that time and for the future. I am one among several to whom he spoke himself. Of his appointment of the present Outer Head there is absolutely no doubt; and there is also no doubt of her entire ability to fill that appointment; or of her right to it; or that it came from and was directed by the Master.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Oct. 15, 1927.</p>	<p>The Search-Light, New York, Vol. 1, May 1898; p.30</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 27, Sep. 1946; p.216</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 8, July 1927; p.101</p> <p>H.P.B. Theos. Movement, p.345</p>
May 29-30, 1898	<p>“THE CONVENTION.”</p> <p>The Fourth Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in America continued at the Grand Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.</p> <p>“Called to order at Convention Hall, Grand Hotel at 10.30 A.M. by Mr. A. H. Spencer, Acting President, who announced that the Convention was to be held in continuance of that commenced at Chicago on Feb. 18th last, and which was suspended by default. . . .</p> <p>“Resolutions adopted . . . (5) That the Theosophical Society in America in Convention assembled at Cincinnati on May 29th, 1898 does hereby declare its purpose to continue the organization as heretofore under the Constitution adopted at Boston in 1895 and its regularly adopted amendments. . . .</p> <p>“Officers for the ensuing year elected, viz: President, Dr. J. D. Buck; Vice-President and Treasurer, Mr. A.H. Spencer. . . .”</p> <p>They met again at 8 P.M. with “about 300 persons present.”</p> <p>“Met again at 10.30 A.M., May 30th.”</p> <p>NOTE: Hargrove resigned from the Presidency of T.S. in A. effective Sep. 13th, 1897. A.H. Spencer became Acting President. At the Convention of Feb. 18th, 1897 “Universal Brotherhood” was formed, T.S. in A. continued. A.H. Spencer remained as Acting President until the T.S. in A. Cconvention May 29th -30th, 1898 at which time J.D. Buck became President and J.H. Spencer was elected Vice-President and Treasurer.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 4, June 1898; pp.7-8</p> <p>English Theosophist (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 4, June 1898; pp.73-77</p>
May 29-30, 1898 continued	<p>“<i>To Members of the Theosophical Society in America.</i>”</p> <p>By J.D. Buck, President T.S.A. Report on the Convention and setting the position of T.S. in America:</p> <p>“The object of the Cincinnati Convention, and of those there present or represented, was not and is not to oppose brotherhood, or to antagonize a society organized at Chicago, Feb. 18th, 1898, and called Universal Brotherhood. We insist upon the right, and emphatically declare our intention to maintain the old T.S.A. as left by Mr. Judge, and refuse to accept as a substitute for it the Universal Brotherhood or anything else yet proposed.”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (New Series), Vol. 4, June 1898; p.16</p>

June 1898	<p>Circular from Julia Keightley on the status of “The Theosophical Publishing Co.”</p> <p>“I am informed that Mr. Neresheimer asked the Court to appoint Mr. F.M. Pierce as Receiver. This the Court refused to do. My lawyer had been instructed to name an <i>impartial</i> Receiver, in order that entire justice might be done to both parties; he named three gentlemen, all of them unknown to either Mr. Neresheimer or ourselves. From these one was chosen by the Court to act as Receiver. We were also given the right to issue the magazine (formerly ‘Theosophy’) for two months, under the supervision of the Receiver; this we propose to do. Mr. Neresheimer asked that the sale be made in large lots. The Receiver refused this, and it will be made in small lots to secure greater outside competition.”</p>	<p>English Theosophist (New Series), Vol. 2, No. 4, June 1898; 1 page</p>
1899	<p>Both Albert Smythe and D.N. Dunlop were expelled by Mrs. Tingley because she deemed their “brand of Theosophy was not acceptable.”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 1, Apr. 1920; p.28</p>
Aug. 15, 1899	<p>In A. Besant’s editorial notes about H.P.B.’s testimony to the reality of Keely’s discoveries, Besant wrote:.</p> <p>“[H.P.B.] often, in her humility, buttresses her own true statements with a mass of rubbish from inferior writers, picked up haphazard; on minor points she often speaks hastily and carelessly; and further she confuses her teaching with excessive digressions.”</p> <p>The editor of O.E. Library Critic remarked that Mrs. Besant in many cases “set up her own authority above that of H.P.B. and even the Mahatmas themselves. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: Although Judge always defended H.P.B. we cannot say the same for Annie Besant.</p>	<p>Theos. Review, Vol. 24, Aug. 15, 1899; p.486</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 24, Feb. 1937</p>

<p>Jan. 22, 1900</p>	<p>“INTERVIEW WITH MRS. ALICE L. CLEATHER.” In London by Eleanor Dunlop. “Mrs. Cleather talks about her negative experiences with Mrs. Tingley and the doubts she experienced as part of the 1896 Theosophical crusade around the world.”</p> <p>When asked by E. Dunlop, “Have you any evidence that Mr. Judge appointed a successor?” Cleather replied, “No. I never saw any of the documents said to exist.” E. Dunlop: “You accepted the ‘Leader,’ then, simply on faith?” Cleather replied, “Entirely, and was utterly disappointed in the result.”</p> <p>“THE TINGLEY SUCCESSION” by Ronald A.V Morris. He stated: “I know that Mrs. Cleather takes a different view of the matter now, but that is what she said at the time before the passage of years had played tricks with her memory. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: An undated document marked “Additional Data re Judge and K.T.” found in the H.P.B. Library. The notes are acknowledged as coming from “A well-informed correspondent”, most likely Mr. Morris. Compiler, Basil Crump, added that Alice Cleather told him: “When J. [Judge] died she [Mrs. Julia Keightley] confided to Mrs. Cleather that he [Judge] had designated her (i.e. given her to understand) to succeed him as O.H. of the E.S.T.” This seemingly contradicts Mrs. Julia Keightley’s statement of 1896 found in The Search Light. See May 1898 entry. Mr. Charles J. Ryan also mentioned with regards to Mrs. J. Keightley that, “Many Theosophists thought she might well be Mr. Judge’s successor.” See Sep. 15, 1946 entry.</p>	<p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 67, p.38</p> <p>The Lamp, Vol. 3, Feb. 1900; pp.206-208</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 8, Oct. 1927; pp.174-175</p> <p>1 page; found in The H.P.B. Library</p>
<p>May 1900</p>	<p>Extracts from W.Q. Judge’s unpublished letters [printed in The English Theosophist, which had become Theosophy.] “The A B C of Theosophy should be taught all the time . . . All members who work hard come at last to the notice of the Lodge; and the moment they do so the Black Lodge also takes notice, and hence questions arise, and we are tried in subtle ways that surpass sight, but are strong for the undoing of him who is not prepared by right thought and sacrifice to the higher nature for the fight.”</p>	<p>The Lamp, Vol. 4, May 1900; pp.88-89</p>
<p>Apr. 1, 1901</p>	<p>Address by Robert Crosbie at a meeting in honor of W.Q. Judge held in San Diego under the auspices of the Point Loma Theosophical Society. “Mme Blavatsky was the first leader, by the force of her wisdom and power of leadership, and all the true students of Theosophy accepted her as such. And when she appointed William Q. Judge as her successor, his leadership was accepted for the same reason — and so, too, with Katherine Tingley, who was appointed by William Q. Judge as his successor.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix G, No. 13, for more details. Also see also Feb. 2, 1898 and 1933 entries.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 51pages In Honor of W.Q. Judge; p.46</p>

Mar. 25, 1902	<p>“THEOSOPHISTS DISTURBED BY A SERIOUS REVOLT IN THEIR RANKS. DR. J.A. ANDERSON QUILTS THE SOCIETY.”</p> <p>“On Sunday last Dr. Jerome A. Anderson, who has been prominently identified with Theosophy for the last fifteen years, and was for a long time president of the local branch, sent his resignation to Mrs. Tingley at her home in the society’s handsome headquarters at Point Loma. He accompanied it with a published statement that reflected seriously on Mrs. Tingley’s abilities as an executive officer, and said that the organization was going slowly to pieces under her management. . . .</p> <p>“Dr. Anderson, who as vice-president of the national society was a member of Mrs. Tingley’s ‘cabinet,’ was close to the throne at Point Loma. His resignation came as a surprise to the people there.”</p>	<p>San Francisco Chronicle, Tuesday, Mar. 25, 1902</p>
Feb. 1903	<p>From “<i>Old Diary Leaves</i>.”</p> <p>H.S. Olcott stated that while searching through records for documentary evidence in the Judge case, he found letters from W.Q.J. to H.P.B. in which Judge “complains of his inability to get in touch with the Masters and begs us to intervene on his behalf. Of course, this proved, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the falsity of the pretensions he had been making to his American colleagues and others, that he had been allied with those Personages for many years and was doing what he did under their instructions and with their approval.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 24, Feb. 1903; p.260</p>
Mar. - Sep. 1903	<p>H.S. Olcott’s account of the events of the “Judge Case” for 1894 (“<i>Old Diary Leaves</i>”).</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 24, Mar. 1903, pp.321-322; Apr. 1903, pp.385-400; May 1903, pp.449-452; July 1903, p.583; Aug. 1903, pp.641-647; Sep. 1903, pp.705-713</p>
Apr. 27, 1903	<p>Mr. Kavasji Mervanji Shroff died at Bombay. He was the first Indian who received a diploma from the T.S., having joined in 1878, before H.P.B. and Col. Olcott left America. Mr. Shroff had been in America on a lecturing tour when Olcott approached him about joining the T.S. Mr. Shroff, a member from Bombay, was of great help to the Founders after their arrival there on February 16, 1879. He did “much to rouse the interest of Parsees, in the great truths of their religion and to help on that revival in religion which is so marked a feature of the day in the Parsee, as well as all other communities of India.” He was one of the Vice-Presidents of the Bombay Lodge, T.S., the first Lodge formed in India.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 24, June 1903; Supp. p.xxvi</p>

<p>Apr. 27, 1903 continued</p>	<p>He displayed marked sympathy for dumb creatures and did his best to ameliorate their condition and alleviate their suffering, and for preventing cruelty to animals. Mr. Shroff was involved in establishing the “Bai Sakerbai Hospital for Animals.” He gathered the headmen, from different classes of traders, in the Bombay Bazaar and convinced them to levy a tax on their trade returns for the upkeep of such a Hospital. He managed to get some land donated and the necessary buildings. He then arranged for the Bombay government to attach a Veterinary College to the Hospital, thus providing students the best possible chance for professional training.</p> <p>Mr. Shroff was also the founder on a grand scale, of a Dairy Farm, the first of its kind in Bombay, in order to supply the Bombay public with pure and unadulterated milk.</p>	<p>Old Diary Leaves, Third Series, pp.420-421</p>
<p>Dec. 25, 1903</p>	<p>Jerome A. Anderson died. (Born July 25th, 1847 in Indiana) At an early age his parents moved to Kansas, where he grew up with almost no educational advantages. His thirst for knowledge was insatiable, and by tallow lamps or the flame of hickory bark he spent hours poring over books in the evening after the rest of the family had retired. It is a legend of his childhood that he never learned to read, being found by accident to possess this ability when four years old.</p> <p>After reading a review of the Occult World by Sinnett from the Sacramento Record-Union, he purchased the book, then Isis Unveiled. He then managed to get his first copy of The Path from the Managing Editor of the Morning Call of San Francisco. This brought him into correspondence with Wm. Q. Judge, and he joined the Society as a Member at Large in 1887.</p> <p>He first entered the Medical College of Ohio and completed his degree at the Medical Department of the University of California. Besides medical essays, he wrote many short novels and numerous poems. H.P. Blavatsky must have thought highly of his published works for she incorporated some of his material in the first <i>E.S. Instructions</i> to show the scientific demonstration of foetal nutrition. In 1889 he was elected as Delegate to represent the Pacific Coast Branches at the next American Section Convention. In 1891 he founded the New Californian, a Theosophical monthly which he edited for the first year. In 1894 the Pacific Coast Theosophical Corporation was incorporated and elected Dr. Anderson as President. He also edited The Pacific Theosophist.</p> <p>After the death of Judge, Dr. Anderson followed Mrs. Tingley until March 1902 when he “lost all confidence in the leader” and “returned to the original Theosophical Society of which Colonel Olcott was President. . . . I have seen the Organization, which she took over from Judge both large and enthusiastic, dwindle away in Lodges and membership until it is now little more than a mere handful of her personal admirers. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See March 25, 1902, “DR. J.A. ANDERSON QUILTS THE SOCIETY.”</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Apr. 1893; pp.8-10</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 25, Mar. 1904; Supp. p.xiv</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 12, p.557</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 5, Dec. 1884; p.343</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; p.523</p> <p>Letter addressed Dear Comrades: from Jerome A. Anderson, M.D., received by Mrs. Cleather. 1 page, typed and not dated, with a personal note to A.L.C. on the back.</p>

Apr. 13, 1904	<p>“To William Q. Judge, <i>Teacher and Martyr.</i>” Dedication to W.Q. Judge. by Jasper Niemand.</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 64pages The Vow of Poverty and Other Essays, p.1</p>
Jan. 24, 1905	<p>Letter from E.A. Neresheimer to “Sidney” on Tingley being W.Q.J.’s successor. “The successorship was attested to by many competent persons at the proper time, and the subsequent work of the successor have proved the truth and validity of it more than any statement made by persons. . . . “It is a fact, the successor of Wm. Q. Judge does not tolerate anything that is inimical to the great cause, hence some persons find it very uncomfortable and invent all sorts of excuses when they wish to get from under. “Is it that you had looked for a real saint — and were disappointed?”</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 7, Oct. 1935; pp.25-26</p>
Jan. 1906	<p>Miss Frances Henrietta Müller, B.A., died in Washington. She was born in the early 1850s into a relatively well-off family. In 1873 she was one of the first women to attend Girton College, Cambridge. In the mid-1880s she was active in a number of feminist organizations. She looked to women as the moral saviours of humanity.</p> <p>Miss Müller’s Application for Membership was dated at Headquarters on January 20th, 1891. She had written to Blavatsky asking if women enjoyed the same rights as men in the T.S. Blavatsky responded there were no distinctions, what counted was the work done, and that women could equally aspire to the position of Adept or Mahatma.</p> <p>She was elected Vice-President of the League of Theosophical Workers at the first Annual Convention of the European Section, July 1891. This organization was for spreading Theosophy by using propaganda and doing charitable work.</p> <p>She was free to travel which allowed her to lecture extensively. In England she lectured at the Blavatsky Lodge on women’s rights and Theosophy. She would travel to India yearly to attend the Anniversary celebrations of the T.S. While in India she would do practical missionary work among educated Hindus, inciting them to work for, as well as speak of the spiritual regeneration of India. The Jalandhur Branch started the “H.P.B. Sanskrit School” under the auspices and financial support of Miss Müller. She also donated monies to help replace the funds which had been misappropriated by the Recording Secretary and Treasurer, Pandit S.E. Gopâlacharlu, from the Treasury at Adyar.</p> <p>Mr. Hargrove stated that Miss Müller was a “‘wild woman’ by nature and selection, who like Mrs. Besant, had ‘gone native’ in India, and who used to travel with Hindu youths whom she had adopted.”[Also see The Path Vol. 10, April 1895]</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>Divine Feminine, pp.174-175</p> <p>Banishing the Beast, pp.12-14</p> <p>T.S. Application for Membership form</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, Aug. 1891; p.517</p> <p>Lucifer. Vol. 14, Apr. 1894; p.170 Aug. 1894; p.524</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 13, Mar. 1892; pp.377-382. Vol. 13, Aug. 1892; Supp. pp.87-88</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 13, Sep. 1893; pp.2-3</p> <p>Letters from WQJ to Hargrove, <i>see</i> Appendix D, Part V</p>

<p>Jan. 1906 continued</p>	<p>Miss Müller was appointed as a delegate of the European Section T.S. to attend and participate at the Parliament of Religions, World's Fair at Chicago, 1893. Miss Müller left London, accompanied by Chakravarti and Mrs. Besant. She gave two talks at the Congress – “Theosophy as Found in the Hebrew Books and in The New Testament of the Christians” and “Theosophy and Woman”. Leoline Wright in her vignettes of the World's Fair remembered “the wealthy Henrietta Müller of Maidstone,* England, whom I recall because she was my first experience of the irrepressible British spinster and for her innumerable necklaces of iridescent shells and beads.”</p> <p>Early in 1895 Miss Müller adopted a young adult Bengali as her son. “Her plan is to have her protégé educated for the Bar, enter Parliament, and devote his life to social and political reform in India.” He added his adoptive mother's name to his own — Akshaya Kumar Ghose Müller.</p> <p>At the 1894 Annual Convention at Adyar, Miss Müller publicly accused Mr. Judge of having tried, some years ago, to force Col. H.S. Olcott to resign the Presidency of the T.S.” [See General Report of the Nineteenth Anniversary of the Theosophical Society, Dec. 15-28, 1894, pp.51-53. Also see Dec. 1895 “The Resignation Mystery, 1892” and Jan. 21, 1892.]</p> <p>Miss Müller had met Swami Vivekananda at the 1893 Parliament of Religions in Chicago. She had extended a cordial invitation for him to come to England. The Swami, still in America, sailed from New York about the middle of August 1895, reaching Paris near the end of the month and then on to England. When he arrived in London he was greeted by Miss Müller and E.T. Sturdy. After strenuous work in England and because of his ill health, Müller proposed a holiday tour of the continent. She became his disciple and toured with him. In 1898 she travelled with the Swami in Northern India along with other devotees. She generously donated monies toward the purchase of the Belur Math, headquarters of the Ramakrishna Math and Mission. By late 1899 Miss Müller left the Swami on account of his illness — she could not associate sickness with holiness. The Swami died July 4th, 1902.</p> <p>* On the original Application for Membership form Miss Müller gives her address as Pinkney's Green, Maidenhead. She was certified to be a worthy member, to join the Blavatsky Lodge, by Walter R. Old and Isabel Cooper-Oakley.</p> <p>H.S. Olcott entered in his Diary for June 14, 1895 that Miss Müller had resigned from membership in the T.S. “In her letter of notification to the <i>Westminster Gazette</i> she says that she withdraws because there is no longer any reason for her remaining and that she does not ‘esteem the opinions of the leaders of the Theosophical Society’.”</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 12, Aug. 1893; p.606</p> <p>Theos. Congress World's Fair 1893, pp.29-33, 168-170</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 13, Dec. 1938; p.403</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, Feb. 1895; p.344</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 10, Apr. 1895; p.31</p> <p>Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, Mar. 1895; p.97</p> <p>Vivekananda, pp.91, 102, 133-134, 157, 938</p> <p>Old Diary Leaves, Fifth Series, pp.323-324</p>
--------------------------------	---	--

<p>Jan. 1906 continued</p>	<p>NOTE: For more on Pandit S.E . Gopâlacharlu see “<i>Official Notices</i>” in The Vahan, Second Series [Vol. 1], Oct.1, 1893, p.3.</p> <p>NOTE: Annie Besant suspected that Colonel Olcott had an affair with Miss Müller while he was staying in Miss Müller’s home in the summer of 1891, following H.P.B.’s death. On Nov. 18th, 1891, Besant sent a telegram to Judge and sailed immediately for New York where she asked Judge to lay charges against Olcott. The only direct references that Olcott may have had an affair can be found in a letter addressed by Herbert Burrows to the Editor of The English Theosophist. [See Jan. 21, 1892.] One could deduce from Miss Müller’s attack on Judge that it may have been based on revenge, perhaps not realizing that it was Besant who asked Judge to bring charges against H.S. Olcott.</p>	<p>The Vahan, Vol. 1, Feb. 1892; p.8</p>
<p>Sep. 1906</p>	<p>Question on expulsion of a member; answer from Olcott while he was in Chicago for the Convention of the American Section in 1906. (Olcott arrived in Chicago Sep. 9th, 1906.)</p> <p>“In the trouble that arose round a great Theosophist, Mr. Judge, many years ago, when a motion was brought forward in India for his expulsion, I opposed it. I objected to what he had done. But I opposed his expulsion on the same ground that I take now, that I would not expel a brother, even if he makes a mistake, especially one who had rendered to the movement such great services as Mr. Judge had done.”</p>	<p>Hammer on the Mountain (1972), p.336</p> <p>Theosophical Lectures, 1907; pp.121-122</p>
<p>Sep. 23, 1906, Est.</p>	<p>“COLONEL OLCOTT: A REMINISCENCE” appeared in The Word “without the name of the writer thereof”. The writer was later identified as Mrs. Laura C. Holloway-Langford.</p> <p>The writer, a close friend of Belle Mitchell (Olcott’s sister who had died in 1896), claimed that Col. Olcott had requested a meeting in New York “for the sake of Auld Lang Syne”. Olcott was described as “greatly depressed” and the writer stated “I realized that loneliness and homesickness were prime factors in his case; as also were physical infirmities; and as were memories of other faces now absent”. He spoke of H.P.B. and the writer then asked “And have you no word now for that devoted co-worker of hers and yours, toward whom, after her death, you were hostile? . . . Do you not mourn him at all, that dear old friend of the long ago? . . .</p> <p>“‘Yes, yes,’ he interrupted, ‘I know how you feel about him and always have felt.’ Then, taking my hand in his, he gave my face a searching glance, before he answered, in a manner subdued and most impressive:</p> <p>“‘We learn much and outgrow much, and I have lived much and learned more, particularly as regards Judge’.</p> <p>“‘I know now, and it will comfort you to hear it; that I wronged Judge, not wilfully or with malice; nevertheless, I have done this and I regret it’.”</p> <p>Note: BCW: Vol. I, p.517, (1977 edition), the Editor suggests that the “old friend [was] most likely William Mitchell, the husband of Belle Mitchell, Olcott’s sister”.</p>	<p>The Word, Vol. 22, Oct. 1915; pp.7-19</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 154, p.60,</p> <p>The Word, Vol. 22, Oct. 1915; pp.7-19</p> <p>Damodar, pp.657-658</p>

<p>Feb. 17, 1907</p>	<p>Col. Henry Steel Olcott, President-Founder of The Theosophical Society, died at Adyar.</p> <p>He was born at Orange, N.Y., August 2, 1832, the eldest son of six children, and descended from a well-to-do Puritan family which emigrated to New England in the 17th century. He studied at the College of New York and later at Columbia University. His earliest interest was the scientific study of agriculture in which he achieved international recognition at the early age of twenty-three. He became co-founder with Henry C. Vail of the Westchester Farm School, near Mt. Vernon, N.Y. The Government of the U.S.A. offered him the Directorship of Agriculture, but Olcott declined the offer, as he preferred to carry on independently. His first book, Sorgho and Imphee, the Chinese and African Sugar-Canes (New York: A. O. More, 1858), ran through seven editions and was prescribed as a school text. Olcott soon became an Associate Agricultural Editor of the famous New York Tribune.</p> <p>Olcott's passion for liberty drove him to enlist in the Northern Army at the outbreak of the Civil War; he went through the whole of the North Carolina campaign under Gen. Burnside, and was invalided to New York, having contracted dysentery. The Government chose him to conduct an inquiry into fraud, corruption and graft at the New York Mustering and Disbursing Office, and he was made Special Commissioner of the War Department. Overriding all opposition and enmity, he rounded up every criminal and cleansed the department. He was then promoted to the rank of Colonel. Soon after, the Navy Department applied for the use of Olcott's services to eradicate abuses in the Navy Yards. He acquitted himself of this new responsibility with equal success, earning outspoken appreciations from the Officials.</p> <p>On April 26, 1860, Henry married Mary Epplee Morgan. They had three sons and one daughter; the youngest son and daughter died in infancy. Olcott's surviving sons, Morgan and William, maintained contact with their father, even after his divorce and his involvement with the T.S.</p> <p>In 1865, Olcott, resigned his Commission and devoted himself to the study of law and was admitted to the Bar in May of 1868. He codified confused practices of insurance law and became a specialist in Customs, Revenue and Insurance cases, acquiring a large and prosperous clientele.</p> <p>Olcott felt a deep fascination for the occult and mystical. He had followed with keen interest various psychic phenomena and studied extensively whatever literature was available on the subjects of mesmerism and magnetism, discovering soon that he had himself considerable mesmeric powers in healing. One day in July of 1874, while working in his New York law office, he had a sudden urge to investigate modern Spiritualism.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>Theosophia, Vol.25, Summer 1968, pp.11-13</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 1, pp.503-518</p> <p>Yankee Beacon of Buddhist Light: Life of Col. Henry S. Olcott (1988) by Howard Murphet, formerly published as Hammer on the Mountain (1972), 339 pages</p>
----------------------	---	---

<p>Feb. 17, 1907 continued</p>	<p>He purchased a copy of the Banner of Light and read in it the account of the curious phenomena taking place at the Eddy farmhouse at Chittenden, Vt. He went there as special reporter for the New York Sun and wrote articles describing what he saw. The New York Daily Graphic persuaded him to return to Chittenden and to write another series of accounts. Olcott did so, and it was during his second stay there, namely on October 14, 1874, that he met H. P. Blavatsky who arrived on that date in company of a French Canadian lady.</p> <p>Col. Olcott's life-story from 1874 on is almost identical with the history of the Theosophical Society itself, from its founding in 1875 to his death at Adyar, February 17, 1907. He was a great organizer, a clever administrator, a world-wide traveller on behalf of the Theosophical Society, a remarkable healer, an able lecturer and a man of forceful action in a great Cause. His devotion to the revival of pure Buddhism and the preservation of Buddhist Culture, against missionary inroads, resulted in later years in a widespread network of Buddhist Schools in Ceylon where Olcott is considered today as a National Hero.</p> <p>Olcott also worked for the renewal of Buddhism in Ceylon, helping to establish three colleges and 250 schools. He wrote People from the Other World (1875), The Buddhist Catechism (1881), and Old Diary Leaves, a six-volume history of The Theosophical Society covering the period from 1874 to September 1898.</p> <p>NOTE: Also see: "The Last Days of the President-Founder" by Annie Besant.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 28, Mar. 1907; pp.425-438</p>
<p>Apr. 1907</p>	<p>"The Theosophical Movement." by Charles Johnston. An address delivered at the Convention of the T.S. in America. Johnston reviewed his twenty-two years in the Theosophical movement and discussed the Hodgson report and the Judge Case.</p>	<p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 5, July 1907; pp.16-26</p>
<p>Nov. 1908</p>	<p>"Reminiscences of the Early Days of American Section T.S." By Alexander Fullerton. He joined in May 1887.</p>	<p>Theos. Messenger, Vol. 10, Nov. 1908; pp.33-42</p>
<p>Feb. 18, 1909</p>	<p>After Robert Crosbie split from Point Loma (1904), he formed the United Lodge of Theosophists in Los Angeles, California (1909). "Mr. Crosbie was a Boston Theosophist during the time of W.Q. Judge. . . . [A]fter Judge's death . . . [he] gave [Mrs. Tingley] his loyalty and support. About 1900 he went to Point Loma. . . . However, in the course of a few years, he came to feel that nothing constructive was to be accomplished by remaining [there] . . . and he quietly left the Point Loma Society in 1904 and came to Los Angeles. . . . When, in 1909, he had been joined by a small nucleus of persons who shared this ideal, The United Lodge of Theosophists was formed to carry out the purposes in view."</p>	<p>Pamphlet, 26 pages The United Lodge of Theosophist, Its Mission and Its Future. Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.316</p>

June 1909	<p>“THEOSOPHICAL WORTHIES, William Quan Judge.” by Annie Besant. “His real work, the spread of Theosophy in America, was splendidly performed, and his memory remains as a lasting inspiration.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 30, June 1909; pp.351-354</p>
1910	<p>Countess Wachtmeister died. Born Countess Constance Georgina Louise de Bourbel de Monpinçon March 28, 1838 in Florence, Italy. She lost her parents at an early age and was sent to live with her aunt in England. She married Swedish Count Karl Wachtmeister in 1863 (The Count died in 1871). They had one son, Count Axel Raoul, a well known composer (1865-1938). The Countess joined the T.S. in 1881. She met Blavatsky in April 1884 on a visit to London, and soon became one of her closest friends. She also took care of H.P.B. while in Germany. Her time spent with Blavatsky, from 1885 to 1891, is documented in her book, Reminiscences of H.P. Blavatsky and The Secret Doctrine (1893). After H.P.B.’s death ‘A League of Theosophical Workers’ was formed, “to carry on in organized fashion all kinds of propagandist and charitable work, that may tend to spreading of the Theosophical ideal.” Wachtmeister was elected President, Miss Müller as Vice-President and Mrs. Cooper-Oakley as Secretary.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 6, p.448</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, Aug. 1891; p.517</p> <p>The Vahan, Vol. 1, Sep. 1891; p.8</p>
Sep. 1910	<p>A. Besant’s account of the events surrounding Olcott’s proposed resignation in 1892. Claimed Mahatmas told him in a communication of Feb.10, 1892 not to resign.</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 21, 1892 for Olcott’s “EXECUTIVE CIRCULAR” where he revokes his resignation; Also see Jan. 11, 1896, Jan. 21, 1892 and H. Burrows’ resignation Oct. 2, 1895.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 31, Sep. 1910; p.1624</p>
Apr. 14-15, 1912	<p>William Thomas Stead died. (Born in 1849) English journalist, editor and spiritualist. He was assistant editor (John Morley was editor) of the Pall Mall Gazette from 1880 to 1883, and editor from 1883 to 1888. In 1890 he started publishing the prestigious monthly, Review of Reviews. Being interested in spiritualism, psychical research and Theosophy, W.T. Stead edited Borderland (1893-1897), a periodical especially devoted to these subjects. Bound for New York, Stead lost his life on the ocean liner, <i>Titanic</i>.</p> <p>In July 1893, he wrote: “It is barely twelve months since my hand began to write automatically.” His communications with his departed friend “Julia” were documented in Review of Reviews starting in April that year and then in Borderland.</p>	<p>The Occult World of Mme. Blavatsky, p.335</p> <p>Oxford Companion to English Lit. (1933)</p> <p>H.P.B. by Sylvia Cranston, p.361</p> <p>Borderland, Vol. 1, July 1893; p.39</p>

<p>Aug. 7, 1912</p>	<p>Franz Hartmann died from heart failure. (Born Nov. 22, 1838 at Donauwörth, small town on the Danube in Bavaria). His father was German and his mother was of Irish descent.</p> <p>“A German physician, philosopher and mystic, who was one of the most productive workers in the early days of the Theosophical Movement, and a personal friend of H.P.B. He was a great student of Paracelsus, and of mediaeval occultism in general.”</p> <p>Since his early youth, Franz felt as if he had two distinct personalities in him: one was a mystic, a dreamer and an idealist, while the other was obstinate and self-willed, inclined to all sorts of mischief.”</p> <p>In 1865, he became <i>doctor medicinae</i> and <i>Magister pharmaciae</i>. He came to live in the United States on August 28, 1865 and became an American citizen in 1867.</p> <p>When The Occult World of A.P. Sinnett was published, he managed to get a copy of it. Being still greatly attracted to certain aspects of the Spiritualistic view of life, he became much irritated at its contents and wrote to Col. Olcott, “giving him and the ‘Brothers’ a piece of his mind.” Correspondence ensued, which led him to eventually sail to India. On December 4, 1883 he arrived at Madras then went to Adyar where he was welcomed by H.P. Blavatsky. He was in residence at Adyar during W.Q. Judge’s visit, also during the expulsion of the Coulombs, and at the time of the visit of Richard Hodgson, December 1884-January, 1885. His first-hand account is in his Report Of Observations made during a Nine Months’ Stay at the Headquarters of The Theosophical Society (Madras), India. He received his first letter from Master M. on December 25, 1883, only three weeks after his arrival at Adyar, in reply to a brief letter he had placed in the “Shrine.”</p> <p>Around 1893, Hartmann started editing a German Theosophical Monthly journal called <i>Lotusblüthen</i> which continued for eight years (1893-1900, sixteen volumes.)</p> <p>In April 1897, he came to America to represent the German Theosophists at the Convention of the T.S. in America held in New York. Dr. Hartmann’s association with Katherine Tingley did not last. He founded in Munich on September 3, 1897, a body known as the <i>International Theosophische Verbrüderung</i>, on lines which he considered to be closer to those indicated by H.P. Blavatsky in the early days.</p> <p>During his lifetime of devotion to the Theosophical Movement he wrote a large number of books, including The Life Of Paracelsus (1887). He died in his homeland at Kempten, in Southern Bavaria.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 8, pp.130, 439-457</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 8, p.457</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 34, Oct. 1912; p.119</p>
---------------------	---	--

1913	<p>Historical retrospect, by Dr. J. D. Buck, on the Theosophical Movement, including the famous <i>missive</i> “Judge’s Plan is right”.</p> <p>“I may say, in passing, that one little sentence in <i>Script</i>, of only four words — ‘<i>Judges</i>’[sic]<i>Plan is right</i>’— led to the disruption of the harmony previously existing, allowed <i>personalities</i> to overshadow <i>Principles</i>, and has given rise to ‘<i>Judgeites</i>’ and ‘<i>Besantites</i>’ ever since.”</p> <p>“For the last two or three years of his life, a broader aspect than the T.S. organization was constantly in Mr. Judge’s mind; and he spoke of the ‘<i>Theosophical Movement</i>’ quite as often as of the ‘<i>Society</i>’.”</p>	<p>Modern World Movements by J.D. Buck, pp.79, 120-125, 131-135</p> <p>p.134</p>
July 21, 1913	<p>Alexander Fullerton died in Flushing, New York. (Born Sep. 12, 1841 in Philadelphia).</p> <p>He attended school when he was four years old, entered Princeton University in 1860 and graduated in 1864. He was ordained Deacon in the Episcopal Cathedral Church, Burlington, New Jersey, in June 1865. In 1875, at his own request, Mr. Fullerton was deposed from the ministry of the Episcopal Church. He then took up the study of law at the University of Pennsylvania and graduated in June 1877. He never applied for admission to the bar.</p> <p>He joined the T.S. in May 1887. As there was no Theosophical work for him in New York at the time, he offered his services to Col. Olcott as his Private Secretary. He sailed for England on August 1888 and passed some days in London, twice visiting H.P.B. at the “odd little cottage near the Crystal Palace at Sydenham” before continuing to India. His stay at Adyar was very brief due to his physical collapse, aggravated by a poisonous bite. He returned to New York three months to the day he had left.</p> <p>Upon his return he discovered that the Aryan Branch had grown in membership. He replaced the ailing Mr. Samuel Clapp as Mr. Judge’s office assistant. He served in that capacity until the American Section T.S. declared its entire autonomy, and was from then on called The Theosophical Society in America.</p> <p>In January, 1889, he returned to London on business in response to telegrams from H.P.B. His stay was expected to be indefinite, but in fact lasted only a few weeks. H.P.B. by then had moved to Lansdowne Road.</p> <p>When he returned to New York he discovered that Mr. Judge’s offices had moved to Park Row and a new publication, The Theosophical Forum, was started in April 1889. Fullerton was made Editor.</p> <p>In the autumn of 1895 he was elected General Secretary of the revamped American Section of the T.S. He was re-elected year after year until 1907 when he opposed Annie Besant regarding the “Leadbeater affair.” He lost to Dr. Weller van Hook, an ardent disciple of Leadbeater.</p>	<p>The American Theosophist, Vol. 14, Sep. 1913; pp.986-989</p> <p>Theos. Messenger, Vol. 10, Nov. 1908; pp.33-42</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 31, Mar. 1910; pp.781-782</p> <p>The Elder Brother p.91</p>

<p>Oct. 9, 1915</p>	<p>Julia Keightley (Jasper Niemand) died. (Born in 185[5]?) Julia Wharton Lewis Campbell was the daughter of a prominent Pennsylvania lawyer and member of the U.S. Congress for several terms.</p> <p>She married Philip W. Ver Planck of New York in 1871. He died six years later and within a year she also lost both her sons suddenly. She was invited to hear Mr. Arthur Gebhard speak on Theosophy in a friend's drawing room. The impression made upon her was so deep that she joined the T.S. within two weeks, in mid 1886.</p> <p>Her childhood was mainly spent among the Pennsylvania mountains and later on the continent of Europe, where she was educated and developed her literary talents. Her early writings consisted of translations from the poems of the Kings of Sweden, in original verse, tales and descriptions published in Harper's Magazine, the Galaxy and other periodicals. Her first theosophical article appeared in The Path, August 1886, under the name "Julius". She also wrote under the names of "August Waldensee," "J," and later as "Jasper Niemand," as well as unsigned articles. She was invaluable in proof-reading and other technical jobs, in preparing the numerous publications and documents for printing, and in other various department activities such as her assiduous work for the Esoteric Section.</p> <p>She first met Dr. Archibald Keightley in 1889 on his first visit to the United States; Mrs. Ver Planck continued to live with her parents in Pennsylvania until the autumn of 1891 when they married. After a year's residence in New York they were called to England by the health of Dr. Keightley's mother. During Annie Besant's absence in India in 1893-1894, Mrs. Keightley took up residence and worked at the London Headquarters for several months.</p> <p>She was very close to W.Q. Judge and was the recipient of many of his letters, which were published under the title Letters That Have Helped Me. These were written for her and for Dr. Keightley, and for the use of others later on, at the express wish of H.P. Blavatsky. In response to the instruction she had received from Mr. Judge, she "wrote a series of wonderful articles, of which it may fairly be said that, for the first time in the history of the Theosophical Society, they sounded some of the depth of the inner, spiritual life. For many, her articles were the first impulse in the present life awaking dormant intuitions of the soul's august mysteries."</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 9, pp.435-438</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Apr. 1894; pp.14-17</p> <p>Theos. Messenger, Vol. 10, Nov. 1908; pp.33, 38</p> <p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 13, pp.220-225</p>
---------------------	---	---

<p>Nov. 3, 1915</p>	<p>Miss Katharine Hillard died. She was a member of a prominent Brooklyn family. Her cousin, Mr. Seth Low, was President of Columbia University (1890-1901) and served as Mayor of Brooklyn (1882-1885) and New York City (1901-1903).</p> <p>She was a very distinguished Dante scholar. After spending four winters in Italy studying Dante and the mysticism of the middle ages she visited H.P. Blavatsky in London in May 1888 en route to New York. She spent two or three evenings with Mme. Blavatsky. “She advised me to settle neither in Rome nor London, but to return to New York. ‘You could not do better,’ she said in her emphatic way, ‘than to go back to New York, and study with W. Q. Judge. He is a <i>good man</i>.’ Never shall I forget the stress she laid upon those words, as if to answer the attacks she doubtless foresaw.”</p> <p>Later that spring she met Mr. Judge, who came to see her in Brooklyn. She applied for fellowship in the Society and was admitted by the Aryan T.S. on December 18th, 1888.</p> <p>“As a successful writer, she had won a reputation for careful research, for sound judgment, for trustworthy craftsmanship.” She worked with Mr. Judge and read many valuable papers before the Aryan T.S. She contributed articles to The Path, The Theosophical Forum (original) and to The Theosophical Forum, New Series generally signing in full, sometimes with initials only.</p> <p>Along with Julia Keightley, Katharine Hillard was an indispensable worker and strong supporter of Mr. Judge and Theosophy, at the cost of her reputation as a respected intellectual scholar.</p> <p>Her translation of the Il Convito into English (Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., London, 1889) is considered one of the best. Among other titles, she published An Abridgement of The Secret Doctrine (1907). [Republished by Edmonton Theosophical Society, 1992.]</p>	<p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 7, pp.59-61</p> <p>Her Application form</p> <p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 13, pp.220-221</p> <p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 34, p.154</p>
---------------------	--	---

1916	<p>Dr Jirah Dewey Buck died. (Born Nov. 20, 1838 at Fredonia, New York.) He graduated from Cleveland Homeopathic College in 1864. He married Melissa M. Clough in 1865. Dr. Buck was Prof. of Physiology at Cleveland Homeopathy College (1866-71), became Dean of Pulte Medical College in Cincinnati in 1880, and President of the American Institute of Homeopathy in 1890.</p> <p>Dr. Buck was a 33° Mason and a lifelong student of occultism. He was one of the first to join the Theosophical Society in 1878 after reading Isis Unveiled. He was appointed by H.S. Olcott to serve as a member of the Board of Control of the T.S. in America on May 13, 1884, to consider plans for a Theosophical revival in the U.S. He was probably one of Judge’s closest friends and, being a medical doctor, looked after Judge’s health. Judge quite often stayed in Cincinnati at the Buck residence. Buck wrote numerous excellent articles — sometimes using the pseudonym “Hiraj” — for The Path, The Theosophist, and Lucifer, and Blavatsky quoted him in The Key to Theosophy. After Judge’s death, Buck became despondent and became a follower of “TK,” an “Occult” writer with pretensions to higher Masonic knowledge.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 3, pp.498-199</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.122-123</p> <p>NOTE: For a list of some of his books see BCW, Vol. 3, p.499</p>
May 17, 1916	<p>Dr. William Hübbe-Schleiden died in Göttingen, Germany. Born at Hamburg, Germany, Oct. 20, 1846. He was one of the chief founders and the first President of the Germania Theosophical Society in 1884. He was a learned Scholar and author who studied law and political economics as a young man and travelled widely in geographical explorations. His title of Doctor was applicable to the field of law — in jurisprudence and political economy.</p> <p>In 1886 he founded a metaphysical magazine, The Sphinx, which he edited for twenty-two volumes (until 1896). He visited H.P.B. (sometimes for a week or more) four or five times during the period that she was writing The Secret Doctrine and considered it to be a work of the utmost importance, actually containing the sacred wisdom of the sages of all time. Several years after his visits to H.P.B. he was asked to record his observations as to how she wrote The S. D. These observations appeared in The Path, Vol. 8, Apr. 1893, p.2, in Reminiscences of H.P. Blavatsky and “The Secret Doctrine” by Countess Wachtmeister, pp.114-155 and in Letters from The Masters of the Wisdom (Second Series), Letters 69 and 70.</p> <p>Dr. William Hübbe-Schleiden received two Certificates from The Masters regarding the “triple production” authorship of The Secret Doctrine. These Certificates and how they came about are explained in The Mahatmas and Their Letters by Geoffrey A. Barborka. “The reason that Mr. Judge was able to publish the two certificates two years after Mme. Blavatsky’s passing was because he had received the same certificates, which had been sent to him by H.P. Blavatsky. Then upon having been given the authorization to print the documents he complied with the instructions.” See April 1893 entry for AUTHORSHIP OF SECRET DOCTRINE.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 7, pp.375-377</p> <p>Reminiscences of H.P.B. (1976), p.97</p> <p>Mahatmas and Their Letters (1973), p.299</p> <p>H.P.B. by Sylvia Cranston, pp.288-289</p> <p>Rebirth of The Occult Tradition, pp.12. . . .</p> <p>Theos Forum (P.L.), Vol. 26, Apr. 1948; pp.223-226</p> <p>Mahatmas and Their Letters, pp.299-305</p>

<p>June 25, 1919</p>	<p>Robert Crosbie died in Monterey, CA. (Born in Montreal, Canada, Jan. 10, 1849) His parents were both connected with the Hudson's Bay Company. He married the daughter of one of his partners of a shoe and leather manufacturing business. (They divorced in 1892.) A favorable opportunity arose to sell the business in Montreal and start another one in Boston. Mr. Crosbie then became an American citizen. He became a member of the T.S. on June 5, 1888 and made his first contact with Mr. Judge at a talk given by Mr. Judge in Boston. At this first meeting Mr. Judge told him: "Crosbie, you are on my list." Mr. Crosbie recorded: "a veil was lifted . . . a tie was formed which has never since been broken." When the Esoteric Section was formed Mr. Crosbie was one of its earliest members. After H.P.B.'s death Mr. Judge put Crosbie in charge of the EST Groups in the seven New England States. He joined Mrs. Tingley at Point Loma in 1898 but left in 1904. In 1909, he founded the United Lodge of Theosophists in Los Angeles, California, and in 1912 founded the magazine, Theosophy.</p> <p>NOTE: Crosbie was present in New York at a meeting with Mrs. Besant, Mr. Judge and others at Astor House. During that meeting, Mrs. Besant narrated the events that took place at the General Council of the Inner Group of the E.S. (in London on May 27, 1891) and kept a record of this meeting. It was at this meeting that a "note" on which the Master had written "Judge's plan is right", fell out of the packet of tied letters she had in her sole possession, and which she had brought herself to that meeting.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 7, Aug. 1919; p.320</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 23, June 1935; p.337 Vol. 24, June 1936; pp.337-343</p> <p>R.C. Bio. Notes</p> <p>R.C. Bio. Notes, (ULT)</p>
<p>1921</p>	<p>Herbert Burrows died. (Born in 1845) English civil servant and an active socialist. Educated at Cambridge University, Burrows was a vocal partisan of Secularism, Irish independence, and women's rights. He was a founding member of the Social Democratic Federation and was active with Besant in leading the Match Girls Strike of 1888. He was the Secretary of the Matchmakers' Trade Union from 1888 to 1889.</p> <p>Burrows stated that he joined the T.S. "a few days before" Besant. She joined on May 10, 1889. Before joining Blavatsky told them, "You had better read what there is against me", and "referred us to the <i>Psychical Report</i>". When he joined he stated that he was a "sceptic by nature" and "a materialist". He served on the European Section Advisory Council formed by H.P.B. While Blavatsky was alive he lectured throughout England spreading Theosophy, helping to create a strong Section. He was a British Parliamentary candidate in 1908 and 1910.</p>	<p>H.P.B. by Sylvia Cranston, pp.363-364</p> <p>A Short History of the T.S., pp.269, 282, 347</p> <p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, 2nd ed., pp.80-81</p> <p>The Occult World of Madame Blavatsky, p.329</p>

<p>June 27, 1921</p>	<p>Alfred Percy Sinnett died in London. (Born January 18, 1840) He was the son of a journalist; his father died when Alfred Percy was only five years old. He did poorly in school, which he left without finishing his studies. He became a draftsman and helped his widowed mother support his three sisters and two brothers. He later obtained a position as associate and sub-editor for The Globe. His career thereafter involved editorial positions with various newspapers. On April 6, 1870 Sinnett married Patience Edensor and on May 1877 she gave birth to a son, Denny, who died of tuberculosis on May 11, 1908. Mrs. Sinnett died of cancer that same year, on November 9th.</p> <p>In 1872 Sinnett had his great opportunity when Mr. George Allen, the proprietor of The Pioneer, an Anglo-Indian newspaper of Allahabad, offered him the editorship. It was while in India that he met Madame Blavatsky and Col. Olcott (December 4, 1879). He was the recipient of The Mahatma Letters, which he kept and which are now in the British Museum. In March 1881 the Sinnetts went to England for a holiday. It was at this time that he published his first theosophical book, The Occult World, which described occult phenomena that had been produced by Blavatsky while staying at the Sinnetts and in the company of friends. This led to The Pioneer terminating his editorial contract. The Sinnetts then moved back to London, arriving on April 26, 1883.</p> <p>In 1885 Sinnett was elected President of the London Lodge, and held this office for many years. During this time he published The Transactions of the London Lodge of The T.S. (forty-four lectures; republished by Edmonton Theosophical Society in 1997). He was always drawn to spiritualism, hence to séances. He came to be at odds with Judge as to who had actually written the famous “Prayag Letter”.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 2, July 1921; p.66</p> <p>Damodar, pp.270-284</p> <p>Autobiography of A.P. Sinnett (1986)</p> <p>The American Theosophist, Vol. 54, July 1966; pp.164-167</p>
<p>Aug. 27, 1921</p>	<p>From a retyped copy of a letter signed by The Anagarika Dharmapala, Maha Bodhi Society, Calcutta, to Mrs Alice L. Cleather in Srinagar. “It was the Judge episode that made me to realise how little brotherhood there was in the Besant Section of the T.S. In America, in 1894, because I showed great sympathy with the party who followed Judge Countess Wachtmeister wrote to the Besantine branches to boycott me. The Judge party invited me to their branches, to the Besantines I was taboo. However I remained in the T.S. until 1905 visiting Adyar; but since then I have abstained going there. In 1895 Col. Olcott wrote me that the Master did not want that I should be admitted as a guest at Adyar. I smiled and said to myself it could not be the Master’s desire but Col. Olcott’s.”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 29, 1933 entry for more information on how Anagarika Dharmapala came to Theosophy. Also see Aug. 3, 1922 and Dec. 3, 1925 for his comments about Annie Besant.</p>	<p>Letter from The Anagarika Dharmapala, Aug. 27, 1921; 2 pages</p>

1922	<p>“Notes By Basil Crump” on E.S.T. circular of April 3rd, 1896, consisting of B.C.’s comments included within the text of a transcribed copy of said circular.</p> <p>Note: See April 3, 1896.</p>	5 pages
Feb. 6, 1922	<p>Letter from The Anagarika Dharmapala to Mrs. Cleather. “T.S. under A.B. is a powerful body. She gets whatever she wants and is in league with politicians. “A.B. was duped by Chakravarti and later on she found she could dupe Chakravarti.”</p> <p>NOTE: The Anagarika Dharmapala left the Theosophical Society in 1905.</p>	<p>Letter from The Anagarika Dharmapala, Feb. 6, 1922; 1 page</p> <p>Anagarika Dharmapala and The T.S., p.7</p>
Mar. 3, 1922	<p>From a retyped copy of a letter signed by The Anagarika Dharmapala, Maha-Bodhi Society, Calcutta, to Mrs Alice L. Cleather. “My dear Sister, “C.W.L. [Charles Webster Leadbeater] and A.B. [Annie Besant] are spiritualistic acrobats. They know the diplomacy of necromancy; but they succeed. In 1907, I attacked them furiously; but as I say they are diplomats and they know what way to go to get hold of the people who desire for occult studies. . . . “I feel sad sometimes that there is not to be found a true successor of the great H.P.B. Col. Olcott loved power more than truth. He feared A.B. W.Q.J. had not. . . . “Theosophy of C.W.L. and Besant is a travesty of the doctrine taught by H.P.B. In 1900 I wrote in my Diary that the 3rd Vol. of the S.D. was a fabrication of A.B. She is clever and managed to do what she willed. . . . Every attempt should be made to warn true Theosophists of A.B.’s & C.W.L.’s writings. The latter is a necromancer and a diabolical liar.”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 29, 1933 for a biographical sketch on Mr. Dharmapala.</p>	<p>Letter from The Anagarika Dharmapala, March 3rd, 1922; 1 page</p>
July 18, 1922	<p>Bahman Pestonji Wadia resigned as a member of the Indian Council and of the Indian Section T.S. [Letter to The General Secretary, Indian Section T.S. Benares City.]</p> <p>To all Fellow Theosophists and Members of the Theosophical Society: A Statement by B.P. Wadia. Constituting his Letter of Resignation with reasons therefor.</p> <p>Includes Wadia’s covering Letter (Addressed to “Dear Madam and Colleagues:”) tendering his resignation as a member of the General Council of the T.S.</p>	<p>Letter from Los Angeles, 1 page</p> <p>Pamphlet, 18 pages</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 44, Oct. 1922; Supp. pp.1-12</p>

Sep. 11, 1922	<p>“News has been received by today’s mail that Mr. B.P. Wadia, a well-known member of the Theosophical Society, who was formerly connected with <i>New India</i>, has severed his connection with the Indian T.S., owing to a serious disagreement with the International Headquarters at Adyar, Madras. Mr. Wadia, however remains a staunch Theosophist.”</p> <p>NOTE: See March/April 1964 entry for J.M. Prentice’s book review of The Last Four Lives Of Annie Besant in The Canadian Theosophist.</p>	The Last Four Lives Of Annie Besant , p.328
Sep. 11, 1922 continued	<p>Comments by Mrs. Besant on B.P. Wadia’s resignation as recorded by A.H. Nethercot:</p> <p>“Nevertheless, with her customary undeviating magnanimity, she forgave him for his defection in the following public words: ‘Sunshine and cloud follow each other, and the sunshine of Theosophical brotherhood in Europe is clouded by the loss of one who has worked well for the Society — B.P. Wadia. For some years he has been slowly drifting from his old moorings, and has now broken the tie . . . Having worked with him for so long, I can only wish him well in the line he has chosen . . .’”</p>	The Last Four Lives Of Annie Besant , pp.328-329
Est. date early 1920’s	<p>“In the course of a serious conversation [with B.P. Wadia], Mrs Besant admitted that what was presented to her — namely that Judge was innocent of the charges made against him — was on the whole accurate, and she said that some time previously she had come to the conclusion that Judge had committed no forgery, and that the messages received by him were genuine. On being requested to say that much, only, if not more, to the Theosophical public the world over, Mrs. Besant demurred and remarked that it was an old forgotten matter — ‘Why revive it?’”</p> <p>NOTE: “Mr. B.P. Wadia, of Bombay, India, for years an active member and speaker of the Adyar Society, has supplied the editor of this volume with a signed statement giving this account of his interview with Mrs. Besant.”</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, pp.297-298</p> <p>The Last Four Lives Of Annie Besant, p.328</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.342</p>
Sep. 15, 1922	<p>“Mr. B.P. Wadia.”</p> <p>Albert Smythe examined Wadia’s resignation.</p> <p>“Mr. Wadia’s position is that the defects are now the dominant characteristics, and that the great body of the members have lost the power of discrimination and merely swallow what prominent members tell them without even being aware of what the Society was founded to do or what its historic literature teaches. Not merely do they not know, but they refuse to know.”</p>	Cdn. Theosophist , Vol. 3, Sep. 1922; pp.105-107
Sep. 18, 1922	<p>“Reply of Mr. N.P. Subramania Iyer, President, Bangalore Cantonment Lodge, T.S., to Mr. B.P. Wadia, with reference to the latter’s statement that accompanied his resignation.”</p>	Pamphlet, 10 pages

Oct. 1, 1922	<p>“AN OPEN LETTER TO MR. WADIA” From J. Krishnamurti and J. Nityananda. “Your contention, then, must be that Dr. Besant officially, and Bishop Leadbeater unofficially, have led the Theosophical Society away from the teachings of H.P.B. . . . “There are two possible interpretations to your accusations: 1.) That ‘Theosophy is not an evolving system of thought’ . . . 2.) That this system of thought, as given forth by H.P.B., was not complete in itself and <i>is</i> capable of further development, but that Dr. Besant and Bishop Leadbeater have not been and are not capable of amplifying and expanding this system of thought by independent investigation, and that they have gone seriously astray from the ‘original programme’.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 44, Dec. 1922; Supp. pp.1-12</p>
Oct. 1922	<p>Editorial comment by Annie Besant on B.P. Wadia’s resignation. “So far as I know, there is no special ‘disagreement with Headquarters’ but with the Society as a whole, which is, he considers, going on wrong lines.”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 44, Oct. 1922; p.8</p>
Oct. 1922	<p>“OUR GENERAL SECRETARIES. No.1. WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE.” Tribute paid to Judge by Besant. “The third name which rises before the mind, when one thinks of the founding of the Theosophical Society, after those of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky and Henry Steele [sic] Olcott, is that of William Quan Judge, one of its Vice-Presidents. . . . “He was beside H.P.B. through those early days. . . . And throughout the remainder of her life on earth, the friendship remained unbroken, and during the later years she regarded him as her one hope in America, declaring that, if the American members rejected him, she would break off all relations with them, and know them no more. . . “. . . Spiritual and intuitional, he was also extraordinarily capable as an organiser and a leader. . . . “. . . [H]idden under the reserved demeanour of the young lawyer: an unquenchable energy, a profound devotion, an indomitable will. . . held together by a single aim — the spreading of the truths of Theosophy. . . .”</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 44, Oct. 1922; pp.4-5, 9-10</p>

<p>Oct. 1922 continued</p>	<p>“RESTITUTION” Referring to Mrs. Besant’s article in Oct. 1922 issue of the Theosophist: “To appreciate the full force of Mrs. Besant’s confession of the real nature and work of Mr. Judge, one has but to turn to her “Case Against W.Q. Judge,” published broadcast by her in April, 1895, as the culmination of two years’ impeachment by her, in public and in private, of the name, the fame, the reputation and character of Mr. Judge. The havoc wrought by her false charges — and false they must have been, by her own statements as above — that havoc must be repaired. Every true Theosophist will rejoice that Mrs. Besant has so far freed herself from the dreadful incubus that has so long clouded her; will hope that she may go on straight-forwardly to repair the mischief done so long ago; will aid her and all others who have shared in and suffer from the consequences of her great folly, to return to the pure teachings and the pure inspiration of H.P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge.”</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 11, Dec. 1922; pp.49-50</p>
<p>Jan. 8, 1923</p>	<p>Claude Falls Wright died in Nicaragua, Central America while there on business. (Born Sep. 18, 1867 in Dublin, Ireland) When he was eighteen, he entered the Royal College of Surgeons to study medicine, and had not completed the first year before he heard of Theosophy through Charles Johnston. This subject then claimed his attention, and he went to London at the age of twenty to see H.P.B., afterwards asking her to advise him about going to India, to which she replied: “Do not go, but come to me and I will teach you.” Acting on H.P.B.’s suggestion, he formed a Branch at Dublin which was opened by W.Q. Judge and Dr. A. Keightley.</p> <p>He was the last secretary that Madam Blavatsky had during the last three years of her life and was beside her at the time of her death. Exactly seven months later he arrived in New York. He travelled about the United States, lecturing and organizing new Branches.</p> <p>Mr. Wright married Leoline Leonard in new York on May 3rd, 1896, which served as the first public appearance for Katherine Tingley in connection with Theosophy. The Wrights had a son who, unfortunately, went insane.</p> <p>The Wrights accompanied Katherine Tingley and others on the “Crusade” around the world. He was present (Feb. 23, 1897) at Point Loma and participated in the Ceremonies of the laying of the Corner Stone of the School for the Revival of the Lost Mysteries of Antiquities. His whole life was devoted to the Theosophical movement.</p> <p>Mr. Wright had been preparing a series of articles on Blavatsky’s life and work from his valuable data when he drowned in Pearl Lagoon in Nicaragua after losing his footing while stepping from a larger to a smaller boat one late evening.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Feb. 1894; pp.351-352</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 44, May 1923; pp.221-222</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 11, pp.593-594</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.463-464</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 278, p.91</p> <p>The Lamp, Vol. 2, June 1896; p.166</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 3, Jan. 1923; p.168 Feb. 1923; pp.184-185</p> <p>H.P.B. As I Knew Her, p.23</p>

1925	Adyar published The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society . Edited by C. Jinarajadasa, V.P. of the T.S. Gives a brief history on “The Judge Case.”	pp.131-141
Dec. 3, 1925	<p>Letter addressed to “My dearest Coworker” [Christmas Humphreys], from Anagarika Dharmapala. “Mrs. A.B. [Annie Besant] I am afraid will eventually destroy the work of H.P.B. and the Masters. The T.S. will become under her management a Christian sect, and bishops, deacons etc. will rule the T.S. Brotherhood will disappear. Ambition, pride, the desire to rule will control the minds of those members and they will degenerate.”</p> <p>Letter from Anagarika Dharmapala to Alice Cleather. “The T.S. has become a political organization and Mrs. Besant engaged in legal disputes spending thousands of rupees in defending immoral persons. . . . She is now absorbed in Indian politics. The T.S. has deteriorated much.”</p> <p>NOTE: Also see Aug. 27, 1921.</p>	<p>Buddhism in England, Sep./Oct. 1933; p.83</p> <p>Letter from The Anagarika Dharmapala, Aug. 27, 1921; 2 pages</p>
Aug. 1926	<p>In the FORWARD to “Part II, Letters to H.S. Olcott, 1879-1884”, Mr. Jinarajadasa wrote the following: “W.Q. Judge might have earned the same place to the gratitude of all Theosophists, but for his grievous blunder in breaking up the Society, and then proclaiming his seceding organization as the original Society, and disowning the Parent Society.”</p> <p>“In Defense of William Q. Judge” The Editor (Dr. H.N. Stokes) of O.E.Library Critic commented on the disparaging remarks made by C. Jinarajadasa about W.Q. Judge. “In this book Mr. Jinarajadasa has shown himself to be extremely conscientious and it is to be regretted that on this occasion, as on some others he has allowed himself to display his ignorance of theosophical history and of conditions in the theosophical world outside his own society.” In this article Mr. Stokes compared remarks made by both Mrs. Besant and Mr. Jinarajadasa.</p>	<p>Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom, 2nd Series, pp.60-61 (1925 Adyar ed.), pp.69-70 (1926 Chicago ed.)</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 16, No. 1, Aug. 1926; pp.8-9</p>

<p>Oct. 6, 1926</p>	<p>“MEMORANDUM OF INTERVIEW WITH DR. ANNIE BESANT.”</p> <p>Mr. William Mulliss a newspaper man from Canada was in Los Angeles, California, and discovered that Annie Besant was also there. He made arrangements with the Publisher and Editor of the Los Angeles Examiner to interview her. Following are Besant’s comments in reference to Mr. Judge.</p> <p>“Mr. M.: Mr. Judge whom I [am] persuaded was the greatest of the Teachers after H.P.B. came similarly under this persecution by biased and prejudiced minds, yet I find you in later years — within the last four or five years — referring to him as ‘that incomparable man, Judge,’ and using a cabinet photo of him in your Magazine.</p> <p>“Mrs. B.: I pay no longer any attention to slanders. As I said, I too have made many mistakes, and that in regard to Judge, I was young in the Movement then, impetuous, and in my zeal did things that I would not think of doing to-day. Judge did a great work in the West and although I still believe that some of his claims are untenable, he did a splendid work for Masters and for Theosophy in America. The Society will survive ruthless destructive criticism. It was nearly wrecked in 1885 by ambitions and personalities. I am convinced after long experience that our sole consideration should be principles — not personalities.”</p> <p>At this point the interview ended abruptly so Mulliss left Besant his memorandum containing all the questions which he had planned to pose to her. She agreed to respond to his queries later. Besant’s lecture tour took her to Toronto in early November that year but the Mulliss Memorandum with her answers was not made public at that time. As far as the Compiler is aware neither these responses (if any) nor the proposed item in the L.A. Examiner have ever appeared in print.</p> <p>NOTE: The complete Memorandum of Interview with Dr. Annie Besant is reprinted in Appendix H.</p>	<p>6 page document prepared by William Mulliss, dated October 6, 1926.</p>
---------------------	---	--

Feb. 15, 1927	<p>“REVISION OF THE SECRET DOCTRINE.”</p> <p>While commenting on James Morgan Pryse’s thirty year old recollection of his facts on The Secret Doctrine, Albert Smythe interjected with his observation on the successorship of Mr. Judge and on Mrs. Tingley as the Official Head of Point Loma.</p> <p>“It is difficult to believe that William Q. Judge appointed Mrs. Tingley as his successor, but all these gentlemen asserted that he did, at one time or another. The present writer never saw any written evidence to this effect, though he was promised sight of an alleged diary of Judge’s and a minute book. Ernest Temple Hargrove was particularly emphatic in these assertions, but he never produced the diary nor the minute book, though these were asked for, and some excuse was always made for their non-production. One cannot help thinking that if they had existed they would have been produced to the world by the one most concerned.</p> <p>“After thirty years documents alone can be regarded as evidence. Memories are apt to fail, and it is a human characteristic after such length of time to view things as one would like to have them rather than as they actually were.”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 7, Feb. 1927; pp.261-262</p>
Apr. 1927	<p>“FACTS ABOUT ‘THE SECRET DOCTRINE’,” by G.R.S. Mead. Stated that he interviewed Judge in London [in July 1894].</p> <p>“I would believe no word against him till he came over to London to meet the very grave charges brought against him and I could question him face to face. This I did in a two hours’ painful interview. His private defence to me was, that his forging of the numerous ‘Mahatmic’ messages on letters written by himself, after H.P.B.’s decease, to devoted and prominent members of the Society, in the familiar red and blue chalk scripts, with the occasional impression of the ‘M’ seal, which contained the flaw in the copy of it which Olcott had made in Lahore, was permissible, in order to ‘economise power’ provided that the ‘message’ had first been psychically received. He also more than hinted that it was entirely in keeping with precedent, and that this was his authority for what he had done.”</p> <p>Mead also claimed that the first edition of The Secret Doctrine was full of “palpable errors.”</p> <p>NOTE: See March/April 1964 entry for Mead’s health condition during the summer of 1894.</p>	<p>The Occult Review, Vol. 45, No. 4, Apr. 1927; pp.251-252</p>
Apr. 1927 continued	<p>“The Rising Cycle.” A rebuttal to Mead’s claims:</p> <p>“Does Mr. Mead offer any <i>evidence</i> to support this ‘private interview?’ He does not. It is a barefaced attempt to ‘soil a dead man’s memory’ and ‘to ignore the ordinary rule of law that the <i>onus</i> of proof lies on the accuser’— to cite Mr. Mead’s own words in 1891 . . . ‘What character can be safe,’ Mr. Mead then wrote, ‘if any unsupported slander is to be taken for proved fact.’ Are these words any the less true to-day than they were in 1891? Are they any the less true now that Mr. Mead is himself turned slanderer?”</p> <p>NOTE: For more details see chapters xxvi-xxxiv in The Theosophical Movement 1875 - 1925.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 15, July 1927; pp.386-394</p>

<p>May 25, 1927</p>	<p>Frederick John Dick died of apoplexy at his home in Point Loma, CA. (Born in Ireland in 1856) He was a Civil engineer by profession, a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers, and for some years Head of the Harbors and Lighthouse Board for Ireland, Inspector of Harbors.</p> <p>Mr Dick applied for fellowship in the Theosophical Society on November 8th, 1888 and soon became a personal pupil of H.P. Blavatsky. While in Ireland, he was Secretary of the Dublin Lodge of the T.S. and editor of The Irish Theosophist.</p> <p>Prof. Dick was twice married. His first wife was Annie P. Dick, a fine writer. She passed away in 1904. Prof. Dick then moved to Point Loma in 1905 where, ten years later, he married Miss Fanny Coryn, sister of Dr. Herbert A.W. Coryn, another personal pupil of H.P.B. While at The Theosophical Society (Point Loma), San Diego California, Prof. Dick served as professor of mathematics and astronomy at the School of Antiquity. Some of his published scientific articles became accepted as standard works of reference in libraries in Europe and America.</p>	<p>The Theo. Path, Vol. 33, July 1927; pp.94-99</p> <p>T.S. Application for Membership form</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 11, pp.571-572</p> <p>The Occult World of Mme. Blavatsky, p.330</p>
<p>July 15, 1927</p>	<p>“HERESY HUNTS.” By Albert E.S. Smythe.</p> <p>Mr. Smythe criticised the article “<i>The Rising Cycle</i>” which appeared in the magazine Theosophy. He stated:</p> <p>“The Magazine ‘Theosophy’ ought to come into court with clean hands when it accuses Mr. Mead of misrepresenting or suppressing truth. <i>Supressio veri</i> and <i>suggestio falsi</i> are supposed to run together, and when ‘Theosophy’ set out to make a deific trinity of H.P.B., W.Q.J., and R.C. [Robert Crosbie], there was not a little suppression required to attain the desired end. . . . Mr. Mead was a close friend of Mr. Judge, as he said, and when Mr. Judge told Mr. Mead, as he told other friends, that the Mahatma messages which he had delivered had been written by him and not precipitated, he was merely giving in confidence his personal and private defence. Mr. Mead did not violate that confidence, and ‘Theosophy’ styles him a scoundrel in consequence. If Mr. Mead had broken faith with Mr. Judge what would ‘Theosophy’ have called him then?</p> <p>“Mr. Judge’s defence in public took another course. He invoked the neutrality of the Theosophical Society as making it impossible for the Society to render a decision on the existence or non-existence of the Mahatmas, which was, Mr. Judge declared, the real issue. On that issue Col. Olcott, the President, ruled Mr. Judge right, and the case was never tried. Subsequently, the inquisition desired by Mrs. Besant and her friends was proposed as a ‘Court of Honour,’ and when Mr. Mead states that Mr. Judge refused to answer any questions the refusal was to submit to that Court.”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 1927 entry.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 8, July 1927; pp.99-102</p>

<p>Oct. 15, 1927</p>	<p>“THE TINGLEY SUCCESSION.” by Ronald A.V. Morris. Disputed Julia Keightley’s 1896 statement that “as early as June, 1894, Mr. Judge told me [Julia Keightley] of the standing of the present Outer Head in the School, and spoke of her work at that time and for the future.” Mr. Morris stated that there had still been no evidence produced to prove that Judge appointed Tingley as successor and that the whole thing originated with E.T. Hargrove.</p> <p>NOTE: See May 1898 entry for Julia Keightley’s quote. NOTE: For more on ‘successorships’ see Ryan’s article “COVINA EXPLAINS”, Sep. 15, 1946.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 8, Oct. 1927; pp.172-175</p>
<p>Nov. 27, 1927</p>	<p>Dr. Herbert A.W. Coryn died from complications of pneumonia in hospital in San Diego, CA. (Born in England, 1863) The son of a physician, he studied medicine and became a member of the Royal College of Surgeons of London. He was associated with his father in a medical practice for many years.</p> <p>He was one of the pioneer members of the Theosophical Society, having joined it in the days of H.P. Blavatsky’s residence in London. He was President of the Brixton Lodge when appointed by H.P.B. (July 1890) to the Advisory Committee of the Theosophical Society in Europe.</p> <p>Dr. Coryn later moved to the U.S.A and worked with W.Q. Judge at 144 Madison Avenue, New York. After the First convention of the Theosophical Society In America (held in Boston in 1895), Dr. Coryn published The Pageant of the Fifth Act. A Study of Mrs. Besant (May 1895).</p> <p>Shortly after Mrs Tingley moved the headquarters from New York to Point Loma in 1900, Dr. Coryn applied for resident membership as a student and worker. Prior to that he served as Physician-in-chief of the International Brotherhood League’s medical staff at the time that Katherine Tingley organized a relief expedition to Cuba directly after the Spanish-American war, going there on a U.S. Government transport furnished by the Assistant Secretary of War, Hon. G.D. Meiklejohn, with the endorsement of President McKinley.</p> <p>Dr. Coryn was also editor of The New Way, a magazine founded by Katherine Tingley in 1911 for free distribution to prisons and hospitals.</p> <p>Dr. Coryn, who remained unmarried, was the brother-in-law of Professor Fred J. Dick who married Dr. Coryn’s sister, Frances.</p>	<p>The Theos. Path, Vol. 34, Jan. 1928; pp.89-93</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 6, July 1890; pp.428-249</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 9, pp.410-411</p>

June 1929	<p>“A ‘Defense of Those Who are Unjustly Attacked’ — III” Letter by Mr. C.H. Collings to the Editor. “I stood solidly by him [Judge] in the past, in the thick of the ‘Judge Row’ in the ‘nineties, and I stand in precisely the same position today. My belief in him, my regard, my loyalty, have no more changed or deteriorated with the passage of years than they have for H.P.B. . . . Let there be no mistake: a day of reckoning has yet to come, and the heavy debt contracted against one of the Masters’ greatest chelas will have to be discharged by those concerned, to the uttermost farthing.” NOTE: See July 15, 1929 entry.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 18, June 1929</p>
July 11, 1929	<p>Katherine Augusta Westcott Tingley died at Visingsö Sweden from injuries in a motor accident on May 31st at Osnabrück, Germany. She was born of Puritan parents at Newbury, Mass. in 1847. She had two brothers. Raised on the banks of the Merrimac in New England — J.F. Fussell claimed that as a child — then Katherine Augusta Westcott — she met H.P.B. outside in the gardens close to the house, and when picked up by this ‘Gypsy’ (Blavatsky) called her ‘mother,’ her ‘real mother’.</p> <p>As a child she constantly talked about things which she said she could see, but which her parents could not. The early period of her life is not clearly known, but it included schooling in the Villa Maria Convent, a French Roman Catholic school, in Montreal, Quebec.</p> <p>She had two unsuccessful marriages. Her first marriage, to Richard Henry Cook, a printer, lasted only two months. About 1880 she married George W. Parent, an investigator. This union lasted about seven years.</p> <p>In 1887 she formed the “Ladies Society of Mercy” to visit hospitals and prisons.</p> <p>She demonstrated an interest in philosophy and her extraordinary psychical powers naturally led her to investigate Spiritualism. She opposed seeking after physical manifestations and insisted that the human soul should be made the object of study.</p> <p>In 1888 she entered her third — and this time successful — marriage to Philo Tingley, a steamship employee who also worked on engineering inventions. He played no role in her career, and the two lived separately for more than twenty years. They had no children.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>Letter from Neresheimer to Basil Crump, dated Feb.27, 1932; 2 pages</p> <p>The Theos. Path, Vol. 36, No. 9, Sep. 1929; p.401</p> <p>Mr. Crump’s notes on Neresheimer’s Paper on Some Reminiscences of W. Q Judge, 5 pages</p> <p>San Diego Union, Mar. 14, 1976</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 12, May 1897; pp.46-47</p> <p>Sunrise, Special Issue, Apr./May 1998; pp.98-108</p>

<p>July 11, 1929 continued</p>	<p>While living in New York, Mr. Judge came to her after learning that she was working among the poor. She opened a soup kitchen in 1893, called the Do-Good mission, on the East Side of New York City. Some time later Mr. Judge showed her a picture of herself which Madame Blavatsky had drawn and given to him as of “one whom he should look for”, and said that but two years before H.P. Blavatsky passed on, on the top lefthand corner of one of her letters to him she had written, “Have you found your chela yet?” Mrs. Tingley joined the Theosophical Society on Oct. 13, 1894, and was accepted into the Esoteric Section two weeks later.</p> <p>Early in 1895, Mr. Judge went to Mineral Wells, Texas, trying to regain his health. “Katherine Tingley had rented a house for him, and by taking care of him and acting as his amanuensis when he was too ill to write himself . . .”</p> <p>“In 1897 she had already founded the International Brotherhood League, in order to provide a wider field for the educational and humanitarian work in which she had been engaged for many years in New York City.”</p> <p>On February 13, 1900, Mrs. Tingley transferred the Society’s international headquarters from New York to Point Loma, California. She was on her Theosophical Lecture-Tour — scheduled to be in Berlin on the 4th of June after her tour of the Netherlands — when she was in a severe automobile accident on May 31st at Osnabrüch, Germany.</p>	<p>Journal of San Diego History, Vol. 43, Winter 1997</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 19, Aug. 1929</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.274</p> <p>California Utopia, pp.12-22</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, p.liii</p> <p>The Theos. Path, Vol. 36, No. 8, Aug. 1929; p.381</p>
------------------------------------	--	--

<p>July 15, 1929</p>	<p>“JUDGE AND BESANT.”</p> <p>Albert Smythe responded to Mr. C.H. Collings’ remarks and added details on Olcott’s reaction concerning the formation of T.S. in America in 1895.</p> <p>“If Mr. Collings saw the Diary which Mr. Judge wrote and in which he appointed Mrs. Tingley his successor and still continues to hold an unchanged opinion, he differs from some others in this respect. Some of us who have not seen the diary, but have been assured by some who have, that it contains what Mrs. Tingley purported to find there, can suspend their opinion on that phase of Mr. Judge’s later life when he was in ill-health and bitterly opposed by all those attached to Adyar who might have been expected to support him. . . .The splitting of the Society was the act of Colonel Olcott who hated Judge. Judge had expected that the Colonel would recognize the autonomous T.S. in America and affiliate it with Adyar, but Olcott changed his mind and refused to do this, and Judge who had apparently been advised to the course taken in Boston in 1895 by Mrs Tingley, was much disappointed with the Colonel’s refusal. I was in the office at 144 Madison Avenue when Judge received a letter from Olcott postmarked and stamped from Spain, and Judge remarked ‘Now everything will be all right.’ But the letter was not what Judge expected and his disappointment was very obvious. This phase of the situation has never been explained, and I have never been able to learn whether Judge counted with warrant on Olcott’s support, or whether it was really a right-about-face on Olcott’s part, for Judge certainly expected Olcott to support him.”</p> <p>NOTE: See June 5, 1895 for Olcott’s Executive Notice from Spain and May 8, 1895 for letter from Judge to Olcott.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 10, July 1929; pp.156-157</p>
<p>Dec. 29, 1929</p>	<p>Walter Richard Old died of a cerebral hemorrhage. (Born March 20th, 1864) English author and professional astrologer, he wrote under the name Walter Gorn Old and the pseudonym “Sepharial.” He was “dreamy and sensitive, a born psychic, and, like many such, swayed by those around him.”</p> <p>On Thursday, May 19th, 1887, the Blavatsky Lodge was founded. Old served as its Vice-President for the year 1889 and was re-elected on Jan. 2nd, 1890 for another year. On Dec. 18th, 1889, at a meeting held at 17 Lansdowne Road, Old was elected as the first General Secretary of the newly formed British Section. He was a member of the Esoteric Section. Along with Miss Laura Cooper and Claude Falls Wright, Old was present when H.P.B. passed away. At the first Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in Europe on July 9th - 10th, 1891, Old was appointed Assistant Secretary to G.R.S. Mead, Secretary. He was also elected as Librarian of the Headquarters Library. Old gave lectures on astrology and contributed to the Questions and Answers section of The Vahan. He was a student of the Kabala and of medicine. He wrote the preface to H.P.B.’s Gems of the East — a Birthday Book of Precepts and Axioms.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>Theos. History, Vol. 8, No. 2, Apr. 2000; p.71</p> <p>First Five Lives of Annie Besant, p.333</p> <p>Theos. Journal, Vol. 3, Nov.-Dec. 1932; p.7</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 4, Apr. 1889; p.169 Vol. 5, Jan. 1890; pp.432-436 Vol. 7, Oct. 1890; p.165 Vol. 8, Aug. 1891; p.516 Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; pp.463-464</p>

<p>Dec. 29, 1929 continued</p>	<p>In November 1892, he travelled to India to work at the Headquarters and contributed to the pages of The Theosophist. In August 1893 both Old and Edge were suspended from their membership in the E.S.T. for violating their pledge of secrecy because of their article "<i>THEOSOPHIC FREETHOUGHT</i>" which appeared in The Theosophist. Old, upset with Annie Besant's comments at the General Council meeting held July 7th, 1894 and how that meeting turned out, decided to send his statement of alleged facts to The Westminster Gazette with the intent of exposing Mr. Judge as a fraud, which he thought Mr. Judge was, according to the copied evidence he had. It was this letter of alleged facts published in November 1894 that re-started the whole Judge Case controversy.</p> <p>Old became very unpopular within the theosophical movement after the Westminster Gazette item. It was apparently reported in the November 12th, 1894, Westminster Gazette that he had also resigned, but this seems doubtful because of his letter which appeared in the December issue of Lucifer. In his undated letter to the Editor, he refers to a note of Nov. 15th which appeared in the previous issue in the "Watch-Tower". He goes on to state: "I am still working for the Society, and I retain the fullest confidence in its power to outlive all trouble that are honestly faced."</p> <p>He officially changed his name to Walter Gornold on April 19th, 1895. On June 23rd, 1896, he married Marie Katherine Susanna Moore who shared his interest in the occult.</p> <p>In a letter to Mrs. Fielding, January 31st, 1939, Sydney H. Old commented on his brother. "It is a matter of keen regret that in 1894/5 my brother (the astral tramp*) should, after all his experience with H.P.B. have been partner to those articles in the Westminster Gazette and the publication of that booklet by Edmund Garrett entitled 'Isis Very Much Unveiled'. He seemed after that to slump in T.S. work, got married, and ended his career as a strong advocate of the Four Square Gospel of Aimé Semple Macpherson." On September 13th, 1929, three months before he died, he announced at a meeting "I have spent all my life and travelled half way round the world in search of the truth. Today I have found it. . . . in the simple Gospel of Jesus Christ which I learned at my mother's knee".</p> <p>Old was a prolific writer, with dozens of titles to his credit. In 1891 he wrote What is Theosophy? A Hand-book for Inquirers Into the Wisdom Religion, 128 pages; The Kabbala of Numbers; The Manual of Occultism, 1910; The Book of Charms and Talisman, 1923; and The Basis of Scripture Prophecies, 1927. He published in The Theosophist, the horoscopes of Mme. Blavatsky, Colonel Olcott, and Annie Besant. He also contributed to other periodicals such as The Sphinx, The Horoscope, the British Journal of Astrology and The Occult Review. The Evening News of London would publish his annual predictions for the coming year.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>The Vahan IS, No. 12, May 15, 1891; pp.1-3</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 12, p.427</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 10, Mar. 1922; pp.172-175</p> <p>Isis Very Much Unveiled, 2nd ed., pp.85-88</p> <p>H.P.B. As I knew Her, p.17</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 19, Feb. 1898; pp.xviii-xx</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Dec. 1894; p.338</p> <p>Astral Tramp, pp.63, 65, 67, 120</p> <p>Letter from Sydney Old, Jan. 31st, 1939</p>
------------------------------------	---	---

Dec. 29, 1929 continued	* “H.P.B. used to call him ‘the astral tramp,’ on account of his habit of ‘roaming about in his astral body at night,’ as she put it.”	H.P.B. As I knew Her , p.24
Mar. 12, 1930	<p>Letter written from Point Loma by Joseph H. Fussell to J.W. Willey. Referring to Mrs. Cleather’s books he wrote: “Mrs. Cleather had made some egregious blunders in regard to historical data, which were available to every student.” He provides examples then states: “‘But there was no foundation for her attack upon Katherine Tingley. It was, as I see it, a case of attempted self-justification.’”</p> <p>Also provided personal information: “‘In 1892 I had the great privilege of becoming the Private Secretary of William Q. Judge . . . and afterwards held the same position under Katherine Tingley.’”</p>	Dear Mr. Willey: 2 pages
July 10, 1930	<p>Mrs. Laura Carter (Holloway) Langford died. (Born in 1848) She was an American author and journalist. Mrs. Holloway was an associate editor (1870-1884) of the Brooklyn Daily Eagle. In 1884 she met Mme. Blavatsky in Paris. At that time she had been considered and recommended for chelaship by Mr. Judge as a suitable candidate to become trained by the Masters as Their mediator. “She was present when Hermann Schmiechen, ‘a young German artist then residing in London,’ produced the portrait of K.H. that summer. Saw K.H. psychically, who was present and guided the artist.”</p> <p>“Mrs. Langford was formerly Mrs. Holloway, one of the ‘Two Chelas’ who wrote ‘Man Fragments of Forgotten History [1885*]’, the other being Mohini Chatterji. . . . She is the Mrs. Lakesby of A.P. Sinnett’s novel ‘Karma’. She was a great friend of William Q. Judge and in later years contributed to The Word, of which Harold C. Percival was editor.”</p> <p>“She resigned from the Theosophical Society after a few years, but retained the friendship of some of the old members. She was a particularly good friend to Mrs. Mitchell, Colonel Olcott’s sister. She met Olcott himself on his last visit to New York in 1906 and had with him an historically significant talk about Mr. Judge. . . .” She died of cerebral haemorrhage.</p> <p>NOTE: See Sep. 23, 1906 entry for Holloway-Langford’s chat with Olcott.</p> <p>NOTE: * Man Fragments of Forgotten History was reprinted by Edmonton Theosophical Society in 1991 with three appendixes including corrections by H.P. Blavatsky from The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to A.P. Sinnett and an index.</p>	<p>The Occult World of Mme. Blavatsky, p.331</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 1391, p.404</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 11, Sep. 1930; p.208</p> <p>Damodar, pp.626-628</p>

<p>Nov. 18, 1930</p>	<p>Archibald Keightley died of heart trouble in New York. (Born in Westmorland, England on April 19, 1859) “After taking his B.A. degree at Cambridge, he became a licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, London (1886), then became a member of the Royal College of Surgeons, and a Master of Arts and Doctor of Medicine of Cambridge.”</p> <p>He experimented in Alchemy, and devoured all the books he could find that dealt with Neo-Platonic and mystical subjects. It was at Mr. Sinnett’s home (1884) that Keightley first met Mr. Judge who was on his way to meet H.P.B. in Paris before continuing his journey to India. In 1887, when H.P.B. was staying at Ostende, Dr. Keightley wrote jointly with a few others, urging her to make her headquarters in London. This was the time when Archibald Keightley and his uncle Bertram became busily engaged in preparing H.P.B.’s MSS. of The Secret Doctrine, as well as helping with the magazine Lucifer.</p> <p>In 1891 he married Julia Ver Planck [See Oct. 9, 1915].</p> <p>After the Boston Convention of 1895, he was elected President of the English organization on July 4-5, 1895. After W.Q. Judge’s death, Dr. and Mrs. Keightley supported Katherine Tingley and her activities but he resigned his post as President of the English T.S. on Nov. 17, 1897 providing only a vague reason for this action at the time.</p> <p>Dr. Keightley was a loyal supporter of W.Q. Judge throughout all the difficulties, and was completely dedicated to Theosophy until his death.</p>	<p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 28, Jan. 1931; pp.289-293</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 9, p.429</p>
<p>Apr. 1931</p>	<p>Series by E.T. Hargrove [“Letters From W.Q. Judge”] began. Provides detailed history of events surrounding the “Judge Case”, including letters received by Hargrove from Judge.</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix D for “Letters From W.Q. Judge” to E.T. Hargrove</p>	<p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 28, Apr. 1931 Vol. 29, July, Oct. 1931, Jan. 1932 Vol. 30, July, Oct. 1932, Jan. 1933 Vol. 31, July 1933 Vol. 32, Jan. 1935</p>

Apr. 17, 1931	<p>Mrs. Ella M. Judge died. Ella Miller Smith was a Brooklyn school teacher when she married W.Q. Judge in 1874. Mrs. Judge was described as a very ordinary woman, and a strict Methodist. Their marriage was very difficult, both on personal and religious grounds, and that only increased when their daughter died at a very early age. “She regarded him as her lawful property, and so, inevitably, made herself a heavy burden in Judge’s life. Yet in her way, she was devoted to him, and during his illness, never spared herself in her efforts to alleviate his suffering.” When travelling, Judge took her with him as often as he could. “She cared nothing about Theosophy”, although she later “came to see the value of the teachings and joined the United Lodge of Theosophists in 1915”.</p> <p>NOTE: According to Report of Proceedings for the Third Annual Convention of the T.S. in America Mrs. E. M. Judge was a member of the Aryan T.S. as early as April 1897 — if not sooner.</p>	<p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 31, July 1933; pp.33-35</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, pp.xix-xx</p> <p>Report of Proceedings, 1897, p.8</p>
Nov. 25, 1931	<p>Letter to Neresheimer from Basil Crump requesting that he “draw up a clear statement of all the early facts from the beginning of J’s [W.Q.J.]’s association with K.A.T. [Tingley], and especially of everything to do with the successorship.”</p> <p>Reply from Neresheimer (Feb. 4, 1932). Retyped with comments by B. Crump. Mr. Neresheimer detailed his meeting Katherine Tingley for the first time at her home and the messages which she had received from the Master on March 5th, 1895, which directed the members of America to split.</p> <p>NOTE: See March 5, 1895 entry.</p>	<p>Two page letter from Peking, China</p> <p>1 page letter from Santa Monica, CA.</p>
Feb. 25, 1932	<p>“SOME REMINISCENCES OF W.Q. JUDGE.” by E.A. Neresheimer. “I desire to say that both the one page circular, dated with a stamp, March 29th, 1896, and the pamphlet dated April 3rd, 1896, were never approved by me, and were sent out without my knowledge, and never seen by me until after they were in general circulation among the members of the ‘Esoteric Section’.” [pp.9-10]</p> <p>NOTE: See April 3rd, 1896 entry. Point by point commentary on Neresheimer’s report by Basil Crump.</p>	<p>Neresheimer Report, Feb. 25, 1932; 14 pages</p> <p>Mr. Crump’s notes 5 pages</p>

Feb. 27, 1932	<p>Letter by E.A. Neresheimer included with his report, "REMINISCENCE OF WILLIAM Q. JUDGE" sent to Basil Crump. (Extracts retyped with comments by Crump.)</p> <p>Neresheimer wrote:</p> <p>"However, while I was preparing my Memoirs of Mr. Judge your letter and notes of Nov. 25, 1931, arrived most opportunely and caused me to make careful examination of the Diary in order to compare it with the Circular of April 3rd, 1896. . . . Only one paragraph out of the twenty 'quoted' in the April 3rd Circular is actually to be found in the Diary. All the rest are mere fiction. That one and only one is on p.5 of the E.S. Circular, commencing with the words 'Leaders and Workers.' The wording of this para[graph] is exactly the same as in the Diary. . . ."</p>	<p>Neresheimer to B. Crump 2 page letter from Santa Monica, CA</p>
Mar. 1932	<p>"A TRIBUTE TO W.Q. JUDGE" Includes "A Short Sketch of His Early Life" and "W.Q. JUDGE AND THE TINGLEY SUCCESSION."</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, Mar. 1932; pp.20-25</p>
Mar. 1932 continued	<p>"Jinarajadasa Withholds the Judge-Olcott Letters." Protest against Mr. Jinarajadasa's announcement in The Theosophist that he was discontinuing the publication of W.Q. Judge's letters to H.S. Olcott from 1879 to 1884. H.N. Stokes, Editor, wrote:</p> <p>"They [Judge's letters] present Judge in his earlier, less matured character as a theosophist, when he was often struggling with himself — Judge in process of development, one may say. Of the later Judge, Judge as manifested in his "Letters That Have Helped Me," or in the Hargrove letters now being published in <i>The Theosophical Quarterly</i>, they give no indication whatever."</p> <p>E.T. Hargrove believed "these very early letters were published in an effort to show that Judge looked up to Olcott as a superior, while their publication ceased with the letter of July, 1884, because later letters would increasingly have proved the opposite. . . ."</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 21, Mar. 1932; pp.5-6</p> <p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 31, July 1933; p.33</p>
Apr. 1932	<p>"Personal Reminiscences of William Q. Judge" by Abbott B. Clark. "Of many prominent men I have known and interviewed W.Q. Judge was the calmest, most impersonal and far-sighted. Other men move around their own personal center like the earth on its axis, but he swung in a larger orbit, like a planet around the sun; so calm and silent was the motion that few ever stopped to look beneath the surface."</p>	<p>Lucifer, (P.L.) Vol. 3, Apr. 1932; p.80</p>
May 1932	<p>"MR. JUDGE'S ALLEGED DIARY." Comments by Albert Smythe on Neresheimer's Report. Smythe stated that "the alleged quotations" or excerpts read at the E.S.T. meeting, claimed to be from Judge's Diary "do not appear in it." "This is pretty conclusive that the whole theory of Leadership which resulted so disastrously for the Theosophical Society in America was cooked up by her [K. Tingley] who was most interested, and two assistants [E.T. Hargrove and J.H. Fussell] both of whom are still living, and can now make what explanations they please."</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 18, 1932 for Fussell's reply.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, May 1932; pp.69-70</p>

<p>May 1932 continued</p>	<p>“IT WAS A BORROWED BODY.” by Cyrus Field Willard. Mr. Willard described the following event at the Boston convention of 1891. “[Judge] said; ‘I am about to sound the Word with the triple intonation, but before I do so, I have a statement to make which I do not care to have you speak to me about later, nor do I wish you to discuss among yourselves. I am not what I seem; I am a Hindu’. “Then he sounded the Word with the triple intonation. “Before my eyes, I saw the man’s face turn brown and a clean-shaven Hindu face of a young man was there, and you know he wore a beard.” NOTE: See April 26-27, 1891, entry for more details.</p> <p>“IN A BORROWED BODY” Excerpt from “Letters That Have Helped Me”, Vol. II; Letters from W.Q. Judge to Jasper Niemand in which he gave accounts of his youth and of his near death. “One day an old wandering Brahmin came to me and asked if I was ready to follow my vows of long lives before, and go to do some work for my old master in a foreign land. Thinking it was a journey only, I said I was. “‘Yes’, said he, ‘but it is not only a journey. It will cause you to be here and there all days and years. Today here. tonight there.’”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, May 1932; pp.65-67</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, Apr. 1932; pp.54-56</p>
<p>May 1932 continued</p>	<p>“MORE LIGHT ON ‘THE JUDGE CASE’.” Letter from Hugh R. Gillespie on Countess Wachtmeister’s own signed copy of a pamphlet which was picked out of a five-cent book box in Sydney, Australia. He pointed out that the Countess had contradictions in her comments pencilled in the margins. In the Editor’s note, A.E. Smythe wrote: “It may be well to place on record the statement made by Claude Falls Wright himself to me in 1894, that the Countess was utterly unreliable, and that her statements could not be accepted without corroboration.” Smythe also gave an anecdote about the Countess and concluded: “She was a psychic and like many such, got things reversed in her consciousness.”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, May 1932; pp.67-68</p>
<p>May 1932 continued</p>	<p>“TRIBUTE TO WM.Q. JUDGE.” By C. F. Willard. Told of being a Royal Arch Mason, as was Judge, and of many conversations with him; and that “[Judge] was one of the most delightful conversationalists and companions that I have ever met. “He was so modest that the knowledge of his ability along occult lines was known to few, except those to whom he wished to impart occult information which he saw would be needed in after years.”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, May 1932; pp.68-69</p>

June 1932	<p>“<i>Mr. Smythe in the Bog.</i>” Rebuttal by H.N. Stokes to A. Smythe’s article “Mr. Judge’s Alleged Diary” in the Canadian Theosophist of May 1932. Stokes stated that he cannot agree with Mr. Smythe’s assessment of Mr. Neresheimer’s letter and suggested that Mr. Judge must have kept a second, more occult Diary which supported the evidence presented.</p> <p>NOTE: See May 1932 entry.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 21, June 1932; pp.11-12</p>
June 1932 continued	<p>“SIDE-LIGHTS ON T.S. HISTORY” Article by James Morgan Pryse (divided into individual topics). Pryse stated that he didn’t believe Judge was in a borrowed body; claimed that he read parts of Judge’s diary but found “It was too sentimental, mushy and spiritualistic for me to wade through it.” Pryse also claimed that C.F. Wright “was a skilful penman and assisted Judge in writing ‘messages’ imitative of the Master’s handwriting.”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, June 1932; pp.124-126</p>
June 1932 continued	<p>“THE POINT LOMA VIEW” Letter to the Editor by J.H. Fussell. He claimed there were more than one Judge diary and the diary from which the quotations in the April 3rd, 1896 circular were taken was not the same diary that Neresheimer had in his possession.</p> <p>NOTE: See Dec. 12, 1932, and January 18, 1966 entries.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, June 1932; pp.126-127</p>
July 1932	<p>“<i>Dr. Fussell Replies.</i>” Analysis of Pryse’s and Fussell’s articles in the June 1932 issue of The Canadian Theosophist.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 21, July 1932; pp.11-12</p>
July 17, 1932	<p>Editor’s comments on the Neresheimer Report and on the May Canadian Theosophist article “Mr. Judge’s Alleged Diary”. Agreed with Albert Smythe “that Mr. Neresheimer should ‘publish in full his account of this affair’. But what is more important is that he should publish the photographic facsimile of the entire diary.” NOTE: See January 1933 entry for Editor’s response to receipt of a copy of Mr. Fussell’s letter to Canadian Theosophist.</p> <p>NOTE: See The Theosophical Movement 1875-1925 pp.653-688 for chapter on “JUDGE’S DEATH AND THE TINGLEY ‘SUCCESSORSHIP’.”</p> <p>Criticism of the Theosophical Movement’s demand to have Judge’s diary published.</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 18, 1933 for Mr. Fussell’s reply.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement (Bombay), Vol. 2, July 1932; p.69 Jan. 1933; p.22</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Dec. 1932; pp.10-11</p>

Aug. 1932	<p>“Mad for Thirty-Seven Years!”</p> <p>Hargrove was criticized for rejecting an offer from members of the Adyar and Point Loma lodges to participate in a White Lotus Day Memorial meeting held in Los Angeles.</p> <p>“Why is it that Mr. Hargrove, who was so intimately associated with Judge and who prizes his memory so highly as to publish his intimate letters, is unable to rise to the height of forgiveness manifested by Judge at the time?”</p> <p>“Report of the Executive Committee”</p> <p>Mr. Hargrove commented:</p> <p>“There was a very active correspondence among other societies calling themselves theosophical, in which we were invited to participate. Point Loma, instructed by a Mahatma to do so, invited us and invited Adyar, and invited everybody else, to assemble on White Lotus Day at Point Loma. And Adyar (in other words, Mrs. Besant), by order of the Maha Chohan — because a Mahatma would not do, as Point Loma had used that already — Mrs. Besant accepted the invitation. This worried Point Loma, made it nervous — it may have thought Mrs. Besant would bring the Maha Chohan along! At any rate, Mr. Leadbeater was to be brought along, so Mr. G. de Purucker, who calls himself ‘Theosophical Leader and Teacher’ had himself interviewed, and explained that he did not want Leadbeater. That made trouble, so the Maha Chohan changed his mind, and the acceptance was withdrawn. We were invited, but we just sat still — quite still — and watched the other people entertain themselves. So, there was no trouble so far as we were concerned.”</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Aug. 1932; pp.4-6</p> <p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 30, July 1932; pp.65-66</p>
Sep. 1932	<p>“The Judge ‘Occult Diary’, Vindication of Tingley, Hargrove, Fussell.”</p> <p>“It is claimed by the authorities at Point Loma that they actually have at least four Judge diaries. Very recently they have unearthed in their archives a series of loose sheets <i>in Judge’s handwriting</i>, in which are found <i>every one of the quotations</i> made by Mr. Hargrove in support of Katherine Tingley.</p> <p>“. . . I have been furnished with photographs of five of these loose sheets, the contents of which I give below, containing six of the disputed quotations.”</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Sep. 1932; pp.4-5</p>

Sep. 1932 continued	<p>“<i>J. M. Pryse as Debunkist.</i>”</p> <p>Criticism of J.M. Pryse’s article in the Canadian Theosophist of June 1932.</p> <p>“Mr. Pryse says that he painted a portrait of Mr. X., which Judge saw and took for a picture of his ‘Higher Self.’ Judge had a copy made which he afterwards recopied and it was one of these pictures which was exhibited at the famous E.S.T. meeting of March 29th, 1896 as the ‘Rajah’ or ‘Luminous Youth’, the <i>alter ego</i> of Judge. . . . Mr. Pryse is one of the venerable antiques of the Theosophical Movement, but it is not too late for him to write a volume of reminiscences demonstrating that H.P.B. was a liar, Judge a forger and fool, and indeed, that the Masters made the mistake of their lives in not selecting him, Pryse, instead of H.P.B., as writer of <i>The Secret Doctrine.</i>”</p> <p>NOTE: This refers to the article “SIDE-LIGHTS ON T.S. HISTORY” which includes “<i>The Bogus Rajah Portrait</i>” in The Canadian Theosophist, June 1932, pp.124-125.</p>	O.E. Library Critic , Vol. 22, Sep. 1932; p.12
Oct. 1932	<p>“A Letter from W.Q. Judge to Katherine Tingley”</p> <p>Letter, originally in Judge’s handwriting, was published here. Stokes (the Editor) wrote: “This letter not only shows Judge’s belief in the supposed H.P.B. communications, but indicates an intimate friendship with and confidence in Mrs. Tingley.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix G for details and Judge’s Letter.</p>	O.E. Library Critic , Vol. 22, Oct. 1932; pp.4-5
Nov. 1932	<p>“A Letter from W. Q. Judge to Dr. A. Keightley”</p> <p>The O. E. Library Critic published the original January 3, 1895 document. It was written in Judge’s own handwriting and verified and declared to be a copy of the original document, and to be “accurate in every respect” in a statement signed by Joseph H. Fussell, Elsie V. Savage, Margherita Siren, Helen Harris.</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 4, 1895 for Judge’s letter to Dr. Archibald Keightley. See also Appendix G for the January 3rd, 1895 document and March 29, 1896 entry.</p>	O.E. Library Critic , Vol. 22, Nov. 1932; pp.6-8

Dec. 1932	<p>“More About the Judge ‘Diary’.”</p> <p>Following a comparison of the documents found in Judge’s handwriting, and the excerpts Hargrove quoted in the April 3rd, 1896 circular to E.S. members, Editor Stokes wrote:</p> <p>“Several questions arise in connection with these documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Does the particular sign used in these purported communications from the discarnate H.P.B., and designated by Hargrove as ‘Promise’, really refer to Mrs. Tingley as he supposed, or to some other person? 2.) How did Judge get these communications? . . . 3.) Did Judge accept these so-called communications from H.P.B. as genuine, including their commendations of the personage called ‘Promise’ by Hargrove?” <p>Stokes compared the quotations and stated:</p> <p>“We must conclude then, I think, that we have the indisputable evidence in Judge’s own handwriting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) That he received a series of communications which he accepted as coming from H.P.B. 2.) That in these communications a person designated as ‘X’ or ‘13’ was spoken of in high terms by H.P.B., and who is proved to be Mrs. Tingley. 3.) That Judge copied these loose scratch pad sheets or memoranda either into a diary or in some other form, making slight corrections. . . 4.) That Judge wrote familiar letters to Mrs. Tingley, indicating the high esteem in which he held her.” 	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Dec. 1932; pp.6-9</p>
Dec. 12, 1932	<p>“MR. FUSSELL EXPLAINS”</p> <p>Reply by Mr. Fussell to charges made against him in the Canadian Theosophist of May 1932 and the Neresheimer Report.</p> <p>“I then informed you that there were <i>other</i> diaries left by William Q. Judge than the one which was in the possession of Mr. Neresheimer, the latter having been placed in his hands in my presence by Katharine Tingley as a mark of her trust and confidence in him, for his study and perusal. . . .</p> <p>“However, knowing full well that the ‘messages and quotations’ cited by Mr. Hargrove in the E.S.T. circular of April 3rd, 1896, were actually quoted from originals in William Q. Judge’s own handwriting, and having myself seen them on more than one occasion, I was perfectly confident that one would be found. . . . I hereby repeat that <i>at the present time I have in my possession the originals in Mr. Judge’s handwriting of every one of the ‘messages and quotations’ referred to by Mr. Neresheimer in his ‘Some Reminiscences of William Q. Judge’ . . .</i>”</p> <p>NOTE: See June 1932 and January 18, 1966 entries.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, Jan. 1933; pp.353-356</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 4, Mar. 1933; pp.204-208</p>

Dec. 18, 1932	<p>“William Q. Judge’s ‘Occult Dairy’” Joseph H. Fussell: “I issue this present declaration; namely, that <i>William Q. Judge’s originals, in his own handwriting, of all of “those alleged ‘messages and quotations’” just above referred to, are in the Archives of the Theosophical Society and are at present in the custody of the undersigned. . . .</i> “. . . I have decided not to resort to legal measures against any who have hitherto published the above-mentioned wrong and libelous statement against Katherine Tingley, Mr. Hargrove and myself, namely, of having ‘concocted’ the “alleged ‘messages and quotations.’”</p> <p>NOTE: See May 1932 for “MR. JUDGE’S ALLEGED DAIRY” by A.E.S. Smythe.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 4, Jan. 1933; pp.130-131</p>
1933	<p>“In Defense of Robert Crosbie”. Editor, Stokes, claimed that comparing statements made by and about Mr. Crosbie in the pamphlet The United Lodge of Theosophists; Its Mission and Its Future, “would lead one to infer that during the days of struggle between the followers of Mrs. Katherine Tingley and her opponents in the Theosophical Society of America and later Mr. Crosbie adhered to the Tingley majority of over 90%, not because he approved of Mrs. Tingley or her policies, but because he had to stay put somewhere and preferred being put with the big majority of whom he disapproved, rather than with the sensible and honorable few. . . . “Fortunately Mr. Crosbie has left indisputable evidence that far from siding with the Tingley majority from motives of policy . . . he did so because he was fully convinced that he was on the right side — the side of Mrs. Tingley.”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 1, 1901 and Feb. 2. 1898 entries.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Mar. 1933; pp.7-10 May 1933; p.9 Nov./Dec. 1934; pp.8-10</p>
Jan. 1933	<p>Canadian Theosophist withdrew its endorsement of Neresheimer’s charges against Fussell, Hargrove, and Tingley. “We have not heard from Mr. Neresheimer but accept Mr. Fussell’s account of his visit and promised recantation which, of course, deprives us of the basis on which our article was founded. We appreciate Mr. Fussell’s generosity in not resorting to legal action, and trust that the publication of his letter will be accepted as an <i>amende honorable</i>.” Also included was Fussell’s Dec. 12, 1932 reply to the charges. NOTE: See Dec. 12, 1932 entry.</p> <p>“‘<i>Canadian Theosophist</i>’ Withdraws Charges.” “It is not always easy to admit that one has made a mistake, and the action of <i>The Canadian Theosophist</i> is most encouraging and refreshing. It is but human to make mistakes and to draw hasty conclusions, but one of the tests of a true theosophist is whether he will withdraw accusations or insinuations against others, whether dead or alive, when the facts prove him to have been wrong.”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 13, Jan. 1933; pp.352-356</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Dec. 1932; p.13</p>

<p>Jan. 1933, continued</p>	<p>The Theosophical Movement, Bombay refused to retract. “We have received from Mr. Fussell, Secretary General of the Point Loma Theosophical Society, a copy of a long letter addressed to the Editor of the <i>Canadian Theosophist</i>. We are requested to publish it, because of our remarks in the July issue about Mr. Judge’s alleged diary and Mr. Neresheimer’s statement about it. Mr. Fussell says that other diaries exist, besides the one to which Mr. Neresheimer referred. We repeat what we said then — let photographic reprints of the numerous diaries be produced so that the Theosophical world may judge for itself. Was it not Mr. Judge who said — ‘He laughs best who does it last, and time is a devil for grinding things’.”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 17, 1932.</p>	<p>Theos. Movement (Bombay), Vol. 3, Jan. 1933; p.22</p>
<p>Feb. 18, 1933</p>	<p>“The U.L.T. Speaks” Joseph H. Fussell, replying to a call to reprint Judge’s Diaries: “The call to produce photographic reprints of the numerous diaries of Mr. Judge, whether official, semi-official, or private, is unreasonable and to do so is unnecessary, besides being very expensive.”</p> <p>NOTE: See July 17, 1932.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 4, Mar. 1933; pp.208-210</p>
<p>Apr. 29, 1933</p>	<p>Anagarika Hevavitarane Dharmapala died at Sarnath, near Benares. (Born Don David Hewavitarne in Ceylon in 1864 to a distinguished family). As a 14 year old boy, Don David came into contact with Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott in June 1880 when they came to lecture in Ceylon. He stated that three years later he wrote to Madame Blavatsky, in November 1883, that he wished to become a Chela. “Madame Blavatsky came and told me that the letter I had sent her had been submitted to the Masters, and that I had been accepted, so I was initiated [by Colonel Olcott in January 1884] when I was about 19 years of age.”</p> <p>“H.P.B. practically forced my father to allow me to accompany him to Adyar in 1884.” Later in H.P.B.’s own room she told me: “Now that you have come you had better not go after phenomena, but you had better work for humanity, and study Pali, the sacred literature.” “Until the day of her departure [from India in March 1885] H.P.B. took care of me.” He wrote in 1925, “I have remained loyal to the Masters and H.P.B. since then. I am now one of the oldest T.S. members alive.”</p> <p>In 1886 he joined Col. Olcott in his campaign to found Buddhist schools, and travelled with him under the name of the Anagarika Dharmapala, “the homeless Protector of the Dhamma.”</p> <p>In 1888 the Theosophical Society started The Buddhist, a new journal at Colombo. C.W. Leadbeater was the Editor and Mr. Dharmapala was the Manager.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell.]</p>	<p>Buddhism in England, July/Aug. 1933; p.55</p> <p>Anagarika Dharmapala and The T.S., p.1</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 54, July 1933; p.487</p> <p>Blavatsky Assn. No. 2, Nov. 13, 1925; pp.13-14</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol.10, Nov. 1929, pp.267-269</p> <p>The Elder Brother, p.51</p>

<p>Apr. 29, 1933 continued</p>	<p>“In 1891 he visited Buddha Gaya [Mission], and thereupon resolved to regain it into Buddhist hands.” On May 31st, 1891 the Budh-Gaya Maha-Bodhi Society was established, in Colombo, with Dharmapala as General Secretary. He was also the Editor of the Maha-Bodhi Journal.</p> <p>The Charter of the Ceylon Section (1880) had been suspended by Col. Olcott on March 3rd, 1891 until he returned from Australia “when I shall endeavor to group the Branches in a way more practicable, because of the purely Buddhistic nature of the work in this Island”. With the restoration of the charter of the Ceylon Section in 1891, Mr. H. Dharmapala was reinstated as Assistant General Secretary.</p> <p>In 1892 the Buddhist Text Society of India was instituted in Calcutta. Mr. Dharmapala was appointed Assistant Secretary.</p> <p>In 1893 he was elected as delegate from Ceylon to the World’s Fair Parliament of Religions where he gave a talk on Buddhism. Leoline L. Wright commented on Mr. Dharmapala that: “No one who saw him then could ever forget the noble and Christlike beauty of the noted Singhalese Buddhist and friend of H.P.B., Dharmapala. Tall and almost luminously ascetic, robed classically in spotless white, he was a lodestone to the throngs who swarmed into those meetings. Merely to look at him was a revelation of character and spiritual attainment.”</p> <p>He was elected a member of the Blavatsky Association at a Council Meeting on March 24th, 1924. He stated that: “I am a member of the Blavatsky Association and wish to see through it the spread of such teachings as were given by H.P.B. as she received them from the Masters.”</p> <p>“In 1925 he first came to England, and later founded in London a branch of the Maha-Bodhi Society . . . to propagate the Dhamma in the west.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Aug. 3, 1922 entry for Mr. A.H. Dharmapala’s reasons for his disillusion with Adyar.</p>	<p>Buddhism in England, Sep./Oct. 1933; p.83 July/Aug. 1933; p.55</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 12, Apr. 1891; Supp. p.xliii</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, Aug. 1891; p.511</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 10, May 1892; p.252</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 13, Dec. 1938; p.404</p> <p>Blavatsky Assn. No.1, Nov. 13, 1924; pp.52-55</p> <p>Buddhism in England, Sep./Oct. 1933; pp.79-80 July/Aug. 1933; p.55</p>
<p>May 1933</p>	<p>“In Defense of Robert Crosbie — II” Referring to an address by Mr. Crosbie, published in a Point Loma pamphlet “In Honor of William Q. Judge”, the Editor of the Critic commented: “These remarks of Mr. Crosbie are not cited as evidence that Mr. Judge actually appointed Mrs. Tingley as his successor, but simply to show that Mr. Crosbie so believed, and that he was at the time one of her devoted adherents.”</p> <p>NOTE: See April 1, 1901 entry.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, May 1933; p.9</p>

<p>July 1933</p>	<p>“CORRESPONDENCE”</p> <p><i>“To the Editors of the Theosophical Quarterly:”</i> Editor, E. T. Hargrove stated: “Mrs. Tingley was Judge’s successor so far as his non-public position was concerned. She was intended to serve as a stop-gap. “Mrs. Tingley failed, and then intrenched herself in her failure. . . . Consequently she was deposed by the order of those whom, from the beginning, Judge recognized as his Superiors and as the true Founders of the Theosophical Society. “As Mrs. Tingley refused to accept her deposition and was able to persuade many that it was invalid the task of carrying on the Work of Judge and of H.P.B. and their Masters, fell to those who have been identified with The Theosophical Society and with the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY from that time to this.”</p> <p>“THE JUDGE DIARY LEAVES” Excerpts from and comments on Hargrove’s letter to the Theosophical Quarterly.</p> <p>“The Judge Diary Question — Mr. Hargrove Speaks”</p>	<p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 31, July 1933; pp.88-89</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 14, Sep. 1933; pp.212-214</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Mar. 1933; pp.6-7</p>
<p>Sep. 20, 1933</p>	<p>Annie Besant died. She was cremated the next day on a pyre lit by C.W. Leadbeater. (Annie Wood was born in London on Oct. 1, 1847 of an English father and an Irish mother.) Early in 1866 Annie first met the Rev. Frank Besant and married him on Dec. 28, 1867 but life as a clergyman-schoolmaster’s wife was in contrast to her strong willed disposition. After her mother died in May 1874 she felt free to follow her conscience wherever it might lead her.</p> <p>Rejecting Christianity, Mrs. Besant joined the National Secular Society in 1874 and became an associate of Charles Bradlaugh, an atheist freethinker. Bradlaugh called Besant “the greatest speaker of her sex in either Europe or America”.</p> <p>In the 1880s she developed an interest in socialism and worked with George Bernard Shaw in the Fabian Society. Then in March 1889 she met Madame Blavatsky and joined The Theosophical Society on May 10th, 1889. After H.P.B.’s death, Mrs. Besant became joint outer head of H.P.B.’s Esoteric School along with W.Q. Judge. In 1893 she went to India where in later years, she campaigned for Indian nationalism and founded the Indian Home Rule League in 1916. Mrs. Besant became President of the T.S. after H.S. Olcott’s death in 1907, until her death. She was one of the greatest orators of her day and is remembered in India as a social reformer.</p> <p>NOTE: For more on Mrs. Besant see a “CHARACTER SKETCH” written by a close friend and co-worker, W.T. Stead, Editor of the Review of Reviews, Oct 1891, pp.349-367.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, Mar. 1933</p> <p>Mrs. Annie Besant A Modern Prophet by Theodore Besterman (1934)</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 12, Sep. 1891; Supp. p.cv</p> <p>The Occult World Of Madame Blavatsky, p.329</p> <p>First Five Lives of Annie Besant by Nethercot</p> <p>Last Four Lives of Annie Besant by Nethercot</p> <p>Borderland, Vol. 1, Oct. 1893; p.175</p>

Sep. 20, 1933 continued	<p>NOTE: "MRS. BESANT AND INDIAN CIVILISATION." Wm. Emmette Coleman provided a summary of Mrs Besant's involvement in India during her first visit there. He wrote:</p> <p>"The recent course of Mrs. Annie Besant in India is no trifling matter; it has its serious side as well as its grotesque. It is probable that the people in England do not realise the possible great harm that may be the outcome of Mrs. Besant's intemperate zeal in [sic] behalf of barbarism, idolatry, and nescience." He described how she captivated the crowds with her enchanting skills as an orator and how she was enthralled with the Indian people.</p>	Light , Vol. 14, Apr. 14, 1894; pp.176-177
Sep. 20, 1933	<p>"Death of Mrs. Annie Besant"</p> <p>Editorial note by the O.E. Critic's Editor on Mrs Besant's death.</p> <p>"With all due recognition of her many achievements, The Critic does not feel called on to present an obituary and stands by what it has said during the past sixteen years, that she turned the Theosophical Movement topsy-turvy."</p> <p>He referred to "The Passionate Pilgrim" by Gertrude Marvin Williams as "the only reliable and impartial biography" of Mrs. Besant.</p>	O.E. Library Critic , Vol. 22, Mar. 1933; p.10
Sep. 29, 1933	<p>George Robert Stowe Mead died after returning from a holiday in bad health. (Born March 22, 1863 at Nuneaton.) He graduated from Cambridge with his B.A.,1884 and later obtained his M.A. in 1926. He also joined the Theosophical Society in 1884. Mead was one of the best and few true scholars to have joined and worked extensively for the T.S. As a student of the classics, Mead had gained a knowledge of Greek and Latin and later studied philosophy at Oxford. He wrote many books on Christianity, the Gnostics and Hermetic Philosophy, which provide an invaluable aid for students to do research.</p> <p>He first met H.P.B. in 1887 and became her private secretary during the last few years of her life. After Blavatsky died Mead, along with Annie Besant, took over as Editors of Lucifer, then its successor (The Theosophical Review) which was edited solely by Mead. He was Editor of The Vahan and General Secretary of the European Section. During this period Mr. Mead also served as vice-president and later as president of Blavatsky Lodge, London.</p> <p>In 1899 he married Laura Mary Cooper (Mrs. Cooper-Oakley's sister). She died in 1924. In February 1909, he bid farewell to his readers of The Theosophical Review stating that he had lost confidence in Mrs. Besant's leadership because of her restoring C.W. Leadbeater's membership into the T.S. In October that year he started The Quest and remained Editor until it ceased publication in 1930.</p> <p>NOTE: The Canadian Theosophist published two short biographies under title "In Memory of George R. S. Mead". The first is by James Morgan Pryse, and the other by Editor, Albert Smythe, which includes a list of Mead's published works.</p>	BCW , Vol. 13, pp.393-397 Cdn. Theosophist , Vol. 14, Nov. 1933; pp.265-268

Oct. 1933	<p>“‘Ex Cathedra’ Hargrove”</p> <p>Rebuttal to Hargrove’s letter to the Editors of the Theosophical Quarterly.</p> <p>“In connection with the ‘Tingley Succession’, Mr. Hargrove says that those who discuss such papers publicly ‘are outside the pale human intercourse’. He ought to know, for it was he who made the first move in that direction with his own pamphlet entitled ‘E.S.T.’, on March 1, 1898, and his immediate associates were responsible for the suit which lugged the ‘E.S.T.’ into the Courts of New York State.”</p> <p>Analysed Hargrove’s letter which appeared in the July 1933 Theosophical Quarterly and showed the inconsistencies with his April 3rd, 1896 circular.</p> <p>NOTE: See July 1933 for Hargrove article and also March 1, 1898.</p> <p>Also in an item titled: “More Work for Joseph H. Fussell, ‘Doc. Theos.’”</p> <p>“Theosophy [magazine] . . . ventures to suggest to Mr. Hargrove that the <i>Quarterly</i> publish the text of the original <i>Minutes</i> of the two night-long sessions held at Mrs. Tingley’s home after Judge’s death — <i>Minutes</i> showing exactly how the ‘Tingley Succession’ was arrived at by those there present — Madam Tingley, Mr. Hargrove, Mr. Fussell, and Mr. Neresheimer among them.”</p> <p>Also included item titled:</p> <p>“Mr. Neresheimer’s ‘Reminiscences’” praising Neresheimer in that he had “courageously admitted the . . . blunder . . . in the course taken after Judge’s death. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See Feb. 25, 1932 for SOME REMINISCENCES OF W.Q. JUDGE.</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 21, Oct. 1933; pp.569-573</p>
Oct. 10, 1933	<p>Unpublished letter and article titled “The Judge Scripts” by Margaret Thomas, sent to the Editor of the Canadian Theosophist, A.E.S. Smythe.</p> <p>1) showed the discrepancies in Hargrove’s claims of 1898 and 1933, 2) claimed that Judge did not appoint a successor, 3) claimed Judge had only one “occult diary” but that there were “other papers” by him.</p>	<p>6 pages, including cover letter</p>
Feb. 1934	<p>“Dr. Besant and Mr. Judge (An Important Statement By Mr. Jinarajadasa)”</p> <p>Republished in The American Theosophist from Theosophical News and Notes of the English Section, January-February, 1934, p.3.</p> <p>“I was in England during all the period of the Society’s difficulty with Mr. Judge; long after, I was vice president of the Society for seven years (1921-28) and in charge of all the documents which form the material for the case against Mr. Judge. <i>Some of that material has not yet been published.</i> I, for one, do not in any way desire to open up this matter, because even though Mr. Judge did break up the Society (I know that after the ‘secession’ he claimed he was the original Society, and H.P.B. and Colonel Olcott merely a kind of colony sent from New York) he did a magnificent piece of work for Theosophy in the U.S.A., and, as I have already said, I recognize the value of the theosophical propaganda done by the various organizations who look to him as the only successor of H.P.B.”</p>	<p>The American Theosophist, Vol. 22, Feb. 1934; p.41</p>

Feb. 1934 continued	<p>“C.J. ‘Wonders Why’.”</p> <p>“Mr. Jinarajadasa caps the absurdity of his position with the following concluding lines (p.263):</p> <p>‘I think all the letters from the Masters have now been published, in Mr. Trevor Barker’s large book, and in the two smaller ones of mine. In these letters, dozens of theosophical workers, pupils and non-pupils of the Masters, are mentioned by name or by initials. The name of W.Q. Judge is strangely enough never mentioned. I wonder why.’</p> <p>“This is clearly enough an intimation to Judge followers and others that the Masters either had never heard of him or considered him not worth mentioning.”</p> <p>NOTE: Mr. Jinarajadasa through a series of incidents has managed to greatly damage his own credibility and in so doing has basically eliminated himself from being taken seriously.</p>	O.E. Library Critic , Vol. 23, July 1935
Mar. 17, 1934	<p>“W.Q. JUDGE IN INDIA”</p> <p>Editorial commemorating the fact that Judge had visited India 50 years before and giving a short summary of his schedule of events during his tour.</p>	Theos. Movement (Bombay), Vol. 4, No. 5, pp.65-66
Nov.15, 1934	<p>“OFFICIAL NOTES”</p> <p>“Mr. Cyrus Field Willard requests me to publish his statement that Mr. Judge never appointed Mrs. Tingley as his successor, but that she was hired by Mr. Neresheimer as his nurse in his last illness, and that when Mr. Judge died she was elected by the Executive Committee of the T.S. in America, consisting of Messrs. Neresheimer, Spencer, Griscom, Hargrove and Robert Crosbie, as the new head. ‘Mr. Neresheimer told me this himself in my house in the presence of my wife,’ Mr. Willard writes.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Neresheimer’s response, Nov. 23, 1934 entry.</p>	Cdn. Theosophist , Vol. 15, Nov. 1934; p.272
Nov. 23, 1934	<p>Letter from E.A. Neresheimer to Mr. Smythe Editor.</p> <p>Mr. Neresheimer, responding to Mr. Cyrus Willard’s statement published Nov. 15, 1934, wrote:</p> <p>“It is true that Mr. Judge did not appoint Mrs. Tingley as his successor, but those who did elect her as the new head were Messrs. Griscom, Hargrove, James Pryse, Fussell, Patterson and Neresheimer. “The statement that Mrs. Tingley “was hired by ‘me’ in Mr. Judge’s <i>last illness</i>” must have been made by Mr. Willard due to a misunderstanding on his part and that of Mrs. Willard, since I did not at any time hire Mrs. Tingley to nurse Mr. Judge, and during Mr. Judge’s <i>last illness</i> Mrs. Tingley did not, as far as I am aware, even visit Mr. Judge.”</p>	Cdn. Theosophist , Vol. 15, Dec. 1934; p.311

Nov. / Dec. 1934	<p>“American Section, T.S. (Adyar) Dons Cast-Off Coat of Point Loma Society”</p> <p>Controversy over the claim to the title “THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA”</p> <p>“For . . . the Convention to adopt the title ‘The Theosophical Society in America’, the cast-off coat of two other still existing theosophical societies, under pretense that it has been ‘legally granted to it’ borders on the ridiculous.”</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 23, Nov./Dec. 1934; pp.5-6</p>
Nov. / Dec. 1934 continued	<p>“William Q. Judge and Katherine Tingley — I”</p> <p>Dr. Stokes, Editor of the O. E. Critic, dealt with the details of Neresheimer’s letter of March 31, 1896. Dr. Stokes stated: “Not a little discussion has been aroused by the circulation in 1932 by Mr. E.A. Neresheimer of a document directly charging Katherine Tingley, J.H. Fussell and E.T. Hargrove with having ‘concocted’ certain statements quoted by Mr. Hargrove in an E.S.T. circular dated April 3d, 1896, as being found in documents left by W.Q. Judge and which Mr. Hargrove regarded as referring to Mrs. Tingley, and which were advanced by him as supporting her as Judge’s successor. The charge of ‘concoction’, as directed against three prominent theosophists, two of whom are still living, is a serious one, and it has been the aim of the CRITIC to get to the facts. . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: See March 31, 1896 and Appendix G, No. 8, for Neresheimer’s letter to A.L. Cleather and for Dr. Stokes’ details on the relation of W.Q. Judge to Katherine Tingley.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 23, Nov./Dec. 1934; pp.6-8</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 23, Jan./Feb. 1935; pp.6-7</p>
1934-1935	<p>“William Q. Judge and Katherine Tingley — I”</p> <p>Includes items sub-titled: “Missing Judge Documents Discovered”, “What Judge Wrote” and “Judge Meant Tingley”.</p> <p>“I was furnished with photographs of most of these forgotten and now rediscovered documents. These I compared, with the assistance of old friends of Judge, with unquestionably genuine and personal letters of Judge in their possession and in the presence of a person expert in examining handwriting, and the unanimous conclusion was that the documents were actually written by Judge.”</p> <p>The Critic analysed who or what was meant by the X’s marked on the letters written by Judge.</p> <p>“I therefore secured from the two Point Loma officials, Dr. J.H. Fussell, who was private Secretary to Mrs. Tingley, and from Miss Elsie V. Savage, another secretary to Mrs. Tingley, certificates to the effect that this sign “X” was constantly used by Judge and others in addressing or in referring to Mrs. Tingley, as shown by numerous letters in the Point Loma archives. These certificates will be found in the CRITIC of December, 1932.”</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 23, Nov./Dec. 1934; pp.6-8;</p> <p>Jan./Feb. 1935; pp.6-8</p>
1934-1935 continued	<p>“William Q. Judge and Katherine Tingley — II”</p> <p>The Editor of the Critic analysed three letters from Mrs. Tingley’s files to identify who was “X”.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 23, Nov./Dec. 1934; pp.6-8</p>

<p>May 30, 1935</p>	<p>Daniel Nicol Dunlop, O.B.E. died. (Born in Dec. 1868 in Ayrshire, Scotland and raised as a Quaker.) He entered into the engineering world as an apprentice with the Howe Machine Company of Ardrossan. At the age of twenty-six Mr. Dunlop became associated with the Westinghouse Company in Pittsburgh and also worked in their New York offices. He returned to England after three or four years. In 1911 he organized the British Electrical and Allied Manufacturers' Association (BEAMA), edited their journal, and was active in development and research work in electrical industries. In 1923-1924 he was founder and chairman of the World Power Conference, and up until the time of his death was chairman of the executive council.</p> <p>Mr. Dunlop became a member of the Theosophical Society in Dublin, Ireland which had been founded by Charles Johnston in 1886. He associated with George W. Russell, W.B. Yeats, Charles Johnston, Claude Falls Wright and others of the Society who gave the impetus to the Irish Literary Renaissance. He, as Editor, contributed to The Irish Theosophist as did his wife Eleanor (Fitzpatrick) Dunlop, who sometimes wrote under her pen-name, Freida Dunlop.</p> <p>While in America he was associated with Mrs. Tingley, as her secretary for some time after her return from the World Crusade, and his intimacy with her methods and practices caused him to change his opinion of her at the time when he was at Point Loma in 1899. He, along with Mr. Smythe, were expelled from the Universal Brotherhood, Point Loma, in 1899. He started and edited a Theosophical publication called The Path with Charles Lazenby, July 1910. He also helped to publish The Open Door as a supplement to The Path at the Blavatsky Institute, in Hale, Cheshire. Dunlop was the author of The Science of Immortality, The Path of Attainment, and British Destiny.</p> <p>He was also on the Executive Council of the T.S. in England and Wales, finally resigning in 1922 due to disenchantment with the uncharitable attitude of officials towards members who disagreed with their policies. Mr. Dunlop stated, "the field of service of free and independent members is restricted in every direction by the attitude of those who use their 'freedom' to circumscribe every influence but the one." After withdrawing from the English Society due to the drift toward Leadbeaterism, he allied himself with the Anthroposophical movement of Rudolf Steiner.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 16, July 1935; pp.141-143, 149</p> <p>Echoes of The Orient, Vol. 2, p.1</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 3, June 1922; pp.57-58</p>
---------------------	---	---

<p>July 17, 1935 continued</p>	<p>“From 1898 down to 1933 when he [Æ] left Ireland [After his wife died in 1932 he lived mostly in London], Æ kept alive in Ireland a nucleus of genuine students under the name of the <i>Hermetic Society</i>. . . . The Hermetic Society was founded by Charles Johnston in 1886, and is therefore the oldest Theosophical body in Ireland. Æ joined it on resigning from the Point Loma Universal Brotherhood in 1898, and led it from that time until he finally handed over his charge to myself [P.G. Bowen] in 1933.”</p> <p>NOTE: The Canadian Theosophist dedicated most of this issue, Vol. 16, August 1935, pp.161-200, to George William Russell — Æ.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 16, Aug. 1935; p.163</p>
<p>July 1935</p>	<p>“Historical Fact and Historical Fiction” Comments on the controversy surrounding The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society and why it was written. NOTE: See 1925 entry.</p> <p>The Editor of the Critic included a quotation from Theosophy (Feb., 1935) pages 151-152: “Mr. Jinarajadasa inserts in his ‘history’ that H.P.B. had ‘<i>verbally</i> made Mrs. Besant <i>Outer Head of the E.S.T.</i>’ What is the evidence? It could only rest on Mrs. Besant’s say so — to which the whole document of May 27, 1891, signed by her, gives the lie . . . This ‘story’ was fabricated by Mrs. Besant at the close of the year 1894” To which he added: “Mrs. Besant has stated in various places that H.P.B. named her as her successor. <i>So she did.</i>” NOTE: See March 27, 1891 entry for H.P.B.’s note to Judge. Also see Fohat Vol.IV, No.4, Winter 2000, p.79.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 23, July 1935; pp.2-4</p>
<p>Aug./Sep. 1935</p>	<p>A Gross and Palpable Fraud.” The Editor, H.N. Stokes, examined the controversy surrounding the successorship to H.P.B.</p> <p>“AN OPEN LETTER TO DR. H.N. STOKES” Fussell’s rebuttal to Stokes’ claim that Judge did not furnish certain evidence at an E.S.T. meeting held after H.P.B.’s death — a letter by H.P.B. in which Besant is said to be her successor in Europe. Fussell claimed that Judge did not withhold H.P.B.’s letter of March 27, 1891 but that Judge “did withhold, or rather did not mention, the letters . . . in which H.P.B. wrote to him direct that he, W.Q.J., was to succeed her. . . . In another letter: ‘Take my place in America now, and, after I am gone, at Adyar’.” NOTE: See May 27, 1891.</p> <p>“H. N. STOKES AND JOSEPH H. FUSSELL” Fussell received a letter from Stokes in which he said he would publish “‘a full retraction’ of the erroneous statement”. . . that William Q. Judge suppressed a certain letter from H.P. Blavatsky in regards to the status of William Q. Judge and of Annie Besant after H.P. Blavatsky’s passing.”</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 23, Aug./Sep. 1935; pp.5-7</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 7, Nov. 1935; pp.65-68</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 7, Dec. 1935; pp.106-107</p>

<p>Aug./Sep. 1935 continued</p>	<p>“A Correction”</p> <p>“In the CRITIC, July, page 4, and August-September, page 5, it is stated that a letter of H.P.B. to Judge, dated March 27, 1891, naming Annie Besant as her successor, was withheld by Judge at the E.S.T. Council meeting of May 27, 1891, resulting in his being chosen as joint Outer Head with Mrs. Besant by the Council. This is an error. The E.S.T. report of that meeting states distinctly (p.2) that this letter was produced and read at the meeting, so that our statement that Judge withheld it is wrong. Who read the letter and whether it was read entirely does not appear, nor does it appear why, in the face of H.P.B.’s distinct statement that Mrs. Besant was her successor, Judge was appointed as her equal. A mysterious slip of paper bearing the words ‘Judge’s plan is right’, supposed to be a precipitated Mahatmic communication, which appeared among Mrs. Besant’s papers, would indicate, whether genuine or not, that Judge had a plan which was that he, although not mentioned by H.P.B. as a successor, should be chosen as equal with Mrs. Besant, the plan which was successfully put through. Nor does this correction invalidate Mrs. Besant’s repeated claims that H.P.B. had selected her as her successor in the E.S.T., and her consequent stand against the later action of Judge in ‘deposing’ her.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 3, 1894, By Master’s Direction. See also Dec. 14, 1888 for Special order by H.P. Blavatsky.</p>	<p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 23, Dec. 1935- Jan. 1936; p.2</p>
<p>1936</p>	<p>Gyanendra Nath Chakravarti died in India. (Born in Benares on the 6th of July, 1863 as a Brahman of the Sandilya Gotra.) His birthday is the same as that of Vamana (dwarf) Avatar. This means that his Brahmanical descent is from the sage Sandilya. His education began in a mission school at Benares. Later he passed the entrance examination of Calcutta University in 1877 high on the list. In 1883 he graduated in Physical Science and obtained the degree of Master of Arts with First Class Honours and University Gold Medal. Shortly thereafter he was appointed Professor of Mathematics and Physical Science in Bareilly College. In January 1893 he took the degree of L.L.B. and joined the bar at Allahabad in April 1893.</p> <p>He joined the Theosophical Society in March 1883, at Cawnpore, in the Chohan T.S. In May 1884, Blavatsky published an article of his in the Supplement to The Theosophist, “<i>How I Became A Theosophist</i>”. In this article he wrote: “a Hindu mind differs from a Western mind. A Hindu is born in a land where phenomena are so common as to attract the attention of even a passing observer though many times they are passed over as feats of jugglery . . . hence he is more capable than an European of comprehending the grand truths of the science, which these phenomenon lead us to.”</p> <p>In January 1893, he took the degree of L.L.B., standing first and getting the highest degree taken by anyone since the University was established, and joined the bar at Allahabad in April 1893.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Oct. 1893; pp.204-206</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, May 1884; Supp. p.75</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 17, Dec. 1936; pp.323-324</p>

1936 continued	<p>On May 4, 1884, he was elected as Secretary of The Rohilkund T.S., a branch at Allahabad. In 1893, at the suggestion of Bertram Keightley, Prof. Chakravarti was invited to attend and participate at the World's Congress of Religions in Chicago. Prof. Chakravarti arrived in New York on September 2nd. He was invited by the Manager of the Parliament not only to attend but to speak in the opening exercises.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 8, Oct. 1893; pp.223-224</p>
Apr. 16, 1937	<p>Emil August Neresheimer died at his home in Santa Monica, California. (Born Jan. 2, 1847 in Moosburg near Munich.) He graduated from business college and then learned the silversmith's and jewellery trades in Switzerland, Augsburg, and Berlin.</p> <p>In 1868 he went to Australia, leaving there in 1870 for California. After two years in California, he came to New York in 1872 where he went into business as an importer of diamonds and other precious stones. He had a reputation in New York City's Maiden Lane as one of the ablest diamond brokers.</p> <p>From childhood he was fascinated with nursery tales and stories of wonderful beings in India. In 1886 Mr. Neresheimer heard of Theosophy from reading Esoteric Buddhism. He joined the Society in January 1889 and quickly became close friends with W.Q. Judge. He served on the Executive Committee of the American Section, and from his intimate acquaintance with its work, and working with Judge, was qualified to know upon what the growth of Theosophy in the United States depended.</p> <p>Mr. Neresheimer wrote: "During all this time (after the Chicago Convention in February, 1898, and until 1901) I was still living in New York, and only received glowing accounts and reports of the activities going on at Point Loma. I then moved with my family to Headquarters, remaining there until 1904, when business matters called me away to Colorado. It was not until March, 1919, that I was again able to return to Point Loma. . . . I left Point Loma with my family early in March 1929." From there he moved to Santa Monica.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum, Vol. 10, June 1937; p.454</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 9, Aug. 1894; pp.145-156</p> <p>California Utopia, p.16</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 24, May/June 1937</p> <p>Neresheimer Report, p.14</p>

1938	<p>Khan Bahadur Novroji Dorabji Khandalavala (N.D.K.) died. (No application form to join the Theosophical Society has been found.) The following facts have been gathered.</p> <p>He was a provincial Magistrate in the Small Cause Court in Poona. According to C. Jinarajadasa, N.D.K. joined the T.S. on November 25th, 1879. He was initiated into the Theosophical Society on March 9th, 1880.</p> <p>On Saturday, January 21st, 1882, both Mme. Blavatsky and Col. Olcott left Bombay for Poona. They had been invited to stay with Judge Khandalavala. On Wednesday evening, Jan. 25th, ten candidates were initiated and a new Branch known as “The Poona Theosophical Society” was formed. Mr. Khandalavala was elected President.</p> <p>After the Seventeenth Anniversary of the Theosophical Society held December 27-29, 1892, the Madras Mail published a summary of Mr. Khandalavala’s speech delivered in Pacheappa’s Hall. It was reported that his attention had been drawn to the Theosophists in 1880 when he went down to Bombay to make himself acquainted with the movement and its originators. His first impression, which he had since held, was that they were earnest, devoted, sincere and frank. His position towards the Theosophists had been that of a critic and an enquirer and he felt satisfied that they were actuated by no mean or selfish motives. He claimed that he had found his own religion simpler and more easily understood by the study of Theosophy.</p> <p>On July 15th, 1884, W.Q. Judge arrived in Bombay. On July 20th, he went to Poona and was greeted at the station by several members of the Poona Branch. In his Official Report to the Theosophist, Mr. Khandalavala remarked that Mr. Judge “created an extremely favourable impression” and was “an excellent speaker”.</p> <p>During the Coulomb crisis (1884-1885) the General Council of the T.S. appointed a Committee to report and advise at the Convention (Dec. 27th -31st, 1884) as to the proper measures to be taken respecting the missionary attack upon Madame Blavatsky. N.D.K. was a member of this Committee and was himself connected with one of the most damaging of the letters put forward. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that Madame Blavatsky should not prosecute her defamers in a Court of Law.</p> <p>Instead of the usual annual Convention and Anniversary meetings, a “Conference of Fellows” of T.S. was held in Bombay on the evening of Dec. 29th, 1889. N.D.K. was elected chairman and gave the members a brief review of the situation and explained the purpose of the meeting. At the time, there had been concerns among the Indian members that “our European and American brethren were willing to decry Theosophy in India, in order to enhance their own importance in the movement.” N.D.K. stated: “For various reasons the work is lagging behind in India. We meet this evening with a view to impress upon the minds of members the necessity of taking such steps as may put it on better basis.”</p> <p>[Continued in next cell.]</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 47, July 1926; p.457</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 9, p.78</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 3, Feb. 1882; Supp. p.2 Vol. 50, June 1929; p.214</p> <p>General Report of the 17th Anniversary of the T.S. Dec. 1892; pp.44-45</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 5, Sep. 1884; Supp. pp.128-129</p> <p>Vania, p.245</p> <p>Official Report of the Ninth Anniversary at Madras, pp.80, 100</p> <p>Report of Investigation, pp.3-4</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 11, Jan. 1890; Supp. pp.lxii-lxvii</p>
------	---	--

<p>1938 Khandalavala, N.D. continued</p>	<p>He then read a letter from Olcott, in London at the time, which was addressed “To Theosophists Present at the Bombay Meeting”. Olcott’s good news concerning remarkable activities “in the countries of the West” exacerbated their concerns that with the rapidly growing American Section and the newly formed Esoteric Section, India would be shut out. The Indian members became more defensive, especially Judge Khandalavala. They felt that in India every man was naturally, and by right of descent, a Theosophist and that any attempt to discredit or weaken the Society in this country was simply suicidal.</p> <p>Shortly after his arrival at Adyar (Dec. 21st, 1892), Walter R. Old consulted with Col. Olcott, telling him that he thought W.Q. Judge was allegedly forging messages. At the Annual Convention in 1892 Judge Khandalavala was asked to counsel on the evidence gathered. His advice to Col. Olcott was to prosecute the case against Judge. The matter was not pursued until a year later when Mrs. Besant arrived at Adyar on Dec. 20th, 1893. Again Judge Khandalavala was consulted on the matter. During that year’s time N.D.K. had taken exception to Mr. Judge’s articles, especially “An Interesting Letter” which he replied with his own “<i>THEOSOPHY IN THE WEST, THE TENDENCY TOWARDS DOGMATISM</i>”. [See July 1893 entry.]</p> <p>He kept in contact with Mme. Blavatsky after her departure from Adyar.* He wrote “<i>H.P. Blavatsky and Her Masters</i>” in October 1898 which included excerpts from letters she had written him. This was reprinted in the Theosophist as “Some Letters of H.P.B.” in July 1926. He also wrote “Madame H.P. Blavatsky as I knew Her” which appeared in the Theosophist in June and July 1929. In this article he quoted from “WHY I DO NOT RETURN TO INDIA”. He received a letter from H.P. Blavatsky, dated Nov. 21st, 1889, but it was not published until Aug. 1932.</p> <p>In 1929 he contributed to the Archives at Adyar “16 autograph[ed] letters of H.P.B., hitherto unpublished, several articles by her, and a number of important letters from W.Q. Judge, B. Keightley, G.R.S. Mead, etc.” He served as a member of the General Council of the Theosophical Society during the Coulomb crisis and was still a member in Aug. 1932. In 1929 it was noted that he was one of the oldest living theosophists in India. There is little mention of him after the death of Annie Besant.</p> <p>* See 1890 entry for the NOTE “WHY I DO NOT RETURN TO INDIA”.</p>	<p>A Short History of the T.S., pp.291, 298</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 53, Aug. 1932; pp.618-627</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 50, July 1929; p.303 Vol. 53, Aug. 1932; p.618</p>
--	---	---

<p>Jan-Mar. 1938</p>	<p>“CONCERNING BOOKS.” “[Basil] Crump corrects some of the statements made in Ryan’s 1937 <i>H.P. Blavatsky [and the Theosophical Movement]</i> on Mrs. Tingley. Gives the circumstances of his and Mrs. Cleather’s association with her. Says that Judge’s circular <i>By Master’s Direction</i> deposing Besant was felt by many at the time to have precipitated the split that followed.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Nov. 3, 1894 entry.</p>	<p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 1953, p.536</p> <p>The Path (Sydney), Jan.-Mar. 1938; pp.17-18</p>
<p>Mar. 1938</p>	<p>“A BELATED EXPOSURE” [Printer’s error, title should have been “A Belated Disclosure”, per note on p.6] By Albert Smythe, regarding: A. Besant’s visit to Toronto in 1893 after attending the World’s Fair in Chicago. “I happened to see the beginning of it in 1893 when Mrs. Besant came to Toronto to speak for the Toronto Theosophical Society after her visit to the Congress of Religions at the World’s Fair. She had then begun to follow the tuition of Mr. Chakravarti, and she gave us a set-back in Toronto that we did not recover from for a long period. A reception had been arranged for her at the Rossin House, now the Prince George, and a large number of ladies had come to meet her. When she came in and was introduced at the head of the line she asked, ‘Are you a member of the Society?’ The answer being ‘Yes,’ she shook hands and said a word or two. The next was asked the same question and answered ‘No,’ and Mrs. Besant said ‘Oh’ and passed on to the next, without a further word and declining to shake hands with the Philistine. So all down the line of fifty or sixty persons, only recognizing members as worthy of her notice. ‘That’s your Brotherhood! That’s your Theosophy!’ were the comments we heard for weeks afterwards.”</p> <p>NOTE: “On their way from Chicago Mrs. Besant and Prof. Chakravarti diverged for lectures at Toledo and Toronto, and on Sunday, Sep. 24th, she lectured in Brooklyn and he in Washington, D.C.”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 19, Mar. 1938; pp.5-6</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 8, Oct. 1893; p.224</p>
<p>May 4, 1938</p>	<p>Alice Leighton Cleather died. (Born in late April 1846, England) [Basil Crump claimed that A.L. Cleather was born April 24th, 1854] She was the daughter of an Anglican minister and the wife of Colonel William Barclay Gordon Cleather (died winter 1919, at 81), a British army officer who had seen active service in India.</p> <p>Mrs. Cleather contacted Theosophy through reading Sinnett’s <i>Occult World</i> in 1881, and she joined the T.S. in 1885 while residing at Eastbourne with her two sons. She met Bertram Keightley, and was introduced to Madame Blavatsky in 1887. She became a member of the Esoteric Section in 1888 and was admitted to the Inner Group of H.P.B.’s Esoteric School on September 17, 1890. In 1917, with William Kingsland, she founded the H.P.B. Library, and in 1923, the Blavatsky Association.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell.]</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 14, pp.518- 521</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 19, Sep. 1938; pp.230-233</p> <p>The Occult World of Mme. Blavatsky, p.329</p> <p>Fohat, Vol. 1, No. 3, Fall 1997; pp.67-68</p>

<p>May 4, 1938 continued</p>	<p>Mrs. Cleather accompanied Mrs. Tingley on her world tour but after 1899 she separated herself from the theosophical movement, per se. She resided in Italy from 1911 to 1918. In 1918, Mrs. Cleather, with her son Graham Gordon Cleather and Basil Crump, went to India, and in 1925, to Peking, China where they met the Panchen Lama of Tibet. Mrs. Cleather and Basil Crump republished H.P.B.'s The Voice of the Silence (Peking, 1927), and the Tashi Lama endorsed this edition with a special sutra written in Tibetan script. Mrs. Cleather and her party resided in Peking for eleven years.</p> <p>The H.P.B. Lending Library was moved to Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, by Mrs. H. Henderson. Mrs. Henderson was succeeded by Mrs. I. Davey as caretaker then it was moved for a time to Vernon, BC (Michael Freeman) and since 1992 has been relocated to Toronto, Ontario (Joan Sutcliffe).</p> <p>Mrs. Cleather was associated with The Blavatsky Association of London (1923-1947). Mrs. Cleather's published works include H.P. Blavatsky, Her Life and Works for Humanity (1922) and H.P. Blavatsky As I Knew Her (1923) among others.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 19, May 1938; p.88 June 1938; pp.111-114</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 25, Apr.-May 1938, July-Aug. 1938</p>
<p>Dec. 1938</p>	<p>“Vignettes from the World’s Congress of Religions” By Leoline Leonard Wright. Mrs. Wright’s parents were Theosophists and their home in Chicago served to entertain visitors. Some of the delegates who stayed in their home during the World’s Congress were Mr. and Mrs. Judge, Gyanenda N. Chakravarti from India, Annie Besant and Mrs. Isabel Cooper-Oakley from London, Claude Falls Wright, and Mrs. Richmond Green.</p> <p>NOTE: See Sep. 15-16, 1893.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 13, Dec. 1938; pp.403-406</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 278, p.91</p> <p>Eclectic Theos. Summer 1993; pp.11-12</p>
<p>Apr. 6, 1939</p>	<p>List of W.Q. Judge’s pseudonyms supplied by J.H. Fussell</p> <p>List of W.Q. Judge’s pseudonyms and dates used (prepared by Theosophy Company, Los Angeles, and loaned to Ottawa U.L.T., March 1970).</p> <p>NOTE: See Appendix I for compiled list of Judge’s pseudonyms.</p>	<p>1 page</p> <p>1 page</p>

<p>Apr. 8, 1939</p>	<p>Ernest Temple Hargrove died at his residence, Chapel Farm, Riverdale-on-Hudson, NY. He was born circa 1870, the second son of James Sidney Hargrove and his Scottish wife, of the family Aird. His body was cremated and information obtained from Woodlawn Cemetery in Bronx, NY indicates his ashes were interred on December 27, 1940 in the plot of the Order of the Living Christ. Cemetery records show that he was 69 when he died.</p> <p>Mr. Hargrove first heard of Theosophy during the time of the great discussion in the London Daily Chronicle. Being at a seaside holiday resort, he saw a placard on a wall with the large heading "Theosophy" advertising a lecture by Mrs. Besant. He did not go to the lecture, but by seeing the word "Theosophy" his whole inner and outer life was changed. He bought some books on the subject and was admitted as a member-at-large without ever having met another theosophist. He spent most of his nights at the London Headquarters, helping in the General Office with correspondence, with the Vahan, with certain Lucifer reviews, and lecturing at various lodges.</p> <p>His father, James Sidney Hargrove, was one of London's best known solicitors. He did most of his work through the House of Commons. Ernest was educated at Harrow, which he left at the age of eighteen to study for the diplomatic service, following which he chose travelling abroad over going to Cambridge. He went to Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, returning home by way of Ceylon. He then decided to become a barrister.</p> <p>Since the age of nine he travelled a great deal in Europe and other places, and thus had had most of the edges knocked off his distinctive character as an "insular Englishman". "To prove this he says he was a great reader of The Path and that he has learned more from it than from other sources."</p> <p>He was recipient of the "Letters From W.Q. Judge" to E.T. Hargrove which were published in the Theosophical Quarterly, which Hargrove edited.</p> <p>Following the death of William Q. Judge a convention was held on April 26, 1896, at Madison Square Garden Theatre, where E.T. Hargrove was elected President of the Theosophical Society in America. After the 4th Annual Convention of T.S. in America, held Feb. 18, 1898 in Chicago [at which time the Constitution and name were changed to Universal Brotherhood], he and a number of others re-established The Theosophical Society in America, May 29-30, 1898. In 1908 the name was changed to The Theosophical Society. Mr. Hargrove was the last editor of The Theosophical Forum, (May 1895-Apr. 1905), which Judge had started.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell.]</p>	<p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.279</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.471-472</p> <p>Theos. Movement 1875-1950, p.279</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.471-472</p> <p>Magic, Vol. 1, Dec. 26, 1896; p.36,</p> <p>Theosophical Quarterly, Vols. 28,29,30,31 and 32. See Appendix D for "Letters of W. Q. Judge" to E.T. Hargrove</p> <p>Magic, Vol. 1, Oct. 16, 1896; p.9</p> <p>Theosophy, Vol. 21, Oct. 1933; p.568</p>
-------------------------	--	---

<p>Apr. 8, 1939 continued</p>	<p>In July 1903 The Theosophical Society started the Theosophical Quarterly, as their official organ. It is believed that Hargrove was Editor or Co-Editor. This excellent magazine ran continuously until Oct. 1938 when publication ceased, due to Hargrove's ill health. Mr. Hargrove's marriage to the daughter of E. August Neresheimer ended in acrimonious divorce.</p> <p>NOTE: Albert Smythe who knew Hargrove has some interesting notes in The Canadian Theosophist Vol. 19, May 1939, pp.84-85.</p>	
<p>Apr. 22, 1942</p>	<p>James Morgan Pryse died "very peacefully" in Los Angeles. Born August 14, 1859 in New London, a suburb of Cincinnati, Ohio where his father, James Morgan Pryse, was a Presbyterian minister. His mother was Mary Morgan. Both had been born in Wales and come to the US in their teens. Rev. Pryse moved his family to Emporia, Kansas in 1863.</p> <p>"Being a minister's son James went place to place in America, taking a high-school course and preparing in Latin, Greek, and the like, for a college in Crawfordsville, Ind." Poor health, overstudy, and trying to do three years' work in a little over one spoiled these plans, and Pryse began to read law. "At 17 he was ready for the bar, but not caring to spend four years as a clerk he went to Red Cloud, Nebraska, to the frontier. There for a while he had a photograph gallery, but sold it and entered a printing office, learned that business, edited a country paper, and with his brother John published other papers in various towns." In Jan. 1886, he gave up printing and was admitted to the bar in the Circuit Court for the Eighth District of the State of Minnesota.</p> <p>He joined the T.S. in July 1887, after corresponding with Mrs. Julia VerPlank (who married Archibald Keightley). In 1889 he started the Aryan Press in New York to help Judge print H.P.B.'s <i>Esoteric Instructions</i>. That same year, H.P.B. cabled him to come to London to start the H.P.B. Press with the capital supplied by Archibald Keightley. At London Headquarters, Pryse lived under the same roof as H.P.B., conversed with her daily, and when she grew feeble took her round the garden in her wheel-chair. After her death the group still remained and worked at the same place until the break came in 1894. Mr. Pryse then went to Dublin, Ireland, where he had charge of printing the Irish Theosophist and contributed articles and poems to the magazine. After a year in Dublin Mr. Pryse was called to New York by Mr. Judge who needed him to help with The Path.</p> <p>In 1901 he married Jessie Mayer. He continued to practise law until 1905. In 1900 he had again taken up writing and wrote Reincarnation in the New Testament. He continued writing books using his knowledge of Greek, Latin and Sanskrit.</p> <p>Mrs. Pryse was stricken with paralysis in August 1928 and passed away on August 27th.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 9, June 1894; pp.90-91</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 2, pp.472-474</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 12, pp.761-765</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 16, Mar. 1935; p.2</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 20, May 1939; p.75</p>

<p>May 7, 1942</p>	<p>Dr. Joseph H. Fussell died. He was born in Nottingham, England in 1863 and came to the U.S.A. in 1890. He met W.Q. Judge soon after and often claimed that this meeting had completely changed his life. He joined the Society as a Member at large on September 16th, 1890*. In 1892 he became private secretary to Mr. Judge and retained this close association until Judge's death in 1896. In 1900 the Headquarters of the Society were moved from New York to Point Loma, CA. Shortly after this Dr. Fussell became Secretary-General of the Society and private secretary to Katherine Tingley, and later to G. de Purucker — a period of fifty-two years of continuous service. He was granted the degree of Doctor of Theosophy by the Theosophical University in 1929. He died at Point Loma following a lengthy illness.</p> <p>* His application form was endorsed by Ron S.(?) Bryan and W.Q. Judge.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 20, July 1942; pp.332-333</p> <p>T.S. Application for Membership form (see Appendix C)</p>
<p>Sep. 30, 1942</p>	<p>Dr. Henry Newlin Stokes died. (Born Oct. 1859) Editor of The O. E. (Oriental Esoteric) Library Critic [Aug. 30, 1911 to Jan. 1942] This independent periodical was published out of Washington, D.C. No organization or individual was safe from criticism, as Dr. Stokes was the watch-dog over the Theosophical Movement. With the slash of his pen and his tenacious pursuit for uncovering facts, many small mysteries came to light. To quote Dr. Stokes: "No one need resign from membership because the CRITIC has shocked his feelings or trodden on his toes. All he has to do is pity the Editor for not having learned better manners — and at the same time to see if he himself is not wearing corns."</p> <p>Stokes entered life as a Quaker. Originally a chemist, he took an interest in occultism, later establishing a library and book lending business that concentrated on occult subjects. He became a member of the Theosophical Society (Adyar) on June 4, 1904. Shortly thereafter he became involved with the Oriental Esoteric Center of Washington. When it came time to choose between it and the TS he chose the O.E. Society. However, he became disillusioned which led him to seek readmission in the TS. He was readmitted June 12, 1915 and he remained a member for the rest of his life, despite his disenchantment with its leadership after 1917.</p> <p>NOTE: Dr. Stokes' great-grandson, Henry Stokes, supplied the following information: H.N. Stokes' doctorate was in chemistry. He was considered a specialist in inorganic chemistry concentrating his research on silicon and phosphorus-nitrogen compounds as well as the chemistry of ore deposition.</p> <p>NOTE: For more on Stokes see "H.N. Stokes and The O.E. Library Critic" in Theosophical History Vol.1, No. 6, pp.129-139 and "H.N. Stokes' Early Contacts With The Theosophical Society" in Theosophical History Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.4-22, both by James Santucci.</p> <p>NOTE: The O.E. Library Critic (Vols. 1-27 Volumes) was republished by Edmonton Theosophical Society in 1993.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 23, Dec. 1942; pp.319-320 Jan 1943; p.353</p> <p>O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 1, Aug. 1911; p.2</p>

<p>Oct. 31, 1944</p>	<p>Bertram Keightley died, of heart failure, in Cawnpore, India. (Born on April 4, 1860 at Birkenhead, England) His father was a Liverpool solicitor and owner of much land which later greatly increased in value. He received a most admirable education; first at Charterhouse, then in Germany and France, and then to Cambridge, where he graduated in Mathematics from Trinity College. He also took the degree of Master of Arts. While still at Cambridge, he studied mesmerism and was led to reading Éliphas Lévi, medieval mystic and Neo-Platonic writers.</p> <p>Upon reading Sinnett's Esoteric Buddhism, he quickly made contact with the author. He was admitted into the London Lodge, T.S. April 5, 1884, and in 1885 became Hon. Secretary until the formation of the Blavatsky Lodge upon H.P.B.'s return to London.</p> <p>In Reminiscences of H.P. Blavatsky (1931) Mr. Keightley draws vivid sketches of H.P.B. at work, and narrates how he and his nephew, Dr. A. Keightley, divided between them the laborious work of planning The Secret Doctrine, typing and arranging the manuscript, reading the proofs and seeing the book through the press.</p> <p>In 1890 Madame Blavatsky sent him as her special messenger to America. That same year she sent him to India to found the Indian Section which was chartered Jan. 1, 1891. He became India's first General Secretary of the T.S. and started The Prasnottara, a magazine for free distribution to its members.</p> <p>Being in London in April 1893, he travelled to America and was a delegate from the European and Indian Sections at the American Convention that month.</p> <p>During Judge's so-called "trial", his attitude was diametrically opposed to that taken by his nephew, Dr. Archibald Keightley. However, at the Judicial Committee, to which he was a party, he stated that as a lawyer, "I gave it as my opinion that the technical objection raised by Mr. Judge was a sound and good one".</p> <p>Mr. Keightley returned from India to London in 1901 where he remained for four years. Following the death of his mother he returned to India to live in retirement with his friend, G.N. Chakravarti, until Chakravarti's death in 1936. He then spent the last years of his life in Allahabad.</p> <p>After Olcott died and Besant took over in 1906, he was no longer in sympathy with her "presidential policy" but he did not demit as a member of the T.S., because it is said that he had made a promise to H.P.B. that he would never leave it.</p> <p>Krishna Prem wrote that Mr. Keightley had apparently one month earlier been taken down from Rani Khet in an unconscious condition from which he only had short flashes of consciousness. He had been taken to Cawnpore where, it is presumed, he died in hospital.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 66, Jan. 1945; pp.99-100 Feb. 1945; p.139</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 30, Sep. 1909; pp.729-730</p> <p>The Path, Vol. 8, Aug. 1893; p.143</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 9, pp.432-435</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 25, Jan. 1945; p.339</p> <p>General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S., p.50</p> <p>Eirenicon, Dec.1944/Jan.1945; p.4</p>
--------------------------	--	--

<p>May 30, 1945</p>	<p>Basil Crump died in Calcutta, India. (Born 1866,est.) At the age of twenty five he first met Alice Cleather, just after the death of Madame Blavatsky. Mr. Crump was a Cambridge man, a barrister of the Inner Temple, a freemason, and finally succeeded his father (a K.C.) as Editor of the Law Times of London.</p> <p>After Mr. Crump's years of residence in England and Italy — he devoted himself entirely to the growing work that was ever his life motive (Theosophy) — with Col. and Mrs. Cleather and their son, Graham. The last year of the first World War saw Group work transferred to India, where it was kept up both on the spot and by correspondence for many years thereafter. Mr. Crump was of much help in the spade work part of Mrs. Cleather's inspiration in her three books on H.P. Blavatsky, published in India. Mr. Crump wrote, in collaboration with Mrs. Cleather, the larger part of Buddhism the Science of Life, and he wrote Evolution as Outlined in the Archaic Eastern Records.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 26, June 1945; pp.115-116</p>
<p>Nov. 1945</p>	<p>“THE ORIGINAL PROGRAMME” John Roger's analysis of the Original Programme of the T.S., its origin, plans and aims.</p> <p>Rebuttal by C. Jinarajadasa to Roger's claims that the Society is under the direct guidance of the Mahatmas. “Let it be noted, therefore, that the claim of Mr. Judge — upheld by the officials appointed for the judicial inquiry [July 10, 1894] makes clear that the Society is in no way bound to the idea of the Masters of the Wisdom as in any way directing the affairs of the Society.”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 26, Nov. 1945; pp.257-265</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 27, Mar. 1946; pp.21-22</p>
<p>Apr. 1946</p>	<p>“HARGROVE'S REPUDIATION” Item denying that Judge appointed Tingley as his successor and claiming that Hargrove was responsible for the succession. “There is evidence that E. August Neresheimer and Claude Falls Wright had both been consulting her as possessed of 'occult powers' before Mr. Judge's death, accepting communications through her as 'messages from the Masters.' One such message, received by Mr. Neresheimer in 1895, contained the injunction, 'Under no circumstances must Mr. Judge know of this' — a provisio [sic] so entirely out of keeping with the law of the Guru-parampara chain that it alone should have been sufficient warning of the questionable nature of the communication.”</p>	<p>Theosophy, Vol. 34, Apr. 1946; pp.228-231</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 27, June 1946; pp.117-119</p>

<p>Apr. 1946 continued</p>	<p>“SOME PAST HISTORY, The ‘Promise’ Myth”</p> <p>“The magazine <i>Theosophy</i> in noting an article by Carey McWilliams in the March <i>Atlantic</i> dealing with ‘prominent religious exhibitionists’ in Southern California, undertakes to correct some of the statements made, and incidentally adds to the notoriety of Ernest Temple Hargrove. . . .”</p> <p>This is followed up with a reprint from Theosophy, April 1946.</p> <p>“Mr. Neresheimer was true to the principles of the philosophy he had learned from Mr. Judge and H.P.B., and that he established for the record the fact that, like H.P.B., William Q. Judge had ‘no “successor”, could have none, never contemplated, selected or notified one.’ It is unfortunately true that Hargrove and his handful of associates did indeed go ‘too far’— so far that the myth of Mrs. Tingley’s ‘extraordinary influence’ over Mr. Judge still exists to be seriously repeated as fact in a contemporary study of religious phenomena.”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 27, June 1946; pp.117-119</p>
<p>Sep. 15, 1946</p>	<p>“COVINA EXPLAINS”</p> <p>Charles J. Ryan’s rebuttal to the April article in Theosophy, which had been reprinted in the Canadian Theosophist.</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 1946 entry.</p> <p>Cited instances in which Blavatsky mentioned looking for possible successors. Regarding a successor for Mr. Judge he wrote:</p> <p>“There were papers to show that Mr. Judge had been contemplating for many months an <i>Esoteric</i> successor in the person of ‘Promise’ (Mrs. Tingley) through whom he believed that H.P.B. would come and help. Without having given an explicit nomination in writing . . . Mr. Judge left notes on this subject which are so plain and showed such confidence in Katherine Tingley that even had there been no other reasons for their action the Council could not reasonably have done anything but accept her as the rightful successor in the E.S.T.” [p.216]. Quoted Julia Keightley from article in Search Light. He also mentioned that “Many Theosophists thought she [Mrs. Julia Keightley] might well be Mr. Judge’s successor.” [p.216]</p> <p>NOTE: See May 1898 and Jan. 22, 1900 entries.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 27, Sep. 1946; pp.212-219</p>

<p>Sep. 19, 1946</p>	<p>Dr. Henry Travers Edge died at the Theosophical Headquarters, Covina, California. He was born January 6, 1867 at Cubbington, near Leamington, Warwickshire, England. His father was Francis Edge, a clergyman of the Church of England, and his mother, Cecilia Tarratt Edge. He was educated at Malvern College from 1880 to 1886; then at King's College, Cambridge.</p> <p>Mr. Edge's first acquaintance with Theosophy was on July 15, 1887, when he read A.P. Sinnett's The Occult World in the Library of Cambridge University. Late the same year he visited H.P. Blavatsky at 17 Lansdowne Road, Holland Park, London, and in 1888 received his diploma of fellowship in The Theosophical Society. He soon became a personal pupil of H.P.B. and was entrusted by her with private literary and office duties which he continued to perform until her death on May 8, 1891.</p> <p>In 1889, Mr. Edge entered for the Natural Sciences Tripos, in Chemistry, Physics and Geology, taking honors. He then studied a year in Germany, and taught in various institutes in England. During the controversial years 1894-95 he sided with Mr. Judge. In 1899 he resigned his post as Demonstrator in Practical Physics at the Royal College of Sciences, South Kensington, London, and accepted Katherine Tingley's invitation to join the Theosophical Headquarters at Point Loma, California.</p> <p>Dr. Edge was one of the original incorporators of Theosophical University, on December 18, 1919, and became its President in 1939, which post he held until June 19, 1946. He taught Latin and Greek, mathematics, physics, chemistry and geology and also conducted classes in Isis Unveiled and The Secret Doctrine.</p> <p>He was a prolific contributor to various Theosophical magazines and journals, starting with H.P.B.'s Lucifer and with the periodicals published at Point Loma. He wrote under his own and under various pseudonyms, he produced literally hundreds of valuable articles and essays on a large variety of subjects. Essentially he was a scholar, wholly devoted and dedicated to the lofty objectives of the Movement.</p> <p>NOTE: In the Spring 1960 issue of Theosophia, the editors published Dr. Edge's "WHY I BECAME A THEOSOPHIST". This article gives interesting insights into his early involvement with H.P.B. and The Theosophical Movement.</p> <p>Mark Jaqua published a selection of H.T. Edge's works in a small book "Some Theosophical Writings", January 1998.</p>	<p>BCW, Vol. 12, pp.737-746</p> <p>Theosophia, Vol. 16, Spring 1960</p>
----------------------	--	---

<p>Dec. 15, 1946</p>	<p>“BESANT-CHAKRAVARTI-JUDGE, THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.” In a letter to the Editor, C. Jinarajadasa wrote regarding: the E.S. succession after H.P.B.’s death: “I wonder if it is possible for Mr. Ryan to publish the original letter [March 1891 letter that H.P.B. wrote to W.Q. Judge which he placed before the E.S. Council on May 27, 1891] so that we may see if there was any garbling, as he states.” NOTE: See Dec. 14, 1888 entry for special order by H.P. Blavatsky.</p> <p>“SINS OF OMISSION” Letter to the Editor from Charles J. Ryan rewording his own comment that A. Besant, in quoting an 1891 letter from H.P.B. to Judge, “garbled” it. “Instead of ‘garbled’ it might have been better to say [Mrs. Besant] ‘abbreviated and slightly mutilated [it].’ The complete sentence, as in the original, reads: — ‘. . She is not psychic nor spiritual in the least — all intellect, and yet she hears the Master’s voice when alone, sees his Light, and recognises his voice from that of D———. Judge, <i>she is a most wonderful woman</i>, my right hand, my successor, when I will be forced to leave you, my sole hope in England, as you are my sole hope in America’.” NOTE: See Sep. 15, 1946. NOTE: H.P.B. has used “D———” in previous instances in reference to Damodar. See The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to Sinnett, p.10, TUP 1973 edition. See “ANNIE BESANT, HER PASSIONS AND HER RELATIONSHIPS - Part I” in Fohat Vol. IV, No.4, Winter 2000, p.79.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 27, Dec. 1946; pp.305-308</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 27, Jan. 1947; p.340</p>
<p>Oct. 2, 1947</p>	<p>Albert Ernest Stafford Smythe died. (Born Dec. 27, 1861, at Gracehill, County Antrim, Ireland, and a graduate in science from Irish universities.) On Nov. 15, 1884, Smythe sailed from Liverpool to the U.S.A. on the British steamer <i>S.S. Wisconsin</i>. Judge who was returning from a trip to India was also on board. On this first meeting Smythe wrote: “Judge was a master of ordinary conditions and could get the honey out of the merest weed. To know him was to love him.”</p> <p>Mr. Smythe resided in Chicago from 1884 to 1887, and in Edinburgh from 1887 to 1889, where he began his Theosophical studies. In 1889, having a choice of going to London to study or to America to work, he chose America and became involved with Theosophy as soon as he arrived in Toronto on September 10, 1889. A lodge was formed in 1891, one of the last Lodges that Blavatsky chartered, and Mr. Smythe was elected President.</p> <p>In 1896, he founded The Lamp, the first theosophical magazine in Canada, which he edited until 1900. Mr. Smythe was in Great Britain from June 1897 to Dec. 1898, the period during which The Theosophical Society in America split in two (in 1898). In 1899 he was expelled by Katherine Tingley from the Point Loma organization.</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 28, Oct. 1947; pp.177-182</p> <p>Echoes of the Orient, Vol. 1, p.xxvi</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 71, Jan./Feb. 1991; p.126</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 1, Apr. 1920; pp.28-29</p>

<p>Oct. 2, 1947 continued</p>	<p>After Mr. Neresheimer's death Mr. Smythe explained some of the circumstances which may have contributed to his expulsion.</p> <p>"Mrs. Tingley cast her spell over Mr. Neresheimer and he followed her loyally till her death. After this, the spell appeared to be broken and he began to realize that all had not been as he had thought it was. I wrote to him an account of the proceedings by which he had superintended my dismissal from Point Loma, having been sent on a roundabout wild goose chase to execute a bogus mission in New York, where on arriving I was delayed till Mr. Neresheimer also arrived with orders to send me back to Toronto as fast as possible. Why should I not have been sent direct to Toronto, but Mrs. Tingley had advertised me as a black magician and this was one of her pretty ways. Mr. Neresheimer wrote me a reply confirming all I had described and acknowledging that he had acted on her orders. This is not mentioned in derogation of anyone now living, but it helps one to understand why Mr. Neresheimer severed his connection with Point Loma. He became a subscriber to <i>The Canadian Theosophist</i>, which he said he held in high esteem."</p> <p>Mr. Smythe joined the editorial staff of the Toronto World in 1903 and went to The Toronto Globe in 1905. Two years later he returned to the World and was chief editorial writer until 1920. In 1928 he was appointed Editor of the Hamilton Herald, and resigned from active journalism in 1934.</p> <p>By 1909 Smythe was once again an active force in Theosophy. With the formation of an independent Canadian Section in 1919, Smythe became General Secretary of The Theosophical Society in Canada, which title he held until 1945. In 1920, he started The Canadian Theosophist which he edited until his death.</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 18, May 1937; pp.83-84</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 8, July 1927; p.102</p>
<p>Oct. 1947- Apr. 1948</p>	<p>8 letters from Masters M. and K.H. to W.Q. Judge and Dr. Hübbe Schleiden were published; each as facsimile reproductions and transcriptions.</p> <p>NOTE: See April 1893 and May 17, 1916 entries.</p>	<p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 25, Oct., Nov. 1947 Vol. 26, Jan., Feb., Apr. 1948</p>

Nov. 1950	<p>“The 75th Anniversary of The Theosophical Society”</p> <p>C. Jinarajadasa stated: “The date of the Foundation Day of the Theosophical Society which we celebrate is November 17. But as a matter of fact, the Society had been organized one month before. The first illustration which I give, which is that of the cover page of the booklet with Preamble and By-laws, gives the date of organization as October 30, 1875 (Figure 1). Following the custom in the United states, where the President of the country is elected in November but does not officially take office until several months later when he takes the oath of office in an inauguration ceremony, Colonel Olcott, who was much influenced by the number seven, arranged for the inauguration meeting of the Society to be on November 17th .</p> <p>NOTE: In “HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY” <i>from the Records of the T.S., from 1875 to the present day</i> prepared by W.Q. Judge and read by Mr. Wade at the Ninth Annual Convention American Section T.S. and First Convention Theosophical Society in America held at Boston, Mass., April 28-29, 1895. “At a meeting held in the rooms of H.P. Blavatsky, 46 Irving Place, New York City, Sept. 7, 1875, it was agreed to form a society for the purpose of occult study. “Upon motion of William Q. Judge, Henry S. Olcott was elected chairman of this meeting, and upon motion of H.S. Olcott, William Q. Judge was elected secretary of the same. “Adjourned to Sept. 8, 1875.”</p> <p>C. Jinarajadasa further stated: “The original Minute Book of the Society existed in Adyar until 1906, when in some mysterious way it disappeared.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Apr. 28, 1895, Sep. 7, 1895 and Dec. 27, 1896 entries.</p>	<p>The Theosophist, Vol. 72, Nov. 1950; pp.81-86</p> <p>Report of Proceedings T.S. in America, 1895; pp.18-24</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 72, Nov. 1950; pp.81-86</p>
Mar.-Apr. 1951	Tribute issue to W.Q. Judge. Includes quotes from letters by H.P.B. to and about W.Q.J.	Theosophia , Vol. 7, Mar.-Apr. 1951; pp.1-16

1952	<p>The Editor of Eirenicon, T.H. Redfern, focused on the “ORIGINS OF THE PASADENA T.S.”, he stated: “The work of Mr. Judge is not as well-known to the Adyar membership as it should be. When Col. Olcott and Mme. Blavatsky left America, where the T.S. had been founded, and went to India, Mr. Judge was the only one remaining who staunchly and steadily carried on with the work there. He went through his personal difficulties and private trials, failing and succeeding as all do who persist in occult work. He missed one major opportunity, but he went on. When others were fearful and half-hearted, W.Q. Judge was faithfully loyal to H.P.B.”</p> <p>Also stated that the “growth in power of W.Q. Judge was due to his occult training, according to Mme. Blavatsky. Writing to him in 1886 she said he had not realised the change that had taken place in him a few years before, when a Nirmanakaya had blended with his astral nature.”</p> <p>Redfern examined the successorship after Judge’s death, from Katherine Tingley to William Hartley. He claimed: “In adopting the title of Leader, Mrs. Tingley imposed this title also on H.P. Blavatsky as Leader from 1875-1891, and W.Q. Judge as Leader from 1891-1896. This was unwarranted. Can anyone familiar with her work doubt that H.P.B. would have repudiated it? . . . It is hard to conceive of the democratic W.Q. Judge approving an autocratic constitution”— which Mrs. Tingley adopted starting with the Feb. 18, 1898 Chicago Convention.</p> <p>NOTE: H.P.B. held the position of Corresponding Secretary for the Society and W.Q.J. was elected President for Life of The T.S. in America. They never held the position of Leader.</p>	Eirenicon , No. 105, Winter Solstice 1952; 16 pages
1955	<p>Victor Endersby did a point by point historical analysis of the Judge Case.</p> <p>NOTE: See July 1963 entry for Victor Endersby’s comments regarding “The Judge Case.”</p>	Theosophical Notes , Jan. 1954, Jun. 1957- July 1958; Feb., May, July, Dec. 1959

<p>Mar. 15, 1957</p>	<p>Edward Toronto Sturdy died at the age of 97. (Born in 1860.) He was the last surviving member of H.P.B.'s Inner Group. He joined the TS in January 1886. Mme. Blavatsky appointed him to the Advisory Council of the Theosophical Society in Europe in 1890. He was a resident at Avenue Road and was present when Mme. Blavatsky died. He was present at the Consultative Council meeting held at Headquarters, London, May 23rd, 1891. By late Fall that year he had published a small, 8 page, pamphlet entitled Theosophy and Ethics.</p> <p>With the great success of the H.P.B. Press, started by James M. Pryse, the Theosophical Publishing Society decided in the Fall of 1891 to expand their printing operation. Sturdy was appointed as one of its co-managers. On October 3rd, 1891, Sturdy was elected as Treasurer of the Blavatsky Lodge, and at the first Annual Convention of the European Section of the T. S. he was elected as its Treasurer. He was present on July 15th, 1892, at 19 Avenue Road, London, in the front room called 'H.P.B.'s Room', when he witnessed the placing of the ashes of H.P. Blavatsky within a copper Indian vase.</p> <p>Sturdy studied Sanskrit and in December 1892 he arrived in India "to seek for the rarer Indian books useful for translation, and to superintend that translation." At the Convention at Adyar in 1893 he was appointed Secretary of a vernacular Sub-Section to carry on the work of translating works from "Telugu, Gujerati, Tamil, Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, Mahratti and Canarese." One of his later translations from Sanskrit was <i>Narada Sutra, An Inquiry Into Love</i> in which he included his own commentary.</p> <p>When the Judicial Committee met on July 10th, 1894 in London to look into certain charges against the Vice-President, Sturdy was in attendance as a delegate from the Indian Section. In the December issue of The Unknown World, Sturdy wrote a criticism on the T.S. and its organization. By June 1895 he resigned his fellowship in the T.S. "and hereafter will in no way be identified with its organisation."</p> <p>By early 1895 Sturdy had written to Swami Vivekananda, who was in America, requesting him to come stay with him in England. The Swami sailed from New York about the middle of August. Sturdy soon became a disciple of the Swami and they began working on an English translation of the Bhakti aphorisms of N-rada. By November 1899 Sturdy "had given up the Swami because he felt that the teacher was not living in the West the life of an ascetic".</p> <p>Mrs. Cleather stated that when she last met Sturdy in 1904 he had become a complete sceptic and spoke of H.P.B. as "a wicked old woman!" In 1938 he was still continuing his work "to advance the sympathetic study of Oriental Religion and Philosophy".</p>	<p>Eirenicon, No. 127, Spring Equinox 1957</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 6, July 1890; p.429</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 20, July 1939; p.152</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, June 1891; p.336</p> <p>Vol. 9, Nov. 1891; p.255, Oct. 1891; p.167</p> <p>Vol. 8, July 1891; p.516</p> <p>Vol. 10, Aug. 1892; p.514</p> <p>Vol. 11, Dec. 1892; p.265</p> <p>Vol. 13, Feb. 1894; pp.521-522</p> <p>The Word, Vol. 1, Jan. 1905; p.192</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894; p.449</p> <p>Vol. 15, Dec. 1894; p.356</p> <p>Vol. 16, June 1895; p.321</p> <p>Vivekananda, pp.91, 93, 156-157</p> <p>H.P.B. As I Knew Her, pp.23-24</p> <p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 19, June 1938; p.124</p>
----------------------	--	--

1958	<p>“HISTORY”</p> <p>Chapter 2 in Theosophists: Reunite! by F. Pierce Spinks.</p> <p>“Assessment of the Judge case as a contributory factor to the present divisiveness of the Theosophical movement. The author, a member of the group that followed Judge in America suggests that Judge relayed psychically received messages in good faith, but questions the source based on subsequent results: the ‘split’ in the Society.”</p>	<p>T.N.C.A.B., Item 1996, p.547</p> <p>Theosophists: Reunite! pp.31-105</p>
Aug. 20, 1958	<p>Bahman Pestonji Wadia died in India. Born Oct. 8, 1881. He resigned from the Indian Council and of the Indian Section of the Theosophical Society on July 18th, 1922, stating Adyar “had strayed away from the ‘Original Programme’ inspired by the ‘Original Impulses’ whereby the Masters brought it into existence through the help of Their Messenger, H.P. Blavatsky.”</p>	<p>To All Fellow Theosophists and Members of the Theosophical Society: A Statement by B.P. Wadia, p.1</p>
1960	<p>“KATHERINE TINGLEY AND THE BREACH OF 1895.” by Boris de Zirkoff.</p> <p>“Advocates the date of the initial meeting of Katherine Tingley and Judge as late fall 1894, so she could not have been responsible for his Nov. 3rd Circular deposing Besant. But Judge mentions Tingley by name in a letter of Oct. 1, 1894 . . . and E.A. Neresheimer notes that he met her at Judge’s introduction after the September 1893 World Parliament of Religions.”</p> <p>NOTE: See next entry for the complete text, found in Eirenicon, of Mr. Boris de Zirkoff’s comments as to when Judge met K.T.</p>	<p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 2001, p.548</p>

1960	<p>“KATHERINE TINGLEY AND THE BREACH OF 1895” by Boris de Zirkoff.</p> <p>“Is it reasonable to suppose that Katherine Tingley ‘claimed to be responsible for the development of Judge’s plans to secede’, provided he actually had such plans, in the first place?</p> <p>“Personally, after several years of work with her, I have never heard anything of the kind. But this may be poor testimony historically speaking. But what about the following:</p> <p>“Madame Tingley met Judge during a clockmakers’ strike in New York (The Gods Await, Point Loma, 1926, Section III). The New York TIMES shows that this strike was of several months’ duration, and the articles about it run from August 28, 1894, to February 22, 1895. To judge by the cold weather spoken of by Katherine Tingley, I would suggest that this meeting took place rather late in the season, maybe late Fall, if not beginning of Winter. (Incidentally, this would dispose of Mrs. Cleather’s statement - H.P. Blavatsky, Her Life and Work For Humanity, p.122 - that Judge’s E.S. Paper By Master’s Direction, dated November 4, 1894, was dictated by Katherine Tingley, etc.) April 28, 1895, Judge ‘seceded’, at Boston Convention. Is it reasonable to suppose that Katherine Tingley would have produced such an impact on Judge within a matter of 3-4 months? Personally, I think it is a lot of ‘bosh’, but I do not expect everybody to agree with me. A lot of “Theosophists” have been for years in the state of mind which is defined something like this: ‘I have made up my mind, Sir; don’t confuse me with the facts!’ . . .”</p> <p>NOTE: In a letter to Mrs. H. Beane, dated October 1st, 1894 Judge wrote: “I have been requested by Mrs. Kate A. Tingley to send some elementary documents on Theosophy and a form of application for membership in the T.S., so I presume that you have had some conference with her upon the subject.”</p>	<p>Eirenicon, No. 137, 1960; p.8</p> <p>Theos. Forum (P.L.) Vol. 7, Oct. 1935; p.26</p>
------	---	---

<p>Apr. 2, 1962</p>	<p>A meeting held at H.W. Dempster's home at 3131 McCall Street, San Diego 6, California, with Dr. Henry A. Smith, President, American Section of The Theosophical Society (Adyar). L. Gordon Plummer and W. Emmett Small were also present. Statement from Dr. Smith: "I reached into my files and found the 'White Papers' . . . written by A.B. [Annie Besant] approximately in 1897. They were a review of the whole (Judge) situation, a review of her position and of her attitude and the attitude of the organization at that particular time. I did not see how anybody could read that without reading between the lines, and it was then that I began to sense that there must be another aspect, another side to it. My first thought was, I wish I could get in touch with one of you people that we might exchange 'White Papers' . . . I just followed the feeling within me. It told me that the first thing to do was to read Judge, which I hadn't done, and in reading Judge I knew Judge, and I became more and more convinced that it was a matter of failure of communication at that time. I felt that Judge was a Founder, and furthermore he was the first President of our Society in this country. I felt he should be restored to his position . . ."</p> <p>"Dr. Smith tried to restore an attitude at national headquarters that would respect the contribution of <i>all</i> noted figures in the history of the movement. For this reason a picture of W.Q. Judge was hung there. His brotherly act caused shock among the bigoted staff.</p> <p>Dr. Smith wished to activate the Research Department on a national basis. It was his hope to establish a nucleus that would link various groups, produce literary works, create effective outlets for such efforts in the world at large. . . . In Jan. 1965, control over the department was wrested from him."</p> <p>Henry Arthur Smith, M.D., joined the Society on July 1st, 1919 and was National-President of T.S. in America from 1960 to 1965. He died on September 10th, 1979.</p> <p>NOTE: Dr. Smith was eventually asked to resign, request a leave of absence for the remainder of his term, or stay and possibly face recall action. He chose an unconditional leave of absence in July 1965.</p>	<p>Extracts from meeting held at Dempster's Home, 3pages of recorded notes</p> <p>The Progressive Theosophist, Vol. 1, June 1966; pp.4-5</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 101, Dec. 1979; p.170</p>
---------------------	--	--

July 1963	<p>“THE LASTING SIGNIFICANCE OF THE JUDGE CASE.”</p> <p>The Editor of Eirenicon quoted Victor Endersby: “It seems to have been the original intention that a balance would be maintained among enthusiasts of variant sorts. The ‘Judge Case’, which split the Society, effectively destroyed this balance, and both sides went to extremes, where some of them still are. (We might say in passing that while Judge is blamed by one side for the split, and credited by the other for it, our own research has convinced us that he was <u>not</u> responsible for it, but was prepared to continue in unity with the Olcott regime, even under circumstances very disadvantageous to himself; first in official unity, then, when that failed, in unofficial harmony and fellowship. But he was no longer master of the situation. The true story of how both sides were victimized by forces inimical to the whole Movement has not yet been published.)”</p> <p>NOTE: Victor Endersby, Editor of Theosophical Notes, issued “AN IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT”, July 1963, whereby he dealt with controversial issues and notions regarding his “supposed affiliation or <u>rapprochement</u> with what is known as neo-theosophy.” He mentioned having “been invited to participate in a reorganized researched group under the management pro tem of Dr. Henry A. Smith, President of the T.S. in A.”</p>	<p>Eirenicon, No. 147, Autumn Equinox 1963; pp.2-3</p> <p>Theosophical Notes, Special Paper, July 1963; pp.1-5</p>
March/April 1964	<p>Book review by J.M. Prentice of The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant by Arthur H. Nethercot. “Nethercot brings out . . . the belated admission by Annie that she had been wrong in her attitude to Judge and in her acceptance at the time that he gave a misleading form to genuine messages from the Masters, (he was never overtly accused of forgery, remember) but such an admission was made privately and never publicized at the time.”</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 45, Mar./Apr. 1964; pp.20-23</p>
March/April 1964 continued	<p>Book review by J.M. Prentice of The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant by Arthur H. Nethercot. Following the above Prentice added: “This recalls to your reviewer a long interview which he had with G.R.S. Mead in 1916. Mead said he had often wondered if he had not gone astray in refusing to support Judge, who had called on him during the 1894 crisis and implored such support. Mead was ill in bed with a severe attack of influenza and his normal judgment was not functioning.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Sep. 11, 1922.</p> <p>“<i>Theosophical Activities</i>” “We regret to say that the General Secretary, G.R.S. Mead, is still extremely weak, his recovery from the breakdown caused by overwork being exceedingly slow.”</p> <p>NOTE: See NOTE in July 7, 1894 entry and May 20, 1894.]</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 45, Mar./Apr. 1964; pp.20-23</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 14, June 1894; p.347</p>

January 18, 1966	<p>A private letter addressed to Boris [de Zirkoff] from Hildor Barton, an early Point Loma student who was present and witnessed Katherine Tingley handing over one of Judge's Diaries to August Neresheimer. "The Diary was turned over as J.H. Fussell recounts. Nere used to go over, duly, each evening, though he preferred to stay at home with his wife. There were no consultations, but only KT's endless recountments of events in the old days. And all the elderly gentlemen would sit there and go to sleep one after another. But Nere would sit bolt upright, like Amen Ra. And one evening KT came with the Diary in her hands and said, "I am going to give this to Nere, because I know it will be well taken care of." Both Marguerite and I are strongly of the thought that this was in 1928. We all thought it strange at the time; for there had been some conflict of ideas between her and Nere. He and Emily left early in 1929."</p> <p>NOTE: See June 1932 for "THE POINT LOMA VIEW", and Dec. 12, 1932.</p>	Letter addressed "Dear Boris", dated Jan. 18, 1966
Nov. 14-20, 1975	<p>The Centenary Congress of the Theosophical Society was held in New York City in celebration of the Society's 100th Anniversary.</p> <p>The following was reported in The Canadian Theosophist by Ted G. Davy, the official representative for the Canadian Section, as its General Secretary and Editor of the magazine. The then International President of the Theosophical Society was John B.S. Coats (1973-1979) who made the reported announcement.</p> <p>"After having been virtually 'in exile' these many years, the Congress paid special tribute to William Quan Judge. With full approbation of the Society, his name was at last relinked with those of H.P.B. and Olcott, his colleagues of 1874 and after.</p> <p>"This restoration of dignity, if not of honour, was the source of considerable joy at the Congress. Those many students who, over the years, have endeavoured to defend Judge's integrity and to continuously make available his valuable writings, must have felt that justice has been done at last. We in the Canada Section have always recognized William Q. Judge as a founder of the Society and as a student of Theosophy who made a special contribution to our understanding of the Ancient Wisdom. It is gratifying to know that as a result to the wider recognition initiated at the Congress, his work will become know to a much larger segment of the Theosophical Movement, and that hereafter he will be identified as one of the Founders of the Society."</p> <p>[Continued in next cell]</p>	<p>Cdn. Theosophist, Vol. 56, Jan.-Feb. 1976; pp.121-127</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 97, Jan. 1976; pp.213-215</p>

Nov. 14-20, 1975 continued	<p>NOTE: Unfortunately the anticipated breakthrough following this proclamation by Mr. Coats at the Congress has never materialized. He died December 26th, 1979, during his term of Office.</p> <p>The Theosophical Society in Canada was “dissociated” from The Theosophical Society at the Meeting of the General Council held at Adyar on December 25th, 1991 (and continued on January 1st, 1992). A change in the By-Laws of TS in Canada, updated to reflect Canadian legal requirements, was taken as the pretext for expulsion. A letter to this effect, dated January 31st, 1992, signed by Hugh Gray, Secretary, informed then-General Secretary of TS in Canada, Stan Treloar, of this action.</p>	Documents in the Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
Nov. 15, 1976	<p>“A CHAPTER OF THEOSOPHICAL HISTORY CLARIFIED” Iverson L. Harris commented on “Some Reminiscences of William Q. Judge” by E. A. Neresheimer.</p> <p>“I have seen the originals of these ‘messages and quotations’ in Mr. Judge’s handwriting, and I showed photographic copies of them to Miss Margaret Thomas (active U.L.T. member) at Oakley House, Bromley Common, Kent, England, while I was attached to Dr. de Purucker’s staff during the temporary transference thither of the International Headquarters of The Theosophical Society (Point Loma) in 1932-1933.”</p> <p>Harris also reproached “the anonymous author or authors of the U.L.T. History of the Theosophical Movement [who] have persistently maintained that the statement that Katherine Tingley was ‘appointed’ by Mr. Judge as his esoteric ‘Successor’ is untenable and even fraudulent.”</p>	Eclectic Theos. No. 37, Nov. 15, 1976; pp.2-3
Sep. 15, 1977	<p>“<i>Historic Footnote:</i>” by Iverson L. Harris.</p> <p>“To those interested in knowing the truth concerning certain statements made late in life by Mr. E. A. Neresheimer in his <i>‘Reminiscences of William Q. Judge’</i>, the following incontrovertible facts are gleaned and quoted from ‘Minutes of a General Meeting held at Headquarters, 144 Madison Avenue, New York, on Sunday, March 29, 1896 at 12:30 p.m.’</p> <p>“Mr. Hargrove read several pages of the memoranda in Judge’s handwriting found after his death. Thereafter, each member of the Council expressed his concurrence and acceptance of the documents read by Mr. Hargrove. Mr. Neresheimer’s concluding statement was as follows: ‘I corroborate everything that has been said by Mr. Hargrove. I was present when the papers of Mr. Judge were examined, and I have seen all the documents to which he refers.’ . . .</p> <p>“In conclusion, I quote the following from Mr. Hargrove’s opening address to the members gathered at Headquarters in New York on March 29, 1896:</p> <p>“‘This is the Rajah’s (Judge’s) statement in regard to our new Outer Head: ‘This Head is as true as steel, as clear as diamond, as lasting as Time’ .’”</p>	Eclectic Theos. No. 42, Sep. 15, 1977; p.7

July 1988	<p>“THE JUDGE CASE”.</p> <p>Editor, Leslie Price, suggested: “Has not the time come to look again at the Judge case? Some Theosophists today have not heard of it and others will deprecate attention to such painful circumstances.”</p>	<p>Theos. History, Vol. 2, July 1988; p.229 Vol. 3, Jan. 1989; p.3</p>
Jan. 1989	<p>“REFLECTIVE RETROSPECTIVE: A New Look at the Judge Case” by Vonda Urban.</p> <p>“Lurking beneath the sombre shadows of the Judge crisis can be seen the same menacing specter scheming to destroy Theosophy that prevailed at Adyar during the ‘Coulomb conspiracy.’ Only this time it was spawned from within the Allahabad TS, among whose members of Indian Brahmanas were some who were unwilling to relinquish their exclusive hold on esoteric knowledge.”</p>	<p>Theos. History, Vol. 3, Jan. 1989; pp.4-12,14</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Item 1997, p.547</p>
May-June 1989	<p>“DID THE ‘JUDGE CASE’ BEGIN WHILE H.P.B. WAS ALIVE?”</p> <p>By Wayne Kell. Lists, with comments, articles relating to the CAUSE versus the organization, including H.P.B.’s “A Puzzle from Adyar” and “Why I Do Not Return to India”</p> <p>Kell states that H.P.B. wrote the above articles in response to Richard Harte’s two articles “<i>APPLIED THEOSOPHY</i>” and “THE SITUATION”.</p> <p>NOTE: H.P.B. also wrote two articles “MUDDLED MEDDLERS” in defence of W.Q. Judge’s position [see Feb. 1890] and “Theosophical (?) Dogmatism and Intolerance” [see Lucifer Vol. 5, Oct. 1889; pp.168-169] where she criticized Harte’s editorship of The Theosophist and his point of view.</p>	<p>Eclectic Theos. May/June 1989; pp.4-5</p>
April/May 1998	<p>“Katherine Tingley: A Biographical Sketch”</p> <p>Grace F. Knoche summarized how Mrs. Tingley proceeded after the passing of William Q. Judge. She wrote:</p> <p>“In some of his papers Judge had alluded to Mrs. Tingley and, shortly after his death, she was recognized as his successor by those closest to him. Almost immediately she felt the urgency to start a new current of thought, to strike anew the brotherhood note, and to move the thinking and attitude of the nations — and theosophists everywhere — from the inevitability of war to its universal abolition by directing their will and energies towards world peace and the pacific settlement of disputes. If we want peace tomorrow, she believed, we must start with the children of today.</p> <p>“Step by step she moved toward these ends.”</p> <p>NOTE: See Jan. 30, 1898 entry for more details.</p>	<p>Sunrise, Vol. 47, No. 4, Apr./May 1998; p.101</p>
Spring 2000	<p>“Lights and Shadows of Brotherhood.” by Brett Furray</p> <p>Mr. Furray examined the period of the Theosophical Movement known as “The Judge Case” and suggests that it is essential to know its history in order to know where we are heading. He stated:</p> <p>“If the split in the ranks that occurred in 1895 didn’t completely destroy the Society as H.P.B. feared, it changed the tenor of the remaining and soon to emerge new Theosophical Organizations. With more than one group calling itself Theosophical, which one was carrying on the original impetus on which the T.S. was founded?”</p>	<p>Fohat, Vol. 4, No. 1, Spring 2000; pp.6-9</p>

<p>Winter 2000 & Spring 2001</p>	<p>“ANNIE BESANT HER PASSIONS AND HER RELATIONSHIPS.” Parts 1 and 2, by Ernest Pelletier. This article focuses on Mrs. Besant’s early years, from 1888 to 1896, before and after she joined the Theosophical Society. Her social and political involvement with individuals who influenced her during that time are examined. From a reading of Mrs. Besant’s hand by a professional palmist, certain weaknesses which led her to detract from the Original Program are illustrated. Also described is the incident at the Council meeting held in London on May 27th, 1891, shortly after Mme. Blavatsky’s death, which involved Mr. Judge and the message from the Master (“W.Q. Judge’s plan is right”) which appeared on a piece of paper found among the letters in Mrs. Besant’s possession.</p>	<p>Fohat, Vol. 4, No. 4, Winter 2000; pp.77-83, 92 Vol. 5, No. 1, Spring 2001; pp.6-11</p>
<p>Summer & Fall 2003</p>	<p>“What Killed William Q. Judge?” Parts 1 and 2 by Ernest Pelletier. In Part 1 Judge’s close relationship with his co-workers and his determination to establish a strong Theosophical Movement in America are examined. In Part 2 how the medical treatments of the times contributed to Judge’s death are explored.</p>	<p>Fohat, Vol. 7, No. 2, Summer 2003; pp.29-34 No. 3, Fall 2003; pp.60-64, 69-70</p>
<p>Fall 2003</p>	<p>The entire issue of Fohat is dedicated to W.Q. Judge. “A practical Occultist” by Robert Bruce MacDonald “William Q. Judge — The Pilgrim” by Ernest Pelletier “Swinging With the Motion of the Spheres” by R.B. MacDonald “Natus: W.Q. Judge” (astrological birth chart) by Alan Leo “What Should Theosophists Talk About” by W.Q. Judge “What is Occultism?” by W.Q. Judge</p>	<p>Fohat, Vol. 7, No. 3, Fall 2003</p>

<p>Edge, S.V.</p> <p>NOTE: Date of death unknown.</p>	<p>Sydney Vernon Edge. (Date of birth unknown)</p> <p>Not much is known about Mr. Edge but from documents the following few facts were gathered:</p> <p>Mr. S.V. Edge was elected on Sep. 30th, 1890 as Assistant-Secretary of the Blavatsky Lodge for the 1890-91 term. He, along with Bertram Keightley, travelled to India on August 21st, 1891, shortly after Mme. Blavatsky's death. Mr. Edge was to join Headquarters staff at Adyar and help Bertram Keightley who was the General Secretary of the Indian Section. While there he wrote an article titled "Adyar" describing the Society's headquarters, the Adyar Library, living conditions and the work carried on there.</p> <p>In January 1893, S.V. Edge was involved in a meeting which included W. Old, (who had recently arrived at Adyar), Bertram Keightley, Col. Olcott and Judge Khandalavala, where 'evidence' against W.Q. Judge was presented. It was at this time that it was decided to prosecute Judge. In a meeting held December 1893 which also involved Col. Olcott, Judge Khandalavala and Annie Besant (who had also just recently arrived on her first visit to India), among others, charges were formulated.</p> <p>[See Dec. 29, 1929, for Walter Old's biographical sketch regarding Mr. Edge's involvement in the <i>THEOSOPHIC FREETHOUGHT</i> article which resulted in both of them getting suspended from the E.S. in August 1893 for violating their pledge of secrecy.] Mr. Edge had joined as a member of the Esoteric School of Theosophy after Mme. Blavatsky's death. In late 1893 S.V. Edge, then Acting General Secretary of the Indian Section T.S., was placed in charge of arrangements of the programme for Mrs. Besant's India tour.</p> <p>In a letter to G.R.S. Mead on November 1st, 1894 from Madras, Mr. Edge mentioned that he was continuing to sub-edit The Theosophist. By April 1895 he had given his notice to resign his position as Sub-Editor of the Theosophist. There is very little mention of him from this point on.</p>	<p>Lucifer, Vol. 7, Oct. 1890; pp.164-165</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 8, Aug. 1891; p.518 Nov. 1891; pp.226-227</p> <p>Old Diary Leaves, Fourth Series, p.508</p> <p>Ransom, pp.298-299</p> <p>To All Members of E.S.T. p.2</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 14, June 1893; Supp. p.ix</p> <p>Lucifer, Vol. 15, Dec. 1894; p.337</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 16, Mar. 1895; Supp. p.xviii</p>
---	--	---

<p>Harte, R.</p> <p>NOTE: Date of death unknown.</p>	<p>Richard Harte. (Date of birth unknown and no application form to join the Theosophical Society has been found.) No known biography exists about Mr. Harte. The following facts have been gathered.</p> <p>Mr. Harte was a long-time active member of the Aryan T.S. in New York and also served as its President. He joined the T.S. in 1877. Mr. Harte attended the Convention of the American Section of the T.S. held at Mott Memorial Hall in New York City on Sunday, April 24th, 1887. At that Convention he was elected as a member of the General Council for the newly formed American Section of the T.S.</p> <p>At some point in 1887 Mr. Harte, an experienced newspaper man with the New York Telegram, went to England, presumably to lend his support and help to Mme Blavatsky. He acquired considerable reputation among theosophists as the alleged writer of the December 1887 editorial, "LUCIFER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, GREETINGS!" When Col. Olcott visited England in 1888 he persuaded his old friend Mr. Harte to join him at Adyar. On October 28th, 1888, Mr. Harte boarded the ship with Charles Johnston and his wife Vera (H.P.B.'s niece), Baroness Kroummess and E.D. Fawcett and Col. Olcott and reached Bombay November 10th. By December, Col. Olcott had appointed him Librarian and Assistant Editor of the Theosophist. Mr. Harte was delegated by the Executive Committee, at the time he left London for India, to represent the American Section at the Thirteenth Convention and Anniversary of the T.S.</p> <p>He served as Secretary of The Theosophical Publishing Society at Adyar which issued reprints on Theosophical subjects such as "Theosophy and the Church", "Keely's Secrets" and "Elementals and Elementaries", among others. He was also appointed, on January 7th, 1889, as one of three Commissioners during Col. Olcott's trip to Japan that year. During that time he stirred up a lot of controversy with his editorial and article (<i>APPLIED THEOSOPHY</i> and <i>THE SITUATION</i>) which appeared in the June 1889 Theosophist. These articles, along with "A <i>Disclaimer</i>" which he published in the July Supplement of the Theosophist, generated strong reactions from H.P. Blavatsky and W.Q. Judge. After Col. Olcott's return from Japan he resigned as Secretary of the T.S. and stated:</p> <p>"In order to avoid any suspicion that opinions expressed by me about the affairs of the Theosophical Society, etc., are of an official nature, or that you are, either directly or indirectly, responsible for them, I beg herewith to place in your hands my resignation of the office of Secretary of the Theosophical Society, the only official position I hold therein."</p> <p>After three years of service in Adyar he returned to England. He wrote "The Shrine of Koot Hoomi", a letter to the Editor, Madras Mail, Jan. 24, 1890, and Theosophy and The Theosophical Society, 8pp, published by Adyar in 1889.</p>	<p>The Path, Vol. 3, Sep. 1888; p.204</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 8, July 1887; Supp. pp.cvii-cviii</p> <p>BCW, Vol. 8, p.268</p> <p>Practical Occultism, p.67</p> <p>A Short History of the T.S., p.252</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 10, Dec. 1888; Supp. p.xxvii</p> <p>The Theosophist, Vol. 12, Oct. 1890; Supp. p.ii</p> <p>T.N.C.A.B. Items 1359 & 1640</p>
--	---	--

List of Biographical Sketches

ANDERSON, Dr. Jerome A. (July 25, 1847 - Dec. 25, 1903).	235
BESANT, Annie (Oct. 1, 1847 - Sep. 20, 1933).	274
BLAVATSKY, Helena Petrovna (Aug. 12, 1831 - May 8, 1891).	38
BUCK, Dr. Jirah Dewey (Nov. 20, 1838 - 1916).	246
BURROWS, Herbert (1845 - 1921).	247
CHAKRAVARTI, Gyanendra Nath (July 6, 1863 - 1936).	282
CLEATHER, Mrs. Alice Leighton (Apr. 24, 1854? - May 4, 1938).	286
CORYN, Dr. Herbert A. W. (1863 - Nov. 27, 1927).	257
CROSBIE, Robert (Jan. 10, 1849 - June 25, 1919).	247
CRUMP, Basil (1866 est. - May 30, 1945).	292
DHARMAPALA, Anagarika Hevavitarane (1864 - Apr. 29, 1933).	272
DICK, Frederick John (1856 - May 25, 1927).	256
DOUBLEDAY, General Abner (June 26, 1819 - Jan. 26, 1893).	66
DUNLOP, Daniel Nicol (Dec. 1868 - May 30, 1935).	279
EDGE, Dr. Henry Travers (Jan. 6, 1867 - Sep. 19, 1946).	294
EDGE, Sydney Vernon (No dates).	308
FULLERTON, Alexander (Sep. 12, 1841 - July 21, 1913).	243
FUSSELL, Dr. Joseph H. (1863 - May 7, 1942).	290
HARGROVE, Ernest Temple (Dec. 17, 1870 - Apr. 8, 1939).	288
HARTE, Richard (No Dates).	309
HARTMANN, Dr. Franz (Nov. 22, 1838 - Aug. 7, 1912).	242
HILLARD, Katharine (? - Nov. 3, 1915).	245
HOLLOWAY-LANGFORD, Laura Carter (1848 - July 10, 1930).	262
HÜBBE-SCHLEIDEN, Dr. William (Oct. 20, 1846 - May 17, 1916).	246
JUDGE, Mrs. Ella Miller (1853 - Apr. 17, 1931).	264
JUDGE, William Quan (Apr. 13, 1851 - Mar. 21, 1896).	206
KEIGHTLEY, Dr. Archibald (Apr. 19, 1859 - Nov. 18, 1930).	263
KEIGHTLEY, Bertram (Apr. 4, 1860 - Oct. 31, 1944).	291
KEIGHTLEY, Julia (Jasper Niemand) (185[5]? - Oct. 9, 1915).	244
KHANDALAVALA, Khan Bahadur Nowroji (Navroji) Dorabji (? - June 2, 1938).	284
MEAD, George Robert Stowe (Mar. 22, 1863 - Sep. 29, 1933).	275
MÜLLER, Frances Henrietta (Early 1850s - Jan. 4, 1906).	236
NERESHEIMER, Emil August (Jan. 2, 1847 - Apr. 16, 1937).	283
OLCOTT, Henry Steel (Aug. 2, 1832 - Feb. 17, 1907).	239
OLD, Walter Richard (Mar. 20, 1864 - Dec. 29, 1929).	260
PRYSE, James Morgan (Aug. 14, 1859 - Apr. 22, 1942).	289
RAMBO, Edward Burroughs (Apr. 5, 1845 - Aug. 16, 1897).	221
RUSSELL, George (Æ) (Apr. 10, 1867 - July 17, 1935).	280
SHROFF, Kavasji Mervanji (? - Apr. 27, 1903).	234
SINNETT, Alfred Percy (Jan. 18, 1840 - June 27, 1921).	248
SMYTHE, Albert Ernest (Dec. 27, 1861 - Oct. 2, 1947).	295

STEAD, William Thomas (1849 - Apr. 14-15, 1912).....	241
STOKES, Dr. Henry Newlin (Oct. 1859 - Sep. 30, 1942).....	290
STURDY, Edward Toronto (1860 - Mar. 15, 1957).....	299
TINGLEY, Katherine (1847 - July 11, 1929).....	258
WACHTMEISTER, Countess Constance (Mar. 28, 1838 - Sep. 23, 1910).....	241
WADIA, Bahman Pestonji (Oct. 8, 1881 - Aug. 20, 1958).....	300
WRIGHT, Claude Falls (Sep. 18, 1867 - Jan. 8, 1923).....	252
ZHELIOVSKY, Vera Petrovna de (Apr.17/29, 1835 - May 5/18, 1896)	213

SUPPLEMENT

TO

THE JUDGE CASE

A Conspiracy Which Ruined the Theosophical CAUSE

Contents

Chapter 1	The Early Years	317
Chapter 2	Judge in London and Paris	320
Chapter 3	Judge Goes to India	325
Chapter 4	Judge at Adyar	329
Chapter 5	Back In America	337
Chapter 6	Bertram Keightley	339
Chapter 7	Richard Harte — Troubles at Adyar	343
Chapter 8	Struggles in India	347
Chapter 9	The Wills of H.P.B.	350
Chapter 10	Olcott is Tested — Suspicions Mount	355
Chapter 11	The “Poison” Letter	361
Chapter 12	Suspicions Begin to Sprout	365
Chapter 13	Bertram Keightley Returns to Europe and America	367
Chapter 14	Fears of Dogmatism	370
Chapter 15	Suspicions Take Root — The September 1884 Letter	373
Chapter 16	Indians Summoned to the CAUSE	382
Chapter 17	W.Q. Judge’s Initiation	384
Chapter 18	Convention of 1893	390
Chapter 19	G. N. Chakravarti	393
Chapter 20	The Proceedings Begin	396
Chapter 21	Delays and Withholdings	401
Chapter 22	Khandalavala and Besant	405
Chapter 23	The Judicial Committee — Pre and Post	408
Chapter 24	Summary	415
Addendum		422
Notes		425
Index to Supplement		445

Chapter 1

The Early Years

William Quan Judge was an enigmatic individual, more complex than has been ascribed. He was selected to be part of the essential core for the founding of the Theosophical Society. With an open heart and mind one cannot, after examining the evidence gathered, be other than moved that his influence was not only necessary but actually of vital importance to the proper communicating of ideas presented by the great and noble philosophy known as Brahma-Vidyâ.

W.Q. Judge was born in Dublin, Ireland, on April 13th, 1851.* He was one of seven children born to Frederick H. Judge and Alice Mary Quan Judge. At the age of seven William was struck by a serious illness which, by all evidence, had led to his death.¹ As the doctor gathered the family to the young lad's bedside to announce that he was dead, William revived. Recovery was slow and it was during his year-long convalescence that he started to demonstrate an interest in mystical subjects. He also read books on mesmerism, phrenology, magic, religion, etc., much to the amazement of his family who, up to this point, had not been aware that he could read.

It eventually became an accepted fact among Judge's close friends that at the time of the encounter with death, another entity had entered into the Irish boy's body.² According to one such friend Judge once described

the experience the Ego had in assuming control of the instrument . . . [which] was never absolutely perfected, for to Mr. Judge's dying day, the physical tendencies and heredity of the body he used would crop up and interfere with the full expression of the inner man's thoughts and feelings. An occasional abruptness and coldness of manner was attributable to this lack of co-ordination. . . . He was always in absolute control of his thoughts and actions, but his body would sometimes slightly modify their expression.³

At the Boston Convention in 1891 Judge apparently made it known that the indwelling Ego in the body was a Hindu.⁴

Judge's mother died giving birth to her seventh child. Frederick H. Judge, described as "a Mason and a student of mysticism",⁵ moved his family to the USA when William was thirteen years old. They arrived in New York on July 14th, 1864, on the Inman Liner, *City of Limerick*. The family stayed briefly at the Old Merchant's Hotel on Cortlandt Street, then on Tenth Street, New York, finally settling in Brooklyn, NY. Judge's father died before William's twenty-first birthday.

Judge had a number of siblings although we are not quite sure what became of all of them. We know his younger brother, Frederick C. Judge, named after his father, was born in 1865 and also donated his time to theosophical work. He died of cirrhosis of the liver at age thirty-two in Calcutta in 1888. Another brother, John H. Judge, was born circa 1859. John first met H.P. Blavatsky when he was seventeen. W.Q. Judge had two sisters who had been residing with him when he died. One of them was a well known organist; one was named Emily.

Judge managed to finish his schooling and eventually went to work in a Law Office, which led him into the legal profession. He became a naturalized American citizen in April 1872 and was admitted to the State Bar of New York in May of the same year. He specialized in Commercial Law.

* Early biographical information has been summarized from "William Q. Judge", *The Irish Theosophist*, Vol. 4, February 1896, pp.90-92, and from *William Quan Judge 1851-1896, Theosophical Pioneer*, compiled by Sven Eek and Boris de Zirkoff, pp.5-7.

Judge married Ella Miller Smith, a school teacher and strict Methodist from Brooklyn, in 1874. It was shortly after his marriage that he came in contact with Helena Petrovna Blavatsky** and pursued his theosophical interests, which his wife did not share for personal and religious reasons at the time.⁶ This was not conducive to a pleasant marital situation, which further deteriorated with the loss of their only child, a daughter, who died of diphtheria at the age of five.⁷

It was following the publication in the New York **Daily Graphic** of Colonel Henry Steel Olcott's accounts of Spiritualistic seances at the Eddy Farm in Chittenden, VT, in late 1874⁸ that Judge wrote to Olcott requesting an introduction to Madame Blavatsky. H.P.B. and Judge seemed to recognize each other upon meeting. He once stated, "It was as if but the evening before we had parted, leaving yet to be done some detail of a task taken up. . . ."⁹ They maintained a close association from that point on.

Judge was a founding member of the Theosophical Society which was first proposed in Blavatsky's apartment at 46 Irving Place, New York on September 8th, 1875, following a lecture by New York architect, George H. Felt, on "The Lost Canon of Proportion of the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans".

Judge was a frequent visitor to H.P.B.'s apartment. He mentioned some years later having been involved with the preparation of H.P.B.'s **Isis Unveiled**, which was published September 29th, 1877. In 1884 he wrote to a friend how H.P.B. acknowledged his contribution of the term 'elemental' during the writing of it. His younger brother, John H. Judge, apparently "rendered valuable service in the matter of preparing H.P.B.'s manuscript for the printer, by copying a good portion of the work. This was not an easy task, for typewriters were [not very practical] in those days, and it was necessary to prepare manuscripts for publication by means of handwritten copy."¹⁰

For some reason, a short time before the publication of **Isis Unveiled**, there apparently developed a disruption in relations between H.P.B. and Judge. One theory is that this was possibly due to an occult test. In Olcott's words:

During that year of interregnum Mr. Judge did not visit us, owing to a difficulty between Mme. Blavatsky and himself, nor did she write to him nor he to her, his only letters being addressed to me. . . . When Mr. Judge reappeared at Headquarters, the old cordial relations between us three were re-established, and continued down to the death of H.P.B.¹¹

On December 18th, 1878, Blavatsky, Olcott, and Edward Wimbridge, an English architect, left New York on board the British steamship *Canada*, en route to India. W.Q. Judge and his brother, John C. Judge, saw them off.

Olcott himself admits that the organization that was left behind was alive in name only.

When the interest of the members had become so weakened as to prevent meetings being held, the work of the Society was carried on in Council, up to the point when all executive functions had practically been concentrated in the President's hands and Council ceased to meet.¹²

Touching upon events leading up to his and H.P.B.'s departure, Olcott stated:

There were no meetings of the Society for two years before our departure. . . . We made no attempt to revive the meetings — knowing it would be useless.¹³

Major-General Abner Doubleday, of Civil War fame, became Acting President of the Theosophical Society. Judge was then "a young man, twenty-[seven] years of age, newly married, poor, and at that time obscure, not of robust health, soon to have the future of an infant child added to his responsibilities, . . . was left

** Hereafter will frequently be identified as H.P.B.

virtually in charge of the interests of the Theosophical Society”¹⁴ in the United States. Most of the Society’s affairs had been conducted around Blavatsky. The void left following her departure was immense and for some years thereafter “it appeared that Judge was left very much alone by both H.P.B. and the Masters.”¹⁵

Over the years, his desire to become more active in the Society grew stronger. Judge was not a rich man; at times he was quite poor. He once mentioned that he had to borrow a nickel for a ferry crossing. His despair both in his finances and in the promoting of Theosophy were almost too much for him to bear. “He wrote rather despairingly to Olcott, complaining that he was being left out in the cold. This situation was undoubtedly connected with his trials as a probationary chela. He asked for news about the Masters, just anything.”¹⁶ His letters seemed to fall on deaf ears.

During this period (1879-1882) Judge corresponded with Damodar K. Mavalankar.¹⁷ Judge had mining interests in Venezuela at the time and some of these letters were written from there, where he spent the greater part of 1881-1882. The replies of Damodar revealed to Judge a more intimate relationship between Master and pupil than he had ever hoped for himself, and this made Judge his fervent admirer and lifelong friend. In the series titled “A Hindu Chela’s Diary”, Judge paraphrases Damodar’s mystical experiences as described in his letters to him.¹⁸

Chapter 2

Judge in London and Paris

In a letter to Damodar dated June 11th, 1883, Judge wrote: “I have your last. On the back is written in red pencil ‘Better come M ^ ’ . . . Olcott wrote me three days ago begging me to come also & thus I have a great obligation.”¹ For Judge this was the most pleasing news. He had longed for the time when he could again engage in the work he loved best. Judge continued:

My dear Damodar I have as great a trial in staying here as in leaving — I think it is a greater one to stay. Because my position is well nigh unbearable & my domestic relations are not pleasant. I would often fain to die & how much better to fly.²

Judge really wanted to go to India and to stay indefinitely, but was torn by his sense of obligation to his wife. This note was all it took for Judge to take action; he must have also been looking forward to fraternizing with his pen colleague Damodar. By early 1884 he felt able to go to India, although just how he adjusted his financial difficulties and provided for his wife’s support is not known. He left New York in February, to remain away permanently if necessary, stopping in London to receive further instructions and to meet with the two other Founders.

It appears that Judge arrived in London on February 27th, 1884.³ He stayed at a hotel while awaiting word from Olcott as to what to do next. Weeks went by and he found himself in despair, waiting for orders. He wrote to his friend in America, Laura Holloway: “The magnetic atmosphere of London is horrible, every one here drinks ale and eats chops eternally”.⁴ He was invited by the Sinnetts for dinner a few times and to Miss Francesca Arundale’s also — all members of London Lodge (L.L.). No doubt conversations after meals were focused on London Lodge. Sinnett’s return to London from India in the spring of 1883 had created many problems for Dr. Anna Kingsford, the President of London Lodge. A serious dispute had arisen between Dr. Kingsford (M.D. of the Faculty of Paris), Edward Maitland and their party, and Sinnett and his party. Sinnett, author of **The Occult World** (1881) and **Esoteric Buddhism** (1883), valued the Indian/Tibetan teachings while Kingsford and Maitland, authors of **The Perfect Way; or, the Finding of Christ** (1882) preferred the Hermetic, Christian-Egyptian teachings. The Chohan, one of the Chief Dhyanis, “the Guru of the Adepts”,⁵ had indicated that he wanted Dr. Kingsford in the Society but did not want to influence the members of the L.L. for their consent.⁶ Olcott was ordered to look after the affair. The matter was somewhat resolved when Olcott arrived in London on April 6th, 1884, and granted Dr. Kingsford a charter for a separate Branch.⁷ On April 9th a meeting was held in Charles Carleton Massey’s law chambers and the Hermetic Lodge of the Theosophical Society was established.⁸

From his hotel in London, Judge could walk over to visit his old friend C.C. Massey. Massey was an English Barrister-at-law and writer. After his father’s death, which left him wealthy, he gave up his short and successful law practice to devote himself to the study of philosophy, psychology and Spiritualism — especially the investigation of psychic phenomena. While in America in 1875 he went to Chittenden, VT, to verify for himself Olcott’s accounts of the Eddy phenomena.⁹ Massey was one of the first to join the T.S. He was also a founder of the British Theosophical Society (June 27th, 1878) which Dr. Kingsford renamed the London Lodge of the T.S. after her return to England from the continent on May 20th, 1883.¹⁰ Massey was also one of the founders of the Society for Psychical Research in 1882.¹¹

A refuge for Judge was spending time at the British Museum investigating the wonderful Greek Gallery and the Assyrian and Egyptian collections. He also found solace in writing letters and most of his evenings were spent alone in his hotel reading or writing. He mentioned writing a paper on his acquisitions in South America. He had been hired by a mining company to do some work in Venezuela from which he was receiving a small monthly compensation for what he called his “South American speculations”.¹² Every extra

penny he managed to save went toward theosophical work. Most often he found himself underdressed and short of money compared to his friends in England. One day he ordered a pair of trousers for \$4 from a tailor. To him this was great — in New York it would have cost him \$10.

Judge was growing weary and despondent with London. He called London a horrid place. To pass the time away he read **The Theosophist** and probably also the local newspapers. He had an inclination for mysteries of the world and the new sciences. The English were known explorers and the local papers would have carried many articles about their exploits. Judge must have found himself unproductive at this time. He had previously expressed his hope of finding temporary work, stating: “The possibility of *working* my passage instead of being unpleasant is quite pleasant.”¹³

An anonymous but interesting book review, titled “The Hollow Globe”, appeared in the July 1884 **Theosophist**. Judge more than likely wrote this article while he was waiting in London. It is a review of **The Hollow Globe; or the World’s Agitator and Reconciler**, sub-titled “A TREATISE ON THE PHYSICAL CONFORMATION OF THE EARTH, Presented Through the Organism of M.L. Sherman, M.D., and Written by Professor Wm. F. Lyon.” The book was published in Chicago in 1871. Its central theme is that the Earth is hollow and contains an interior world which is accessible through a navigable aperture in the Polar Sea. Among the topics included are fragments of history and information on the open Polar Sea, the igneous theory, volcanoes, earthquakes, and electro-magnetism that can produce earthquakes. Interestingly, Judge later wrote a similar article in **The Path**, October 1889, titled “The Skin of the Earth” under the pseudonym of Bryan Kinnavan.¹⁴ Judge’s review of **The Hollow Globe** ends abruptly as though he had to drop it suddenly and move on to something else. The review article concludes with a comment that some of the material had been to some extent corroborated in recent theosophical articles such as “Fragments of Occult Truth” and other teachings given in **The Theosophist**.¹⁵ Judge may have delayed sending his review until he had a chance to discuss the contents of the book with Blavatsky (after all **The Theosophist** was still being “conducted” by her as Editor) while in Paris. **The Hollow Globe** was apparently written as a spirit communication (through Dr. Sherman) and the reviewer wondered if the ‘Spirit’ may have been an ‘Adept’. Perhaps due to how this book had been written, elementals and mediumship versus mediatorship were discussed with Blavatsky, as will be pointed out later.

There may have been underlying friction between Judge and Sinnett at the time. From his correspondence it appears that Judge seemed uncomfortable visiting them. When Sinnett’s **Esoteric Buddhism** was published he had claimed that “this knowledge is now being given out for the first time”. Judge had stated this was a mistake and pointed out in **The Theosophist**, that “Nearly all the leading portions of the doctrine are to be found broadly stated in the Bhagavad Gita.”¹⁶ On the occasions that he was invited to the Sinnetts for dinner Judge would be informed as to the travels of Olcott, Blavatsky and party who embarked on a French steamer for Marseilles on February 20th, 1884.¹⁷ Finally, once they reached Nice, France, on March 15th, Judge telegraphed Olcott for instructions. He received a telegram the next day telling him to go to Paris and meet them there on their arrival on March 27th. Judge called himself the weary pilgrim, feeling blue, and he was glad to get out of London. He stated, “I walk about in a mental cloak, and do not care either to see or hear.”¹⁸ Judge arrived in Paris on March 25th, 1884.¹⁹

The group of travellers consisted of Olcott, Blavatsky, Mohini M. Chatterji, a personal pupil of Master K.H.,²⁰ B.J. Padshah, a clever Parsi graduate from the University of Bombay, and Babula.²¹ Blavatsky was ill at the time and Babula came along as her personal servant. A few days after arriving in France, they were invited to go to Nice to visit Lady Caithness, Duchesse de Pomar, and to stay at her Palais Tiranty. Mohini and Padshah went ahead to Paris where they were greeted by Judge. On March 28th at 11 P.M. Judge, Mohini and Dr. Thurmann, F.T.S. met Blavatsky and Olcott at the station and were conducted to their apartments

at 46, Rue Notre Dame des Champs, which Lady Caithness had provided for their use for the next three months.²²

As soon as Judge arrived in Paris he wrote to Holloway about his change of address, the American Exchange, Paris, where she could reach him. In a letter sent a few days earlier he had included a most interesting and foretelling message which he had received from Blavatsky:

I have not been able to have any long private conversations with her. I have had some talks with her and can tell you now that I have confirmation of much that has occurred. She told me independently and voluntarily that the Master had told her in India, that he [Master M.] was doing, or “about to do something with and for me”.²³

Judge had obviously been having occult experiences which he discussed with H.P.B. Not much is mentioned about what eventually happened. What was the Master about to do? A change of plans occurred soon after H.P.B. arrived in Paris and she was ordered to go to London.

Judge was determined that he had to go to India and that was what he was going to do. He did not appear to know the particulars as to why he *had* to go to India. It seems his thirst for communion with H.P.B. and the Masters and his willingness to serve the CAUSE were all he required. Judge explained his delay in leaving for India by stating, again in a letter to Laura Holloway: “I am ordered by the Masters to stop here [Paris] and help Madame in writing the ‘Secret Doctrine’”²⁴ In his next letter he wrote:

To resume with coherency. After the first hurry was over here, I said I had to go to India at once. Olcott thought I had better stay with H.P.B. and so did she. But I said that all the orders I had were to go to India and without further ones I was going, and so she said I was probably right and then it was decided that I would wait here until O. could get me a steamer in London where he went on the 5th. All was thus arranged definitely. But the next morning, as I was sitting in the bedroom with Mohini, in which he and I slept, and after we had been there about an hour after coffee, Olcott came from his room, which was at the other end of the hall, and called me out, and told me privately that the Master had been then to his room and had told him that I was not to go yet to India, but to stay and help H.P.B. on the “Secret Doctrine.” By the way my fate is mixed up with “Isis Unveiled.” I helped her on that, and, as she reminded me yesterday, I suggested the use of the word “elemental” to make the distinction clear between them and the “elementaries.” As she said, “that was your word, Judge.” It shows she is not ungrateful nor like so many who are unwilling to concede what they are indebted to others for.

Mohini and I had not yet left our rooms and H.P.B. was still in bed. Perfectly convinced after a few minutes that O. was right, especially as the afternoon before I had had an intuition of it in the street, I returned to our room and told Mohini nothing. But after about half an hour he looked up and said, “Judge, I believe your Master has been in the house this morning for some purpose.” I then told him of the change of plan, and he said, “it must be right.”

So then, here I am for how long or short I do not know, and I am to make suggestions and write upon the work. So see my fate again linked with the second working up of “Isis.” In this place you will remember her letter of last June *that my fate was indissolubly linked with that of theirs (the ^)*.²⁵

[Italics added]

In a letter, dated October 23rd, 1889, H.P.B. referred to Judge as being “*part of herself since several aeons.*”

On April 5th, 1884, Olcott and Mohini left for London. Olcott had been ordered by the Master to go there and settle the problems that had arisen in the London Lodge. H.P.B. was to stay in Paris and work on **The Secret Doctrine** with Judge, who was about to receive valuable occult training. Judge relates what happened shortly after Olcott’s departure:

As we sat there I felt the old signal of a message from the Master and saw that she was listening. She said: “Judge, the Master asks me to try and guess what would be the most extraordinary thing he could order now?” I said that Mrs. K[ingsford] should be made the President of the London Lodge.”

Try again. “That H.P.B. should be ordered to go to London.” That was right and he ordered her to take the 7:45 express, giving the exact hours it would arrive at the different stations and in London.²⁶ Although Blavatsky “was ordered to stay in London only 24 hours”,²⁷ she ended up staying at the Sinnetts’ until April 15th.²⁸ Judge stayed behind working with Babula as his servant. Judge had his thirty-third birthday two days before Blavatsky’s return to Paris.

There are few details of what happened between H.P.B. and Judge after her return but a glimpse of what occurred during his Paris stay can be found in a letter to Holloway. Here he described how for several days he was in the most awful blues that he had ever had and that H.P.B. had actually been worried. He wrote:

It seemed impossible to stave them off, and as they were accompanied with an uncontrollable desire to weep, I was in a bad way. [H.P.B.] said I had got into my past current, and, also that in going about I had absorbed some old elementaries which she saw about me. She gave me to wear all day her talisman ring which is of great value and strength. It has a double triangle and the Sanscrit for “life” on it. This helped me, but all the while I felt that something was to be done by me.

. . . This point in my career I feel is a turning point and I hope to turn it with advantage.²⁹

With all the delays and mental anguish Judge had suffered it was finally time for him to be prepared for initiation. When he received the note “Better come M ^” on the back of Damodar’s letter, Judge had not hesitated. Unknown to him at the time, some of his past karma was waning and it was an opportune time for action to be taken. Either H.P.B., or Master “M” through her, exercised the power needed to drive those negative energies away from Judge and to rid him of those affinities, his past currents, which were still attracted to him. In **The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett** there are hints as to what an Adept can do for a chela who has gained the right to be liberated from the few remaining “bad magnetic emanations” or even worse, elementaries and imperfect “Intelligences”, and have his constitution cleared up.³⁰ It may have been at this time that Judge’s globes (planets or chakras) were cleansed (operated upon³¹) by H.P.B. or the Masters.

One thing becomes apparent — from this moment onwards Judge gained in confidence and his Will appeared to gain in strength. He also became more aware of the positive energies around him. As indicated earlier, H.P.B. tested his ability to pick up on messages coming to her.

It was a very busy time and many visitors from all classes were constantly calling. Among them was the Countess d’Adhémar, who at once professed a profound admiration for H.P.B. On May 13th, 1884, Blavatsky and Judge went for a visit to Count and Countess Gaston d’Adhémar de Cransac at their “Château Écossais” situated at Enghien, not far from Paris.³² Bertram Keightley from London had also expressed interest in meeting Blavatsky so he was invited for a few days.³³

In connection with their stay there, Judge wrote:

At Enghien especially, H.P.B. wanted me to go carefully through the pages of her copy of *Isis Unveiled* for the purpose of noting on the margins what subjects were treated, and for the work she furnished me with what she called a special blue and red pencil. I went all through both volumes and made the notes required, and of those she afterwards wrote me that they were of the greatest use to her. . . .

. . . The subject of elementals came up, and I asked her if she intended to give much on it. Her reply was that she might say something, but it was all *sub judice* as yet and must wait for orders, as it was not a quiet or harmless part of the thing.

She then asked me to write down all I knew or thought I knew on that head, and she would see if that much coming from me would be allowed to pass the unseen critics. A long chapter on Elementals was then done, nearly all by my pen, and she put it away for some time. The day that it was finished was warm and pleasant, and in the middle of the afternoon she suddenly grew absorbed once more. The air of the room at the same time was turned to the temperature of much below freezing, to judge by sensation, and I remarked on the fact. It was not a change of the weather at all, but seemed to blow out from H.P.B. as if she was an open door from some huge refrigerating store. I again drew her attention to it and said, "It feels as if a door was open on the Himalaya Mountains and the cold air was blowing into this room."

To this she replied: "Perhaps it is so," and smiled. It was so cold that I had to protect myself with a rug taken from the floor.

In about three days she announced that my small and inadequate chapter on Elementals had been of such a sort that it was decided she would not put much, if anything, into *The Secret Doctrine* on the subject, and mine was either destroyed or retained. It certainly is not in any part of the published volumes.³⁴

While in Enghien, Judge's mail was forwarded to him. Inside his mail he found messages from the Masters.³⁵

Judge knew that the Masters were interested in others to whom they could give occult training. During his conversations with H.P.B. he mentioned that Holloway might be a suitable individual. H.P.B. stated: "The Master will marshal a procession before us containing good and bad, leaving to our Karma to make the proper selection. . . . he says 'She may come'."³⁶ Mrs. Holloway, an American, was a widow and a wonderfully gifted clairvoyant. Judge informed Olcott in his letter of April 24th, 1884, that "she has money and will be no expense" and that he was "writing to tell her to come as soon as she can."³⁷ Also, he thanked Olcott for the £5 which he received and told him "I am not going to London, my dear, just to buy a coat." Judge was "ashamed to go out with my rags" and in a previous letter had let out "a wishful thought toward London's cheap coats."³⁸ Judge had been told that he could stay with Miss Francesca Arundale at 77 Elgin Crescent, Notting Hill, London.

On April 30th, 1884, Judge, in Paris, wrote to Olcott who was still in London: "I have got now a magnificent coadjutor, *if not a successor* to H.P.B. and one who has trained scientific methods of literary work, as well as psychical abilities of the kind that makes H.P.B. so remarkable."³⁹ Although Holloway failed, it was Sinnett's bungling of events that caused her to leave London and eventually leave the Theosophical Society. Master K.H. wrote to Sinnett:

She is an excellent but quite undeveloped clairvoyante. Had she not been imprudently meddled with, and had you followed the old woman's and Mohini's advice indeed, by this time I might have spoken with you thro' her — and such *was* our intention. It was again your own fault, my good friend.⁴⁰

In a letter to Miss Arundale, K.H. wrote: "Deeds are what we want and demand. L.C.H. [Laura Holloway] has done — poor child — more in that direction during two months than the best of your members in these five years."⁴¹ As demonstrated by his assessment of Holloway's potential, Judge's occult judgment was proven time and time again.

Chapter 3

Judge Goes To India

Mischief was brewing at Adyar during the month of May 1884. Before she left Adyar (February 20th, 1884), Blavatsky had discovered that Emma Coulomb¹ had tried to extort two thousand rupees from a wealthy Indian member. As early as 1881, while the headquarters were still in Bombay, Mme. Coulomb had tried to sell “secrets” to a clergyman but was rebuffed. She was getting very bitter against H.P.B. who never seemed to confide in her. The Coulombs were apparently interested in setting up a hotel of their own and decided to ask a well-to-do nobleman and member of the Society, Prince Harisinghji, for a “loan”. In February 1884, while in Bombay on her way to Europe, Blavatsky visited the Prince where Mme. Coulomb (who accompanied Blavatsky to the steamship) reminded him of her request. Blavatsky heard about it and put a stop to the whole matter. Mme. Coulomb vowed revenge and began to lay her plans for the destruction of the Society, and Blavatsky along with it.

H.P.B. had arranged for repairs to a wall in her room and for the construction of an additional room on the second floor next to her bedroom while she was away. Shortly upon their return to Adyar, Emma and her husband, Alexis, took complete control of Blavatsky’s room, keeping everyone away. They took advantage of the situation to also prepare the construction they required to implicate Blavatsky in deception, and set the scene for the allegations of fraud which they later presented to the missionaries.²

Charges of slander against the Theosophical Society and Blavatsky, extortion, and waste of the Society’s funds, were brought against Mme. Coulomb³ by the Executive Committee of the General Council on May 14th, 1884. “Madame Coulomb neither acknowledged nor denied any of the charges, but gave only evasive answers.” Only the first three out of the ten charges against Mme. Coulomb were tried. “All the affidavits agreed unanimously, that her presence at head-quarters were [sic] causing an immense waste of time, energy, money, and that her continuance there was against the interests of the T.S.” A committee was appointed to take possession of the property belonging to the Society over which the Coulombs had charge, and to request them to leave the premises.⁴ The Coulombs refused to leave or hand over the keys to Blavatsky’s rooms.

Blavatsky was cabled in Europe. On May 17th, Damodar received a telegram from H.P.B. authorizing Franz Hartmann to have exclusive possession of her room and the Occult Room and demanding the removal of the Coulombs from the premises of the Society’s headquarters. That same day Mr. Coulomb was forced to hand over the keys to Damodar. In a letter to the **Bombay Gazette**, P.D. Khandalavala quoted a letter from Judge in which he had written: “I saw Madame Coulomb’s letter to Mme. Blavatsky in Paris, in which she admits a belief in the Mahatmas, and requests Mme. Blavatsky to ask them (the Mahatmas) to quickly drop a message at Adyar to prevent the Board of Control ejecting her.” Blavatsky was firm, however, and wrote to Adyar to expel the culprits. “On the 18th the Coulombs received a telegram from H.P.B.: ‘Sorry you go prosper’; they resisted for a few days but ultimately departed from Headquarters on the 25th of May, 1884.”⁵

Judge explains what occurred while in Paris in April 1884: “a message was received . . . informing us that the Coulombs had begun operations, and that, unless someone went and stopped them, they would get their traps finely finished, with a due appearance of age and use to carry out the conspiracy.”⁶ It was at this point that Olcott asked Judge to go to Adyar to take charge of the situation. Judge later stated: “I went to Adyar in the early part of the year 1884, with full power from the president of the Society to do whatever seemed best for our protection against an attack we had information was about to be made in conjunction with the missionaries who conducted the Christian College at Madras.”⁷ Olcott and Judge returned to London on June 13th.⁸ “Mr. Judge left London at the end of June”⁹, headed for India.

Judge Arrives in India

Judge arrived at the Bombay harbor at 8:30 on Tuesday morning, July 15th, 1884. At 1 o'clock the steamship docked and Tookaram Tatya came aboard to greet him. Judge quickly wrote to Olcott the same day expressing that the Indian members were untroubled by the Coulomb affair and that "there has not been one word said about it in any of the papers, and if I can stop further progress of pamphlets and exposés, it will be all fixed". He added: "Many branches have expressed a desire that I should stop on my way and address them. I am to stop here some few days to receive visitors and enquirers." He also asks Olcott to "tell [Blavatsky] for Jesus' sake not to give Coulomb the slightest encouragement until we get them out of India."¹⁰

Judge gave his first public lecture in India, at the Framjee Cowasjee Institute in Bombay on "Theosophy and the Destiny of India". He opened his lecture by revealing some of his personal experiences. A report in **The Theosophist** by someone identified only as "H." and dated July 18th, 1884, contains the following remarks:

Mr. Judge began by saying that, born of Christian parents, he very early saw that Christianity was inadequate to his moral aspirations and was unable to solve the many doubts and difficulties which perpetually rose before his mind. Led by an irresistible desire to find out the truth, he turned his thoughts to the religions of the East. . . . Speaking of the Society's avowed objects, that which related to the so-called supernatural phenomena, the lecturer did not think it necessary or desirable to dwell upon at length. Not because he disbelieved in phenomena, but because it was impossible to convince every one of their genuineness by ocular demonstration.¹¹

The second part of Judge's lecture focused on the "Destiny of India". He "earnestly exhorted his hearers to let politics alone, and to turn their thoughts to their real destiny, to the intellectual, moral and religious regeneration of India." He further explained:

The history of all conquered countries, of England herself after the Norman conquest, of Spain, of Mexico, when Spain over-ran her, showed that in every case the conquered have been too apt to give up their manners and customs, their habits of thought, their religion and their nationality, for those of the conquerors. India, alone, of all conquered countries, has resisted the shock of invasion, and remains to this day as thoroughly Indian in thought, in manners and in religion, after years of subjection to a foreign rule, as in the days when her own sons ruled the land. The lecturer called upon his hearers to rouse themselves, to study their own books, and to translate them for the benefit of the world. He believed that translation by western authors, although not without merit in some cases, were at best unreliable interpreters of Indian modes of thought, and that a genuine Indian, with a fair knowledge of the language in which his books are written, could do much towards enriching European minds with the treasures of Indian philosophy and religion.

H. concluded his report with these sentiments:

The lecture made a deep impression on its hearers, and it is my firm conviction that if such able discourses were repeated from time to time, and theosophy presented to outsiders in the attractive form which Mr. Judge knows so well how to give it, the first object of your Society — that of Universal Brotherhood under the common banner of Theosophy — will soon be much nearer accomplishment than it now appears.¹²

Judge then went to Poona, arriving on the evening of July 20th, 1884, where he was greeted at the station by several members of the Poona Branch. It is not clear where Judge stayed while in Poona but he most likely stayed with Khan Bahadur Nowroji Dorabji Khandalavala (N.D.K.), a Magistrate with the Small Cause Court in Poona and the first President of "The Poona Theosophical Society". The Poona Branch, established, January 25th, 1882, was one of the first theosophical centers in India. It was formed while Olcott and H.P.B. were still in Bombay. N.D. Khandalavala was an enthusiastic member and quite fond of Blavatsky.

On the evening of July 23rd, 1884, Judge gave a lecture to 300 people at the Poona Town Hall on “The West and what India can give it” and “which was heard with great attention and created an extremely favourable impression as Mr. Judge is an excellent speaker”. Judge Khandalavala filed his report, on Judge’s lecture, with **The Theosophist** and stated:

He gave a brief description of life in America, particularly with reference to the education and prospects of young men in that country, and pointed out how the West had progressed in material civilization — a part of which India would do well to follow, but other portions of Western civilization would prove injurious to this country where the intellectual part of the brain seemed to be more developed than the part referring to material progress. He said that this country had an immense store of learning in religion, philosophy and certain sciences called psychical, and that if those stores were unearthed and properly brought to light, they would be the means of giving to humanity the principles of that one true religion which is the highest science and the highest philosophy. That the destiny of India was to teach the people of the West spirituality, and that the learned sons of India ought to work in that direction to rehabilitate themselves in the eyes of the whole world, which would then look up towards India with the respect which it has the means to command.¹³

At least two members present expressed their gratitude towards Judge. Rao Bahadur Mahadev Govind Ranade, scholar and reformer, “made a long speech”¹⁴ and stated “that he knew of no one amongst the Hindoos of the present generation in the city of Poona that were worthy to sit by the side of these Founders who had so unselfishly worked to promote a good cause.” The other was M.M. Kunte, who occupied the chair. He stated that “the rising generation of scholars were ignorant of the beauties of the old literature of India, and that an effort should be made to enlighten the young men about the excellencies of their religion.”¹⁵

On July 25th, 1884, Judge arrived at Hyderabad¹⁶ where he was greeted by members of the Society and escorted by the President, Dorabjee Dasabhy, to the lodging arranged for his stay where he received many visitors and discussed philosophical questions with them. On the 27th experiments in psychometry were conducted by Judge and he gave some instructions to a few who appeared capable of continuing the experiments and developing their powers.

On July 29th, 1884, he once again lectured on “Theosophy and the Destiny of India”, this time at the Mahboob College Hall at Secunderabad.¹⁷ Approximately “500 persons of all nationalities, castes and creeds” were in attendance. A lengthy report by C.V. Loganada Moodr included the following:

He stated that he had come all the way from America, to help in the work of the Theosophical Society. He said that, as the organisation of the Society in New York was made under the auspices of the venerable Mahatmas, the Theosophical Society really had its rise in India, or, as he called [it], “The Land of Mysteries.” He gave a short and interesting account of the circumstances under which it was organised, and said he was one of the founders with Madame H. P. Blavatsky and Colonel H. S. Olcott. . . . He impressed upon the minds of the public the fact that *freedom of thought* led men to practise Universal Brotherhood, to some extent, in the same way as persons engaged in trading transactions, cultivate a kind of brotherhood with persons in foreign countries, forgetting the artificial differences imposed by caste, creed and color. . . . He gave the literal meaning of Theosophy as derived from two Greek words *Theos* (God), and *Sophia* (wisdom or knowledge), and he said that since God includes the Universe, the object of the Theosophical Society is to study the laws of the Universe. . . . [H]e asserted that the laws of Nature require Universal Brotherhood which the Theosophical Society declared to be its first and chief object.

He then proceeded to expound on the three Objects of the Society.

In the second part of the lecture, “The Destiny of India”, he stated that

India, in spite of the frequent conquest by various nations, at different periods, had ever remained the same, preserving its literature, religions, laws and customs in their entirety. . . . [India’s] destiny . . .

. *always was* to preserve this great mine of truth and to give the West and the world, the system of philosophy, religion and science that it very much needs. . . .

In the evening Mr. Judge made experiments in Psychometry with ostrich eggs and old Indian coins. The attention of the members was next directed to Crystal reading.

The next evening, July 30th, 1884, he delivered another lecture at the same Hall, titled "Is There a Soul in Man?" He stated that

He regretted very much that the young Indians have become the disciples of Mr. Bradlaugh without studying deeply the literature, philosophies and sciences which their own ancestors had bequeathed to their children and without a due investigation of the truths therein contained. . . .

He concluded his lecture by refuting some malicious and ill-founded charges against the Society which were published and circulated in pamphlets, by some *self-opinionated* and *narrow-minded* atheists and Christians, and showing how the Theosophical movement has been *wilfully* misrepresented, and how utterly ignorant the authors of those publications were of the declared objects of the Society. . . .¹⁸

From Secunderabad Judge went to Adoni¹⁹ and then to Gooty²⁰ where he arrived on the evening of August 4th, 1884. On the morning of the 5th approximately fifty invited guests assembled in the bungalow of the President of the Gooty T.S. to listen to Judge's message. The Branch Secretary reported that "he explained some passages in the Hindu sacred books, that the West had laughed at" and that the destiny of India "was to furnish the world again with true philosophy and a true system of morals to be found in her ancient literature."²¹

Chapter 4

Judge at Adyar

Before continuing it is important to point out who was in charge while the Founders were away from Adyar for an extended period. On January 21st, 1884, Colonel Olcott, issued a “Presidential Special Order” appointing the following members of the General Council to an Executive Committee to cover the financial, executive and supervisory affairs of the Society during his absence in Europe: Messrs. R. Raghoonath Row, Diwan Bahadur; G. Muttuswami Chetty, Garu; P. Sreenivasa Row, Garu; and T. Subba Row, Garu.¹ On February 19th, the day before leaving Bombay, he added three more names to his Executive Committee: St. George Lane-Fox, Dr. Franz Hartmann, W.T. Brown, declaring “and the whole will be known as the Board of Control.”²

Judge reached Adyar on August 10th, 1884. Before he arrived Dr. Hartmann had received a letter from Master “M” instructing him to “Be friendly towards W.Q. Judge. He is true, faithful and trustworthy. . .”³ When Judge arrived he learned that the Coulombs were “just out of the place”,⁴ having been evicted only recently. Judge, a well trained lawyer, immediately took charge of the investigation. He at once opened a register, calling a number of witnesses to examine the handiwork of the Coulombs and then closed Blavatsky’s quarters to the public. Judge wrote:

Over three hundred people examined the place, who signed their names to a declaration of the condition and appearance of things; and then a resolution prohibiting further prying by the curious was passed. The very next day Missionary Patterson, expert Gribble⁵ & Co., came to examine. It was too late. The law was already in existence; and Mr. Gribble, who had come as an “impartial expert,” with, however, a report in full in his pocket against us, had to go away depending on his imagination for damaging facts. He then drew upon that fountain.⁶

T. C. Rajamiengar was one of the individuals who had examined the Shrine, before Blavatsky left for Europe as well as after. He wrote:

It was in September 1883 that I had actually an opportunity of closely examining the structure of the shrine, so as to see whether the trickery, now pretended to be exposed, had ever any existence. . . .

Madame Blavatsky had her sleeping apartment in the hall up-stairs in the Adyar premises. There is a door-way leading from this hall to a room where the shrine is suspended, the shrine itself (a cupboard as they call it) being on the wall about four feet above the ground. I opened the doors of this shrine and found in it some photos and a silver cup and a few other things. I clearly examined every portion of this shrine from within, tapping with my hands every part of it, and nowhere could I find room for suspicion. Not satisfied with this, I examined the outside of the shrine, the front and the sides, and the top; and they stood the test. For fear of disarranging the things, I did not move the shrine about, but what was more satisfactory, I examined the back portion of the wall on which rested the shrine (which was inside the hall containing Madame Blavatsky’s sleeping apartment) and found that there could not be the slightest room for suspicion in any direction, so far as the matter of the structure of the shrine is concerned. . . .

I shall now give an account of the so-called trap-door. I found this trap-door in an incomplete state for the first time in June 1884, a few months after the departure of the founders. It is so small a door that a thin spare boy of 10 or 12 years could hardly enter through it. It is intended to be understood the phenomenal letters were ushered into the shrine through this passage, but any one seeing the passage for himself, would be convinced of the impossibility of the thing being done.⁷

One important testimony as to the condition of the Shrine and the Occult Room was that of Babula, Blavatsky's personal servant for the previous five years. He arrived at the Theosophical headquarters on the evening of September 20th, 1884,⁸ and his statement was signed and witnessed the next day by Judge and four others.⁹ It read in part:

[W]hen 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.¹⁰

This appears to be the last documented duty that Judge discharged in connection with his stay at Adyar.

Judge later wrote to the **Boston Index** a few words regarding the so-called exposé of Madame Blavatsky and the Report of the Society for Psychical Research of London upon theosophic phenomena. He wrote:

I found that Mr. Coulomb had partly finished a hole in the wall behind the shrine. It was so new that its edges were ragged with the ends of laths and the plaster was still on the floor. Against it had been placed an unfinished teak-wood cupboard, made for the occasion, and having a false panel in the back that hid the hole in the wall. But the panel was too new to work and had to be violently kicked to show it was there. It was all unplanned, unoled, and not rubbed down. He had been dismissed before he had time to finish. . . .

All these things were discovered and examined in the presence of many people, who then and there wrote their opinions in a book I provided for the purpose, and which is now at headquarters. The whole arrangement was evidently made up after the facts to fit them on the theory of fraud. That it was done for money was admitted. . . .¹¹

Judge explained what he did with the Shrine.

I myself removed the shrine to an adjoining room, from which that night it disappeared. This was months before Hodgson arrived in India. If he saw what he thought was a part of the shrine, it was a joke put on him by Dr. Hartmann, who would be pleased to lead such a wild investigator into a trap. No part of it was retained by Hartmann.¹²

Judge had removed the Shrine from the "Occult Room" and moved it to Damodar's room. Hartmann apparently took it from there and burned it. Interestingly Hartmann's name was not among those who witnessed Babula's Statement. Richard Hodgson,¹³ the investigator selected by the Society for Psychical Research to go to India and investigate the charges made by the Coulombs against Blavatsky, stated in his Report:

The ultimate fate of the Shrine, according to a statement made by Dr. Hartmann to Mr. and Mrs. Cooper-Oakley, Mr. Hume, and myself, was as follows. . . . The Shrine was therefore first removed openly to Mr. Damodar's room, and, on the following night, was thence removed secretly by three Theosophists, concealed in the compound, afterwards broken up, and fragments burned piecemeal during the following week. Dr. Hartmann had only retained two portions of the back of the Shrine, which he had enveloped in brown paper and kept carefully concealed in his room. . . .¹⁴

Blavatsky, in a letter to Judge dated May 1st, 1885, wrote that Hartmann had testified to [Hodgson] that *the shrine had been stolen from Damodar's room*; seriously & earnestly in the presence of numerous witnesses, he asked Hodgson to look about him when he went to the Coulombs, to see whether he would not find it *hidden* somewhere, for it was surely either Coulomb or the missionaries who had stolen it. He even went so far in his lying as to show Hodgson the imprint of feet & hands on the walls under Damodar's window.¹⁵

There is no doubt that Hartmann's behavior left an unfavorable impression with Hodgson.

In this same letter, Blavatsky explained that from information she had received from her Master she learned that Hartmann began by setting Hodgson against Subba Row, Bawajee, Damodar and others by “telling him that they were all ‘awful *liars*’, thus prejudicing Hodgson against the chief witnesses.” Hartmann was described as a maverick, a liar, one who enjoyed using deceit to confuse others. Blavatsky wrote: “The man is most intelligent, or rather intellectual, cunning, crafty and having no feeling for any one, or anything & is hundred times more dangerous than the Coulombs.”¹⁶

Hartmann later admitted that he had dropped a bogus “Letter” on Judge’s head, ordering him back to America, though Judge maintained that his departure was in no way influenced by Hartmann, and that he had his own reasons for leaving. In his letter of May 16th, 1885, Judge wrote to Blavatsky,

I tell you neither you, nor Olcott, nor Holloway, nor deceit, nor trick, nor message, nor devil, nor Hartmann, had anything to do with my departure from India, and perhaps someday that departure will be of benefit to the Society and the Cause.¹⁷

The Masters later indicated to Blavatsky that Judge “showed intuition by leaving India”¹⁸ that is, that Judge had taken the correct course of action. Judge’s response to Blavatsky provokes even more perplexing questions, which are dealt with in Chapter 17.

In her letter of May 1st, 1885, to Judge, Blavatsky wrote that Hartmann confessed to Mrs. Oakley that he had burned the shrine. However, he told Hodgson that it was Judge and Bawajee, along with him who burnt it. According to other theosophical historians the Shrine was either burnt by Judge or he had it burnt. Historian Michael Gomes maintains that “it remains a matter of conjecture” as to whether Judge assisted Hartmann in burning the “Shrine”.¹⁹ Kirby Van Mater, long time archivist with The Theosophical Society (Pasadena), also agrees that the Shrine had been burnt before Judge left India.²⁰ Gertrude Marvin Williams, in **Priestess of the Occult: Madame Blavatsky**, claims Judge “admitted” taking the initiative to destroy it and that “in the presence of Hartmann and another unnamed Theosophist, Judge hacked the magical cabinet apart and they patiently burned it, one small piece at a time.”²¹ Victor A. Endersby, author of **The Hall of Magic Mirrors**, states: “In 56 years of familiarity with the literature I have not seen or heard of any such statement.”²² According to testimony, the Shrine was removed to Damodar’s room on September 20th, 1884, but nothing is said about it being seen thereafter. Judge has given no indication that he had anything to do with its disappearance from Damodar’s room.

One interesting point which weighs heavily against Richard Hodgson is that none of Judge’s observations were ever incorporated in his Report. Judge tells Blavatsky, “You must have observed that Hodgson has left me out. And yet I am an important factor. I was there. I examine[d] all, I had all in charge, and *I say there was no aperture* behind the shrine.”²³ One important point which has not been emphasized is that Judge had left the Occult Room as he had found it, except for the Shrine which he had carried to Damodar’s room. When Hodgson arrived at Adyar on December 18th, 1884, he demanded to see the “Occult Room” and the “Shrine”, but Damodar refused. Two days later, when Blavatsky arrived from Ceylon with Olcott who had gone there to greet her, Hodgson again requested permission. On entering the Occult Room he noticed that the wall where the Shrine once stood “had been considerably altered” and that “its walls were covered with fresh plaster . . . all traces of the alleged ‘machinations’ of the Coulombs in connection with the Shrine had been obliterated.”²⁴

Olcott somewhat explains what happened to the “Occult Room”. H.P.B. had requested him to shift his quarters from his one-story brick bungalow to her new room which the Coulombs had built for her while she was in Europe in 1884.²⁵ Upon his return to Madras from Europe²⁶ (November 15th, 1884) Olcott found that with the arrival of the rainy season the new roof was leaking like a sieve. Apparently, being anxious to have a place to display the new portraits of the Masters which he had received in London,²⁷ without thinking of the consequences, he ordered the “Occult Room” torn down and rebuilt. This complicated Hodgson’s investigation and, coupled with Hartmann’s strange behavior, Hodgson was easily persuaded to find guilt

rather than innocence. When Hodgson saw the fresh plaster his suspicions became more acute, which in turn caused him to interpret this act as tantamount to a confession of guilt as conspirators.

The theosophists had failed to see, perhaps due to hysterical confusion, or possibly simple mindlessness or mischief, that by re-plastering the wall they had destroyed crucial evidence that might have completely exonerated Blavatsky of alleged tomfoolery and cleared the Society of this whole matter.

With Judge's departure, Hartmann, as Chairman of the Board of Control was left in charge once again. St. George Lane-Fox, a member of the Board of Control, had returned to London, arriving September 14th, 1884, to report to Olcott what had happened at Adyar. Hartmann's strange behavior complicated Hodgson's investigation even more. Considering Hartmann's conduct it is no wonder that Blavatsky was so infuriated with him, as per her letters to Judge. Blavatsky was greatly disappointed with both Hartmann and Olcott.

It becomes obvious that Judge and Hartmann did not get along while Judge was at Adyar. Master "M" easily recognized Hartmann's *bête noire* (he was jealous of Judge coming to Adyar to take over the responsibilities²⁸) and had tried to warn him of it. He had been at Adyar since December 1883, was a good friend of Olcott, and had been in charge until Judge came along. Besides, Judge was his junior by thirteen years, so why should he not, at the very least, cause a little trouble to show his resentment? Hartmann was jealous of Judge and he wanted to be the man in full control of the problem developing at Adyar. His actions demonstrated that he resented Judge's sudden appearance, with full authority no less. When Judge decided to return to America he later explained Hartmann's reaction to the news: "When I announced my intended return he was pleased as a hen with an egg and almost cackled, but pretended to be sorry and tried to dissuade me."²⁹

Although the mischief caused by the Coulombs and the subsequent Hodgson Report did not destroy the Theosophical Society as had been planned by the Coulombs and the missionaries, it did create considerable difficulties — which could have been avoided had the Members of the Society maintained calmness, such as Judge had demonstrated while he was there at Adyar. The Coulomb plot was not the death-knell of the Society at all. In fact if it had not been for the machinations of certain individuals and the doubting Thomases, coupled with those members who were suspicious, the whole of the nefarious Coulomb plot could easily have been convincingly managed at the time. It appears that up to that point the situation had been managed well by Judge at Adyar. He was not overly concerned, trusting that Blavatsky would eventually be cleared of any wrongdoing and that the Society would recover from the bad publicity. Even Blavatsky, up to this point, was not overly concerned. St. George Lane-Fox, one of the members of the Executive Committee, evaluated the situation from London on October 5th, 1884, in a letter to the Editor of **The Times**:

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.³⁰
But the situation would soon change.

The Seeds of Suspicion

The sequence of events which followed, in conjunction with the previous Coulomb-related incidents, provided the breeding ground to incubate doubts and suspicions until the proper time when the evil self-serving and cunning Brothers of the Shadow could take advantage of the fermented conditions. Combined further with the credulity of the Society's members, the perfect venom was produced to use against the Society to destroy its effectiveness as a *united* body of members whose Object it was to form the nucleus of Universal Brotherhood. The incident that ensued eventually created the great rift that divided and literally fragmented the Society into bits.

September 11th, 1884, is the date that the **Christian College Magazine**, a sectarian journal of Madras, printed its first installment of the articles titled “The Collapse of Koot Hoomi”, written by its Editor, Rev. Mr. George Patterson. Advance proofs had been sent to the Press all over India before the issue was published. Two days later he sent to the Press a “Postscript” to his advance proofs, written by Mr. Coulomb. The article was based mainly on fifteen letters alleged by the Coulombs to have been written to them by Blavatsky during her absence from the headquarters of the Society, at Bombay and Adyar, giving them instructions to produce occult phenomena “fraudulently”. In October another batch of letters was published. The Coulombs claimed that they were Blavatsky’s sole confederates in showing spurious phenomena and that all the rest of the members of the Society had been played as dupes and been cleverly deceived for the previous nine years.

These articles generated much excitement in India, particularly in Madras and at Adyar (by then the headquarters of the Theosophical Society), in Poona and in Bombay, the previous headquarters of the Society where some of the alleged phenomena had occurred. Blavatsky and Olcott were both in Germany at the time. Judge, having been given full authority by Olcott to look after the affairs at Adyar while he was there, was left to answer the questions generated by this controversy which was creating anxieties in some Indian minds.

It was at this time that Judge received a letter from Judge Nowroji Dorabji Khandalavala (N.D.K.), a Parsee from Poona, asking him to look at the originals of the published letters, if possible, and also asking Judge to give his opinion as to whether or not “those letters could have been tampered with.”³¹ Judge, apparently still at Adyar or at least in the Madras area, responded to his request on Adyar letterhead paper on September 17th, 1884. It was Judge’s response to this letter upon which much of the “Judge Case” was based some years later. This is examined in detail in Chapter 15.

Shortly after Judge’s response to Judge Khandalavala’s questions, Khandalavala wrote an article titled “Madame Blavatsky and Her Slanderers” which was published in the November 1884 **Theosophist** on pages 48 and 49. His article more or less summed up the slanderous attacks of the missionaries and answered the two articles in the **Christian College Magazine**.

We do not have Khandalavala’s letter to Judge but can surmise that he was ambivalent about the authenticity of the letters supplied by the Coulombs. It would seem that, at the time, he was developing doubts and wondering if Blavatsky possibly had committed this unthinkable act, and that he may in fact have been duped. It appears Judge’s reply had more than satisfied Khandalavala’s concerns and brought great relief to him, and peace of mind to the members of the Poona Branch. Judge’s letter gave them the encouragement they needed, the will and determination, to come out from the shadows into the light and provide the necessary support for the Theosophical Society and for H.P. Blavatsky. Judge Khandalavala in particular, an active Magistrate in a Court of Law, would have been extremely vigilant about whom he associated with and would have been equally careful not to prejudice his status in the community. On September 21st, 1884, he and fourteen members of the Poona Branch of the Theosophical Society, including A.D. Ezekiel, wrote a letter to Olcott expressing their support for the Founders and the Society.³²

A.D. Ezekiel had been mentioned in some of the letters in the articles, “The Collapse of Koot Hoomi”. Franz Hartmann described him as “a great sceptic” and stated “he made me promise that if any occult phenomena should happen after my return to headquarters, I would let him know it.”³³ In one of the letters forged by the Coulombs, Blavatsky had allegedly made reference to a telegram, implying that fraudulent phenomena had been involved with regards to it. Ezekiel was there when the said telegram was received by Blavatsky. He immediately wrote letters defending her against the accusations which had been brought forward. His first, dated September 13th, 1884, was addressed to the Editor of **The Times of India**, as was another on the 18th explaining the events as he knew them.

Madame Blavatsky and several others knew too well what an inveterate doubter I am regarding these phenomena, and she must have been a thorough simpleton, and not the clever imposter she is represented to be if she called for the telegram to make a “tremendous impression” as alleged. . . . but she knew my nature too well to expect anything out of me. She did not make any the least attempt to produce an impression of any sort upon my mind. . . .³⁴

After the September 17th letter from Judge, A.D. Ezekiel must have been *thoroughly* convinced of Blavatsky’s innocence.

Another Poona member, Pestanji Dorabji Khandalavala, brother of Judge N.D. Khandalavala, wrote a long letter which was published in the **Bombay Gazette** on September 19th, 1884, to disprove the authenticity of the letters published in the **Christian College Magazine**. He stated:

Madame Blavatsky had put up at my home during her last visit to Poona, and I pass by with contempt the spurious letter that is made to hang upon a telegram which Mme. Blavatsky cared nothing about after reading and which telegram was never attempted to be placed before anybody. . . . I shall content myself by giving only one instance to show how utterly untrustworthy the alleged letters are.³⁵

The above examples are cited not to provide a defense of Blavatsky but to show that Judge’s September 17th, 1884 letter generated much enthusiasm. The genuine responses at the time by the members of the Poona Branch inspired others to also support and defend Blavatsky and the Theosophical Movement in India. The Movement in India was not vibrant at the time and could have easily been discredited. Judge had become fully aware that the Indians were not embracing Theosophy *en masse* with enthusiasm, that they were skeptical, hesitant and it was very difficult for them to break from tradition. These realizations encouraged him to return to America.

No further documentation has been found to date regarding Judge’s stay at Adyar after September 21st, 1884, the day after Babula, Blavatsky’s servant, arrived from England. Most historians have assumed that Judge left India sometime in October but no attention has been paid to what he did in the interim. There appear to be approximately twenty-eight days which cannot be accounted for while he was there. Other so-called important members of the Society have had their history recorded and examined closely, for example, Blavatsky, Olcott, and others who came after. It would seem that it has not been worth anyone’s time to even speculate as to what Judge might have done for those weeks. It has been generally assumed that he was either sick or could not wait until he had his chance to return to America, when in fact he had first decided to go to India, permanently if necessary, and work for Theosophy.

One of the few to comment on this subject is historian Josephine Ransom who summarized Judge’s stay at Adyar in one short paragraph in which she states that he spent time with Damodar K. Mavalankar and other members of the Council:

But Judge was not happy at Headquarters. He was ill and restless, and, in October, decided to return to the United States. He and Hartmann did not readily get on together. Hartmann afterwards admitted that he had dropped a bogus “Letter” on Judge’s head, ordering him back to America, though Judge averred that his departure was in no way influenced by Hartmann, and that he had his own reasons for leaving. In later years he often harked back to this brief visit, but always with a sense of uneasiness that he had not made the most of it. He began to feel that the strength of The Theosophical Society was not in India, but in the West, and that the West should not be neglected as in the past.³⁶

The United Lodge of Theosophists (ULT) in **Theosophical Movement 1875 - 1950** briefly states:

Mr. Judge remained in India only long enough to attend to his duties in connection with the Coulomb conspiracy, but during this period he strengthened the bond of fraternity with Damodar and other Hindu members whom he knew only by correspondence.³⁷

The **Madras Mail** of September 29th, 1884, reported that Judge had addressed “some Madras students”,³⁸ presumably within a day or two of this published item. This is the last record of Judge’s activities in India.

Judge had his own personal reasons for being at Adyar, reasons which had not been clear to him in detail, but he was determined that he would follow his intuition. We can assume that while Judge was at Adyar taking care of business concerning the Coulombs, which was the primary reason authorized by the President of the T.S., H.S. Olcott, his personal reasons for being at Adyar were becoming clearer to him. He was there to be tested by the Masters and possibly initiated. This is detailed in Chapter 17.

Judge had executed all the correct and necessary duties when he arrived at Adyar to ensure that the Coulombs and the missionaries could not succeed in their endeavors to destroy the Society and Blavatsky’s reputation. His actions exhibited that he was not worried about the Coulombs and their conspiracy — that he had done all that was required of him to ensure that this affair would be easily resolved by Olcott and Blavatsky when they returned to Adyar. He had come to the conclusion that he was no longer as needed in India as he had first thought and that he must return to America where his duty, more accurately his dharma, lay before him awaiting his return.

Judge had clearly expressed that he wanted to be useful to the CAUSE; he did not want to be a burden on the Society — he wanted to work for his passage. However, to leave India he needed money so he asked Damodar for 500 or 600 rupees. At first Damodar refused to give Judge the money because he was in despair that Judge should leave at that time. Damodar was a reticent self-sacrificing, hard-working and devoted soul, whom H.P.B. described as trembling at the thought of saying more than was permitted. He had found comfort in Judge’s presence at headquarters, as opposed to Hartmann’s. Damodar did not have the sum of money requested by Judge but did manage to get it for him. Blavatsky later explained to Judge that Damodar had later told Olcott that he felt obliged to furnish Judge the money because he was “one of the Founders, had worked loyally in defending me [Blavatsky] & the Society, and that you were *entitled* to it”. Blavatsky added: “Neither Olcott nor I look upon the transaction as ‘borrowing’ but as something *due to you*.”³⁹

Historians have based their knowledge on information supplied by Albert E.S. Smythe, the first General Secretary of the Canadian Section of the T.S., and Lloyd’s of London records which show that Judge was on board the British steamer *S.S. Wisconsin*⁴⁰ on November 15th, 1884, sailing from Liverpool to New York. It took approximately three weeks to sail from Bombay to Liverpool in those days, unless the seas were rough in which case a few more days would have been required for the journey. The same journey sometimes only took two weeks. Presuming Judge sailed from Bombay, and allowing an average of eighteen days for the journey, it can therefore be estimated that he left India on or near Sunday, October 26th, 1884. He might have left from Colombo as well, but likely not as there are no records indicating that Judge ever set foot in Ceylon at that time. Questions come to mind: Where is the documentation of Judge’s activities from approximately September 28th to October 26th, 1884? What was he doing? Where was he? Records were kept at Adyar of people coming and going at the time. Why has that information not been released?

It has been chronicled that before Judge sailed from Liverpool he went to London for at least a day or two after buying his ticket to return to America. In his May 16th, 1885, letter to H.P.B., in follow-up to his arrival from India, he wrote,

When I left India I left letters for you & Olcott fully explaining & also assuring you of my continued affection & friendship. . . . Then from London I wrote you again assuring you that I was all right.⁴¹

He possibly also visited the Arundales for he mentions in this same letter having seen Holloway once since his return “to deliver a pair of (drawers?) which Miss Arundale bought her in London.”⁴²

It was on this voyage from Liverpool to New York on board the *S.S. Wisconsin* that Judge first met Albert E. S. Smythe, the future General Secretary of the Canadian Section of the T.S.⁴³ Smythe later recorded their meeting in the pages of **The Canadian Theosophist**. The effects of the last seven years of trial, for that they truly were, on Judge's physical being were obvious to Smythe during their journey on the steamer to New York: "He looked old and pallid and had I been told his age was 33 I would have said it was 20 years out."⁴⁴ Little did Smythe realize that part of the reason Judge looked so tired was that he had undergone a most exhausting initiation which had taken a lot of his energy, of which he did not possess much in the first place. Damodar had also undertaken initiations earlier which at times either had to be delayed due to lack of physical stamina, or left him grasping for energy. Judge was to also later discover that he had contracted Chagres disease through his earlier business trips to South America.⁴⁵

Before he left India Judge wrote two articles which were later published in **The Theosophist**. The first article was "Thought Transference or Mind Reading" and the other was "Chirognomy and Palmistry". Both were published in the 1884 November and December issues respectively. These two articles were likely drawn from information he gathered and from the talks he delivered when he first arrived in India and may have been a follow-up to his earlier review of **The Hollow Globe**.

Judge was keenly aware that the soil was fertile for the growth of the Theosophical Movement in the West and that it partly rested on him to make the concepts of the Aryan Philosophy available to it. However, his innate affinity to India never abated. Although Judge felt compelled to return to America where his future lay, his feelings for India were never far from his heart. He was obviously quite drawn to it and felt that he could have a positive impact on the Movement there as well. Two years later in a letter to Olcott, dated August 3rd, 1886, Judge wrote:

I don't get on here with these . . . Westerners. I am a Hindoo in Irish form, and . . . can do more for the cause in India than I can here.⁴⁶

Chapter 5

Back in America

Upon his return to New York on November 26th, 1884,¹ Judge found his financial prospects greatly improved. He joined the law firm in which Olcott's brother worked, and was thus able to devote more time to the Society. Olcott later described the inner change that had taken place in Judge.

Mr. Judge felt what you may call the 'divine afflatus' to devote himself to the work and to pick up the loose threads we had left scattered there in America and carry on. The result shows what one man can do who is altogether devoted to the cause.²

Judge had immediately started work to build a strong Theosophical Society based on the Original Program with the continued guidance of the Masters.³ He was not one to boast about his position in the Society or explain his actions — he was a modest, unassuming man who worked hard and was completely devoted to the CAUSE.

Soon after Judge's return, Olcott wrote him letters of abuse and H.P.B. wrote him a letter of distress. Both were upset that Judge had left Adyar before Olcott's return. On May 1st, 1885, H.P.B. wrote:

There was a time that I regarded you as a true friend, & after your short note, or postal card, from London I have no reason yet to regard you otherwise. Still everything you said, say & did, would give me the right to think that there is a great change in you.⁴

We have to understand H.P.B.'s disappointment and her frustrations — she had been very sick and was still convalescing from the fiasco at Adyar where she had been asked to resign her office as Corresponding Secretary of the T.S.,⁵ then ousted from headquarters by the very people she trusted, and told to go to Europe where she would not be seen for a while and where she could write her **Secret Doctrine**. No doubt she was very upset, but she was about to find out information that would please her tremendously — information about Judge of which she was not yet aware.

Judge replied to H.P.B. on May 16th, 1885, and expressed his concern over her situation. "I am sorry indeed. Humanity seems to never get any better but steadily worse." He then tells her, "My dear HPB if Master will not enlighten you about me then I must say nothing and remain to work out my own salvation as I can."⁶ It is obvious that the Masters had not yet informed H.P.B. what had happened to him while he was in India, but she was soon to find out from them — for Judge never personally told her.

On October 3rd, 1886, while she was in Ostend, H.P.B. wrote to Judge telling him of the changes that occurred to him while he was in India in 1884.

The trouble with you is *that you do not know the great change* that came to pass in you a few years ago. Others have occasionally their *astrals* changed & replaced by those of Adepts (as of Elementaries) & they influence the *outer*, and the *higher* man. With you, it is the NIRMANAKAYA not the "astral" that blended with your astral. Hence the dual nature & fighting.⁷

From H.P.B.'s letter, it can be deduced that the Masters eventually explained to her the extent of Judge's initiation, although it appears that she thought Judge did not fully understand the complexities of it. This might be true but, as will be outlined in the evidence to be presented, Judge was certainly aware of his initiation although he might not have *fully* understood all the intricate details at the time. From this moment onward one thing becomes evident from H.P.B.'s correspondence to him, and that is she had more confidence in his abilities as an occultist and treated him more as an equal colleague for the CAUSE than any other individual.

There is no doubt that Judge's abilities grew and he gained in confidence. Judge's despondency and insecurities of earlier years seemed entirely gone. His will appeared to have gained in strength and he had become more aware of the energies around him. He revitalized the New York work, reorganizing it under its original Charter and name, "The Aryan Theosophical Society of New York." He held regular meetings, started a theosophical lending library, and launched the printing of inexpensive literature.⁸ He quickly attracted to himself devoted workers who gladly carried out his plans.

In reviewing the situation in America, Judge realized that a radical change was needed in the administration of the Society. He wrote to H.P.B. and Olcott suggesting that an American Section be formed to replace the American Board of Control.⁹ In June 1886 the Council of the T.S. at Adyar dissolved the Board of Control and in October Judge was elected as permanent General Secretary. The new Section soon prospered under his dynamic leadership and new branches were chartered all over the country. In April 1886 Judge had started a new monthly magazine called **The Path** which later became the official organ of the American Section of the T.S. In the first issue it was stated:

THIS MAGAZINE is not intended either to replace or to rival in America *The Theosophist*, nor any other journal now published in the interest of Theosophy.

. . . To us it appears that there is a field and a need for it in this country. No cultivating of the field is necessary, for it is already ripe.¹⁰

H.P.B. wrote to Judge from Ostend on July 27th, 1886, regarding his new magazine:

. . . I will begin to work from this day to bring Olcott to let you have 50 monthly for your Path. They *must* be found — for if we were three *original* ones to this day, very soon we will be two . . .¹¹

As there were few qualified writers in America at the time, Judge wrote many of the articles himself under a number of pseudonyms.¹² His style was simple and focused, and he dealt with a variety of theosophical and associated subjects. In a letter to Judge, H.P.B. remarked in admiration of his **Path** magazine that it was "pure Buddhi".¹³

Under Judge's guidance, moves were made to unite in thought and action the membership scattered across the United States. With himself at first as primary speaker, he eventually placed three full-time traveling lecturers in the field to aid struggling groups and to support established centers. **The Path**, leaflets, and specialized small magazines were regularly circulated among the membership, keeping them in touch with one another and with the headquarters in New York. * Local speakers were encouraged to start new centers in nearby communities. With only about a dozen Branches in 1886, by 1896 there were over one hundred.¹⁴

While chronicling his memoirs and the history of the Society, Olcott comments about the changes he had observed in Judge:

His brain was fertile in good practical ideas, and to his labors almost exclusively was due the rapid and extensive growth of our movement in the United States; the others, his colleagues, but carried out his plans.¹⁵

* A "Bibliography of Works by and about William Q. Judge" is included in this book, **The Judge Case: A Conspiracy Which Ruined the Theosophical CAUSE**, Part 1. It details books, pamphlets and periodicals only. Judge also contributed articles to other publications, such as **The Theosophist**, **Lucifer** and **The Irish Theosophist**, among others, which are contained in various compilations of his articles and letters. These compilations are also included in this bibliography, as well as titles of an historical and biographical nature.

Many of his other important contributions to the evolution of the Theosophical Movement are found within these pages. Also included, in Part 2, are Judge's letters to Ernest T. Hargrove from the **Theosophical Quarterly**, which have been republished in Appendix D. Hargrove came from England on March 31st, 1894, to help Judge during his time of need. He gave talks on theosophical subjects in towns and cities across North America. These letters touch the hearts of many as they are guided through much of the turmoil surrounding the Movement and the accusations leveled against Judge while he was trying to carry on with the work of promoting the Theosophical CAUSE until his death in March 1896.

Chapter 6

Bertram Keightley

By the fall of 1888 H.P. Blavatsky's **The Secret Doctrine** was published. Both Bertram Keightley and his step-nephew¹ Dr. Archibald Keightley, had spent much time helping Blavatsky in reviewing the manuscript and preparing it for publication. Within a year of its release Blavatsky had decided to offer the services of Bertram Keightley, her private Secretary at the time and the co-Secretary of the newly formed Esoteric Section of the T.S., in London, to Judge in America. But one has to wonder why H.P.B. made the "offer", as Judge wrote that Keightley had come to New York in the fall of 1889 "according to a request by H.P.B."² Judge had first met Bertram Keightley in 1884 while in France and considered that his experience working with H.P.B. qualified him as a respectable speaker to deliver theosophical lectures across the country on behalf of the Society — thereby relieving Judge of the responsibilities of revisiting all the branches he had started.

Bertram Keightley, a man of means, arrived in New York in late November 1889. He delivered his first lecture before the Aryan T.S. on "The Second and Third Objects of the Theosophical Society as Related to the First." This lecture was published in June 1890 as Paper No. 1 in Judge's new publication, **Department of Branch Work**, established to assist branches by providing suggestions for theosophical work and study. Some years later Judge sent copies of these Papers to Keightley in India where they were read to Branch members there.³

After a short visit to, and several talks in New York, Washington, Boston and Hartford, Keightley "proceeded to California, where for three months he travelled far and wide, delivering public lectures on Theosophy, invigorating the existing Branches and founding new ones, filling the press of California with Theosophic fact and truth."⁴

Before heading for California Bertram Keightley attended the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Branch on December 8th, 1889, where he spent several days. He then lectured in Nebraska then went west to San Francisco, San José, Los Angeles and San Diego before returning north again to Sacramento, CA, the State Capital. He then headed east reaching Omaha on March 31st, 1890, very much broken down from over-work and the effect of an illness in California, and was laid up until the 6th of April. He then lectured in Lincoln, Nebraska and, on his way east, in Tekamah and Sioux City, Iowa, expecting to reach Cincinnati on the 25th.⁵ On April 27th - 28th he attended the T.S. American Section, 4th Annual Convention in Chicago as H.P.B.'s special delegate. On the afternoon of the 27th he delivered H.P.B.'s message to the American Convention. He stayed in Chicago until May 8th, then proceeded to Muskegon (Michigan), Darlington (Wisconsin), and St. Paul and Minneapolis (Minnesota). He visited Niagara Falls briefly before reaching New York on Sunday, May 25th, becoming the guest of E.A. Neresheimer, a member of the Executive Committee of the T.S. American Section. The next eighteen days were spent in and around New York resting and visiting and giving the odd lecture. On May 27th, 1890, he attended the Aryan T.S. and gave a brief account of his tour. On June 3rd, he lectured at the Aryan T.S.⁶ on "The Theosophical Doctrine of Evolution".⁷

An interesting incident occurred on Monday, June 9th, 1890.

When [Bertram Keightley] arrived at *The Path* office he was told there was a cablegram for him, and he found it lying on the table in the inner office; as it was addressed "Judge, New York," it had of course been opened. This cablegram bore the word "Right," and the cryptograph of Mahâtmâ M., with a seal impression, at once recognized by him as that of the seal he had seen in H.P.B.'s possession early in 1888. This was the first time that B.K. had seen an impression of that seal, and he at once asked Mr. Judge whether he knew anything of the seal or writing on the cablegram. Mr. Judge denied

all knowledge of either, and the presence of the seal and cryptograph had a decisive influence in causing Bertram Keightley to obey the instructions given in the cablegram.⁸

Judge later stated: “It is quite possible that if this message was sent to my name over the cable I opened it first. But, I emphatically deny placing those marks upon it.”⁹ At the time, Bertram was satisfied with Judge’s explanation as to what had happened and he looked upon it as just another phenomena, such as he had witnessed before while working with H.P.B. in London; but his mind had seeds of doubt which soon germinated and later grew to fill his entire mind with suspicions directed towards Judge.

On Thursday, June 12th, 1890, Bertram left for Baltimore, Maryland, and lectured on Friday night to 150 people assembled at Lehmann’s Hall. On Saturday he went to Washington D.C. where he held two meetings and gave interviews to reporters. On Sunday evening he left for New York in consequence of business there and arrived during the night or morning of June 16th. He delivered his farewell address on Tuesday night before the Aryan T.S. On June 17th he boarded the *City of New York* and sailed for England the next morning.¹⁰

Before Bertram Keightley’s return to England Judge wrote a very interesting prophecy of coming events which appeared on the fifth Anniversary of **The Path** in April 1890.

Let us press forward with new energy in the work of the next four years, for when the second fifth is reached an important era for theosophists and the world will be at hand, when the result of again being weighed in the balance of events will be more serious than it is now.¹¹

This prophecy turned out to be so accurate that one can only speculate Judge had been told about these future events by *his Teacher and Initiator*, Master Morya. This prediction would account for Judge’s exhaustive campaign to spread Theosophical ideas as fast and as wide as possible in order to have a strong established organization in America able to sustain the Movement through those troubled days ahead.

It appears that the cablegram Bertram Keightley received was an order from H.P.B. to return to London. H.P.B. had received several letters from American members of the E.S. who had misconstrued what was said to them by Keightley.¹² She immediately wrote a letter to Judge marked “private and E.S.”:

I answer your question re E.S. and Bert. If he has informed all the E.S. groups . . . that “they are to form the auric egg & are to do this by means of colors, and are to do this 7 times a day & so as until formed” — then he has said that which has no more meaning than an order to form a sheep out of a goose’s egg. If he added to this that “this was by *my order*” then he was either insane or he fibbed, not to use a worse word.¹³

H.P.B. further explained to Judge:

All this . . . have forced me, acting according to the rules, to suspend Bert. I cannot expel him for ever, as this would be to ruin him for ever — but I suspend him for an indefinite period and — I send him to India.¹⁴

Bertram Keightley’s imprudent behavior prompted H.P.B. to issue a response to his personal speculative utterances in E.S. meetings which were taken by many members to be H.P.B.’s teachings and, therefore, authoritative. In order to rectify the situation “that I have never dreamt of giving any such absurd & idiotic orders”¹⁵ she issued a circular “Notice” on August 9th, 1890. It was marked “*Strictly Private and Confidential, E. S. T. S.*” and stated in part:

1. I have neither written, issued, nor sent through Bertram Keightley any orders or instructions whatever respecting the above matter. . . .
3. The only “orders” in Instructions which I issue in the U.S. are through Mr. William Q. Judge, or those which I myself sign my name to with my physical hand.
4. Any report or statement by any one of orders or instructions alleged to be by me in any other form than as stated in the foregoing paragraph are and shall be false; and any member acting on any other

sort of order and without first sending the same to Mr. William Q. Judge, will be expelled from the Section.¹⁶

Many have simply overlooked this very important “Notice from H.P.B.” where she clearly asserts Judge’s status within the Esoteric School, Theosophical Society. H.P.B. made similar statements on numerous other occasions but not with as much firmness and authority as this.

When Bertram Keightley returned to London H.P.B. wanted to prove a point to him and demanded to see the telegram she had sent him in New York. The subsequent event was described and signed by Claude Falls Wright:

In my presence and that of B. Keightley, Countess Wachtmeister, and Kenneth Austin, H.P.B. at London, immediately after the arrival of Bert Keightley, took a piece of cigarette paper and looking Bert in the face, while blowing him up for his loss of the telegram, suddenly said with a half smile, “Bert, would you like a telegram; wouldn’t you like a telegram, Bert?” She rubbed the piece of paper between her fingers as she spoke and then *unfolded it into the lost telegram!* On it were several of the very seal marks about which there has been so much dispute. Bert Keightley claimed the telegram, but she insisted upon its being handed around to the rest of us, desiring us to examine it closely saying, “Look, those are the Master’s marks, look, you may have some day to know them again.” Then she went on to say that we might mention the matter to anybody we chose, except Judge, for, she said, he does not want to be associated in any way with phenomena.¹⁷

On August 9th, 1890, the date that she issued her “Notice”, H.P.B. also appointed “Bertram Keightley to act as my personal representative in India and Ceylon in all matters relating to the Theosophical Movement.”¹⁸ Madame Blavatsky’s instructions to Bertram Keightley were “To change his [Olcott’s] attitude & bring him back into touch with HPB & Masters”. She reiterated this in her letters to him and in her letter of September 5th, 1890,¹⁹ reminded him, “Do what you are bid & if you do it well you may atone for much.” In her letter to Judge in August 1890 she wrote,

If he succeeds in saving the situation in India where Theosophy is falling into dreamless sleep & decay — well & good. If not — he will have to work until he has atoned for his sins.

In this same letter she also wrote:

I do not want Olcott nor any one to know anything of his guilt or his suspension.²⁰

Just before leaving England for India Bertram Keightley wrote a note (August 9th, 1890) to Judge stating: “In reply to your questions; — *I never* said ‘that they are to form the auric Egg &c &c &c’ by HPB’s orders.”²¹ Keightley’s note to Judge was an attempt to justify his actions and it also implicated him with ample motive to hold Judge accountable for his being reprimanded by H.P.B.

Bertram Keightley reached Bombay on August 31st, 1890, and “visited, on his way . . . to the Head-quarters, the Bombay, Surat, Baroda, Poona, Hyderabad, Bellary, Gooty and Cuddapah Branches.”²² To convey to the Indian membership the hard work needed to start Branches, he recounted that Judge had no easy task in America and at first had “the greatest possible difficulty in getting three members in order to form a quorum” adding that Judge “went through the form of meeting by himself, week after week, and magnetized his act of will afresh into a centre of attraction” to make it a success.²³

Bertram Keightley was one of the idealistic, well-meaning and well-educated individuals sent by Blavatsky to help Olcott. Although highly intellectual he was deceived by appearances and easily influenced by those Indian members who considered themselves by right of descent natural Theosophists not prepared to look beyond their caste and their old superstitions to assert themselves as *true* Theosophists, as Damodar had done. Keightley easily made friends with them and accepted their customs and ways as easily as Annie Besant did when she went to India a few years later. One who soon became one of his best friends was Professor Chakravarti. Although Chakravarti had not been active theosophically and was not a member of

the Esoteric Section, Bertram Keightley soon came to believe him to be, if not a Mahatma, at least an Occultist of high rank and one directly connected with the Masters of H.P.B.

On November 17th, 1890, Bertram Keightley had been appointed General Secretary of the Indian Section, subject to the approval of H.P.B., and by January 1st, 1891, his appointment took effect, as did the Charter for the consolidated Indian Section.²⁴

Chapter 7

Richard Harte – Troubles at Adyar

Because of the lack of committed Indian theosophists to the CAUSE, such as Damodar and Subba Row had been, Olcott recruited among his friends and acquaintances for personnel to take over many of the responsibilities at headquarters.

W.Q. Judge, like H.P. Blavatsky, acquired his fair share of enemies. One particularly bitter person was Richard Harte, Olcott's old friend from New York. Olcott had lured Harte¹ to Adyar for his journalist skills to act as the interim Editor of **The Theosophist** while Olcott left for a tour of Japan, January to July 1889. In June, Harte wrote an article titled "Applied Theosophy" and did not indicate that he had written it, which implied that it had been authored by Olcott.² Harte also wrote "The Situation" which was signed F.T.S. and included in the same issue. Judge claimed this second article obviously was "intended to support and enforce the first".³

Judge quickly took exception to certain ideas embodied in these two articles, one of which was:

"Adyar" is not a place only, it is a principle. It is a name which ought to carry with it a power far greater than that conveyed by the name "Rome". Adyar is the centre of the Theosophical Movement.
...⁴

Part of Judge's article of response was published by Olcott, after his return from his tour, in "Centres of The Theosophical Movement" but with the comment:

The criticism of Mr. Judge is marked by his usual force and directness, but at the same time contains passages of a far too personal character for me to admit them. To do so would be to depart from the policy of editorial dignity, which I have promised myself to follow out so long as I am the responsible Editor of this Magazine.⁵

Although Olcott, President of the Theosophical Society, denies taking sides in this issue, it becomes evident that he is supporting Harte's ideas regarding Adyar.

H.P.B. had also responded to Harte's articles published by him as acting Editor of **The Theosophist**. In her article, "A Puzzle from Adyar"⁶ in the August **Lucifer**, she furiously and personally attacked Harte, charging him of "abnormal fancies" and that he might be, "owing to the relaxed climate of Southern India, ill" and then defended herself. She also objected strongly to Harte publishing extracts of a private letter to him as a member of Olcott's Commissioners in India. This letter from Bertram Keightley, Secretary of the Esoteric Section of the T.S., was never intended to be published. In "A Disclaimer" in the July 1889 Supplement of **The Theosophist**, Harte published the following:

Mr. Keightley tells this Commissioner that he must not believe "*that the Esoteric Section has any, even the slightest, pretension to 'boss' the Theosophical Society or anything of the kind.*" Again he says: "*We are all, H.P.B. first and foremost, just as loyal to the Theosophical Society and to Adyar as the Colonel can possibly be.*" And yet again he says: "*I have nothing more to say, except to repeat in the most formal and positive manner my assurance that there is not a word of truth in the statement that the Esoteric Section has any desire or pretension to 'boss' any other part or Section of the T. S.*"

Richard Harte further added to "A Disclaimer":

It is to be hoped that after this very distinct and authoritative disclaimer no further "private circulars" will be issued by any members of the Esoteric Section, calling upon the Fellows to oppose the action of the General Council, because "Madame Blavatsky does not approve of it," and also that silly editorials, declaring that Theosophy is degenerating into obedience to the dictates of Madame Blavatsky, like that in a recent issue of the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, will cease to appear.⁷

In “A Puzzle from Adyar” Blavatsky wrote that he, as *acting* Editor, “*had no right*” to publish it, as had been indicated in the letter itself. As Judge had stated, she also declared:

It is pure nonsense to say that ‘H.P.B. . . . is loyal to the Theosophical Society and to Adyar’ (!?). H.P.B. is loyal to death to the Theosophical CAUSE, and those great Teachers whose philosophy can alone bind the whole of Humanity into one Brotherhood. . . . [T]he degree of her sympathies with the “Theosophical Society and Adyar” depends upon the degree of the loyalty of that Society to the CAUSE. Let it break away from the original lines and show disloyalty in its policy to the CAUSE and the original programme of the Society, and H.P.B. calling the T.S. *disloyal*, will shake it off like dust from her feet.⁸

Blavatsky had obviously personally written to Harte on these matters as, in a letter dated August 26th, 1889, addressed to “My dear H.P.B.” he responded: “I receive your scolding in all humility; no doubt I deserve it or worse. . . . Seriously my dear teacher, superior and friend, I think you do me a little injustice. . . .” He then proceeds to justify his comments regarding the Esoteric Section:

But I confess that the moral effect of belonging to the E.S. seems to me disastrous in the extreme. To say nothing of the larger wrecks, look at Judge! He used to be truthful and unselfish, and, I think, moderately large-minded; but now . . . he does not seem to be able to tell two words of truth, he has become filled with personal ambition to rule or ruin, and if you do not pull him up by the coat-tails he will in six months have utterly disgusted the majority of the Fellows in the American Section.⁹

In a P.S. he stated his objection to the idea of succession for the Presidency: “[I]f I find that the idea gets currency that the Vice-Presidency carries a presumptive right or an understood right to succeed the President-Founder *I shall contradict it in the largest type in the Theosophist*”.¹⁰

In her response, a letter dated “London, Sept 12 1889”, Blavatsky wrote:

You *ruin systematically* the T.S. ever since you took charge of the Theosophist; and by your tactless and indecent attack in it on the E.S. and the British Section you force me to wash publicly our dirty linen in Lucifer.

In response to Harte’s comments regarding Judge, she stated:

I will not permit Judge to be lowered or humiliated in [The Theosophist]. Judge is one of the Founders and a man who has ever been true to the Masters. . . . And *Judge will be the President of the T.S. after our death* or the T.S. will die with us.¹¹

In this same letter, Blavatsky had stated:

It is the MASTERS who declare that the number of follies (which seem each, if individually viewed trifling perhaps) that you have committed during Olcott’s absence, amount in their totality to an enormous evil, — enormous in its result direct and immediate as also delayed, but as certain, nevertheless.¹²

Harte persisted, however, and in January 1890 he wrote an article, “Muddled Rule-Makers”, which focused on the policies adopted by the American Section. He wrote, “The rules and by-laws fabricated by Branches for their own government are sometimes rather eccentric [sic].” He ridiculed some of the by-laws of a newly formed Branch in Washington in which Olcott was designated as the “Chief President” of “the government of the International Theosophical Society” adding, “And we call upon Mr. William Q. Judge, General Secretary of the American Section of the Theosophical Society, for some explanation thereof.”¹³

This infuriated Blavatsky and in the February **Lucifer** she chided Harte for his “very untheosophical and undignified attack made by one officer of the T.S. on another officer of the same.” She stated that: “Such harsh expressions . . . are not only objectionable on account of their offensive character, but detrimental and dangerous to the T.S.”¹⁴ When Olcott was called to London in the fall of 1889, following publication of Harte’s two articles, “Applied Theosophy” and “The Situation”, Blavatsky scolded him and demanded that Olcott relieve Richard Harte of his position as acting Editor of **The Theosophist**.

Olcott returned to Adyar on February 5th, 1890. On February 27th, he issued a “Special Notice”:
 The undersigned resumes the responsible direction of the *Theosophist*; at the same time thanking Mr. Richard Harte most sincerely for his valuable services during the period of the absence of the undersigned from India.¹⁵

Richard Harte gave his letter of resignation from the office of Secretary of the Theosophical Society to Olcott on September 23rd, 1890.¹⁶ His editorial relation with **The Theosophist** ended with the March 1891 issue. On February 15th, 1891, the day before leaving for Australia, Olcott appointed Bertram Keightley as Managing Editor of **The Theosophist**, in place of Harte who, due to supposed “private matters obliging”, returned to England.¹⁷

During the three years Richard Harte was at Adyar he singlehandedly probably did more harm to the Theosophical Movement than any other person, other than the Indian members themselves. He originally was sent there as a representative of the American Section to support ideas which he had been given a mandate to support by the members in America. He became one of Judge’s and Blavatsky’s greatest enemies. Here is a letter from Judge to Harte which explains their position. The letter is dated October 23rd, 1890.

Dear Harte:

I have your note enclosed in Col. Olcott’s, and by the same mail I have copies of your interviews about Bert in India, and also of your telegrams to him. Inasmuch as these documents are precisely in line with the stuff you have uniformly been sending me for the last year or two, I believe they are authentic. At any rate, if they are not authentic, it remains for you to publicly deny them. You refer to Mme. Blavatsky’s occult nose being wrong. I should consider it right, especially in your case, as years ago she told me what harm you would do us and how you would create trouble. Inasmuch as many people think your intentions are good, I am forced to the conclusion that your definition of kindness is spitefulness, and that your power to distinguish right from wrong is absolutely atrophied. In these interviews you have gone to the trouble not only to misrepresent facts but also to make new obstructions and to set in motion false ideas which will have a tendency to involve the Society with the government in India. Col. Olcott’s reply to your insane drivel is altogether too mild. He ought to let everybody know that your attack is unworthy of notice, as is that of a man who persistently twists the right into wrong and makes black white. I sincerely trust that you will be deprived of all official position, so that in the future whatever you may choose to say will be devoid of the slightest official sanction. Very truly you are secretary in partibus infidelium. You have hitherto sent me very plain language about myself, and I now give you some about yourself. *The best plan for you to pursue is to leave India; leave the Theosophical Society alone.* Become a Tipperary Nationalist, anything but to interfere with concerns which you cannot understand. *You are a worse enemy to us than Coues is:* Coues is no enemy, he is only an outside lunatic who has no power except what we give him, and we give him none; whereas, you have a semblance of authority, remain in the Society, and persist in these outrageous attacks and insinuations, which spring either from lunacy or deliberate malice — you can take your choice. I am writing this way because I know the harm you are doing in India. You can do no harm here, hence, I have no personal concern as to this country in respect to yourself, although you have caused me much annoyance and increased my correspondence by the manner in which you have done some official business with this country. I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM Q JUDGE¹⁸ [Italics added]

Interestingly there have been more articles written about the exploits of Elliott Coues than about Richard Harte. Most historians have only focused on Harte’s relationship with H.P.B. and ignored the main target of his attack, which was Judge.

The incidents briefly described above involving Richard Harte and his articles, combined with Bertram Keightley’s letter to Harte, and Olcott’s naive stance on the whole matter, was the beginning of a lot of animosity regarding the status of Adyar and that of Judge as well. The issues raised then and the problems

which ensued from these incidents have never been fully addressed even to this day. Harte planted the seeds which created confusion, doubt, and suspicion in the Indian members. He was somehow influenced by the aura at Adyar and, in turn, became infectious. These ideas regarding Adyar have generated much resentment and divided the Movement into different 'sects', each following different loyalties, while claiming to be the rightful heirs.

Chapter 8

Struggles in India

Olcott had been in London in August 1888, so his visit there in the fall of 1889, within a year of his last, created much inquiry. He had received a cable asking him to come and make a two-month lecture tour of Great Britain. However, there were more compelling reasons for his visit. Olcott was upset with the set-up of the Esoteric Section and with the formation of the British Section of the T.S. the year before.¹ The stresses and strains created many problems between Adyar and London. He felt that H.P.B. interfered too much in his executive matters but conceded that he did not always perceive that esoteric reasons were frequently involved.² H.P.B. apparently wanted full Presidential powers as his representative in her area.³ Additionally, as part owner of **The Theosophist**, Blavatsky was extremely upset about the way the magazine was being edited. It was at this time she told Olcott that Richard Harte had to go.

On December 25th, 1889, the day before Olcott left London for Colombo, H.P.B. placed in his hands a document appointing him as her “confidential agent and sole official representative for the Esoteric Section in Asiatic countries.”⁴ H.P.B.’s confidence was such that she trusted him without any Pledges,⁵ although Olcott never was a member of the E.S.⁶

The T.S. in India had been struggling to keep up with the growth being reported in Europe and America. As Olcott was in Europe on official business he decided that no Convention would be held at Adyar, as usual, in December 1889. He did, however, grant permission to the President’s Commissioners to meet at headquarters on December 27th for a conference and lectures. Because a number of members would be in Bombay for other reasons, the General Secretaries of the four Indian Sections⁷ unanimously decided to hold this Conference meeting in Bombay during Christmas 1889 instead. One of the General Secretaries, a prominent Parsee member of the T.S. since November 25th, 1879, Khan Bahadur Nowroji Dorabji Khandalavala (N.D.K.), took the chair and stated:

For various reasons the work is lagging behind in India. We meet this evening with a view to impress upon the minds of members the necessity of taking such steps as may put it on better basis. This large gathering will bring us into contact with those members who have confounded the movement itself with the “phenomena” and will afford an opportunity of giving them a correct idea of the significance of this movement.

Large ideas of philosophy viewed in their true light give us the only right conception of the great work of the Theosophical Society.⁸

The underlying concern of the Indian members was the fact that other countries were progressing at a much faster rate than they were, including Japan where Olcott had spent much of his time of late. They may have thought that because of all the travels the President had undertaken they were being neglected and had better do something to revitalize their situation or be left out altogether.

One circumstance which greatly contributed to the good feeling and cheerfulness of the Brothers in Conference was the news that New York, London and Adyar were in future to pull together in unity and unison, and that, for the present at least, the disintegrating forces — those tending to the breaking up of the Theosophical Society into a number of separate Theosophical Societies — had been overcome and silenced. It is felt here in India, where it is a common saying that every man is naturally and by right of descent a Theosophist, that any attempt to discredit or weaken the Society in this country is simply suicidal. Whether rightly or wrongly, the idea has latterly sprung up among many of the Fellows here that our European and American brethren were willing to decry Theosophy in India, in order to enhance their own importance in the movement. This suspicion is happily passing away, and when the Indian Fellows become fully persuaded that England and America really

appreciate the great value of a strong India as a base of operations in other lands, it will undoubtedly be clearly perceived that it is the duty and should be the delight of the Indian Fellows themselves to make Theosophy in this country a really impregnable fortress, from which shall issue forth expeditions into yet unconquered countries, and from which all the younger Sections may be able to draw moral support in times of need.⁹

Part of their concern was the fact that unlike India, America and Britain had united all their Branches each under their respective Section. France, Germany, and Australia were organizing themselves as well. The newly formed Esoteric Section in London (with Judge as H.P.B.'s Representative in America), left the Indian members seriously concerned that its formation was intended to diminish India's role as the birthplace of the very philosophical wisdom the Theosophical Society was advocating. This concern had further been exacerbated by Richard Harte's publishing of extracts of Bertram's letter in "A Disclaimer" in the July 1889 Supplement of **The Theosophist**.

When Olcott returned to India from England he was greeted by the Indian members. He had been struggling to encourage the Indian members to become more involved with the Society. In November he had asked them to reorganize the Rules of the Society in order to fulfil their needs, to make them feel that they were appreciated and an integral part of the whole Movement. Olcott had requested that by February 1st, 1890, they present him with changes they recommended be made to the code of rules, for review by Olcott and the General Council. These resolutions had been read, discussed, amended and adopted at the Bombay Conference. One of the ten resolutions proposed was:

That the division of the Society in India into four different Sections, does not appear to be convenient, and for the present there should be only one Section for the whole of India, managed by a General Secretary (with an Executive Council) who will carry on his duties separately from the General work and management of the Theosophical Society.¹⁰

When Bertram Keightley was sent to India in August 1890 at H.P.B.'s special request as her intermediary and to render Olcott "any needed assistance and attend the December Convention as European Delegate",¹¹ she had written an "Open letter" for him to bring to India to be read by the Indian members and then possibly handed over to Olcott. April 1890 had marked the fifth anniversary of H.P.B.'s departure from India. Her letter, which has since been printed under title, "Why I Do Not Return To India", was addressed "To My Brothers of Âryāvarta". She wrote:

In Europe and America, during the last three years, I have met with hundreds of men and women who have the courage to avow their conviction of the real existence of the Masters, and who are working for Theosophy on *Their* lines and under *Their* guidance, given through my humble self.

In India, on the other hand, ever since my departure, the true spirit of devotion to the Masters and the courage to avow it has steadily dwindled away. At Adyar itself, increasing strife and conflict has raged between personalities; uncalled for and utterly undeserved animosity — almost hatred — has been shown towards me by several members of the staff. There seems to have been something strange and uncanny going on at Adyar, during these last years. No sooner does a European, most Theosophically inclined, most devoted to the Cause, and the personal friend of myself or the President, set his foot in Headquarters, than he becomes forthwith a personal enemy to one or other of us, and what is worse, ends by injuring and deserting the Cause.¹²

H.P.B. was not accusing any one individual but from her message it was clear she was quite upset about the status of Indian members, that their belief in the Masters had steadily dwindled after she had departed from India. Judge had also recognized this problem while in India in 1884 and had come to the realization that he could do more for the CAUSE if he returned to America. Judge never saw nor read this "Open Letter". When he addressed this very same problem after Blavatsky's death he was met by strong opposition, receiving

disparaging letters arguing and opposing his views. The protection provided by the Mahatmas at Adyar had dwindled away and much of it was now under the grip of evil influences.

Meanwhile, Olcott felt it was more difficult to do business with H.P.B. in London. On September 2nd, 1890, Olcott learned in a casual announcement received from G.R.S. Mead that Bertram Keightley had sailed for India, “without a word to me from anybody that he was coming. This is characteristic of their way of doing business in London.”¹³ In **Old Diary Leaves** Olcott wrote:

[H.P.B.] was driving me almost to desperation at about that time, even to the extent of sending out Mr. Keightley to India with a sort of letter-of-marque, apparently intended to destroy the prestige of Adyar, and concentrate all exoteric, as well as esoteric, authority in London. Fortunately for all concerned, he showed this document to one of our strongest Indian members, who begged him not to show it to another person, for it certainly would give a deathblow to H.P.B.’s influence in India. This was the prickly side of my dear “chum”.¹⁴

There is little doubt that the letter Olcott is referring to is “Why I Do Not Return To India” and that “one of our strongest Indian members” was Judge N.D. Khandalavala from Poona.¹⁵

There was another Indian magistrate who was influential in the affairs of The Theosophical Society: S. Subramania Iyer, who later became Chief Justice of Madras.

In Theosophical matters he has had great influence, but has exerted it so silently and with such self-effacement that it is but little known to The Society at large.¹⁶

Upon his arrival in Madras in 1885 (from Madura, where he had joined the Society in 1882), he was at once a member of the inner committee of seven who really managed all the affairs of The Society, and . . . the President-Founder was always careful to consult him upon all points requiring decision, and placed great reliance upon his judgment. He was also a member of the committee appointed to investigate the affair of the Coulombs, and it was largely owing to his advice that Madame Blavatsky was dissuaded from prosecuting them.¹⁷

S. Subramania Iyer was a staunch supporter and very close friend of Swami Vivekananda,¹⁸ who was quite antagonistic to the Theosophical Society following his experiences in America at the time of the Parliament of World Religions in 1893.

Chapter 9

The Wills of H.P.B.

Shortly after reviewing **The Secret Doctrine** Annie Besant joined the Theosophical Society on March 10th, 1889. Besant had made a name for herself as one of England's finest orators and her abilities were needed by the growing Society. Besant showed great promise as a student of Theosophy and was soon sitting at H.P.B.'s side acknowledging her as her new guru. She was quickly brought in as a pledged member of the Esoteric Section. Just one month before her death H.P.B. appointed Besant (April 1st, 1891) as the Chief Secretary of the Inner Group of the Esoteric Section and Recorder of the Teachings,¹ and arranged for her to go to America to meet Judge and deliver Blavatsky's message to the American Convention held April 26th - 27th, 1891, as her special delegate. At the time Besant accepted that Judge was an Occultist, a view she later discounted. On May 8th Blavatsky died in London while Besant was on her way back from America.

Besant had sailed for England on May 6th and, upon receiving word of Blavatsky's death, Judge followed on May 13th, 1891. Olcott would not sail from India until June 15th. Evidentiary facts have been gathered and are presented here for consideration regarding that period between Blavatsky's death on May 8th and the time of Judge's arrival in London on May 21st, 1891.

Blavatsky executed her first Will before she left India in early 1885. According to Olcott she drew up a Will on January 31st, 1885. Olcott stated:

The witnesses were P. Sreenivasa Row, E.H. Morgan, T. Subba Rao, and C. Ramiah. It contains a clause to the effect that she wishes her ashes to be buried within the compound of the Headquarters at Adyar; and another request that annually, on the anniversary of her death, some of her friends should assemble here and read a chapter of the *Light of Asia* and one of *Bhagavad Gîtâ*.²

This is the Will and Testament which is being kept at Adyar to this day, and considered Blavatsky's official Will. But it was not the Last Will and Testament she executed.

A second Will was drawn up in March 1887 while Blavatsky was living in Ostend with Countess Wachtmeister, who looked after her needs. Ten days before leaving Ostend she lost consciousness while sitting in her chair. Sylvia Cranston recounts from Wachtmeister's notes:

When the lawyer, doctor, and consul arrived, they found a joyous party. The doctor kept repeating, "But she should be dead, . . . she should be dead." He had never known a case in which a person in such condition recovered. The drawing of the will went smoothly until the lawyer learned HPB had left all her worldly goods to the countess and nothing to her relatives. Fearing the countess had exercised undue influence on her mind, he objected, but HPB vehemently opposed. Madame Gebhard, to avoid a scene, gently informed the lawyer, "perhaps when you know the amount which Madame Blavatsky has to will away, you will have no further objections to making the will as she desires, for had Madame Blavatsky died, there would not have been sufficient money to pay for her funeral expenses."

The party broke up several hours later. Departing, the American consul laughingly said: "Well, I think this is enough fatigue for a dying woman!"³

Wachtmeister continued:

I will add that I never saw that will again. After HPB's death at Avenue Road, London, on May 8, 1891, I went to Ostend to see the lawyer and asked him what had been done with the will. He told me that after my departure he had given the will to HPB. I suppose that she must have destroyed the deed, as it was never found among her papers.⁴

Blavatsky's second Will, although very different from the first in content, has one element of similarity — both Wills were drawn up at moments of her pending death.

At the end of March 1889, a few months after **The Secret Doctrine** was published, according to Cheiro, a famous palm reader who was in London at the time, Blavatsky invited him to visit her one evening at Avenue Road. Blavatsky had deduced from evaluating her own palm that her life was nearing its end. She apparently contacted Cheiro to verify her conclusions and give her a time frame in which she could expect the inevitable. Again according to Cheiro, Blavatsky thanked him after his reading and said, "Your warning will do me good, for I will now put my papers in order and prepare in earnest for the short time that lies before me."⁵ Although a third Will has never been acknowledged, it can be assumed from Blavatsky's supposed comments that she was taking this seriously and that she would take the time to draw up another Last Will and Testament.

In her 1887 Will, Blavatsky had apparently left nothing to Olcott and nothing for Adyar either; all was to go to Countess Wachtmeister who was looking after her night and day and receiving no compensation in return. H.P.B.'s circumstances had changed drastically since then and a very different Will was needed to reflect this new status. Judge had become her most trustworthy supporter and the most dedicated to the CAUSE. Blavatsky eventually came to realize that her own Master had initiated him in 1884 and she depended on Judge for the many tasks she needed done. In one of her letters she wrote: "I trust Judge more than anyone in the world. . . ."⁶

Recognizing Blavatsky's involvement with Judge in all aspects of theosophical work, and the fact that Besant had only recently joined the Society, it would seem reasonable to assume that Blavatsky would not have designated Besant as the main benefactor in her Will. Olcott mentioned that when he had arrived at the London headquarters on September 4th, 1889, he "found Mrs. Annie Besant living in the house, having just come over from the Secularists into our camp, with bag and baggage".⁷ Besant claimed, and declared some months after Blavatsky's death, that she was "the person who arranged H.P. Blavatsky's business affairs in England"⁸ during that time. It would be reasonable to expect, therefore, that Besant was *the* person in charge of Blavatsky's Last Will and Testament and would have known where to find it after her death.

It is reasonable to deduce that Blavatsky drafted a new Will sometime after Cheiro's visit and also to assume that Blavatsky drew up her Last Will and Testament circa August 1890 when a Deed of Trust was executed in which Annie Besant's property at 19 Avenue Road was officially vested into the hands of trustees as a headquarters for the British Section.⁹ It was agreed at the time that

On the one hand, it was not right to have left the house in Mrs. Besant's name, and on the other, Madame Blavatsky's health precluded it being in her own name.¹⁰

Once again Blavatsky's health was a major concern.

Following are several reasons why a third Will is a possibility:

1. On July 27th, 1886, Blavatsky had offered Judge her royalties from **The Secret Doctrine** and **Isis Unveiled**.
2. In August 1886 Blavatsky asked Judge to help her get her royalties from J.W. Bouton for her **Isis Unveiled**. She protested that the money was being sent to Olcott at Adyar while she needed the funds to survive (See Chronology, Aug. 22, 1886 entry for more details).
3. Olcott mentioned years later in **Old Diary Leaves** that "she also offered to turn over her share of the *Theosophist* to Judge and make him her successor".¹¹
4. When Blavatsky wrote her second Will she wanted Wachtmeister to have all, but her **Secret Doctrine** had not been published yet, nor had the Esoteric Section been formed.

5. When Olcott, a lawyer, finally declared six months after Blavatsky's death that there was a Will, he carefully worded his speech at the Sixteenth Convention and Anniversary of the Theosophical Society at Adyar. He stated:
*In the will that she executed here, she left me everything and offered her sister the copyrights to her books. . . .*¹² [Italics added]
 He not only omitted any reference to the 1887 (second) Will, he carefully avoided mentioning the words "Last Will and Testament" when proclaiming Blavatsky's Will. (Years later in **Old Diary Leaves** he did write that "she executed what proved to be her Last Will and Testament. . . . 31st January 1885."¹³). Also, in the published transcript of this Will there is no mention of copyrights being offered to her sister.
6. Blavatsky had subsequently made arrangements regarding her share of the net profits from the sale of her books (in 1888 and 1890) and they did not include monies going to Adyar.¹⁴
7. In the interview by William Mulliss in October 1926, Besant claimed that she had been appointed H.P.B.'s literary executor. [See Appendix H for full text.] In **Rebirth of the Occult Tradition**, Boris de Zirkoff wrote: "As far as English Law is concerned, a Literary Executor can be appointed only in a Will."¹⁵ It is possible that Besant *was* in fact appointed Literary Executor — in a Will that would have been executed *after* she became associated with Blavatsky.
8. It would have been out of character and imprudent for Blavatsky not to have had a new Will executed to reflect changed circumstances.
9. If Blavatsky did destroy the second Will, as Wachtmeister speculates, she would not have done so without another Will to replace it, as it is obvious after reading "Why I Do Not Return To India" that she would not leave *everything* to Olcott and Adyar as stipulated in her first Will.

The interesting question which arises is, what was Judge so concerned about that he would send a telegram from New York, on May 9th, to 19 Avenue Road telling the members there to "*Do nothing till I come*"?¹⁶ This was done shortly upon receiving word of Blavatsky's death and only a few days after Besant's departure from New York on May 6th, 1891.

Blavatsky had appointed Judge as "my only representative for [the Esoteric] section in America" on December 14th, 1888. On December 25th, 1889, she appointed Olcott as her "Sole official representative for the Esoteric Section in Asiatic countries", although Olcott's position appeared to be mostly in an administrative capacity. Neither was in England at the time of Blavatsky's death. Judge, who H.P.B. claimed "had been a part of herself and of the Great Lodge 'for aeons past'",¹⁷ felt very responsible for preserving the integrity of the E.S. materials. H.P.B. had reinforced this in her circular "Notice" of August 9th, 1890, in which she stated that all orders in E.S. Instructions issued in the U.S. would only be through Judge or directly by herself. This would have been reason enough to spring Judge into action and immediately send that telegram. Edmund Garrett, Editor of the **Westminster Gazette** and a friend of Besant, reported that "Avenue-road was at first inclined to resent this ukase",¹⁸ that is, an official order, having the force of law. Interestingly, this telegram of Judge's is mentioned by various authors¹⁹ but it never appeared in any official theosophical periodicals of the time. The telegram appears to have been expurgated.

By the time Judge arrived in London on May 21st, Besant was already wearing Blavatsky's ring and Blavatsky's body had been cremated. Was Judge the one who was supposed to receive H.P.B.'s ring after her death? There is sufficient information included in the Chronology and Appendix A to cover the details surrounding this ring. It will not, therefore, be repeated here.

No Will was ever presented to Judge while he was in England. He may not have known at that time that there was a Will but likely expected there would be. Judge had represented Blavatsky in other legal matters before and would therefore have found it strange that he was not presented with her Will while in London. Some

years later, Besant admitted that she destroyed *very important documentary evidence* in her possession related to the “Judge Case” stating, “I destroyed all the letters I had received from Mr. Judge, as I could not carry them with me round the world. . . .”²⁰ Could it be that Blavatsky *did* have a third Last Will and Testament and that it suffered the same fate?

The Mystery Will

Olcott did not arrive in London until nearly two months after Blavatsky’s death. Upon word of her death Bertram Keightley went to Colombo on May 21st, 1891, where he was to meet Olcott on the 28th.²¹ However, Olcott only arrived in Colombo on June 10th, from Adelaide, met Bertram and sailed on to Bombay. They left Bombay on a French steamer on June 15th and reached Marseilles on July 2nd. When they arrived in London, on July 4th, they were greeted by Judge who took them to headquarters at 19 Avenue Road “where [Olcott] had an affectionate greeting from Mrs. Besant and other residents of the house.”²²

Olcott described what happened shortly after he arrived:

Mrs. B. and I visited the bedroom of H.P.B., and, after a time of solemn meditation, pledged ourselves to be true to the Cause and to each other. The death of my co-Founder had left me as the recognized sole centre of the movement, and it seemed as if the hearts of all our best workers warmed towards me more than they had ever done before.²³

There are no reasons to not take Olcott’s description of events at face value, although the incident does seem rather strange. A few days later he stated:

I passed some time alone in her room, and I received there what was necessary for my guidance in the future; I may simply say, in one word, the gist of it was that I should continue the work as though nothing whatever had happened. . . .²⁴

One does wonder if Olcott gave all the details of the event or did he purposely leave out some very important information — information that would have undermined Olcott’s authority and the whole Adyar organization that he had built. Apart from the loss of his “chum”, could the contents of a possible third Will have contributed to Olcott’s melancholy after her death while he was in London? Judge realized a few months later, when the two of them were in California, that something was troubling Olcott. He included in a cable to Besant on October 26th, 1891: “There is something wrong with H.S. Olcott.”²⁵

Serious questions arise concerning what occurred in H.P.B.’s bedroom. Why wasn’t Judge included in this little private parley? Why were none of the other residents at headquarters invited into Blavatsky’s room with Olcott and Besant? Why Blavatsky’s room at all?

Olcott first met Besant the night of his arrival in London, September 5th, 1889, when he came to settle his differences with H.P.B. regarding the E.S. and other matters. Besant, a Secularist at the time, had just joined the ranks of the Movement. Olcott immediately took to her and thought she was “a natural Theosophist”. Ten years later he recalled an incident that transpired that evening:

She had not, I believe, made one public discourse in support of Theosophy, nor had she said one word of the sort during the conversation between her and H.P.B. and myself. . . . I recollect taking her then by the hand and saying, just at parting: “I think you will find yourself happier than you have ever been in your life before, for I see you are a mystic and have been frozen into your brain by your environment.”²⁶

Olcott quickly became an admirer of Besant’s lecturing abilities after listening to her on a number of occasions.

Now, after having met barely two years prior, they forged an alliance that was only jeopardized once, shortly after Blavatsky’s death. What kind of *tête-à-tête* did they have to suddenly come out from Blavatsky’s bedroom pledging allegiance to each other and to be true to the Cause? *Which* Cause? Based on the premise

that there was a third Will, this would have been the most opportune time for Besant to hand it over to Olcott. Besant, living in the same house as Blavatsky and looking after her business affairs, may well have been the only person who knew of the existence of Blavatsky's Will. Perhaps when she arrived in London from New York she immediately read the Will, pondered upon its contents, and wondered what to do with it.

Again presuming the third Will existed, in all probability after reading it Besant was determined to show it to Olcott first, since he was the President of the Society, and let him decide what to do. Besant must have felt it her duty to personally hand over Blavatsky's Will to him. She appeared to believe at the time that the Esoteric Section was part of the whole Society and that Olcott as its President was, therefore, "the only one who represents the mission from the Masters themselves".²⁷ This belief becomes even more evident when reading her statement and resolution at the Annual Convention at Adyar in 1894.²⁸

Supposing that in Blavatsky's Will there was nothing bequeathed to Olcott or to Adyar, would that not have been of concern enough to Besant for her to wait until Olcott's arrival to determine what to do next? And she was not about to question her perception — *her* truth.

Shortly after joining the Society Annie Besant gave two lectures at the Hall of Science, August 4th and 11th, 1889, on "Why I Became A Theosophist." There she described *her loyalty to truth as she saw it*.

An imperious necessity forces me to speak the Truth, *as I see it*, whether the speech please or displease, whether it bring praise or blame. That one loyalty to Truth I must keep stainless, whatever friendships fail me or human ties be broken. She may lead me into the wilderness yet must I follow her; she may strip me of all I love, yet I must pursue her; though she slay me yet I trust in her; and I ask no other epitaph on my tomb but "She tried to Follow Truth".²⁹ [Italics added]

Following up on the possibility that there was a third Will, could the Cause that Olcott and Besant both adopted following their *tête-à-tête* have been to maintain the status quo of the Theosophical Society as she envisioned it was and to which Olcott had dedicated his life's work? The premise that in this probable third Will Blavatsky made Judge one of her benefactors, but not Adyar, would have been reason enough for Besant and Olcott to have pledged allegiance to each other. This Will was their little secret. If Besant did hide the supposed Will until Olcott saw it, would Olcott not have felt a deep sense of gratitude toward her? How could Olcott ever repay her for having *saved* the Society — Adyar, which he considered to be the center of the Theosophical Movement. Olcott's actions certainly lend credence to this probability and he certainly supported Besant as much as anyone could thereafter. As mentioned earlier, Olcott would likely have found some very disturbing information in Blavatsky's Will — *information he decided would never be revealed* and it never was, but there is sufficient evidence to establish the probability that a third Will existed and that Olcott chose to withhold it.

Judge might have suspected that Blavatsky had another Will when he sent that telegram on May 9th, but he apparently never made a fuss about it. Judge may not have cared much about a Will; his main concern was the CAUSE.

Like H.P.B., Judge was fully aware that Olcott's Executive responsibility was centered from the first on being the President and that his authority was mainly exoteric. Judge, on the other hand, although closely involved with exoteric matters, was mainly concerned with the Esoteric and was loyal to the Theosophical CAUSE and to its great Teachers. Olcott was always concerned with promoting and sustaining the headquarters as *the* center of the organization. He seemed to lose track of the original CAUSE and of the main objectives while still believing that he was following orders from the Masters and was loyal to H.P.B. In a letter to Olcott in April 1885 she paraphrased K.H. as saying that Olcott had managed to save the Society's body but had lost its soul.

Chapter 10

Olcott is Tested – Suspicious Mount

By the time Olcott arrived in London on July 4th, 1891, following Blavatsky's death, he had developed doubts about H.P.B.'s abilities. He had started to suspect that H.P.B. had actually written many if not most of the letters and messages, claiming and believing that they had been written by the Masters. Three years earlier, on his way to London in 1888, Olcott had received a letter in his ship's cabin in which Master K.H. had warned against this specifically.

But your revolt, good friend, against [H.P.B.'s] "infallibility" — as you once thought it — has gone too far, and you have been unjust to her, for which I am sorry to say, you will have to suffer hereafter. . . Just now — on deck, your thoughts about her were dark and sinful, and so I find the moment a fitting one to put you on your guard.¹

Olcott had received very few messages from the Masters after H.P.B. left India and was not expecting to receive any more after her death. Judge had been aware of Olcott's message drought and had written letters to him claiming that he had not received many either. He was hoping that would somehow help to keep Olcott's spirits up and encourage him. Judge had actually been in contact with the Masters a lot more frequently than he had been letting on. Olcott had absolutely no idea that Judge had undergone an initiation in 1884 and he *never* found out either. Olcott's mind was suspicious and he did not believe that Judge had any occult abilities. He assumed that Judge knew very little about occultism.

During this time, in London, Besant was a fervent believer in the Masters. She had received letters she thought to have been written by the Master himself, through Judge, and had no difficulties accepting this as fact for she claimed she could recognize their "well-known script".² She even boasted in public lectures about having received letters, which was a violation of the Rules of the Esoteric Section.³ Olcott later published that once H.P.B. had gone, "the precipitated writings must alter",⁴ which Judge claimed was incorrect and provided examples to prove otherwise.

A most interesting incident occurred in London between Olcott and Judge which tested Olcott's occult savvy, his faith in Judge, and his ability to detect if Judge had in fact developed occult abilities. According to Judge, he had been developing occult powers since the early days in New York without Olcott's knowledge. This incident also provides information as to whether Olcott respected Judge as a co-Founder and was willing to work with him. Upon reading the following Statement by Olcott the reader should keep in mind that it was written from memory, likely in December 1894 or January 1895, when Besant was in Adyar collecting all she could in preparation for her **Case Against W.Q. Judge** (see the Compiler's Analysis of same in Appendix A). Most historians know that Olcott's recollection of facts is not always accurate, especially his **Old Diary Leaves**, but his records are in fact still used as long as they can be verified by other sources. It is more difficult to brush aside his known biases against Judge when reviewing the facts, especially his article "Centres of The Theosophical Movement" and his negative review of **The Ocean of Theosophy**,⁵ along with all other subsequent conflicts between him and Judge.

If the following incident is read with the idea, using Olcott's own words, that he was being tested by the Masters, many interesting ideas and facts can be deduced. His loyalty and dedication to the Theosophical Society and to Adyar are not in question here, but his respect and loyalty towards Judge certainly are as they had been skewed for whatever reason. In his Statement in **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, Olcott provides an example of his reservations about Judge.

While at London in July, 1891, some conversation occurred between W.Q.J. and myself about the expenses of the European Convention, and I proposed that as H.P.B.'s legatee I should sell some valuable articles of hers and give the money as her contribution towards those expenses. Judge then

told me as from "the Master," that I need not trouble myself about it as "they" would see that the money was forthcoming, and that I would get a message about it. As I did not get any message soon, I spoke to W.Q.J., who replied that what he had already told me was all that he had heard from the "Master."

The same day on returning from town and sitting down to my writing-table, I lifted a piece of blotting-paper, and under it found the following message written on paper. "I withhold the message until later" (cryptograph and illegible impression of seal).

I withhold the
message until
later

Later, W.Q.J. left on my writing-table a note as follows:—

"Dear Olcott, Master says he has sent you a message in a *queer* envelope and you are to look for it."

Dear Olcott
Master says he has sent you a
message in a queer envelope
and you are to look for it
W Q J

Upon searching I found in the ordinary envelope of a private letter, which I had previously received and which after reading I left open with other letters on my table, a piece of paper bearing writing in red pencil with cryptograph and a legible seal impression. This at once put me in mind of the "Panjab Seal."⁶ I showed the paper to Bertram Keightley and gave him a history of the seal. I then put back the paper in the envelope in which I had found it, and placed it on my table. The substance of this "Mahâtmâ note" was to the effect that there was no need to sell H.P.B.'s jewels as money would be provided.

I thereupon spoke to W.Q.J. and asked him if he had seen among H.P.B.'s effects a certain seal (describing the "Panjab Seal" and telling the circumstances of its making in the Panjab, *but not naming the exact place*). Judge said he had not seen the seal, whereupon I remarked that I hoped no scoundrel would get possession of it, and use it to give colour to bogus "Mahâtmâ messages," and I added that if ever I should see a message which bore the impression of that seal, I should of course know it to be fraudulent. (I did not at the time inform Judge that I had got the message about which he had written to me.)

After two days I again looked into the envelope for the paper (which I had replaced) but found that it was not there.⁷

In a letter to Olcott dated August 30th, 1893, which was also included in **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, Judge responds to what he claims are wrong notions about him that Olcott has held for many years. Judge does not deal with this particular incident in great detail but does correct Olcott's errors concerning it.

You are in error when you say I told you you would find a message from M. on the table at Avenue Road. I did not. I showed you in the cab a note of his on your letter "I sent him a message." It is signed. After that I said he told me he had written you and I so stated. You have added to it about the table. That I did not say. And once more I deny all you said and think of me in respect to the seal. That is all I will say.⁸

In the first paragraph of his relating this incident, Olcott's first concern was money — that the expenses for the European Convention would be met. He was continually concerned about expenses coming out of the Adyar budget. He was equally concerned that Adyar should get its fair share of revenues — royalties from the publications, mostly through H.P.B.'s efforts, were continually diverted to Adyar for their expenses, for Olcott's tours and for other lecturers coming to India. The second point he mentions is his reaffirmation that he is H.P.B.'s legatee. This may be so, but who was the legatee in Blavatsky's second Will when she was in Ostend? If Olcott was not the legatee to that second Will why should he have been the legatee in the presumed Last Will and Testament drawn up shortly before Blavatsky's death? It was not until after Wachtmeister could not turn up the second Will that the first one was accepted and Olcott became legatee.

Suspicions that Judge had allegedly been writing red missives on letters to members only surfaced after the death of H.P.B., although it is believed rumors were circulating at Adyar during the time Richard Harte was there as acting Editor of **The Theosophist**. Bertram Keightley, who had reached Bombay on August 31st, 1890, likely became aware of the rumors circulating in India that Judge was allegedly forging Mahatmic messages. By the time Olcott arrived in London on July 4th, 1891, his perception of Judge may have been somewhat tainted by what Keightley likely imparted to him during their voyage. Olcott remembered that he also had heard rumors about Judge's alleged talent for imitating handwriting and that he had done some while at Adyar in 1884.⁹

The evidence that there were suspicions in India about bogus "Mahâtmâ messages" being produced by Judge, at that time, came from a letter Judge had sent to Tookaram Tatya on May 30th, 1891, from Avenue Road, London. Tatya, suspicious of a seal impression on it, returned the letter to Judge for verification. Tatya claimed that when he received the letter the impression was perfectly clear but when it was returned by Judge, the seal impression had been rubbed out. If there had not been suspicions concerning Judge circulating forged messages in India before Blavatsky's death, there would have been no reason to return the letter to Judge in the first place. From Judge's letter to Tatya it will be shown that the rumors about Judge had originated on the West coast of India and that these rumors had been initiated by the same people who at first had come to Blavatsky's defense in 1884 but who had quickly lost their faith in the Masters.

When Olcott showed the cryptograph to Bertram Keightley, and gave him the history of the Seal, it was as if he was saying to him — I now know what you mean about suspecting Judge. From this point onward it becomes evident that both Olcott and Bertram Keightley were developing suspicious minds about Judge's abilities to communicate with Master Morya. The matter of the Punjab Seal will not be of primary focus here. This one episode coupled with the cablegram involving Bertram on his return to London from America in 1890 are sufficient to show that suspicion was slowly developing into a malignancy. This would have been the opportune time for Bertram Keightley to admit to Olcott that he had seen this cryptograph and seal impression before and that H.P.B. had demonstrated it by reproducing a lost cablegram, with several seal marks on it, in his and others' presence.

Matters having been settled following H.P.B.'s death, Judge left London on August 6th, 1891, and returned to New York.

Bertram Keightley left London with Sydney V. Edge on August 21st, 1891, to return to Adyar. Bertram was most excited about his trip to England. He stated: "My trip to England has been successful beyond expectation." He had managed to obtain a promise from Besant "to make a rapid tour in India this Christmas, if the necessary funds can be raised."¹⁰ Sydney V. Edge became Bertram's assistant Editor of the new magazine, **The Prasnotara**, and assistant General Secretary of the Indian Section.

Olcott left Liverpool on September 16th, 1891, on his way to Japan via USA. He arrived in New York on the evening of September 23rd, and spoke to reporters at Astor House the following day.

On September 28th, 1891, Olcott took the train from New York to California. Judge had gone ahead and "was lecturing and conversing with inquirers, when Col. Olcott arrived in San Francisco. They were together on the platform when Col. Olcott lectured, October 7th, the evening before he sailed over the Pacific Ocean for Japan."¹¹ Judge continued his tour of California and other western centers.

Olcott's suspicions were further piqued when he reached Colombo on November 29th, 1891, en route for Madras on his way back from America and Japan. He received a packet of letters which had been forwarded to him. Among the letters was one dated October 17th, 1891, from Abbott Clark, of Villa Park, Orange County, California. Olcott describes what he found:

Inside the letter I found a slip of paper bearing a message in handwriting resembling that usually attributed to "Mahâtâmâ M." and his cryptograph. The paper employed was Cashmere paper, identical with a certain sample lot bought by me in Jammoo, Cashmere, in 1883, to be used in the *Theosophist* Office for packing books, being cheap and strong. It is hand-made paper and some of it was taken by H.P.B. with her to Europe in 1886.

The message, which is written in red pencil and partly in black (and has no seal), runs thus, part being illegible: —

"Judge is not the forger you think and did not write 'Annie.' My seal is with me and he has not seen it, but would like to. Both are doing right, each in his own field. Yes, — I have been training him and can use him when he does not know; but he is so new, it fades out often as it may in this letter from an enthusiast (here follow some illegible words). [Olcott does not mention the words which follow: "it for you ____ know"] 'Facit per alium' applies to the *Lahore Brass*. No; it is not pencil."

(Signed with "Mahâtâmâ M.'s" cryptograph).

Judge is not the forger you think and did not write "Annie" My seal is with me and he has not seen it but would like to. Both are doing right each in his own field. Yes I have been training him and can use him when he does not know, but he is so new it fades but often as it may in this letter from an enthusiast
it for you know M.E.W.

The message presented two suspicious points. (I) It speaks of the “Panjab Seal” as “my seal” (*i.e.*, Mahâtmâ M.’s) and also mentions it as the “Lahore Brass.”

In reference to the making of the seal, I had simply mentioned to Judge the Province of the Panjab, and as Lahore is supposed to be the capital of the Panjab, the writer apparently thought he could safely call the seal the “Lahore Brass.” Unfortunately for him the seal was not made there.

The quoting of the maxim “*(qui) facit per alium (facit per se)*” is suspicious, and opens the door to any amount of fraud and deception.

I then caused a letter to be written to Mr. Abbott Clarke to inquire when he had posted the letter. He replied that although he wrote the letter on the 17th October, he had not posted it till the 20th through forgetfulness. He also mentioned that Mr. Judge was in the locality about twenty-four hours on October 17th and 18th.¹²

Judge later explains:

Now taking up the next charge, that I have sent such messages pretending them to be from the Master although in reality, as alleged, emanating from myself, it appears that eight affirmations, or grounds, or bases, are cited by the prosecutor in support of the charge. The first two are entirely false in fact. They allege, first, error in matter of fact and second, a threat based on a mistake. I have, as a matter of fact made no error in any of these messages and no threat whatever is made, either based on a mistake or otherwise. The first alleged error is that in a message said to have been sent by me, the brass seal previously referred to is called “the Lahore brass.” About this I know absolutely nothing. The alleged message was found by Col. Olcott in a letter from Abbott Clark, of California, at a time when I was in California, it is true, but Abbot[t] Clark swears that I could not have done anything with his letter, and that he carried it around in his pocket for some time after it was written, while he waited to procure stamps for mailing it, and did not post it until after I had started for the East. It is in evidence, as admitted by the prosecutor, that the letter in which this message was found was opened in Adyar and forwarded from there to Col. Olcott. There were at that time, in Adyar, certain spies and enemies, who gave out information to those who wished to hurt the Theosophical Society and those persons opened letters not addressed to themselves. I cannot repudiate as a fact Mr. Abbott Clark’s letter in which this appeared, but I can and do emphatically repudiate, *in toto*, the message alleged to have been made by me. In the statement made by the prosecutor, it is taken for granted, as if proved, that I was misled by Col. Olcott’s speaking of the Punjab and that I therefore came to the conclusion that the seal had better be called, in this alleged bogus message, “the Lahore brass.” The fact of the matter is that I know nothing about Lahore, or the Punjab, and all my knowledge of this brass seal, considered as an object, is derived from Col. Olcott’s testimony, together with that of Bertram Keightley.¹³

Clark later supplied a statement from San Francisco, California on April 21st, 1894.

I, ABBOTT CLARK, a member of the THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, do hereby state and affirm as follows:

I have seen it stated in the newspapers that it is charged that I wrote Col. H.S. Olcott in 1891 to India and that in that letter was some message not known to me and that Col. Olcott replied asking where William Q. Judge was at the time and that I replied he was in my house.

Across a margin of the paper is the following postscript, in the black carbon usually devoted to the seal impression:—

*facit per
alium ap-
plies to the
lahore-brass
tho. it is not
panjab or*

1. Facsimile of message from Mahatma Morya. Reproduced from *Isis Very Much Unveiled* (pp.50-52) and also found, without the postscript, in *The Passionate Pilgrim* (p.209).

The facts are: That in 1891, Mr. W.Q. Judge was lecturing in this State and I was with him at Santa Ana and that I had no house, and never had, being too poor to have one. Bro. Judge stopped at the hotel in Santa Ana, where he came from my home, my father's house, at Orange, where he had been at dinner, and at Santa Ana I arranged his lecture, and I stayed at my Aunt's in Santa Ana; while in the hotel a conversation arose with us in which I spoke of Theosophical propaganda among the Chinese on this coast, and Bro. Judge suggested that I write to Col. Olcott as he knew many Buddhist Theosophists and might arrange it better than Bro. Judge, and I then myself wrote to Col. Olcott on the matter showing the letter after it was done to Bro. Judge to see if it should be improved or altered and he handed me back the letter at once. I put it in my pocket and kept it there for several days waiting for a chance to buy stamps for postage as I was away from any post office. Bro. Judge left by himself the morning after I wrote the letter and went to San Diego and the only time I saw him again was in the train, just to speak to him on his return, after about four days and the letter was not mentioned, thought of, nor referred to.

I assert on my word of honor that Bro. Judge said nothing to me about any message pretended to be from Masters or otherwise, and so far as any reports or statements have been made relating to me herein different from the above they are absolutely false.

From India I got a reply from Adyar T.S. Office from one Charlu saying he had opened my letter in Col. Olcott's absence, and had forwarded it to him; and Dharmapala told me he had seen letters from me to Olcott on the matter, received in India away from Adyar. The said Charlu in reply also asked me where Bro. Judge was when the letter was written, and I wrote that he had been at my house on that date, which is true as above stated, Orange being but three miles from Santa Ana, as I thought Charlu wished to have Bro. Judge's dates, but thought also the questions were peculiar from such a distance. I never got any reply to my sincere first question in that letter about propaganda from him, and never any reply of any sort from Col. Olcott. When Dharmapala was here he did not bring any message in reply from Olcott, but referred to recollecting speaking with Olcott about a proposal from California to work with the Chinese. And Charlu did not speak of any enclosure in said letter. A year later I again wrote on the same matter to Col. Olcott which was answered by Gopala Charlu, now dead, saying but little if anything could be done by him. To all this I affirm on my honor.¹⁴

(Signed) ABBOTT CLARK.

WITNESS SIGNATURE,

(Signed)

ALLEN L. GRIFFITHS.

E. B. RAMBO.

Olcott was obviously becoming ever more suspicious and, indeed, more convinced that Judge was adding a seal impression to bogus messages to insinuate authenticity, that is, as coming from the Masters. Even though Abbott Clark insists that Judge had no opportunity to add anything to his letter and indicated this in his response to Olcott's query (albeit not as clearly as he might have), once again Olcott chose to presume guilt rather than allow Judge the benefit of the doubt.

Chapter 11

The “Poison” Letter

While Olcott was in London (July 4th to September 16th, 1891), he was quite distraught about the whole matter surrounding Blavatsky’s death and perhaps also with the presumed third Will given to him. It was at this time that he stayed as a guest of Miss Henrietta Müller, and at which time they supposedly had an affair. When Besant became aware of the “grave immorality” (to quote Herbert Burrows’ words) she cabled Judge in New York. She was convinced that the charges were true and wanted to present her evidence to Judge regarding Olcott’s conduct while he had been in London. Judge replied that she may come. Besant had listened to these accusations, had investigated them according to her own moral standards of what constituted an “investigation,” until she became convinced the charges were true.

While Judge was still in San Francisco he wrote, on October 26th, 1891, to Besant about his concerns for Olcott. Judge had perceived, or been told by the Master, that there was something wrong with Olcott. He also stated that the Master had desired Besant not to go to India at this time. Besant’s thoughts were that she had better go to India in order to see Master “M”. She had never been told to go to India to see the Master; she had decided on her own volition that this was what she must do. She had told Bertram Keightley that she would go *if* the Indian members could raise the appropriate funds, and now through Judge was told not to go. The Master knew about Besant’s wish to see Him but explained that “on account of health”¹ she should not go to India at this time and had better see Dr. Z. Mennell (Blavatsky’s doctor) “to obtain certificate advising postpone[ment]”² for her use in advising Bertram Keightley, the General Secretary of the Indian Section. Judge had also informed Besant that “as He has often said one has not got to go there to see Him.”³

Besant sent a telegram to Judge on November 18th, 1891, of her sudden sailing. She reached New York on the 27th or 28th. She recounted to Judge the circumstances and details of the charge as well as the evidence and demanded that Judge, as Vice-President of the Society, immediately demand Olcott’s resignation. Besant had arranged for a London member to “go to India as special messenger so as to avoid all risks from spies at Adyar.”⁴ After cross-questioning her as to the facts with E.A. Neresheimer, Judge decided to write to Olcott as a friend concerning these allegations. Judge suggested to Olcott that even if the charges were true that he had better not resign. Suddenly the pledge Olcott and Besant made to each other after their private parley in Blavatsky’s room became secondary to her own moral convictions and her need for moral justice and exactitude which she had stated she would pursue for *Truth*. The question is, why didn’t she write to Olcott herself and demand an explanation regarding the alleged rumors? In all probability she needed Judge’s involvement to deflect any repercussions from coming her way. (Details regarding Olcott’s resignation, his third, can be found in the Chronology.)

Olcott received a letter from Judge, dated December 28th, 1891, in January 1892. Judge was concerned that he had not heard from him since he had left San Francisco in October. On opening the letter Olcott found across the first page, to the left, the following words written in red pencil: “I might tell him of your ‘*poison*’ interview with —— [name given] —‘M’.” Olcott was greatly incensed by the insinuation and wrote an indignant reply to Judge. Judge responded:

I have puzzled my head over your reference to “poison” as if in one of mine; as I never referred to it I cannot catch on and have given it up in despair.⁵

This incident generated more suspicions in Olcott’s mind of Judge’s guilt. Olcott by then believed that Judge was indeed writing missives on letters as coming from Master “M” to persuade others. Olcott came to the conclusion that Judge was doing this to undermine Olcott’s authority as President of the T.S. in order to step in and take control of the whole organization at Adyar.⁶

A few more details will help clarify the confusion that occurred surrounding this episode at the time and which created some misunderstandings which developed into many presumptions regarding Judge.

When detailing her case of moral indecency against Olcott, Besant also “confided” to Judge “under plea of secrecy” about a “perfectly harmless conversation” Olcott had “with an intimate friend on the properties of certain poisons”.⁷ Judge explains what happened to the letter he wrote to Olcott:

The words of the message, which are in red, are “I might tell him of your poison interview with . . . (name omitted here).” The explanation thereof is this. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that sentence was precipitated in that letter, through me, without my knowledge at the time. It is unfinished, but would have been completed but for the alteration of conditions at the time and various hindrances unnecessary to relate. It grew out of the fact of Mrs. Besant’s explicit statement to me that a certain person (whose truthfulness we had no reason to doubt) had thrown out hints about Col. Olcott’s being a man capable of administering poisons, and her further averment, at the same time, that Madame Blavatsky had hinted the same thing to her. This is not the first time Mrs. Besant has made to me accusations of a serious character against other persons. The statement did not command my credence, but at the same time I was disturbed by it and it caused some grave questions to arise in my mind. It influenced me to endeavor to procure from occult sources information on the subject, and I did obtain at least partial information. All this caused the precipitation of that incomplete message in the letter, which would have been finished and been a good deal longer were it not for the disturbance of the conditions necessary for its completion. It would then show that the Master might tell, or explain, to me about the poison interview which had been a weight on my mind but that the doubts and suspicions then existing on both sides prevented any useful messages being sent for mutual use. The person who should have least reason for surprise at the revelation in this explanation is Col. Olcott, for I have a letter from him in 1892 in which he says:

“What do I mean by ‘poison’? well you will learn in time; the simple fact is that certain people had the damnable wickedness and impudence to hint that I might use it on third parties. Damn them.” The “people” he referred to were in England.⁸

Besant inadvertently supports Judge’s claims by explaining facts that the **Westminster Gazette** had gotten wrong about the October 26th, 1891 letter she received from Judge.

The “message” dealt with E.S.T. matters partly, but chiefly with my journey to India. The “danger” was a predicted turning of Col. Olcott against the T.S. and H.P. Blavatsky. It had nothing to do with the idea, rightly characterised by the *W. G.* as “astounding nonsense,” that Col. Olcott intended to poison me. Mr. Judge knew nothing of this absurdity until I told him of it myself when I visited America later in the year, after my journey to India had been postponed in deference to the above “message.” So the *W. G.* is mistaken in alleging that I was warned not to imperil myself in the neighbourhood of Col. Olcott, and in supposing that this story, never heard of by any of us till after the Indian visit had been given up, had anything to do with its postponement.⁹

Besant further explains where the idea originated.

First the “poison interview” was a perfectly harmless conversation with an intimate friend on the properties of certain poisons; secondly, Mr. Judge knew of this interview prior to the date of the above letter under pledge of secrecy from Annie Besant, with in addition, a most injurious suspicion levelled at the Colonel in consequence of a dream the above-named friend had had some months later.

...¹⁰

In **Isis Very Much Unveiled** (p.54), Edmund Garrett included what he called “The ‘poison threat’ missive” which had appeared on the letter to Olcott and which is included below:

*I might tell him of your "poison" interview
with Mennell
M.L.*

The “[name given]” in Besant’s **Case Against W.Q. Judge** is here identified as “Mennell”, that is, Dr. Mennell, who had been Blavatsky’s physician and whom Besant was advised to see regarding her health during the time of her proposed visit to India.

According to Besant’s statement above, this “intimate friend” had a follow-up dream in regard to this poison question. But Besant had received another warning against her going to India then. Vera Johnston, living in London at the time, had forwarded a message from her mother, Vera Petrovna Jelihovsky, H.P.B.’s sister, to Annie Besant. Vera Petrovna Jelihovsky describes that she had a “feeling, impression, conviction — you may call it whatever name you like — came to me in night time.” She wrote to Judge:

This was not a dream. . . .

. . . So, *according to reason*, I did my best to destroy the impression and to get rid of my strange feeling, the notion that I was *obliged* to warn her. But it gave me no rest; it positively obsessed and persecuted me! I felt a painful depression, accompanied by an ever-increasing conviction that I had better act, as I was prompted to from the beginning, for such was my moral duty.

At last I came to the conclusion that the consciousness under which I felt myself obliged to warn Mrs. Besant came from my sister; that it was her will to keep Mrs. Besant from going to India and had no other possibility to act except through me.¹¹ [See Oct. 1891 entry in Chronology for more details.]

After marrying, in the late summer of 1888, Vera and her husband, Charles Johnston, sailed to India with Olcott, Richard Harte and others on October 22nd, 1888. They stayed in India for a while but had returned to England before Blavatsky died. It is quite plausible that Vera Johnston, H.P.B.’s niece, along with a number of other people, had heard Olcott speaking about “the properties of certain poisons” at that time or later in 1891 when they were all together again in London. As Judge stated, “the person who should have least reason for surprise at the revelation in this explanation is Col. Olcott”. It appears that the whole of the incident was entirely innocent in the first place but suspicion and doubt were stronger than truth. As it turned out both Olcott and Besant chose to sway suspicion towards Judge rather than simply describe the facts as they knew them, and then ask Judge directly to explain how the message came to be on the letter to Olcott in the first place. They chose to see guilt rather than innocence and acted accordingly.

At first Judge indicated that he knew nothing about the missive but he later discovered through Master “M” what had actually happened. When Judge asked “M” why he delayed Annie’s trip, the Master replied that Judge “would see, that in 1893 a necessity for it would come”. In his August 30th, 1893, letter to Olcott, Judge explained:

That necessity is here, a breach in the ranks not led by you, but not prevented, for you are an older man on the spot and are the chief officer. It is a breach of interest to the T.S. and not to the E.S., and you have not dealt well nor wisely in it with me nor with the thing itself.¹²

In this letter Judge also explains about his occult development and that

In 1875 and up to 1879 the Masters spoke with me and gave me teaching both that way and in writing and also told me how I was to regard you and act to you. They explained to me many things and showed what would happen. I have tried to follow the directions but do not pretend to have made a complete success of it.¹³

But then he says:

Just drop 1875 and begin with 1886 if it suits you better, and take it from that on and from now on and you will find it all right. I could have said all this before, but was not told to, and besides always found you sneering at me, and saw in your brain, into which I have often gazed, the doubts and the suspicions.¹⁴

In an undated letter received by Judge from Master “M” some time after the passing of H.P.B. is the following statement:

I have spoken to Heliodore in the West, and she may go to India in ‘93.¹⁵

(See the Compiler’s Analysis of **The Case Against W.Q. Judge** in Appendix A for details regarding “Heliodore”, a name given to Annie Besant.)

Chapter 12

Suspicious Begin to Sprout

All doubts and suspicions began to sprout in the year 1893. The new year began a few days early with the arrival of Walter R. Old at Adyar on December 21st, 1892. It appears that Edward T. Sturdy traveled with him to India at the same time. They joined their friends Sidney V. Edge, Bertram Keightley and H.S. Olcott at Adyar. E.T. Sturdy had studied Sanskrit for a long time and had decided to go to India “to seek for the rarer Indian books useful for translation, and to superintend that translation.”¹

Olcott instantly took a liking to Walter Old. Olcott describes what happened:

My time during the rest of the month was largely given to the gathering of material for my *Old Diary Leaves*, in addition, of course, to the usual office business, and nothing of a sensational kind occurred until the 22nd, when Mr. Walter R. Old, of the London working staff, arrived and joined our Headquarters organization. Almost immediately there was an interchange of confidences between us, which for the first time opened my eyes to the treacherous policy that Mr. Judge had been following up with regard to the Society and myself in the matter of his relations with the Masters. I cannot tell how shocked I was to discover his lack of principle, and to find that my previously more or less vague suspicions fell far short of the reality. Without making any pretensions to exceptional goodness, I certainly never did anything to warrant him in making, in a forged letter, my own Teacher and adored Guru seem to say that, if Mrs. Besant should carry out her intention of visiting India, she might run the risk of my poisoning her! . . . Mr. Keightley and Mr. Edge were taken into our counsels, and helped to compare the documents mutually submitted by Mr. Old and myself. On the arrival of the Delegates to the Convention at the usual time, we submitted the papers to our respected colleague Judge Khandalvala, of Poona, who decidedly advised me to prosecute the case, as it was too serious a menace to the Society’s prosperity to allow it to go on.²

In the above quotation from **Old Diary Leaves**, Fourth Series, Olcott mentions that he and W.R. Old “exchanged confidences”. By the time he started writing his Fifth Series, these “confidences” had become “notes and memoranda”. On page 1 Olcott writes:

As previously shown, the rumblings of the coming tempest about Mr. Judge were beginning to be heard. Towards the end of last year the arrival of Mr. Walter G. Old of the London staff, with the budget of notes and memoranda which he had taken, enabled me by comparing documents to see the depth and fullness of the treachery which Mr. Judge had long been planning. I find from my Diary of 1893 that the greater part of the first day was spent by Messrs. Keightley, Old, and myself in summarising the evidence in the case; and needless to say, all our hearts were filled with sorrow, for this was almost if not the very first case of downright perfidy in our Society’s history.³

Here again is a case where Olcott’s statement cannot be depended upon for accuracy. His bias against Judge is most damaging if not questioned and investigated further.

Bertram Keightley and Col. Olcott credit Old with supplying evidence which, in addition to what was gathered at Adyar, led to the decision to take action against Judge. It appears, however, that Old had very little of his own evidence, if any, to present when he arrived at Adyar other than innuendoes and suspicions gathered through friends. Herbert Burrows claimed that “what really happened” was that

After Mr. Old had been some time in India he came to the conclusion that certain charges against Mr. Judge, which up to then had been vaguely floating about, were true, and he said so.⁴

Old later supplied a lot of the information which was serialized in **The Westminster Gazette** beginning in October 1894, and which Edmund Garrett eventually published as a book, **Isis Very Much Unveiled**. Old justified this action by claiming:

The published facts are just those which came into the evidence of Col. Olcott and Bertram Keightley, and upon which the charges were based and action taken; and they are, moreover, part of a body of evidence, which, from the outset, it was decided to publish.⁵

The “body of evidence” he refers to is the material which was gathered over the following year and of which Old made copies prior to handing it over to Besant shortly after her arrival in India in November 1893. Olcott acknowledged that “the copies and facsimiles made by Mr. Old were taken while [the materials] were in his custody, in the earliest stages of the inquiry”.⁶ This was also the material which Judge claimed “open enemies of mine” had copies while he was never provided with any, to which Old had responded:

I am the only person who holds certified copies of the documents. I was not *allowed* to make such copies; I secured such in self-defence at the time of my handing over the originals to Mrs. Besant; for it must be remembered that I had already brought charges against Mr. Judge, which at that date I had not had an opportunity of proving. . . .⁷

Olcott claimed to have been shocked “to discover [Judge’s] lack of principle, and to find that my previously more or less vague suspicions fell far short of the reality.” He felt vindicated — his unsubstantiated doubts were now confirmed. But he may well have been genuinely shocked by a letter that Walter Old uncovered from among the papers at Adyar in December 1892. This was the letter Judge had written to Judge N.D. Khandalavala in 1884, which became Exhibit “A”, and which contained samples of imitations of handwriting.

It is interesting to note that although Exhibit “A” was the prosecution’s strongest piece of material evidence it was not mentioned openly by the main characters, other than Judge himself who brought attention to it in his **Reply By William Q. Judge**. There is no doubt the intent was to use it against him. In **The Case Against W.Q. Judge** Besant never refers to it, although copies of other letters from Judge are included. In the above quotation, Olcott instead dwells on the ‘poison’ letter. There appears to have been a concerted effort to discredit Judge by misleading people to believe that he would stoop to such treachery as to imply Olcott would poison Besant.⁸ This leads one to hypothesize that perhaps the individuals involved were unsure about the Exhibit “A” letter actually working in their favor.

Chapter 13

Bertram Keightley Returns to Europe and America

After the so-called evidence against Judge was examined by H.S. Olcott, W.R. Old, S.V. Edge, and B. Keightley and shown to a few of the Delegates to the Convention — likely including Tookaram Tatya — and the papers submitted to Judge Khandalavala for his professional judgment, he advised to prosecute. Bertram Keightley felt that the burden to find more evidence fell on him and so he volunteered to take the initiative — since his expenses would not be a burden to the Society’s treasury. The decision was made and, as B. Keightley wrote:

In January, 1893, thanks largely to additional facts supplied by Mr. W.R. Old, I felt that sufficient evidence was available upon which to take public action, and I very strongly urged upon Colonel Olcott the duty of doing so. He consented; and a full brief of the case was prepared.¹

At the December 1892 Annual Convention Bertram Keightley issued a letter to the members of the Indian Section announcing:

As many of you know, I am an only child, and my widowed mother has now passed the three score years and ten of ordinary life, and her health is failing rapidly. It is now some eighteen months since I parted from her, and she has passed through a very severe illness since then. Under these circumstances, you will, I am sure, recognise that imperative duty obliges me to visit and spend some time with her in the coming year. My intention is to start from India shortly after the Convention and return, I trust, after the close of next hot weather, to resume among you the work which I have undertaken, and which I have not the smallest intention of abandoning.²

Bertram was not always this considerate towards his mother. Some years earlier, in 1884, in France: Mme. Blavatsky was listening to a young guest . . . , Mr. Bertram Keightley, bitterly complaining about his mother who was insisting that he either return home to Liverpool, or continue on his journey through the Continent, undertaken for health reasons. “Mother is afraid that I might leave everything and follow you to Madras,” he said. . . . It was then that the postman rang, and among other letters, there was one from Mrs. Keightley to her son. He opened it without much urgency, but suddenly his face reddened, and he looked both stunned and frightened. In the letter, his mother’s words concerning the respect and obedience that children owe their parents were *underlined in red ink, with a familiar signature*. . . .³

Before leaving Bertram Keightley made arrangements with his Assistant Secretary, S.V. Edge, to look after **The Prasnotarra** and his other duties. Besides seeing his mother he had other reasons as well. He also wanted to persuade Besant to reschedule her trip to India which had been postponed a year earlier. He had also made all his traveling arrangements, his plans and his excuses, to visit America once more. He had made friends there during his tour in 1889-1890 and this gave him ample reasons to return, and investigate and observe Judge through different eyes. All the trappings of a conspiracy were now afoot.

The steamer, *S.S. Neiman*, that Bertram Keightley boarded from Madras capsized just off the Eastern Coast of Ceylon near Trincomalee, “sinking within a few hundred yards of shore” on January 22nd, 1893.

The passengers passed the night in crowded boats, unable to cross the surf till daylight, and then were obliged to walk many miles through sand, marsh, mud and jungle to the nearest village, the sun blistering them and hardly any food or water being attainable. Mr. Keightley was barefoot. A few articles were washed ashore, but almost all of his luggage was totally lost, money, letters, personal souvenirs, — worst of all, the notes collected during two years for a work on Indian literature, and the cherished letters from H.P.B. Mr. Keightley was well upon arriving in England, but later gave evidence of the climatic effects of India, and will need no small treatment before entire restoration to health. To be robbed and then shipwrecked within a few months is certainly Karma in severe form,

and Bro. K. would seem now entitled to a long stretch of uninterrupted bliss. Perhaps this may include his attendance at the American Convention in April!⁴

Keightley was forced to spend time in Ceylon waiting for another ship. “The S.S. *Yara* was to have taken him from Colombo to Marseilles, but, owing to its having been detained in salvage work, Bro. Keightley was not able to leave Colombo till the 6th [of February]. . . .”⁵ He stated:

I then returned to England to take action; but on my arrival found that several of the most material links in our chain of evidence broke down utterly. Hence I felt compelled in justice and fairness to refuse to proceed further in the matter and therefore advised my colleagues, Colonel Olcott included, to wait for further evidence.⁶

Shortly after arriving in London and spending some time with his mother he boarded another ship and sailed for New York. He attended the American Convention, held on April 23rd and 24th, 1893. He read letters of greeting from the Indian and European Sections. Numerous other messages were received from abroad, among them an official letter from Olcott, the President-Founder — his first to a Convention of the American Section. This letter is important as it shows the position he assumed and the means he took to express his personal views. He also wanted to send a strong and direct message to Judge. Olcott’s message, dated March 23rd, 1893, was addressed to “The Delegates of the American Section in Convention assembled”.

Brethren:

During the past year you have been giving abundant proofs of the tireless zeal with which you have pursued the work of our Society. The results prove the truth of the oft-repeated statement of our Masters that their help is always given to the earnest and unselfish worker. We have but one danger to dread and guard against. This is the subordination of general principles to hero-worship, or admiration of personalities. I shall not excuse myself for frequent recurrence to this theme, for I am convinced that, if the Society should ever disintegrate, this will be the cause. The Masters wrote in *Isis* that “men and parties, sects and schools are but the mere ephemera of the World’s day”; and, following the precedent of their great recognized exemplar, Buddha Sakyamuni, they taught me to believe *nothing* upon authority, whether of a living or a dead person. I pray you to keep this ever in mind; and when I am dead and gone to recollect that the admission of the microbe of dogmatism into our Society will be the beginning of its last and fatal sickness.

Wishing you for the coming year a continuance of prosperity, and expressing a hope that I may sometime personally attend a Session of your Convention, I am fraternally and affectionately yours,

H.S. OLCOTT,
*President Theosophical Society.*⁷

While the central message was a warning against hero-worship and admiration of personalities, Olcott’s *underlying* message was to assert his official authority as President of the T.S. over the whole of the Theosophical Movement. He indicated that he would not tolerate any other authority (that is, alleged messages from the Masters) or anyone who chose to regard H.P.B. as a Teacher *par excellence*. Olcott was promoting a view similar to that of Richard Harte’s — that his exoteric authority was supreme and that Adyar was the headquarters for all of the Movement. This was an attempt to reduce H.P.B.’s status. He was also by now convinced that Judge was sending bogus messages to bolster his own standing in the Movement in order to replace Olcott as President.

At the American Convention George W. Wright, President of the Chicago T.S., “read his report, showing that the Theosophical Society had been assigned to the fifteenth and sixteenth days of September, 1893, in the Parliament of Religions at Chicago.”⁸ This announcement created much excitement at the Convention and it would seem, for a moment, that a lot of the problems which concerned Bertram Keightley suddenly

became obscure. He was praised “as a great man”⁹ and appointed as chairman of the Committee on the Parliament of Religions matter. A telegram received from London (23rd) was read declaring the approval and support of the European Section to the plan and announcing that Annie Besant would attend the Conference in Chicago “on her way to India.”¹⁰ After a number of resolutions were adopted the Committee was discharged. Bertram Keightley then addressed the Convention at length on “India and the Theosophical Society”. Upon Bertram Keightley’s suggestion Gyanendra Nath Chakravarti, a Brahmin from Allahabad, was invited to be a delegate from India at The Theosophical Congress in Chicago.

Chapter 14

Fears of Dogmatism

Olcott had issued warnings against hero-worship of H.P.B. two years prior to his strongly worded letter to the 1893 Delegates of the American Section. He had made reference to this at the Annual Convention at Adyar in December 1891, warning then against idolatry of H.P.B. The incident which prompted Olcott's initial warning originated with an article which appeared in **The Path** [See Chronology, Aug. 1891 entry]. The article attributed to Jasper Niemand was published while Judge and Olcott were in London the summer of 1891. Olcott had taken exception to the "message" from the Mahatma in the article, accusing Judge of having written it under the pseudonym Jasper Niemand and expressing fears the article encouraged dogmatism and fanaticism in the Society.

When Besant re-visited America (November 30th, 1892 to February 25th, 1893) Judge showed her some of his correspondence with Olcott, including an unpublished letter written by Judge in reply to questions raised by Olcott on the "message" in the Niemand article. Besant seized the opportunity and asked if she could publish the letter. Upon her return to London she included it in **Lucifer**, April 1893. This letter was not published as having been addressed to Olcott because of the restriction imposed by Judge. It was titled "An Interesting Letter" and subtitled "Written to an Indian Brother".

Olcott published two responses to "An Interesting Letter" in the July 1893 **Theosophist**. One was titled "Theosophic Freethought" and was supplied by Walter R. Old and Sydney V. Edge. The second was by N.D. Khandalavala (N.D.K.) and titled "Theosophy in The West: The Tendency Towards Dogmatism". One of N.D.K.'s objections was to Judge's statement that "our true progress lies in fidelity to Masters as ideals and facts". He implied that Judge was no better than the missionaries in India with their attempts to convert the Hindus. Another of his objections centered on Judge's statement: "a very truism, when uttered by a Mahatma has a deeper meaning for which the student must seek". N.D.K. wrote: "In the first place, however, we must have evidence to convince us that the alleged 'truism' was actually written by a Mahatma."¹ In his letter Judge had also written: "my means of proof and identification are within myself", a statement to which N.D.K. took equal exception. Judge had alluded to the fact that no external evidence was required for one *who knew* and no amount of proof was sufficient for the disbeliever.

N.D.K. also quoted from H.P.B. on the great need for "unbiased and clear judgment" in all matters, but apparently forgot, or never read, her article "Lodges of Magic" (**Lucifer**, October 1888), in which she discussed this very question of the evidence of "messages" from the same standpoint as Judge.² Judge wrote: "If you have not the means yourself for proving and identifying such a message, then signature, seal, papers, watermark, what not, all are useless".³

The other article, "Theosophic Freethought", by W.R. Old and S.V. Edge, was also published to repudiate "An Interesting Letter" with the full endorsement of Olcott. After quoting Tennyson, "*There is more faith in honest doubt, Believe me, than in half the creeds*" as justification for their actions, they stated that it "calls for the frankest possible criticism". They wrote:

Certain statements made therein appear to us so far-reaching in their tendency, and at the same time so contrary to the spirit which has hitherto animated the T.S., that to pass over them without comment or protest would amount to a consent we are by no means inclined to yield to them.⁴

Both questioned Judge's statement in "An Interesting Letter":

As to "Master's seal," about which you put me the question, I do not know. Whether He has a seal or uses one is something on which I am ignorant. In my experience I have had messages from the Master, but they bear no seal and I attach no significance to the point.⁵

They challenged Judge by stating in a footnote in “Theosophic Freethought”:

In regard to this statement we can only remark that Mr. Judge’s memory must be seriously defective. We must therefore remind him that a very important step in connection with the re-organization of the Esoteric Section of the T.S. was taken, after the death of H.P.B., on the authority of a certain message, purporting to come from one of the Mahátmás, and which bore, as Mr. Judge will now remember, a seal-impression, said by him to be that of “the Master.” No doubt Mr. Judge will take the opportunity of either rectifying his statement or of showing how his acting upon the authority of “the Master’s” seal at one time, and professing ignorance of it at another, may be regarded as consistent.⁶

After consultation, Judge and Besant jointly suspended Walter R. Old and Sidney V. Edge in August 1893 from their membership in the E.S.T. for violating their pledge of secrecy. In a jointly issued Circular, Judge and Besant wrote:

The article was given to public printers and sent in advance to many persons in Europe, but it was not sent in time in London, where Brother Judge was in July, to permit our cabling to India, and no previous notice was given Brother Judge, nor was he asked his views.

This footnote is, *first*, a violation of the pledge of secrecy made by Brother Old, in that it published to the world a statement by him in relation to a private E.S.T. Council meeting, and *second*, is a violation of honor and confidence as a member of the Council of the E.S.T. By reason of the above we are compelled to take action.⁷

This was a most interesting position for Besant to take and raises suspicions about her motives and integrity. Apparently Besant had already been made aware within the last year by a member of the Bombay Branch about certain innuendos and their suspicions of Judge committing acts of fraud, but she was still publicly supporting Judge and his policies as before, equal in her eyes to the policies of H.P.B.⁸

Another article by E.T. Sturdy contributed much to malaise within the Society. He had asked Besant, Editor of **Lucifer**, to publish his article, “Gurus and Chelas”, which she did in the August 1893 issue. However she expurgated three paragraphs at the end of the article, without disclosing so, which were aimed at Judge. Sturdy was a close follower of Olcott and a great admirer of Besant. Upset with the results, Sturdy asked Olcott to re-publish his article in **The Theosophist**. Olcott obliged and reprinted it in the October 1893 issue with the formerly removed paragraphs. Here are Sturdy’s expurgated paragraphs, which he considered the pith of his argument:

[Of concrete things and persons we need concrete proofs. Of concrete letters and messages from living men, we need concrete evidence; not metaphysical or mere argumentative proof. Yet you can never *disprove* these claims. If I choose to send a letter in green, blue, or red or any other coloured ink or pencil and tell you I received it from a Mahatma for you, or merely say nothing and enclose it in a letter to you; you may be very much astonished, but you can prove no lie or forgery against me. If you are wise you will act as if you had never received it; unless indeed you make a mental note or two against me; one of folly for my having done such a thing and given no proofs, and another of watchfulness as to my character generally.

Nor does it seem probable that the Mahatmas, who, as far as we know, teach no dogmas, but always act by the amount of understanding an individual has, would encourage a system of mere statement and claim without accompanying proof; for this would be to lay the seeds in men’s hearts of a faith in the statements of other men quite outside their experience and quite unsupported, men whose hearts they had not fathomed. This would lead back to all the evils of the past, not forward into light and knowledge.

All such is glamour: there is no false mystery in chelaship; all nonsense about “developing intuition” is merely making excuses for what cannot be proven and is about the same in the end as the Christian

“faith.” Let a man go on his path acting sternly by what he *knows*, not by what he is asked or persuaded to believe. Let him act by no directions which *may* be merely the thoughts of others no wiser than himself. How does he know? He does not know. Then let him be quite clear and straightforward in this, that he does not know.]⁹

Within a few weeks of returning to England from America following The Theosophical Congress in Chicago, Besant left for her first visit to India, accompanied by Countess Wachtmeister. They reached Colombo on November 10th, 1893. Walter R. Old who had been at Adyar for one year by then must have been excited with Besant’s arrival in India. He documented that at Tuticorin “Mrs. Besant set foot on Indian soil on the 16th Nov. at 10h. 24m. A.M.”¹⁰ There were a number of issues he wanted to confront her with.

Old, a professional astrologer, was working on Besant’s astrological chart at the time. He likely wanted to discuss a few details about her horoscope which he was planning to publish under his pseudonym, Sefharial, in the January issue of **The Theosophist**. When preparing the progression part of her chart he recognized that there were evil influences which appeared to be affecting her.

From the present year (1893) till the close of the century, *a series of evil primary directions are formed in the horoscope*, and it is to be hoped that the effects signified thereby — severe illness, loss of friends, changes in life, severed links, home troubles and losses, — will lose some of their keen edge when working out their destined purpose in a life already charged with so much sorrow and hardship.¹¹ [Italics added]

In August that year he and Sidney V. Edge had been suspended from their membership in the E.S.T. for violating their pledge of secrecy governing this body. This was the crucial issue Old was particularly concerned with and he wanted to justify his actions to Besant. Old later explained what happened in a letter to the **Westminster Gazette**:

For this act of mine, I was suspended from my membership in the Esoteric Section, under the authority of the joint signatures of William Q. Judge and Annie Besant, Outer Heads of the E.S.T., and my name was dishonourably mentioned before the members of the E.S., among whom I numbered many an old colleague and friend. The mandate somehow found its way into the public Press. However, there was one advantage. After her official action in suspending me from membership Mrs. Besant was, of course, bound to hear my justification. This happened at Adyar in the winter of 1893.¹²

Old continued with his explanation as to what happened next.

Mrs. Besant’s first remark to me after reading the case and examining the documents was, “You were perfectly justified by the facts before you.”

In the presence of the president-founder Colonel Olcott, Mrs. Besant, Countess Wachtmeister, Mr. E. T. Sturdy, together with Mr. Edge and myself, it was decided that the task of officially bringing the charges should devolve upon Mrs. Besant, and that the whole of the evidence should be published. Consequently, the documents were handed over to Mrs. Besant for the purpose of drawing up her charges, and the president sent an official letter — or, as Colonel Olcott now claims, a “private letter” in official form — dated at Agra, February 12[7th], 1894, to Mr. Judge as vice-president. . . .¹³

There is sufficient information in the Chronology to enable one to undo the significant knots being tied during this time — 1893.

Chapter 15

Suspicious Take Root – The September 1884 Letter

As outlined in Chapter 2, in 1884 the Coulombs collaborated with the Christian missionaries to denounce Blavatsky as a fraud. It was shortly after publication of a series of articles titled “The Collapse of Koot Hoomi” (the first of which appeared on September 11th, 1884, in the **Christian College Magazine** of Madras) that Judge N.D. Khandalavala had written to W.Q. Judge asking him to look at the originals of the published letters. He was seeking Judge’s opinion as to whether or not “those letters could have been tampered with”.¹ Judge did see some of those letters and his response to N.D.K.’s queries, dated September 17th, 1884, eventually became Exhibit “A” in the “Judge Case” which ensued some ten years later.

Among the documents reviewed on December 22nd, 1893, the day after the arrival of Walter Old and Edward Sturdy, was the September 17th, 1884, letter. The puzzling question is, how did this letter (Exhibit “A”) from W.Q. Judge to Judge Khandalavala, of Poona, get to Adyar? There are a number of possibilities:

- Judge Khandalavala brought it with him to Adyar for the Ninth Annual Convention held at Adyar on December 27th to 31st, 1884.
- Judge Khandalavala gave it to Bertram Keightley in September 1890 shortly after Keightley’s arrival in India or when, as General Secretary of India, Keightley visited Poona from January 31st until the morning of February 3rd, 1892,² and was his guest.
- Judge Khandalavala gave it to someone in his Branch and they brought the letter to Adyar.
- In December 1889 during the time of the Bombay Convention, Judge Khandalavala handed the letter over to Richard Harte.

The first option is highly unlikely. If the letter had been brought to Adyar at that time then Olcott would have seen it. It could have been brought to Adyar and left there for Olcott to review whenever possible — but Olcott apparently did not see it then.

At first Judge’s 1884 letter was comforting to Khandalavala and induced him to write letters in Blavatsky’s defense. But Khandalavala’s nature was such that he quickly began to doubt Judge, which aroused in him doubts and suspicions about Blavatsky as well. He pondered the possibility that she was not what he had first been convinced she was, and that she was in fact a medium and the Mahatmas were only a figment of her imagination. Although he liked Blavatsky very much and kept in contact with her after she left India, he began to doubt the involvement of the Masters. It is also possible that he brought the letter to Adyar shortly after receiving it and that he used it to influence other members of the 1885 Committee to cast suspicion and doubt about Blavatsky’s innocence, which contributed to the Committee’s recommendation “that Madame Blavatsky should not prosecute her defamers in a Court of Law.”³

The second possibility is also unlikely. Although Bertram Keightley had just delivered Blavatsky’s Open Letter (later published as “Why I Do Not Return to India”), Khandalavala did not know him well — Keightley having just arrived in India for the first time. N.D.K., therefore, would not likely have entrusted him with such a responsibility. Nor would it have been convenient to give it to Keightley in early 1892 as he was on a tour and was not returning to Adyar for some time. Both of these possibilities are further negated since it appears Keightley initially found out about the letter only after it was uncovered by Walter Old.

The possibility of Judge Khandalavala having given it to a Poona member to bring to Adyar is also unlikely, considering the perceived significance of this document.

The most likely scenario is the letter having been handed over to Richard Harte. He had demonstrated through his articles in **The Theosophist** that he had a certain affinity toward the Indians. Harte's two main articles, "Applied Theosophy" and "The Situation", were certainly supportive of the Indian psyche. They encouraged the membership from all over the world to look upon Adyar as a holy place deserving recognition as the giver of life to the rest of the Theosophical Society. Once again there is sufficient information elsewhere within these pages to follow what occurred as a result of Harte's articles. Richard Harte, who was acting Editor while Olcott was away in Japan, would have attended the Bombay Conference in December 1889 to report on activities and fraternize with members. Judge Khandalavala likely felt secure in trusting Harte and gave him the 1884 letter from W.Q. Judge to bring to Adyar. Olcott, being away in Japan, would not have seen it then.

Although Judge's 1884 letter to Khandalavala was now at headquarters in Adyar, Olcott did not see it until Old uncovered it. Bertram Keightley was busy touring and lecturing and had started the first Indian Section journal, **The Prasnottara** (Questions and Answers). With Harte having brought the Judge letter to Adyar the rumors which had been circulating around Poona and Bombay were now also being circulated around Adyar.

Richard Harte returned to England after his editorial relation with **The Theosophist** ended in March 1891. Walter Old left England in late fall of 1892, and arrived at Adyar on December 21st, 1892 where, on December 22nd the letter was uncovered. The most likely scenario is that Harte informed Old about the letter and where he could find it once he got to Adyar. This Old did and showed it to Olcott first then to the other conspirators, as described by Olcott.

There is yet another alternative as to what may have happened with the 1884 letter. When Richard Harte returned to England he could have brought the letter with him to London and later given it to Walter Old. Old left some time in late fall of 1892 and would have had plenty of opportunity to show it to Besant before they were both in Adyar in December 1893. There is only a very slight possibility this could have occurred as Besant did not see the evidence until she reached India. If Harte had indeed brought the letter to London he could have used it to confront Blavatsky and justify his actions against Judge. Had this in fact transpired, a record of Blavatsky's reaction to such an event would surely have surfaced; this is something she would not have ignored. Also, if the letter had been in Old's possession for any great length of time he would have had a duplicate made and it would have surfaced either in **Isis Very Much Unveiled** or in some other medium. Following its discovery it was always kept by Olcott and then belonged to the Archives at Adyar.

Judge had not been supplied with copies of the documents as legally required in order for him to prepare a defense, nor was he granted an inspection of them prior to the Judicial Committee hearing in London July 7th and 10th, 1894. He persisted with his request to at least be shown the documents before returning to America. (See Chapter 21 for details.) As far as can be determined, of the documents Judge was shown July 19th, 1894, in the presence of Dr. Buck, only one crucial piece of material evidence has surfaced.

A document came into the hands of the writer in spring 1989. It was a single sheet of paper; a letter that was hard to read except for the header and the date. It was handwritten on Adyar letterhead paper, 10½ inches by 8 inches, folded in half, thereby making four pages, each measuring 5¼ inches wide by 8 inches. Page 1 is on the right hand side of this sheet; page two on the left hand side and, when folded in half, page 2 becomes page 4, leaving the opposite side (inside) of the sheet blank. The paper was very thin and the writing on the opposite side could easily be seen through it. When the back of the letter was inspected more closely, a date was discovered written at an angle across the first page. The note was "Seen by W.Q.J. July 19/94". Doris and Ted Davy were asked to transcribe it and my wife and I did likewise. A copy of the letter and the transcript are included here.

(174) A

SECRETARY'S OFFICE OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

Adyar, (Madras) India.

Sept. 17, 1884.

Dear Brother Anaji

It is not at all like her handwriting. Your amateur is not expert; I can do better myself, unless there be

H. S. Dethy

H. P. Blywatsky

Admiral T. D. Nally

Do not show these to any one but yourself and your family

forgery can be committed. And if you say Coulomb's clever forgery of Dr. Hartmann's letter you would begin to be sure that to forge Mr B's writing would be child's play to her.

We have an explanation of the telegram. You know it was not for Nassau. It was for Hudson.

At the proper time P. Deb will
 be produced & it will be shown
 how Mrs C. got the telegram.
 So do not be distressed now
 in a hurry. As for phenomena
 they have happened here since
 H. B. went away; and they
 have happened in N.Y. & Me.
 Hereafter let philosophy and
 phenomena be spoken of because
 this is not spiritualism where
 phenomena are produced for
 money under conditions.

You must have the pamphlet
 by this time. H. B. is sick in
 London with rheumatism. He
 will be returning as soon as he
 meets Sam Fox who will be there
 in a few days.

Respectfully
 Yours truly

William D. Fox

SECRETARY'S OFFICE OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

Adyar (Madras) India

April 17/1904

Dear Sir,

I have the pleasure to inform you that the book you have ordered has been forwarded to you by the publishers. It is not yet published, and is not yet in the hands of the public. It is a very interesting and valuable work, and I trust you will find it so.

Yours faithfully,
 The Secretary

I have the pleasure to inform you that the book you have ordered has been forwarded to you by the publishers. It is not yet published, and is not yet in the hands of the public. It is a very interesting and valuable work, and I trust you will find it so.

Yours faithfully,
 The Secretary

A
 SECRETARY'S OFFICE OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
 ADYAR, (MADRAS) INDIA
 Sept. 17, 1884

Dear Brother Navroji

It is not at all like her handwriting. Your amateur is not expert; I can do better myself, witness these by a [friend].

H.S. Olcott
 H.P. Blavatsky
 A.D. Ezekiel N Dorabji

"Do not show these to anyone but Ezekiel and cut them out of _____."

So you see that forgery can be committed. And if you saw Coulomb's clever forgery of Dr. Hartmann's letter you would begin to be sure that to forge Mme B's writing would be child's play to her.

We have an explanation of the telegram. You know it was not for [Jacob] Sassoon[‡]. It was for Madam.

At the proper time R[amalinga] Deb will be produced and it will be shown how Mrs. C. got the telegram. So do not be distressed nor in a hurry. As for phenomena they have happened here since H.P.B. went away and they have happened in N.Y. to me. Hereafter let philosophy and not phenomena be spoken of because this is not spiritualism where phenomena are produced for money under conditions.

You must have the pamphlet by this time. HPB is sick in London with rheumatism. Olcott will be returning as soon as he meets Lane-Fox who will be there in a few days.

Regards to Ezekiel

Fraternally

William Q. Judge

On other side of page: "Seen by WQJ July 19/94"

[The note on side of sheet is not in W.Q. Judge's handwriting but was likely written by Navroji D. Khandalavala himself. — Compiler]

[‡] See **First Report: Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research**, p.211 and Appendix I, pp.318-321.

Examining Exhibit “A”

The “A” at the top right hand corner of this letter must have been placed there to indicate that it was the primary material evidence to be used against Judge at the July 1894 “Judicial Committee”. Judge explains the significance of this letter (Exhibit “A”):

The last item brought forward by the prosecutor should, if a good piece of evidence, have been produced in the beginning of the charges. It is a letter written by me when I was in India in 18[84]⁴, to the Parsee Judge Khandalavala, at the time of the Coulomb charges against Madame Blavatsky. He had written to me asking me to look at the originals of the published letters, if possible, and give him my opinion. I did see some of those letters and wrote to him on the subject, which was whether any of the letters could have been tampered with. In the middle of the letter I gave him four samples of imitations of handwriting which I say are written by a friend, the words being “*witness these, by a friend,*” after which follow bad imitations of Col. Olcott’s, Madame Blavatsky’s and other signatures. I also refer to a clever forgery, by Mme. Coulomb, of Dr. Hartmann’s handwriting. This letter proves nothing whatever except that I wanted to show this man that forgery could be committed. The prosecutor has hoped to make it appear by this letter, that the execution of a forgery was nothing to me. But if it be put forward to sustain that view, it is weak, because the imitations in it are poor, whereas the prosecutors say that my alleged imitations in messages are perfect. It could be used against me by suppressing the words, “witness these, by a friend.”⁵

Let us analyze some of Judge’s statements. *First*, he admits to having written the letter. *Second*, he states that *a friend* has supplied the imitation signatures. The question then arises, who was the friend? This will be explored later. *Third*, that for the prosecutors to use this material evidence effectively against him, they would have to suppress the words “witness these, by a friend”. With the words “a friend” missing, in this case covered up with a note, the letter reads “witness these by H.S. Olcott, H.P. Blavatsky, A. D. Ezekiel, Dorabji”, which makes it look like Judge wrote the four sample imitations.

The next obvious question is, who wrote the added note? The note is in a different handwriting and is certainly not Judge’s. Another question is why would the note have been positioned where it was when it could have been placed at the top, above the Adyar letterhead or just below it? Interestingly, part of the “a” was not fully suppressed. This in itself supports Judge’s statement that if words were suppressed, “it could be used against me”. This only leads to the conclusion, as explained above, that the note was purposely placed there in order to conceal the words “a friend” to give the reader the impression there were no other words after “by” in the sentence. This would make the sentence read as indicated above. By purposely suppressing the words “a friend” it not only implicated Judge as capable of forging other peoples’ signature but it could be used to claim that he was a fraud as well.

After hours of painstakingly trying to sort out this whole situation the signs keep pointing to the recipient of the letter: Khan Bahadur Nowroji Dorabji Khandalavala (N.D.K.). It is here suggested that after receiving the letter from Judge in 1884, it was Khandalavala who wrote the note which reads: “Do not show these to anyone but Ezekiel. . . .” We can only imagine, because there is no strong evidence to support our claim, that the note was added to the letter and handed over to Pestanji Dorabji Khandalavala, Judge Khandalavala’s brother, who in turn, as requested, showed the letter to A.D. Ezekiel, an elderly member of the Poona Branch. Ezekiel was mentioned in some of the letters in the articles, “The Collapse of Koot Hoomi”, and therefore had a strong interest in the whole situation at the time. As a result of having been shown Judge’s letter by his brother, Pestanji Dorabji Khandalavala had also written a letter in support of H.P.B., dated September 19th, 1884, to the **Bombay Gazette**, at the time of the Coulomb controversy.

There are a number of issues involving Judge Khandalavala which lead us to question his integrity and his trustworthiness as a member of the Theosophical Society and true friend of the Founders. Perhaps the most troubling incident occurred after Walter Old arrived at headquarters on December 21st, 1892, and uncovered

Judge's 1884 letter. After the letter was paraded about to the members at Adyar, Olcott requested Khandalavala's legal advice as to how to proceed in handling this seemingly difficult matter regarding Judge. According to Olcott:

On the arrival of the Delegates to the Convention at the usual time, we submitted the papers to our respected colleague Judge Khandalavala, of Poona, who decidedly advised me to prosecute the case, as it was too serious a menace to the Society's prosperity to allow it to go on.⁶

Khandalavala was repeatedly consulted on the matter, not only by Olcott but also by Annie Besant, a full year after the initial legal consultation requested by Olcott.

Khandalavala was regarded as a highly respectable member of the Theosophical Society and was involved very closely with Olcott and Blavatsky. He had been a member of the special "Committee" which in 1885 advised Blavatsky not to prosecute her defamers in a Court of Law. He was especially close to Olcott after H.P.B. left India and never returned. Khandalavala could organize and influence large groups of Indians to join and *support* the efforts of the Theosophical Movement in India. In a letter to Blavatsky regarding "The Collapse of Koot Hoomi" articles in the **Christian College Magazine**, he wrote:

I made the best of the situation and sent two letters signed by Ezekiel to *The Times* of India which greatly restored the peace of mind of our fellows and sympathisers. It was the Poona Branch that did the most to restore confidence and at best a hundred members if not more have been kept perfectly steady by me.

Regarding Blavatsky's wish to prosecute, he continued:

Last year at the convention [1884] they were just about to make a mess by rushing into the arms of the law. I had intuitively grasped the real danger that lay before us from the very first day of the publication of those blessed letters and in spite of all difficulties I came to Adyar and helped along with others to avoid a course which would have sealed the fate of the Society and overwhelmed us with eternal ruin and shame. Whatever the trust — it was not in a Court of Justice that you were to have it.⁷

Khandalavala was the person who received one of H.P.B.'s *most important letters*, "Why I Do Not Return To India", hand-delivered by Bertram Keightley in August 1890. This Open Letter, addressed "To My Brothers of Aryavarta", was kept hidden for many years before it was ever published. His influence on the Society and in particular on Olcott is hard to ascertain for he kept himself in the shadows, but enough information has surfaced to cast a large black cloud over his head — a cloud of machinations.

The most troubling question is, why did Khandalavala not admit that the words "a friend" had been suppressed from Judge's 1884 letter when asked by Olcott in December 1892 for his expert legal advice regarding the matter? Why did he not reveal that there were words missing in the letter which altered the message? He was a provincial Magistrate in a Small Cause Court in Poona and was, therefore, a lawyer well acquainted with the Law. Being a lawyer and a Magistrate he would have possessed a keen mind for details and should have remembered the specifics of Judge's letter. One would think that he would have known the legal consequences of tampering with what became known as Exhibit "A", the prime piece of material evidence supporting the allegations against Judge. The suppression was so accurately done that no one even suspected the strangeness of the sentence as demonstrated earlier. It leaves us to wonder why he would have suppressed the words "a friend" — unless he had a change of heart.

In July 1893 Khandalavala wrote "Theosophy in The West: The Tendency Towards Dogmatism", in response to Judge's article, "An Interesting Letter". [See previous Chapter for details.] In this article N.D.K. wrote:

In the early days of the Society, much vagueness, and inaccuracy, and many hasty assertions, found their way into the movement. A part of this was excusable at the time, but now the most jealous regard for truth, accuracy of statement, and a banishment of everything tending in the remotest degree to mislead or delude, are peremptorily needed. Eager enthusiasm showing the maximum amount of boldness with a minimum amount of evidence, is scarcely commendable.⁸

I leave to those who seek further answers to digest for themselves the reasons why those words were suppressed, and *how*.

Who Wrote the Imitation Signatures?

It has been explained why Judge wrote the September 17th, 1884, letter, which became known as Exhibit “A”, to Khandalavala. It is here proposed that it was in Madras that Judge wrote the letter, using the letterhead paper from Adyar. It is important to note that Judge did not carry his own paper with him; it was customary for him to take letterhead paper from one headquarters and use it to write letters from another location. He did this in numerous instances and Olcott even tried to use this against him after Blavatsky’s death. It is further proposed that the “friend”⁹ Judge referred to in his **Reply by William Q. Judge**, dated April 29th, 1895, was Master “M” and that he was present at the time of writing.

Prior to September 17th, 1884, in all likelihood Judge wandered off from Adyar. As he had done while in London, he would have explored Madras, the nearest city. Judge had a quiet, placid nature and other sensitive qualities, combined with a propensity to work for Theosophy. He was perhaps even influenced to get away from the tension and swarming activity at the headquarters compound and go to Madras which was a relatively short distance from Adyar. It may have been in Madras that he met Master “M” for the first time while in India as this was the most logical place for them to meet. There is also a less likely possibility — that they met in solitude as Judge sketched the buildings of headquarters. See Chapter 17 for evidence that Judge did have contact with Master “M” while he was in India.

Interestingly, Khandalavala’s ability to imitate her handwriting shocked even H.P.B. In a letter to Sinnett she wrote the following regarding a letter (dated December 29th, 1885) she had received from N.D.K.

I send you a funny thing. Read the 3rd, 4th, & 5th & 6th lines. This is undeniably my handwriting. Kandalavala copied it from my letter to him. When I received and saw it I was positively startled. Let me write it “*staunch* fearless friends whose devotion to the Master and yourself has not wavered one hair’s breath” — I wrote it without looking at it, so as not to be impeded by the desire of copying it. Now I ask you, were such a letter a *whole* letter written in the same handwriting as these two ½ lines wouldn’t [you] swear it was my handwriting? Please put it carefully away and keep it. Why Khandalavala should have copied that sentence in my handwriting I do not know. Once he had written three letters copied from my own and brought them to me and I *swore* to them myself, not knowing what he meant. . . . I tell you these lines *are* in my handwriting and I, the first, would swear to them in any Court.¹⁰

Chapter 16

Indians Summoned For The CAUSE

Judge's September 17th, 1884, letter to Judge Khandalavala — with the help of his friend (Master Morya) — was to provoke a response from him and from the members of the Poona Branch (Blavatsky's friends) to summon their courage, to declare their allegiance to the Movement, to mount a defense for their friend (H.P.B.), to show their commitment to the Theosophical CAUSE and to declare themselves true Theosophists. The Mahatmas had tried on other occasions to stimulate the environment in India but all the attempts had failed. In a letter to A.P. Sinnett, in a venture to establish a new journal, Mahatma Koot Hoomi (K.H.) wrote:

That effort must be made by your friends in the world, and every Hindu theosophist who has the good of his country at heart, and not very afraid to spend energy and his time.¹

In 1883 the Mahatmas had a plan in place for Sinnett to return to India after his visit in England to start a new project, the **Phoenix** journal, which would have been “devoted to the interest of my [K.H.’s] benighted countrymen”² and would have been a strong voice supportive of theosophical thought. Mahatma K.H. continues: “Our paper once established I will never concern myself any more with any worldly enterprise.”³ The letter to Khandalavala, by Judge and Master “M”, was the last attempt to see if the Indians were willing to declare their support. K.H. wrote:

Moreover, we are permitted to reward those who will have helped the most effectually to realize this grand idea (which promises in the end to change the destiny of a whole nation, if conducted by one like *yourself*).⁴

Had the **Phoenix** project been undertaken by Sinnett the whole of the Coulomb affair would have been minimized to a great extent and could possibly have been averted altogether had there been a friendly newspaper in India supporting the Theosophical CAUSE. Before the **Christian College Magazine** published “The Collapse of Koot Hoomi” in September 1884 proofs had been circulated among other papers in India in order to mount support. Much of what ensued could have been avoided if Sinnett had accepted the offer from the Mahatmas to start this newspaper venture.

Khandalavala had come to realize by 1889 that the situation in India needed to be revitalized. He arranged to host a Conference in Bombay in December to see what could be done. He stated:

For various reasons the work is lagging behind in India. We meet this evening with a view to impress upon the minds of members the necessity of taking such steps as may put it on better basis. . . .

Large ideas of philosophy viewed in their true light gives us the only right conception of the great work of the Theosophical Society.⁵

The Bombay Conference concluded with a “Vote of Confidence and Thanks To The Founders.” The statement read as follows:

The Conference further wishes to convey to both of the Founders of the Society, the assurance of its most cordial and grateful recognition of the great services they have rendered to India and are now rendering to the world at large.⁶

The Indian members were flush with their adulation but always fell short with their total commitment to the Theosophical CAUSE and to become *true* theosophists. Very few Brahmans would ever commit themselves to adopting the teaching of Theosophy. Although their system had degenerated they still preferred promoting their own rather than adopting Theosophy, which would have explained theirs. Master Morya stated it plainly:

They join the Society, and though remaining as stubborn as ever in their old beliefs and superstitions, and having never given up caste or one single of their customs, they, in their selfish exclusiveness, expect to see and converse with us and have our help in all and everything. . . . Their forefathers have driven away the followers of the only true philosophy upon earth away from India and now, it is not for the latter to come to them but to them to come to us if they want us.⁷

The Indian members came to the realization that they were losing their Aryan advantage now that **The Secret Doctrine** was published and, with the formation of the Esoteric Section, their belief that in India “every man is naturally and by right of descent a Theosophist”⁸ was in danger of being depreciated. Their salvation came when Besant arrived on Indian soil in 1893 and adopted Hinduism and their system of beliefs.

In his letter to Olcott on August 30th, 1893, Judge summarized the words of Master “M”:

Now as to the general matter of India, here is what he has said to me in substance: “India is spiritually proud, that is why the Indian section is the weakest in the T.S.; the pioneer work of the past should have been followed up by using native agencies to get hold of devotion and devoted work in Hindu members. . . .”⁹

This statement also gives us clues as to why Judge decided to leave India. When Judge was in India, headquarters was being looked after by Indian members of the T.S. Both Subba Row and Damodar held major positions while other Indians were there in minor positions. Master Morya must have mentioned to Judge at that time that his services to the CAUSE would be put to greater use if he returned to America where his true destiny lay. However, as a result of the Hodgson investigation into the Coulomb conspiracy Damodar left headquarters in frustration within the year, never to be seen again, and Subba Row resigned in 1886 on account of differences with H.P.B. and Judge in the publishing of **The Secret Doctrine**.

Olcott was always so busy with administration, and attending to his lecture circuit and touring various countries, that he took the easy way to replenish his staff by convincing members from abroad to come to India and serve the CAUSE at Adyar headquarters. This to a great extent discouraged Indian members from dedicating themselves to the Society in such a way as to encourage others to rally together, as might have occurred had they been given the opportunity to serve in major positions at the time.

Chapter 17

W.Q. Judge's Initiation

Dr. Franz Hartmann, who was at Adyar when Judge arrived there on August 10th, 1884, had been warned by Master "M" to not give Judge a hard time. He had received a note from Master "M" stating: "Be friendly towards W.Q. Judge. He is true, faithful and trustworthy. . ."¹ From this note we can gather that "M" had been observing Judge for some time — actually since 1875 — after all, H.P.B. stated in 1888 that Judge had been "a chela of thirteen years standing".² Judge was in India because of a note written in red pencil attached to one of Damodar's letters which stated: "Better come M ^".³ It was customary for Master M's notes to be written in red pencil.

Upon his arrival at Adyar headquarters, Judge was busy organizing witnesses to examine the handiwork of the Coulombs and record their findings. Over three hundred people examined the conditions and appearance of things and signed their names to a declaration in a register. At times he would wander off by himself and sketch the buildings at headquarters where he was staying. Judge stated that he knew intuitively that he had to go to India. Olcott had seen an opportunity to take advantage of Judge's talent as a lawyer to send him there to take charge of the investigation into the Coulomb affair. Judge on the other hand was at Adyar for other reasons and he soon discovered why.

Adyar headquarters was not the most hospitable place for a sensitive man like Judge. Apart from all the commotion regarding the Coulomb investigation and the endless visitors there were other influences at work as well. Hartmann describes his experience at Adyar during his nine months' stay at headquarters.

If we are once convinced that there are Adepts in White Magic, it will require only a small stretch of the imagination to believe that there are black magicians too, and that they are naturally opposed to and trying to counteract everything that the former wish to accomplish. Although those black magicians necessarily work in secret and in the dark, nevertheless I have received during my stay at Adyar a certain amount of evidence that such black magicians exist and that they are working to counteract and impede the work done by the Theosophical Society. . . .

. . . [O]ne night I saw a "black magician" in my room. He was there in his *astral body*, standing in midair about two feet from the floor and was making magnetic passes over me of a kind that I had never seen before, and which instead of seeming to communicate some influence to me appeared to draw something from me. . . . Something told me, to get up and take a certain amulet, which was lying upon the table, and which I had received from the *Master*. This I did and the influence left, but on subsequent occasions I frequently felt it again; it would appear suddenly and without provocation, and tempt me to say and do things which were against my better judgment; but I believe that except in minor and insignificant cases I have always been able to overcome them.⁴

Amulets or talismans were quite often used by the Brothers of White Magic, in this case by the Mahatmas of the Theosophical Society. H.P.B. wore her signet ring as a talisman, as well as other jewelry. As detailed in Chapter 2, Judge wore H.P.B.'s ring for a day while in Paris to stabilize his constitution. Judge explained that "she gave me to wear all day her talisman ring which is of great value and strength. It has a double triangle and the Sanscrit for 'life' on it. This helped me. . . ."⁵

Another example of the use of amulets was the case of Dharbaghiri Nath. As a youth, before the formation of the Theosophical Society, he had been visited by the "Master" who gave him an amulet for protection for his wanderings through the jungles. In telling his story he claims that he had been attacked by Dugpas and other Black Magicians and the amulet helped to save him from harm.

As there is “the law of perfect justice and equilibrium which pervades nature”,⁶ and by the law of analogy and correspondence, Adepts of black magic and Dugpas also have their ways of magnetizing objects, others, or even themselves in order to captivate their intended victim. Such was the case with Chakravarti on Annie Besant during the summer of 1893. That summer Besant had removed H.P.B.’s signet ring from her finger to have it fitted with another ring on the inside so it would fit better on her finger and reduce the risk of her losing it. Chakravarti arrived in London in July and was there for two months⁷ before leaving with Besant for the Parliament of Religions in Chicago. It was at this time that Archibald Keightley and others observed Chakravarti’s frequent magnetization of Besant.

It is not known whether Judge was given an amulet or talisman before going to Adyar to wear as protection against evil influences but we do know that he was being closely watched by Master “M”. In her Open Letter addressed “To My Brothers of Aryavarta” and later published as “Why I Do Not Return to India”, mentioned earlier, H.P.B. recognized that after her departure from Adyar in early 1885 there had been an increase in strife and conflict among personalities there. It becomes obvious that the Adyar headquarters was under constant supervision by the Adepts of Black Magic in order to take advantage of opportunities to influence the people working there. Headquarters was a very busy place, with known visitors as well as unknown, in both physical and other forms. It is no wonder that Judge would have gone off on his own to seek refuge from all the activity.

Sparse documentation concerning the activities of Judge while he was in India has led to certain deductions having to be arrived at. For example, it was earlier determined that Judge would have had to leave India on or around October 26th, 1884, in order to be in England for a day or so, as he indicated in a letter to H.P.B., then board the British steamer S.S. *Wisconsin* on November 15th, 1884, for New York. Unfortunately, Judge became very silent about what happened to him in India after September 21st. Sometimes this in itself can prove to be most revealing. In a letter to Jasper Niemand Judge explained:

[T]he true chela does not talk much of his Master and often does not refer to that Master’s existence. It has almost become the same as unnecessarily waving the red flag at a bull. Those of us who have experience do not do it; but the younger ones do.⁸

One has to look hard to find clues as to what happened during this time. By also studying Judge’s behavior before and after 1884 it becomes apparent that he experienced something of great significance at that time.

We know that Judge was living at the Adyar headquarters while he was attending to business. At times the place was crowded with visitors coming there as witnesses or simply out of curiosity. The Visitors Book, the record that can provide information regarding Judge’s comings and goings from headquarters, has not been produced. As explained earlier, none of the reports published at the time depict Judge’s involvement at any functions, ceremonies, writing or signing any documents at headquarters after September 21st, 1884, the day Judge witnessed Babula’s “Statement” after his return from Europe.

To show that Judge was not present at Adyar headquarters after September 21st, 1884, it is important to note that certain functions occurred at which he should have been present or at the very least have his name mentioned since he was the person in charge at the time. The following incident is one such event, but there is no mention of his name. It is provided below as it was recorded.

THE THEOSOPHICAL EXPOSURE
(From our own correspondent.[**Bombay Gazette**])

Madras. Sept. 27, [1884]

This morning the Rev. Mr. Alexander and the Rev. Mr. Patterson, both connected with the **Christian College Magazine**, with Mr. Gribble of the Madras Civil Service, and Mr. Padfield, visited the Theosophical Headquarters and compared the alleged letters of Madame Blavatsky with some in the possession of the Theosophists. In a letter to this evening’s **Mail**, Dr. Hartmann says: “As would

naturally be supposed, the handwriting of the letters produced by our visitors resembled to a certain extent the handwriting of Madame Blavatsky; but the general appearance of them, as well as other minor details, make it appear plain to us that Madame Blavatsky's letters have not been altered in the original, but that they have been copied, and that such additions have been made as were considered necessary to answer the purpose for which they were intended, while some of the most aggravating letters may be entirely spurious. But it is impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion before we hear from Madame Blavatsky. We have been requested to exhibit the occult room to our visitors, which during the past two weeks, has been visited by many people, who were unanimously astonished at the absurdity of the tricks prepared by Mr. Coulomb."⁹

It was reported in the **Madras Mail**, September 29th, 1884, that Judge had addressed "some Madras students"¹⁰ presumably within a day or two of the published item. Some of Judge's activities can be traced up to this point, but where was he until the estimated time of his departure from India circa Sunday, October 26th, 1884? When did he leave Adyar? What was he doing? Who was he with?

It has been pointed out that Judge was likely with Master "M" on September 17th, but there are approximately twenty-eight days, from September 28th on, which cannot be accounted for. Fortunately, H.P.B. gives us the best possible explanation as to what occurred to Judge during those days when he went missing. In a letter from Ostend on October 3rd, 1886, she stated:

The trouble with you is *that you do not know the great change* that came to pass in you a few years ago. Others have occasionally their *astrals* changed & replaced by those of Adepts (as of Elementaries) & they influence the *outer*, and the *higher* man. With you, it is the NIRMANAKAYA not the "astral" that blended with your astral. Hence the dual nature & fighting.¹¹

At the time of the Mystery Schools the initiated, under penalty of death, would never reveal any of its great secrets to the uninitiated or profane. Judge did not mention his initiation at all, not even to H.P.B., his mentor — in this incarnation — since 1875. H.P.B. had to inquire through her Master (Morya) to obtain any information regarding what had happened to Judge while he was in India. Judge most likely took initiations, in general, very seriously and would not even mention any aspect of his own initiation directly; but he could not hide the fact that he had been initiated for through his writings the secret is revealed. His style of writing was simple and direct, much different from that of H.P.B.'s. She stated regarding his magazine, **The Path**:

Once that the Masters have proclaimed your *Path* the *best*, the most *theosophical* of all theosophical publications, surely it is not to allow it to be rubbed out. . . . [Lucifer] is the fighting, combative Manas; the other (*Path*) is pure Buddhi. . . . *Lucifer* will be Theosophy militant and *Path* the shining light, the Star of Peace. If your intuition does not whisper to you "IT IS SO," then that intuition must be wool-gathering. No, sir, the *Path* is too well, too *theosophically* edited for me to interfere.¹²

From this letter of H.P.B.'s, and from Judge's own writings, we can determine with some confidence what kind of preparation Judge underwent, what kind of initiation ensued and how it affected him. As there are myriad initiations we confine our attention to what is available through the writings of H.P.B. mainly. If initiations are associated with the five elements, plus two more, and in relation with the sevenfold constitution of man, then the candidate or chela would be initiated with his corresponding element. The candidate would be tested shortly after having his aura cleansed and that test would determine where the candidate ranked and which initiation he or she was qualified to undertake. For example, H.P.B. states that for the third initiation, the candidate must have the capabilities to use his Will to produce effects associated with feeling, hearing, and seeing. The chela's power is always proportionate to the intensity of his *Will*.

While Judge was in Paris in the spring of 1884 his astral was destabilizing his constitution. There was a need to drive away the negative energies which were the cause for his mental anguish, hence, the blues he was suffering at the time. H.P.B. gave Judge her talisman ring to help him, which it did. When Judge received a copy of the "Prayag letter" in 1893 from an Indian correspondent, he quickly recognized the authenticity

of the letter. He was able to determine its genuineness not only from his intuition but also from his own experience of similar incidents which had occurred to him while in France. This in itself is an indication that the Master must have done something else to or for Judge at that time which he recognized in the content of the letter.

In a biographical series titled, “William Q. Judge”, which ran in **The Irish Theosophist** in 1896, Jasper Niemand (Julia Keightley) wrote:

It is a matter of record that, when the seven years’ probation of this life were over, the Master best known in connection with the T.S. sent to Mr. Judge, through H.P.B., His photograph, inscribed upon the back “to my colleague,” with a cryptogram and signature; and, a little later, a letter of thanks and advice, delivered to Mr. Judge in Paris by H.P.B. A message sent to him through H.P.B. in writing from the Lodge at about this time ends by saying: “Those who do all that they can and the best they know how do enough for us.”¹³

While they were in Paris, H.P.B. had informed Judge “that the Master had told her in India, that he [Master M.] was doing, or ‘about to do something with and for me’.”¹⁴

Judge gained in confidence and his Will appeared to gain in strength following his experiences in Paris. As indicated in Chapter 2, H.P.B. tested his ability to pick up on messages and impressions coming to her, and he became more aware of the positive energies around him. It was also during this time that he was instructed on how elementals and elementaries affect one’s constitution. What Judge went through during his stay in France were simply preparations that all chelas have to undergo prior to the actual event. The initiation took place later that year while he was in India.

A few years later H.P.B. stated that for Judge it was the Nirmanakaya which blended with his astral. Nirmanakayas of the Path of Compassion are:

[D]eceased Adepts who refuse Nirvana and prefer doing good to the world by remaining present and alive in the astral body in the sphere of the earth. They differ from the astral shades of ordinary mortals in so far that the Mayavi Rupa remains whole, and with the exception of the physical body they have all the other principles.¹⁵

There are many different degrees of Nirmanakayas. Judge gives us a hint as to what happened to him by using Napoleon as his example of an historical person who had been overshadowed and influenced by a Nirmanakaya. Judge states:

Nirmanakayas — constantly engage in this work deemed by them greater than earthly enterprises: the betterment of the soul of man, and any other good that they can accomplish through human agents. . . . Nirmanakayas . . . work behind the veil and prepare the material for a definite end.¹⁶

The complexities of Judge’s initiation appear to have been very substantial and must have taken the Masters some time to conduct. We can only surmise that Judge’s body was placed somewhere and protected from *any* influences while his consciousness underwent this initiation. Judge’s body was presumably laid in a comatose state and his consciousness extricated for initiation. The other option was for Judge to have personally gone to Tibet, as had Blavatsky years before, but this was unlikely.

Having an initiation is comparable to having surgery — a certain amount of time is needed to convalesce. Sometimes it takes months or years depending on the operation required. In Judge’s case the blending of the Nirmanakaya with his astral may have taken a substantial amount of time. A noticeable change occurred in him at about the time he started his **Path** magazine in the spring of 1886.

H.P.B. also indicated the high level of confidence and respect she had in Judge's abilities by acknowledging Judge's initiated status, stating:

W.Q.J. is the *Antaskarana* between the two *Manas(es)* the American thought & the Indian — or rather the trans-Himalayan Esoteric Knowledge.¹⁷

This declaration by H.P.B. in itself indicates that he had been initiated by the Masters of Esoteric Buddhism.

After his initiation Judge decided, or was advised, that there were no reasons for him to stay in India. The Coulomb affair was under control and Olcott and Blavatsky were expected back at Adyar soon. Judge left letters behind for them, fully explaining and assuring his continued affection and friendship. After his return to New York Judge received letters from Olcott criticizing him for leaving early, accusing Judge: “you left India because you have 2 children” and “Ah! you left because Hartmann palmed off on you a pretended (directive?) so to do.”¹⁸ At first, not knowing that Judge had been initiated, H.P.B. was quite upset with Judge for leaving early or even at all. Judge says that Blavatsky wrote to him “to grieve over my backsliding”. The idea had been that Judge might even stay in India for good — he had made arrangements for his wife in the event that he did not return. After his initiation all changed. In his letter of May 16th, 1885, to Blavatsky, Judge gives clues as to what happened. He states:

I did not leave India because I got a message from a Mahatma. *I never got any message from any Mahatma either pretended or real while I was in India. That disposes of Hartmann. . . . My dear HPB if Master will not enlighten you about me then I must say nothing and remain to work out my own salvation as I can. . . .*

I tell you neither you, nor Olcott, nor Holloway, nor deceit, nor trick, nor message, nor devil, nor Hartmann, had anything to do with my departure from India, and perhaps someday that departure will be of benefit to the Society and the Cause.¹⁹

At first glance it appears that Judge had covered all the bases but by analyzing his statement some interesting information is discovered. He mentions what did *not* make him leave India but left out the real reason why he did, and implies that he “must say nothing.” Hence, H.P.B.'s letter from Ostend dated October 3rd, 1886, which clearly reveals that Judge had been initiated while he was in India. Both were initiated by Master Morya and both fell under his direct responsibility.

Judge specifically mentions that he did not leave India because of *any messages* but this excludes the fact that he had direct contact with Mahatmas. The only logical conclusion which can be drawn from his letter is that he met with Master Morya leading up to his initiation. As explained earlier, Judge met with Master Morya on September 17th, 1884, when the letter which included the “four samples of imitations of handwriting . . . written by a friend”²⁰ was penned, and then sent to Judge Khandalavala in Poona.

Another significant passage is “perhaps someday that departure will be of benefit to the Society and the Cause”. This again alluded to his initiation but it also had other significance. This meant that he had to return to America where the duty rested upon him to establish the Theosophical Movement in the West, in particular North America. Although India had maintained the Ancient Wisdom, much had deteriorated into superstitions, beliefs and rituals. Many of the books of Occult treasures were disintegrating and were badly in need of a revival in order to preserve the Aryan philosophy. H.P.B. stated:

Without the revival of Aryan philosophy, for which we are labouring, the West will tend towards the grossest materialism. . . .²¹

Judge's responsibility, in part, was to encourage the Indian theosophists to cooperate with him to release their treasures for the western world. After returning from India Judge made it one of his priorities, and in 1891 founded the instrument for publishing a large number of *Oriental Department Papers* consisting of Sanskrit and other Oriental Scriptures. (See: Bibliography of Works by and about William Q. Judge.) In the

Supplement to the March 1891 issue of **The Theosophist**, (pp.xxx-xxxii), Bertram Keightley, in his “General Secretary’s Report” quotes extensively from a circular “received from Mr. William Q. Judge, the General Secretary of the American Section, which bears the official endorsement of the Executive Committee of that Section, and a strong recommendation, both personal and official, from our revered H.P. Blavatsky”. Judge proposed a cooperative effort to translate and publish Hindu texts “to give to the world the impression that this work is the united work of the entire Society”. His plan was “to make this a distinct department of the American work, giving, however, to the Indian Section . . . full credit for the matter printed”. He proposed printing uniform pamphlets of “these translations and papers. . . every month or oftener as occasion may require, and in quantity sufficient to distribute them freely to all our American members, and to send back to India enough to meet the needs there”.

Judge understood and expounded the value of the Aryan literature. His adaptations and commentaries are highly valued in some theosophical circles and are used in various universities as references.

Chapter 18

Convention of 1893

One year after the arrival of Old and Sturdy at headquarters and the uncovering of allegedly incriminating evidence against Judge, the Annual Convention held at Adyar, December 27th to 30th, 1893, appears to have been the opportune time to discuss and sanction the previous year's decision to proceed with the case against Judge. A number of skillful lawyers who were on the various Boards and Committees, for example, G.N. Chakravarti, were in attendance and, according to Besant's Diary for December 20th and 22nd, 1893, Judge Khandalavala of Poona was also present for consultations.¹

Besant, who had arrived in India for the first time on November 16th, 1893, was scheduled to be in Madras from December 19th, 1893, leaving January 7th, 1894, and expected in Calcutta on the 10th. The much anticipated gifted orator, as she had been promoted by Bertram Keightley, was received by huge crowds wherever she went. It was no wonder that "the attendance was exceptionally large"² for the Anniversary meeting held at Adyar from December 27th to 30th. There she met Tookaram Tatya from Bombay, Judge Khandalavala from Poona and her new guru, G.N. Chakravarti, from Allahabad.

Olcott opened the Adyar convention with his Annual Address. After welcoming his "brothers, friends and colleagues", he stated:

The night's blackness is rolling away, the dawn of a happier day is breaking. Thanks — as I believe — to the kind help of those whom I call my Masters and the Elder Brothers of the race, our patient and loyal persistence is about being [sic] rewarded by help of the most valuable kind, for they have sent me "Annabai" [Annie Besant] to share my burden, relieve our mental distress, and win the respect and sympathy of good people. While she is not yet able to quite fill the void left by the departure of my co-Founder, H.P.B., she will be in time, and meanwhile is able to render service that her Teacher could not, by her peerless oratory and her scientific training. This meeting will be historical, as marking her first appearance at our Annual Conventions: — her first, but not her last, for I have some reason to hope that she will devote a certain part of her future years to Indian work. (Great applause.)

Mrs. Besant's and my close association in the Indian tour now in progress, and the consequent mutual insight into our respective characters and motives of action, has brought us to a perfect understanding which, I believe, nothing can henceforth shake. *She and I are now at one as regards the proper scope and function of the E.S.T. as one of the activities carried on by our members. . . .* Whatever misunderstandings have occurred hitherto with respect to the exact relationship between the Society, as a body, and the Esoteric Section which I chartered in 1888, — now known as the Eastern School of Theosophy — and of which she is the sweet spirit and the guiding star, have passed away — I hope, forever.³ [Italics added]

The reader should bear in mind the specific declaration of H.P.B. that "the E.S.T. (Eastern School of Theosophy) has no official connection with the Theosophical Society"⁴ as a body, and the historical fact that its formation was opposed and its conduct under H.P.B. disapproved by Olcott. By this time Olcott had become reluctant to ever allow Judge to become President of the T.S. and had in fact declared his preference for Besant. She had already committed her support to Judge as Olcott's successor pending his retirement (announced January 21st, 1892) and had issued a Circular to this effect on March 11th, 1892. Upon withdrawal of his resignation, Besant expressed complete support for Olcott's ideas, his plans and his policies.

Olcott, fully hoodwinked by the maleficent influences at Adyar and by his Hindu and Parsee friends, either did not realize that Besant had never been accepted as a chela by the Masters or he simply assumed she had been because of her recent position as joint head of the E.S. After Blavatsky's death, and before Olcott

arrived in London, a Council Meeting had been held on May 27th, 1891, in which Judge's plan had been endorsed by the Masters. They had inserted a message, "W.Q. Judge's Plan is right", which Besant found amongst her papers. This message only endorsed Judge's suggestion that he and Besant be co-heads of the E.S.,⁵ but was never intended as a message of their acceptance of her as their chela. H.P.B. never stated nor insinuated, and no records were ever published to indicate that Besant had been accepted as a chela of the Masters. Yet Olcott boldly states:

"Annabai" will in time become to me what H.P.B. was, and I shall try to prove as staunch and loyal a colleague to her as I think you will concede I have been to my lamented co-Founder of this Society. In her bright integrity, her passionate love of truth, her grand trained intellect and her unquestioning altruism, I feel a strength and support which acts upon me as the elbow-touch of the comrade to the soldier in battle. Disciples of the same Master, devoted to the same cause, and now friends who know and trust each other. . . .⁶

The President-Founder had considered retiring but as a result of his infatuation with Besant decided to stay on as President, determined to fight it out and rid the Society of Judge. While Judge was promoting harmony and good-will among all Theosophists, Olcott and Besant were plotting against Judge in secrecy. But they were not the only ones.

Both Judge Khandalavala and G.N. Chakravarti were members of the T.S. but neither was ever a member of the Esoteric Section. These two were part of Olcott's *eminent counsel* whom he depended upon for legal advice. They were members of the Committee which, at the Convention in December 1884, unanimously recommended that no defense be made on behalf of H.P.B. against the Coulomb charges. They were also among the powers behind the President who influenced his decision-making. Both were in favor of having Adyar as the spiritual center for all of the Theosophical Movement around the world and both felt indignant about Judge, each for their own reasons.

The Brahmans in India were suspicious that the Theosophical Society was losing its impartiality as equal friend to all religions and was becoming distinctly Buddhist in its sympathies and affiliations. The Brahmans hesitated to enter its membership and to cooperate in its work by withholding aid in bringing out priceless literary treasures to make available to the West. Judge was aware of this problem and sent out an Open Letter on April 5th, 1893, to as many Brahmans as he could reach. The letter was marked "To The Brahmins of India"⁷ and its purpose was to encourage a revival of their confidence in the Theosophical Society.

Shortly after Judge's Open Letter, he received a note along with a copy of a letter from Benee Madhad Battacharya, at one time the president of the Prayag T.S. in Allahabad. It was a message which Sinnett was directed by one of the Brothers, writing through Blavatsky in November 1881, to convey to the native members of the Prayag Branch of the Theosophical Society. Professor G.N. Chakravarti arrived in New York on September 2nd, 1893.⁸ When Judge showed him the copy of this (the "Prayag") letter, Chakravarti declared it a "forgery and a humbug", as did Besant. The letter was later published by Judge in **The Path** under title, "A Mahatma's Message to Some Brahmans", as "a genuine message". Judge stated that "its philosophical and occult references are furthermore confirmed by the manuscript of part of the third volume of the *Secret Doctrine*, not yet printed."⁹ This letter added to Chakravarti's reasons for resenting Judge. Khandalavala had similar reasons for resenting Judge as well.

In the April 1895 **Theosophist** Olcott added a presidential "Postscript", dated March 27th, 1895, to denounce "A Mahatma's Message to Some Brahmans" published by Judge.

The message is one of the most transparently unconvincing in the history of Mahatmic literature. It bears upon its face the seal of its condemnation. It is an ill-tempered attack upon the Brahman gentleman's orthodoxy, under the guise of a general threat that none of his caste can approach the

Masters save by “giving up entirely caste” . . . “old superstitions” . . . “faith in the gods or god”, etc.
 . . .¹⁰

Franz Hartmann had received a letter from Olcott in which Olcott called his attention to the “Postscript” in **The Theosophist**. Hartmann was aghast and wrote to Judge on April 25th, 1895:

What is the matter? Has the world become struck with blindness, and does the President of the T.S. not know what Theosophy is? Have all the lectures of Mrs. Besant been after all nothing but eloquence mixed with gush? Do our own Theosophical writers only repeat parrot-like what they hear, but without understanding?

. . . I never imagined it possible that anybody could not see the plain meaning of that letter to some Brahmans, in which the Master asks them to strive to *outgrow* their orthodox beliefs and superstitions, faith in gods or a (separate) god, and to attain *real knowledge*.¹¹

For a conspiracy to transpire the fewer people involved the better, and in this case only one person was needed to create enough suspicion and doubt for the entire case against Judge. Once the dominoes were in place, with the proper evil influences to fan the doubts and suspicions, they fell as intended. The plan was to regain India’s heritage as the rightful birthplace from which all Spiritual wisdom came and from which it was to disseminate, with Indians at the controls.

One of the difficulties of proving a conspiracy is knowing who the conspirators are and finding the documentation to support the claim. Strategies planned behind closed doors are not usually revealed to the general public, but because — as in this case — only one individual had the key, others were needed to naively release information in order to substantiate the allegations against Judge. One of those naive persons, one of the easiest to manipulate, was Olcott. Although as mentioned earlier, Olcott’s **Old Diary Leaves** cannot be unquestioningly trusted for accuracy, they do provide a valuable source from which to glean important details, sometimes mentioned only in passing in the telling of an unrelated story. Also, whether a topic is included or left out is sometimes equally telling. When pertinent information is sifted properly it can also produce details to implicate the one who conveniently avoided publicity, and thereby prove that Judge Khandalavala had ongoing involvement in the case against Judge.

By December 1893, Olcott, President, and his obedient “General Council” had changed all the original Rules of the Society since its inception in 1875. Olcott governed with absolute autocracy, by decree and “Executive Notice”. The newly “Revised Rules” proclaimed by Olcott were drawn up specifically to shift power from the general membership to a much more manageable group, a “Judicial Committee”, whereby the authorized few could divest themselves, with a three-fourths majority, of censurable officers of the T.S. — namely William Q. Judge.

Chapter 19

G. N. Chakravarti

Shortly after the invitation was sent to Gyanendra Nath Chakravarti asking him to be the delegate representing India at The Theosophical Congress (at the World's Fair in Chicago) a "discouraging reply was received" and "at first it seemed that he could not come".¹ He was apparently too busy, having only completed his law degree from the University of Allahabad in January 1893, and joined the Bar at Allahabad in April. After the American Convention Bertram Keightley returned to England and waited for further word from his friend. Judge also left for England to attend the Third Annual Convention of the European Section held on July 6th and 7th, 1893. "Judge arrived at Southampton June 24th, where Dr. and Mrs. A. Keightley met him, and he got to Headquarters on the evening of the same day."²

Sometime "in June [Chakravarti] consented at the risk of losing his caste, and started for London."³ Having researched the meaning of the words "at the risk of losing his caste" some interesting explanations have been elicited regarding the Hindu religion but more specifically the high-caste system of some Brahman families at that time. These words have little significance in today's world but had great importance to some Hindus even fifty years ago. The religious implication of losing caste to a distinguished Brahman such as Chakravarti would have been devastating.

Theosophy (ULT) magazine explains the dilemma.

Serious difficulties at once supervened, for while Mr. Chakravarti was very agreeable to the proposed plan, grave objections were raised among the Brahmins. Such a mingling with "Mllechhas" (foreigners) was offensive to their teachings and traditions, and it was a violation of caste for a Brahmin to cross the seas. Thus, if he attended at all, Chakravarti would be "outcaste" for the time being and would be compelled upon his return either to renounce his caste or to submit to "purificatory rites" which, to Western minds, would be superstitious and degrading, and to an orthodox Brahmin extremely humiliating.⁴

The above comment goes a long way in explaining the Brahman belief system but Chakravarti provided, in his first speech at the Theosophical Congress, the deeper philosophical reasons for his dilemma — that the East is Spirit and the West is Matter.

To the East is given the sacred satisfaction of having given birth to all the great religions of the world, and to the West belongs the proud privilege of having supplied the world with all that can make physical life comfortable and even luxurious.⁵

A study of the states of consciousness (lokas and talas), reveals the following definition for the word Pâtâla: "The nether world, the antipodes; hence in popular superstition the infernal regions, and philosophically the two Americas, which are antipodal to India."⁶ In **The Secret Doctrine** H.P.B. writes of Pâtâla as undeniably being America. Pâtâ or Pâdâ means foot in Sanskrit, and is associated with *the earth*, therefore pâtâla is *something under the feet*.⁷ Before **The Secret Doctrine** was published the interpretation of Pâtâla had degenerated to insinuate *the unclean*, the Brahman's interpretation for *beneath the feet*. Some Brahmins have related to the writer that many wishing to come to America in the last century were faced with the same dilemma as Chakravarti.

It was partly for this reason that Subba Row, "he being an initiated Brahmin and holding to the *Brahmanical esoteric* teaching"⁸ refused to help H.P.B. with **The Secret Doctrine**.

He was greatly disturbed by the vulgar profanation of the Masters' names which had then taken place, and, as a Brâhmana, he strongly disapproved the fact that H.P.B. revealed to the public some of the inner meanings of the Hindû Scriptures, concealed until then in the secrecy of the inner temples.⁹

H.P.B. says: “Such as Subba Row — uncompromising *initiated* Brahmins, will never reveal — even that which they are permitted to. They hate too much Europeans for it.”¹⁰

To continue **Theosophy** (ULT) magazine’s comments:

Nevertheless, the difficulties were resolved and all objections overcome. Mr. Chakravarti formally accepted the invitation to attend the Parliament as the guest of the Society and three Brahminical associations were induced to countenance his mission by appointing him to represent them. They were: the *Hari Bhakti Prodayini* of Cawnpore; *Varnashrama Dharma Sabbha* of Delhi, and the *Sanatan Dharma Rakshani Sabbha* of Meerut. All this, as may be inferred, occupied several months in its accomplishment.¹¹

The American Section had always been very generous with donations going to Adyar. Being the hosts and having the responsibilities for bringing these Delegates to The Theosophical Congress stretched the budget of the American Section to the point that “it was necessary to borrow a part of the needed money in order that Prof. Chakravarti might sail in time”.¹² Judge added a note in the August **Path** earnestly inviting the members from Europe and America to send whatever money they could spare for this object.

Chakravarti arrived in London in July and on August 10th, 1893, “the occasion of Bro. Bertram Keightley’s interesting lecture on *India and the Theosophical Society*, the [Blavatsky] Lodge had, for the first time, the pleasure of hearing Bro. Chakravarti.”¹³ On the 17th “Bro. Chakravarti again spoke, as also did Bro. Dharmapala, who is likewise passing through London on his way to represent the Buddhists at the Parliament of Religions.”¹⁴ The former stayed at headquarters on Avenue Road while the latter stayed with Sir Edwin Arnold.

Many Theosophists who met Chakravarti at the Parliament of Religions in Chicago were not impressed with his demeanor. Although he spoke well they considered him condescending. Professor Arthur H. Nethercot, in **The First Five Lives of Annie Besant**, wrote the following:

Chakravarti, a light-complexioned, rather fat-faced, sleepy Brahmin, originally from the sacred city of Benares, with a small, drooping, pointed black mustache, a “black, observing eye,” a shiny black turban and a flat white necktie, had taught physical science and mathematics at various Indian colleges and now held the chair of mathematics at Allahabad University. He had also just passed the bar examination there and had a great reputation as a mystic, a student of the great Indian religious literature, and a skilful hypnotist. He spoke a soft, classical English, with a slight accent but with much expressiveness. He had gentle, dignified manners, and yet withal looked rather contemptuously at those about him. Annie Besant was at once fascinated by both his manner and his words. She knew immediately that she would gladly become a chela of this new guru, even if she was old enough to be his mother.¹⁵

Besant was completely bewitched by Chakravarti who was also “the President of the Prayag Students’ Theosophical Association at Allahabad”.¹⁶ Chakravarti had made it his duty in life to study the psychic realms and to develop occult powers. He was a member of the Prayag Society in Allahabad which the Mahatmas had warned about. The members of that Lodge were mostly Orthodox Brahmins who indulged in these practices. From the time Chakravarti arrived in London in July 1893 until their return from America to London on October 4th, 1893, when he “went to stay with [his friend] Mr. Bertram Keightley and his mother”,¹⁷ Besant traveled and lectured with him.

In response to a letter from Jasper Niemand (Julia Keightley) Judge explained why he had been “cold” to Besant at the time.

It is true Annie suffered through my cold and hard feelings. But it was her fault, for I say now as then to Annie, that she, absorbed in Chakravarti, neglected my members, who are my children, and for whom I wanted her best and got her worst. That made me cold, of course, and I had to fight it, and

didn't care if Annie did not like it: I have no time to care. I am glad she has gone to India. It is her trial and her chance, and when she gets back she can see for herself if she is able to prevent the "big head" from coming on as has happened with others.¹⁸

Besant had been taking occult instruction from Chakravarti, as her new guru. During conversation with Dr. J.D. Buck and Dr. Archibald Keightley in 1894, Besant confided "[t]hat she took orders through Mr. Chakravarti as coming from the Master."¹⁹ Many of Besant's friends in England had come to realize that since she had met Chakravarti her behavior had changed. Judge wrote, in a letter to Edmund Garrett:

But you were right when you say that Mrs. Besant made a remarkable change in respect to me. That is true, and Mr. Chakravarti whom you name is, as you correctly say, the person who is responsible for it. Before she met Chakravarti she would not have dreamed of prosecuting me. . . .

. . . But by the influence of the Mr. Chakravarti whom you mention the whole power of the society was moved against me. . . .²⁰

Albert Smythe recounted an episode in Toronto during Besant's visit there following the Congress of Religions at the World's Fair where he noted the beginnings of change in Besant. At a reception in her honor Besant specifically asked each person she was introduced to whether or not they were members of the Society. If the answer was yes she shook their hand; if the answer was no she "said 'Oh' and passed on to the next, without a further word and declining to shake hands. . . ." Smythe wrote that this "gave us a setback in Toronto that we did not recover from for a long period."²¹

Ten days after returning to London from America urgent business compelled Chakravarti's return to India and on October 20th, 1893, Besant proceeded overland to Marseilles, where Countess Wachtmeister joined her for their voyage to India — Besant's first. Bertram Keightley stayed in London with his mother.

Chapter 20

The Proceedings Begin

On February 7th, 1894, Olcott wrote an official communication to Judge. After stating that demands had been forwarded to him by Besant for an official enquiry for his alleged misuse of the Mahatmas' names and handwritings, Olcott gave Judge two options: to retire from all offices or face an enquiry (Judicial Committee). Besant had made her plans and formulated her demands from Allahabad where she had been staying with Chakravarti. Chakravarti by then had strong occult influences over Annie Besant, Walter Old and Bertram Keightley, as well as a few other Europeans at Adyar. Judge Khandalavala may have been influenced as well but it is doubtful as it is believed that his actions were his own, and probably more damaging to the whole of the Theosophical Society and particularly to Judge. As events unfolded it appears that Judge Khandalavala had a strong control over Olcott.

Olcott no longer had H.P.B. to help guide him — but now he had his new guiding light, his star, his ally: Annie Besant. She was a potent influence in the world and a member of the Esoteric School. Little did Olcott realize that the only occult guidance she was receiving was from her new guru, Chakravarti. Olcott had confused Besant's seeming integrity, her professed passionate love of truth and her intellect for occult knowledge and wisdom.

The deck was being stacked. Walter Old announced on February 29th, 1894, that “acting under medical advice received during a recent illness,” he was going to England for the summer and would leave Madras “about the 31st March”.¹ W.R. Old “left Adyar on the evening of 7th April for Europe per S.S. ‘Avoca,’ viâ Colombo. . . .”² Old had made copies of the evidence related to the alleged charges to be laid against Judge and was prepared to take action when the time came. The familiar explanation of his departure was merely a cloak to hide the fact that the main tactic was to spread the charges against Judge among the English and to assess their response. Bertram Keightley, who was still in England with his mother, was familiar with the documentation and was to remain in England to support Old.

At midnight on March 12th, 1894, Olcott met Besant and Sturdy at Dhond Junction and proceeded on to Poona where they stayed for a few days. Olcott had been with Besant throughout most of her tour. He had taken five days to return to Adyar for the purpose of searching through his records for any documentary evidence in the case of Judge. He wrote in **Old Diary Leaves**:

The result arrived at was the getting together of a large number of Judge's private letters to H.P.B. and myself in which he complains of his absolute inability to get into touch with the Masters and begs us to intervene on his behalf. Of course, this proved, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the falsity of the pretensions he had been making to his American colleagues and others, that he had been allied with those Personages for many years and was doing what he did under their instructions and with their approval.³

However, once the letters which Olcott mentions are understood and placed in their proper context it is believed that they actually enhance Judge's position rather than damage it. It was felt among Judge's supporters that it was not very commendable of his accusers to make public correspondence between Judge and H.P.B. (pupil and teacher) and between him and Damodar (his fellow-disciple) written during Judge's period of probation. H.P.B. described this period as one of mental suffering and that at such times the pupil feels utterly alone, deserted, even though the Master might actually be quite near. These letters of Judge were eventually published in **The Theosophist** starting with the January 1931 issue but were quickly stopped when they started showing Judge in a brighter light. Quotations from some of the letters are included in the Chronology.

After consulting one more time with Khadalavala on how to handle the case against Judge, Besant left Poona with Olcott for Bombay where they consulted again with Tookaram Taty and Muncherjee M. Shroff before she boarded her ship which sailed “at 5 P.M.” on “March 20th”,⁴ bound for England.

M.M. Shroff was the Secretary of the Blavatsky Lodge T.S. in Bombay and one of the oldest members of the Society, along with Kavasji Mervanji Shroff who was its Vice-President. Both were very instrumental in the development of the Branch in Bombay. M.M. Shroff, concerned with the rumors circulating around the west coast of India at the time, had written a letter to Besant on April 2nd, 1892, in which he stated that Judge was “strongly suspected of having forged all along letters in the name of the Masters after H.P.B.’s departure. H.S. Olcott, B. Keightley, and Edge are absolutely convinced that Judge forged these letters, and has been duping and deceiving poor Annie!”⁵

Besant had written back on April 22nd, 1892, “I know that Col. Olcott has made random statements to that effect (that Judge forged the letters), as he made random statements about H.P.B. committing frauds.”⁶ M.M. Shroff also wrote to Judge about this matter and was told that he should ask Olcott for the proof of the charges against him “for he is the one who has given them out and is their sole author.”⁷ The plot was thickening and Besant, now convinced that Judge had acted inappropriately, was willing to carry the torch all the way and confront him. For example, in a letter from Calcutta, dated January 11th, 1894, she wrote:

You must resign the outer headship (of E.S.T.) held jointly with myself, or the evidence which goes to prove the wrong done must be laid before a committee of T.S. . . . And you must resign the position of President-elect.⁸

She wanted to confront Judge not because she wanted to find the truth, for she was convinced she had that, but to *trap* him into admission of guilt.

In documenting the details for this sensitive “Case” one is often misled with information incorrectly documented by other authors’ works on the history of the Theosophical Movement. For instance, in **A Short History of the Theosophical Society**, Josephine Ransom states on page 299:

A copy of the demand for investigation was posted 7 February, to Mr. Judge. Mrs. Besant also sent him copies of all the papers upon which she based her statements, an action to which the President strongly objected.

This is a prime example of skewing information. The author leads the reader to believe that Besant sent Judge the February 7th letter along with the complete set of copies for him to prepare for his defense. In fact, after Besant had written to Olcott on the 6th from Allahabad, Olcott was the one who sent Judge a letter on February 7th, 1894, giving Judge his options to resign or defend himself, but with no papers. Also, according to evidence, Besant did not send Judge “copies of all the papers” but did send him *much later* a copy of her statement of her complaint and the six charges against him. Besant never sent Judge any documentation at that time either for him to prepare his defense against the accusations. An analysis of the facts by Dr. Archibald Keightley is presented in Chapter 21.

Judge received Olcott’s February 7th letter on March 10th and cabled his reply the same day. “Charges absolutely false. You can take what proceedings you see fit; going [to] London [in] July.”⁹ In his circular of March 15th, 1894, Judge stated:

The accused person has the right to fix the place of trial. When the President calls the committee, I shall fix on London as the place for its meeting, as I am going to attend the European Section Convention next July.¹⁰

In her Statement at the European Convention of the T.S., July 12th, 1894, Besant stated: “I offered to take on myself the onus of formulating the charges against [Judge].”¹¹ In the published version, Olcott added the following “*Note*”:

I cannot allow Mrs. Besant to take upon herself the entire responsibility for formulating the charges against Mr. Judge, since I myself requested her to do it. The tacit endorsement of the charges by persistence in a policy of silence, was an injustice to the Vice-President, since it gave him no chance to make his defence; while, at the same time, the widely-current suspicions were thereby augmented, to the injury of the Society. So, to bring the whole matter to light, I, with others, asked Mrs. Besant to assume the task of drafting and signing the charges.¹²

Judge explains the conspiracy against him quite well:

But there was an object in accusing me as Vice-President. The chief prosecutor has said in the presence of many persons that she would not prosecute me as an individual, and that the object of the attack was to make me give up the Vice-Presidency and an office which she called "Successor to the Presidency" but which had no existence.¹³

Olcott had resigned from the Presidency on three separate occasions at this point. Each time it had been either arranged or implied that Judge, as Vice-President, would inherit the position or be designated as the next President — and each time, Olcott withdrew his resignation. At the time of Olcott's latest resignation, January 1st, 1892, Judge had the support of the members of the Theosophical Society to replace him. In February 1892 Olcott revoked his resignation, with Judge encouraging him to do so. Olcott later stated, in his Address at the Annual Convention at Adyar in December 1893:

With the formation of my present close acquaintance with Mrs. Besant, my course has become very clearly marked out in my mind. Unless something unexpected and of a very revolutionary character should happen, I mean to abandon the last lingering thought of retirement and stop at my post until removed by the hand of death.¹⁴

By then it had been decided that Besant should become the next President, and the perceived threat of Judge *succeeding* to the Presidency had to be resolved, even though that year the General Council had revised the Rules. Olcott stated:

The only radical alteration has been in the term of the Presidential office, which we have fixed at seven years, in the belief that a satisfactory incumbent will be indefinitely re-elected, while an unsatisfactory one should not be immovably fixed in office.¹⁵

This was not applicable until after Olcott's death as he had been deemed President for life. It did, however, establish that any future President was to be elected.

Walter Old (Sepharial) did Judge's astrological horoscope. "Sepharial' . . . in India in 1893" calculated that Judge would not live long and that Olcott need not worry about him — "that Mr. Judge could not live more than three years."¹⁶ But still, Olcott plotted and planned just in case.

In 1895, summarizing the conspiracy against him, Judge wrote:

The design from the beginning was to get me out of the way to the Presidency of the T.S. Mrs. Besant was to demand my resignation, after that Col. Olcott was to resign his office, then Mrs. Besant was to be nominated as President; Vice-Presidency probably to go to Bert. Keightley, though on that the outer proofs are not yet definite. In London last July [1894] Mrs. Besant said several times that the object of the proceeding was to prevent my succeeding to the Presidency. . . .

In July [1894] she [Annie Besant] told me the first day, as explaining the sentence above quoted about a "high example" [referring to Besant's letter dated Feb. 14th, 1894 to Judge where she stated: "That you had made an intellectual blunder, misled by a high example."] and another, that I was "largely a victim", that her theory was *first*, that H.P.B. had committed several frauds for good ends and made bogus messages; *second*, that I was misled by her example; and *third*, that H.P.B. had given me permission to do such acts. She then asked me to confess thus and that would clear up all. I peremptorily denied such a horrible lie, and warned her that everywhere I would resist such attack on H.P.B. These are the facts, and the real issue is around H.P.B.¹⁷

Although Olcott had received Judge's March 10th, 1894, denial of the charges, he was confident that with Besant's prestige and Bertram Keightley's status with the American members that given the facts, Judge would be removed. If the matter came to a tribunal hearing before a Judicial Committee, Olcott was convinced that he held that Committee by a majority. If the matter should go before the Sections they controlled two out of the three absolutely. Olcott was sure of India, sure of Britain, and sure that he had nothing to fear in America as, at best, Judge could count on nothing more than a division and a split in the American Section.

Upon becoming aware of Olcott's February 7th ultimatum to Judge, G.R.S. Mead and Bertram Keightley (who was still in England), General Secretaries of European Section and Indian Section respectively, issued an official joint response, dated March 27th, 1894. Olcott's situation was reversed. Both condemned Olcott's procedures and the highhanded way in which he had proceeded against Judge. They felt that even if Judge were guilty, he was entitled to the preliminary assumption of his innocence until that guilt was conclusively established. It was evident that both Mead and Keightley saw at once that Olcott and Besant had grossly violated the principles of universal brotherhood as well as the constitution of the Theosophical Society. In addition, although Mead and Keightley were likely not aware when they sent Olcott their official response, by then Olcott had sent Judge two more letters, both dated March 20th, 1894, in follow-up to Judge's response of March 10th. In the second letter, addressed "To William Q. Judge, Esq., Vice President T.S.," Olcott wrote:

Pending the decision of the Judicial Committee, I hereby suspend you from the office of Vice President T.S. as required by our Revised Rules.¹⁸

Another unexpected disappointment for Olcott was Judge's four page circular dated March 15th, 1894. Judge had sent 5000 copies to as many theosophical members as he could, stating:

It is disagreeable to talk much of oneself, but sometimes it is necessary, and in this case it has been made a necessity by the action of others, as also by the existence of many vague and suppressed rumors which have been flying about in quarters not public but sufficiently active to compel action on my part. Hence I now make known in advance that which has been spoken obscurely for some time, and which is now before me officially from the President, Col. H. S. Olcott, to the end that all members of the Society and friends of my own in all parts of the world shall be in possession of facts so that surprise and perhaps confusion may be prevented.¹⁹

Two of Olcott's strongest allies and co-conspirators, Annie Besant and Walter Old, were on their way to England, therefore, Olcott was left with the influential members of his General Council (among them, Khandalavala, Chakravarti, and Subramania Iyer) to plan the next strategies. Olcott knew that if the matter were to go before the Sections, he and his allies had the control they needed, except perhaps in America. It was therefore decided that another section was needed to ensure that his plans would come to fruition. On April 27th, 1894, Col. Olcott, P.T.S., in his usual autocratic way, dispensed another "Executive Notice". It is reprinted here in its entirety:

The undersigned avails of Mrs. Annie Besant's forthcoming visit to the Australasian Colonies, to invest her with the functions of President's Commissioner, with authority to represent him in all current Society business during her tour, and act for him and in his name in disposing of the same, as perfectly as though it were his individual act. Mrs. Besant is empowered to organize a Section or Sections; to authorize the formation of Branches; to admit persons to Fellowship; to regulate disagreements and disputes within the Society; to remit at her discretion in cases of great poverty the whole or any part of any fee or other pecuniary contribution chargeable as a condition of membership; and, generally, to exercise the same powers as are constitutionally enjoyed by the undersigned in his Presidential capacity.

Mrs. Besant will, of course, make or cause to be made to the undersigned a full report of her official actions under the above special commission and according to the Revised Rules of the Society.²⁰

Besant had been in the Society barely five years by this time and yet Olcott willfully empowered her with full authority to represent him in all business functions. Along with Olcott, she had visited the sacred places, attended religious festivals and proclaimed herself an Indian at heart, as well as taking the Brahmanical thread. Olcott had forged a strong accord with *Annabai*, her given name by the Hindus, and praised her highly in **The Theosophist** with a long personal tribute and extensive articles covering her tour. Annie Besant, he declared, was to share his burden.

Olcott had also ordered his “General Council” to revise the Rules of the Society to take into consideration the disposing of Officers of the T.S. for misconduct. Section 2 of Article VI was changed to read:

[T]he President may be deprived of office at any time, for *cause shown*, by a three-fourths vote of the Judicial Committee hereinafter provided for (in Section 3). . . .

Section 4 of Article VI declares that the same procedure shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the cases of the Vice-President and President; thus making the former, as well as the latter, amenable to the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee for offences charged against him.

It was under this customized clause that “the Vice-President [was] arraigned.”²¹

Olcott officially ratified and proclaimed the changes himself on December 31st, 1893.²² In reality, however, there is substantial evidence to support the legal opinion that Olcott had no actual power and the Society he operated was a *de facto* organization, and that the General Council of the T.S. was based on wholly illegal proceedings.²³ With this latest procedure, all the original Rules of the Society had been changed since its inception in 1875.

Olcott had no plans to attend the Judicial Committee in London but circumstances quickly changed and he was compelled to go. But Olcott was confident — he had made all the correct changes necessary — that the plot to rid the Society of Judge would eventually be accomplished.

Chapter 21

Delays and Withholdings

Much of the material covering both the General Council meeting and the Judicial Committee meeting held in London on July 7th and 10th, 1894, respectively has been covered in the Chronology. Important documents have been carefully scrutinized for passages which cast more light on puzzling and obscure circumstances and explain interesting events. Some of the details, when unraveled, are extremely important for they sometimes expose the motive behind the person's behavior.

One of the not so obvious bits of information, of importance to the understanding of this case, is timing. Some say "timing is everything", and in this case timing has much to do with how events unfolded. One such important incident was the restricted time allowed to Judge for him to prepare a "defense" against the "Charges" brought by Besant.

Again, before dealing with the evidence which Judge did eventually manage to see it is important to provide the reader with what Dr. Archibald Keightley compiled. In his letter found in "Truth and Occultism" in **The Irish Theosophist**, March 1895, pp.92-95, Dr. Keightley exposes a few of the misstatements published regarding Judge. It is mentioned in **The Path**, with the following statement:

It is strange that falsehood and vituperation should be considered "proof" and "argument", and evidently the original "Truth and Occultism" pamphlet from which this article takes its name, is an exemplification of the old French adage "*Qui s'excuse, s'accuse*"!¹

Dr. Keightley first quotes Annie Besant in her article "Should Mr. Judge Resign?"

Let me say I had drawn up six charges to lay before the committee. Under each of these charges I had drawn up the evidence on which the charge depended. I had made what would be called a brief; the charges were the indictments, and the evidence was practically the speech of the counsel stating what the charges were. My only deviation from the legal action was this — that I sent a complete copy of the whole statement that I proposed to make, to Mr. Judge; that, I knew, was outside the legal duty, but I did it in order that the case might be met upon its merits, that he might know everything I was going to say, every document I was going to use, and every argument I was going to employ.²

Dr. Keightley responded:

Much virtue is continually claimed for sending Mr. Judge the little that was sent him in regard to the charges. The course followed is alleged to be a deviation from the legal procedure for the benefit of Mr. Judge. It was a deviation, but not in the sense implied by Mrs. Besant. Quite the reverse. I am professionally informed that the procedure in an action of law is as follows:

1. A statement of the complaint must be sent to the defendant. This Mrs. Besant did, though vaguely. Her statement consisted of the six charges and a specification of documents upon which they were based.

2. A full statement setting forth the purport of all the documents upon which the complaint is founded must be sent to the defendant. This Mrs. Besant did not do. She sent a partial statement insufficiently setting out *some* of the documents only and entirely omitting others which, according to the specification, were intended and therefore had to be used, unless the defendant consented to their withdrawal. This partial statement Mrs. Besant calls her prosecutor's brief. Here, therefore, she departed from legal procedure and entirely in her own favour.

3. The defendant must put in what is called a "defence." This Mr. Judge did even before the second item of procedure was taken by the plaintiff.

4. The plaintiff must give full opportunity for the defendant and his agents to inspect and take copies and extracts and facsimiles or photographs of all documents intended to be used against him, and no document can be used except those produced. This Mrs. Besant did not do and never has done.

5. At least six weeks, sometimes six months or more, are allowed before the trial for the preparation by the parties of their respective evidence and witnesses. It has been forgotten that the genuineness of all documents has to be proved on oath unless admitted to be genuine by the opposite party. If evidence is required from abroad the Court will postpone the trial until it can be obtained. The fact is that Mrs. Besant delayed taking procedure No. 2 until Mr. Judge was actually leaving the U.S.A. to attend the trial, the date of which had already been fixed. This was a flagrant injustice which would not be tolerated in any Court of Law. No opportunity whatever was given for inspection and copying documents before the trial. This also is a gross breach of even legal procedure.

Besant boarded ship at Bombay on March 20th, 1894, at 5P.M. Besant's document of "so-called charges" was dated March 24th, 1894, on board the *S.S. Peninsular*, Indian Ocean.³ A letter mailed from India would generally take approximately five to seven weeks for delivery to New York. By the end of April Besant had arrived in London.⁴ It only took seven days for mail, via ship, to go from England to New York. Judge and Dr. Buck arrived in London on July 4th which means they left New York on June 26th or 27th. If Judge received Besant's papers just before sailing, as stated above, Besant would have had to mail her papers around June 15th or 16th or later for Judge to have received them on June 23rd, giving him three or four days to prepare a defense. Besant held on to those papers for nearly two months before mailing them to Judge. WHY? Did she purposely delay mailing her "so-called charges" to Judge to allow him the smallest possible window of opportunity to prepare his defense?

Judge stated regarding the so-called charges, that:

It follows no rule of legal, military, or ecclesiastical procedure with which I am familiar. The real charge was the one sent me by Col. Olcott of *misuse of Mahâtmâs' names and handwritings*; these so-called charges should have been in the form of proper specifications under the main charge.⁵

Dr. Keightley continues:

And now Mr. Judge is (*vide Vâhan*, March, 1895) arraigned before the whole Society on charges which it has not seen, on evidence supplied neither to the Society nor to the defendant.

I suppose it to be upon the strength of Mrs. Besant's statement in *Lucifer*, as above quoted, that Mr. Mead is issuing an official statement, advance copy of which has been sent to me, as member of the Executive Committee, in which, in reply to Mr. Judge's official letter saying that he has no copies of the evidence, Mr. Mead replies that Mr. Judge has copies of all that was to be used against him. I at once notified Mr. Mead that the above statement was not true, and gave my reasons (in part) therefor. But as I now find other advance copies have been sent out, and Mr. Thomas Williams has published the same incorrect statement in *Light*, I am obliged to make public contradiction of the above. The facts are as follows:

Mrs. Besant sent Mr. Judge: (a) a rough specification of some seventy-eight exhibits (letters, telegrams, etc.) as evidence in support of six charges. I say "some seventy-eight," because such items as the following occur:

"Various sentences written in Judge's letters to A. B., Babula, Olcott, Tookeram, Cooper-Oakley." Allotting in all such cases *one* letter to each person named, there are seventy-eight pieces of evidence. But there is nothing to show whether there are one or a dozen such letters to each person. This specification in my hands is a certified copy of the original one sent to Mr. Judge in New York.

(b) Mrs. Besant sent also what she calls "a brief." It contained many arguments based upon many assertions. In this brief were quotations from a few of the seventy-eight pieces of "evidence." I am told by three persons who have seen this brief that there are under a dozen pieces of evidence given. These latter are *all* the copies of evidence which Mr. Judge has or has had, and this is the way in which Mr. Judge has known "every document I was going to use," or has had, as Mr. Mead says, copies of all that was to be used against him. It cannot be denied that Mrs. Besant intended to use against him all the seventy-eight or more pieces of evidence quoted, for the six charges and rough

specification were the official documents to be used before the T.S. Judicial Committee, not one of which could subsequently be withdrawn by Mrs. Besant, or anyone else, at their own discretion. I have not seen this brief, as Mrs. Besant required Mr. Judge to give his word of honour that he would show it to no one (Dr. Buck having previously seen it), and told several of us that she had ordered it to be burned when the matter was supposed to be settled. It now appears that Miss C——, who is not a T.S. official, has it in charge and has shown it to members. Three members who have seen it pledge their honour to the statement that it contains under a dozen of the pieces of evidence.

Moreover, Mr. Judge has not even *seen* all the evidence. None of that which is the property of Mr. Bertram Keightley was even shown to him!

Furthermore, Mrs. Besant at Richmond, in July, 1894, promised Mr. Judge, in the presence of Mr. Mead, Dr. Buck, Mr. B. Keightley, Mrs. A. Keightley and myself, that he should have copies of all the evidence. Why did she so promise if, as is now said, Mr. Judge had knowledge of every document and copies of the evidence before leaving America? As a portion of this conversation is now being used against Mr. Judge and is distorted, I here give the real context. *Other parts of that conversation have yet wider bearing.*

Mr. Judge asked Mrs. Besant if she would then give him back his letters, which were the so-called evidence, seeing that the closing of the matter was under consideration. It was evidently useless to talk about bringing the matter to a conclusion, if the alleged evidence was to be promptly handed over to one of his avowed enemies, who would naturally have continued the office of prosecutor, even if that office had been laid down by Mrs. Besant. In reply to Mr. Judge's question, Mrs. Besant said that they were not all hers to give. The question was not so strange as it is made to appear, as Mrs. Besant and Mr. B. Keightley were, with Colonel Olcott, owners of the bulk — if not all of the evidence so-called. Colonel Olcott had been and was consulted on this head. Mr. Judge then said, in almost these exact words:

“Well, Annie, if the case was reversed, I would take the consequences of returning you *your* letters under the same circumstances. However, will you give me copies?”

Mrs. Besant consulted Mr. Mead by a look and Mr. Mead said:

“Why, yes, Annie, I think Judge ought to have copies.”

Mrs. Besant then agreed that the copies should be given. Four of the seven persons present remember this as here set forth. The copies NEVER have been given, and the statement made by Mr. Judge in his letter, published by Mr. Mead in *The Vâhan*, [March 1st, 1895 issue] and in *The Irish Theosophist* for February, 1895, is in every particular correct.

Mr. Judge is being asked to reply to charges based upon letters and telegrams beginning 1875 down to the present day, often very vaguely specified, as in the extract above, part of which he has not even seen. And when he makes his very natural and necessary demand, untrue statements are made in regard to him.

In any case it is not only unjust, but contrary to every code of common fairness, to endeavour to prove charges such as those brought against Mr. Judge on the strength of brief extracts from supposed letters. Everyone must know that carefully selected extracts can be made to prove almost any villainy. It is significant that Mrs. Besant admitted to many persons in July, 1894, that she was aware these charges could not be actually proven against Mr. Judge.

Mr. Judge has not at his command the lists of the Theosophical Society kept at Adyar, as have his accusers, the statements even of Mrs. Besant and my step-uncle, Mr. Bertram Keightley, being circulated all over the world by those lists, so that I must ask members who receive this statement of Dr. Buck and myself to circulate it as widely as possible.

Included next is a shorter version of the same principal details, written by Judge, which was published in the February 1895 issue of **The Irish Theosophist**, pp.85-86.

THE CHARGES AGAINST WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

EDITOR *Irish Theosophist*:

A long and sustained attack has been made on me and charges have been brought forward by Mrs. Besant, and in *The Westminster Gazette*, which it is thought I should reply to more fully than I have as yet. A very good and decisive reason exists for my not making that full reply and explanation, and it is time Theosophists should know it. It is as follows:

I have not been furnished with copies of the documentary evidence by which the charges are said to be supported. These documents — being letters written by myself and some of them ten years old — have been in the possession of Mrs. Besant from about February, 1894, to July 19th, 1894, and open enemies of mine have been allowed to make copies of them, and also to take facsimiles, but they have been kept from me, although I have demanded and should have them. It must be obvious to all fair-minded persons that it is impossible for me to make a full and definite reply to the charges without having certified copies of those documents.

I arrived in London July 4th, 1894, and constantly, each day, asked for the copies and for an inspection of the papers. Mrs. Besant promised both, but never performed her promise. The proceedings and the Convention closed July 13th, and for six days thereafter I daily asked for the copies and inspection, getting the same promise with the same failure, until July 19th, when I peremptorily demanded them. Mrs. Besant then said she had just given them to Colonel Olcott, to whom I at once applied. He said he had sent them all to India. I at once told this to Mrs. Besant, saying I would give the facts to the daily papers, whereupon she went to Colonel Olcott, who said he had made a mistake as they were in his box. He then — I being in a hurry to leave from Liverpool on the 21st — let me hastily see the papers in Dr. Buck's presence, promising to send me copies. I had time to copy only two or three short letters. He has never fulfilled that promise.

These facts the members should know, as they ought at last to understand the animus under the prosecution. I shall not reply until I have full certified copies. It would seem that I am in this matter entitled to as much opportunity and consideration as my open enemies have had. — Yours,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

New York, Jan. 25th, 1895.

Chapter 22

Khandalavala and Besant

Like Olcott, Judge Khandalavala was also quite enamored with Annie Besant. He wrote a long article titled “Hypatia and Annie Besant” which appeared in **The Theosophist**, January 1895. In his article he stated:

If the individual soul has its life made up of many lives, and it lives and manifests its power in a series of bodies carrying with it all its accumulative forces for good and evil, then must the soul of Hypatia have reincarnated over again on this earth in a suitable body through which it could carry on its unfinished work. To those who would take the trouble to think of the incidents in the lives of Hypatia and of Annie Besant, there cannot but appear a remarkable similarity in these two personalities. . . . The fervour for leading a truly religious life was apparent from her earliest years in Mrs. Besant, exactly as the soul of Hypatia. . . . Both personalities are seen to keep their audiences spell-bound by their eloquence. . . . Mrs. Besant’s love for India and the Hindus is not to be wondered at.¹

Judge Khandalavala, himself a Parsee, had placed Annie Besant on such a high pedestal and revered her so much that it would be hard if not impossible for her to disregard such adulation. In fact, however, while he was praising her he was also misleading her. In actuality, convincing Besant was easy once one appealed to her ego and her sense of perceived moral justice. The prominent Indian members needed to convince someone *special* (a dupe) with their concerns about Judge, whose influence they seemed to perceive as a threat to the status quo of both Indian culture and religion. Khandalavala used her by encouraging her into believing that Judge was guilty of fraud. Why? Besides his correlation between Hypatia and Besant, they needed someone whom they could take advantage of — one who would be in sympathy with them, their religious beliefs and their culture. Most Indian members were not “prepared to become a thorough theosophist *i.e.* to do what D[amodar] Mavalankar did, — give up entirely caste, his old superstitions and show himself a true reformer. . . .”² Besant had become “Indian”, having adopted the Hindu religion, the Hindu culture, their creed and their ethical values and teachings instead of being *neutral* as Olcott had expressly warned the members who attended the Congress of the Parliament of Religions in 1893. Olcott, still somewhat cognizant of Blavatsky’s teachings at the time, had emphasized to the Theosophical Members attending the Congress the importance of remaining totally impartial — that the Society was completely neutral of any creeds. He stated:

Of course, it is to be distinctly understood that nothing shall be said or done by any Delegate or Committee of the Society to identify it, as a body, with any special form of religion, creed, sect, or any religious or ethical teacher or leader; our first duty being to affirm and defend its perfect corporate neutrality in these matters.³

By 1896 Olcott appears to have modified this requirement. He wrote:

Mrs. Besant herself has proved the star of highest magnitude in our theosophical sky since the death of H.P.B. in 1891: no woman of our times is so widely known, admired and loved as she; even by those who do not accept her religious views.⁴

Blavatsky’s message since the inception of the Society had always been that:

Theosophists have no dogmas, exact no blind faith.⁵

Our mission does not consist in spreading any dogmas, whether Buddhist, Vedic or Christian; we are independent of any formula, any ritual, any exotericism. . . . [T]he essential attitude of the Theosophical Society is to declare and maintain the Truth common to all religions, the real Truth, unsoiled by the inventions, the passions, and the requirements of the ages, and to invite all men to partake of it, without distinction of sex, colour or rank, and, which is much more, of beliefs.⁶

With Besant adopting the Hindu Brahman culture and willing to defend and promote it as her own, why would any Brahman, or any Indian for that matter, object? **The Theosophist** reported that during Besant's tour, under the title of "The Battle of the Gods," the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* wrote:

[S]he extolled the Hindus, confessed herself a Hindu, and appealed to her countrymen and countrywomen, nay, to the world at large, to adopt the Hindu method, for the regeneration of the race.

The Calcutta paper, *Hope*, devoted no less than three columns of its leader to "Mrs. Annie Besant's arrival in Calcutta," and "Mrs. Annie Besant's place in the movement of Hindu Revival." The Editor remarked:

Mrs. Annie Besant's acceptance of the cardinal principles of Hindu Religion and Philosophy marks a new epoch in the history of the development of the Theosophic Movement in India.⁷

In his Annual Address at the 20th Anniversary Convention held at Adyar in December 1895, Olcott stated:

I am most happy to tell you that the restraint formerly used towards myself as to the work in the Eastern School of Theosophy has all passed away with the American crisis. I am now in a position to cordially testify to the value of the teachings given by Mrs. Besant, to her personal competency, and to recommend such as incline towards the study and practice of Indian Esotericism to place themselves under her. There is no sign of dogmatic assumption nor of desire to interfere in the practical working of the Society. And in every one of her relations with us Mrs. Besant has won our love, confidence and respect.⁸

The Hindus had found the perfect person they could trust to help them keep their traditions as well as their caste system while professing themselves *true* theosophists. After all in India it was "a common saying that every man is naturally and by right of descent a Theosophist".⁹ Because of the adoration Besant received from the Hindus the whole of the Theosophical CAUSE was severely compromised.¹⁰

H.P. Blavatsky described the Indian members' situation well in her Open Letter (Why I Do Not Return To India") addressed "To My Brothers of Aryavarta".

In India, . . . ever since my departure, the true spirit of devotion to the Masters and the courage to avow it has steadily dwindled away. At Adyar itself, increasing strife and conflict has raged between personalities; uncalled for and utterly undeserved animosity — almost hatred — has been shown towards me by several members of the staff. *There seems to have been something strange and uncanny going on at Adyar, during these last years.* No sooner does a European, most Theosophically inclined, most devoted to the Cause, and the personal friend of myself or the President, set his foot in Headquarters, than he becomes forthwith a personal enemy to one or other of us, and what is worse, ends by injuring and deserting the Cause.¹¹ [Italics added]

The fact is that many Hindus involved with the Theosophical Society were Orthodox Brahmans who did not want to change. They resisted encouragement to change their attitude regarding caste, old superstitions and beliefs and were particularly resistant to any attempts from Judge, who remained true to the original CAUSE and continued to expound the same philosophy as H.P.B. The Hindus were not willing to be *true* Theosophists as outlined in the "Prayag Letter". Master "M" stated their position quite well in this Mahatma Letter when he stated:

What have we, the disciples of the true *Arhats*, of esoteric Buddhism and of Sang-gyas to do with the *Shasters*, and Orthodox Brahmanism?¹²

The objective at the time was to humiliate William Q. Judge before his peers and before the world, pressure him into a confession of guilt as a fraud, just as had been attempted with his teacher and colleague, H.P. Blavatsky. By destroying Judge's reputation, H.P. Blavatsky's reputation was being tarnished by association — she had supported him until the very end when she died on May 8th, 1891. Judge once wrote that she always signed off her letters to him "Yours till death and after, H.P.B."¹³

Madame Blavatsky's reputation had already been damaged by the Coulomb conspiracy. Not because she had been denounced as being an imposter or allegedly having performed so-called "Occult Phenomena" by *alleged* fraudulent manner, but because she was not supported or permitted to defend herself in a Court of Law. The fifteen men of the "Committee" formed by Olcott were too embarrassed and would not support her. They bought her a ticket and shipped her to Europe, away from the media, despite her being in terrible health at the time. Blavatsky stated:

But the loyalty and courage of the Adyar Authorities, and of the few Europeans who had trusted in the Masters, were not equal to the trial when it came. In spite of my protests, I was hurried away from Headquarters. Ill as I was, almost dying in truth, as the physicians said, yet I protested, and would have battled for Theosophy in India to my last breath, had I found loyal support.¹⁴

In his **Historical Retrospect**, Olcott focused only on H.P.B.'s health when he touched upon her departure from India. He wrote:

Madame Blavatsky falling ill to the point of death, at Adyar, was ordered by her physician to return to Europe, and settle herself in a genial climate where she would for some time enjoy perfect solitude and freedom from worry. So I overcame all her opposition, bought her tickets, and sent her away by the French mail steamer of the 31st March, 1885. She had to be hoisted aboard in a hospital chair. Dr. F. Hartmann, Miss Flynn, and "Bawaji", a Madras Brahmin yogi, accompanied her.¹⁵

A few weeks later H.P.B. wrote to Olcott, expounding on the consequences of the actions taken. In her letter of April 11th, 1885, she quotes Mahatma K.H.:

The Society has liberated itself from our grasp and influence and we have let it go — we make no unwilling slaves. He [Olcott] says he has saved it? He saved its body, but he allowed through fear its soul to escape; it is now a soulless corpse, a machine run so far well enough, but which will fall to pieces when he is gone. Out of the three objects the second alone is attended to, but it is no longer either a brotherhood, nor a body over the face of which broods the spirit from beyond the Great Range. His kindness and love of peace are great and truly Gautamic in their spirit; but he has misplaced that kindness.¹⁶

Regarding the events of 1884-1885, H.P.B. stated:

It was during that time and Colonel Olcott's absence in Burma, that the *seeds of all future strifes*, and — let me say at once — disintegration of the Theosophical Society, were planted by our enemies.¹⁷
[Italics added]

Chapter 23

The Judicial Committee – Pre and Post

A consensus had been reached by all parties in July 1894 but, because of the lack of occult knowledge and the personal bitterness towards Judge, the whole intrigue continued until his death.

Before returning to the events of the official enquiry (Judicial Committee) it is important to place in proper perspective the consequences of Olcott's actions, undertaken when he sent Judge the letter accusing him of "*alleged misuse of the Mahâtâmâs' names and handwriting*". By virtue of the discretionary power given to Olcott in the Revised Rules (ratified by himself on December 31st, 1893) and without consulting members of the General Council, on March 20th, 1894, he suspended Judge from the office of Vice-President. As mentioned earlier both G.R.S. Mead, General Secretary of the European Section T.S. and Bertram Keightley, General Secretary of the Indian Section T.S. (who was in England at the time), wanted to place on record their emphatic protest against Olcott's departure from constitutional procedure.

Moreover by so doing you place yourself *officially* in the position of having prejudged the case and virtually announce before any enquiry has taken place or even any *specific* charges have been formulated, that you believe Mr. Judge guilty.

It appears to us that such an attitude is inconsistent with that strict impartiality and justice which ought to characterize at least the official actions of the President of the T. S., and that it is calculated to bring discredit upon the Society by laying its chief executive officer open to the charge of condemning a colleague without even giving him a hearing.¹

Both protested that Olcott was abusing his power as President of the T.S. and that if the inquiry were to take place it would set a precedent from which the Society might not recover.

As this is the first time that any official proceedings against an officer of the Society have been inaugurated, it is evident that the precedents thereby created will be of extreme importance in the future history of the Society. Moreover the nature of the allegations involved is such as to cause danger that the free and unsectarian basis of our organization may be compromised, by the proceedings in relation thereto amounting to an official declaration by the Society of a dogma, to wit: either belief or disbelief in the existence of "Mahatmas."

Hence it is very necessary that every step taken in the premises should be strictly constitutional and impartial, and should be most carefully considered both as making a precedent and as involving constitutional questions of grave importance. It is therefore our plain duty as the General Secretaries of two out of the three Sections of the T.S. and members of its General Council, to call your attention officially to the following points with a view to safeguarding (1) the Constitution, (2) the non-sectarian character, and (3) the impartiality of the Theosophical Society.²

The Mahatmas certainly did not choose Olcott to become part of the T.S. for his proficiency as an attorney, as in accounts of incidents researched Olcott does not come across as very effective. One must acknowledge that he did do a lot for the Movement at first, but on the other hand, after being separated from H.P.B. he became confused and easily swayed by the people who surrounded him and he ruled the Society as an autocratic dictator, dispensing Executive Notices. A number of examples of his ineptitude appeared at the meeting which took place in London in July 1894.

Olcott had suspended Judge as Vice-President of the Society pending disposal of the charges by an official enquiry, a committee set up to investigate the accusations. At the July 7th, 1894, Council Meeting Judge protested that he had never been legally elected as Vice-President of the T.S. and could not be charged as such. In his March 15th, 1894, Circular Judge declared:

The only charges that could be made against the Vice-President would be those of failing to perform his duties, or misusing the office when there were any duties attached to it.³

Olcott objected saying that as far back as December 1888 at the Adyar Convention he had appointed Judge as Vice-President in open convention. The choice was approved by the Delegates assembled. At another Convention of 1890, with a new set of Rules, Bertram Keightley moved nomination of Judge, with Olcott supporting it, and he was duly elected Vice-President. Judge claimed that although these things may have occurred he was never officially given notice of the appointment, to which Olcott admitted that Judge was correct. Nevertheless, because his name was duly published in the Official List, Olcott ruled that Judge was in fact the Vice-President of the T.S.⁴

Judge raised another point, that even if he were Vice-President he

was not amenable to an enquiry by the Judicial Committee into certain alleged offences with respect to the misuse of the Mahatmas' names and handwriting, since if guilty the offence would be one by him as a private individual, and not in his official capacity; he contended that, under our Constitution, the President and Vice-President could only be tried as such by such Committee for official misconduct — that is misfeasances and malfeasances. An opinion of council in New York which he had taken from Mr. M.H. Phelps, F.T.S.,⁵ was then read by him in support of this contention. The matter was then debated. Bertram Keightley moved and G.R.S. Mead seconded:

“That the Council, having heard the arguments on the point raised by William Q. Judge, it declares that the point is well taken; that the acts alleged concern him as an individual; and that consequently the Judicial Committee has no jurisdiction in the premises to try him as Vice-President upon the charges as alleged.”⁶

Olcott had to concur with the motion and it was declared carried. Judge did not vote. “On Mr. Mead's motion, it was then voted that above record shall be laid before the Judicial Committee.”⁷ Again Judge did not vote.

The President then laid before the Council another question mooted by Mr. Judge, to wit: That his election as successor to the President, which was made upon the announcement of the President's resignation, because *ipso facto* [by the fact (or act) itself] annulled upon the President's resumption of his office as President. On motion, the Council declared the point well taken, and ordered the decision to be entered on the minutes. Mr. Judge did not vote.

The President called attention to the resolution of the American Convention of 1894, declaring that his action in suspending the Vice-President, pending the settlement of the charges against him was “without the slightest warrant in the Constitution and altogether transcends the discretionary power given the President by the Constitution, and is therefore null and void.” Upon deliberation and consideration of Sections 3 and 4, Article VI, of the General Rules, the Council decided (Mr. Judge not voting) that the President's action was warranted under the then existing circumstances, and that the said resolutions of protest are without force.

On motion (Mr. Judge not voting) the Council then requested the President to convene the Judicial Committee at the London Headquarters, on Tuesday, July 10th, 1894, at 10 a.m.⁸

At the Judicial Committee Olcott admitted that he had made a number of errors. What he neglected to say is that these errors were strategic ones which impeded him from gaining advantage over Judge. Olcott also made errors in his legal proceedings against Judge. He admitted that when he sent Judge the February 7th, 1894, letter to either retire from all offices of the T.S or have a Judicial Committee convened to proceed with the alleged matter of misuse of the Mahatmas' names and handwritings, he had omitted to mark the letter “Private”. With the letter addressed to “Dear Sir and Brother”, Judge perceived it as being an Open Letter as well as a breach of the Constitution, and vehemently protested in a public circular addressed “To all Members of the Theosophical Society”. Judge stated in his circular:

Hence the President's alternatives, offered as above, are mistakes, and are the initial steps to the promulgation of the dogma of belief in the "Masters".⁹

Another error of Olcott's was that

The name of the accuser not being mentioned, the wrong impression prevailed that I [Olcott] was the author of the charges, and at the same time intended to sit as Chairman of the tribunal that was to investigate them.¹⁰

Olcott at first wanted to keep these accusations against Judge within the reach of his own supporters only, but by making these errors Judge was enabled to take advantage of the situation and reach out to as many people as he could so that

. . . all members of the Society and friends of my own in all parts of the world shall be in possession of facts so that surprise and perhaps confusion may be prevented.¹¹

Olcott had to retreat and admit:

It having been made evident to me that Mr. Judge cannot be tried on the present accusations without breaking through the lines of our Constitution, I have no right to keep him further suspended, and so I hereby cancel my notice of suspension, dated February 7th, 1894 [actually March 20th, 1894], and restore him to the rank of Vice-President.¹²

Judge stated:

At that meeting of the Council it was decided that it would be a breach of the Constitution and of the neutrality of the T.S. to try the question raised, because involving the existence or non-existence of Mahatmas, and that I could not be tried by the Committee because that can only deal with the Vice-President for acts done as such.¹³

Olcott concluded the July 10th, 1894, meeting by stating:

The meeting was worth holding for several reasons. In the first place, because we have come to the point of an official declaration that it is not lawful to affirm that belief in Mahatmas is a dogma of the Society, or communications really, or presumably, from them, authoritative and infallible. Equally clear is it that the circulation of fictitious communications from them is not an act for which, under our rules, an officer or member can be impeached and tried. The inference, then, is that testimony as to intercourse with Mahatmas, and writings alleged to come from them, must be judged upon their intrinsic merits alone; and that the witnesses are solely responsible for their statements. Thirdly, the successorship to the Presidency is again open (*vide* Gen. Council Report of July 7th, 1894), and at my death or at any time sooner, liberty of choice may be exercised in favour of the best available member of the Society.

I now bring my remarks to a close by giving voice to the sentiment which I believe to actuate the true Theosophist, viz., that the same justice should be given and the same mercy shown to every man and woman on our membership registers. There must be no distinctions of persons, no paraded self-righteousness, no seeking for revenge. We are all — as I personally believe — equally under the operation of Karma, which punishes and rewards; all equally need the loving forbearance of those who have mounted higher than ourselves in the scale of human perfectibility.¹⁴

It was agreed that statements would be read by the accuser and the accused, Annie Besant and W.Q. Judge, before the membership at the July 12th, 1894, Third Session of The European Convention of the T.S. Besant stated: "We come to you, our brothers, to tell you what is in our hearts." She then immediately shifted the blame from herself onto others and denounced that all this "mass of accusations" against Judge was inspired largely by personal hatred for Judge and hatred for the Theosophical Society, adding:

The charges were not in a form that it was possible to meet, a general denial could not stop them, and explanation to *irresponsible accusers* was at once futile and undignified. . . . [Italics added]

. . . [T]he charges themselves were repeated with growing definiteness and insistence [sic], until they found expression in an article in *The Theosophist* signed by Messrs. Old and Edge. At last, the situation became so strained that it was declared by many of the most earnest members of the Indian Section that, if Mr. Judge became President with these charges hanging over him unexplained, the Indian Section would secede from the T.S.

She then added:

I hold strongly that, whatever may be the faults of a private member, they are no concern of mine, and it is no part of my duty, as a humble servant of the Lords of Compassion, to drag my brother's faults into public view, nor to arraign him before any tribunal. . . .

. . . I agreed to intervene, privately, believing that many of the charges were false, dictated and circulated malevolently, that others were much exaggerated and were largely susceptible of explanation, and that what might remain of valid complaint might be put an end to without public controversy.¹⁵

Walter Old immediately wrote a letter to the President-Founder in London in which he objected to the two paragraphs in the "Statement of Mrs. Besant" and asked for his letter to be published.

I . . . am greatly disturbed by the mention of my name (in conjunction with that of Mr. Edge) in what appears to me, and must appear to all others, I think, as an invidious connection. . . .

The circular having now gone out to the public and to members of the Society, it is too late to request that my name be withdrawn entirely from the proceedings, as I certainly should have done had I known of it earlier; but I must ask you to kindly take such steps as will set it forth clearly to all to whom this publication of the General Council may have gone, that neither Mr. Edge nor I are to be regarded as in the category of persons referred to in the paragraph immediately preceding the mention of our names. . . .¹⁶

Besant continued shifting the responsibility from herself by claiming that she was not responsible for her actions. She stated: "my vision is not always clear in these matters of strife and controversy which are abhorrent to me."¹⁷ In biographies about Annie Besant's life it is easy to come to the conclusion that her whole life, up to this point, was a constant struggle in "strife and controversy". One is left to wonder about her clarity of vision in, for example, the accusation of "grave immorality" against H.S. Olcott which she brought before Judge and E.A. Neresheimer in November/December 1891. A few years later Judge wrote regarding this episode and the letter he subsequently sent to Olcott, "against my inclination and judgment, under great pressure and being also somewhat convinced by Mrs. Besant's arguments":

I found for myself that Mrs. Besant had acted hurriedly, impulsively and injudiciously, and that no such letter should have gone from me to Col. Olcott.¹⁸

Perhaps Besant's great need for moral justice and exactitude blinded her from being an objective and fair-minded individual.

As in many other instances she portrays herself as having sacrificed herself for the greater good of the Society, all the while generating great strife against others by attacking and therefore breaking many of the Rules of the Esoteric Section.

Besant then stated:

I did my utmost to prevent a public Committee of Enquiry of an official character. I failed, and the Committee was decided on. And then I made what many of Mr. Judge's friends think was a mistake. I offered to take on myself the onus of formulating the charges against him. I am not concerned to defend myself on this, nor to trouble you with my reasons for taking so painful a decision; in this decision, for which I alone am responsible, I meant to act for the best. . . .

In due course I formulated the charges, and drew up the written statement of evidence in support of them. They came in due course before the Judicial Committee, as you heard this morning. That Committee decided that they alleged private, not official, wrongdoing, and therefore could not be tried by a Committee that could deal only with a President or Vice-President as such. I was admitted to the General Council of the T. S. when this point was argued, and *I was convinced* by that argument that the point was rightly taken.¹⁹ [Italics added]

She then stated:

And now I must reduce these charges to their proper proportions, as they have been enormously exaggerated. . . .²⁰

and that:

I regard Mr. Judge as an Occultist, possessed of considerable knowledge and animated by a deep and unswerving devotion to the Theosophical Society. I believe that he has often received direct messages from the Masters and from Their chelas, guiding and helping him in his work.²¹

One can't help but feel that she only acknowledged Judge as an Occultist because she wanted to include herself as a recipient of messages from the Masters and could, therefore, be also regarded as an Occultist.

What was most disturbing to Judge about Besant's statement before the Delegates of the European Convention was that she once again broke the Rules of the Esoteric Section. Rule seven states:

If a member, whether falsely or truly, asserts that he has received letters or communications from Masters, unless directed to divulge the same, he will *ipso facto* cease to derive any benefit from the teachings, whether the fact be known or unknown to himself or to others. A repetition of such offense gives the Head of the Section the right to expel the offender in discretion.²²

Three years earlier, in her public lecture at the Hall of Science in August 1891, Besant declared that she had received messages from the Masters.

Judge must have approached Besant about her statement, telling her that she had just broken one of the Rules of the E.S. This in all likelihood infuriated Besant for she immediately prepared a statement condemning the righteousness of Judge over her moral virtues and circulated it to all the London papers. Judge wrote:

Statements were made at the local Convention by Mrs. Besant and by me, and a resolution to close the whole matter was passed, and these were included in the pamphlet [**Neutrality of the Theosophical Society**]. This was intended in good faith to stop the whole thing in the T.S., but almost the next day Mrs. Besant issued a circular to the world, sending it to all the London papers, entitled *Occultism and Truth*, as a direct attack on me, asserting that the doctrine of "the end justifies the means" must not be allowed to prevail in the T.S., though she did not name me. Since then she has admitted that it was intended for me. With such a spirit, and after such an immediate going-back upon a solemn resolution declaring the matter closed, it was plain that the matter was not closed.

Shortly afterwards *The Westminster Gazette* reopened the whole matter with additional and elaborate charges of fraud and duplicity in the matter of messages from Masters, and this was immediately seized upon by prominent English members, by Mrs. Besant and B. Keightley, as a reason for reopening the disgraceful persecution of a fellow-member. Since then the attacks have been incessant, and the end and purport of them all was to secure a vacancy in the Vice-Presidency. Mrs. Besant and B. Keightley attended Indian meetings and, proposing and seconding, had carried a set of resolutions reiterating charges and requesting the President to demand my resignation as Vice-President.²³

This seeming about-face of Annie Besant and her flippant, castigating and snide remarks directed towards Walter Old resulted in keeping the case against Judge before the public. By making it appear that she was conciliatory, deflecting the strife onto others, she plotted the course of action without missing a beat. The plan by the conspirators was to rid the Society of Judge and she was determined to achieve that goal. Olcott and Besant, along with the Indian members, considered him a threat to their ideas of what the Society should be. Each for their own reasons felt threatened by Judge. The Brahmans of India were particularly worried

that the Society was promoting Buddhist ideals and they wanted to maintain and promote their own religious creeds. The accusers were intent on destroying Judge's reputation, and by doing so damages would also be inflicted upon the reputation of Mme. Blavatsky. This assault on Judge was encouraged by the black forces at work behind the scenes whose objective was to discredit the messengers of the Society and thereby also desecrate the Teaching.

After the European Convention the accusers felt confident that at least they had achieved a small victory over Judge. They did not obtain a confession but did end up getting him removed as the successor to Olcott. In her editorial remarks "On the Watch-Tower" for the August 1894 issue of **Lucifer** Besant stated:

This number of LUCIFER contains the text of the Enquiry into the charges made against Mr. W.Q. Judge. The statement appended to it, read by myself at the evening meeting of the Convention on July 12th, gives succinctly my own position in the matter, and contains all that I need say on the past. The future lies before us, and the Society will go forward unbroken; it has surmounted imminent danger of disruption, which threatened it. Had Mr. Judge succeeded to the Presidency, according to the election of 1892, with these charges hanging over him, India would have rejected him and the Society would have been rent in twain; but in the course of these proceedings, that election has been declared null and void, and the choice of the Society of its future President remains unfettered.²⁴

Besant continued her assault by fueling the flames of suspicion and doubt towards Judge. Following her editorial she published her declaration in "Truth Before and In All Things". This was meant to be the introduction to her article "Occultism and Truth". In it she stated:

The following declaration is aimed at an opinion too often finding expression among would-be Occultists of an untrained type, that what is falsehood on the material plane may in some "Occult" way be truth on a higher plane, and that the plea of "Occultism" excuses conduct inconsistent with a high standard of righteous living. The spread of such views would demoralize the Society, and would tend to degrade the lofty ideal of Truth and Purity which it has been the effort of every great religious teacher to uphold and to enforce by example.²⁵

In her statement at the Convention on July 12th, 1894, although she acknowledged the fact that Judge had done nothing wrong officially, Besant personally believed that he was guilty of "giving a misleading material form to messages received psychically from the Master in various ways, without acquainting the recipients with this fact."²⁶ She stated she had been misled:

I believe that Mr. Judge wrote with his own hand, consciously or automatically I do not know, in the script adopted as that of the Master, messages which he received from the Master or from chelas; and I know that, in my own case, I believed that the messages he gave me in the well-known script were messages directly precipitated or directly written by the Master.²⁷

She further claimed:

Now personally I hold that this method is illegitimate and that no one should simulate a recognized writing which is regarded as authoritative when it is authentic. And by authentic I mean directly written or precipitated by the Master himself. If a message is consciously written it should be so stated: if automatically written, it should be so stated. At least so it seems to me.²⁸

At the T.S. Convention in Boston in 1895, Judge made the following statement (read by Dr. A. Keightley on his behalf):

I have to state, that during all the years since 1875 I have been taught much about occultism by the Masters and their friends, and have been shown how to produce some phenomena, among others the precipitation of writing for the Masters at certain times. . . . And, from that time on, . . . I have been in communication with the Master and friends of his, receiving help and direction from him and them in my Theosophic work and sending for him, very frequently, — I may say hundreds of times — messages to friends and correspondents, without identifying them all as such.²⁹

Judge's take on precipitated messages was always that:

The outer senses cannot give a safe final judgment upon a precipitated message, they can only settle such physical questions as how it came, through whom, the credibility of the person, and whether any deception on the objective plane has been practiced. The inner senses, including the great combining faculty or power of intuition, are the final judges. The outer have to do solely with the phenomenal part, the inner deal with the causes and the real actors and powers.³⁰

Blavatsky wrote in "Lodges of Magic" that, unless the individual has been given the key by which to test the communication:

The inevitable consequence of applying his untrained judgment [to determine the genuineness of a 'precipitated' letter] would be to make him as likely as not to declare false what was genuine, and genuine what was false.³¹

Besant claimed that

The source of messages can only be decided by direct spiritual knowledge or, intellectually, by the nature of their contents, and each person must use his own powers and act on his own responsibility, in accepting or rejecting them.³²

Blavatsky once wrote about Besant, "She is not psychic nor spiritual in the least — all intellect. . . ."³³ One is led to conclude that, while she seemed to understand the process, and considered herself trained as an Occultist (under the tutelage of Chakravarti), she lacked the intuition to discern their authenticity for herself and wanted to be told directly. As Mahatma K.H. explains, the key to occult knowledge is intuition.³⁴

Chapter 24

Summary

After careful examination of the available documents for **The Judge Case** it becomes evident that the Orthodox Brahmans and the Shasters then associated with the Theosophical Society, because of their cultural and religious degeneration over the years, had become influenced by Dugpas and Black Magicians.¹ This was the cause of most of the troubles for the Theosophical Society. The first objective of these Black Magicians was to get H.P. Blavatsky away from Adyar and out of India forever. This they managed to do with the accusations of fraud brought against her by the Coulobms in complicity with the missionaries in 1884 and 1885. With Blavatsky physically gone from Adyar the door opened wider and wider for them to invade and influence the atmosphere there — the Masters' beneficent influences progressively dwindled and were replaced proportionately by evil influences. Judge became aware of such incursions at the time he was at Adyar and chose to return to America where the influences of the dark forces were not as pervasive and penetrating, and where Theosophy could take root and do the most good for humanity.

The Adepts of the dark forces knew well what Judge was capable of accomplishing. They therefore encouraged some of the Brahmans to discredit his work and his strong support for H.P.B. and the Theosophical CAUSE. The Brahmans were easily convinced by occult means that they had to protect their cultural heritage, their identity. With their tools of deception, doubt and suspicion, the evil forces also managed to confuse the western men and women who went to work at Adyar. Their ideals became distorted and backbiting became commonplace. Separateness in ideals became the focus, and unity of purpose became simply an impossible dream. The Masters had made it clear that the men and women first chosen to work for the CAUSE had no prior religious convictions or biases. Unfortunately the Indians were difficult to sway from their predispositions.

Western orientalists, from the ancient Greeks to our more modern philosophers, have all drawn from the abundant wealth which India possessed. The world is indebted to India for preserving much of the ancient wisdom. Unfortunately, her people became indifferent, the caste system became enclosed and segregated leaving only those of fortunate birth with access to their ancient wisdom. The have-nots, although outnumbering the haves, were excluded from this knowledge, creating much suffering. With the advent of Theosophy the Masters of Wisdom, the true keepers of that Knowledge, chose H.P. Blavatsky as their agent to reintroduce the ancient wisdom, Brahma-Vidya, to the West. As with all things esoteric, those who were infected with the old system refused to change and mounted a defense to destroy the new movement.

In his Presidential Address, on the growth of the Society, Olcott reported that by December 27th, 1893, there were 322 "living" Branches. Of those branches, 175 were in Asia, 86 were in America, 48 in Europe and 13 in Australasia.² With the excitement surrounding Annie Besant's visit to India in 1893 the Indian section only managed to increase the number of branches by 3 while in America the increase jumped by another 23 and Europe by 10. The problem was that although India reported a large number of Branches many were inactive or basically dead. Sometimes statistics can be deceiving.

In Judge's General Secretary's Report for the Ninth Annual American Convention, 1895, he exposed the problems with the statistics reports of the Indian Section.

I beg to report that in accordance with your direction of last April I requested of the General Secretary of the Indian Section information as to the rule prevailing there in regard to voting by members or Branches. To this I have not received any reply; but unofficially I was informed by an F.T.S. who spent eight months there lately that dues were collected direct from members because if attempted to be collected through Branches there would be no collection; and he also stated that of the whole alleged list of Branches dues were paid by members of only 90, and that not 40 of those 90 were

active. Recent official report shows that only 70 Branches voted on the question of removal of their Headquarters.³

The facts became clear to Judge that India was not pulling its own weight when it came to collecting dues to maintain its own expenses. In fact, Judge became aware that although the Indian Section reported a large number of branches most of them only existed on paper. Of those active branches only a small minority of members actually participated in the movement, which resulted in only a few who actually controlled the movement in India. Few of the natives participated in lecturing from center to center — most of that was performed by foreigners. Therefore few Indians saw the virtues of becoming dedicated to Theosophy or to the Theosophical CAUSE. On the other hand America had grown to 102 active branches by April 1895. In his report from the American Section to the Adyar Convention for 1894 Judge reported:

There has been no diminution of the work in this country, no loss of interest with the public, but an increase of public knowledge and inquiry, and of steady effort on the part of members, both new and old, since last year. The largest meeting of the year was that at San Francisco, where in April we held our Convention. It was fully attended by members and the public.⁴

Both in the Western and Eastern parts of America lecturers were going from center to center holding meetings expounding the teachings of Theosophy.

As demand grew for funds the American section decided to change their method of accounting and record keeping. Demands on the American Section to send more and more money each year to Adyar became economically unfeasible and unattainable. At the Convention in San Francisco the membership changed the Section's constitution by striking out the clause which required them to send Adyar 25% of their receipts, most often leaving them unable to meet their own expenses. Judge explained:

For instance, much money paid out for lecturing is entered in the books, but as it often equals in expense what comes as receipt, it would be hardly fair to consider that a basis for 25% to Adyar. And, again, donations are made to us for particular purposes, and neither should those enter into the calculation.⁵

Judge explained to Olcott that this was in no way a notice that the Americans intended to stop helping Adyar but that the current practices could no longer be sustained as in the past. Sending 25% off the top was considered unreasonable. This may have contributed significantly to Olcott's resentment towards Judge.

After the 1895 American Convention in Boston, Judge, now President of T.S. in America, sent Olcott information of the action taken, along with copies of the Resolutions regarding the formation of the T.S. in America. Albert Smythe, a fellow Irishman and friend of Judge, was present at the American headquarters when Judge received word from Olcott. Smythe explained what happened.

The splitting of the Society was the act of Colonel Olcott who hated Judge. Judge had expected that the Colonel would recognize the autonomous T.S. in America and affiliate it with Adyar, but Olcott changed his mind and refused to do this, and Judge, who had apparently been advised to the course taken in Boston in 1895 by Mrs. Tingley, was much disappointed with the Colonel's refusal. I was in the office at 144 Madison Avenue when Judge received a letter from Olcott postmarked and stamped from Spain, and Judge remarked "Now everything will be all right." But the letter was not what Judge expected and his disappointment was very obvious. This phase of the situation has never been explained, and I have never been able to learn whether Judge counted with warrant on Olcott's support, or whether it was really a right-about-face on Olcott's part, for Judge certainly expected Olcott to support him.⁶

Judge expected Olcott's support — that Judge would be President of the American Society with Olcott the International President of the Society. Legally this made a lot of sense, but Olcott did not see it that way. As with his other interpretations of the laws, Judge was always one or two steps ahead of Olcott. This could account for Olcott's acrimonious attitude towards Judge, in addition to his resentment of Judge's close association with H.P.B. and involvement with the Esoteric Section. Olcott always perceived that the E.S. was

a threat to his authority and was chided for having those thoughts by Master K.H. himself.⁷ This, along with the fact that he eventually lost contact with the Masters made him more resentful and bitter.⁸ Unfortunately, he was being influenced by the forces which took control over Adyar after 1885. This can be easily established by reviewing the people Olcott hired as managing editors of **The Theosophist** and for other office duties.⁹ Olcott's demeanor towards Judge can be easily followed in the Chronology and in letters included in some of the Appendices.

When Judge and the American members democratically voted to reform the American Section into one less dependent on Olcott, he took exception to the American action. His response in this instance was similar to that in 1889 when Blavatsky formed the Esoteric Section. Over the years Olcott had always been extremely slow in his response to Judge's requests when it came to organizing the movement in America. By this time it appears the Masters could no longer communicate with Olcott because his mind was filled with suspicions, resentments towards Judge and strongly influenced by other forces.

It seems that over the years Olcott, although well-meaning, got caught in delusions of his own making. For example, in her response to a letter from Hartmann, H.P.B. wrote:

As to . . . that portion of your letter where you speak of the "army" of the deluded — and the "imaginary" Mahatmas of Olcott — you are absolutely and sadly right. Have I not seen the thing for nearly eight years? Have I not struggled and fought against Olcott's ardent and gushing imagination, and tried to stop him every day of my life? Was he not told by me (from a letter I received through a Yogi just returned from Lake Mansarovara) in 1881 (when he was preparing to go to Ceylon) that if he did not see the Masters in their true light, and did not cease speaking and enflaming people's imaginations, that he would be held responsible for all the evil the Society might come to? Was he not told that there were no such Mahatmas, who Rishi-like could hold the Mount Meru on the tip of their finger and fly to and fro in their bodies (!!) at their will, and who were (or were imagined by fools) more gods on earth than a God in Heaven could be, etc., etc., etc.? All this I saw, foresaw, despaired, fought against; and, finally, gave up the struggle in utter helplessness. . . .

. . . Olcott to this day is sincere, true and devoted to the cause. He does and acts the best he knows how, and the mistakes and absurdities he has committed and commits to this day are due to something he lacks in the psychological portion of his brain, and he is not responsible for it. Loaded and heavy is his Karma, poor man, but much must be forgiven to him, for he has always erred through lack of right judgment, not from any vicious propensity.¹⁰

Annie Besant, although very intelligent, was quite naive about occult matters until she received some training from Chakravarti. Unfortunately his psychic training drew her away from the true Theosophical CAUSE as set out by the Masters and drew her into a world of fancy and mediumship which H.P.B. had tried to draw people away from in the first place. We only have to review her later associations, for example with C.W. Leadbeater, to realize that she took the Theosophical Society in a completely different direction.

Besant summarizes and ties in her own moral convictions as well as the Indian position quite well while describing Chakravarti.

Among his own people he is honoured and trusted, not only as a Brâhman, but as maintaining the Brâhman traditions in a careless and loose-living age.¹¹

G.N. Chakravarti was fearful of Judge's theosophical influence; he was concerned that through Judge's efforts Brahmanism in India would be eroded. Using his occult influence and his constant magnetization over Besant he was able to work on her *linga sharira* to release it out of her body. With Besant's strong desire (strong kamic forces) for justice, he was able to take advantage of these needs and thereby assist her to harass Judge astrally and physically¹² in order to get a confession from him. She thought that she could frustrate Judge, hence, confuse him. Judge was aware of these techniques but in addition to this, and his health

problems (he suffered from Chagres fever, a malignant type of malarial fever which often leaves a predisposition to tuberculosis in its trail), he also faced “the efforts of the Dark Powers to kill him, — the venomous hatred of his persecutors and slanderers, *once his close associates*, supplying the lines of contact for the major onslaught.”¹³ He was too tired to keep up the fight by staying where he could be found. This intrusion created many problems for Judge which further affected his vitality.

To rehabilitate his health he decided to move around so that his enemies could not trace him down. He wrote from Cincinnati on May 20th, 1895, “I am away from home for my health [which is] much hurt by others’ hate.”¹⁴ Secrecy became necessary. Judge wrote to Hargrove, June 14th, 1895, “There was no need for me to write you because we communicate other ways.” He added:

Claude [Falls Wright] is now running the T.S. office in my absence, as it appears I shall have to stay away a considerable time. I am on the move like a pilgrim. But I am better a little each day. Been with Dr. Buck for a month. Don’t give away the address. Address will remain 144 Madison Avenue for all.¹⁵

By this time Judge could only trust a few of his friends, one of whom was E.T. Hargrove who looked after many of Judge’s needs until he died.

In his May 20th, 1895 letter Judge stated the following about Annie Besant:

I wish we could all ignore Mrs. B. once and for all. She lives by fighting or flattery now. But what blasphemy to say that, even be I guilty, the Master would stoop so low as to bid her hound me over the world trying to murder my character. *I pity her in her next life*. It will not be I who will then annoy her but the hundreds who have been insulted and outraged by her acts and words ag’st me. Instead of one she will then have hundreds of enemies and obstructions.¹⁶

Years of fighting Chagres fever, and after 1894 the evil influences and the hatred sent towards him, Judge could no longer sustain the fight and died at 9:00 a.m.¹⁷ on March 21st, 1896.¹⁸ The Masters of the Theosophical Movement did not intervene as they had done with Blavatsky on many occasions. It is presumed by some that the Masters withdrew their direct influence following the deaths of Blavatsky and Judge, and that the Movement was left to karma and to those who could find the true spirit upon which it had been founded. Judge died with a longing to continue to serve the Theosophical CAUSE. His accusers and those who influenced them cast a large shadow of doubt and suspicion, a spell, over Judge’s work in the Theosophical Movement. This created a rift which has never healed and most likely never can because of the divisions of philosophy which transpired. These divisions, likely orchestrated, have given people the choice between True Wisdom and pseudo wisdom.

Those who followed Judge also broke into factions, each believing they had captured the true spirit of the Movement and had the proper leader in place to continue Judge’s endeavors. With Judge barely dead his followers reorganized themselves and quickly became at odds with one another, some believing at first that Judge had found his successor while others recanted. With all these organizations in place, each believing they had the approval of the Masters and unable to move the other into reconciliation, Judge remained unvindicated, and basically forgotten by those who had cast him aside as a fraud. Judge was a Founding Member of the original Theosophical Society. H.P.B. on at least one occasion referred to him as “My Co-Founder, W.Q. Judge, General Secretary in America.”¹⁹ He was also the only North American initiated by the Masters, in 1884.

Franz Hartmann, who H.P.B. once thought she could train as an occultist, and who had been exposed to the astral influences of the black magicians at Adyar, expressed succinctly when reviewing Edmund Garrett’s **Isis Very Much Unveiled**:

To me it appears that the author is a clever and sharp reasoner, but without a great deal of intuition, or to express it in “theosophical language,” one in whom Kama-Manas has been excessively

developed at the expense of Buddhi-Manas, as is generally the case among the higher classes of educated Englishmen, whose principal characteristic is superficiality of thought with a great knowledge of insignificant details — but absent of profundity of intelligence.²⁰

Hartmann's comments were specific and to the point. He made sure that his perception of the facts not only included those outside Theosophical circles but also those highly intellectual persons, many of whom were in complete support of Besant's actions. Among these were Bertram Keightley, G.N. Chakravarti, Walter Old, N.D. Khandalavala and others with strong intellectual capabilities. One interesting note is that all the persons involved with the writing of Besant's **The Case Against W. Q. Judge** were lawyers. It is amazing that this document, which was intended to be her prosecutor's brief, was such a dud. That alone indicates that Besant's actions to bring Judge before the Judicial Committee were not the real reason in mind at the time. The real reason was to bring accusations against Judge in order to discredit him before his peers, ruin his reputation and prevent him from ever becoming President or hold office in the Theosophical Society ever again.

Ruining a man's reputation is worse than killing his body — for the body is dissipated after death — but the thoughts of injury to a man's character may continue to affect that Ego for a long time thereafter. Such harmful actions condemn that Ego to be subjected to resentment and prejudice in subsequent lives. Persons bringing about or executing accusations based on unsubstantiated innuendoes will also suffer (seemingly) great injustices as a result of their previous actions.

In 1906, while in America and away from the influences of Adyar, Olcott confessed shortly before he died that he had “wronged Judge, not wilfully or with malice; nevertheless, I have done this and I regret it.”²¹ This admission in itself indicates that Olcott was not in full control of his own mind at the time his actions were taken against Judge — that his mind was being influenced by external forces.

Annie Besant although not as forthright in her reflection did admit:

As I said, I too have made many mistakes, and that in regard to Judge, I was young in the Movement then, impetuous, and in my zeal did things that I would not think of doing to-day. Judge did a great work in the West and although I still believe that some of his claims are untenable, he did a splendid work for Masters and for Theosophy in America.²²

As for the others involved in conspiring to formulate unsubstantiated accusations against W.Q. Judge, there are no records available to show that any effort was made by them to make amends. Most of these people became less and less involved with the T.S. Bertram Keightley “had given H.P.B. a promise that he would never leave the T.S. and he never did, but he found himself so utterly out of touch with it in India . . . that he took no part in its activities.”²³ He became very demoralized with the Society after Besant took it over. He lived out his last years near his friend, G.N. Chakravarti, in Allahabad and surrounded himself with “a number of highly educated Hindus” and developed “a good understanding of the Advaita Vedanta”.²⁴

After about eleven years, Annie Besant's association with Gyanendra N. Chakravarti came to an end. It was reported “that she had been disappointed in her expectations from her association with him.”²⁵ Little is recorded of Chakravarti's involvement with Besant and the T.S. but his influence over her is quite noticeable in her writings which

were tinged with Brahmin thought and dogma, and she never recovered the independence and purity of Theosophic thinking, for she had barely escaped from the Guruship of Mr. Chakravarti until she fell under the spell of Mr. Leadbeater and his psychic revelations.²⁶

N.D. Khandalavala remained with the Theosophical Society and served on the General Council of the T.S. well into the 1930s. He maintained possession of much archival material, especially the most famous letter from H.P.B., “Why I Do Not Return to India”, which was published for the first time in 1932.

The Dugpas and Black Magicians who acted upon the naive and the weak-minded theosophists achieved their goal of destroying what they could of the Theosophical Society. They played with members’ best virtues and ruined much of the Theosophical CAUSE, to the extent that most theosophists today are still caught in the web of Maya which was spread over the Society. Some maintain and believe that they are following the Original Program as set up by the Masters, but how can they be sure when there are more enemies within the Theosophical Movement than there are without? These members still believe that if they follow their leaders and remain loyal to these organizations, salvation and help will come from the Masters — that if they join certain Esoteric groups they will be the ones chosen to achieve enlightenment while those outside will not. Although there is more theosophical literature available today than at any time prior, the amount of dogmatism has increased in proportion.

During a series of crises in 1889-1890 H.P.B. wrote what appear to have been prophetic words regarding both Judge and the Society. In the “Preliminary Explanations” to E.S. Instruction No. III she affirmed that Judge “has ever remained faithful to his original pledge”. She claimed that although he was being targeted, “Brother Judge refuses to defend himself”, then stated the following:

Is it the part of a “Brother-Fellow” to remain indifferent and inactive when one who has done so much for the noble and sacred CAUSE is vilified for its sake . . . when he is selected by the enemy as the mark of all the lying and damaging attacks of those who wish to destroy the Society in order to build on its ruins another, a *bogus* Body of the same name, and to enshrine therein an idol with feet of clay and a heart full of selfishness and evil, for the admiration and worship of credulous fools? Can we allow them to achieve this object when they seek to ensure success by ruining the character of this most unselfish champion of our T.S.?²⁷

Those who really *knew* Judge had a great deal of respect for the man. One incident worth noting is the following, which appeared in **The Irish Theosophist**.

In the Convention of 1895, some ninety persons out of four thousand or thereabouts, were found, after six months’ active work and search, to sign a species of memorial unfavorable to Mr. Judge. Not half a dozen of these were active workers. With a single exception they could not be said to be persons of any marked standing. They had, as against them in judgment, men and women whose names are as well known in foreign cities, or upon the great foreign exchanges, or through the United States, as they are known in the cities of their residence. Commenting upon this fact, a party of such men were lunching in New York, just after the Convention, 1895, and said to an English guest: “Here are we, whose word is our bond in the communities where we live and beyond them; we can raise thousands of dollars upon our mere word at half an hour’s notice, and that financial test is the great test of the present time. We know Judge intimately; we have seen him almost daily for years. He can have anything he wants of us, and he wants nothing for himself. We know his character and daily life; the whole community knows it, and we know these charges are untrue. A man is known where he lives as he is known nowhere else. We are by no means fools, as our business contemporaries can tell you, and we stand by Judge to a man.”²⁸

If we judge a tree by its fruit then we should judge William Q. Judge by his deeds. He stated:

We have entered on the dim beginning of a new era already. It is the era of Western Occultism and of special and definite treatment and exposition of theories hitherto generally considered. We have to do as Buddha told his disciples: preach, promulgate, expound, illustrate, and make clear in detail all the great things we have learned. That is our work, and not the bringing out of surprising things about clairvoyance and other astral matters, not the blinding of the eye of science by discoveries impossible for them but easy for the occultist. The Master’s plan has not altered. He gave it out long ago. It is to make the world at large better, to prepare a right soil for the growing out of the powers

of the soul, which are dangerous if they spring up in our present selfish soil. It is not the Black Lodge that tries to keep back psychic development; it is the White Lodge. The Black would fain have all the psychic powers full flower now, because in our wicked, mean, hypocritical, and money-getting people they would soon wreck the race. This idea may seem strange, but for those who will believe my unsupported word I say it is the Master's saying.²⁹

– The End –

ADDENDUM

Certain issues need to be addressed today regarding the failure by those who have controlled the information, namely the Presidents of the Theosophical Society in Adyar, to make public important documents relating to the “Judge Case”. Olcott charged Judge of alleged *misuse of Mahâtmâs’ names and handwritings*, which was immediately followed by Besant’s “brief” of six so-called charges. Since then most theosophical historians have ignored this controversial case. Adyar has maintained that Judge was guilty, and historical records have been kept in check to reflect this. Because Adyar had control over most of Blavatsky’s papers, Olcott’s papers, Judge’s letters to H.P.B., Olcott and others, it has been relatively easy to maintain the status quo. Most people who came to the Society after this whole affair were sincere students who blindly followed their leaders (who were hoping that it would just be ignored). But, to quote Judge, “sincerity does not confer of itself knowledge, much less wisdom”.¹

Accurate history is important and its study by any would-be theosophist should be encouraged. It should not be distorted to protect a Society’s image. Responsibility to protect and defend historical archives from corruption falls upon officials entrusted with this obligation. One is left with the impression that the powers controlling Adyar policy may not want certain truths exposed.

History is never totally forgotten and can sometimes rise from the ashes, Phoenix-like, to punish those who have ignored it. Theosophical organizations have a responsibility to release historical documents to its membership so they may be made aware of the karmic ties they are associating themselves with. It is incumbent upon the membership to request that these documents be released.

Among the items listed below are records covering the time period of Judge’s stay in India. These are valuable documents which could supply pertinent information to clear up many controversial details.

Some of the important historical documents that should be in the Archives at Adyar include:

1. Exhibit “A”, which H.S. Olcott, Annie Besant, Judge Khandalavala, Walter R. Old, W.Q. Judge and Dr. Buck, and others have seen.
2. The “Register” in which Judge kept a record of all the witnesses who viewed the Shrine and the Occult Room at Adyar.
3. The Visitors Book kept during the time Judge was at Adyar. All persons coming and going had to sign in and out.
4. According to Josephine Ransom in **A Short History of the Theosophical Society**, Annie Besant kept a Diary of events when she traveled during the years 1893, 1894 and 1895 in which she recorded details of important incidents involving her.²
5. The letters from W.Q. Judge to H.S. Olcott which were not published in **The Theosophist**. The letters published were the ones where we find Judge struggling during his years of probation, before he went to India where he was initiated by Master “M”.
6. All the documentation mentioned in Annie Besant’s **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, which was never supplied with her document.
7. Before leaving India in 1884 Judge left letters behind to Olcott and to H.P.B. “explaining” and “assuring” them of his continued affection and friendship.
8. “Documents, Records, and Private Letters in connection with the Coulomb, Judge, Leadbeater and other Cases, and with many other incidents; all in the Archives of the Theosophical Society” according to Josephine Ransom in **A Short History of the Theosophical Society**, p.563.

In 1889 Richard Harte wrote “Applied Theosophy” in which he equated Adyar to the “Rome” of Theosophists. This statement³ was and is still accepted and promoted by Adyar as their philosophy, attributing it to Olcott all these years. But Adyar is not “the centre of the Theosophical Movement” and true theosophists do not need Adyar in their hearts in order to aspire to the true CAUSE as established by the Masters and H.P. Blavatsky, and sustained and promoted by William Q. Judge.

Chapter 1 ~ The Early Years

1. See Appendix J ~ Astrological Observations.
2. See “A Practical Occultist” in **Fohat**, Vol. 7, Fall 2003, pp.53-54, 69.
3. **Theosophy (Path)**, Vol. 11, May 1896, p.52.
4. **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 13, May 1932, p.66.
5. **The Lamp**, Vol. 2, April 1896, p.131.
6. Mrs. Judge eventually came to see the value of the teachings and joined the United Lodge of Theosophists in 1915. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.6.
7. **The Lamp**, Vol. 2, April 1896, p.131.
8. These accounts were collected and published as a book one year later, titled **People From The Other World**.
9. “Yours Till Death and After, H.P.B.”, by W.Q. Judge in **H.P.B., In Memory of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky By Some of her Pupils**. (1931), pp.65-66.
10. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, pp.6-7, as related by John H. Judge during a visit to Point Loma Theosophical headquarters, August 25th, 1914.
11. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.7, taken from **A Historical Retrospect — 1875-1896 — of the Theosophical Society**, H.S. Olcott, Madras, 1896, p.19. The authors of **WQJ T. Pioneer** added: “This was written from memory. As Olcott’s Diaries of the earliest years of the T.S. have strangely disappeared, there is no way of confirming what occurred at the time.”
12. **General Report of the 21st Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1896, pp.4-5 and **A Historical Retrospect — 1875-1896 — of the Theosophical Society**, p.3.
13. **General Report of the 21st Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1896, p.20 and **A Historical Retrospect — 1875-1896 — of the Theosophical Society**, pp.18-19.
14. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 4, March 1896, p.114.
15. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.11.
16. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.11.
17. Dâmodar K. Mavalankar was born in September 1857 at Ahmedâbâd, Gujarât, to a wealthy Brahman caste family. He became involved with the Theosophical Society as a very young man and was a disciple of Master Koot Humi. He became the business manager of the publications department of the Society, which consisted mainly of **The Theosophist** at the time, for which he wrote numerous articles. (See: **Damodar and the Pioneers of the Theosophical Movement**, compiled and annotated by Sven Eek, pp.3-5.)
18. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.11. See **Damodar**, Sven Eek, pp.78-100.

Chapter 2 ~ Judge in London and Paris

1. Original letter is in the Adyar Archives. The letter from Damodar referred to has been lost. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.11. Judge’s letter was reprinted in **Damodar**, pp.76-77.
2. **Damodar**, Sven Eek, p.76.
3. **The Word**, Vol. 14, March 1912, p.331.
4. **The Word**, Vol. 14, March 1912, p.328.
5. **The Word**, Vol. 15, April 1912, p.20.
6. **LBS**, Letter XXXIV [34], p.82.

7. **Old Diary Leaves**, Third Series (1904), pp.90-94, and Michael Gomes' Blavatsky Lecture 2001, pp.19-21.
8. **Old Dairy Leaves**, Third Series, 1895, p.94. "But the problem was not settled, as the members of the Hermetic Branch wished to belong also to the London Lodge, so as to benefit by the course of instruction being given there. This Col. Olcott disallowed, and made a Provisional Rule forbidding multiple membership. This decision upset the plans for the Hermetic Lodge. The Colonel suggested that Mrs. Kingsford return her Charter and form her friends into an independent Society, and thus make it feasible for them to belong to both. This was done." **A Short History of the Theosophical Society**, Josephine Ransom, 1938, pp.198-199.
9. **BCW**, Vol. 1, (1977), p.438.
10. **Creating the New Age: Theosophy's Origins in the British Isles**. Michael Gomes' Blavatsky Lecture 2001, p.19.
11. **BCW**, Vol. 1, (1977), p.498.
12. **The Word**, Vol. 14, March 1912, p.328.
13. **Damodar**, Sven Eek, p.76.
14. Judge had written other mystical articles before, such as "The Wandering Eye", "The Tell Tale Picture Gallery" and "A Weird Tale". All of these articles were later republished in a small and very rare 86 page book titled **Occult Studies**. It was privately printed and published in Boston, Mass. by W.W. Harmon most likely after Judge's death in 1896.
15. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, July 1884, pp.251-254.
16. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, Feb. 1884, p.122. An Editor's Note following Judge's comments states he was not justified in these remarks and that Sinnett had most decidedly "*for the first time clearly explained* to the world of the profane" the allegories that lay scattered in the Hindu sacred literature.
17. **Report of Investigation**, p.59.
18. **The Word**, Vol. 14, March 1912, p.332.
19. **The Word**, Vol. 15, April 1912, p.17.
20. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No.LXXXIV [84], pp.397-398. Mohini had been selected by the Masters to accompany Blavatsky on this European trip to impress the French and to educate the English. He had been sent notes by K.H. just prior to H.P.B.'s arrival in Paris one of which stated: "Appearances go a long way with the 'Pelings'. One has to impress them externally before a regular, lasting, interior impression is made. Remember and try to understand why I expect you to do the following: When Upasika [H.P.B.] arrives, you will meet and receive her as *though you were in India, and she your own mother*. You must not mind the crowd of Frenchmen and others. . . . it is the interior man, the *indweller* you salute, not H.P.B." **Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom**, Second Series, Letters 62 and 63, pp.111-113.
21. Babula or "Baboola". His real name was Vallah Bulla. **Report of Investigation**, p.133.
22. **Old Diary Leaves**, Third Series (1895), pp.79, 86.
23. **The Word**, Vol. 15, April 1912, p.17.
24. **The Word**, Vol. 15, April 1912, p.18.
25. **The Word**, Vol. 15, April 1912, pp.18-19.
26. **The Word**, Vol. 15, April 1912, pp.22-23.
27. **The Word**, Vol. 15, April 1912, p.22.
28. **Vania**, p.180.
29. **The Word**, Vol. 15, April 1912, p.18.
30. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. CXXXIV [134] (The Prayat Letter), pp.461-464.

31. Experiencing such occult powers is often equated to undergoing surgery. As with any operation the patient has to convalesce, therefore, Judge would have gained in strength and confidence over time. The old axiom applies here also: one has to learn to walk before one can run.
32. **Rebirth of the Occult Tradition**, Boris de Zirkoff, p.5. and **BCW: The Secret Doctrine**, Vol. 1, as “Historical Introduction”, p.5.
33. **Lucifer**, Vol. 8, July 1891, p.359.
34. **Reminiscences of H.P.B.**, pp.102-104. Much of Judge’s conversations with H.P.B. while they were in France centered around Elementals and Elementaries. After Judge started **The Path** and his other magazines to answer questions for students, he included some of his knowledge which he received through his experiences and that which was imparted to him by H.P.B. at that time, in 1884. To mark the fiftieth anniversary of Judge’s passing the Bombay Company (ULT) in India published a small book, **Vernal Blooms**, which included much of that occult knowledge.
35. **LBS**, Letter from Judge to H.P.B. dated Feby. 5, 1886, p.313.
36. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 53, November 1931, p.197.
37. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 53, November 1931, p.197.
38. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 53, November 1931, p.196.
39. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 53, November 1931, p.201.
40. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. LXII [62], p.355.
41. **My Guest**, Francesca Arundale, p.49.

Chapter 3 ~ Judge Goes To India

1. Emma Coulomb met Blavatsky in Cairo, Egypt, in 1872 at which time she apparently gave Blavatsky some money as “she was really in want.” Emma married one year later and she and Alexis almost immediately lost their fortune. They then moved to Calcutta in 1874 where they struggled to survive. They lived for a while in Galle, Ceylon, and eventually moved to Bombay in March 1880. They sought out Blavatsky there and she invited them to live at the headquarters where apparently one week later, Olcott asked Emma to “direct the domestic affairs.” **Some Account of My Intercourse with Madame Blavatsky, From 1872 to 1884; . . .** by Madame Coulomb, (1884), pp.3-8.
2. **Damodar**, Sven Eek, pp.580-583.
3. Franz Hartmann stated that during her stay at headquarters Madame Coulomb claimed no wages. “She had arrived at head-quarters penniless and taken into the house by Madame Blavatsky out of charity, and been given full control over everything, including the purse; and when she left the head-quarters she sported a large roll of bank notes. (The household expenses at the head-quarters since the Coulobms left, have been each month 230 to 270 Rupees less than the monthly expenses during their presence.)” **Report**, p.25.
4. **Report**, pp.39-41.
5. **Vania**, pp.210-211, 227.
6. **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 3, p.123.
7. **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 3, p.204. In a letter to Padshah, Feb. 5, 1886, Judge wrote: “I went there with full authority and from the first moment saw all, had all the keys and took complete charge.” **Practical Occultism**, p.15.
8. **A Short History of the T.S.**, p.201 and **Old Diary Leaves**, Third Series (1895), p.155.
9. **A Short History of the T.S.**, p.203.
10. **Practical Occultism**, pp.13-14; **The Theosophist**, Vol. 53, December 1931, pp.307-308, letter from Judge to Olcott.
11. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, September 1884, Supp. p.128.

12. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, September 1884, Supp. p.128.
13. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, September 1884, Supp. p.128.
14. **Theos. Movement**, Bombay, March 17, 1934, p.66.
15. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, Sep. 1884, Supp. pp.128-129.
16. The Hyderabad Theosophical Society was formed on December 17th, 1882. Dorabjee Dasabhy, President; Babu Gya Prasada, Secretary; Babu Raghunath Prasad, Assistant Secretary. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 4, February 1883, Supp. p.2.
17. The Secunderabad Theosophical Society was formed on December 25th, 1882. M. Etherajulu Naidu Garu, President; I.M. Ragoonayakulu Naidu Garu, Vice-President; C. Kuppuswami Aiyar Avergal, Secretary. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 4, February 1883, Supp. p.2. By October 1884 it was reported that the President, M.E. Naidu, had resigned and Bezonji Aderji was elected to replace him for the un-expired term. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 6, October 1884, Supp. p.143.
18. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 6, October 1884, Supp. pp.141-143.
19. The Adoni Theosophical Society was formed on October 1st, 1883. With the President-Founder in the chair an election was held. Elected were B.Veerasamiah Garu, President; A. Theruvengada Mudaliar, Vice-President; C. Munusawmy Nayudu, Secretary and Treasurer. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, November 1883, Supp. p.21.
20. The Gooty Theosophical Society was formed on December 14th, 1883 with W .T. Brown presiding over the election of officers. I. Sreneivasa Row Garu, President; Pattu Kesava Pillai Avergal, Vice-President; Bangalore Pappu Narasimiah Garu, B.A., Secretary. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, January 1884, Supp. p.8.
21. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, September 1884, Supp. p.129.

Chapter 4 ~ Judge At Adyar

1. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, February 1884, Supp. pp.41-42.
2. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 5, March 1884, Supp. p.54.
3. **BCW**, Vol. 8, (1960), p.448.
4. "The So-Called Exposé of Madame Blavatsky" by W.Q. Judge. First appeared in the **Boston Index**, March 11, 1886 and copied in the **Banner of Light**, April 3rd, 1886. Also found in **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 3, pp.122-124, and **Theosophy**, Vol. 35, pp.107-109.
5. J.D.B. Gribble was a retired Anglo-Indian official employed by the missionaries as an expert. He visited the headquarters with Rev. Patterson on September 27th, 1884, and at the end of October issued a pamphlet, **Report of an Examination into the Blavatsky Correspondence**. This was followed by the missionary-sponsored pamphlet by Emma Coulomb, **Some Account of my Association with Madame Blavatsky from 1872 to 1884**, under the date of November 29th, 1884, and issued in December. **Vania**, p.251. [On the cover of the 1885 reprint the title has been changed to: **Some Account of my Intercourse With Madame Blavatsky . . .**]
6. "The So-Called Exposé of Madame Blavatsky" by W.Q. Judge. **Theosophy**, Vol. 35, pp.107-109; **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 3, pp.122-124.
7. **Vania**, pp.220-221.
8. Babula left England for India on August 16th, 1884, apparently on account of his wife's illness. According to Hodgson's Report, at first he, and then Subba Row questioned Babula thinking that he was responsible for the disappearance of the Shrine on the 20th of September. Babula was being accused of taking the Shrine from the Occult Room and destroying it under orders from Mme. Blavatsky. Upon questioning by Hodgson, Damodar then claimed that Babula had returned on the morning of the 21st instead, but the Visitor's Book had a written entry of him returning at 9PM on the evening of the 20th. This created more confusion and suspicions with Richard Hodgson. **First Report**, [Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research], p.227.
9. The other four witnesses to Babula's Statement, dated September 21st, 1884, were Babajee Dharbagiri Nath, F.T.S., Damodar K. Mavalankar, Nivaran Chandra Mookerjee and V. Cooposwamy Iyer, Pleader, of Madura. Interestingly Hartmann's name was not among these. **Report of Investigation**, p.134.

10. **Report of Investigation**, pp.133-134.
11. “Madame Blavatsky in India, A Reply to Moncure D. Conway” by W.Q. Judge. **Theosophy**, Vol. 34, May 1946, pp.250-251 and **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 3, pp.198-205. The article first appeared in **The Arena**, (5: 28), March 1892.
12. “The So-Called Exposé of Madame Blavatsky” by W.Q. Judge. **Theosophy**, Vol. 35, January 1947, pp.108-109, and **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 3, pp.122-124.
13. Richard Hodgson arrived at headquarters on December 18th, 1884. He spent three months pursuing his inquiries and returned to England in April 1885. His Report to the British Psychical Research Society was released while Blavatsky was in Germany in 1885. **First Report** [Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research], p.219.
14. **First Report** [Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research], Mr. Hodgson’s Report, p.224.
15. Letter from H.P. Blavatsky to W.Q. Judge dated May 1st, 1885. **Theos. History**, Vol. 5, No. 2, April 1994, pp.52-54.
16. **Theos. History**, Vol. 2, April 1994, p.52. A year later, in a letter to Hartmann dated April 3rd, 1886, H.P.B. wrote: “[Olcott] was led on blindly by people as blind as himself to see you in quite a false light, and there was a time, for a month or two, when I myself — notwithstanding my inner voice, and to the day Master’s voice told me I was mistaken in you and had to keep friends — shared his blindness.” (This was apparently in reference to Olcott having been made to believe Hartmann wanted to oust him from the presidency.) **The Path**, Vol. 10, March 1896, p.368.
17. Letter from W.Q. Judge to H.P.B. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, January 1997, pp.165-166. His foretelling statement “and perhaps someday that departure will be of benefit to the Society and the Cause” is explored in Chapter 17: W.Q. Judge’s Initiation.
18. **LBS**, Letter from W.Q. Judge to H.P. Blavatsky, pp.313-314.
19. **Theos. History**, Vol. 5, No. 2, April 1994, p.49.
20. **Sunrise**, April/May 1996, “A Biographical Sketch”, pp.99-111.
21. **Priestess of the Occult: Madame Blavatsky**, Gertrude Marvin Williams, p.243. New York, Alfred Knopf, 1946, 345 pages; New York, Lancer books, circa 1970, 384 pages.
22. **The Hall of Magic Mirrors**, Victor Endersby, A Hearthstone Book published by Carlton Press, Inc., New York, 1969, p.218. His original investigations first appeared in his periodical, **Theosophical Notes**, which Edmonton Theosophical Society republished.
23. **LBS**, Letter from W.Q. Judge to H.P. Blavatsky, (February 5, 1886), p.313.
24. **First Report** [Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research], Richard Hodgson’s Report, p.220.
25. **Old Diary Leaves**, Third Series (1895), pp.246, 378.
26. Olcott, accompanied by Rudolph Gebhard of Germany, left Marseilles, France, on October 20th, 1884, on the S.S. *Colombo*, arriving at Bombay on November 10th. **Old Diary Leaves**, Third Series (1895), p.183; **BCW**, Vol. 6, pp.xxxvii-xxxviii.
27. The portraits of the Masters were started on June 19th, 1884, by Hermann Schmiechen, a German painter. They were given to Olcott for the Theosophical Society.
28. Most of Judge’s investigative and preliminary work when he first arrived at Adyar, such as his register of witnesses, was never brought forward and hardly even mentioned by Hartmann in any of his reports. In fact, when Hodgson arrived at Adyar he asked Hartmann to help him gather testimonies from members regarding the Shrine and the Occult Room.
29. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, No. 5, January 1997, p.165.
30. **The Latest Attack on the Theosophical Society**, issued by The Council of The London Lodge, London, 1884, 23 pp., (p.4).
31. **Reply by William Q. Judge . . .** p.20; **Two Replies by William Q. Judge**, p.46.
32. **The Latest Attack on the Theosophical Society**, issued by The Council of The London Lodge, London, 1884, 23 pp., pp.7-10.
33. Hartmann’s statement was directly related to Ezekiel’s mental state immediately after H.P.B. and her party left Bombay for Europe on February 20th, 1884. “Statement from F. Hartmann”, **First Report** [Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research], Richard Hodgson’s Report, p.123.

34. **Vania**, p.225.
35. **Vania**, p.226.
36. **A Short History of the T.S.**, p.203.
37. **Theos. Movement**, 1875-1950, p.118.
38. **Theosophy Unveiled**, pp.58, 74, and **Theosophy Exposed**, p.80.
39. **Theos. History**, Vol. 5, No. 2, p.52.
40. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.12; **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 20, April 1939, p.35.
41. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, No. 5, January 1997, p.165.
42. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, No. 5, January 1997, p.166.
43. Judge and Smythe likely agreed to correspond when they were both settled again but as far as can be ascertained, they had no communication between 1884 and 1889.
44. **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 20, April 1939, p.35. This is corroborated by Mrs. Judge in a letter to **Theos. Movement**, quoted in Vol. 1, No.9, July 1931, p.35 (and reprinted in **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 12, September 1931, p.209) where she wrote, "You remember he spent several months in India but at a most trying and unsettled time, and came back very worn and ill."
45. "What Killed William Q. Judge?", **Fohat**, Vol. 7, Summer 2003 (Part I), pp.29-34, and Fall 2003 (Part II), pp.60-64, 69-70.
46. **General Report of the 21st Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1896, p.22, and **A Historical Retrospect — 1875-1896 — of the Theosophical Society**, p.21. Also see "A Practical Occultist", **Fohat**, Vol. 7, Fall 2003, pp.53-54, 69.

Chapter 5 ~ Back in America

1. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, (from Lloyd's of London records), p.12.
2. **Report of Proceedings T.S. in Europe**, First Annual Convention of the T.S. in Europe, London, July 1891, p.49; also in **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.13.
3. In a letter to Olcott (see August 30, 1893 entry) Judge mentions that he had been receiving teachings from the Masters since 1875 and that Olcott did not know of it. (**Reply By William Q. Judge**, p.15.) According to Olcott there was a period during those years in New York when H.P.B. was writing her **Isis Unveiled** that Judge had stayed away for a while. Olcott claimed there had been some trouble between Judge and H.P.B. This may have been one of Judge's tests during his probation period.
4. Letter from H.P. Blavatsky to W.Q. Judge, dated May 1st, 1885 from Naples. **Theos. History**, Vol. 5, April 1994, p.50. In this letter she tears a strip off everyone's hide, especially Hartmann.
5. Blavatsky resigned her position as Corresponding Secretary of the Theosophical Society on March 21st, 1885. Her letter is reprinted as "Retirement of Madame Blavatsky" in the Supplement to **The Theosophist**, Vol. 6, May 1885, p.195.
6. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, January 1997, p.165.
7. **Theos. Forum** (P.L.), Vol. 3, August 1932, pp.251-253, and **WQJ T. Pioneer**, pp.18-19.
8. **Sunrise**, April/May 1996, p.104.
9. **Report of Proceedings**, Second Annual Convention, 1888, p.7. In his "Report of the General Secretary" Judge also stated: "Of course the American Branches could have met together and formed themselves independently, but since we draw our real inspiration from India, it would seem unwise as well as disloyal to have failed to try and keep the orderly and regular succession."
10. **The Path**, Vol. 1, April 1886, p.1.
11. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.7. From an unpublished letter of H.P.B.'s.

12. See Appendix I ~ Judge's Pseudonyms and Words of Wisdom, for a list of William Q. Judge's pseudonyms.
13. **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.14; **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, June 1895, p.156.
14. **Sunrise**, April/May 1996, p.105. See **Report of Proceedings** for the Second Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in America, New York, April 26th and 27th, 1896, "President's Report", pp.10-13.
15. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fourth Series (1910), p.508.

Chapter 6 ~ Bertram Keightley

1. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, March 1895, p.95.
2. **The Path**, Vol. 8, August 1893, p.144.
3. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 12, April 1891, Supp. pp.1-li.
4. **Report of Proceedings**, American Section, 1890, p.9.
5. **The Path**, Vol. 5, May 1890, p.66.
6. Details of Bertram Keightley's tour after the Chicago Convention and including his stay in New York: **The Path**, Vol. 5, June 1890, pp.96-98; July 1890, p.130.
7. As far as can be determined, this lecture has never been published.
8. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.55.
9. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, p.21.
10. **The Path**, Vol. 5, July 1890, p.131.
11. **The Path**, Vol 5, April 1890, pp.1-2.
12. **Theosophy**, Vol. 9, August 1921, p.306. See Chronology, April 1890 entry.
13. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, July 1996, p.92.
14. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, July 1996, p.92.
15. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, July 1996, p.92.
16. **Theosophy**, Vol. 9, August 1921, p.306.
17. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, p.21.
18. **BCW**, Vol. 12, (1980), p.309.
19. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, July 1996, p.91.
20. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, July 1996, p.92.
21. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, July 1996, pp.92-93.
22. **General Report of the 15th Convention and Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1890, p.13.
23. At the December 1890 Annual Convention in Adyar Bertram Keightley gave a lecture, "Theosophy in the West", which incorporated many of his experiences in America while touring there the year before. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 12, July 1891, p.589.
24. **General Report of the 15th Convention and Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1890, p.12.

Chapter 7 ~ Richard Harte – Troubles at Adyar

1. Richard Harte was an experienced journalist from New York and a Fellow of the T.S. since 1877. Harte accompanied Olcott to India, arriving in Bombay November 10th, 1888, to assist with the editorship of **The Theosophist**. After three years of service, Harte returned to England.
2. One is left to wonder why Adyar has continually insisted that “Applied Theosophy” be attributed to Col. Olcott. By May 1921, United Lodge of Theosophists, in their magazine **Theosophy** (Vol. 9, No. 7, May 1921, pp.193-208), had proven that it had been written by Richard Harte in June 1889. In November 1930 Adyar first republished “Applied Theosophy” as No. 143 in their Series of **Adyar Pamphlets**, indicating H.S. Olcott as the author. In 1975, on the occasion of the Centenary of The Theosophical Society, Adyar once again published the article in a 280 page book titled **Applied Theosophy and other Essays**, still attributing it to Olcott. It was also reprinted in **The American Theosophist**, Vol. 69, June 1981, pp.164-170, and again attributed to Olcott. There is abundant evidence in **The Theosophist** to show that Olcott did not write this article. (See the Chronology section for details.)
3. **Theos. Forum (P.L.)**, Vol. 28, July 1950, p.386.
4. See Chronology, June 1889 entry.
5. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 10, September 1889, p.703.
6. **Lucifer**, Vol. 4, August 1889, pp.506-509, and **BCW**, Vol. 11, pp.378-384.
7. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 10, July 1889, Supp. pp.cxix-cxx.
8. **Lucifer**, Vol. 4, August 1889, p.507, and **BCW**, Vol. 11, p.380.
9. **Theos. Forum (New Series)**, Vol. 5, January 1934, pp.130-131.
10. **Theos. Forum (New Series)**, Vol. 5, January 1934, p.132.
11. **Theos. Forum (New Series)**, Vol. 5, January 1934, p.133.
12. **Theos. Forum (New Series)**, Vol. 5, January 1934, p.133.
13. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, Jan.1890, Supp. pp.lxxv-lxxvi. See Chronology, Jan. 1890 entry.
14. **Lucifer**, Vol. 5, Feb. 1890, pp.517-518. See Chronology, Feb. 1890 entry.
15. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, March 1890, Supp. p.cv.
16. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 12, October 1890, Supp. p.ii.
17. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 12, March Supp. p.xxix. Also see the biographical sketch of Richard Harte in the Chronology section.
18. **Practical Occultism**, pp.225-227.

Chapter 8 ~ Struggles in India

1. The British Section of the T.S. was formed on October 19th, 1888. “The Lodges forming the Section were: Blavatsky, Scottish Theosophical Society, Dublin, and those newly formed in Cambridge and Glasgow. Sinnett refused to belong to this British Section. He obtained formal consent from Col. Olcott ‘as President of the whole Society, recognising the right of the London Lodge to continue as an integral part of the Theosophical Society though remaining outside the organisation of the British Section’.” **A Short History of the T.S.**, p.251.
2. See Appendix H ~ Miscellaneous Letters, for letter from K.H. to Olcott.
3. **Hammer on the Mountain**, pp.237-238.
4. **BCW**, Vol. 12, (1980), p.484.
5. See Chronology, Sep. 12, 1889 entry.

6. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 53, August 1932, pp.607, 609.
7. "The Conference, though not numerous, was thoroughly representative. Three out of the four General Secretaries being present, and nearly 200 other Fellows from all the Sections, including many of the best workers and most respected men in the Society in India." **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, January 1890, Supp. p.lxvii.
8. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, January 1890, Supp. p.lxiv.
9. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, January 1890, Supp. p.lxiii.
10. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, January 1890, Supp. p.lxvi.
11. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 12, October 1890, Supp. pp.ii-iii.
12. **BCW**, Vol. 12, (1980), p.158.
13. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, July 1996, p.91.
14. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fourth Series (1910), p.245.
15. "N.D. Khandalavala, quoting some short passages from this Letter in his article, 'H.P. Blavatsky and Her Masters' (*The Theosophist*, Vol. XX, October, 1898, pp.23-24), states that it was at first intended to be circulated to the Indian Members, but 'was afterwards, for certain reasons, not published.' He was permitted to take a copy of it. With the 'climate' prevailing at the time in the Indian T.S., the reasons which Khandalavala does not specify are easy to determine." [**BCW**, Vol. 12, (1980), pp.156-157.] Shortly after B. Keightley's arrival in India with the Letter, Col. Olcott expressed that he wished to resign as President of the T.S. Blavatsky thrice reiterated by letter and cable to Olcott that resigning was not an option for him and that she would withdraw Keightley from India if he did.
16. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 64, March 1943, p.439.
17. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 64, March 1943, p.439.
18. Vivekananda was especially opposed to Hindus joining the Esoteric Section. **Vivekananda: Complete Works**, Vol. 3, pp.209-210.

Chapter 9 ~ The Wills of H.P.B.

1. The title conferred on Besant by H.P.B. was nothing more than that of "Chief" Secretary to take notes just as one would for any other meeting. There was no occult status to this position other than that her notes would have been the ones kept on record. This position would be the first step taken for training in her role as pupil. Besant never actually recorded a meeting of the Inner Group. She missed meetings, and then H.P.B. died.
2. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fourth Series (1910), p.418; **The Theosophist**, Vol. 60, February 1939, pp.355-360; **The Theosophist**, May 1892, Supp. p.lix..
3. **H.P.B.**, by Sylvia Cranston, p.321.
4. **Reminiscences of H.P.B.**, p.64 (Quest, 1976) or pp.77-78 (1893).
5. **Mysteries and Romances of the World's Greatest Occultists**, by Cheiro (Count Louis Hamon), London: Herbert Jenkins Limited, 1935; p.178. Also see **Fohat**, Vol. 5, Spring 2001, p.6.
6. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, June 1895, p.156.
7. **Old Diary Leaves**. Fourth Series (1910), p.171.
8. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 13, March 1892, Supp. p.xlv.
9. "The lease of 19, Avenue Road, purchased for £1,600 in 1883, was given to H.P.B. in 1890 by the then owner, and by H.P.B.'s wish was at once vested in the hands of trustees. . . . The lease was burdened with a mortgage . . . the responsibility for this remaining with the donor of the lease. A cheque for [£405 16s 11d.] was given to Annie Besant [by a theosophist who requested anonymity] last month, and paid by her to the mortgagees, thus releasing the property." (**The Vahan**, Second Series, No. 2, September 1, 1891,

p.7.) In December 1896 Olcott named some of the prominent financial supporters: “The Blavatsky Lodge acquired permanent premises in Avenue Road, through the abundant generosity of Mrs. Besant, the Countess Wachtmeister, the Messrs. Keightley and others. . . .” **General Report of the 21st Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1896, p.15, and **A Historical Restropect — 1875-1896 — of the Theosophical Society**, p.14.

10. **General Report of the 15th Convention and Anniversary of the TS**, 1890, p.59. In **A Short History of the T.S.**, p.257, Ransom writes this as having taken effect in August 1889. The **General Report**, however, states that “in the early part of this year [1890] . . . the Theosophical Society had become possessed, through Mrs. Annie Besant’s generosity, of the lease of her house as its Head-Quarters . . .”, p.58. Alterations were undertaken and additions built. The headquarters were inaugurated July 3rd, 1890. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, August 1890, pp.661-662.

11. **Old Diary Leaves**, Third Series (1904), p.379.

12. **General Report of the 16th Convention and Anniversary of the TS**, 1891, p.49.

13. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fourth Series (1910), p.418.

14. See Chronology, Apr. 4, 1888 and March 9, 1890 entries.

15. **Rebirth of the Occult Tradition**, pp.65-66.

16. See Chronology, May 9, 1891(est.) entry.

17. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 4, March 1896, p.115.

18. **Isis Very Much Unveiled**, 2nd ed., p.28.

19. For example: Arthur H. Nethercot mentions this telegram on p.357 in **The First Five Lives of Annie Besant**. His references are **The Theosophist**, July 1891; **Bright**, pp.20-21; Williams, **The Passionate Pilgrim**, p.204. We do not have the reference for Bright and the latter is mentioned on p.205 not 204; the first reference does not exist in **The Theosophist**.

20. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.82.

21. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 12, June 1891, Insert in Supp. at p.lxxi.

22. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fourth Series (1910), pp.301-303.

23. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fourth Series (1910), p.303.

24. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 12, September 1891, p.707.

25. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.42.

26. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fourth Series (1910), p.172.

27. Annie Besant’s “Address of Welcome to the President-Founder” at the First Annual Convention of the T.S. in Europe, held in London, July 9th and 10th. 1891. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 12, September 1891, pp.705-706.

28. **General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the TS**, 1894, pp.39-46.

29. **A Short History of the T.S.**, p.257.

Chapter 10 ~ Olcott is Tested – Suspicions Mount

1. **Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom** 1st series, pp.51-52. Extracts appeared in **Lucifer**, Vol. 3, August 1888, pp.146-147. See Appendix H ~ Miscellaneous Letters for full text.

2. At the Third Session of the European Convention on July 12th, 1894, Annie Besant read her statement before the members present. She stated: “I believe that Mr. Judge wrote with his own hand, consciously or automatically I do not know, in the script adopted as that of the Master, messages which he received from the Master or from chelas; and I know that, in my own case, I believed that the messages he gave me in the well-known script were messages directly precipitated or directly written by the Master.” **Neutrality of the T.S.**, Minutes of A Judicial Committee of the Theosophical Society, p.13 and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.460.

3. Refer to Chapter 23 for quotation from E.S. Rule 7 to this effect.
4. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, letter from Judge to Olcott, August 30th, 1893, p.30.
5. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 14, September 1893, pp.762-763.
6. See Appendix A ~ The Case Against W.Q. Judge, for details regarding the “Panjab Seal”.
7. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, pp.69-70. See Appendix A ~ The Case Against W.Q. Judge, for more details. Facsimiles of the images inserted in the text were reproduced from **Isis Very Much Unveiled**, pp.37-38.
8. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.35.
9. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.72.
10. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 13, October 1891, Supp. p.ii.
11. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 13, December 1891, Supp. p.xxvii.
12. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, pp.70-71.
13. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, pp.15-16.
14. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, pp.16-17.

Chapter 11 ~ The “Poison” Letter

1. In another letter dated November 12th, 1891, Judge further explains what the Master had to say about her health. “He (^) says your health is not in the best order, and that that is sufficient reason for the outside, and advised you to see Mennell and get a certificate to that effect so as to use in India, etc.” **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, pp.42-43.
2. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.42.
3. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.42.
4. **English Theosophist**, Vol. 1, No. 4, December 1895, p.28.
5. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.71.
6. Olcott was unusually concerned in general about being ousted from the presidential chair, suspecting various individuals at various times including, at one point, Franz Hartmann. See **The Path**, Vol. 10, March 1896, p.368fn.
7. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.62.
8. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, pp.18-19.
9. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.42.
10. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, pp.62-63. Also see Compiler’s Analysis to same in Appendix A ~ The Case Against W.Q. Judge, footnote 33, regarding the changes made to conceal this person’s identity.
11. **The Path**, Vol. 10, April 1895, pp.25-26.
12. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, pp.32-33.
13. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.29.
14. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.33.
15. **Theos. Forum (P.L.)**, Vol. 25, October 1947, p.577 + facsimile reproduction on facing page.

Chapter 12 ~ Suspicions Begin to Sprout

1. **Lucifer**, Vol. 11, December 1892, p.265.
2. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fourth Series (1910), pp.507-508.
3. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fifth Series (1932) 1975, p.1.
4. **Isis Very Much Unveiled**, 2nd ed., p.83.
5. **Lucifer**, Vol. 15, December 1894, p.338.
6. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 16, April 1895, Supp. p.xx.
7. **Lucifer**, Vol. 16, March 1895, p.67.
8. This is only one example of Olcott's misleading information and biased renditions of history, which have caused many historians to be misled by Olcott's version of events.

Chapter 13 ~ Bertram Keightley Returns to Europe and America

1. **Lucifer**, Vol. 15, February 1895, p.507.
2. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 14, December 1892, Supp. p.xvii.
3. **H.P.B.**, by Sylvia Cranston, pp.252-253.
4. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 14, March 1893, Supp. p.xxxvi, and **The Path**, Vol. 8, April 1893, pp.30-31.
5. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 14, March 1893, Supp. p.xxxvi.
6. **Lucifer**, Vol. 15, February 1895, p.507.
7. **Report of Proceedings**, American Section, 1893, p.4.
8. **Report of Proceedings**, American Section, 1893, p.16.
9. **Report of Proceedings**, American Section, 1893, p.17.
10. **Report of Proceedings**, American Section, 1893, p.17.

Chapter 14 ~ Fears of Dogmatism

1. **The Theosophist**, Vol.14, July 1893, pp.624, 627.
2. This same standard was also expressed by Mahatma K.H. in his first letter to A.P. Sinnett regarding Sinnett's suggestion of the simultaneous production in Simla and London of one day's editions of the London **Times** and **The Pioneer**. (**Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. I, p.2.) Judge added part of H.P.B.'s "Lodges of Magic" in his 1895 **Reply by William Q. Judge to Charges . . .** which is included in Appendix A ~The Case Against W.Q. Judge.
3. **Lucifer**, Vol. 12, April 1893, p.103.
4. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 14, July 1893, p.606.
5. **Lucifer**, Vol. 12, April 1893, p.103.
6. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 14, July 1893, pp.609-610.
7. A circular, **To All Members of E.S.T.**, signed by Annie Besant and William Q. Judge, August 1893, p.2.

8. **Theosophy Exposed**, pp.34-35.
9. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, October 1893, pp.31-32.
10. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, December 1893, Supp. p.xiii.
11. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, January 1894, p.223.
12. **Isis Very Much Unveiled**, 2nd edition, p.85.
13. **Isis Very Much Unveiled**, 2nd edition, p.85.

Chapter 15 ~ Suspicions Take Root

1. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, p.20; **Two Replies by William Q. Judge**, p.46
2. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 13, March 1892, Supp. pp.xlvii-xlviii. On the evening of the Feb. 1st, 1892, Bertram Keightley and K.B.N.D. Khandalavala each spoke to a group of about 100 "native gentry". Bertram "Keightley . . . spoke about the entirely *unsectarian character* of the Theosophical Society, after which many difficult questions were asked and in the answers given by Brother Keightley as well as by Brother Khandalavala [sic] many misconceptions were removed." It was at this time that Keightley and N.D.K. seemed to have forged a strong bond with each other.
3. **Report of Investigation**, p.4.
4. In the original copy of **Reply by William Q. Judge**, the year was printed as 1894 instead of 1884.
5. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, p.20. See Appendix A ~ The Case Against W.Q. Judge, for the complete text.
6. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fourth Series (1910), pp.507-508.
7. **LBS**, Letter LXIIIA (63A), p.161.
8. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 14, July 1893, p.628.
9. E.T. Hargrove claimed "H.P.B.'s Master called [Judge] *friend*". **Theosophical Quarterly**, Vol. 36, July 1933, p.89.
10. **LBS**, Letter (No. LXIII) to A.P. Sinnett, after December 29th, 1885 but undated, p.158.

Chapter 16 ~ Indians Summoned to the Cause

1. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. LXXVIII [78], p.378.
2. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. LXXVIII [78], p.381.
3. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. LXXVII [77], p.378.
4. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. LXXVIII [78], p.378.
5. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, January 1890, Supp. p.lxiv.
6. **The Theosophist**, Vol.11, January 1890, Supp. p.lxvii.
7. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. CXXXIV [134], pp.461-462.
8. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, January 1890, Supp. p.lxiii.
9. **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, p.34.

Chapter 17 ~ W.Q. Judge's Initiation

1. **BCW**, Vol. 8 , (1960), p.448.
2. **BCW**, Vol. 10, (1964) 1974, pp.194-195. Facsimile of document appointing William Q. Judge sole representative of the Esoteric Section in America.
3. **Damodar**, p.76.
4. **Report**, p.23.
5. **The Word** Vol. 15, April 1912, p.18.
6. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. XII [12], p.68.
7. Opening comments by E.T. Hargrove in **The Letters from William Q. Judge to E.T. Hargrove**, p.316. “[Chakravarti] sailed from India in June, 1893, spent two months in England, and had securely laid the foundation for all that followed by the time he sailed for New York with Mrs. Besant on August 26th.”
8. **Letters That Have Helped Me**, pp.103-104.
9. **Vania**, pp.232-233.
10. **Theosophy Unveiled**, pp.58, 74, and **Theosophy Exposed**, p.80.
11. **Theos. Forum (P.L.)**, Vol. 3, August 1932, pp.251-253, and **WQJ T. Pioneer**, p.18-19.
12. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, June 1895, p.156.
13. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 4, March 1896, p.115.
14. **The Word**, Vol. 15, April 1912, p.17.
15. **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 3, p.461.
16. **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 3, pp.23-25.
17. See Chronology, Oct. 23, 1889 entry for more quotes from H.P.B. Also see **WQJ T. Pioneer**, pp.20-21.
18. Letter from W.Q. Judge to H.P. Blavatsky. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, January 1997, p.166.
19. Letter from W.Q. Judge to H.P. Blavatsky. **Theos. History**, Vol. 6, January 1997, pp.165-166.
20. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, p.20.
21. **BCW**, Vol. 2, (1967), p.381.

Chapter 18 ~ Convention of 1893

1. **A Short History of the T.S.**, p.299.
2. **General Report of the 18th Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1893, p.1.
3. **General Report of the 18th Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1893, pp.1-2.
4. **BCW**, Vol. 12, (1980), p.485.
5. See Chronology, July 6, 1891 entry.
6. **General Report of the 18th Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1893, p.15.
7. **The Path**, Vol. 8, May 1893, pp.52-56.

8. **The Path**, Vol. 8, October 1893, p.223.
9. **The Path**, Vol. 9, March 1895, pp.430-431.
10. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 16, April 1895, p.475.
11. **The Path**, Vol. 10, June 1895, pp.96-97.

Chapter 19 ~ G. N. Chakravarti

1. **The Path**, Vol. 8, October 1893, p.205.
2. **The Path**, Vol. 8, August 1893, p.155.
3. **The Path**, Vol. 8, October 1893, p.205.
4. **Theosophy**, Vol. 10, May 1922, p.203.
5. **Theos. Congress World's Fair 1893**, p.14.
6. **Theosophical Glossary**, ULT, 1973, p.251.
7. **Inner Group Teachings of H.P. Blavatsky**, compiled and annotated by Henk J. Spierenburg, 2nd and revised edition, 1995, p.46.
8. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. LXXVI [76], p.376.
9. **BCW**, Vol. 5, (1950), p.270.
10. **BCW**, Vol. 5, (1950), p.270.
11. **Theosophy**, Vol. 10, May 1922, p.203.
12. **The Path**, Vol. 8, August 1893, p.159.
13. **The Vahan**, Vol. 3, August 1, 1893, p.7, and September 1, 1893, p.7.
14. **The Vahan**, Vol. 3, September 1, 1893, p.7.
15. **First Five Lives of Annie Besant**, pp.390-391.
16. **Lucifer**, Vol. 12, August 1893, p.605. Chakravarti explained where he was from in his first address at the Theosophical Congress. He stated: "I come from the city of Allahabad, the capital of the Northwestern Provinces of India, the Hindu name of which is Pryaga. It is called the Tvitha-rajah, or the king of the different places of pilgrimage, as it is situated on the confluence of two of the most sacred rivers of the Hindus—the Ganges and the Jumna." (**Theos. Congress World's Fair 1893**, p.13.) The Prayag Theosophical Society was established on November 6th, 1881, and was renamed "Prayag Psychic Theosophical Society" effective January 1st, 1883.
17. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, December 1893, p.194. They left New York on the *City of Paris* on September 27th, 1893. (**The Path**, Vol. 8, October 1893, p.224.)
18. **Theosophical Quarterly**, Vol. 29, July 1931, p.40. See Appendix D ~ Letters From William Q. Judge to E.T. Hargrove.
19. **The Path**, Vol. 10, June 1895, pp.97-98.
20. **Isis Very Much Unveiled**, 2nd ed., pp.124, 129.
21. **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 19, March 1938, pp.5-6.

Chapter 20 ~ The Proceedings Begin

1. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, February 1894. A printed slip pasted at the front of the pages of the Supplement.
2. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, May 1894, p.528.
3. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fifth Series (1932) 1975, p.144.
4. **Old Diary Leaves**, Fifth Series (1932) 1975, p.149.
5. **Theosophy Exposed**, p.34. From part 4. "Critical Historical Review of The Theosophical Society", reprint of "A Paper read at the Chicago Psychological Science Congress by Wm. Emmette Coleman, Member, American Oriental Society, Member Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain [and Ireland], Member Pali Text Society, etc. Reprinted in the *Chicago Religio-Philosophical Journal*", September 16th, 1893.
6. **Theosophy Exposed**, p.34.
7. **Theosophy Exposed**, p.34.
8. **The Path**, Vol. 9, March 1895, p.432.
9. See Chronology, Mar. 10, 1894 entry.
10. **Charges Against William Q. Judge**. *To All Members of the Theosophical Society*, (4pp.), p.2.
11. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.12, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.458.
12. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.15, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.462.
13. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, p.2.
14. **General Report of the 18th Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1893, p.15.
15. **General Report of the 18th Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1893, p.14.
16. **Modern Astrology**, (Old Series) Vol. 1 (Aug. 1895 - July 1896), p.291.
In Sepharial's "The Horoscope of Annie Besant" he predicted "Annie Besant will live to her 60th year, but will not reach her 60th birthday. . . ." (**The Theosophist**, January 1894, p.224.) She actually lived to within days of her 86th birthday.
17. **The Path**, Vol. 9, March 1895, p.432.
18. **Report of Proceedings**, Eighth Annual Convention, 1894, p.23.
19. **Charges Against William Q. Judge**. *To All Members of the Theosophical Society*, (4pp.), p.1.
20. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, May 1894, Supp. p.xxvi.
21. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.4, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, pp.449-450.
22. Four page letter. "*For the information of the Members of the European and Indian Sections of the Theosophical Society.*" Theosophical Society, European Section; From G.R.S. Mead, Gen. Sec. European Sec. T.S. and Bertram Keightley, Gen. Sec. Indian Sec. T.S., March 27th, 1894, p.3.
23. **The Path**, Vol. 10, May 1895, pp.57, 59. See Appendix C ~ Historical Sketch, for full text.

Chapter 21 ~ Delays and Withholdings

1. **The Path**, Vol. 10, May 1895, p.61.
2. **Lucifer**, Vol. 15, February 1895, p.456. Also included in **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, March 1895, p.92.
3. **Reply By William Q. Judge**, p.6. See Appendix A ~ The Case Against W.Q. Judge, for full text.

4. **The Vahan**, Vol. 3, May 1, 1894, p.6. **The Vahan** came out on the 1st of the month. In the May issue there is an announcement by Besant about a new policy at Headquarters, and a list of her forthcoming lectures. Also Alice Cleather mentions Annie Besant as having returned by the time Cleather posted her May report to **The Theosophist**.
5. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, p.6. See Appendix A. ~ The Case Against W.Q. Judge, for full text.

Chapter 22 ~ Khandalavala and Besant

1. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 16, January 1895, pp.252-253.
2. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. CXXXIV [134], p.462.
3. See Chronology, May 27, 1893 entry.
4. **General Report of the 21st Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1896, pp.15-16 and **A Historical Restropect — 1875-1896 — of the Theosophical Society**, p.14.
5. **BCW**, Vol. 1, (1966) 1977, p.304. "A Society Without a Dogma."
6. **BCW**, Vol. 10, (1964) 1974, pp.[116-117] 121-122.
7. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, February 1894, pp.331-332.
8. **General Report of the 20th Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1895, p.5.
9. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, January 1890, Supp. p.lxiii.
10. **The Theosophist, A World Magazine**, (published in Hollywood, CA), Vol. 1, January 1930, p.389, reprinted a statement by Dr. Besant from **New India**: "The revival of [India's] religions by Colonel Olcott and myself as channels of the power of the Hierarchy, the Inner Government of the World, has opened the path to her physical freedom."
11. **BCW**, Vol. 12, (1980), p.158.
12. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. CXXXIV [134], p.462.
13. **H.P.B., In Memory of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, by Some of Her Pupils**, (1931), p.65.
14. **BCW**, Vol. 12 (1980), p.162. "Why I Do Not Return To India."
15. **General Report of the 21st Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1896, p.15, and **A Historical Retrospect — 1875-1896 — of the Theosophical Society**, p.14.
16. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 53, August 1932, pp.606-607.
17. **BCW**, Vol. 12, (1980), p.160. "Why I Do Not Return To India."

Chapter 23 ~ The Judicial Committee – Pre and Post

1. Circular. Theosophical Society. European Section. General Secretary's Office. London, March 27, 1894, p.4.
2. Circular. Theosophical Society. European Section. General Secretary's Office. London, March 27, 1894, p.2.
3. **Charges Against William Q. Judge, To All Members of the Theosophical Society**, (4pp.), p.2.
4. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.5, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.451.
5. Myron H. Phelps joined the T.S. on June 4th, 1890.
6. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.9, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.455.
7. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.9, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.456.

8. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, pp.9-10, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.456.
9. **Charges Against William Q. Judge**, *To All Members of the Theosophical Society*, (4pp.), p.3.
10. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.4, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.450.
11. **Charges Against William Q. Judge**, *To All Members of the Theosophical Society*, (4pp.), p.1.
12. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.7, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.454.
13. **Report of Proceedings**, 1895, p.10.
14. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.8, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.454.
15. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.11, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.458.
16. **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, pp.463-464. See Dec. 29, 1929 for a biographical sketch of Walter Old in the Chronology.
17. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.12, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, pp.458-459.
18. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, p.11.
19. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.12, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.458.
20. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.12, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.459.
21. **Neutrality of the T.S.**, p.13, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.460.
22. **BCW**, Vol. 12, (1980), p.494.
23. **Report of Proceedings**, 1895, pp.10-11.
24. **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.441.
25. **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.441. "Truth Before and In All Things."
26. **Neutrality in the T.S.**, p.13, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.460.
27. **Neutrality in the T.S.**, p.13, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.460.
28. **Neutrality in the T.S.**, p.13, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.460.
29. **Reply by William Q. Judge**, p.15.
30. **The Path**, Vol. 8, November 1893, p.233, and **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 1, p.370.
31. **Lucifer**, Vol. 3, October 1888, p.93.
32. **Neutrality in the T.S.**, p.14, and **Lucifer**, Vol. 14, August 1894, p.461.
33. **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 27, January 1947, p.340. (See Chronology, Dec. 15, 1946 entry.)
34. **Mahatma Letters**, Letter No. XLVIII [48], p.279.

Chapter 24 ~ Summary

1. The Masters of the T.S. were well aware of the impending problems the Shasters and Orthodox Brahmans could cause to the Theosophical Movement. In 1881 Master Morya dictated, through H.P.B., what became known as the Prayag Letter. (See **Mahatma Letters**, 2nd edition, pp.461-463). This letter was a forewarning of the problems which could arise with the Allahabad members who were involved with psychism and the influences they were opening themselves up to. Throughout the Society's history some members and detractors have been influenced by dark forces to create disharmony and discord, to attack, distract and derail those members and groups working in unison to promote the Movement as a Universal Brotherhood. All strong, focused groups have found themselves under attack at one time or another and most have been destroyed. As a result, numerous organizations calling themselves

theosophical have deviated from the Original Program and become very political, dogmatic, and followers of ritualistic worship.

2. **General Report of the 18th Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1893, p.10.
3. **Report of Proceedings**, 1895, p.10.
4. **General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1894, p.22.
5. **General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S.**, 1894, p.23.
6. **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 10, July 1929, pp.156-157.
7. See Appendix H ~ Miscellaneous Letters, Item No. 4.
8. Cyril F. Willard, an experienced newspaper man, claimed that Franz Hartmann had told him in 1896 that "Olcott complained to him, with tears in his cross eyes, that the Masters had deserted him after all he had done for Them." **Cdn Theosophist**, Vol. 13, May 1932, p.66.
9. Mr. A.J. Cooper-Oakley, although a fine scholar, was the first in a long list of people who "exhibited much bitterness in his attitude and was the cause of unfortunate friction and disharmony at Headquarters." **BCW**, Vol. 12 (1980), p.733.
10. **The Path**, Vol. 10, March 1896, pp.368-369, 371.
11. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, December 1893, Supp. p.xi.
12. See Appendix F ~ W.Q. Judge's Last Messages.
13. **Theosophical Quarterly**, Vol. 30, July 1932, p.31.
14. **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.185. This letter is also included in Appendix D ~ Letters From W. Q. Judge to E.T. Hargrove.
15. Appendix D ~ Letters From W. Q. Judge to E.T. Hargrove, June 14th, 1895.
16. **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.185. Letter dated May 20th, 1895. This letter is also included in Appendix D ~ Letters from W. Q. Judge to E.T. Hargrove.
17. **The Lamp**, Vol. 2, April 1896, p.130.
18. See "What Killed William Q. Judge?", **Fohat**, Vol. 7, Summer 2003 (Part I), pp.29-34, and Fall 2003 (Part II), pp.60-64, 69-70. See also Appendix J ~ Astrological Observations.
19. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, June 1895, p.155.
20. **Lucifer**, Vol. 15, January 1895, pp.427-428.
21. **The Word**, Vol. 22, October 1915, p.10.
22. Mulliss' interview with Annie Besant in 1926. See Appendix H ~ Miscellaneous Letters, for full text.
23. **Eirenicon**, Dec. 1944/Jan. 1945, p.4; **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 25, January 1945, p.339.
24. **Eirenicon**, Dec. 1944/Jan. 1945, p.4; **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 25, January 1945, p.339.
25. **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 17, December 1936, p.323.
26. **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 17, December 1936, p.324.
27. **BCW**, Vol. 12, (1980), pp.594-595.
28. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 4, March 1896, p.116.
29. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, January 1895, p.56.

Addendum

1. **By Master's Direction.** E.S.T. Circular. November 1894, p.4.
2. In "A Besant Diary of Principal Events" which appeared in **The Theosophist**, (Vol. 69, October 1947, pp.84-88), one of the three entries listed in 1894 is "Engaged in the Judge 'case'."
3. The following statement by Richard Harte was criticized by Judge in his article "Centres of The Theosophical Movement" and by H.P.B. in "A Puzzle from Adyar".

"Adyar" is not a place only, it is a principle. It is a name which ought to carry with it a power far greater than that conveyed by the name 'Rome'. ADYAR is the centre of the Theosophical Movement. . . . Every loyal Fellow has in his heart a little ADYAR, for he has in him a spark of the spiritual fire which the name typifies. ADYAR is the symbol of our unity as a Society, and so long as it exists in the hearts of its Fellows, the powers of the enemy can never prevail against the Theosophical Society.

(**The Theosophist**, Vol. 10, June 1889, p.523, and **The American Theosophist**, Vol. 69, June 1981, p.170.)

Index to Supplement

A

Adhémar (*see* d' Adhémar)
 "A Disclaimer" 343, 348
 Adyar 325, 329-335, 337-338, 343-355,
 357-361, 365-366, 368, 370, 372-375 [378],
 380-381, 383-386, 388, 390-391, 394, 396,
 398, 403, 406-407, 409, 415-419, 422-423
 animosity toward H.P.B. 348
 looked upon as a holy place 374, 391
 spies, enemies 348, 359, 361, 385
 under the grip of evil influences 349, 385, 390,
 415, 417-419,
 Alexander, Rev. Mr. 385
 "A Puzzle from Adyar" 343-344
 "A Mahatma's Message to Some Brahmans" 391
 "An Interesting Letter" 370, 380
 Antaskarana 388
 "Applied Theosophy" 343-344, 374, 423
 Arundale, Miss Francesca 320, 324, 335
 Astor House 358
 Astral 337, 384, 386-387, 417-418, 420

B

Babula [Vallah Bulla] 321, 323, 330, 334, 385, 402
 Battacharya, Benec Madhad 391
 Bawajee (Bawaji) 331, 407
 Besant, Annie 341, 350-355, 358, 361-367,
 369-372, 374, 380, 383, 385, 390-392,
 394-406, 410-415, 417-419, 422
 Annabai 390-391, 400
 adopts Hindu religion 405-406
 appointed Chief Secretary of E.S. 350
 arrival in India (Nov. 1893) 372, 390
 cables Judge in New York re: Olcott (1891) 361
 destroys important evidence 353
 first met Olcott 353
 joined the T.S. 350
 lectures at the Hall of Science 354
 promise to B. Keightley 358
 revisits America (1892-1893) 370
 sails from Bombay (1894) 402
 sails from New York (May 6th, 1891) 350, 352
 Black Magicians 384-385, 415, 418, 420
 Blavatsky, H.P. (H.P.B.):
 Blavatsky's room at Adyar 325, 329-331
 died (May 8th, 1891) 350
 Eddy Farm 318
 first met W.Q.J. 318
 in France (1884) 321-324
 imitation signature 375 [378]

left Adyar for France (Feb. 20th, 1884) 325
 left Adyar permanently (Mar. 31st, 1885) 407
 left New York for India (Dec. 18th, 1878) 318
 Last Will and Testament 350-354, 357, 361
 resigned as Corresponding Sec. (Mar. 21st, 1885) 337
 returned to Adyar (Dec. 1884) 331
 royalties 351, 357
 ring 323, 352, 384-386
 Board of Control (Adyar) 325, 329, 332
 Board of Control, American 338
 Bombay 321, 325-326, 329, 333, 335, 341,
 347-348, 353, 357, 371, 373-374, 382, 390, 397, 402
Bombay Gazette 325, 334, 379, 385
 Bouton, J. W. (H.P.B.'s publisher) 351
Boston Index 330
 Brown, W.T. 329
 Buck, Dr. Jirah Dewey 374, 395, 402-404, 418, 422
 Buddhi-Manas 419
 Buddhi, pure 338, 386
 Buddhism 338, 406
 Burrows, Herbert 361, 365

C

Cables / cablegrams 325, 339-340, 347,
 353, 357, 361, 397
 Caithness, Lady (Duchesse de Pomar) 321-322
Canada (Steamship) 318
Canadian Theosophist, The 336
Case Against W.Q. Judge, The 355, 357,
 363-364, 366, 422
 "Centres of the Theosophical Movement" 343, 355
 Chagres 336, 418
 Chakravarti, Professor G. N. 341, 369, 385, 390-391,
 393-396, 399, 414, 417, 419
 Chatterji, Mohini M. 321-322, 324
 Cheiro (Count Louis Hamon) 351
 Chetty, G. Muttuswami 329
 Chittenden, VT (*see* Eddy Farm)
 Christian College at Madras 325
Christian College Magazine 333-334, 373, 380, 382, 385
City of Limerick (Steamship) 317
 Clark, Abbott 358-360
 "Collapse of Koot Hoomi, The" 333, 373, 379-380, 382
 Colombo, Ceylon 335, 347, 353, 358, 368, 372, 396
 conspiracy 325, 334-335, 338, 367, 383, 392, 398, 407
 Cooper-Oakley, Mr. & Mrs. 330-331, 402
 Coues, Elliott 345
 Coulombs, The 325-326, 329-335, 349, 373,
 375 [378]-379, 382-384, 386, 388, 391, 407, 415, 422
 Coulomb, Alexis 325, 330

Coulomb, Mrs. Emma 325, 330
 belief in the Mahatmas 325

D

d'Adhémar, Count Gaston 323
 d'Adhémar, Countess Marguerite Joséphine 323
Daily Graphic, New York 318
 Dasabhy, Dorabjee 327
 Damodar (*see* Mavalankar):
 Davy, Doris and Ted 374
 Deb, Ramalinga 375 [378]
 de Zirkoff, Boris 317, 352
 Dharmapala, A.H. 360, 394
 Dogmas or dogmatism 368, 370-371, 380,
 405-406, 408, 410, 419-420
 Doubleday, Major-General Abner 318
 Dublin, Ireland 317
 Dugpas 384-385, 415, 420

E

E.S. or E.S.T. (*see* also Esoteric Section) 340, 344,
 352-353, 362-363, 371-372,
 390-391, 397, 412, 416, 420
 Eek, Sven 317
 Eddy Farm (Chittenden, VT) 318, 320
 Edge, Sydney V. 358, 365, 367, 370-372, 397, 411
 Elementals 318, 321-324, 387
 Elementaries 322-323, 337, 386-387
 Endersby, Victor A. 331
 Enemy 345, 348, 406, 420
 Enghien, France 323-324
 Esoteric Section (*see* also E.S. or E.S.T.) .. 339, 342-344,
 347-348, 350-352, 354-355, 371-372,
 383, 390-391, 411-412, 416-417
 Ezekiel, A.D. 333-334, 376, 378-380
 imitation signature 375 [378]

F

Felt, George H. 318
 Flynn, Miss 407
 Fraud 325, 330, 333, 356, 359, 371, 373,
 379, 397-398, 405-407, 412, 415, 418

G

Garrett, Edmund 352, 362, 366, 395, 418
 General Council 325, 329, 334, 338, 343, 348,
 392, 398-401, 408, 410-412, 420
 Gomes, Michael 331
 Griffiths, Allen L. 360
 Gribble, Mr. 329, 385
 "Gurus and Chelas" 371

H

Handwriting 357-358, 366, 375 [378], 379, 381,
 385-386, 388, 396, 402, 408-409, 422

Hall of Magic Mirrors, The 331
 Hargrove, Ernest T. 338, 418
 Harisinghji, Prince 325
 Harte, Richard 343-348, 357, 363,
 368, 373-374, 423
 Hartmann, Dr. Franz 325, 329-335, 375 [378],
 379, 384-385, 388, 392, 407, 417-419
 arrived at Adyar (Dec. 1883) 332
 jealous of Judge 332
 Heliodore (name given to Besant) 364
 Hermetic Lodge of the T.S. 320
 Hinduism 383
Historical Retrospect 407
 Hodgson, Richard 330-332, 383
 arrived at Adyar (Dec. 18th, 1884) 331
 Holloway, Laura (L.C.H.) .. 320, 322-324, 331, 335, 388
Hollow Globe, The 321, 336
 Hume, A. O. 330

I

Initiation 323, 336-337, 355, 384, 386-388
Irish Theosophist, The 317, 338, 387, 401,
 403-404, 420
Isis Unveiled 318, 322-323, 351, 368
Isis Very Much Unveiled 362, 366, 374, 418
 Iyer, S. Subramania 349, 399

J

Jelihovsky, Vera Petrovna 363
 Johnston, Charles 363
 Johnston, Vera 363
 Judicial Committee 374, 379, 392, 396, 399-401
 403, 408-409, 412, 419
 Judge, Alice Mary Quan:
 Mother 317
 died giving birth 317
 Judge, Frederick C. 317
 Judge, Frederick H.:
 Father 317
 Judge, John H. 318
 brother of W.Q.J. 317
 met H.P.B. 317-318
 Judge, W.Q. (W.Q.J.):
 admitted to State Bar in 1872 317
 American citizen 317
 arrived at Adyar (Aug. 10th, 1884) 329
 arrived at Bombay (July 15th, 1884) 326
 arrived in London (July 4th, 1894)
 for Judicial Inquiry & European Convention 402
 arrived in New York (Nov. 26th, 1884) 337
 arrived in Paris (Mar. 25th, 1884) 321
 arrived in Southampton (June 24th, 1893)
 for European Convention 393
 asked to go to Adyar by H.S.O. 325
 asked to go to Adyar by M 320
 born (April 13th, 1851) 317
 died (March 21st, 1896) 418
 elected General Secretary of American Section 338

expected Olcott's support re: T.S. in A. 416
 founding member of T.S. 318
 initiation 336-337, 351, 355, 384-388
 in London (1884) 320-321, 350, 352
 left India (Fall 1884) 335, 383, 385
 left for India (June 1884) 325
 left Liverpool for N.Y. (Nov. 15th, 1884) 335
 left Liverpool (August 6th, 1891) 358
 left New York for London (May 13th, 1891) 350
 lectures in India 326-328
 letter of Sep. 17th, 1884 333-334, 357, 373-382, 388
 married 318
 met H.P.B. (Fall 1874) 318
 shrine 329-331
 sent telegram to London after H.P.B.'s death 352
 started **The Path** (Apr. 1886) 338
 status in E.S. 340-341, 348, 352
 suspended from Vice-Pres. (Mar. 20th, 1894) 399, 408
 W.Q. Judge's Plan is right (message) 391
 works on **The Secret Doctrine** 322, 324

K

Karma 323-324, 367, 410, 417-418
 Khandalavala Khan Bahadur Nowroji (N.D.K.)
 325-327, 333, 347, 349, 366-367, 370, 373-374,
 379-382, 388, 390-392, 396, 399, 405, 419-420, 422
 doubts and suspicions 373
 imitation signature 375 [378]
 Khandalavala, Pestanji Dorabji 325, 334, 379
 Keightley, Dr. Archibald 339, 385, 393, 395,
 397, 401-402, 413
 quotes Besant 401-403
 Keightley, Bertram (B.K.) 323, 339-343, 345, 348-349,
 353, 356-359, 361, 365-369, 373-374,
 380, 389-390, 393-399, 403, 408-409, 412, 419
 Managing Editor of **The Theosophist** 345
 Keightley, Julia (Jasper Niemand) 387, 393-394, 403
 Kinnavan, Bryan (Pseudonym of W.Q.J.) 321
 Kingsford, Dr. Anna 320, 322
 Koot Hoomi (K.H.) 321-322, 324, 333, 355,
 373, 379, 380, 382, 414, 417
 Kunte, M.M. 327

L

Lane-Fox, St. George 329, 332, 376 [378]
 Leadbeater, C.W. 417, 419, 422
 Lloyd's of London 335
 "Lodges of Magic" 370, 414
 London 320-325, 331-332, 335, 337, 339-341, 344
 347-355, 357-358, 361, 363, 365, 368-371,
 374-375 [378], 381, 385, 391, 393-395,
 397-398, 400-402, 404, 408-409, 411-412
 London Lodge (L.L.) 320, 323
 Loyal / loyally / loyalty 335, 343-344, 354-355,
 390-391, 407, 420
 loyalties 346
Lucifer 338, 343-344, 370-371, 386, 402, 413
 Lyon, Professor Wm. F. 321

M

"Madame Blavatsky and Her Slanderers" 333
Madras Mail 335, 386
 Mahatma(s) 325, 327, 339, 342, 349, 358-359, 370-371,
 373, 382, 384, 388, 394, 396, 406, 408-410, 414, 417
 Master M (*see* Morya):
 Massey, Charles Carleton 320
 founder of SPR 320
 Mavalankar, Damodar K. 319-320, 323, 325, 330-331,
 334-336, 341, 343, 383-384, 396, 405
 Maitland, Edward 320
 Mead, G.R.S. 349, 399, 402-403, 408-409
 Menell, Dr. Z. 361, 363
 Moodr, C.V. Loganada 327
 Morgan, E.H. 350
 Morya ("M") 322-323, 329, 332, 339-340, 357-359,
 361, 363-364, 381-388, 406, 412, 422
 "Better come M ^" 320, 323, 384
 "Muddled Rule-Makers" 344
 Müller, Miss Henrietta 361
 Mulliss, William 352

N

Napoleon 387
 Nath, Dharbaghiri 384
 New York 317-318, 320-321, 327, 335-341,
 343, 347, 352, 354-355, 358, 361, 368,
 385, 388, 391, 402, 404, 409, 420
 Niemand, Jasper (*see* Keightley, Julia)
 Nirmanakaya 337, 386-387
 Neresheimer, Emile August 339, 361, 411

O

Occult Room 325, 330-331, 386, 422
 "Occultism and Truth" 412-413
Ocean of Theosophy, The 355
 Olcott, Colonel Henry Steel 318-322, 324-327, 329,
 331-338, 341, 343-345, 347-363, 365-368,
 370-375, 379-381, 383-384, 388, 390-392,
 396-400, 402-413, 415-417, 419, 422-423
 admitted to errors 409
 alleged immorality 361, 411
 arrived in London 320, 353, 357
 Besant to share his burden 390-391
 confessed he wronged Judge 419
 first met Besant 353
 gives Judge two options 396-397
 imitation signature 375 [378]
 lack of right judgment 417
 left Adyar for France (Feb. 20th, 1884) 320
 left Paris for London (April 5th, 1884) re: L.L. 322
 left Bombay for London (June 15th, 1891) 350, 353
 left for Japan 343, 358
 left Liverpool for USA / Japan (Sep. 16th, 1891) 358
 left London for Colombo (Dec. 26th, 1889) 347
 left New York for India (Dec. 18th, 1878) 318
 loyalty to Adyar 343, 355

returned to Adyar (Dec. 1884) 331
 returned to Adyar from London (Feb. 5th, 1890). 345
 returned to London (June 13th, 1884) 325
 sends Besant to Australia as "President's
 Commissioner" to form new section. 399-400
 upset with Judge for leaving India 337, 388
Old Diary Leaves 349, 351-352, 355,
 357, 365, 392, 396
 Old Walter R. 365-367, 370-374, 379,
 390, 396, 398-399, 411-412, 419, 422
 arrived at Adyar (Dec. 21st, 1892) 365, 379
 left Adyar (April 7th, 1894) 396
 Sepharial 372, 398

P

Padfield, Mr. 385
 Padshah, B.J. 321
 Paris, France 320-325, 384, 386-387
 Parliament of Religions 349, 368-369, 385, 394, 405
Path, The 321, 338-340, 370, 386-387, 391, 394, 401
 Patterson, Rev. Mr. George 329, 333, 385
 Phelps, Myron H. 409
 Phenomena 320, 326, 329-330, 333-334
 340-341, 347, 376 [378], 407, 413-414
Phoenix, The 382
 Poison 361-363, 365-366
 Poona, India 326-327, 333-334, 341, 349, 365,
 373-374, 379-380, 382, 388, 390, 396-397
Prasnottara, The 358, 374
 Prayag Letter 386, 391, 406
 Prayag T.S. 391, 394
 Precipitated / precipitation 355, 362, 413-414
Priestess of the Occult: Madame Blavatsky 331

R

Rambo, Edward B. 360
 Ransom, Josephine 334, 397, 422
 Rajamiengar, T.C. 329
 Ramiah, C. 350
 Ranade, Rao Bahadur Mahadev Govind 327
Reply by William Q. Judge to the Charges 366, 381
 Revised Rules 392, 398-399, 408
 Rome 343, 423
 Row, T. Subba (Rao). 329, 331, 343, 350, 383, 393-394
 Row, P. Sreenivasa 329, 350
 Row, R. Ragoonath 329
 Rumors 357, 361, 374, 397, 399

S

Sassoon, Jacob 375 [378]
 Seal (Master's seal or Punjab seal) 339-341
 356-360, 370-371
Secret Doctrine, The 322, 324, 337, 339,
 350-351, 383, 391, 393
 Sepharial (*see* Walter Old):
 Sherman Dr. M.L. 321
 "Should Mr. Judge Resign?" 401

Shroff, Kavasji Mervanji 397
 Shroff, Muncherjee M. 397
 Shrine 329-331, 422
 Sinnett, A.P. 320-321, 323-324, 381-382, 391
 Smith, Ella Miller:
 married W.Q.J. in 1874 318
 Smythe, Albert E.S. 335-336, 395, 416
 on Besant 395
 Society for Psychical Research (S.P.R.) 320, 378, 330
S.S. Neiman (coastal steamer) 367
S.S. Peninsular (steamship) 402
S.S. Yara (steamship) 368
S.S. Wisconsin (steamship) 335-336, 385
 Sturdy, Edward T. 365, 371-373, 390, 396
 Successor 324, 351, 390, 398, 409-410, 413, 418

T

Tatya, Tookaram 326, 357, 367, 390, 397
 "The Situation" 343-344, 374
 "Theosophic Freethought" 370-371
 Theosophist:
 true 341, 382, 406, 410, 423
The Theosophist 321, 326-327, 333, 336, 338
 343-345, 347-348, 351, 357, 370-372, 374, 389,
 391-392, 396, 400, 405-406, 411, 417, 422
 "Theosophy in the West, The Tendency Towards
 Dogmatism" 370, 380
The Times of India 333, 380
The Times (London). 331
 Thurmann, Dr. 321
 "To The Brahmins of India" 391
 Trap-door 325, 329-330
 "Truth and Occultism" 401
 "Truth Before and In All Things" 413

V

Van Mater, Kirby 331
 Venezuela, South America 319-320, 336
 Vivekananda, Swami 349

W

Wachtmeister, Countess 341, 350-352, 357, 372, 395
Westminster Gazette, The 352, 362, 366, 372, 404, 412
 "Why I Became A Theosophist" 354
 "Why I Do Not Return to India" 348-349, 352, 373,
 380, 385, 406, 420
 Will:
 first Will 350, 352
 Last Will and Testament 350-353, 357
 second Will 350-352, 357
 third Will 351, 353-354, 357, 361
 Williams, Gertrude Marvin 331
 Wimbridge, Edward 318
 Wright, Claude Falls 341, 418
 Wright, George W. 368

Works Cited

Books, Pamphlets and Periodicals

- Abridgment of Discussions** **Abridgment of Discussions upon Theosophical Subjects**, Held at Meetings of the Aryan Theosophical Society of New York and Elsewhere. Edited by William Q. Judge. No. 2, May 1886, 4 pp.
- The American Theosophist** **The American Theosophist**. Official Organ of the American Theosophical Society. Changed from **The Theosophic Messenger** with Vol. 14, No. 4, Jan. 1913, to present. Wheaton, IL: The American Section of the T.S.
- Annie Besant An Autobiography** **Annie Besant An Autobiography**. Adyar, Madras, India: Theosophical Publishing House, 1989 edition, 332 pp.
- The Aryan Path** **The Aryan Path**. Edited by Sophia Wadia. Bombay, India: Theosophy Co. Ltd., Vol. 1, Jan. 1930 to Vol. 50, Special Advance Issue, 1979.
- Astral Tramp** **The Astral Tramp**. A Biography of Sepharial by Kim Farnell. London: Ascella Publications, 1998, 202 pp.
- Atma's Messenger** **Atma's Messenger**. Edited by Melville S. Wadham. New Haven, CT: Atma Branch T.S., Vol. 1, Apr., May and June 1895, 16 pp.
- Austral Theos.** **Austral Theosophist**. Melbourne, Australia, Vol. 1 & 2, Jan. 1894 to Feb. 1895, Monthly, 16 pp.
- Autobiography of A.P. Sinnett** **Autobiography of Alfred Percy Sinnett**. London: Theosophical History Centre, 1986, 58 pp. + 7 pp.
- Banishing the Beast** **Banishing the Beast: Sexuality and the Early Feminists** by Lucy Bland. New York: The New York Press, 1995, 410 pp.
- BCW** **H.P. Blavatsky Collected Writings**. Compiled by Boris de Zirkoff. Wheaton, IL: Theosophical Publishing House, Vol. 1, 1966 to Vol. 15, 1991, including Index.
- Bhagavad-Gita** **The Bhagavad-Gita**. From the Sanskrit by William Q. Judge. Bombay, India: Theosophy Company (India) Ltd., 1971, 133 pp.
Bhagavad-Gita. Recension by William Q. Judge. Combined with his Essays on the Gita. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1969, 220 pp.
- Blavatsky Assn.** **Proceedings of the Blavatsky Association**. Headquarters: 22, Craven Hill Bayswater, London, W. 2. The Honorable Mrs. A. J. (Iona) Davey, Secretary (For the Council). No. 1, Nov. 13, 1924, 59 pp.; No. 2, Nov. 13, 1925, 40 pp.; No. 3, Mar. 1927, 46 pp.
- Borderland** **Borderland**. A quarterly review and Index. Edited by W.T. Stead. London, Vol. 1, July 1893 to Vol. 4, Oct. 1897.

- California Utopia** **California Utopia: Point Loma: 1897–1942** by Emmett A. Greenwalt. San Diego, CA: Point Loma Publications, Inc., 1978, 244 pp. First published as **The Point Loma Community in California: 1897–1942**, 1955.
- The Case Against W.Q. Judge** **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**. London: Published by Annie Besant at the Office of the Theosophical Publishing Society, 1895, 88 pp.
- Cdn. Theosophist** ^{ETS*} **The Canadian Theosophist**. Edited by Albert E.S. Smythe until Oct. 1947. Vol. 1, No. 1, Mar. 15, 1920 to present.
- Conger** **Colonel Arthur L. Conger** by Alan E. Donant. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1999, 32 pp.
- Damodar** **Damodar and the Pioneers of The Theosophical Movement**. Compiled and Annotated by Sven Eek, Adyar, Madras, India: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1978, 720 pp.
- Divine Feminine** **Divine Feminine: Theosophy and Feminism in England** by Joy Dixon. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press, 2001, 293 pp.
- Echoes from the Orient** **Echoes from the Orient**. A Broad Outline of Theosophical Doctrines by William Q. Judge. Los Angeles, CA: The Magazine Theosophy, 1918, 64 pp.
- Echoes of the Orient** **Echoes of The Orient: The Writings of William Quan Judge**. 3 volumes. Compiled by Dara Eklund. San Diego, CA: Point Loma Publications Inc., 1975, 1980, 1987 and Cumulative Index, 1993.
- Eclectic Theos.** **The Eclectic Theosophist**. Edited by W. Emmett Small, Helen Todd. An occasional Newsletter from Point Loma Publications, Inc., later as a Bi-Monthly, No. 1, Mar. 5, 1971, to No. 126, Nov/Dec. 1991.
- Eirenicon** **Eirenicon**. “No true occultist dare fash with hurt feelings”. Most likely edited by T.H. Redfern. Cheshire, England: The Peace Lodge of The Theosophical Society, circa early 1940s to Jan. 1966, No. 152.
- The Elder Brother** **The Elder Brother: A Biography of Charles Webster Leadbeater** by Gregory Tillett. London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982, 337 pp.
- English Theosophist** **The English Theosophist**. Founded by W.A. Bulmer. London: The H.P.B. Press, Vol. 1, Sep. 1895, Monthly.
The English Theosophist (New Series). Edited by W.A. Bulmer. Vol. 2, Nos. 1-4, Mar. 1898 to June 1898.
- First Five Lives of Annie Besant** **The First Five Lives of Annie Besant** by Arthur H. Nethercot. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1960, 419 pp.
- First Report** **First Report of The Committee of the Society for Psychical Research**, Appointed to Investigate the Evidence for Marvellous Phenomena Offered by Certain Members of the Theosophical Society. London, 1884, 130 pp. [Private and Confidential]. Privately issued for associates only. Another report was published later as part of **Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research**, Volume III, London, December 1885, pp. 201-400. (Report of the Committee Appointed to Investigate Phenomena Connected with The Theosophical Society.)

- Fohat** ^{ETS} **Fohat.** Edited by Robert Bruce MacDonald. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: Edmonton Theosophical Society, Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1997 to present.
- Future of the Theos. Publishing Co.** ^{ETS} **The Future of the Theosophical Publishing Co.** by Julia Keightley [Jasper Niemand]. New York, Feb. 27, 1898, 35 pp.
- General Report of the 15th Anniversary of the T.S.** **General Report of the Fifteenth Convention and Anniversary of The Theosophical Society.** Adyar, Madras, India, Dec. 27 - 29, 1890, 94 pp.
- General Report of the 16th Anniversary of the T.S.** **General Report of the Sixteenth Convention and Anniversary of The Theosophical Society.** Adyar, Madras, India, Dec. 27 - 29, 1891, 80 pp.
- General Report of the 17th Anniversary of the T.S.** **General Report of the Seventeenth Anniversary of The Theosophical Society.** Adyar, Madras, India, Dec. 27 - 29, 1892, 70 pp.
- General Report of the 18th Anniversary of the T.S.** **General Report of the Eighteenth Anniversary of The Theosophical Society.** Adyar, Madras, India, Dec. 27 - 30, 1893, 78 pp.
- General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S.** **General Report of the Nineteenth Anniversary of The Theosophical Society.** Adyar, Madras, India, Dec. 25 - 28, 1894, 62 pp.
- General Report of the 20th Anniversary of the T.S.** **General Report of the Twentieth Anniversary of The Theosophical Society.** Adyar, Madras, India, Dec. 27 - 30, 1895, 87 pp.
- General Report of the 21st Anniversary of the T.S.** **General Report of the Twenty-First Anniversary of The Theosophical Society.** Adyar, Madras, India, Dec. 27 - 30, 1896, 103 pp.
- Golden Book of the Theosophical Society** **The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society (1875-1925).** Edited by C.J. Jinarajadasa. Adyar, Madras, India: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1925, 415 pp.
- The Grail** ^{ETS} **The Grail.** Nos. 1-3 edited by Herbert Coryn; 4-5 edited by Herbert Coryn and Basil Crump. London, Vol. 1, Mar. 1897 to Sep. 1897, Monthly, 20 pp.
- Greatest Occultists** **Mysteries and Romances of the World's Greatest Occultists** by "CHEIRO" (Count Louis Hamon). London: Herbert Jenkins, 1935, 319 pp.
- Hammer on the Mountain** **Hammer on the Mountain, The Life of Henry Steel Olcott (1832-1907)** by Howard Murphet. Wheaton, IL: Theosophical Publishing House, 1972, 339 pp. Republished as **Yankee Beacon of Buddhist Light: Life of Col. Henry S. Olcott**, Wheaton, IL: Theosophical Publishing House, 1988.
- Hastings** **Defence of Madame Blavatsky** by Beatrice Hastings. Worthing, Sussex, England, 1937, Vol. 1, 60 pp., Vol. 2, 105 pp.
- A Historical Retrospect — 1875-1896 — of the Theosophical Society** **A Historical Retrospect — 1875-1896 — of the Theosophical Society.** Published as a 32 pp. pamphlet by The Society in 1896. Full text in the General Report of the Twenty-First Anniversary of the Theosophical Society, pp. 2-33.
- H.P.B. A Great Betrayal** **H.P. Blavatsky: A Great Betrayal** by Alice Leighton Cleather. Calcutta, India: Thacker, Spink & Co., 1922, 96 pp. Republished by The H.P.B. Lending Library, Vernon, BC, Canada.

- H.P.B. and the Present Crisis in the T.S.** **H.P.B. and the Present Crisis in the Theosophical Society** by Countess Constance Wachtmeister. London, 1895, 12 pp. Republished in *Theosophical History*, Vol. 3, Apr. 1989, pp. 51-61.
- H.P.B. Theos. Movement** **H.P. Blavatsky and The Theosophical Movement** by Charles J. Ryan. San Diego, CA: Point Loma Publications, Inc., 1975, 441 pp.
- H.P.B. As I Knew Her** **H.P.B. As I Knew Her** by Alice Leighton Cleather. Calcutta and Simla, India: Thacker, Spink & Co., 1923, 76 pp. Republished by The H.P.B. Lending Library, Vernon, BC, Canada, Nov. 1979.
- H.P.B. by Sylvia Cranston** **H.P.B. The Extraordinary Life & Influence of Helena Blavatsky Founder of the Modern Theosophical Movement** by Sylvia Cranston. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1993, 648 pp.
- H.P.B. Her Life and Work for Humanity** **H.P. Blavatsky: Her Life and Work for Humanity** by Alice Leighton Cleather. Calcutta, India: Thacker, Spink & Co, 1922, 124 pp.
- HPB Theos. Articles** **H.P. Blavatsky Theosophical Articles.** 3 vols. Los Angeles, CA: The Theosophy Co., 1981.
- In Honor of W.Q. Judge** **In Honor of William Quan Judge.** Point Loma, CA: The Theosophical Publishing Company, 1901, 51 pp.
- The Internationalist**^{ETS} **The Internationalist**, formerly **The Irish Theosophist**. Edited by H.A. Coryn and G.W. Russell, Vol. 1, Nos. 1-6, Oct. 15, 1897 to Mar. 15, 1898.
- Irish Theosophist**^{ETS} **The Irish Theosophist.** Edited by D.N. Dunlop. Dublin, Vol. 1, Oct. 1895 to Vol. 5, Sep. 1897.
- Isis and the Mahatmas**^{ETS} **Isis and the Mahatmas.** A Reply by William Q. Judge, 1895, 30 pp.
- Isis Very Much Unveiled,**
2nd ed. **Isis Very Much Unveiled, Being the Story of the Great Mahatma Hoax** by Edmund Garrett. London: Westminster Gazette Office, 2nd edition, 1894, 132 pp.; 3rd edition, 1895, 136 pp.
- Journal of San Diego History** **The Journal of San Diego History.** Published by The San Diego Historical Society.
- The Lamp**^{ETS} **The Lamp.** Edited by Albert E.S. Smythe. Toronto, ON, Canada, Vol. 1, Aug. 1894 to Vol. 4, Sep. 1900, Monthly.
- Last Four Lives of Annie Besant** **The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant** by Arthur H. Nethercot. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1963, 483 pp.
- The Latest Attack on the Theosophical Society**^{ETS} **The Latest Attack on the Theosophical Society.** Issued by The Council of The London Lodge. London, Oct. 1884, 22 pp.
- LBS** **The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to A.P. Sinnett**, and other Miscellaneous Letters. Transcribed, Compiled, and with an Introduction by A.T. Barker. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1973, 404 pp.
- Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom** **Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom**, Second Series. Transcribed and Compiled by C. Jinar-jad-sa. Adyar, Madras, India: Theosophical Publishing House, 1925 and 1973 editions, 191 and 189 pp.

- Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom** 1st series **Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom**, (1881-1888) First Series. Transcribed and Compiled by C. Jinar-jad-sa. Adyar, Madras, India: Theosophical Publishing House, 1919 edition, 124 pp.
- Letters That Have Helped Me** **Letters That Have Helped Me**. Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY: The Theosophy Company, 1946, 300 pp.
- Letters That Have Helped Me - J.N.** **Letters That Have Helped Me**. Volume 1. Compiled by Jasper Niemand. New York: The Theosophical Publishing Co. of New York, 1911, 90 pp.
- Letters That Have Helped Me - J.N.** **Letters That Have Helped Me**. Volume 2. Compiled by Jasper Niemand. New York: The Quarterly Book Department, 1918, 126 pp.
- Light** **Light**. A Journal of Spiritual Progress and Psychic Research. Founded by Mr. E. Dawson Rogers, Manager of the National Press Agency, London. Edited for some years by Rev. Stainton Moses (*pseud.* "M.A. Oxon"). First issue, Jan. 7, 1881. Still in publication.
- Lucifer** **Lucifer**. Founded and Edited by H.P. Blavatsky and Mabel Collins Cook to Oct. 1888; H.P.B. to Sep. 1889; H.P.B. and Annie Besant to June 1891; Besant to Sep. 1895; Besant and G.R.S. Mead to Aug. 1897. London, Vol. 1, Sep. 1887 to Vol. 20, Aug. 1897, Monthly.
- Lucifer (P.L.)** **Lucifer: The Light-Bringer**. Edited by H. Alexander Fussell. San Diego, CA: Theosophical University Press, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan./Feb. 1930 to Vol. 7, No. 6, Dec. 1935, Bi-monthly.
- Magic** **Magic**. "Devoted to Universal Brotherhood, Theosophy, and Archaic Science." Edited by T.W. Willans. Sydney, Australia, Vol. 1, No. 1, Oct. 1896 to Vol. 1, No. 3, Dec. 1896, Monthly. Title changed to **The Australian Theosophist** with Vol. 1, No. 4, Jan. 1897 to Vol. 2, No. 4, Feb. 1898.
- Mahatma Letters** **The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett**. Compiled by A.T. Barker. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1975, 2nd edition, 493pp + 44pp.
- Mahatmas and Their Letters** **The Mahatmas and Their Letters** by Geoffrey A. Barborka. Adyar, Madras, India: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1973, 422 pp.
- Mercury** **Mercury**. Edited by William John Walters, with Edith and Marie A. Walsh. San Francisco, CA, Vol. 1, July 1894 to Vol. 5, Aug. 1899.
- Modern Astrology** **Modern Astrology** by Alan Leo. London, Vol. 1, (Old Series) Aug. 1895 to July 1896.
- Modern World Movements** **Modern World Movements** by Jirah Dewey Buck. Chicago: Indo-American Book Co., 1913, 191 pp.
- Mrs. Annie Besant A Modern Prophet** **Mrs. Annie Besant: A Modern Prophet** by Theodore Besterman. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1934, 274 pp.
- My Guest** **My Guest—H.P. Blavatsky** by Francesca Arundale. Adyar, Madras, India: Theosophical Publishing House, 1932, 81 pp.
- Neresheimer Report** **Some Reminiscences of W.Q. Judge**. Typescript by Emil August Neresheimer. Feb. 25, 1932, 14 pp.

- Neutrality of the T.S.** **The Neutrality of the Theosophical Society: An Enquiry Into Certain Charges Against The Vice-President, Held in London, July, 1894.** London: The General Council of the Theosophical Society, 1894, 16 pp. Reprinted in *Lucifer*, Vol. 14, Aug. 1894, pp. 449-464.
- New England Notes** **New England Notes.** "A Monthly Record of Theosophical Activities". Edited by L.F. Wade. Boston, Vol. 1, Jan. 1895 to Apr. 1896, 4 pp.
- Northern Theos.** ^{ETS} **The Northern Theosophist.** Edited by W.A. Bulmer. Middlesbrough, England, Vol. 1, Dec. 1893 to Vol. 2, July 1895, Monthly, 8 pp.
- The Occult Review** **The Occult Review.** Edited by Ralph Shirley. London, Vol. 1, Jan. 1905 to Vol 65, July 1938. Monthly.
- The Occult World of Mme. Blavatsky** **The Occult World of Madame Blavatsky.** Compiled and edited by Daniel H. Caldwell. Tucson, AZ: Impossible Dream Publications, 1991, 335 pp.
- O.E. Library Critic** ^{ETS} **The O. E. [Oriental Esoteric] Library Critic.** Edited by Dr. H.N. Stokes. Washington, DC: The O. E. Library League, Vol. 1, Aug. 1911 to Vol. 27, 1942, Bi-weekly then Monthly with Vol. 15, June 1926. Originally intended as a prison reform periodical.
- Official Report of the Ninth Anniversary at Madras** **Official Report of the Ninth Session of the General Convention and of the Celebration of The Ninth Anniversary at Madras December 27th — 31st, 1884.** Madras, India: The Theosophical Society at Adyar, 1885, 129 pp.
- Old Diary Leaves** **Old Diary Leaves,** First Series (1885) to Sixth Series (1935) by Henry Steel Olcott. Adyar, Madras, India: Theosophical Publishing House.
- Ourselves** **Ourselves.** The People's Theosophic Monthly. Edited by C.H. Collings. London, Vol. 1, No. 1, Apr. 1895 to Vol. 2, No. 10, Oct. 1897.
- Oxford Companion to English Lit.** **The Oxford Companion to English Literature.** Compiled and edited by Sir Paul Harvey. Great Britain: Oxford University Press, 1933, 866 pp.
- Pacific Theos.** **The Pacific Theosophist.** Edited by Jerome A. Anderson. Seattle, Washington, and San Francisco, Vols. 1 to 8, Nov. 1891 to May 1898, Monthly.
- Palmistry** **Palmistry: The Language of the Hand** by Cheiro the Palmist (Count Louis Hamon). New York: Gramercy Books, 1999, 162 pp. + Illustrations of Famous Hands.
- Passionate Pilgrim** **The Passionate Pilgrim: A Life of Annie Besant** by Gertrude Marvin Williams. New York, NY: Coward-McCann, 1931, 382 pp.
- The Path** ^{ETS**} **The Path.** Founded and edited by William Q. Judge. New York, Vol. 1, Apr. 1886 to Mar. 1896, Monthly. Changed to **Theosophy**, Vol. 11, Apr. 1896. Changed to **Universal Brotherhood**, Vol. 12, Nov. 1897 to Vol. 17, No. 12, Mar. 1903.
- The Path (Sydney)** **The Path.** Official organ of the Sydney Lodge. Article by Basil Crump "Concerning Books", Jan.-Mar. 1938.
- The Plot Against The Theosophical Society** **The Plot Against The Theosophical Society** by A. Keightley, E. Adams, C.H. Collins, and H.T. Edge. London: The Publishers, 1895, 89 pp.

- Practical Occultism** **Practical Occultism.** From the Private Letters of William Q. Judge. Edited by Arthur L. Conger. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1951, 307 pp.
- Prasnottara**^{ETS***} **The Prasnottara.** Edited by Bertram Keightley. Adyar, Madras, India, Vol. 1, Jan. 1891 to Vol. 13, 1903. Monthly, 16 pp.
- Priestess of the Occult** **Priestess of the Occult, (Madame Blavatsky)** by Gertrude Marvin Williams. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knoff, 1946, 345 pp. + 9 pp. Index.
- The Progressive Theosophist** **The Progressive Theosophist.** Published by the National Committee for Progressive Theosophy, U.S.A., Vol. 1, No. 1, June 1966, 2 pp.
- R.C. Bio. Notes** **Robert Crosbie (1849-1919): Biographical Notes.** Compiled by Wane Kell. Publisher unknown.
- R.C. Bio. Notes (ULT)** **Robert Crosbie, The Friendly Philosopher, 1849–1919,** Biographical Notes. Compiled by United Lodge of Theosophists.
- The Real H.P.B.** **The Real H.P. Blavatsky** by William Kingsland. London: John M. Watkins, 1928, 322 pp.
- Rebirth of The Occult Tradition** **Rebirth of The Occult Tradition: How The Secret Doctrine of H.P. Blavatsky Was Written,** by Boris De Zirkoff. Adyar, Madras, India: Theosophical Publishing House, 78 pp. Also republished in Vol. 1 of the 3 volume edition of **The Secret Doctrine** as HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION: HOW “THE SECRET DOCTRINE” WAS WRITTEN. Adyar, Madras, India: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1978, pp.1-76.
- Reminiscences of H.P.B.** **Reminiscences of H.P. Blavatsky and The Secret Doctrine** by Countess Constance Wachtmeister et al. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1893, 162 pp. Also the Quest edition, Wheaton, IL: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1976, 141 pp.
- Reply by William Q. Judge** **Reply by William Q. Judge to Charges of Misuse of Mahatmas’ Names and Handwritings.** Pamphlet, publisher unknown, 1895, 29 pp.
- Report**^{ETS} **Report of Observations Made During a Nine Month stay at the Headquarters of the Theosophical Society at Adyar (Madras), India** by F. Hartmann, M.D., F.T.S. (An American Buddhist). Madras, India: Graves, Cookson and Co., 1884, 60 pp.
- Report of Investigation**^{ETS} **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. Adyar, Madras, India: Theosophical Society at Adyar, 1885, 152 pp.
- Report of Proceedings**^{ETS} **Theosophical Society, American Section, Report of Proceedings.** Held at Chicago, 1888, 55 pp.; Chicago, 1889, 69 pp.; Chicago, 1890, 88 pp.; Boston, 1891, 51 pp.; Chicago, 1892, 45 pp.; New York City, 1893, 32 pp.; San Francisco, 1894, 52 pp.

- Report of Proceedings European Section**
- Fifth Annual Convention of the European Section T.S.** held at London, July 4th and 5th, 1895. **Report of Proceedings** up to Noon on July 4th. First Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in Europe, held at London, July 4th and 5th, 1895. **Report of Proceedings.** Pamphlet, 46 pp.
- Report of Proceedings T.S. in America, 1895**^{ETS}
- Ninth Annual Convention, American Section T.S. and First Convention, Theosophical Society in America. Held at Boston, Mass., April 28-29, 1895. Report of Proceedings.** Theosophical Society in America, 1895, 62 pp.
- Report of Proceedings T.S. in America**^{ETS}
- Second Annual Convention of The Theosophical Society in America, Held at New York City, April 26-27, 1896. Report of Proceedings.** Theosophical Society in America, 48 pp.
- Report of Proceedings T.S. in America**^{ETS}
- Third Annual Convention of The Theosophical Society in America, Held at New York, April 25-26, 1897. Report of Proceedings.** Theosophical Society in America, 1897, 60 pp.
- Report of Proceedings T.S. in Europe**
- Theosophical Society in Europe, Report of Proceedings.** First Annual Convention held in London, July 1891, 65 pp.; 2nd July 1892, 69 pp.; 3rd July 1893, 39 pp.
- Review of Reviews**
- The Review of Reviews.** Founded and edited by W.T. Stead. London, Vol. 1, Jan. 1890 to Vol. 82, 1932.
- The Search Light**
- The Search Light.** New York and Point Loma, 1898 to 1911. Published by the Defence Committee, usually in time of crisis as a sort of policy-defending “white paper”. Clark Thurston, Chairman.
- A Short History of the T.S.**
- A Short History of The Theosophical Society.** Compiled by Josephine Ransom. Adyar, Madras, India: Theosophical Publishing House, 1938, 591 pp.
- Some Account**^{ETS}
- Some Account of My Intercourse with Madame Blavatsky, from 1872 to 1884;** with a Number of Additional Letters and a Full Explanation of The Most Marvellous Theosophical Phenomena; by Madame Coulomb. Published for The Proprietors of The “Madras Christian College Magazine,” by Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E.C., 1885, 112 pp.
- Sunrise**
- Sunrise.** Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, Vol. 1, No. 1 Oct. 1951, edited by James A. Long, then by Grace F. Knoche from Vol. 20, No. 12, Sep. 1971 to Dec. 1998/Jan. 1999. Edited by Sarah Belle Dougherty to present.
- Theos. Congress World’s Fair 1893**^{ETS}
- The Theosophical Congress Held by the Theosophical Society at the Parliament of Religions, World’s Fair of 1893,** at Chicago Ill. September 15, 16, 17. New York: American Section Headquarters T.S., 1893, 195 pp.
- Theos. Forum (New Series)**^{ETS}
- The Theosophical Forum (New Series).** Issued by The Theosophical Society in New York, Vol. 1, May 1895 to Vol. 10, April 1905.
- Theos. Forum (P.L.)**
- The Theosophical Forum.** Published by The Theosophical Society, Point Loma, CA, Vol. 1, Sep. 1929 to Vol. 29, March 1951.

- Theos. History** **Theosophical History.** An independent quarterly journal founded in 1985 and edited by Leslie Price, London (Vols. 1 and 2) until Apr. 1989, then by James Santucci, Fullerton, CA, from Vol. 3, Jan 1990 to present.
- Theos. Journal** **The Theosophical Journal.** London: The Theosophical Society in England, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan./Feb. 1960 to Vol. 38, No. 6, Nov./Dec. 1997, Bi-monthly.
- Theos. Messenger** **The Theosophic Messenger.** Previously **Mercury.** "A Monthly Magazine for the Interchange of Theosophical Opinions and News". Edited by William John Walters. San Francisco, CA, Vol. 1, Oct. 1899 to Vol. 14, Dec. 1912.
- Theos. Movement** **The Theosophical Movement.** Bombay, India: Theosophy Company (India) Ltd, Vol. 1, Nov. 1930 to present, Monthly.
- Theos. Movement 1875-1925** **The Theosophical Movement 1875-1925.** New York: E.P. Dutton & Co. Inc., 1925, 705 pp.
- Theos. Movement 1875-1950** **The Theosophical Movement 1875-1950.** Los Angeles, CA: The Cunningham Press, 1925, 351 pp.
- Theos. Or Neo-Theos.** ^{ETS} **Theosophy or Neo-Theosophy.** Compiled by Margaret Thomas (Member of The Theosophical Society, Scotland, Wales and England, 1912-1924). Manuscript 67 pp. Serialized in **Theosophical Notes**, Dec. 1952 to Oct. 1953.
- The Theos. Path** **The Theosophical Path.** Point Loma, CA: New Century Corporation, Vol. 1, July 1911 to Vol. 45, Oct. 1935, Monthly.
- Theos. Review** **The Theosophical Review.** A continuation from **Lucifer.** Edited by Annie Besant and G.R.S. Mead from Vol. 21, Sep. 1897 to Vol. 40, Aug. 1897, then by G.R.S. Mead from Sep. 1907 to Vol. 43, Feb. 1909, Monthly.
- Theosophia** ^{ETS} **Theosophia.** Edited by Boris de Zirkoff. Los Angeles, CA, Vol. 1, May/June, 1944 to Vol. 37, Summer 1981, Bi-monthly.
- Theosophic Isis** ^{ETS} **The Theosophic Isis.** Edited by Dr. Herbert A. W. Coryn. London, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan. 1896 to Vol. 2, No. 2, Feb. 1897, Monthly.
- Theosophical News** **Theosophical News.** "A Weekly Report of Activities." Boston, Vol. 1, June 22, 1896 to Sep. 20, 1897, 4-8 pp.
- Theosophical Notes** ^{ETS} **Theosophical Notes.** An independent publication, not controlled by or the organ of any Lodge or Association. A Monthly by Victor Endersby from Berkeley, CA then from Napa, CA, Dec. 21, 1950 to Apr. 1978.
- Theosophical Quarterly** **Theosophical Quarterly.** Founded by Clement A. Griscom. Issued by The Theosophical Society in New York. Vol. 1, July 1903 to Vol. 35, Oct. 1938.
- The Theosophical Society and The Westminster Gazette** **The Theosophical Society and The Westminster Gazette** by Annie Besant and Bertram Keightley. Madras, India, Dec. 23, 1894, 16 pp.
- The Theosophist** **The Theosophist.** Started in Bombay, India by H. P. Blavatsky as Editor, Vol. 1, Oct. 1879, as A Monthly Journal with Supplements. Still in publication.

- Theosophists: Reunite!** **Theosophists: Reunite!** by F. Pierce Spinks. Boston: The Christopher Publishing Press, 1958, 387 pp.
- Theosophy** **Theosophy.** Los Angeles, CA: The United Lodge Of Theosophists, Vol. 1, Nov. 1912 to present, Monthly.
- Theosophy at the World's Fair** **Theosophy at the World's Fair, September 15-16, 1893.** Pamphlet. New York. Issued in May 1893 by William Q. Judge, *Gen. Sec. American Sec. T.S.*, 8 pp.
- Theosophy Exposed**^{ETS} **Theosophy Exposed or Mrs. Besant and Her Guru.** "An Appeal To Educated Hindus". Madras, India: The Christian Literature Society, 1893, 113 pp.
- Theosophy (Path)**^{ETS**} **Theosophy.** Formerly **The Path.** New York: Theosophical Publishing Company. Continued as Vol. 11, Apr. 1896 to Vol. 12, Oct. 1897 then changed to **Universal Brotherhood**, Vol. 12, Nov. 1897 to Vol. 14, Dec. 1899.
- Theosophy Unveiled** **Theosophy Unveiled** by John Murdoch. Madras, India: The Christian Knowledge Society, 1885, 93 pp.
- T.N.C.A.B.** **Theosophy In The Nineteenth Century: An Annotated Bibliography** by Michael Gomes. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1994, 582 pp.
- Transactions of the L.L.**^{ETS} **Transactions of the London Lodge.** London. Published lectures presented at their meetings. Forty four issues were published in all starting with June 11th, 1884 to Apr. 1906, then four issues of the New Series, from Mar. 1913 to Jan. 1916.
- Transactions of the Scottish Lodge**^{ETS} **Transactions of the Scottish Lodge of the Theosophical Society (1891-1893).** Vols. 1 - 4. Edinburgh, Scotland: The Darien Press.
- Two Replies by William Q. Judge** **Two Replies by William Q. Judge.** Los Angeles, CA: The Theosophy Company, 53 pp.
- The United Lodge of Theosophist, Its Mission and Its Future** **The United Lodge of Theosophist: Its Mission and Its Future.** Los Angeles, CA: The Theosophical Company, 26 pp.
- Universal Brotherhood (Path/Theosophy)** **Universal Brotherhood.** Formerly **The Path**, changed to **Theosophy**, Vol. 11, April 1896 to Vol. 12, Oct. 1897, then to **Universal Brotherhood**, Vol. 12, Nov. 1897 to Vol. 14, Dec. 1899. Edited by Katherine Tingley and E.A. Neresheimer. New York: Theosophical Publishing Co. The name changed to **Universal Brotherhood Path** with Vol. 14, Jan. 1900 to Vol. 17, Mar. 1903.
- The Vahan** **The Vahan.** Edited by G.R.S. Mead. London: The European Section of the Theosophical Society. Second Series [Vol. 1], Aug. 1891 to Vol. 30, Dec. 1920. Monthly.
- The Vahan IS** **The Vahan.** Initial Series. A vehicle for the interchange of Theosophical News and Opinions. Issued by the council of the British Section of the T.S. for free distribution to members. No. 1, Dec. 1890 to No. 15, July 1891. Published bi-weekly, 8 pp.

- Vania** **Madame H.P. Blavatsky Her Occult Phenomena and The Society for Psychical Research** by K.F. Vania. Bombay, India: Sat Publishing Co., 1951, 448 pp.
- Vivekananda** **The Yogas and Other Works** by Swami Vivekananda. New York: Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Center, 1953 and 1984 editions, 954 pp.
- Vivekananda, Complete Works** **The Complete Works of the Swami Vivekananda**. Part III. Almorya, Himalayas: Advaita Ashrama, 4th Mayavati Memorial Edition, 1932, 461 pp.
- The Westminster Budget** **The Westminster Budget**. The pages are the same size as the pages of **Light** magazine. No other information available except what has been entered in the text.
- What is the Theosophical Organization?** **What is the Theosophical Organization?** Pamphlet. Dublin: The Irish Theosophist Press, June 3, 1895, 20 pp.
- Word, The** **The Word**. Edited by Harold W. Percival. New York: Theosophical Publishing Company, Vol. 1, Oct. 1904 to Vol. 25, Sep. 1917.
- WQJ T. Articles** **William Q. Judge Theosophical Articles**. 2 vols. Los Angeles, CA: The Theosophy Co., 1980.
- WQJ T. Pioneer** **William Quan Judge: Theosophical Pioneer**. Compiled by Sven Eek and Boris De Zirkoff. Wheaton, IL: Theosophical Publishing House, 1969, 96 pp.

NOTE: ^{ETS} Indicates re-published works by Edmonton Theosophical Society.

* Volumes 1 - 20 only.

** **The Path** and **Theosophy** only.

*** **Prasnottara**, Vols.1-4, 1891-1894 only.

Circulars, Letters and Newspapers

- 1875-1891 A Fragment of Autobiography by Annie Besant.** London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1891, 14 pp.
- Anagarika Dharmapala And The Theosophical Society** by Michael Gomes. Madras, India: Maha Bodhi Society, Centenary Souvenir (1891-1991), 8 pp.
- An Occultist's Life.** Hargrove issued circular to E.S.T. members regarding K. Tingley, May 17th, 1896, 7 pp.
- Application For Fellowship.** The Theosophical Society, Application For Fellowship. Most application forms are accompanied with an "Obligation."
- An Urgent Appeal.** E.S.T. circular. Strictly Private and Confidential. E.T. Hargrove. New York, May 14, 1896, 4 pp.
- Book of Rules, E.S.T.** 144 Madison Avenue, New York City. STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL. Katherine A. Tingley, (date unknown), 20 pp.
- The Blavatsky Lodge of the T.S. AT A SPECIAL ADJOURNED MEETING.** FOR MEMBERS ONLY. Circular, January 5th, 1895, 1 page
- By Master's Direction.** E.S.T. by William Q. Judge. STRICTLY PRIVATE AND ONLY FOR E.S.T. MEMBERS. New York, Nov. 3, 1894, 12 pp.
- THE CASE AGAINST W. Q. JUDGE, A REVIEW** by Basil Crump, Barrister-at-Law. London, May 5, 1895, 4 pp.
- Charges Against William Q. Judge.** *To All Members of the Theosophical Society* by William Quan Judge, New York, March 15, 1894, 4 pp.
- Chicago, May 20, 1895.** A letter addressed to *Dear Sir* by Geo. E. Wright, President Chicago Branch, Room 48, Athenaeum Building, Chicago, 1 page.
- Circular Letter.** From J.D. Buck to E.S.T. members. (Only Buck's return address [Cincinnati] as header), Feb. 1st 1895, 2 pp.
- Circular Letter.** Issued by members of the T.S. in New York and Brooklyn through Henry T. Patterson. [Estimated date, Dec. 1894.] 3 pp.
- A Common-Sense View** of MR. JUDGE'S CIRCULAR OF NOVEMBER 3, 1894. Issued by Bertram Keightley in London, Feb. 1895, 8 pp.
- COUNTESS WACHTMEISTER REFUTES HERSELF.** A reprint, published by J.D. Buck. June 10, 1895, 1 page.
- The Crusade of American Theosophists Around the World.** Report by Katherine A. Tingley. New York: The Theosophical Society in America, 1897, 16 pp. First published in **Theosophy (Path)**, Vol. 11, Mar. 1897; pp.378-385.
- Dear Mr. Willey:** The Theosophical Society, International Headquarters, Point Loma, California. Letter by Joseph H. Fussell, Secretary General. 2 pp.

Eastern School of Theosophy by A. Besant from Colombo, Ceylon, December 19, 1894, 4 pp. PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL. FOR E.S.T. MEMBERS ONLY.

Esoteric School of Theosophy by Katherine A. Tingley. STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL. 144 Madison Avenue, New York City, estimated date Jan. 1898, 8 pp.

Esoteric School of Theosophy by Katherine A. Tingley. STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL. 144 Madison Avenue, New York City, February 18, 1898, 1 page.

E.S.T. circular. 144 Madison Avenue, New York City. May 21, 1896, 7 pp.

E.S.T. circular, by Archibald Keightley. London: Printed Privately by Members of the E.S.T. on *The Irish Theosophist* Press, Jan. 12, 1895, 17 pp.

E.S.T. Order No. II of 1894. Order No. II of 1894, New York, Dec. 3, 1894, 1 page. STRICTLY PRIVATE AND FOR E.S.T. MEMBERS ONLY.

E.S.T. Order No. III of 1894. Order No. III of 1894, New York, Dec. 10, 1894, 1 page. STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

E.S.T. — Private. 144 Madison Avenue, New York City, (undated), 1 page circular.

European Section of The Theosophical Society. Constitution and Rules. 1891, 19 pp.

Extracts from meeting with Dr. Henry A. Smith, President, American Section of The Theosophical Society (Adyar), April 2, 1962, 3131 McCall Street, San Diego 6, Calif.
Present: Henry A. Smith, L. Gordon Plummer, H. W. Dempster, W. E. Small (at Dempster's home).

Fellow Theosophists. A Circular letter to Fellow Theosophists by Robert B. Holt. March 5th 1895, 1 page.

Fellow Theosophists. A Circular letter to Fellow Theosophists by Robert B. Holt. March 20th 1895, 2 pp.

Fellow Theosophists by A Fellow of the Theosophical Society. Circa 1895, 3pp.

A Forgotten Pledge by Che-Yew-Tsang (E.T. Hargrove), Feb. 3rd, 1895, 14 pp.

Letter from C.A. Griscom Jr. to Albert E. S. Smythe. March 22, 1896, 2 pp.

Letter from E.A. Neresheimer to Basil Crump. February 27th, 1932, 2 pp.

Letter from the Board of Trustees of the Aryan T.S. Addressed "To The Secretary of ____ Branch T.S."
"Signed by all the Trustees (except, of course, Mr. Judge)." 144 Madison Ave., New York City, January 18, 1895. 1 page.

Letter signed by Hildor Barton to Boris [de Zirkoff]. January 18, 1966.

A Letter to Mrs. Annie Besant on the Recent Crisis in the Theosophical Movement by Amy Constance Morant. London. August 17, 1895, 4 pp. Also contains a brief reply by Annie Besant, Aug. 22, 1895.

A Letter to The European Section. Circular by G.R.S. Mead, Feb, 1st 1895, 6 pp.

Letter from Sydney H. Old to Mrs. Fielding. Handwritten and signed, dated January 31, 1939 from Kelowna, British Columbia (Canada). 5 pp.

MEMORANDUM OF INTERVIEW WITH DR. ANNIE BESANT. A 6 page interview with Dr. Annie Besant by William Mulliss a Canadian newspaper man from Hamilton, Ontario. The unsigned Memorandum is dated October 6, 1926. Mulliss also added an Addmemo which is dated October 25, 1926.

Minutes of Council E.S.T. Held at London, May 27th, 1891, after the departure of H.P.B. Issued at New York, November 1894. STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL. 8 pp.

Mr. Crump's notes on Mr. Neresheimer's Paper on Some Reminiscences of William Q. Judge. Estimated date, after Feb. 25, 1932, 5 pp.

A Narrative by Alexander Fullerton. New York, May 14, 1895, 4 pp.

New England Theosophical Corporation, 24 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, Mass., U.S.A. March 19, 1894, 2 pp. To President H.S. Olcott, signed by the Pres. and Sec. of the Boston, Malden, Cambridge T.S., Robert Crosbie, L.F. Wade, Geo. D Ayers, F.J. Goodwin, M.L.Guild, Anna Carret.

Newspapers:

Boston Herald
The Daily Chronicle (London)
The Journal (New York)
The Mail and Express (New York)
The Morning Advertiser (New York)
New York Press
New York Daily Tribune
New York Sun
The San Diego Union
San Francisco Chronicle

New York, April 6th, 1895. Includes an opening statement signed by ten members of the American Section. 34 pp.

Notes By Basil Crump. Basil Crump's comments on E.S.T. circular of April 3rd, 1896. A transcribed copy, 5 pp.

A PAGEANT OF THE FIFTH ACT: A Study of Mrs. Annie Besant by Herbert Coryn. London, May 1895, 4 pp.

THE JUDGITES. A THEOSOPHICAL POPE. Independent Theosophists Protest. A 1 page circular issued by The Independent Theosophists of Boston. (From Boston Herald, April 30, 1895.)

President's Office. *To All Members of the T.S.A.* E. Aug. Neresheimer, President T.S.A. 144 Madison Avenue, New York, Jan. 18, 1898, 1 page.

The President's Resignation. Issued by the Theosophical Society, European Section. General Secretary's office, March 9th, 1892, 7 pp. Contains Olcott's Jan. 21, 1892 letter of Resignation, W.Q. Judge's Feb. 22, 1892 letter to Col Henry S. Olcott and Judge's letter to G.R.S. Mead, General Secretary of the European Section, T.S.

Reorganization of the T.S. Includes a Draft of Proposed Constitution for The Theosophical Society in Great Britain and Ireland. Date estimated, Summer 1895, 4 pp.

Reply of Mr. N.P. Subramania Iyer, President, Bangalore Cantonment Lodge, T.S., to B.P. Wadia, with reference to the latter's statement that accompanied his resignation. September 18, 1922, 10 pp.

Should Mr. Judge Resign? Speeches by Annie Besant and Bertram Keightley at the Dec. 25th, 1894 T.S. Convention at Adyar, 15 pp.

To **The General Secretary, Indian Section T.S.** Letter by B.P. Wadia. Los Angeles, CA, July 18, 1922, 1 page.

Theosophical Society, European Section. General Secretary's Office. *For the information of the Members of the European and Indian Sections of the Theosophical Society.* G.R.S. Mead, Gen. Sec. European Sec. T.S. and Bertram Keightley, Gen. Sec. Indian Sec. T.S. London: The H.P.B. Press, March 27, 1894, 4 pp.

Theosophical Society, European Section. No. 2. General Secretary's Office. *For the information of the Members of the European and Indian Sections of the Theosophical Society.* London: The H.P.B. Press, June 15, 1894, 2 pp.

The Theosophical Society and The Secession Therefrom by Constance Wachtmeister and Alexander Fullerton. New York, January 1897, 4 pp.

The Theosophical Society and the Westminster Gazette by Annie Besant and Bertram Keightley. Madras, India, Dec. 23, 1894, 16 pp.

Three **Letters from The Anagarika Dharmapala** to Alice Leighton Cleather. Aug. 27, 1921, 2 pp.; Feb. 6, 1922, 1 page; March 3, 1922, 1 page; (Typed transcripts).

To All Fellow Theosophists and Members of the Theosophical Society: A Statement by B.P. Wadia, July 18, 1922, 18 pp.^{ETS}

To All Members of The E.S.T. by Annie Besant and William Q. Judge. London: Eastern School of Theosophy, May 27, 1891, 8 pp.

To All Members of E.S.T. by Annie Besant and William Q. Judge. London: The H.P.B. Press, August 1893, 4 pp.

To All Members of The Universal Brotherhood. 144 Madison Avenue, New York, March 1st, 1898, 1 page.

To . . . , Dear Friend. Theosophical Society in America. Headquarters, 144 Madison Avenue, New York City. A letter from the President of T.S. in America, William Q. Judge, with enclosed Resolutions passed at the Annual Convention of the American Theosophical Society. May 8th, 1895, 3 pp.

To Each Branch of the Theosophical Society Throughout The World. John M. Pryse, Clerk of Meeting. Jan. 15th 1895, Circular, 1 page.

To E.S.T. Members in Europe. E.S.T. London Office of William Q. Judge. December 30, 1894, 1 page.
STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL.

To Members of the Theosophical Society by Alexander Fullerton. New York, June 18, 1896, 3 pp.

TO MY FELLOW-MEMBERS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY. Circular by Alexander Fullerton. 144 Madison Ave., New York City, January 16, 1895, 1 page.

To the Fellows of the Theosophical Society by Geo. W. Russell., F.T.S., March 26, 1894, 8 pp.

To the Members, Branches and Sections of the Theosophical Society by J.D. Buck.
[date estimated March 1895 from Albert Smythe's notes]

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE. E.S. Circular issued by Annie Besant as President of Blavatsky Lodge, 1 page.

To the Members of the E.S.T. E.S.T. circular. 144 Madison Avenue, New York City, March 29, 1896, 1 page.

To the Members of the E.S.T. E.S.T. circular. 144 Madison Avenue, New York City, April 3, 1896, 19 pp.

To the Members of the E.S.T. E.S.T. circular. Katherine A. Tingley. 144 Madison Avenue, New York City, September 3, 1897, 2 pp.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY by Henry T. Patterson and signed by 121 American members, 8 pp.

T.S American Section. Theosophical Society, American Section, General Secretary's Office, New York. Alexander Fullerton Gen. Sec. American Section T.S. 3 pp.

Two page letter. Letter (March 12, 1930) written from Point Loma, CA by Joseph H. Fussell to Mr. J.W. Willey. Copy of letter in the H.P.B. Library. From the files of Basil Crump's miscellaneous letters.

Two page letter from Peking, China. Letter to Neresheimer from Basil Crump (Nov. 25, 1931). Copy of letter in the H.P.B. Library.

The T.S. The Theosophical Society. 4 pages of Minutes and a Draft Code of Rules. Copy of the official minutes of October 19, 1888, for the formation of the British Section of the Theosophical Society.

T.S. Application for Membership – Original Application forms of the Theosophical Society, in the Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society.

Bibliography of Works by and about William Q. Judge

Books, Pamphlets and Periodicals

Abridgement of Discussions upon Theosophical Subjects, Held at Meetings of the Aryan Theosophical Society of New York [and Elsewhere]. No. 1, April 1886, 4 pp.; No. 2, May 1886, 4 pp.; No. 3, June-Sep. 1886, 4 pp.; No. 4, Nov. 1887, 4 pp.; No. 5, Mar. 1888, 4 pp.

Astral Intoxication and Other Papers. New York: The Path, 1895, 19 pp.

The Bhagavad Gita. The Book of Devotion. Prepared in collaboration with James H. Connelly. New York: The Path, 1890.

The Bhagavad-Gita. Recension by William Quan Judge, Combined with his **Essays on the Gita.** Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1969, 220 pp.

Culture of Concentration and Of Occult Powers and Their Acquirement. New York: The Path, 1895, 29 pp.

Cyclic Impressions and Other Papers. With Archibald Keightley, J.D. Buck, G.R.S. Mead, William E. Gates, and Mrs. M.C. Brainard, Cleveland, Ohio: The Dharma Press, 1892, 58 pp.

Department of Branch Work. New York: Theosophical Society, American Section. 46 issues published from June 1890 to November 1894. "These Papers, be it understood, are furnished only to the Branches, *not to individuals.*" (**The Path**, Vol. 5, July 1890, p.136.) They contain valuable suggestions for Theosophical work and study. [Republished by Edmonton Theosophical Society — 1992.]

Dr. Elliot Coues in his Letters. June 14, 1889, 12 pp. pamphlet.

Echoes from the Orient. A Broad Outline of Theosophical Doctrines. New York, 1890, 68 pp.

An Epitome of Theosophy. New York: The Path Office, 1887, 4 pp. Published as a leaflet for free distribution.

An Epitome of Theosophy. New York: The Path Office, 1888, 27 pp.

Isis and the Mahatmas. A Reply by William Q. Judge. With Correspondence, Original Articles, and Portrait. London, 1895, 88 pp. [Republished by Edmonton Theosophical Society.]

"Light on the Path" and Mabel Collins. 1889, 8 pp. pamphlet.

Notes on the Bhagavad Gita. The first seven chapters were originally published in **The Path** from 1887 to 1895 under the pseudonym "William Brehon." Remaining chapters were written by Robert Crosbie at a later date. Los Angeles, CA: The Theosophy Company, 1918, 237 pp.

Ocean of Theosophy. New York: The Path Office, June 1893, 154 pp.

Occult Studies. Boston, Mass.: W.W. Harmon, n.d., 86 pp. A series of reprints from the writings of Wm. Q. Judge, together with a review of a book titled "The Hollow Globe."

Oriental Department. New York: Theosophical Society, American Section, Oriental Department, Irregular, bi-monthly, January 1891 to April 1897. Consisting of Sanskrit and other Oriental Scriptures specially translated for this Department by Professor Manilal Dvivedi and Charles Johnston. [Republished by Edmonton Theosophical Society — 1988.]

The Path. Edited by W.Q. Judge. New York, Vols. 1-10, April 1886 to March 1896, Monthly. [Republished by Edmonton Theosophical Society — 1986.]

Reply by Mr. Judge to Charges of Misuse of Mahatmas' Names and Handwritings. Read at Boston, Mass., April 29, 1895 by Dr. Archibald Keightley on behalf of W.Q. Judge, 29 pp.

“The So-Called Exposé of Madame Blavatsky.” Letter to the Editor, **The Index** (Boston), March 11, 1886. pp.441-442. Reprinted in **The Esoteric She**, compiled and edited by Daniel Caldwell. San Diego: Point Loma Publications, 1991, pp.22-24, and in **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 3, compiled by Dara Eklund. San Diego, CA: Point Loma Publications, 1987, pp.122-124.

The Theosophical Forum (Original Series). Started as an 8-page Question and Answer pamphlet for members-at-large as a result of a proposal by W.Q. Judge. Edited by Alexander Fullerton. Issued from April 1889 to April 1895. Contains many of Judge's answers to questions. [Republished, with an Index, by Edmonton Theosophical Society — 1992.]

Theosophical Forum (New Series). Started by W.Q. Judge then edited by E.T. Hargrove from April 1896. New York: Theosophical Society in America, monthly magazine. Vols. 1-10, May 1895 to April 1905. [Republished, with an Index, by Edmonton Theosophical Society — 1991.]

Theosophy Generally Stated. Bombay, 1893/94, 8 pp.

Universal Brotherhood, A Fact in Nature. Bombay, 1893/94, 8 pp.

The Yoga Aphorisms of Patanjali. An interpretation by W.Q. Judge, assisted by James H. Connelly. New York: The Path Office, 1889.

Compilations of W.Q. Judge's Articles and Letters

Articles by William Q. Judge. Los Angeles, CA: The Theosophy Company. 31 pamphlets. Also published in 1980 as **Theosophical Articles by William Q. Judge: Reprinted from Original Sources**, Vols. 1 & 2.

Conger, Arthur L. [Editor]. **Practical Occultism.** From the Private Letters of William Q. Judge. Covina, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1951, 307 pp.

Eek, Sven [Compiler]. **Damodar and the Pioneers of the Theosophical Movement.** Contains correspondence between W.Q. Judge and Damodar K. Mavalankar, Adyar, Madras: Theosophical Publishing House, 1965, 720 pp.

Eek, Sven [Compiler]. **Damodar: The Writings of a Hindu Chela.** Contains W.Q. Judge's reworking of their correspondence as “A Hindu Chela's Diary.” Point Loma, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1940, 338 pp.

Eklund, Dara [Compiler]. **Echoes of the Orient.** Vol. 1. San Diego, CA: Point Loma Publications, 1975, 582 pp.

Eklund, Dara [Compiler]. **Echoes of the Orient.** Vol. 2. San Diego, CA: Point Loma Publications, 1980, 517 pp.

Eklund, Dara [Compiler]. **Echoes of the Orient.** Vol. 3. San Diego, CA: Point Loma Publications, 1987, 534 pp.

Eklund, Dara [Compiler]. **Echoes of the Orient**. Vol. 4 – Cumulative Index. San Diego, CA: Point Loma Publications, 1993, 135 pp.

“**Forum**” **Answers by William Q. Judge**. Reprinted from **The Theosophical Forum** (1889-1896). Los Angeles, CA: The Theosophy Company, 1982, 141 pp.

“GLEANINGS: FROM UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF W. Q. J.” **The English Theosophist**. Vol. 2, Oct. 1898, pp.140-143; Vol. 3, Jan. 1900, pp.206-209; Feb. 1900, pp.238-243; Mar. 1900, pp.267-268. [Republished by The Theosophy Company in **Letters That Have Helped Me**, 1946 edition, pp.167-178. Republished by Edmonton Theosophical Society: See Part 2, Appendix I, **THE JUDGE CASE: A Conspiracy Which Ruined the Theosophical CAUSE.**]

The Heart Doctrine. A collection of articles by W.Q. Judge. Los Angeles, London & Bombay: The Theosophy Company, 1951, 211 pp.

Langford, Laura Holloway. “Extracts from Letters Written by William Q. Judge from London and Paris in the Spring of 1884 to a Longtime Friend.” **The Word** (New York), Vol. 15, March 1912, pp.324-32, April 1912, pp.17-24.

“Letters From the Archives.” **The Theosophical Forum** (Point Loma, California), Vol. 22, Feb. 1944, pp.82-83, Mar. 1944, pp. 131-132, May 1944, pp.215-216, June 1944, p.261, Nov. 1944, p.514, Dec. 1944, pp.546-551; Vol. 23, Jan. 1945, pp.23-25, Feb. 1945, pp.78-79, Apr. 1945, pp.160-161, Sep. 1945, pp.419-420; Vol. 24, Feb. 1946, pp.76-77, Apr. 1946, p.171, May 1946, p.226.

“Letters From William Q. Judge.” Written to E.T. Hargrove. **Theosophical Quarterly** (New York), Vol. 28, Apr. 1931, pp.314-326; Vol. 29, July 1931, pp.25-45, Oct. 1931, pp.107-122, Jan. 1932, pp.238-247; Vol. 30, July 1932, pp.27-38, Oct. 1932, pp.122-129, Jan. 1933, pp.206-212; Vol. 31, July 1933, pp.31-35; Vol. 32, Jan. 1935, pp.198-205. [Republished by Edmonton Theosophical Society: See Part 2, Appendix D, **THE JUDGE CASE: A Conspiracy Which Ruined the Theosophical CAUSE.**]

Niemand, Jasper (Julia Keightley) [Compiler]. **Letters That Have Helped Me**. New York: The Path, 1891. [Republished by The Theosophical Publishing Co. New York, 1911, 90 pp.]

Niemand, Jasper (Julia Keightley) and Thomas Green [Compilers]. **Letters That Have Helped Me**, Vol. 2. England, 1905. [Published by The Quarterly Book Department, New York: 1918, 126 pp.]

Theosophical Articles. 2 vols. Los Angeles, CA: The Theosophy Company, 1980, 621 pp., 655 pp.

Two Replies by William Q. Judge. Los Angeles, CA: The Theosophy Company, n.d., 53 pp.

Vernal Blooms. A collection of articles by W.Q. Judge. Los Angeles, London & Bombay: The Theosophy Company, 1946, 257 pp.

Historical / Biographical

Bates, Ernest Sutherland. “Judge, William Quan.” **Dictionary of American Biography**, ed. by Dumas Malone. Vol. 5, New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1933, pp.233-234.

Bragdon, Claude. **Episodes from an Unwritten History**. Rochester, NY: The Manas Press, 1910, 2nd (Enlarged) ed. pp.23-25.

Deveney, John Patrick. “An 1876 Lecture by W.Q. Judge on His Magical Progress in The Theosophical Society”. **Theosophical History**, Vol. 9, July 2003, pp.12-20.

- de Zirkoff, Boris. "William Quan Judge — A Founder." Found in **The Dream That Never Dies**. San Diego: Point Loma Publications, 1983, pp.85-90. Originally published in **Theosophia**, Vol. 17, Spring 1961.
- de Zirkoff, Boris. "William Quan Judge: His Occult Status." **Theosophia**, Vol. 31, Spring 1975.
- Eek, Sven. "William Quan Judge. A Theosophical Pioneer". **The American Theosophist**, Vol. 50, April 1962, pp.65-72.
- Eek, Sven and Boris de Zirkoff [Compilers]. **William Quan Judge: The Life of a Theosophical Pioneer and some of his Outstanding Articles**. Wheaton, Ill., Madras, India and London: Theosophical Publishing House, 1969, 96 pp.
- Fohat**. Issue dedicated to W.Q. Judge. Edmonton, AB: Edmonton Theosophical Society, Vol. 7, Fall 2003, pp.49-72.
- Fullerton, Alexander [Editor]. **Department of Branch Work Papers**. New York. Nos. 1/2 - 9/10, June-Dec. 1890; 11-22, Jan.-Dec. 1891; 23-29, Jan.-Dec. 1892; 30-38, Jan.-Dec. 1893; 39-36, Feb.-Nov. 1894.
- Gomes, Michael. **The Dawning of the Theosophical Movement**. Wheaton, Ill: Theosophical Publishing House, 1987, 248 pp.
- Greenwalt, Emmett. **California Utopia: Point Loma: 1897–1942**. San Diego, CA: Point Loma Publications, 1978, pp.1-46. Originally published in **The Point Loma Community in California: 1897–1942**. Chapters 1-4. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1955.
- In Honor of William Q. Judge**. Point Loma, CA: Theosophical Publishing Company, 1901, 51 pp.
- Knoche, Grace F. "A Salute to William Quan Judge." **Sunrise**, Vol. 35, April/May 1986, pp.157-160.
- Langford, Laura Holloway. "William Quan Judge, A Reminiscence." **The Word**, Vol. 22, Nov. 1915, pp.75-89.
- "Leaves of Theosophical History." **The Theosophical Forum** (Point Loma, California), June 15, 1932 to Nov. 1937, Oct. 1939 to Nov. 1941.
- Leslie-Smith, Leslie H. "100 Years of Modern Occultism: A Review of the Parent Theosophical Society", 1987, 69 pp. Contains a segment on "The Controversy Concerning W.Q. Judge", pp.26-32. Found in **Theosophical History Centre, Miscellaneous Papers**.
- "The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to W.Q. Judge." With notes by Michael Gomes. **Theosophical History** (California State University), Vol. 4, Oct. 1992–Jan. 1993; Vol. 5, Apr., July, Oct. 1994, Jan., Apr., July, Oct. 1995. 9 letters printed out of 16.
- Pelletier, Ernest E. "What Killed William Q. Judge?" **Fohat**, Vol. 7, Summer 2003, Part I, pp.29-34; Fall 2003, Part II, pp.60-64, 69-70.
- Report of Proceedings and Documents**. "The Theosophical Congress Held by The Theosophical Society at the Parliament of Religions, World's Fair of 1893, at Chicago, Ill., September 15, 16, 17." New York: American Section T.S., 1893, 195 pp. [Republished by Edmonton Theosophical Society — 1988.]
- Ryan, Charles. **H.P. Blavatsky and the Theosophical Movement**. Point Loma, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1937, 370 pp.
- Sunrise**: Special Issue. Contains 21 articles on W.Q. Judge commemorating the centenary of his death. Vol. 45, April/May 1996, pp.97-192.

The Theosophical Movement, 1875–1925: A History and a Survey. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1925, 705 pp. Originally published in **Theosophy Magazine** (U.L.T. Los Angeles), Feb. 1920 to Oct. 1922.

The Theosophical Movement, 1875–1950. Los Angeles, CA: Cunningham Press, 1951, 351 pp.

Theosophical Society, American Section, Report of Proceedings. Held at Chicago, 1888, 55 pp.; Chicago, 1889, 69 pp.; Chicago, 1890, 88 pp.; Boston, 1891, 51pp.; Chicago, 1892, 45 pp.; New York City, 1893, 32 pp.; San Francisco, 1894, 52 pp.

Theosophical Society in America, Report of Proceedings. First Convention, held in Boston, Mass., April 28-29, 1896, 62 pp.; Second Annual Convention, New York City, April 26-27, 1897, 48 pp.; Third Annual Convention, New York City, April 25-26, 1897, 60 pp.

Tingley, Katherine [Editor]. **Helena Petrovna Blavatsky.** Point Loma, CA: The Women's International Theosophical League, 1921, 81 pp. Includes articles by W.Q. Judge about H.P. Blavatsky.

“W.Q. Judge: Biographical Notes.” Los Angeles, CA: United Lodge of Theosophists, 1996, 63 pp. Bio-Chronology on William Quan Judge from 1851 to 1896.

Wadia, Sophia. “William Quan Judge — A Lover of India.” **The Kaiser-I-Hind**, March 21, 1937, pp.3,7.

Illustrations: Sources

Part 1 & Part 2

Cover: William Quan Judge — **Universal Brotherhood Path**, Vol. 15, June 1900

Inside cover: William Quan Judge aiming bow and arrow — Courtesy of United Lodge of Theosophists (ULT) Los Angeles, CA.

Part 1:

Frontispiece: William Quan Judge (July 1895) — **Sunrise**, April/May 1991

1. Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, circa 1877-1878 — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
2. William Quan Judge — **Blavatsky Collected Writings**, Vol. 11
3. Henry Steel Olcott in 1875 — **The Theosophist**, August 1932
4. Dr. Jirah Dewey Buck — **Universal Brotherhood**, February 1898
5. (Mrs.) Melissa M. Buck — **The Theosophical News**, August 30, 1897
6. Major General Abner Doubleday — Internet photo, Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, LC-B8172-1497 (DLC)
7. Edward Burroughs Rambo — **Universal Brotherhood**, October 1897
8. Dr. Jerome A. Anderson — **The Path**, April 1893
9. Bertram Keightley — **The Theosophist**, September 1909
10. Dr. Henry Travers Edge — **Theosophia**, Spring 1960
11. Dr. Archibald Keightley and Dr. Herbert A.W. Coryn — **Universal Brotherhood**, December 1897
12. George Robert Stowe Mead — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society; also found in **The Theosophist**, January 1910
13. Alfred Percy Sinnett — **The Theosophist**, September 1909
14. Emil August Neresheimer — **Theosophy**, August 1897
15. Alexander Fullerton — **The Theosophist**, March 1910
16. Walter Richard Old — **The Astral Tramp**, courtesy of Kim Farnell
17. Claude Falls Wright — **The Path**, February 1894
18. Annie Besant — **Isis Very Much Unveiled** by Edmund Garrett, 2nd edition
19. Julia Keightley (Jasper Niemand) — **The Path**, April 1894
20. Countess Constance Wachtmeister — **The Path**, November 1893
21. Isabel Cooper-Oakley — **The Path**, July 1894
22. Daniel Nicol Dunlop — **The Theosophical News**, June 7, 1897
23. Ernest Temple Hargrove — **The Path**, September 1894
24. Dr. Franz Hartmann — **The Occult Review**, January 1908
25. Alice Leighton Cleather — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society, courtesy of The H.P.B. Library
26. Basil Crump — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society, courtesy of The H.P.B. Library
27. Tookeram Taty — **The Path**, May 1894
28. Gyanendra Nath Chakravarti — **The Path**, October 1893
29. Subramania (Subrahmanya) Iyer — **The Theosophist**, August 1909
30. Nowroji (Navroji) Dorabji Khandalavala — **The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society**
31. Bertram Keightley, William Q. Judge, Colonel Olcott and George R.S. Mead — **The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society**
32. William Q. Judge (wearing his pill-box hat) — **Echoes of The Orient**, Vol. 3; **H.P.B.: The Extraordinary Life & Influence of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky**, Illustration No.8
33. Workers at London Headquarters after Blavatsky's death in 1891 — **The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society**
34. Annie Besant, Colonel H.S. Olcott and William Q. Judge in 1891 — **The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society**
35. The Neresheimer residence at Bayside, Long Island, New York — **The Theosophical News**, July 26, 1897

36. Delegates to the World's Parliament of Religions, Chicago 1893 — **Sunrise**, April/May 1996
37. Group of prominent Theosophists prior to attending the World's Parliament of Religions at Chicago — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society, courtesy of Dara Eklund
38. William Q. Judge and Colonel Olcott, San Francisco, CA, October 1891 — **The American Theosophist**, May 1914; **Blavatsky Collected Writings**, Vol. 15; **Sunrise**, May/April 1996
39. Mahatma Koot Hoomi — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
40. Mahatma Morya — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
41. Notre-Dame-des-Champs in Paris (side view) — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
42. Notre-Dame-des-Champs in Paris (front view) — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
43. Le Château Écossais at Enghien, near Paris, France — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
44. Le Château Écossais at Enghien, near Paris, France — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
45. Photo of the original Minute Book of The Theosophical Society — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
46. First page of the original Minute Book of The Theosophical Society — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society

Part 2:

Frontispiece: William Quan Judge (1892) — **The Word**, Vol. 15, April 1912

47. Annie Besant (1891) — **The Theosophist**, October 1931
48. William Q. Judge (1891) — **Blavatsky Collected Writings**, Vol. 13
49. Colonel H.S. Olcott (1906) — **The Theosophist**, October 1906
50. Cover of the June 1895 issue of **The Path** — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
51. Clement Acton Griscom — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society, courtesy of Raymond P. Tripp, Jr.
52. Ernest Temple Hargrove — **The Lamp**, August 1895
53. Henry Turner Patterson — **The Theosophical News**, August 2, 1897
54. George William Russell — **The Canadian Theosophist**, August 1935
55. Charles Johnston — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society, courtesy of Raymond P. Tripp, Jr.
56. Group photo: H.P. Blavatsky with her sister Vera Jelihovsky, niece Vera Vladimirovna Johnston (nee Jelihovsky) and her husband, Charles Johnston, and Col. H.S. Olcott — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society
57. Diploma, The Theosophical Society of The Arya-Samaj of Arya-Wart — **The American Theosophist**, May 1913
58. Albert E.S. Smythe — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society, courtesy of Ted G. Davy
59. William Mulliss Williams (W.M.W.) [He never used the name "Williams".] — **The Canadian Theosophist**, February 1932
60. Dr. Henry Newlin Stokes — **The Canadian Theosophist**, January 1943
61. James Morgan Pryse — **The Path**, June 1894
62. Robert Crosbie — **Universal Brotherhood**, February 1898
63. Alice L. Cleather at the birthday party of the blind Abbot of Kwan Yin Temple — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society, courtesy of The H.P.B. Library
64. Annie Besant with her new colleagues in Theosophy (1894) — **The Passionate Pilgrim** by Gertrude Marvin Williams
65. Kavasji Mervanji Shroff — **The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society**
66. Damodar K. Mavalankar — **The American Theosophist**, December 1913
67. Mohini Chatterji — Archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society, courtesy of The H.P.B. Library
68. Anagarika Hevavitarane Dharmapala — **The Path**, December 1893
69. Headquarters of The Theosophical Society in America, 144 Madison Avenue, New York — **Universal Brotherhood**, February 1899
70. Katherine Tingley — **Sunrise**, April/May 1998
71. Katherine Tingley and Claude Falls Wright on board the steamship "Paris" (1896) — **The Theosophical News**, August 1896

The Judge Case



The Judge Case

A

Conspiracy

Which Ruined

The Theosophical CAUSE

Part 2

Ernest E. Pelletier

Illustrations

Part 2

Frontispiece: William Quan Judge, 1892

47. Annie Besant (1891)

48. William Q. Judge (1891)

49. Colonel H.S. Olcott (1906)

50. Cover of the June 1895 issue of **The Path**

51. Clement Acton Griscom

52. Ernest Temple Hargrove

53. Henry Turner Patterson

54. George William Russell

55. Charles Johnston

56. Group photo: H.P. Blavatsky with her sister Vera Jelihovsky, niece Vera Vladimirovna Johnston (nee Jelihovsky) and her husband, Charles Johnston, and Colonel H.S. Olcott

57. Diploma, The Theosophical Society of The Arya-Samaj of Arya-Wart

58. Albert E.S. Smythe

59. William Mulliss

60. Dr. Henry Newlin Stokes

61. James Morgan Pryse

62. Robert Crosbie

63. Alice L. Cleather at the birthday party of the blind Abbot of Kwan Yin Temple

64. Annie Besant with her new colleagues in Theosophy (1894)

65. Kavasji Mervanji Shroff

66. Damodar K. Mavalankar

67. Mohini Chatterji

68. Anagarika Hevavitarane Dharmapala

69. Headquarters of The Theosophical Society in America, 144 Madison Avenue, New York

70. Katherine Tingley

71. Katherine Tingley and Claude Falls Wright on board the steamship "Paris" (1896)

Contents

- Appendix A ~ The Case Against W.Q. Judge.** 1-119
 Includes a reprint of the pamphlet of this title published by Annie Besant in 1895. It chronicles the main thrust of the accusations brought before the 1894 Judicial Committee accusing Judge of allegedly adding messages in Master’s script to his letters in order to personally gain from it. An analysis by the Compiler describes how there were two editions of this pamphlet which consisted, in part, of the “prosecutor’s brief” prepared by his accusers, and also why and when it was drafted. The **Reply By William Q. Judge To Charges of Misuse of Mahatmas’ Names and Handwritings** is also reprinted in full. In addition, there is significant information dealing with the Brass Seal and H.P. Blavatsky’s Signet Ring.
- Appendix B ~ The Prayag Letter.** 121-164
 Deals with this famous Letter — how some Brahmans were concerned that Theosophy was a vehicle for Buddhist teachings rather than Vedic/Brahmanism. The disputed “By Master’s Direction” is also included, with pertinent related documents which deal with this whole crisis.
- Appendix C ~ Historical Sketch.** 165-211
 Contains historical documents dealing with the records of the Theosophical Society and the conflict which arose between the President of the Theosophical Society, Colonel Olcott, and W.Q. Judge, the Vice-President. Some of these documents show the difficulties Judge encountered because of the lack of communication and instructions from the President. A number of original Application forms are included, as well as Judge’s 1884 sketches of the Adyar Headquarters.
- Appendix D ~ Letters From W.Q. Judge to E.T. Hargrove.** 213-293
 Contains letters Judge wrote to Ernest T. Hargrove and which Hargrove first published, with his annotations, in **The Theosophical Quarterly**. They are reprinted here for the first time since then. These letters give a very insightful look at Judge’s character, his dedication to the Theosophical CAUSE and the strains he was under.
- Appendix E ~ Contentious Letters.** 295-326
 Includes documents which provide the reader the opportunity to study for themselves the confusion and mistrust which sprouted within the Movement; how theosophist turned on theosophist and sides were being drawn.
- Appendix F ~ W.Q. Judge’s Last Messages.** 327-366
 Contains two items from Judge’s notebooks/diaries. These have never been published before and were Judge’s last entries before his death. The first, prepared by him for the Aryan Theosophical Society, was written one week after the First Convention of the Theosophical Society in America held in Boston, April 1895. The second is his Annual Address to The Aryan T.S. in November 1895. Also included is a short account of Judge’s last days, penned by E.T. Hargrove, and tributes at the cremation by some of Judge’s closest friends and co-workers.

- Appendix G ~ Judge’s Diaries and Katherine Tingley.** 367-419
Investigates the post mortem pandemonium which befell the members of the Theosophical Society in America after the death of W.Q. Judge. It appraises some of the controversies surrounding Judge’s Diaries and the Tingley successorship.
- Appendix H ~ Miscellaneous Letters.** 421-452
Examines some of the letters and observations from the post “Judge Case” controversy. The impact on theosophical thought some of the main players had, and how the modern theosophists’ views have been molded by these ideas and misconceptions are examined.
- Appendix I ~ Judge’s Pseudonyms and Words of Wisdom.** 453-484
Provides the reader with information regarding the pseudonyms used (and possibly used) by Judge, as well as quotations from his writings on various theosophical subjects.
- Appendix J ~ Astrological Observations.** 483-511
Includes Judge’s astrological horoscope by two professionals, one in the Eastern (Vedic) tradition and the other from the Western perspective. An undated chart which includes a transit delineation is also reprinted here.

APPENDIX

A



THE CASE AGAINST W. Q. JUDGE

Table of Contents ~ Appendix A

1. A brief account of “The Brass Seal” from New York Sun , November 25, 1894	5-9
2. Introduction to “An Interesting Letter” — The Theosophical Movement 1875-1950 (p.426) “An Interesting Letter. (<i>Written to an Indian Brother.</i>)” by W.Q. Judge Lucifer , Vol. 12, April 1893, pp.101-104	10 10-12
3. “A Letter from Mrs. Besant.” dated “Colombo, December 19th, 1894” to the Editor of the Daily Chronicle (See Chronology, Dec. 19, 1894 entry) (Light , Vol. 15, January 12, 1895, pp.21-22)	.13
4. Letter by Bertram Keightley to The Westminster Gazette dated Dec. 23, 1894, Adyar, Madras. The Theosophical Society and The Westminster Gazette , (pp.14-16)	14-15
5. GENERAL REPORT of The Nineteenth Anniversary of The Theosophical Society , December 25, 26, 27 and 28, 1894. Olcott addresses “The Judge Case”.. . . .	16-18
6. Letter “ <i>To G. R. S. Mead, Esq.</i> ” by Constance Wachtmeister. Lucifer , Vol. 16, April 1895, p.164	18-19
7. Letter by William Lindsay to C. Wachtmeister, and his response to her comments. <i>To the Editor of The Irish Theosophist</i> , Vol. 3, May 1895, pp.141-142	19-20
8. A Narrative . By Alexander Fullerton, May 14, 1895	21-24
9. The Case Against W. Q. Judge. Compiler’s Analysis 88 page pamphlet published by Annie Besant	25-33 34-80
10. The European Convention met at London on July 4, 1895. Theosophy (ULT), Vol. 10, 1921-1922, pp.398-407	81-87
11. Introduction to Mr. Judge’s Replies (by the Compiler)	88
12. Isis and The Mahatmas. A Reply by William Q. Judge. (30 page pamphlet) To the Editor of The Sun (pp.1-3) A Reply From William Q. Judge to The Westminster Gazette (pp.3-13)	88-89 90-94
13. Reply By William Q. Judge To Charges of Misuse of Mahatmas’ Names and Handwritings. 29 page pamphlet published by William Q. Judge in 1895	95-115
14. Editorial comments by Annie Besant giving her version of what happened to H.P.B.’s ring after H.P.B. died. (Lucifer , Vol. 16, June 1895, pp.269-270.) Illustration of H.P.B.’s Signet Ring Regarding H.P.B.’s Signet Ring — Compiler’s Comment	115 116 116
15. Addendum regarding H.P.B.’s ring	117-119

1. New York **Sun**, Nov. 25, 1894.

When BLAVATSKY died both Col. OLCOTT and WILLIAM Q. JUDGE started at express speed for London, the Colonel from India and JUDGE from New York. If the Mahatmas had really loved either of these distinguished aspirants for supremacy in the Theosophical organization, the sages would have transported their favorite to London astrally and instantaneously, for every moment was precious. As it was, both the Colonel and JUDGE were obliged to travel by the ordinary steamship lines; and, New York being nearer to London than Bombay is, Mr. JUDGE won the race and got there first and got the ear of Mrs. BESANT, the third great power in Theosophy, and, in the understanding of many of the faithful, the person marked by the Mahatmas to succeed the lamented BLAVATSKY.

It is now asserted that the new "evidence" of the existence of the Mahatmas, which Mrs. BESANT announced with such sensational effect in her Science Hall speech of 1891, consisted of messages procured chiefly by JUDGE, in the form of advice and commands from the Masters which were generally calculated to promote JUDGE'S political interests in the organization. The *Westminster Gazette* publishes in fac-simile many of these messages, and the showing is certainly remarkable.

When Mr. JUDGE got to London the Masters had made no sign. On the evening of May 23 JUDGE proposed to Mrs. BESANT that they should endeavor to restore communication by writing a question on paper, enclosing it in an envelope, and putting the envelope in a certain cabinet in the apartments in Avenue road formerly occupied by Madame BLAVATSKY. This was done. JUDGE wrote the question, closed the envelope, and put it into the cabinet. Mrs. BESANT did not remain in the room. JUDGE waited there for the answer. After a proper interval he opened the envelope and soon was able to exhibit to his astounded and delighted colleague the words "Yes, and hope," distinctly written in red chalk at the foot of the question; and likewise the impression in black carbon of a peculiar seal, a cryptograph M, which was then and for some time afterward accepted as the mystic seal of the Mahatma MORYA. The seal business was hailed with joy as a novelty, for in KOOT'S former correspondence with BLAVATSKY no such elegance had been displayed. Here is a picture of the seal and of an impression from the same:



THE BRASS SEAL.



"MASTER'S SIGNATURE."

The next day, at a meeting of the Inner Group, Mr. JUDGE exhibited another communication from Mahatma MORYA, also stamped with the seal, which he said he had received in New York. Three days later, at a meeting of the Esoteric Section Council, Mr. JUDGE developed a plan for the dissolution of the Council and the concentration of its power in the hands of Mrs. ANNIE BESANT and himself. We quote from the *Westminster Gazette*:

As Mrs. BESANT, who took the chair and expounded the new scheme, was turning over the papers on the table, there fluttered out a little slip of paper, at which she just glanced and was about to put it by, when WILLIAM Q. JUDGE pointedly asked her what it was. The slip of paper bore the words in red pencil:

'Judge's plan is right.'

Signature and seal as before. Round it went from hand to hand. None questioned that paper and script alike had just been precipitated into their midst by the Master. Under these circumstances discussion was

obviously out of place. WILLIAM Q. JUDGE at once went and took his seat at Mrs. BESANT'S side. 'JUDGE'S plan' was unanimously adopted.

From this time communications from the Mahatma MORYA became frequent, both in the form of sentences written by the Mahatma and attested by the seal, and also by the mystic impression of the seal, as a sign of approval, upon ordinary letters written by JUDGE to this or that correspondent. JUDGE wrote on May 29 to BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY, a Theosophist who was then at headquarters at Adyar:

Fear not, BERT! Masters watch us and since May 8 have sent word here in writing.

And before this letter reached KEIGHTLEY by her Majesty's mail to India, somehow or somewhere the significant seal had been impressed upon it, as much as to say, "JUDGE is right. We the Masters are watching you, BERT, you bet!"

A low caste Hindu named BABULA, who had been Madame BLAVATSKY'S servant and had become a person of some consequence among the Indian Theosophists, received at Adyar a little later a letter from JUDGE, signed "Your friend, WILLIAM Q. JUDGE." Before the letter reached BABULA, the Mahatma had underscored the words "Your friend," adding an emphatic "Yes," in writing, and the seal mark of approval.

The Mahatmas were behind JUDGE and his new importance gave him immense prestige with the faithful. No post of honor in the organization now seemed beyond his ambition. It would be too long a story to recite the factional struggles for supremacy, in which for a time JUDGE and Mrs. BESANT worked together, Col. OLCOTT being out in the cold; while afterward JUDGE stood alone with his Mahatma, the victim of the suspicions and even the positive distrust of Mrs. BESANT and the Colonel and their adherents. The entire plot turns on the circumstance that when Col. OLCOTT reached England from India and beheld one of the precipitated messages upon which the seal had been impressed, he recognized that seal; for Col. OLCOTT himself had had it engraved years before by an Urdu seal cutter in one of the cities of the Punjab:

'An idea occurred to me,' explains the Colonel, 'of sending through H. P. B., as a playful present to my Master M., a seal bearing a fac-simile of his cryptograph.' Back went the Colonel to Madras, where Madame was, and presented the seal to her with a jocular remark. Madame's keen eye dwelt upon it a moment, and then she pointed out that the Colonel, in his jocularly playful mood, had made a slight mistake. 'The Master's cryptograph was not correctly drawn' according to the pattern already familiar to the recipients of his missives. There was a twiddle too much, or a twiddle too little, in it. The Colonel himself saw the blunder when it was pointed out, and he now declares he would know it anywhere. For this sufficient reason the 'playful present' was not sent on to the Himalayas; neither did it appear in any of the communications vouched for by Madame. It went into Madame's despatch box, along with a lot of other mystical odds and ends; and among these it was remarked, as late as 1888, by the Mr. KEIGHTLEY already mentioned. This gentleman asked the prophetess what the little brass seal might be. Madame BLAVATSKY'S answer was, 'Oh, it's only a flap-doodle of OLCOTT'S.'

In 1888, according to the *Westminster Gazette's* narrative, when Mr. JUDGE was staying with Madame BLAVATSKY in London, he wrote this sentence in a letter on Theosophical policy addressed to Col. OLCOTT:
I believe the Master agrees with me, in which case I will ask him to put his seal here.

Sure enough, when the letter was received, there was the seal! That had been the first recorded instance of its use by the Mahatma. The second, and only other known instance previous to the death of BLAVATSKY and of the beginning of the new series of miracles which convinced Mrs. BESANT, had been in 1890. Here again the seal was used on a cable message to Mr. KEIGHTLEY, then in America, urging him to do a certain thing. This message was telegraphed from BLAVATSKY in London to JUDGE in New York, and by JUDGE transmitted to KEIGHTLEY. When the despatch reached KEIGHTLEY it was endorsed "Right!" in red pencil, and it bore the seal; the endorsement and signature being on the telegraph form used at the New York end

of the cable. If OLCOTT and KEIGHTLEY recognized in 1888 and in 1890 the purely mundane origin of the seal, they held their tongues at that time.

But not so when the seal turned up on the Mahatma's messages and on JUDGE'S letters after the death of BLAVATSKY. The explosion came soon after the Colonel's arrival in London, and under these circumstances, as alleged by the *Westminster Gazette*:

That busy July, 1891, the period of Mahatma M's greatest activity, was also marked by the assembling at Avenue road of one of the periodic conventions of Theosophic Europe. Some conversation occurred between the President [OLCOTT] and the Vice-President [JUDGE] about the expenses of this convention, and the former, being Madame BLAVATSKY'S legatee, mentioned a happy thought of his, of selling some of the jewels that lady had left behind her, and giving the proceeds as her posthumous contribution to the expenses.

But Mr. JUDGE responded airily that Col. OLCOTT need not trouble about it, as 'Master' had promised him [JUDGE] that the cash should be forthcoming, and also that he would carry a message on the subject to OLCOTT himself.

The Colonel waited for his message. None came.

The Colonel jogged Mr. JUDGE'S memory. Mr. JUDGE said he had no more to tell.

But that very day, on sitting down at his writing table, and lifting up a piece of blotting paper, the Colonel found under it a piece of peculiar paper, with this message in red, and the seal in black:

'I withhold the message until later. M.'

Now Col. OLCOTT thought he recognized that particular quality of paper, and, as far as it was legible, that seal impression, which was curiously faint and vague.

Presently Mr. WILLIAM Q. JUDGE left on the same writing table the following note, scribbled on a torn-off scrap of paper:

'DEAR OLCOTT: Master says he has sent you a message in a queer envelope, and you are to look for it.
'W.Q.J.'

OLCOTT looked accordingly; and sure enough, in the ordinary envelope of a letter, previously opened and put by on the table, there was a piece of paper bearing a message with all the proper Mahatma marks about it. And this time the Mahatma had precipitated a decently clear impression of the seal.

And then the Colonel smiled a 'sickly sorter smile.' For now he *did* recognize that seal.

The purport of the message was precisely what JUDGE had foretold. Col. OLCOTT was not to sell the BLAVATSKY jewels, as the money would be provided.

Having shown it to a brother member, the Colonel replaced it in the envelope, and went off to have a few words with Mr. WILLIAM Q. JUDGE. He remarked to JUDGE that he had missed a certain brass seal from among Madame BLAVATSKY'S relics, and described the Punjaub seal and the story of its making. Had JUDGE seen the seal? JUDGE answered in the negative.

From this time such messages of Mahatma MORYA as bore the seal impression, bore it in very vague and blurred shape. The messages themselves became less frequent than before. The old gentleman in the Desert of Gobi was on his guard. Stories were rife among the Theosophists, and old MORYA knew it. Once in a while a prominent disciple like KEIGHTLEY would get a reassuring message like this, which was precipitated in December of that same year on typewriting transfer paper:

JUDGE leads right. Follow him and *stick!*

No seal mark on that. When about to return from India, Col. OLCOTT received a letter on ordinary business from a correspondent in Orange county, California, and into this there had somehow found its way a slip of paper bearing the following communication in red from the Mahatma, with the black seal too blurred to distinguish:

JUDGE is not the forger you think, and did not write ANNIE. My seal is with me and he has not seen it, but would like to. Both are doing right, each in his own field. I have been training him and can use him when he does not know, but he is so new it fades out often, as it may in this letter from an enthusiast it for you know [sic.] M.

Then Col. OLCOTT, as the *Westminster Gazette* alleges, wrote to his correspondent in California and learned that Mr. JUDGE had spent two days in Orange county at the date when the letter enclosing the above Mahatma message was written.

The controversy between Col. OLCOTT and Vice-President JUDGE grew flagrant, and such dark insinuations of hocus-pocus were flung about within the Society that a formal inquiry seemed inevitable. In December, 1893, Mrs. BESANT went to India. There she seems to have changed her mind about the value of the new evidence, through JUDGE, of Mahatma MORYA'S actual existence. She even came to believe that the alleged messages had been written by Mr. JUDGE'S own hand. A split between the Oriental and Occidental sections of the Society was imminent. She offered to turn prosecutor herself, and thereupon all the documents in the case were put into her hands for the purpose of drawing up her charges against JUDGE. In February, 1894, Col. OLCOTT wrote from Agra to Mr. JUDGE as follows:

I place before you the following options;

1. To retire from all offices held by you in the Theosophical Society, and leave me to make a merely general public explanation; or,
2. To have a Judicial Committee convened and make public the whole of the proceedings in detail.

In either alternative, you will observe, a public explanation is found necessary: in the one case general, in the other to be full and covering all the details.

The conclusion of this inquiry will amaze those who are as yet ignorant of the eccentricities of the Theosophical Judiciary. How far the inquiry went in the inner courts of the Esoteric Section we do not know. The record before the outside world is a pamphlet issued in London last July, consisting of statements by Col. OLCOTT, by Mrs. BESANT, and by Mr. WILLIAM Q. JUDGE. Col. OLCOTT incidentally summarizes as follows the "charges of misconduct preferred by Mrs. BESANT against the Vice-President:"

That he practised deception in sending false messages, orders, and letters, as if sent and written by Masters; that he was untruthful in various other instances mentioned.

And then the good Colonel proceeds to argue substantially thus: (1) That the Mahatma messages are either genuine or fabricated; (2) if genuine, to affirm them as such is to affirm dogmatically the Mahatmas' existence, and therefore to abandon the Theosophical Society's neutral attitude on the subject; (3) if bogus, these missives must have been produced by the Vice-President in his private capacity, and not officially, and for this he cannot be tried by an official tribunal. Mrs. BESANT retracts what she said in her speech of 1891, and makes this interesting explanation:

I do not charge, and have not charged, Mr. JUDGE with forgery in the ordinary sense of the term, but with giving a misleading form to messages received psychically from the Master in various ways. Personally I hold that this method is illegitimate. I believe that Mr. JUDGE wrote with his own hand, consciously or automatically I do not know, in the script adopted as that of the Master, messages which he received from the Master, or from *chelas*; and I know that in my own case I believed that the messages he gave me in the well-known script were messages directly precipitated or directly written by the Master. When I publicly said that I had received, after H. P. BLAVATSKY'S death, letters in the writing that H. P. BLAVATSKY had been accused of forging, I referred to letters given me by Mr. JUDGE, and as they were in the well-known script I never dreamt of challenging their source. I know now that they were not written or precipitated by the Master, and that they were done by Mr. JUDGE; but I also believe that the gist of these messages was psychically received, and that Mr. JUDGE'S error lay in giving them to me in a script written by himself and not saying so. Having been myself mistaken I in turn misled the public.

And, lastly, Mr. JUDGE himself, the defendant in the astounding inquiry:

I repeat my denial of the said rumored charges of forging the said names and handwritings of the Mahatmas, or of misusing the same. * * * I admit that I have received and delivered messages from the Mahatmas. * * * They were obtained through me, but as to how they were obtained or produced, I cannot state. * * * My own methods may disagree from the views of others. * * * I willingly say that which I never denied, that I am a human being, full of error, liable to mistake, not infallible, but just the same as

any other human being like to myself, or of the class of human beings to which I belong. And I freely, fully, and sincerely forgive any one who may be thought to have injured or tried to injure me.

Are not these noble, generous, manly, and modest words, considering all of the circumstances of the case? What wonder that the delighted Theosophs, having heard OLCOTT, Mrs. BESANT, and JUDGE, passed without a single dissenting vote these resolutions:

That this meeting accepts with pleasure the final adjustment arrived at by ANNIE BESANT and WILLIAM Q. JUDGE as a final settlement of matters pending hitherto between them as prosecutor and defendant, with a hope that it may be thus buried and forgotten; and,

Resolved, That we will join hands with them to further the cause of genuine brotherhood in which we all believe.

It seems quite clear to us that the source of all the trouble is with Mahatma MORYA, doubtless aided and abetted in his malicious tricks by KOOT HOOMI LAL SING, although the latter has kept himself more in the dark in later years. Instead of working in good faith for the cultivation of public interest in Aryan literatures and the promotion of the universal brotherhood of man, these mischievous old sages take a simian delight in involving their simple-minded disciples in all sorts of bedevilments. For any Theosoph to follow their lead is to bring himself either into a ridiculous position or into something even worse than that. They have a monstrous advantage over him in their power to work miracles at a great distance. They can put the innocent victim in a false position before the world by psychically inspiring him, as they seem to have psychically inspired our distinguished fellow townsman, and then leaving him at the mercy of the ordinary rules of evidence and of common sense.

While these two Mahatmas are at large, the reputation of every prominent American and European Theosophist is in their keeping. It is not right that an American citizen enjoying all the rights and privileges which are his under the Constitution, should be subject to such annoyances and grave perils as those from which Mr. WILLIAM Q. JUDGE has now so happily emerged. The right place for the two hoary old Mahatma sinners is Sing Sing, and if extradition papers are of any account in the Desert of Gobi we advise JUDGE, who is a lawyer and knows the ropes, to put them there—both MORYA and KOOT.

2. Introduction to “An Interesting Letter” — **The Theosophical Movement 1875-1950**, p.426.

While Mrs. Besant was on her third visit to America in the winter of 1892-3, Mr. Judge showed her the correspondence with Col. Olcott. One of the letters of Mr. Judge was on questions raised by Col. Olcott on the “message” in *The Path* of August, 1891. Mrs. Besant asked and obtained from Mr. Judge consent to the publication of this letter in her magazine *Lucifer*, where it appeared in April, 1893, immediately after her return from the United States. This letter was, according to the restriction imposed by Mr. Judge, not published as to Col. Olcott, but as to “An Indian Brother,” and was given by Mrs. Besant the caption, “An Interesting Letter.”

So soon as *Lucifer* with the “interesting letter” reached India, Col. Olcott took action. In *The Theosophist* for July, 1893, appear two articles in criticism of the views expressed by Mr. Judge in the “interesting letter.” The second of these, signed “N. D. K.” (the initials of N. D. Khandalavala, a prominent Indian member), is an argument, from a similar point of view to that of Mr. Sturdy in “Gurus and Chelas,” against the danger of mere substitution by the unwise of “Masters” for a personal “Savior.” “Reliance on Masters as ideals and as facts” seems to N. D. K. mere folly. N. D. K. says:

Does not the Christian missionary come canting after us with exactly the same words? Substitute the words “Jesus and Saviour” for “Masters” in the sentences of Mr. Judge, and they will read like a propaganda of the Evangelist preachers.

N.D.K. objects very strongly to Mr. Judge’s saying that he “knows out of his own experience” of the existence of Masters and suggests that Mr. Judge “systematically and exhaustively bring forward his experiences for the benefit of us all”

Lucifer, Vol. 12, April 1893, pp.101-104.

An Interesting Letter.
(Written to an Indian Brother.)

144, MADISON AVENUE,
NEW YORK.

DEAR BROTHER,—I have your last long and welcome letter. The fears you express of the T. S. leading to dogmatism or fanaticism seem to be groundless to me. If we had a creed there would be danger; if the Society declared any particular doctrine to be true, or to be the accepted view of the T. S., great danger would result. But we have no creed, and the T. S. has not declared for any doctrine. Its members have asserted certain beliefs, but that is their right. They do not force them on others. Their declaration of their own beliefs does not unfit them to be members. I have my own settled beliefs, but I do not say that another must accept these. The eternal duty of right thought, act, and speech, is not affected by my theories. Hence all I ask of another is, to do his own duty and let me do mine. Such, indeed, is the very genius of our Society, and that is the very reason why it still lives and has an influence.

And when we come to examine the work and the foundation of the T. S. and its policy, I find it perfectly proper for me to assert, as I do, in accordance with my own knowledge and belief, that our true progress lies in fidelity to Masters as ideals and facts. Likewise is it perfectly proper for another to say that he does not know anything about the Masters—if such be his case—but is willing to work in and for the T. S. But he has no right to go further and deny my privilege of asserting my belief in those Beings.

So also further; I have the right to say that I think a constant reliance on Masters as such ideals and facts—or either—will lead the T. S. on to greater work. And he has his right to say that he can work without that reliance. But neither has he nor have you any right to say that my belief in this, or any assertion of it, is wrong or in any way improper.

I belong to that class of persons in the T. S. who out of their own experience know that the Masters exist and actually help the T. S. You belong to a class which—as I read your letters and those of others who write similarly—express a doubt on this, that, or the other, seeming to question the expediency, propriety and wisdom of a man’s boldly asserting confidence and belief in Beings who are unprovable for many, although you say (as in your present letter) that you believe in and revere the same Masters as I do. What, then, must I conclude? Am I not forced to the conclusion that inasmuch as you say you believe in these Beings, you think it unwise in me to assert publicly and boldly my belief? Well, then, if this is a correct statement of the case, why cannot you go on your way of belief and concealment of it, and let me proceed with my proclamations? I will take the Karma of my own beliefs. I force no man to accept my assertions.

But I am not acting impulsively in my many public statements as to the existence of Masters and help from Them. It is done upon an old order of Theirs and under a law of mind. The existence of Masters being a *fact*, the assertion of that fact made so often in America has opened up channels in men’s minds which would have remained closed had silence been observed about the existence of those Beings. The giving out of *names* is another matter; that, I do not sanction nor practise. Experience has shown that a springing up of interest in Theosophy has followed declaration, and men’s minds are more and more powerfully drawn away from the blank Materialism which is rooted in English, French, and German teaching. And the Masters have said “It is easier to help in America than Europe because in the former our existence has been persistently declared by so many.” You may, perhaps, call this a commonplace remark, as you do some others, but for me it has a deep significance and contains a high endorsement. A very truism when uttered by a Mahâtma has a deeper meaning for which the student must seek, but which he will lose if he stops to criticize and weigh the words in mere ordinary scales.

Now, I may as well say it out very plainly that the latter half of your letter in which you refer to a message printed in the *Path* in 1891 in August¹ is the part you consider of most importance. To that part of your letter you gave the most attention, and to the same portion you wish for a reply more than to the preliminary pages. Now, on the contrary, I consider the preceding half of your letter the important half. This last bit, all about the printed message, is not important at all. Why? Because your basic facts are wrong.

(1) I never published such a letter, for I was not in America, although if I had been I should have consented. In August of that year I was in Europe, and did not get back to New York until after that month’s *Path* was published. I had sailed for London May 13th, on hearing of H. P. B.’s death, and stayed there three months. Of course while away I had to leave all the publishing in the hands of Bro. Fullerton and others. But I do approve their work.

(2) The next baseless fact is thus smashed: *I did not write* the article you quote. I am not Jasper Niemand. Hence I did not get the message he printed a *part of* in his article. Jasper Niemand is a real person and not a title to conceal my person. If you wish to write him about the article, or any other, you can address care of me; I will forward; in time he will reply. This wrong notion about Jasper ought to be exposed. People choose now and then to assume that I am the gentleman. But several who have corresponded with him know that he is as distinct from me in person, place, and mind as you are yourself.

1. See Chronology, August 1891 entry.

(3) Now, in July it was that Jasper Niemand got his message containing, I believe, things relative to himself, and also the words of general interest quoted by him. The general words he saw fit to use. Having had privilege to send his articles to *Path*, which accepts them without examination, his article was used at once without it being necessary for me to see it, for my orders were to print any he might send. Hence I saw neither the article nor proofs before publication. But I fully approve now as I did when, in the next September, I read it.

It is true I had later the privilege of seeing his message, but only read the text, did not examine the signature, and do not remember if even it had a signature. The signature is not important. The means for identification are not located in signatures at all. If you have not the means yourself for proving and identifying such a message, then signature, seal, papers, watermark, what not, all are useless.

As to "Master's seal," about which you put me the question, I do not know. Whether He has a seal or uses one is something on which I am ignorant. In my experience I have had messages from the Master, but they bear no seal and I attach no significance to the point. A seal on other messages of His goes for nothing with me; the presence or absence of a seal is nothing to me; my means of proof and identification are within myself and everything else is trumpery. Can I be more definite? Anticipating—as a brother lawyer—your question, I say in reply that I have no recollection as to any signature or seal on this message to Jasper Niemand, because I read it but once.

Further, I think it a useful message. The qualities spoken of were more than ever needed at that crisis, and words of encouragement from Masters, however trite, were useful and stimulating. We do not—at least I do not—want Masters to utter veiled, mystical, or portentous phrases. The commonplace ones suit me best and are best understood. Perhaps if you were satisfied with simple words from Them you might have had them. Who knows? They have written much of high import, enough for fifty years of effort in the letters published by Mr. Sinnett in the *Occult World*, and attributed to K. H. Why should one desire private messages in addition? I do not. Some men would sell their lives for the most commonplace phrase from Masters.

But as Masters are still living in bodies, and that in your own country and not so far from you as I am, I consider you privileged in, so to say, breathing the same air with those exalted personages. Yet I know beyond doubt or cavil that we, so far away, are not exempt from Masters' care and help. Knowing this we are content to "wait, to work, and to hope."

Fraternally,
WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

P.S.—Perhaps I ought to say somewhat more fully that the message in *Path* from Master had, in my judgment, far more value than you attribute to it. There are in this Section many members who need precisely its assurance that no worker, however feeble or insignificant, is outside the range of Master's eye and help. My co-workers in New York were so impressed with the value to the Section of this particular message, that one of them paid the cost of printing it on slips and sending it to every member of the Section in good standing. Of course its worth and importance are better understood here than they can be by anyone not familiar with the Section, and I can see ample justification of the Master's wisdom in sending the words He did.

3.

A Letter from Mrs. Besant.

(See Chronology, Dec. 19, 1894 entry) (Light Vol. 15, Jan. 12, 1895, pp.21-22)

The following letter, dated “Colombo, December 19th, 1894,” has been addressed by Mrs. Besant to the Editor of the “Daily Chronicle”:—

On landing here yesterday from Australia I was met with the series of articles in the “Westminster Gazette,” bringing various serious charges against prominent members of the Theosophical Society. I sail to-morrow for India, where three months’ work lies before me ere I can return to England. With what may be called, perhaps, without offence, a somewhat deficient sense of chivalry, the “Westminster Gazette” chose, as the fittest time to issue charges gravely affecting my honour, a moment when I was in New Zealand, thus securing a three months’ run for its statements ere the accused could be heard in explanation. Nor can I even now, at this distance, take up the matter, since anything I say can be contradicted on the morrow with the certainty of a month’s interval ere I can again be heard. Such a struggle is too unequal. I therefore ask of your courtesy, always generously shown to me, the permission to make a single request.

For twenty years now I have been in public life, for the most part exposed to very hostile scrutiny, and at the end of those years there is not a land in which the English tongue is spoken in which I have not won the love and trust of hundreds. I do not plead that these twenty years of work should be taken as in themselves disproving the charges made, but I do plead them fearlessly as a reason why the public should hear me before it condemns. I shall be in England in April, and will then, in your columns, if you permit, give the other side of the story. But one thing let me say, to prevent misconception. Within the Theosophical Society there is—as Madame Blavatsky stated in the “Key to Theosophy”—a band of students who have bound themselves to silence on matters touching their body, just as have the Freemasons. To that body I belong. No broken obligations on the part of others can release me from the promise of silence I have given, and where the accusations of the “Westminster Gazette” are based on events supposed to have occurred within that body, I shall not reply to them either in my own defence or in that of anybody else. If this silence on this part of the accusations is held as proof of guilt, so be it. I had rather stand condemned as liar and impostor before the world than soil my honour with a broken pledge. For from a harsh and mistaken judgment one can learn the lesson of strong endurance, but a lie—and a broken promise is a lie—pollutes and deforms the moral nature.

[Besant contradicts herself about not defending herself and goes on to attack W.Q. Judge in her address to the Annual Convention of the Indian Section held on Dec. 25-28, 1894. — Compiler]

A special meeting of the Blavatsky Lodge was held on Saturday last [Jan. 5, 1895], when, on the motion of Mr. Herbert Burrows, it was resolved that, in the interests of Theosophy, Mr. Judge ought definitely to reply to the charges which had been brought against him, and till he had done so should cease to hold the office of Vice-President.

4. **The Theosophical Society and The Westminster Gazette**, December 23rd, 1894, pp.14-16.

Reprinted in **The Daily Chronicle**, January 16, 1895 and in **Lucifer** Vol. 15, February 1895, in *The Clash of Opinion*, pp.505-507.

Letter by Bertram Keightley, to *The Westminster Gazette* dated Dec. 23, 1894, from Adyar, Madras.

For the last ten years I have been a member and an officer of the Theosophical Society; and if considerable personal sacrifices, pecuniary and otherwise, can prove anything, they may in this case show at least that my belief in Theosophy, in the T. S. and in H. P. B. has been genuine. I may be a dupe or a fool; of that my friends are the best judge; but even Mr. E. Garrett in the *Westminster Gazette*, has, so far, not dared to impugn my honour and honesty.

Perhaps, therefore, you will give me space in your columns to add to Mrs. Besant's exhaustive reply to Mr. Garrett on the whole case, a few words in reply to his statements as to myself personally.

Mr. Garrett refers to me:—

1. In the *W. G.* November 1st, where he speaks of a letter from Mr. Judge to myself, dated May 29/91, and bearing the "seal."

The fact is as stated. But Mr. Garrett might, in fairness, have added that this letter reached Adyar, Madras, *after I had left for England*, was opened by my assistant, a Hindû, and then forwarded to me in London, so that the presence of the seal was not necessarily traceable to Mr. Judge, though its appearance did raise a doubt in my mind.

2. *W. G.* November 2nd.

The facts are as stated. But again Mr. Garrett might have added, what was well known at any rate to his informant Mr. Old, that when I first saw the seal-impression on a telegram in New York in 1890 and recognised it, I took it as a precipitation done by H. P. B., whose ability to produce such precipitations I had several times verified under conditions which, to my mind, were such as to exclude all possibility of fraud on her part.

The reason I asked Mr. Judge whether he knew anything of the seal on the telegram was because, being addressed simply to "Judge New York" it had been opened in his office before reaching my hands.

Up to 1891, I had never heard or seen anything which could give me other than the very highest opinion of Mr. Judge's honesty and honour, while his devoted, unselfish and noble service to the cause to which my own life is devoted, had earned for him my deep respect and affection.

As remarked above, the first doubt of him was raised in my mind in 1891 by the appearance of the seal impression (which I knew to be a "flap-doodle of Olcott's") *after* H. P. B.'s death.

I did *not* speak, as Mr. Garrett suggests I ought to have done, in June 1891, when Col. Olcott told me of the notes he had received, for two reasons. First, because Col. Olcott told me of them in confidence and I had not his permission to speak of them; secondly, because there was to my mind—which happens to have had a legal and scientific training—not evidence enough to connect Mr. Judge with them directly.

And I may remark here that, as an officer of a public Society, I considered it my duty to give no voice to suspicions which would ruin a man's life and character, until I was in possession of demonstrative evidence

in proof of them. And I think this attitude is that which every honest and honourable man would take up, especially in regard to a colleague who had shown so much devotion and self-sacrifice as Mr. Judge.

4. W. G. Nov. 3rd.

The facts as regards the slip of tissue paper contained in a letter from Mr. Judge early in 1892, are correctly given. The circumstance strengthened my doubts, and became subsequently one of the pieces of evidence in the case.

These are all the precise statements as to myself which call for comment and I have now only to refer to the general accusation of condoning fraud and hushing it up levelled against myself in common with Mrs. Besant.

In January 1893, thanks largely to additional facts supplied by Mr. W. R. Old, I felt that sufficient evidence was available upon which to take public action. And I very strongly urged upon Col. Olcott the duty of doing so. He consented; and a full brief of the case was prepared. I then returned to England to take action; but on my arrival found that several of the most material links in our chain of evidence broke down utterly. Hence I felt compelled in justice and fairness to refuse to proceed further in the matter and therefore advised my colleagues, Col. Olcott included, to wait for further evidence.

That further evidence was eventually supplied by Mrs. Besant herself, as she states above.

Then, the case being complete, action was *at once* taken and all that lay in our power done to bring the matter to an open trial.

In this we were defeated by Mr. Judge's technical objection, which was, I still think, a sound one.

I then joined with Mrs. Besant in doing all I could to emphasise our own standpoint in these matters, by the circular which the Press ignored with such curious unanimity; and I then returned to my work in India.

The complete file of the *Westminster Gazette* only reached me just as I was leaving Tinnevely for Colombo to meet Mrs. Besant on her return from Australia, and I now take this, the earliest opportunity, of making a reply to what has been said about myself.

Though I regret the breach of faith and gentlemanly feeling to which it is due, yet I do not regret in the least the fact that these matters have been made public. And though I feel ashamed that an English journal should so far forget the honourable traditions of English journalism as to publish confidential documents obtained by breach of faith, to assail the absent where no reply can be made for months, and to give publicity to such malicious slanders as the statements of Mr. Judge concerning one so universally honoured and respected in all circles as Mr. G. N. Chakravarti, yet I for one am thankful that matters have been brought to a definite issue and that the members of our Society can decide for themselves on which side lies the right.

In conclusion, I may add that I fully, and entirely endorse all that Mrs. Besant has written above and I shall always consider it as a great honour to thus find myself associated with her.

ADYAR, MADRAS
December 23, 1894.

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY

5. **The Theosophist** Vol. 16, 1895, pp.8-11.

Olcott's address at the Nineteenth Anniversary of the Theosophical Society, December 25-28, 1894. Olcott's address is called "The Judge Case" and was issued as part of the General Report of the Nineteenth Anniversary of the TS Dec. 25-28, 1894.

NOTE: Olcott's address "The Judge Case" was the label that stuck ever since.

The Judge Case.

We are at a crisis that is the most serious within our history since that of 1884. The unavoidable failure to dispose of the charges against Mr. Judge last July, has set in motion most powerful opposing currents of feeling. By some he is enthusiastically supported, by others as unreservedly condemned. Petitions from Branches, Committees and lists of members have been sent in, asking that the Vice-President be called upon to publish a defence or resign; other Branches and individual members, even more numerous, recommend him to make no defence, as their confidence in his truthfulness and integrity is unshaken and unshakeable. From what reaches me I think that the opinions of our members may be classified thus:

1. The American Section, with the exception of some individuals of the best class and some of lesser importance, stands solidly in his favour.

[9] I have even had it intimated that if Mr. Judge should be forced to resign, the Section will secede in a body, form an American Theosophical Society independently, and elect him President.

2. The Dublin, Brixton, and some other European lodges have passed votes of confidence; copies of a draft of Resolutions in his favour are circulating in France, Belgium, and Holland, and being sent me numerously signed; and I should not be surprised if a large number of excellent people in the European Section should unite with the Americans to form the new Section in the event of a split. The Bournemouth and some other British Lodges and a large number of English Theosophists call on him to explain or retire. German opinion is reported to me as being adverse to him. Spain is against him, France divided, Holland divided.

3. Australasia, so far as I have any direct intimations, is on the side opposed to Mr. Judge.

4. India has, to my knowledge, sent in no protest in his favour, although many members recognizing his immense services and his tireless activity in official work, deprecate any hasty action based on *exparte* newspaper charges. The Poona T. S., through its President, "demands his expulsion from the Society." The above facts prove the existence of the strong antagonistic currents of feeling above noted.

What courses are open to us and which should we choose? I offer the thoughts which occur to me with the hope that I may be judicially impartial, regardless of all personal feeling or bias.

Firstly. The Constitution of the Society must be rigidly adhered to at whatsoever cost. Not to save or to expel one man or twenty, will I swerve a hair's breadth from the strict letter of the law. In July last, both the General Council and Judicial Committee voted to quash the proceedings against the accused on a point which, although technical was nevertheless irrefutable. Whatever is now or may hereafter be done in this affair, therefore, must be constitutionally done. As we can not legally try Mr. Judge, Vice-President, for alleged misdemeanours committed by W. Q. Judge, individual; and as the individual cannot be tried for his private opinions, we have to fall back upon the moral aspect of the case, and see how an individual accused of the immoral act of deception usually behaves. We have the familiar precedent of H. P. B. who, before leaving India—for the last time, as it proved—placed her resignation in my hands in order to relieve the Society from the burden of defending her against the charges of the Coulombs and the Missionaries. The Convention

subsequently passed a vote of confidence, which I officially conveyed to her, and this restored her to her former status in the Society. State Cabinets invariably resign office upon the passage of a legislative vote of lack of confidence. This is the unwritten, sometimes the written, law of honour. Frequently, the resigning official offers himself for re-election or again accepts office, if [10] so requested. From the fact that I had to over-rule the point made by him that he was not and had never been Vice-President *de jure*, I was led to believe that Mr. Judge was disposed to follow the same course as far as relinquishing that office was concerned. But, however that case may be, I should, if the case were mine, do as I have more than once before, both within and without the Theosophical Society, offer my resignation but be ready to resume office if my superiors or colleagues showed that I possessed their confidence, that there was a necessity for my so doing, and circumstances permitted. While the Society cannot compel Mr. Judge to resign and offer himself for re-election, and a very large body of our members advise him not to do so, he has it in his power to relieve the present strain by so doing and to thus enable the whole Society to say whether it still wishes to be represented by him before the world, or the contrary. Such a course would not affect his relations with the American Section or the Aryan T. S., those concerning only the Section and Branch and, having no Federal character, not coming under the purview of other Sections nor being open to their criticism. International action is only called for in Federal questions.

It is proper for me as a student of Practical Psychology of very long experience, to draw attention to the important fact that, even if the charges of forged writing and false messages brought against Mr. Judge were made good before a jury, under the exoteric rules of evidence, still this might not be proof of guilty knowledge and intent. This must not be overlooked, for it bears distinctly upon the question of moral responsibility. Every student of modern Spiritualism and Eastern Occultism knows that a medium, or psychic, if you prefer the word, is often irresistibly impelled by an extraneous force to do acts of turpitude of which he is incapable in his normal state of consciousness. Only a few days ago, I read in the learned Dr. Gibier's "Analyse des Choses," a solemn statement of this fact accompanied with striking examples in his own practice. And the eminent Prof. Bernheim also proved to me this dreadful fact by hypnotic experiments on patients in the Hôpital Civil, at Nancy. Equally well known is it that persons, otherwise accounted sane, are liable to hallucinations which make them sometimes mistake their own fancies for spiritual revelations and a vulgar earth-bound spirit for an exalted historical personage. At this moment, I have knowledge of at least seven different psychics in our Society who believe themselves to be in communication with the same Mahatmas and doing their work, who have each a knot of disciples or adherents about them, and whose supposed teachers give orders which conflict with each other's! I cannot impugn the good faith of either of these sensitives, while, on the other hand, I cannot see my way to accepting any of their mandates in the absence of satisfactory proof of their genuineness. So I go on my way, doing my public duty as well as I can see it, and leaving to time the solving of all these mysteries. My objective intercourse with the Great Teachers ceased almost entirely on the death of H. P. B., while any subjective relations I may have with them is evidence only to myself [11] and would carry no weight with third parties. I think this rule applies in all such cases, and no amount of mediumistic phenomena, or of clearest visions of physically unseen Teachers by psychics who have not passed through a long course of training in Raja Yoga, would convince me of my duty to accept blindly the mandates of even well-meaning advisers. All professed teachings of Mahatmas must be judged by their intrinsic merit; if they are wise they become no better by reason of their alleged high source; if foolish, their worthlessness is not nullified by ascribing to them the claim of authority.

In conclusion, then, I beg you to realise that, after proving that a certain writing is forged and calculated to deceive, you must then prove that the writer was a free agent before you can fasten upon him the stigma of moral obliquity. To come back to the case in point, it being impossible for any third party to know what Mr. Judge may have believed with respect to the Mahatmic writings emanating from him, and what subjective facts he had to go upon, the proof cannot be said to be conclusive of his bad faith however suspicious the available evidence may seem.

The way out of the difficulty lies with him, and with him alone. If he should decide to neither give any satisfactory explanations nor to resign his Federal office, the consequence will undoubtedly be that a large number of our best people of the class of Mr. Herbert Burrows will withdraw from the Society; while if he should, his numerous friends will stand by him all the more loyally throughout. I do not presume to judge, the case not being before me on its merits.

I must, however, express my profound regret that Mr. Judge should have circulated accusations of resort to Black Magic, against Mrs. Besant and Mr. Chakravarti; neither of whom have ever, so far as I have been able to judge in years of personal intercourse, done the least thing to deserve such a suspicion. As for Mrs. Besant, I can conscientiously affirm that in all my life I never met a more noble, unselfish and upright woman, nor one whose heart was filled with greater love for mankind. The Theosophical Society owes her a debt it can never repay.

The President wishes it known that his Address being a Presidential document, in the drafting of which the obligation of strict impartiality rested upon him, his private views with respect to the case of Mr. Judge were withheld. When the right time came, he should know how to act for the best interests of the Society.

6. **Lucifer**, Vol. 16, April 15, 1895, p. 164.

To G. R. S. Mead, Esq.

DEAR SIR,

Having received the following note from Mr. Lindsay which deviates from truth, and as he informs me that he has the intention of making it public for the defence of Mr. Judge, thus giving misleading statements, you will greatly oblige me by inserting the following in LUCIFER and the *Vâhan*. Mr. Lindsay writes:—

You told me that before H. P. B. died, she showed you a box wherein was Master's seal, and that immediately after H. P. B.'s death you took the box with the Master's seal in it into your keeping, and that the box was not in anyone else's hands till given over by you to Annie Besant on her return from America. When the box was opened by Annie Besant, the Master's seal was not to be found in it, and all this took place before Mr. Judge came to England.

Now, the true facts are the following:—

H. P. B. never shewed me the seal above named. I did not even know of its existence. I had seen the impression of the seal during H. P. B.'s life-time, but not the seal itself, and I believed these impressions to be from a genuine seal belonging to the Master.

After the death of H. P. B., when Colonel Olcott came to London, he made enquiries about the seal and told us how the seal was made under his directions in the Punjab and then given by him to H. P. B.

In the presence of many people I was asked if I had ever seen the seal, and I replied "No," that I had searched diligently and minutely for various articles belonging to H. P. B. after her death, thus obeying certain instructions given by her to me, but I had found *no seal* among her things. H. P. B.'s property, which I had thus collected, I handed over to Annie Besant on her arrival in England from America.

What Mr. Lindsay writes tallies so entirely with the experience of Bertram Keightley, that I think Mr. Lindsay in his eagerness to defend Mr. Judge has got slightly confused in his mind.

Bertram Keightley has said in the presence of several witnesses that in the year 1888, in Lansdowne Road, he saw this seal in a box which H. P. B. requested him to get out for her, and she told him that it was a flapdoodle of Olcott's.

False statements are always mischievous, and so I have felt it my duty to relate facts as they have really occurred and in confirmation of which I could bring forward many witnesses.

Yours faithfully,

CONSTANCE WACHTMEISTER.

We are glad to be able to endorse the above statement of Countess Wachtmeister, that *no seal* was found after H. P. B.'s death. We, with Mr. Mead, were present when Countess Wachtmeister made the search referred to, and after everything had been carefully examined, all cupboards, drawers and boxes were sealed up in our presence until Mrs. Besant's return. The Countess Wachtmeister never examined anything except in our presence and that of Mr. Mead.

ISABEL COOPER-OAKLEY.

LAURA MARY COOPER.

With regard to the seal, I was present when the Countess denied having ever seen it, though she had seen impressions of it, as she has stated above. In 1888, I saw the seal itself at Lansdowne Road, in a box which H. P. B. requested me to get out of her wardrobe for her, and in reply to a question, she told me that it was a flapdoodle of Olcott's.

I agree with Countess in thinking that Mr. Lindsay has confused events, and ascribed to Countess what really happened to me at an earlier date.

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY.

7. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, May 1895, pp.141-142.

To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.

DEAR SIR, — As the Countess Wachtmeister has thought fit to publish in *Lucifer part* of a letter to her, written by me, together with some comments thereon, kindly allow the whole of the letter to appear in your columns, with a few remarks added. — Yours fraternally,

WM. LINDSAY.

London, Feb. 17th, 1895 (posted March 1st).

DEAR COUNTESS, — You will, no doubt, remember telling me the following some time ago, "*for use if at any time required.*" Please note, therefore, that I shall use it, should I think fit, in defending Mr. W. Q. Judge. What you told me was, that before H. P. B. died she showed you a box wherein was Master's seal, and that immediately after H. P. B.'s death you took the box with the Master's seal in it into your keeping, and that the box was not in *anyone* else's hands till given over by you to Annie Besant on her return from America. When the box was opened by Annie Besant the *Master's seal was not to be found in it*, and all this took place *before* Mr. W. Q. Judge came to England.

You may be hurt that I should take this action, but you must not forget that the above information was given me for the express purpose of defending Mr. Judge should it be needful. I know you now regard Mr. Judge in a very different way, but that is no reason why I should not now use the information.—Sincerely yours,

WM. LINDSAY.

Every F.T.S. knows by this time that there is no darker sin against the Manifold Deity who runs the European Section (for whom, I take it, G. R. S. Mead acts as Manifested Logos) than want of courtesy. I, remembering this, and wishing to live yet a little longer, wrote the above letter to the Countess Wachtmeister prior to using the information contained in it. By which act I am, at the earliest possible date, honored by the now rather common distinction of being called a liar in *Lucifer*.

The Countess practically confirms her statement to me in the remarks following the extract of my letter, though she puts it in new language, for which confirmation I beg to thank her. Following these remarks are some by Mrs. Cooper-Oakley, Miss Cooper and Mr. Bertram Keightley, which is strange, seeing that the Countess addressed her letter to the Editor of *Lucifer* from India. How, then, is it that comments are made by these people, who are in England, in the same issue; unless it be, as I have for some time suspected, that *Lucifer* is, in fact, edited by a syndicate, trading, if I may use the term, under the title of G. R. S. Mead?

One thing, however, is worthy of note, viz., that a common cause has a wonderful power of drawing people together, however antagonistic they may have been toward each other in the past; for we find T. S. members who, while it was only a matter of forming the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood that they had in hand, were willing to wage war continually among themselves, now that a really congenial and worthy cause is to be upheld, *i.e.*, the persecution of a brother Theosophist (W. Q. Judge), are (apparently) ready, aye, are *anxious* to join hands, forgetting past differences, and to stand shoulder to shoulder in the fight for this noble ideal.

Truly I have heard of many “experiences” in divers lands of Mr. Bertram Keightley, but of this particular one, relating to the seal in question, I have never before been told.

Of course I am not responsible for the truth of the statement made by the Countess, but only for the correct rendering of such, as told to me, which I maintain I have done, and, after all, the principal point remains unchanged, viz., *that the seal was gone before W. Q. Judge came to England.*

WILLIAM LINDSAY.

April 23, 1895.

8. **A Narrative.** By Alexander Fullerton, May 14, 1895, 4 pages.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION.

Some time before H.P.B.'s death, I should say about 1890, Mr. Judge handed me one day in New York an envelope. Upon opening this I found a note from himself stating that he had been directed by H.P.B., in recognition of my earnest services in the cause of Theosophy, to hand to me the enclosed copy of the Master's seal. Then followed the words, "This I know myself". He added that I might perhaps value this at a time when rewards were not flying around generally, said that I was to show the seal to no one, and desired me to return it to him if at any time I should cease to value it. At the center of a separate sheet of thin paper was the impression of a seal, the same as that since made familiar to the public in the pages of *Isis Very Much Unveiled*. I cut out the impression from the center of the sheet and placed it in a locket in my watch chain, always wearing it thereafter. When Mr. Judge published in *Lucifer* a letter stating that he was ignorant whether or not the Master used a seal, I at once recalled his note to me and re-read it. Either, then, the assertion in *Lucifer* was a falsehood or the impression of the seal given to me was a gross imposture. When among the charges preferred against Mr. Judge was one respecting falsehood in affirming and denying his knowledge of the Master's seal, I was aware of how dangerous a document was the one in my possession, and some time after the futile meeting of the Judicial Committee I determined to restore to Mr. Judge that note, thinking that he would always feel uncomfortable while it was in the possession of another person. I accordingly restored to him the note and the separate sheet with the hole in the middle from which the impression had been cut. Mr. Judge pretended not to know what these papers meant! In April, 1895, thinking it desirable to have further light upon the matter, I sent to Mrs. Besant for examination by Mr. B. Keightley and herself the impression of the seal, and later had from her this word: "The seal you send is the fraudulent one". The history of this seal and the use made of it are given in *Isis Very Much Unveiled* and in *The Case against W. Q. Judge*.

About January, 1894, we procured at 144 Madison Avenue a new book for the registration of members joining the T.S., and it occurred to me that it would be well if the first four entries were made by those who had made the majority of entries in the former book. The matter seemed to me of little consequence, and I barely referred to it, but one day made myself an entry in the fourth space on the first page. That evening occurred the regular meeting of the Aryan Branch, and Mr. Judge sent down to me from the platform a note containing these words in his own handwriting, "My occult friend says: 'Let W.Q.J. make the first entry in the new book, A.F. the second; after that as you please.' I wish to conform to the above. W.Q.J.". The explanation of this was obvious, and I was filled with indignation and contempt. It was evident that Mr. Judge had opened the book during the day, had seen the entry by myself, inferred an order of entries different from that he desired, and supposed (though entirely without fact) that I should be annoyed if he directed a different order, whereas that I should be entirely content if I supposed the order he desired to have been directed by a higher Power. He therefore invented a direction from his "occult friend". The supposition that any occult personage, of however low a grade, would interest himself in the order of entries in a record book was too grossly absurd for belief, and I at once understood that this was an undignified imposture.

When the formulated charges against Mr. Judge were first read by me, I at once perceived that at least two of them must be true, and considered that a thorough investigation was due to the Society and to himself. The conviction of his guilt was made to my mind still more certain by his conduct both before and after the meeting of the Judicial Committee. The whole of his strength and ingenuity was expended in every possible effort to avoid investigation. Every possible shift, dodge, evasion, chicanery was employed to this end, and the most frantic graspings at every possible and incompatible plea to escape procedure made it certain to me that only guilt could prompt such policy. Attempts to throw dust in the eyes of the public, to confuse the issue, to throw enquirers off the track, were incessant. After the futile meeting of the Committee

his policy was that of bitter denunciation of everyone in anyway opposing him, as also angry charges of malicious prosecution, malignant motives, and even insanity, together with assaults on character which I believed then, and believe now, to have been utter calumnies. I have repeatedly made the remark that the most dangerous enemies Mr. Judge has in this affair are himself and his friends.

While holding to the full these convictions and considering what step duty required of me, I received on December 31st, 1894, a message transmitted to me by a pupil of the Mahatma M. The message warmly endorsed Mr. Judge and commended him to my entire support. Fully believing in the integrity of the pupil and the genuineness of this message, I at once bowed to the superior knowledge of the Master and issued a circular on January 16th. Although what follows is conclusive as to Mr. Judge's proceedings and policy, I am still utterly unable to explain or account for the message referred to, so entire is my confidence in the integrity and the trustworthiness of the pupil. None the less is it incumbent upon me to follow the dictates of common honesty, and to return, though with added certainty and assurance, to the position taken before that message was received.

On Friday, March 29, I received from this same pupil a communication from the Master desiring me to write a letter to Col. Olcott advising the appointment of a committee after a specified fashion for an investigation of the charges against Mr. Judge, and also a letter to leading Theosophists advising them to recommend to Col. Olcott this course. The letter expressed a wish for my prompt compliance, and left to my own option any mention to Mr. Judge of the matter. I at once dictated these two letters, and that evening mailed the one to Col. Olcott so that it should catch the steamer on Saturday. The letter to leading Theosophists I gave to a friend to be mimeographed, and of the copies received from him on Saturday evening mailed a number on Sunday morning. As I thought that I myself in like circumstances would desire to be informed of a matter so closely affecting myself, I used the option and wrote Mr. Judge of the affair on Friday evening, at the same time telegraphing him that I had received an important message, had instantly complied, and had written him. This was sent as a night message, at half rates. It would reach the town in which Mr. Judge was staying on the following morning, Saturday, and would be in his hands late on Saturday afternoon or in the evening when he would go to the post office for his mail, which reached the town at four o'clock. Mr. Judge was distant from New York three or four days by mail. On Sunday morning I received from Mr. Judge a telegram stating that he had received my telegram, did not understand it, and wished to know particulars. On Sunday afternoon I received a second telegram from him stating that he had had a message from the Master that I should take no steps until we (Mr. J. and myself) met. Now it certainly seemed singular that the Master should so soon have forgotten that I was to act promptly and that any communication thereon to Mr. Judge was optional: but even more singular was it that the Mahatma was ignorant that my letter to Colonel Olcott and part of the letters to leading Theosophists had already been mailed, or that, if knowing this, he should instruct Mr. Judge to send a telegram which would be useless because too late. But some explanation of these singular facts reached me that same evening, Sunday. I then received a visit from Mr. Griscom and Mr. Fussell, who came to tell me that a project for the secession of the American Section from the T.S. had [3] been long in preparation in a quiet way, that Mr. Judge had now been informed of it, and that he had telegraphed his approval thereof and directed the matter to be made public. Mr. Griscom had copied off a portion of Mr. Judge's telegram for me to read, but had, apparently through inadvertence, copied a sentence too much. This sentence read, "Fullerton acts on his own responsibility". I naturally inquired what this meant, and the facts were rather unwillingly given. It seems that on Friday I had told Mr. Fussell of my reception of the order to send the letters and of my purpose to give him a copy of the one to leading Theosophists. On Saturday afternoon Mr. Fussell asked me if I would give him then his copy, as he wished to show it to one or two friends. The "one or two friends" turned out to be a meeting of the conspirators at Mr. Griscom's house that evening, three having come from Boston and a number having assembled from New York. To them Mr. Fussell read my letter, and he and Mr. Griscom then telegraphed Mr. Judge its contents, wholly without consultation with me or any authority from me. This telegram was sent on Saturday

evening at 6:30, too late to be received by Mr. Judge that evening, but doubtless received on Sunday morning. Mr. Griscom did not know that I had posted the letter to Colonel Olcott on Friday evening, and that I should post the other letters on Sunday morning, so that his telegram of course did not mention these facts. Hence it would seem that Mr. Griscom's telegram misled Mr. Judge's Mahatma and caused the second message to me on Sunday.

I pointed out in a letter to Mr. Judge the singular facts concerning the Mahatma's direction to him respecting the telegram to me, and also forwarded him the transcript I had received on Friday of the Master's direction to myself. On Sunday, March 31, Mr. Judge wrote me two letters, in each of which he spoke of having received my telegram on Saturday evening, and in one of them gave some account of the Mahatma's message to him, which had been received on Sunday before lunch, and which ordered him to send the telegram which I received that afternoon. When my letter pointing out the singular conduct of the Mahatma reached Mr. Judge, he was evidently in consternation and in sore need of an excuse. He accordingly wrote me that he had made a mistake as to the person had in view by the Mahatma, the person who was to do nothing until we met not being myself but Mr. Judge, a somewhat remarkable mistake in a Chela of such long experience and favored with such constant communications from the Master. But even more significant was Mr. Judge's further statement that confusion had been thrown into the matter by his having received my telegram two days late. Now that telegram, as has already been stated, would naturally be received by him on Saturday evening, and both of his letters on Sunday distinctly stated that he had so received it. Moreover, if the telegram had been two days late, Mr. Judge must have answered it before he received it, which would have been something of an exploit even for so experienced an Occultist. And why should the Mahatma's ignorance be caused by a belated telegram? I may say, in passing, that I made no reference to this affair when Mr. Judge returned to New York, but he himself brought the matter up and then claimed that the telegram was a day and a half late. I remarked that both of his Sunday letters spoke of his having received it on Saturday evening, whereupon he exclaimed with some vehemence that he was sick in bed on Saturday evening and did not receive my telegram till Sunday morning. I abstained from again reminding him of his assertion in the Sunday letters.

The whole case was abundantly clear. Mr. Judge had duly received my telegram on Saturday evening, had answered it either then or on Sunday morning, had received on Sunday morning Mr. Griscom's telegram, had jumped at the determination to stop my action till he could himself take part, and had done this in ignorance of the terms of the message to me and of the certainty that his telegram would expose him. Later, when the absurd inconsistencies were pointed out, he was driven to any false[4]hood to exonerate himself, and adopted two, one of which was absurd, and the other was contradicted by his own letters.

This affair finally decided me as to the positive stand I should take. I determined that all imposture and falsehood as to myself were thereupon to end. I should retire from membership in Mr. Judge's division of the E.S.T., should discontinue my services as his assistant, and should decline to be a candidate for re-election to the Executive Committee and to the Treasurership. Foreseeing the possibility of misrepresentation, I wrote, before his return to New York, to three leading members of the Society, informing them that no matter what action the Convention should take I myself should no longer hold the offices I have mentioned. The same communication I made to Mr. Judge in New York, immediately resigned from his division of the E.S.T., and left the office on the day before Convention, April 27th. I also determined to take proper steps to annul the circular of January 16th, and to recall the endorsement which I had therein given Mr. Judge's proceedings and policy.

I have thought it fitting to put the above facts in permanent shape so that they may be protected from loss of memory and be available for such use as propriety and truth may demand.

The charges and evidence against Mr. Judge as preferred by Mrs. Annie Besant, 19 Avenue Road, Regent's Park, London N. W., are fully given in the pamphlet just issued by her, —*The Case Against W. Q. Judge*.

I expected, upon the secession of the American Section, to affiliate with the European Section, but information reaches me from various parts of the country that loyal Theosophists are not prepared either to lose their status as F.T.S. or to have membership in a schismatic body organized to protect wrong-doing from judicial penalty. They desire to maintain the American Section. Mrs. Besant advises the application to Col. Olcott in London next month of seven Branches for recognition as the American Section of the T.S.; new Branches of not less than seven members each to be formed if needed. There are probably many Branches in the schismatic organization wherein a portion of the members are opposed to secession, and such members could unite, apply for Charter, and sign the petition for recognition as Section. Possibly in some towns there may be seven members-at-large desirous to organize and thus assist. Scattered Theosophists can record their desire to be members-at-large in such a Section.

Every loyal F.T.S., anxious to preserve the Society which H.P.B. founded, for which she labored, and in which she died, has thus an opportunity to aid in the continuance of her and its work. The blessing of the Masters who prompted the foundation may well be expected upon an effort to preserve it, especially when that effort is on behalf of right, straight-forwardness, and honesty, and in opposition to deception, disingenuousness, and the misuse of sacred names; and it is reasonable to suppose that they will regard with complacency their own Society with its motto "There is no religion higher than Truth", rather than an opposing body which significantly discards that motto as one of its first corporate acts.

I, for one, shall rejoice to co-operate with Miss Walsh, Mr. George E. Wright, Mr. Ryden, Mrs. Davis and other loyalists in their effort to preserve the T.S. in this country and to vindicate the cause of purity and truth.

ALEXANDER FULLERTON, F.T.S.
late Treasurer American Section.

*42 Irving Place,
New York City.
May 14, 1895.*

9.

The Case Against W.Q. Judge

Compiler's Analysis

They may charge me and publish her so-called addresses as much as they like. If they publish a thousand documents, I do not intend to defend them. I intend to make my own explanation of the affair and drop it there. — William Q. Judge. **Report of Proceedings T.S. in America**, 1895, p.37.

Two different editions of **The Case Against W. Q. Judge** were published by Annie Besant. The compiler has copies of both. It has been deduced that the 88 page edition was released by Besant on April 29th, 1895.¹ This is the only edition quoted from and reproduced in this document. However, it was not the first edition.

It will also be established that Besant prepared **The Case Against W. Q. Judge** for publication during her stay in India prior to returning to London on April 21st, 1895.

In her "STATEMENT" of April 24th, 1895, Besant claimed that she had destroyed most of the Judge letters in September 1893. She stated:

I am not able to produce documentary evidence; immediately after I learned from the Master, in Sept., 1893, that Mr. Judge had deceived me, in the shock of the disgust I felt, I destroyed the "messages," except those written on the margins of letters.²

Besant had been immediately drawn to Gyanendra Nath Chakravarti, a Brahmin mystic, upon his arrival in England in July 1893 and had been taking occult instruction from him, as her new guru, since that time. During conversation with Dr. J.D. Buck and Dr. Archibald Keightley at Richmond Park, London, England, in July 1894, Besant confided "[t]hat she took orders through Mr. Chakravarti as coming from the Master."³

She continued: "Nearly a year later, just ere leaving for Australia⁴ I destroyed all the letters I received from Mr. Judge, as I could not carry them with me round the world, and would not risk their falling into hands of others, in case of my death." Just three days before her departure Besant had her palm read by Cheiro, as had Mme. Blavatsky at the end of March 1889, two years prior to her death. Cheiro's reading of Blavatsky's palm had been quite accurate and Besant would have known this since it was Blavatsky who introduced her to Cheiro. When Cheiro read Besant's palm on July 22nd, 1894, he informed her that her life line indicated a long life, therefore, impending death should not have been a serious consideration.⁵ In addition, in January 1894, 'Sephari' (Walter R. Old), a well known astrologer, had predicted that Besant would live until 1907.⁶ Taking her earlier statement at face value, that is, that she felt disgust regarding these letters, she would not have wanted to carry them with her. However, these letters could have been stored in a safe or left with

1. See Chronology, NOTE, Apr. 29, 1895 entry.

2. See Chronology, Sep. 15-16, 1893 entry, or page 82 of **The Case Against W.Q. Judge** (in ADDITIONAL MATTER. NOT PREPARED FOR THE COMMITTEE.)

3. **The Path**, Vol. 10, June 1895, pp.97-98. Also see Chronology, July 12, 1894 entry for Cleather's remarks.

4. Besant left London for Australia on July 25th, 1894. (**The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, September 1894, p.777.)

5. See Chronology, July 22, 1894 entry.

6. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, January 1894, p.224.

someone she trusted; they did not have to travel with her. She also knew she was returning to London after the tour.

According to her own “STATEMENT”, within a year she had destroyed *all* the letters except those that did not belong to her. The letters that she first kept in 1893 were likely the ones she was convinced were from the Masters.⁷ These were also destroyed at this point, although she likely kept records of those that had the messages written on the margins. By her own admission, Besant had no letters of Judge’s in her possession at all after July 1894. By the time she attended the Judicial Committee meeting on July 10th, 1894, she had already destroyed most of the “messages” the previous September. Letters that she did not destroy the following July belonged to others, including Col. Olcott, and he took them back with him to India. Among the papers was a letter Judge had written to N.D. Khandalavala — Exhibit “A”.

It was during Besant’s first visit to India (November 1893 to March 1894) that she drew up a large part of the “Charges”, her so-called “prosecutor’s brief”,⁸ for the Judicial Committee meeting. Chakravarti likely assisted her. She spent some time with him in late January and early February, living “in a bungalow in his compound”.⁹ In his Executive Notice of April 27th, 1894, Olcott outlines one of the first steps taken by Besant to set things in motion:

On February 6th last [1894], while at Allahabad, Mrs. Annie Besant handed [to Col. Olcott, President], a written demand that certain accusations “with reference to certain letters and in the alleged writings of the Mahatmas,” injurious to the public character of Mr. W.Q. Judge, Vice-President of the Society, should be dealt with by a Committee as provided by Art. VI, Secs. 2, 3 and 4.¹⁰

Subsequently a Judicial Committee meeting was held in London on July 10th, 1894. A final settlement was reached between Annie Besant and W.Q. Judge, and the matter was supposedly “buried and forgotten”.¹¹

However, on November 3rd, 1894, Judge issued a pamphlet marked “Strictly Private and Only For E.S.T. Members” and titled **By Master’s Direction**, declaring their co-headship of the E.S.T. at an end “under Master’s direction”, on the grounds that Besant had breached her pledge of secrecy and had been pursuing two systems of occult development. On her arrival in Colombo on December 19th, 1894, Besant was met with a series of articles that had been published in the **Westminster Gazette**. These articles were the result of a European member of the E.S.T. having made public Judge’s private circular, proof of which was provided by the fact that one of only ten copies signed by Judge and sent to Besant’s E.S.T. council in England was published by the **Westminster Gazette**.¹² Besant, however, declared that as Judge’s office had apparently sent a copy of the circular to an expelled member of the E.S.T. in India, the circular was therefore “not under the pledge of secrecy in Asia, Europe, and Australasia, and may be used as a public document by all members of the School within these limits”¹³. The **Westminster Gazette** articles contained charges of deception and fraud against Judge.

7. On July 10th, 1894, at the Judicial Committee meeting Besant stated: “I believed that the messages he gave me in the well-known script were messages directly precipitated or directly written by the Master.” **Neutrality of the T. S.**, p.13.

8. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, March 1895, p.93; and **General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S.** (Dec. 25th to 28th, 1894), p.41.

9. **Last Four Lives of Annie Besant**, p.20.

10. EXECUTIVE NOTICE dated April 27th, 1894, by Col. Olcott, P.T.S. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 15, May 1894, Supplement p.xxvii.

11. See Chronology, July 10, 1894 entry for the Resolutions moved at the conclusion of the Judicial Committee meeting.

12. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, March 1895, p.96.

13. **Lucifer**, Vol. 15, February 1895, pp.466-467.

At the Annual Convention in Adyar held a few days after her arrival, Besant moved that her new Resolution be passed. She proposed “That the President-Founder be and is hereby requested to at once call upon Mr. W.Q. Judge, Vice President, Theosophical Society, to resign the office of Vice-President. . . .”¹⁴ Bertram Keightley seconded. The following day the Indian Section held its Annual Convention. Besant’s Resolution “moved by Mr. Tookaram Tatya of Bombay and seconded by Mr. A. Nilakata Shastri, was unanimously carried.”¹⁵

Upon arrival at Benares following the Convention, Besant proceeded to write her document, **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**. On January 20th, 1895, Besant, in Benares at the time,¹⁶ wrote to Olcott asking for the documents on which the charges against W.Q. Judge had been based the preceding year.¹⁷ On February 21st, 1895, Olcott consented to furnish the documents to her, but with conditions. Olcott wrote:

Before you sail, I shall confide the documents to your custody once more, on the conditions of their return to me intact on my arrival in London in June, of your placing your statement and the evidence in the hands of the General Secretary of the European Section for distribution to Branches and Members, and of his supplying a certified copy of the evidence to Mr. Judge for his information and use.¹⁸

This period from early January to late February, allowed Besant the time to arrange her notes, compose her document and mail it to G.R.S. Mead, in London, to prepare for publication. It was reported in the February 1895 **Prasnottara** (p.3) that “She will do no lecturing until February 21st, when she arrives at Lahore.” Besant may have had other opportunities to write her document while in India but none as convenient as this time period. While in Benares¹⁹ she was again close to her new guru, Chakravarti,²⁰ who had encouraged her to proceed against Judge.

Both the Annual Convention for the Indian Section and the (Anniversary) Convention of the Theosophical Society were held at Adyar in December 1894, as they had been the previous year. Instead of two different Conventions at different times of the year, holding both annually in December at Adyar encouraged attendance by more delegates from all parts of India. Interestingly, both Tookaram Tatya and Chakravarti were members of the “‘Prasnottara’ Committee”²¹ which reported at the Annual Convention of the Indian Section. **The Prasnottara** was the official publication of the Indian Section and was edited by Bertram Keightley. Mr. Tatya would likely have reiterated his support of Besant’s efforts at this Convention, having

14. **General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S.** (Dec. 25th to 28th, 1894), p.46.

15. **General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S.** (Dec. 25th to 28th, 1894), p.62.

16. “Mrs. Besant, Countess Wachtmeister and the General Secretary, [Bertram Keightley] took up their residence in the new Head-quarters of the [Indian] Section at Benares on January 21st [1895].” **Prasnottara**, Vol. 5, February 1895, p.2.

17. See Chronology, Jan. 20, 1895 entry.

18. See Chronology, Feb. 21, 1895 entry.

19. Bertram Keightley had debated if he should make Allahabad or Benares his home and the new home for the Head-quarters of the Indian Section. He stated that Countess Wachtmeister and Annie Besant “offered to each bear one-third of the expense of providing a suitable Head-quarters . . . provided that I will join them, contribute the other third and also make Allahabad or Benares my own Head-quarters and home in India. . . . and thus a suitable, permanent centre of T.S. work would be established at Allahabad or Benares forming a most efficient centre of Theosophical work . . .” **Prasnottara**, Vol. 4, November and December 1894, p.175.

20. Gyanendra Nath Chakravarti was also on the 1884-85 Committee which voted against H.P.B. defending herself regarding the Coulombs’ accusation of fraud. Bertram Keightley and Chakravarti were close friends and eventually lived together.

21. **Prasnottara**, Vol. 4, January 1894, pp.1-2.

probably handed her his documents the previous year.²² When the doubting Mr. Tatyā came to these Conventions he seemed very prepared to take action.

After Besant had a final draft of her document she sent it to G.R.S. Mead, General Secretary of the British Section, to have it type-set and ready to print when she returned to London. She arrived in London on Sunday evening, April 21st, 1895,²³ too late to do any review of her document. Early Monday morning she was assailed by interviewers from the **Daily Chronicle**, **Star**, **Morning Leader**, and **Westminster Gazette**, to obtain the latest information, mainly on the current difficulties.²⁴ She also had a private interview with **The Westminster Budget**, which was published on May 3rd, 1895 — interesting details of this interview will be revealed later. She likely consulted with Mead late that Monday or sometime on Tuesday at which time she briefly reviewed the document in preparation and gave him the footnotes indicated by “[Note added, April, 1895]” which were drafted after the document was sent to Mead from India. The footnotes are the same in both the 80 page and the 88 page editions of **The Case Against W.Q. Judge**, except for one.

This footnote, which reads: “I feel the thoughts. . .”, is found on page 39 of the 88 page edition. The footnote was “Added at wish of the verifying committee, April, 1895”. This “committee of prominent members of the Society”²⁵ met on April 28th, 1895,²⁶ adding credence to the likelihood that the 88 page document was published and released after that date. Therefore, the 80 page edition would have been the first one prepared for printing but it was not the one that was released for the general public. The reasons why will be explained later.

On the same day that she gave Mead the footnotes she also gave him the “ADDITIONAL MATTER. NOT PREPARED FOR THE COMMITTEE” which appeared on pages 75 to 80 in the 80 page edition, and in the 88 page edition on pages 79 to 84. This “ADDITIONAL MATTER” consisted of confirmation statements by Tookaram Tatyā dated April 4th, 1895, as well as by Annie Besant and Bertram Keightley, both dated April 24th, 1895, along with the “STATEMENT OF ANNIE BESANT” of the same date. The “ADDITIONAL MATTER” in the 80 page document did not include “THE MAN IN THE STREET” by G.R.S. Mead with Bertram Keightley’s confirmation and Annie Besant’s note regarding same, or the “NOTICE” on the last page.

Besant, probably because of her committed exuberance for “moral” justice,²⁷ was under enormous pressure from several Lodges and a number of influential Theosophists in England “to publish, as soon as possible, the whole evidence . . . ‘so that there may no longer be the slightest doubt what are the precise charges against Mr. Judge and the evidence in their support.’ In response to this Mrs. Besant will, on reaching England, publish the statement she drew up last July to lay before the Judicial Committee, and which

22. Tookaram Tatyā’s last sentence in his Statement in “ADDITIONAL MATTER” is not worded as though he had given Besant the letters in April 1895, the date of his Statement, but rather earlier.

23. **Lucifer**, Vol. 16, May 1895, p.250, or see Apr. 21, 1895 entry.

24. **Lucifer**, Vol. 16, May 1895, p.250.

25. **Lucifer**, Vol. 16, May 1895, p.251.

26. See Chronology, Apr. 27, 1895 entry.

27. See “Annie Besant: Her Passions and Her Relationships”, **Fohat**, Vol. IV, No.4, Winter 2000, Part 1 and Vol. V, No.1, Spring 2001, Part 2. In her speech at the Annual Convention in Dec. 1894, Besant stated that despite the difficulties in the Society regarding Judge’s refusal “to resign office or meet the charges” she would stand by the Society and bear “the difficulty as to dishonor” she expected to meet. Stating that she agreed with Olcott “as to the possibilities of unconscious fraud under mediumistic conditions” she added, “It is no excuse for an official who under mediumship commits acts of moral turpitude. . . .” **General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T. S.** (Dec. 25th to 28th, 1894), pp.44-46.

contains the evidence establishing the charges.”²⁸ The second edition (88 pages) of **The Case Against W.Q. Judge** came about partly because of this pressure she was under.

The first edition of **The Case Against W.Q. Judge** was the 80 page document to which she had Mead append the footnotes and her “STATEMENT.” Upon closer review of the document, after it was printed, she ordered some changes. These were on pages 41, 42 and 62 in both editions. The word “Heliodore”, which denoted Besant, was removed from 3 messages — two on page 41 and the other on page 42. She claimed that these messages were received by her through Judge but that they were *written on the margins of letters*. She first claimed that the messages were from the Masters as she had recognized the “red pencil” markings and the “Mahâtmâ M.” script. She lived with Blavatsky for a while so she could recognize the Master’s writing. However, she had Mead replace this word with “H——” in the 88 page edition, the one which is surmised to have been released on Monday, April 29th, 1895.

In her letter of March 27th, 1891, to Judge, H.P.B. had written regarding Besant:

Unselfishness and altruism is Annie Besant’s name, but with me and for me she is Heliodore, a name given to her by a Master, and that I use with her, it has a *deep meaning*.²⁹

One can only hypothesize what the word could have implied. In the French dictionary, **Petit Larousse**, *héliodore* is defined as a stone constituted of golden-colored beryl³⁰ (which is a gem, beryllium aluminum silicate, a very hard, lustrous mineral. . . .³¹). In a dictionary of that era, the 1893 edition of **Funk and Wagnalls**, *helio* is defined as: “Derived from Greek *helios*, the sun: a combining form denoting something pertaining to, resembling, or caused by the sun or sunlight.” “Dore” is variously defined as “a door” and as “a dumbledore”.³²

Interestingly, in the February 1888 issue of **Lucifer**, the first part in a series of articles by Franz Hartmann titled “The Talking Image of Urur” appeared. The Conclusion (Chapter XX) was published as a separate pamphlet circa 1890. In it, “the stranger whose name was Heliodorus” explained to a long-time seeker that “The Mysterious Brotherhood has been with you always; but you could not find it, because you sought for it in externalities instead of within your own inner world.” Perhaps a hint is to be found there also. In any event, the word Heliodore was removed from the document.

Another change that was ordered appears on page 62 (also page 62 in the 80 page edition) to a letter not addressed to Besant but from Judge to Olcott, dated December 28th, 1891. Here the words “[name given]” which appeared in the first (80 page) edition were replaced with “[———]”³³. However, they were not replaced in the same quotation which also appears on page 71 (page 69 in the 80 page edition), in Colonel Olcott’s “STATEMENT”.

28. **Prasnottara**, Vol. 5, April 1895, pp.23-24.

29. **H.P.B. and the Present Crisis in the T.S.**, p.4. It is also in this letter that H.P.B. mentions “She [Annie Besant] is not psychic nor spiritual in the least — all intellect. . . .”

30. **Petit Larousse**, 1980 edition.

31. **Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary**, Unabridged, second edition, 1977.

32. **Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of the English Language**, 1893 edition.

33. This individual’s name, which was known to Besant and Olcott, was also mentioned to Judge when Besant arrived in New York on November 28th, 1891. She had “confided” this secret to Judge “under plea of secrecy” about a “perfectly harmless conversation” Olcott had with this person. (See “The ‘Poison’ Letter” chapter in the Supplement for details.) According to Judge a message containing the name was precipitated through him without his knowledge in the letter he wrote to Olcott.

Statements of confirmation which appear at the end of the document in both editions under “ADDITIONAL MATTER” are questionable. The first, Tookaram Tatya’s statement, only establishes what may have happened to letters he personally received from Judge. The last sentence in what appears to be a private note to Annie Besant, and which is included as part of his confirmation statement dated April 4th, 1895, just prior to Besant leaving Bombay for England, reads: “These letters are handed over to you to make use of when required”. It does not appear to have been written with the thought that Besant had nearly completed work on her document. This sentence reflects more the idea of handing over the letters for her use if and when needed at some point in the future, leading one to believe that the letters had been handed over to Besant earlier. It would seem from the unfolding of events that his letters were already in Besant’s possession before the date of his confirmation and may in fact have been handed to her at the Annual Convention in December 1893. What seems more probable is that she consulted with Mr. Tatya before she left Bombay for England and received his permission to use his private note as a statement of confirmation.

Bertram Keightley supplied a statement of confirmation, dated April 24th, 1895. He had taken leave from his commitments as General Secretary of the Indian Section to come to England.³⁴ He was present for the changes and, in all likelihood, also a member of the verifying committee to examine the prepared document prior to its release. Keightley was also in Benares when Besant prepared her document and likely helped her write it as well. The footnote by the verifying committee on page 39³⁵ is not found in the 80 page document, which is another indication that it was the first edition. This footnote was added to the 2nd edition of **The Case Against W. Q. Judge**, the 88 page copy released on April 29th, after the verifying committee checked out the document — as reported and documented to have occurred.

Another interesting detail is the content of Keightley’s signed statement referring to his review one year earlier: “I hereby declare and attest that when Mrs. Besant was preparing the above statement last year (1894) for presentation to the Judicial Committee, I carefully examined the letters from Mr. Judge to Mrs. Besant mentioned therein and verified the accuracy of the extracts quoted, and the fact that the context in no way altered or changed the sense of these extracts.” As detailed, Besant admitted in the “ADDITIONAL MATTER” segment of **The Case Against W.Q. Judge** (p.82), that she did not have the documentary evidence to present. This is why Bertram Keightley’s statement was needed in this document. It was included to substantiate Besant’s claims and to support her allegations. She did not have any documents to present except those supplied by others: the ones Olcott held in India, including the main document on which her case against Judge was based: Exhibit “A”. Unfortunately, Bertram Keightley was also under the influence of Chakravarti. Therefore, how trustworthy were perception and interpretation of events? How distorted were the facts — the TRUTH?

The first (80 page) edition was published and circulated among Besant’s friends and those whom she thought were on her side. Since the edition with the word “Heliodore” was already printed she kept it for reasons we can only speculate. Mrs. Cleather ended up receiving a copy, probably because at that time she had not committed as to who she supported and also because she was a member of the Esoteric Section. The 88 page document was the copy from which Basil Crump, Barrister-at-Law, did his analysis. Crump did not pursue the differences between the two editions although, within days of its release, he did provide his professional

34. Keightley was “summoned to England by the dangerous illness of his aged mother, and left Bombay . . . on Feb.16, [1895].” **The Theosophist** Vol.16, April 1895, p.467.

35. This note, referring to a letter from Judge to Olcott written May 15th, 1883, was obviously added to emphasize that Judge had not been in contact with the Masters since 1875. However, it inadvertently supports the fact that Judge was in contact with the Masters prior to his initiation in 1884 (while in India) but could not yet control the impressions he was receiving.

analysis of her “prosecutor’s brief” as a legal document.³⁶ At a quick glance both editions look the same — therefore no independent historian, as far as can be determined, has previously explored the mystery of two editions.

Further to the interview with **The Westminster Budget**: The interviewer proceeded to question Besant: “But what does Master Morya say to Mr. Judge’s doings?” She replied:

He told me first that the messages were forged. He said, when I showed him one of them, ‘It is not mine. Judge has done it.’ Eighteen months ago³⁷ he told me I must clear this matter up, and I have struggled ever since to do so. How hard the struggle has been, that no one knows, for I have stood all alone. All that happened last summer was only an effort to do the Master’s bidding. But my hands were tied then; I could do no more than I actually did, and immediately after the conference last summer I was bound, under penalties, to keep my appointments in Australia. I have had the full evidence against Judge for eighteen months, and I am now preparing it all, from the very first for publication.

It appears that Besant has been caught in some contradictions. Ironically, while she was being interviewed by **The Westminster Budget**, her document, **The Case Against W.Q. Judge** was getting readied for print. During the interview she claimed to have had the “full evidence” for eighteen months, while on page 82 of her pamphlet she claimed to have destroyed all the letters she had received from Judge and therefore could not produce this “documentary evidence”. Contradictory statements, both in print, only days apart: one given to the newspapers shortly after her return to London on April 21st, and the other in her “STATEMENT” written on April 24th.

Another point which comes out of this interview is that she is “now preparing it all, from the very first for publication.” At the time, the technology was available and other letters in the handwriting of the Masters had been reproduced and printed. It should, therefore, have been possible to do the same with at least some of “the full evidence” alluded to in **The Westminster Budget** interview. However, not one of the supposedly forged messages in Besant’s so-called evidence was ever published.

“O what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive!” Interestingly the first person deceived was herself — Annie Besant. Unfortunately, because of her skills of persuasion she caught many others in her web of deception. Where was the evidence that Besant ever was in contact with Masters? And yet she obviously influenced a large number of people with messages she claimed originated from that source. It seems that she had one standard for herself and another for Judge.

In his **The Case Against W.Q. Judge. A Review**, Basil Crump stated:

If this case were being tried before a proper tribunal, there would certainly be no defence required. But alas! it is being tried by lynch-law. And what *proof* have we in this ‘brief’? . . . THERE IS NO PROOF. . . From preface to conclusion it would be child’s play to pick to pieces and pulverise.

In fact she presented no evidence to support her claims and, therefore, no lawyer would have been willing to take her case for he would have risked being charged for bringing a frivolous case before the Courts. Basil Crump further stated about the so-called notes Besant had kept:

No Court of Law would look at an extract, apart from the document as a whole. It is simply outrageous that these extracts should be put forward as ‘evidence.’ . . . Extracts have been preserved; *the letters themselves have been destroyed by the prosecutor.*³⁸

36. See Chronology, May 5, 1895 entry.

37. “Eighteen months ago” is November 1893, approximately when Besant spent time with Chakravarti in Allahabad (near Benares).

38. See Chronology, May 5, 1895 entry for more details.

It becomes abundantly clear that her so-called case was to be tried in the court of public opinion in order to destroy Judge's reputation and, as he stated, to "completely blacken my character and destroy, if possible, my usefulness".³⁹ In a letter to the Editor of **The Irish Theosophist**, Dr. Archibald Keightley wrote, "It is significant that Mrs. Besant admitted to many persons in July, 1894, that she was aware these charges could not be actually proven against Mr. Judge."⁴⁰

Judge's response to the charges can best be summarized with his words:

They may charge me and publish her so-called addresses as much as they like. If they publish a thousand documents, I do not intend to defend them. I intend to make my own explanation of the affair and drop it there.⁴¹

H.P. Blavatsky, referring to W.Q. Judge in her "Introduction to E.S. Instruction No. III" stated:

I now call upon all those who will remain true to their pledges to do their duty by both, *when the time comes*, and especially by their American brother. Both are threatened and both are hated by certain persons as unjustly as I am by some unprincipled enemies who would still call themselves Theosophists.

Speaking of difficulties in the Society at that time H.P.B. added:

Brother Judge refuses to defend himself . . . No man who knows himself innocent ever will. But is that a reason why *we* should let him go undefended. . . . when he is selected by the enemy as the mark of all the lying and damaging attacks of those who wish to destroy the Society in order to build on its ruins another, a *bogus* Body of the same name, and to enshrine therein an idol with feet of clay and a heart full of selfishness and evil, for the admiration and worship of credulous fools? Can we allow them to achieve this object when they seek to ensure success by ruining the character of this most unselfish champion of our T.S.?⁴²

If perchance this case had been brought before a Court of Law, Annie Besant would have been exposed for what she really was — an irrepressible, impetuous person moved by her intellectual prowess, and a persuasive individual who believed herself to be the epitome of moral decency standing "on moral ground before the world"⁴³ because she *thought* she had the truth. She was duped and convinced through deception by occult means that no one other than herself could possibly perceive the truth — and there was no one to stop her. Charles Johnston⁴⁴ expressed it well when he stated:

Mrs. Besant ceased to be a member of the Theosophical Society in 1896, after she had fallen under Brahmanical influence and had violated fundamental theosophical principles; with her gift for publicity, she carried a certain number of people with her, and the same gift has added to their number. But, since the year 1896, what Mrs. Besant has said or done has been quite irrelevant to real Theosophy, or relevant

39. **Reply By William Q. Judge** (pamphlet), p.1.

40. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, March 1895, p.95.

41. **Report of Proceedings T.S. in America**, 1895, p.37.

42. **Blavatsky Collected Writings**, Vol. 12 (1980), pp.593-595.

43. **General Report of the 19th Anniversary of the T.S.** (Dec. 25th to 28th, 1894), p.46. In her address at the Convention, Besant used this phrase to describe the Society and, by association, the expectation regarding its officials. While not an official herself, Besant was a member of the E.S.T. whose rules set a higher standard of conduct expected of its members.

44. Charles Johnston (1855-1931) joined the T.S. in 1885 and met H.P. Blavatsky in the spring of 1887. He married H.P.B.'s niece, Vera V. de Zhelihovsky, in London shortly after. Johnston was a brilliant scholar and an accomplished Sanskritist and Orientalist who wrote many articles and translated into English many Indian scriptures as well as others from German and Russian texts.

only so far as she misuses that sacred name as a label for her activities. Her work is a travesty of Theosophy, and it has become a sacrilegious travesty.⁴⁵

H.P.B. had great respect for Judge's occult standing, as demonstrated by the fact that he was *the only* individual from whom she never requested a Pledge in the Esoteric Section.⁴⁶ Judge had written the Book of Rules for the E.S.T. and was jointly involved in the writing of Instructions circulated among its members. H.P.B. stated about Judge: "He is one of the three founders of the Theosophical Society, the only three who have remained as true as rock to the Cause. While others have all turned deserters or enemies, he has ever remained faithful to his original pledge."⁴⁷ On the other hand Besant demonstrated a complete lack of respect for Judge's work and through her actions in preparing her **Case Against W.Q. Judge** ignored her Pledge.

As a member of the Esoteric Section, Annie Besant would have vowed:

I pledge myself never to listen without protest, to any evil thing spoken falsely or yet unproven against a brother Theosophist, and abstain from condemning others.

and as H.P.B. quoted from the *Book of Discipline* in the Schools of Dyzan:

*If thou canst not fulfil thy pledge, refuse to take it, but once thou hast bound thyself to any promise, carry it out, even if thou hast to die for it.*⁴⁸

Annie Besant once proclaimed that *she never betrayed a trust.*

And I do not think that my worst enemy can say of me that I have ever betrayed a cause or a person, or used a friend's trust for a private end.⁴⁹

In fact she broke her Pledges and the Rules of the Esoteric Section of the Theosophical Society as well as those of the Inner Group. She betrayed not only Judge but also her teacher, H.P. Blavatsky, and her teacher's Teachers — she betrayed all those theosophists who aspired to "Universal Brotherhood" and looked up to her for leadership, guidance and above all TRUTH.

45. A lecture by Charles Johnston, on April 25th, 1926, at the Convention of The Theosophical Society. **Theosophical Quarterly**, Vol. 24, July 1926, p.14.

46. **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, June 1895, p.154; **Theos. Forum (P.L.)**, Vol. 5, June 1934, pp.132-133. See Chronology, June 15, 1895 entry.

47. **Blavatsky Collected Writings**, Vol. 12 (1980), pp.593-594.

48. **Blavatsky Collected Writings**, Vol. 12 (1980), E.S. Instruction No. III, pp.589 and 592.

49. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 11, March 1890, Supp. p.cxiii.

9a. **The Case Against W. Q. Judge.** (1895)

[3]

PART I.

LETTER TO MEMBERS OF THE T. S.

BY

ANNIE BESANT.

[5]

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE T.S.

BROTHERS AND SISTERS,

In sending out to you, at the request of many Lodges and representative members of the T. S., the evidence in support of the six charges made by me against Mr. W. Q. Judge, Vice-President of the T. S., and in placing in your hands the document prepared by me to lay before the Judicial Committee in July, 1894, I feel that an explanation is due to you from myself, as a member of our Brotherhood, of the line of action adopted, and the motives which actuated me, more full and definite than I am bound to lay before the public.

This course is necessitated by the false issues which are being raised by Mr. Judge and his adherents in order to cloud the real issue raised last year: "Is Mr. Judge guilty or not guilty of circulating bogus Mahâtmic messages?" The old advice, "No case, abuse the plaintiff's attorney," has never, perhaps, been more deftly and unscrupulously acted upon than on the present occasion, and the absence on Society work of "the plaintiff's attorney" has very much facilitated the carrying out of the plan, and the consequent obscuring of the original issue. Such a hail of attacks has been poured on me in published pamphlets and private letters, by Mr. Judge, Dr. Archibald Keightley, Dr. Buck, Mr. E. T. Hargrove, and others, that it is impossible for me—were it even worth while—to answer them one by one. Dr. Archibald Keightley, especially, makes the most extraordinary assertions as to supposed psychic experiences of my own—of which he cannot possibly have any knowledge save by the delusive and uncorroborated testimony of a psychic—and I have not time to contradict all these absurdities. I cannot answer in detail, for the sake of defending myself personally, all the accusations, nor correct all the misstatements and half truths, that distort past occurrences, and becloud present issues. Whether I be, or be not, moved by ambition, love of power, envy, etc., whether I be, or be not, an agent of Black Magicians, or deluded, or confused, or self-contradictory; all this does not affect the main question, "Has Mr. Judge forged scripts adopted by the Mahâtmâs?" In answer to that [6] question I lay before you the evidence, on which you can form your own judgment.

Further, in deference to the urgent representations of some members whose opinions have weight with me, I give you, at the cost of some pain to myself, a frank narrative that may make clear to you my motives, and enable you—if you think it worth while—to see the relation between the separate facts which are skilfully marshalled against each other as though inconsistent. I say at some pain to myself; for I have until now rigidly refrained from dragging the holy name of the Master into this controversy, and have preferred to bear blame rather than shelter myself by an appeal to Him. What I now say on this will be of weight only to such of you as believe in the existence of the Masters, but even with you it should not overbear your own judgment and reason. These things cannot be proven, they can only be seen as true or false by the intuition of each hearer; anyone can claim authority from the unseen world, and every claim should be judged on its merits, none should be accepted as of external authority. On this a disciple writes me as he was lately instructed, and as one of the lessons that should be learned from the present troubles, I lay it before you, ere

going further, that you may not suppose that in stating what is authoritative to me I am seeking to dominate you:

Those who believe in Occultism and the Great Masters should never forget that there are innumerable invisible agencies, hosts of Elementals and Elementaries—from little Nature-Spirits to the highest Angels, from Puck-like mischievous imps to the Arch-demon himself—pervading all space. A neophyte, therefore, cannot be too careful in distinguishing impressions, sounds, visions, caused by the dark side of Nature, illusions thrown up by his own sub-conscious desires, or cast by embodiments of falsehood, from the voice and teaching of the Brothers of the White Lodge, the sage precepts of the Incarnations of Truth.

The Masters of Wisdom lead Their humble disciples step by step to the glorious region of light, shewing to them each step they have to take, and helping them to assimilate each new truth they are taught, and at every step preparing them for the next. Concerned as these Merciful Beings are with the spiritual development of mankind, with the *drawing out* of the highest faculties, the noblest virtues of the neophyte, They never try to *force* upon him a proposition, which he is not ready to accept, even though the proposition embody a great truth. Know then for [7] a fact, that nothing comes from the Master which does not bring the most absolute conviction to the mind, and find the completest echo from the heart. That which is opposed to one's reason and revolting to one's moral sense is never from the Great Ones. For Their words illumine the mind and soothe the heart; they come like rays of light into dark places, and remove instead of creating confusion.

You know that even an ordinary schoolmaster, if he be expert in his profession, will not confuse his pupils who have scarcely mastered the four simple rules of arithmetic with an enunciation of the principles of the Binomial Theorem and Differential Calculus. How then should an Adept, a Mahâtmâ, Who is so much wiser, follow methods which are far more calculated to mystify the soul than to enlighten it?

Is it again likely that the Lords of Perfection would demand of Their humble servants blind faith, and a following opposed alike to reason and to principle? Is it possible that these Knowing and Seeing Ones would seek to blind and delude their loved disciples? No, the wise Masters do not tax your credulity, nor stagnate the growth of your soul. For to tax one's credulity is to paralyse one's reason, to starve one's intuition, to shut off the Divine Light, which alone can perfect the life of the Ego. The Master's method is not to storm or surprise the disciple, but so gently to open his inner vision as to make him think and feel that he has himself found the light and the truth.

Two other preliminary matters—the question of charity and brotherhood, and the accusation that Mr. Judge has been kept in the dark, and refused copies of the documents. Some seem to think that brotherhood demands that no notice should be taken of wrong, that it should be allowed to go on unchecked; is it against brotherhood to interfere with a man who is murdering another, or to save a person from being defrauded by warning him of a deception practised against him? If not, why should it be against brotherhood not to stand by and see people led astray and deluded in silence? why should we be told that, in deference to brotherhood, we must connive at the destruction of a great spiritual movement, by allowing the poison of deception to filter through every vein? Such brotherhood would be the brotherhood of thieves. Not so did H. P. Blavatsky understand brotherhood. On the contrary, while condemning backbiting and evil-speaking, she wrote as follows of the duty of public officials and preachers towards immorality [8] outside the Society, and of private members of the T.S. where the wrong-doing of a member was concerned.

“If a Theosophist happens to be a public officer, a judge or magistrate, a barrister, or even a preacher, it is then of course his duty to his country, his conscience, and those who put their trust in him, to ‘denounce severely’ every case of ‘treachery, falsehood and rascality,’ *even* in private life; but *nota bene*, only if he is appealed to and called to exercise his legal authority, not otherwise. This is neither ‘speaking evil’ nor ‘condemning,’ but truly working for humanity; seeking to preserve society, which is a portion of it, from being imposed upon, and protecting the property of the citizens, entrusted to their care as public officers, from being recklessly taken away. But what has a ‘working’ member of the T. S., independent of any public

function or office, and who is neither judge, public prosecutor nor preacher, to do with the misdeeds of his neighbours, or some still worse crime? and if another member becomes possessed of irrefutable evidence to that effect, it may become his painful duty to bring the same under the notice of the Council of his Branch. Our Society has to be protected, as also its numerous members. This again would be only simple justice. *A natural and truthful statement of facts cannot be regarded as 'evil-speaking' or as a condemnation of one's brother.* [Italics mine.] Between this, however, and deliberate backbiting there is a wide chasm."¹

But it is a chasm entirely overlooked by Mr. Judge's adherents. H. P. B. has here drawn the circumstances for us; a public teacher was appealed to to take action, and sought to lay irrefutable evidence before the tribunal appointed by the Constitution for the trial of a Vice-President. The statement prepared is now laid before you, and you can judge whether or not it is "natural and truthful." The failure in brotherhood would have been in not seeking to preserve the Society from being imposed on.

The complaints of Mr. Judge that he has been refused copies of the documents are not true, nor is it true that I promised him copies of the documents. I refused to shew him the documents because he had copies in the statement of those I was going to use, and I did not care to run any risks with the originals. These were, however, shown to him afterwards by Colonel Olcott at my request, and he took his own time in scrutinising them; all the more important ones bear his own endorsement, [9] "Seen, July 19th, 1894, W. Q. J." He made no complaint at the time that he was hurried in his inspection. As to copies, no duty lies on me to supply Mr. Judge with copies, still less with copies of long letters on various subjects, in which perhaps only a few sentences are cogent to the charges made; I have not the time to make copies, nor am I inclined to undertake the cost of having them transcribed; if Mr. Judge chooses to appoint a trustworthy copyist, such a person can come and make copies of all the documents, used and not used. Since the Spring of 1894, he has had, as given in the appended presentment of the case, a copy of all the written evidence I was going to use. What he has not had is a copy of all the irrelevant parts of the letters from which the relevant passages are taken.

To turn now to the narration of events:

I met Mr. Judge first in April, 1891, when sent to America by Madame Blavatsky to make his acquaintance and to carry a message from her to the American Convention. I knew of him that he had been one of Madame Blavatsky's pupils in the early days, and he showed me a letter of hers, in which she spoke of him as being one of the founders of the T. S. I knew that from the year 1886 Mr. Judge had been working in America for the Society, with marked ability, devotion and success, that he had sacrificed for it his means of livelihood, and worked with unswerving courage and unflinching purpose. I found him to be a man of clear insight, shrewd ability, earnest devotion, and some psychic gifts, so that he was available to some extent as a medium of communication with persons not physically present. He claimed to have given sixteen years (from 1875 to 1891) of unbroken service to the T. S. and the Masters, and this long period of service gave him weight in my eyes. It was not until Christmas, 1893, that I learned that the "sixteen years" were illusory, that for the greater part of them little work was done, that during part of them there was a complete breach between H. P. Blavatsky and himself, and that at one time she uttered most bitter reproaches against him and regarded him as having become her enemy. This first illusion of his long and unbroken service—while I was young in the service of the T. S., though not in the service of the Humanity for the helping of which the T. S. was founded—coloured my whole attitude to him, made me regard him as an Occultist far more advanced than myself, and was a considerable factor in my later deception.

[10] My first-hand experience of the Masters, before I met Mr. Judge, had been clear, definite, and absolutely convincing to me. On this was based my statement as to their existence, in my Hall of Science speech,

1. "Is Denunciation a Duty?" *Lucifer*, Vol. III.

August, 1891, the statement so ingeniously distorted by the *Westminster Gazette* into pledging myself to the letters I had also spoken of. This experience began in 1889. In the beginning of the year, before I joined the T. S., I was making desperate efforts to pierce the darkness, and was seeking with passionate earnestness to obtain some direct evidence of the existence of the Soul and of the superphysical world; one evening as I sat alone, concentrating my mind on this longing, I heard the Master's voice—but knew not whose it was—and after some questions asked by Him and answered by me, came the promise that I should soon find the light—a promise quickly verified. As I did not till later know Who had spoken to me, I ought not to put this as evidence at that time, and it was in the summer of 1889 that I gained my first direct evidence. I was in Fontainebleau, and was sleeping in a small room by myself; I was waked suddenly and sat up in bed startled, to find the air of the room thrown into pulsing electrical waves, and then appeared the radiant astral Figure of the Master, visible to my physical eyes. Between that summer and my meeting Mr. Judge in 1891, I had had a considerable number of such first-hand experiences, appealing to sight, hearing and touch, to say nothing of the exquisite fragrance, generally accompanying such manifestations, and the statements made to me on some of these occasions were of such a nature that they were verified by subsequent events. Hence my remark at the Hall of Science: “unless every sense can be at the same time deceived . . . I have exactly the same certainty for the truth of these statements, as I have for the fact that you are here.” The expression was not too strong for the facts, though absurd and out of place when distorted to a support of any letters, and I fail to see any over-credulity in the acceptance of this reiterated experience of my senses. It was of these experiences, related to her by me, that H. P. Blavatsky wrote to Mr. Judge, under date March 27th, 1891: “She hears the Master's voice when alone, sees His Light, and recognises His Voice from that of D——.” I have hitherto kept silence on these matters, because they are not useful in public discussion and cannot (and ought not to) have any value beyond that which my word may give them, for I cannot prove them. I have contented myself with the assertion that [11] I have personal knowledge of the existence of the Masters—a statement made in obedience to H. P. Blavatsky's wish; but I mention them to you now, my T. S. brothers, in order that you may better understand later events.

Mr. Judge came to England after H. P. B.'s departure in 1891, and then came my first receipt of “letters from the Masters.” I had seen the scripts adopted by Them for communication made through H. P. B., and was familiar theoretically with the way in which precipitations were made, both through mediums and by Occultists. I had, as related above, ample proof of Their objective existence, altogether apart from Mr. Judge. It therefore seemed to me by no means strange that precipitations should be made through Mr. Judge, and I no more dreamed of “test conditions,” than any man of ordinary intelligence demands test conditions ere he will credit an ordinary telegram or letter; such a man, without being foolishly gullible, might easily be deceived by a forged telegram. It is easy to be wise after the event, and in the light of all the evidence placed in the hands of the *Westminster Gazette*, but I did not see that evidence till Christmas, 1893, and took action within a few days of seeing it.

Nor was this all; half heart-broken at H. P. B.'s death, and shrinking from the responsibilities she had laid upon me, and for which I felt unprepared, I was only too glad to find from the “messages” that these responsibilities were to be shared with Mr. Judge, and this sharing was in accord with the many expressions of affection and confidence in letters from her shewn to me by Mr. Judge, and since published to the world. I knew nothing then of her expressions of disapproval and doubt concerning him, nor have these been since given equal publicity by himself and his adherents, although necessary if we are to have her full opinion of him; half her opinion is misleading. The “messages” being thus welcome in their contents, in accord with extracts from H. P. B.'s letters, and in the recognised script, no thought of challenging their authenticity entered my head. I mentioned them at the Hall of Science, not to establish my belief in the existence of the

Masters—based on quite other evidence—but merely to say that the continuance of the scripts after H. P. B.’s death was “rather a curious fact against the whole challenge of fraud” made against her.²

[12] Some have asked why the Masters did not interfere to enlighten me. To what end? No growth of intuition—the power of discriminative vision—would be possible if the aspirant is to be given the use of the eyes of others. He has to learn *to see*, and to gain discrimination by suffering, for many are the illusions that will surround him, and he will always remain helplessly their prey unless the inner vision be opened by the pain that follows on mistakes. And it seems to me further that if, at that time, I had discovered the deception worked by one regarded as H. P. B.’s most devoted chela, so soon after her death, I should not have been strong enough to have borne the shock, nor clear-sighted enough to have separated the unfaithful worker from the noble work of the T. S. I might have left the Society in hasty disgust. Information is never given by occult methods to a soul not strong enough to receive it; were it so given, evolution would be paralysed and natural growth prevented; such a one is left to ordinary means of information until strong enough to bear more blinding light; when that time comes, the light is given, which would earlier have dazzled and confused.

The “messages” received by me through Mr. Judge were not numerous, and there was nothing in any of them to arouse suspicion. It was the first few of these only of which I spoke at the Hall of Science.

Meantime I was drawing nearer to the Masters and learning much, and was gathering strength for the coming trial. Several times I was warned that serious trouble was approaching, and that I should find myself isolated in the coming struggle, but I did not relate these warnings to rumours that began to circulate that Mr. Judge was fabricating messages from the Masters, and I met these rumours—which were substantiated by no shadow of evidence—with entire disbelief, as any other loyal-hearted person would treat unsupported vague accusations against a friend. Mr. Old’s and Mr. Edge’s article in *The Theosophist* of April, 1893, was met by Mr. Judge in a way that made me a little uneasy, but I had already recognised in him a certain fondness for roundabout methods, for gaining an end indirectly rather than directly. So I put down what would have been in myself an evasive reply to his legal way of looking at things. His request to me to erase the supposed seal of the Master from a message again distressed me, as I could conceive no reason for erasing it, were it genuine. But the idea was to me incredible that a man who had worked so devotedly and—as [13] I still thought—for so long and uninterrupted a period, could deliberately imitate the scripts of the Masters, and it seemed as though it would have been easier to reject even circumstantial evidence (sometimes proved wrong in the inferences drawn from it, however conclusive on its face), had such been forthcoming, than to give credence to the thought of his guilt. Of evidence at that time, however, I had none, only vague accusations, and so far was I from crediting these that I remember saying that before I could believe Mr. Judge guilty, I should need the word of the Master, given to me face to face.

I went to America in September, 1893. Some words and acts of Mr. Judge awoke again in me a fear, for he spoke in a veiled way that seemed to imply that he was going to use Master’s authority where no such authority had been given. The result was that I made a direct appeal to the Master, when alone, stating that I did feel some doubt as to Mr. Judge’s use of His name, and praying Him to endorse or disavow the messages I had received through him. He appeared to me as I had so often before seen Him, clearly, unmistakably, and I then learned from Him directly that the messages were not done by Him, and that they were done by Mr. Judge. (I informed few people of this last year, but among the few were Mr. Judge, Dr. Buck and Dr. Keightley, so that they knew on Whose authority my knowledge was based, though I made no public claim.) No details were given to me by Him, but word was sent to me a little later that no action might be taken before the public on information that I could not prove—and how could I prove what had occurred to me when alone?—but that I should find evidence on reaching Adyar. If on reading that evidence I found

2. See *1875 to 1891*, the verbatim report, published at the time.

that, with other facts known to me, it was intellectually convincing, then I should take action to put an end to the deception practised. The order to take action was repeated to me at Adyar, after the evidence was in my hands, and I was bidden to wash away the stains on the T. S. "Take up the heavy Karma of the Society. Your strength was given you for this." How could I, who believed in Him, disobey?

When I reached Adyar, I found I had no choice as to looking into the evidence, even had I wished to disobey my instructions. Messrs. Old and Edge had appealed to me to see if the evidence of fraud was not enough to justify their article, and in addition appeals were made to me from various parts of India, and from important members of the T. S., to take some action which [14] should put an end to the vague and injurious accusations which were current, and enable Mr. Judge to answer the charges, if answer were possible. Until I reached Adyar, Christmas, 1893, I did not know what evidence was available; up to that time I had mentioned the fact that I knew Mr. Judge had deceived me only to four persons—to Mr. Chakravarti, to Mr. Bertram Keightley (who broached the subject to me, he having information of his own), to Countess Wachtmeister just before reaching Ceylon, and to Colonel Olcott after my arrival, when he spoke to me of serious evidence in his hands. At Adyar I looked over the incriminating documents, and was startled by the double game Mr. Judge had been playing in England and in India, as well as by the trivial and impossible character of the supposed "messages"; it was at once clear why he had steadily opposed my going to India, and why all had been done that was possible to prevent my becoming friendly with Colonel Olcott. I wrote to Mr. Judge early in January, and privately, asking him to resign the Presidency-elect and the co-Headship of the E. S. T. The whole pretence of long under-hand plotting against Mr. Judge, as well as of sudden public action, thus falls to the ground. I wrote to Mr. Judge a few days after I had the evidence, and wrote privately, so that by a voluntary resignation he might free the Society, and thus prevent the necessity of taking public action against him.

I know it is now said that Mr. Judge was not President-elect, so could not resign the succession. This is an after-thought, though so much has been made of it. At that time, like everyone else, he considered himself definitely as Colonel Olcott's successor. He strongly urged the insertion of his name as Colonel Olcott's successor in the constitution of the T. S., under revision in 1893, having prepared the way by the document sent to Colonel Olcott, and given below on p.33, directing the Colonel to nominate him as successor; in August, 1893, he wrote to Colonel Olcott, complaining: "You have fostered by want of a good stand the idea that they think my presidency 'conditional' (that is the word) and it a possibility that I may not have the office;" he wrote to me under date, Feb. 20th, 1894: "I refuse to accede to your propositions to (a) retire from the E. S. T., and (b) to resign the successorship to the Presidency of the T. S." He wrote at the same time to the household in Avenue Road that I asked him to "resign the successorship to the Presidency of the T. S., to which I have been elected." Further, in New York, in 1893, he offered to [15] give me a letter to Colonel Olcott, resigning the succession, in case Colonel Olcott preferred any other successor; and under date Jan. 15th, 1894, he wrote as follows to Mr. Chakravarti, whom he now says he knew to be an agent of Black Magicians: "Annie, as you know, has been asked by H. S. O. (a) to become President of T. S., and (b) to stay in India. I see that she desires to stay there, and I also see that she would, if ordered, try to be President, and of course in such an event she would have my help, even though I know from intellect she is not fit. But of course my help only goes with an order. Hence I do not see in the future that she will get such an order.³ I therefore mentally leave her out of the matter for that office. Her staying in India has nothing to do with that. But how does it strike your noble mind to be President yourself? Without an order I would gladly ask all the T. S. to have you its next President, if you would agree. It needs as President to be in India just a man like you. Will you tell me what you think of the idea? If I cannot get you to look with favour on it, then my next idea will be to keep thinking of your coming to work here, and keep wishing that Olcott may live for twenty years, so that I could work here with you and for you. I am not joking one little bit in this." It was with regard

3. Compare this with the insinuations in the *April Path* on my action at that date.

to this that I wrote, as quoted in *Path*, that Mr. Chakravarti—Mr. Judge uses the initial X.—would not have the Presidency at any price.

I add here certain other facts as to Mr. Judge's attitude towards Mr. Chakravarti, whom he now assails so gratuitously, without any provocation. The change of attitude occurred when he found he could not use Mr. Chakravarti to crush me. Until then, he treated him as his helper and superior; thus he wrote in the letter quoted above: "I am bound to keep you informed. Other letters from London say that you told them you were a chela of a Master who is not M.,⁴ but that when in the West you took orders or the like through the latter, and 'that you must keep silent as to Judge'. Now if you did not say this it shows discernment on the part of the person; if you did say so, then I am assured of the person's truth, and that is the sole reason why I write it. So I beg you will not read it to mean that I am growling, or think you have to explain to me; if you [16] like you can confirm it or not. As it is the same as you said to me, except 'that you must keep silent as to Judge,' it merely means now that I get this right from the other person, or am able by your help to find out if it be a guess on the person's part. Am I justified in analysing the message you gave me as to these words, 'satisfied with work in America,' as thanks for work in T. S. field? The analysis will make a difference to me, and you are the only man I can ask. For, thanks to me for work in the field of Theosophy covers the world, while the 'in America' relates solely to the latter place." He writes on Oct. 20th, 1893, as to "your loving friends here" that they "are full of love for you and happy recollections," and thanks him "for your presence and all your work and words." On Feb. 8th, 1894, he writes to him as to myself: "Now she has her own place and powers and can rely on herself"—this after I had carried out "the plot," and was acting under the influence of the Brâhmans and Black Magicians! After Mr. Judge had received my letter demanding his retirement, and when he had all his "inner knowledge" of Mr. Chakravarti's agency and of his being the influence directing my actions against himself, Mr. Judge still appealed to Mr. Chakravarti for help against me; he wrote him on Feb. 23rd, 1894: "She could not have seen the presence round you of the One who wears a yellow turban. . . . London household is against her. Much of her influence is gone and more will slip away. . . . I trust that when she has had the benefit of your wise counsels, she will not only see that she must undo this, but also *how* to do it." And Mr. Judge wrote to London: "Annie has asserted that G. N. Chakravarti acted in August, September and October for the Master, both in New York and London; *this is correct in my opinion also.*" (Italics mine.)

Compare all this with the unprovoked attacks on Mr. Chakravarti in the circular of Nov. 3rd, 1894, and since, and the pretence of "inner knowledge," and the reports of spies about one who was acting "for the Master." The attacks are the more unworthy in that Mr. Chakravarti did nothing to invite them, and had only stepped out of his quiet and silent life for the sake of doing a great service to the T. S. as its delegate at a very heavy cost to himself.

The succeeding steps are all within the knowledge of members, and I need only again remark that the pretence raised that Mr. Judge did not know the case against him is false. I sent to him the statement now issued to the T. S., and all that would [17] have been added to it would have been the *viva-voce* statements of the witnesses, who would have merely substantiated my summary. With this before him, he elected to challenge the jurisdiction of the Committee, first on the ground that he was not legally Vice-President at all (though he had borne the title for years and acted as such), and, when that was decided against him, that the acts were not Vice-Presidential acts. The view so much pressed that the Committee would have infringed the doctrinal neutrality of the Society by listening to the charges and the defence, blurs the essential fact that Mr. Judge escaped the investigation on a purely technical plea, and by his own action prevented the charges from being heard. It is therefore a little absurd now to complain that he is being accused without being given an opportunity for defence, and to demand that we shall again go through all the weary technicalities of

4. This is now perverted into "the chela of a chela."

getting a representative body together, perhaps only again to have the hearing prevented by some new technicality.

The failure of the Judicial Committee, and Mr. Judge's refusal of a Jury of Honour, were followed on the evening of the same day by an attempt on Mr. Judge's part to force the question on suddenly before a "Committee" of the persons who happened to be on the premises that evening, after Mr. Sinnett, Mr. Burrows, Mr. Bertram Keightley, Mr. Firth and other well-known members had left. His own personal adherents would have formed the Committee, and would merely have white-washed him, and I declined to go before such a Committee at all, angrily as it was pressed on me. Mr. Judge then agreed to a Committee for the following day, but barred the following as members; Mr. Sinnett, Mr. Keightley, Mr. Herbert Burrows, Mr. E. T. Sturdy, and I think Mr. Firth—who had shown himself unfavourably impressed with Mr. Judge's tactics before the Judicial Committee. As this really made the Committee a farce, I again declined, despite all threats of the representations that should be made to my detriment before the Theosophical public—threats since abundantly carried out. I reluctantly agreed to a volunteer Committee, if impartial, but refused absolutely to be a party to hushing-up the matter by placing the evidence before a picked body of Mr. Judge's adherents. Then Dr. Buck intervened, on the day of the Convention, urging me to make a statement to the meeting in the evening, and in order to make clear exactly what I meant by saying in that statement that I did not charge Mr. Judge with forgery, in the ordinary sense of the word, but with giving [18] a misleading material form to messages psychically received, I must divide the "messages" into three sets.

One, those received by myself, with nothing about them to arouse suspicion;

Second, designed to influence T. S. action, some of this possibly thought by Mr. Judge to be put into his mind;

Third, trivial, undignified, erroneous, and (in one case) malicious, and tending to Mr. Judge's personal advantage.

In the first class were those I had myself received, and I thought that Mr. Judge's error lay in deliberately imitating the script in writing in order to give them more weight than they would have had, had he honestly repeated them to me as psychic impressions. These were the only ones of which the public had any knowledge, and on which it had therefore been misled, and the only ones consequently on which the public had any right to an explanation. On these I spoke, and my statement was clear and precise.

On the second class, in connection with which there was clear evidence of duplicity and intrigue, I kept silence, because debarred from explaining the circumstances and producing the evidence, and I shrank from making a damaging statement unsupported by proof. In fact, I was checkmated, and did not see what further I could do for the time.

With regard to the third class, where the question of forgery arose, I was still in doubt when I made my statement, whether Mr. Judge was morally, though I knew he was physically, responsible for them. Men of the world will probably regard this as incredible, but any who are conversant with the perplexities of mediumship and psychism will understand my hesitancy, and why I could not charge forgery where the challenged person had not been heard in explanation. There was clear and indubitable evidence that frauds had been committed by the use of two scripts, recognised as adopted for Mahâtmâ communications. The evidence connecting Mr. Judge with these frauds was so cogent that, failing a satisfactory explanation from him as to some form of lower mediumship, of which he was the unfortunate victim, his guilt must be taken as proved. But when I spoke at the Convention, I hoped some explanation would be forthcoming with regard to the "messages" that were obviously spurious and fraudulent, and I clung to that hope till Mr. Judge left

England. It seemed possible that he might have been controlled mediumistically by injurious influences, and I therefore refrained from charging [19] him with forgery. I drew up the case from the documents very carefully as a statement of facts, and my object in sending it to Mr. Judge was that he might explain, if he could, the circumstances that seemed to condemn him. Till his explanation was before me I was more than willing to give him the benefit of the doubt, and I suspended even my own judgment till he should have spoken. Remembering that all I was certain of was, what I knew from the Master, that they were done by Mr. Judge, and that this did not exclude the possibility of automatic writing, you will agree with me that most thoughtful and responsible persons would have suspended judgment as I did till the challenged person had been heard.

The statement was made under peculiar circumstances; Mr. Judge and Dr. Buck vehemently pressed me to say something which would close the matter, and both solemnly assured me that no ground should be given in future for suspicions, and that no such messages as I had challenged should again be sent out, just as Mr. Judge had assured Colonel Olcott that no more should be heard of the seal. Thinking that irresponsible mediumship might be at the bottom of the wholly spurious "messages," I agreed to make a statement that covered only that of which I was sure, and left aside the darker charges that I had been prevented from submitting, and on which explanation might be forthcoming.

Mr. Mead has generously and frankly stated what added much to the difficulty of my position. I was completely isolated, was regarded on all sides as mistaken and uncharitable, and was treated far more as a guilty person, to be cross-examined and put upon defence, than was Mr. Judge. No member of any weight stood by me, except Mr. Sturdy—who was much engaged and away from London most of the time—Mr. Sinnett, and Mr. Bertram Keightley. Mr. Sinnett had to leave London on the rising of the Committee, or I might have sought his counsel, as he knew of the spuriousness of Mr. Judge's "messages," and had previously shown me those he had received from him. Checkmated at all points, isolated, and finding the way completely blocked to further action, I accepted my defeat, wrote enough to set the public right on the point on which I had misled it, and listened silently to Mr. Judge's denial, which I had no means to refute.

It did not seem impossible that under my apparent defeat the end had been gained, and that in view of his devoted service [20] and the real help given to many, and the lesson already taught, Mr. Judge was to escape further trouble, and to be given an opportunity to go on working, having renounced all deceptive methods. I was only too glad that this should be, at the small cost of my own public defeat and condemnation by many, and rejoiced indeed should I have been had Mr. Judge's later actions made oblivion of the past possible, and shown that he was not morally guilty of the frauds committed.

Unhappily, his conduct after the statement destroyed all my hopes of future straightforwardness, as well as of any explanation being forthcoming that would exonerate him from the graver charges. His attempts to get rid of the evidence, first to browbeat me into handing it over to him, and then to persuade me to destroy it, compelled me to think that he had no defence and feared the future publication of the documents. The efforts made to win over Colonel Olcott, flagrantly in face of former conduct by Mr. Judge's friends, roused my suspicions, and when Mr. Judge left England, refusing to the last all explanation, not only to me, with whom he was grimly angry, but to those who had stood by him throughout, I felt that the obvious judgment arising on the *prima facie* case was the only one possible, and that the darker charges of fraud and forgery were true. This once recognised, it was plain that the matter could not be left as it was, for my charge to clear away from the T. S. the dark stains that were dimming its purity remained unfulfilled. What to do to re-open the matter I did not see, and immediate further action (beyond the *Occultism and Truth* circular) was rendered impossible by my leaving England, but I felt that things could not, and ought not, to remain as they were, and the duty that lay on Mr. Judge to resign the Vice-Presidency was discussed among us at Avenue Road. The unexpected receipt from Mr. Judge of another "message" in the script of a Master (when I was in New

Zealand) showed me that, against his promise, he was continuing the frauds, and thus opening up the way to action that would have to be taken on my return to England. I was therefore not sorry when on my way home to India I found the question had been already raised, objectionable as the manner of the raising was, and that a door was thus opened for escape from the *impasse* into which I had been forced.

Two questions may naturally arise in the minds of many of you: (1) Why did I not say at the beginning that my information on the main point came directly from the Master, and that [21] the direction to take action came from Him? (2) Why was I frustrated, if obeying direction received?

1. Because I did not think it right to use the holy name of the Master to strengthen an accusation; I shrank from thus exposing it to public criticism, and further the case had, and has, to rest before the Society on evidence, and not on my unprovable assertion of superior knowledge. No public accusation should ever be made which cannot be proved to the public on evidence, the value of which can be judged by the public. I mention now the authority on which I acted, because I am directed to do so by that same authority, for the helping of many who look to Him, and who will believe what I say. As to the direction to take action, it must be remembered that only the bare direction came from Him. Ways, methods, procedure were all left entirely to myself, so that I am alone responsible for any errors made in trying to carry out my difficult duty.

2. There is a very obvious reason why it was best that I should be defeated for the moment. The T. S. could not, last summer, have been carried to a satisfactory decision. The matter was so serious, the minds of the most earnest workers were so unprepared, the feeling was so strong that Mr. Judge's guilt was incredible in face of his record, that, forced to an immediate decision, the majority would probably have gone with him in blind loyalty, refusing to believe in the possibility of such charges being true, and the whole Society would thus have been committed to him, and bound up, in the eyes of the public, with his misdoing. Time was needed, and was secured by my temporary defeat. Last year, only India would have stood against Mr. Judge, America and Europe going with him, two Sections to one, or the majority of the T. S. But by my Australasian visit a new Section has been built up, and this stands with India and Europe in demanding Mr. Judge's resignation, with only America partially in opposition. That is, we have three Sections to one, the majority of the T. S., and we carry on the Society, the worst being that part of the present American Section may break away, leaving the present minority as the Section in union with the parent Society. During these months of delay, Mr. Judge's own action has opened people's eyes, while the doings of his partizans have shown the dangers into which blind credulity may lead earnest and worthy people. Bitter as the lesson has been, it will have been cheaply purchased, if it sends the Society onwards into the next century [22] purer and therefore stronger, freed from dogmatism and sectarianism, with a sounder knowledge and a more discriminating faith.

What is there in any of this, my brothers, to cause so much distress of mind? To those of you who believe only in the great spiritual truths of Theosophy, apart from living Divine Teachers, these truths remain unsoiled and unshaken by any crime or blunder of their modern exponents; they stand on their own rock of intuition and reason, and no storm that blows down personal reputations can shake them. To those of you who believe in the existence of the Divine Teachers, and that They sent Their Messenger H. P. B. to build this Society, there should be no cause for fear, for how can They be finally frustrated in Their loving work for man? If the time be ripe, the movement will continue to expand, and if not, the forces will all serve to ensure a future success.

But it is [sic] so heart-breaking that good people should be deluded? Oh, beloved friends and comrades, no pure-willed Soul can be deluded save where it lacks experience, and the *delusion is the experience that it needs* to make its vision clear for the future. Why grieve over the learning of a salutary lesson, those of you, at least, who believe in reincarnation, and know that the Soul must grow, and can only become perfect through suffering? The Holy and Wise Ones grieve no more over our falls than the tender mother grieves

when the babe tumbles as it strives to walk; only by falling will it learn balance and steadiness; and like the mother, They raise the children gently again, tenderly smiling on them, and encouraging them to try again; for they too were once children who stumbled, though now They stand unshaken and beyond all fall.

Nor doth the whirl of bitter words and unjust misrepresentations matter, for no blow can strike and give pain save where there is a Karmic obligation, and in the reception of the blow that debt is discharged, and that fetter falls from the Soul that may be nearing its liberation. Our enemies are our best friends, if they cannot provoke us to anger, nor to any passion that forges a fresh bond for the Soul.

Stand then, comrades, on this field of Kurukshetra, where friends, relations, and teachers are found on both sides, and fight without passion and without anxiety, so shall you not incur sin.

Your faithful servant,
ANNIE BESANT.

[23]

PART II.
STATEMENT

PREPARED FOR THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE, JULY, 1894,

BY

ANNIE BESANT.

[25]

PRESENTMENT OF CASE.

CHARGES.

- I. Untruthfulness, in now claiming uninterrupted teaching from and communication with the Masters, from 1875 to the present time, in flagrant contradiction with his own letters in which he states that he has no such communications, and asks certain persons to try and obtain communications for him.
- II. Untruthfulness, in denying that he has sent any letters or messages purporting to be from the Masters, whereas he has sent such by telegram, and enclosed in letters from himself, to Annie Besant and others.
- III. Deception practised towards H. S. Olcott with regard to the Rosicrucian Jewel of H.P.B.
- IV. Lack of straightforwardness *re* alleged Lodge message on Colonel Olcott's tenure of the Presidency.
- V. The use of a seal to substantiate certain messages supposed to be from a Master, which seal was not His.
- VI. The sending of messages, orders and letters as if sent and written by Masters, such messages, etc., being proved to be non-genuine by: [26]
 - (a) Error in matter of fact.
 - (b) Threat based on mistake.
 - (c) Triviality.

Further the probability being against their genuineness and in favour of their being written by W. Q. Judge from:

- (a) Their occurring only in letters from W. Q. Judge or in letters that had been within his reach.
- (b) The limitation of the knowledge displayed in them to that possessed by W. Q. Judge.
- (c) The personal advantage to himself, directly in some cases, and indirectly generally as being the only person through whom such written messages were received.

Further the possibility of such imitation of known scripts by him is shown by imitations done by him to prove the ease of such imitations.

[27]

STATEMENT.

I PROPOSE to lay before the Committee six definite charges against Mr. W. Q. Judge, and to support each of them by definite evidence. They really form but a single charge of seeking to gain influence and authority by unfair means, and they shew the steps by which, since the death of H. P. Blavatsky, Mr. Judge—in assuming a position of authority in the Theosophical Society, to which his long and eminent services justly entitle him—unhappily sought to strengthen that position by exaggerating his connexion with, and by producing and giving to various persons letters and messages alleged to be from, certain exalted Personages in Whose existence both he and the recipients of those messages believed.

Communication with Them has lately been claimed by him to an extent, which by his own earlier letters is shewn not to have existed, and this constant communication has been claimed, not only to generally strengthen his position, but in special cases with the direct view of influencing, and even dominating, his colleague Colonel Olcott, the President of the Society; alleged messages from these Personages have been used, both in a script recognisable as assigned to One of Them, and in typewriting, to directly control the policy of the Society and the public action of one of its members, Annie Besant, in her Society work.

This claim on Mr. Judge's part has been supported by the various deceptions stated in the charges, deceptions which have broken down confidence in his straightforwardness in the minds of some of his colleagues. But the private wrong might have been privately dealt with, or left to the people concerned, who could have refused to be influenced by his claims, had it not been that Mr. Judge was the President-elect of the Theosophical Society, and that imputations affecting his honour—publicly made in the press of India, Europe and America, and widely believed to be true—affected the welfare of the whole Society. It became clear that the vacating of the Presidency by Colonel Olcott—by death or otherwise—would be the signal for the disruption [28] of the Society, and that the pretensions of the future President having become thus notorious, could not be treated as those of a private individual, with which the Society had no concern.

In face of this danger to the Society—to the helping of which I am vowed—and on the appeal of various members of the Theosophical Society in India, I formally asked the President to direct an official investigation, so that the matter might be set at rest by the rebuttal or the proof of the charges, and the unity of the Society may be preserved.

Whatever decision this Committee may come to on the facts submitted to it, or even if it refuses to come to any decision upon them, I respectfully submit that it should consider the advisability of recommending the annulment of the election of Mr. Judge to the Presidency, thus setting the Society free to elect its President when the office is actually vacant, with the knowledge put at its disposal by the present proceedings. The Committee will thus avert the danger of a disruption of the Society, that would be brought about by forcing on it as President an official elected in ignorance of the facts now to be recited. If, with the knowledge of these facts, it should re-affirm its previous choice when the Presidency becomes vacant, there will at least be no feeling that it has been trapped into an election in ignorance of important matters that should have affected its decision.

CHARGE I.

Untruthfulness in now claiming uninterrupted teaching from, and communication with the Masters, from 1875 to the present time, in flagrant contradiction with his own letters, in which he states that he has no such communications, and asks certain persons to try and obtain communications for him.

The substance of this charge is the setting up of an exaggerated claim to connexion with certain beings called Masters, Who are believed in and honoured by many members of the Theosophical Society, with a view of forcing Colonel Olcott into a recognition of Mr. Judge's superior position. The evidence for the claim is a letter from Mr. Judge to Colonel Olcott, dated [29] August 30th, 1893; the evidence for the rebuttal of the claim is a series of letters from Mr. Judge to various persons, extending from September, 1877, to May, 1887.

In evidence of the claim I put in a letter from Mr. Judge to Colonel Olcott, written in New York, bearing date August 30th, 1893.

(Copy Letter.)

MY DEAR OLCOTT,—Mead has sent me your long letter, and it seems to me you and I ought to come to a clear understanding, which is possible if you will divest your mind of certain wrong notions. These are about me, and you have entertained them a good many years; now they come out and embitter all our relations, as well as leading by their influence to a certain amount of cliquism that should not exist as between you and me. I will go over a few things in a kind spirit, even if the facts may be in themselves disagreeable.

(a) You have the idea that you understand me and my character and that you know all that went on with me and the Masters in 1875 and after. Neither position is correct. You know but little of me, and when you had the chance to know me you let it go. For many years you refused to help me in U.S. and did absolutely nothing for the work here, but put up Coues as a stumbling block right inside the T.S., being carried off by his long string of absurd titles that he had printed himself. All the time I was here there was a chance to help. You took the fees as by law entitled and that ended it. Not a letter nor a word that might help. But at the same time H. P. B. helped and corresponded to some purpose.

(b) You knew nothing of my relations with Masters then. I will now tell you. In 1875 and up to 1879 the Masters spoke with me and gave me teaching both that way and in writing and also told me how I was to regard you and act to you. They explained to me many things and showed what would happen. I have tried to follow the directions but do not pretend to have made a complete success of it. However, I tried. The letter of mine—my property—to H. P. B. that you have, is only one, and was merely a temporary wail of slight envy because I then foolishly thought my period of service entitled me to what others got who had done nothing. It proves nothing, as I, the writer, must best know what it means. I asked Master why you were not included in the work done with me and he said [30] that you had your work to do and had to go by another way just then, and forbade me referring to it then. He showed me your exact character, and as from my youth I know certain ways and means that are closed to yourself, I have always had my own means of hearing from him. This H. P. B. knew, and for that reason I never cared what she might say of me, for she told me what she would do and say. And in 1876 both he and she explained to me all about precipitation and demonstrated to me how it could be done, as well as explaining other laws that you dimly sense but do not of yourself know; and also taught me how phenomena could be done. This is out of your province. Not knowing these things you have no right to assume that I know nothing. I have never said what is here written to anyone and have made no claim. But I tell *you* so you may not continue your foolish assertions and ideas that Judge may

be a smart organizer but knows little of occultism. That attitude will do you no good. Already you have erred in saying in print that once H. P. B. gone, the precipitated writing must alter. That is incorrect, as can be shown from precipitation by mediums. It will not stand. It must soon be shown incorrect as it is an important point. But that can wait awhile. Why even Sinnett now has a medium or clairvoyant he calls "K. H.'s chela" who gives him new so-called instruction in the old hand of K. H. This all goes with Sinnett to show that H. P. B. is out and Sinnett the "*only channel*," and that is his position; another man to try and beat down H. P. B., merely in his case to save the "consistency" of Esoteric Buddhism. Master told me this months ago, and lately Sinnett has confirmed my information by making the assertion. This is why near a year ago I said to you, you would be wanted "as a witness" which you wrongly covered with fraud and said I could not use you to commit fraud. Are you not a witness to the times and the letters, and to the fact that K. H. gave a date for the ending of his letters? Why then imply needlessly fraud to me? Why, my dear fellow, I know all about you and the whole of the T. S. as far as needed. I have not said this before, but now you are so far gone in wrong notion of me it is time you heard the facts.

(c) When you brought up the seal matter I asked Master what of it and he said, "Yes, Olcott made it as a joke and a very childish one, but we have the right to adopt the seal if we like and to use it; and it has been used even on a letter to him not as validating the message but to show him if he wants to [31] see that we have the object now." And now I have asked as to your statement to George and the reply is "Henry (here the name altered because I thought of you by the name he always used for you, in the other case I used your name myself as 'Olcott') is wrong; his knowledge of these laws is limited, though his facts are many yet undigested in the finer way; the seal being one he made is no reason why it should not be added to the signature by us, in order once more to show him that we have it; surely our use of it may sanctify it; and no one else can use it though some one might imitate it."

(d) I asked him also at another time about your passwords and the sign you make over mesmerized water, to which he replied: "Yes, you are right of course in supposing that any good clairvoyant might read the sign or the password the moment he writes of them, even though he conceals the same from the recipient." This I knew, but there is the confirmation.

(e) In 1875 the Master himself told me that he was compelled to arrange a password with you that you thought H. P. B. could not know, but that you were mistaken, she did know it but was bound by the most strict pledge to never use it except in the way agreed with you; and H. P. B. in 1875 or 1876 told me she knew it also, that you demanded it, that you had a fancy she did not know of it, that it was done to save the "situation" and that it did save it, but that it was absurd for you to put yourself and her in that position, and ended by saying she feared one day the attitude you took would undo for you all she did or at least a great part of it. These are facts of history and yet you think I did not know Master nor her. Now this fellow in India tells you a tale of his hiring elephants and all that. What if he did? That does not prove she did not send him to meet Master's servant; you are in "black doubt" over it; well, your doubts will continue and grow so long as you put her in one compartment and the Master in another.

(f) Master told me, too, by my request, as to the message you gave (in 1892?) out from Adyar. He said to me that he had not sent you that message: but had given you some inspiration and you were wrong as to the expected messenger, who did not come. I knew it then; he did not come in April, I knew he would not, nor later. All this Master told me and that is why I paid no attention to it.

(g) Further. I got very incensed at you with the constant nagging I got, the constant failure to show any appreciation, and the constant irritation shown by you, leading you to act as [32] if you thought we all wanted to take your office or honor. He told me that I must treat you well as an old servant who had done good work and that I must try to prevent your resignation going into effect. His word is law to me and hence I moved

the resolution here that made the call for you to take it back. You did so. But you never nominated me. Was that kind? You did not want to nominate me. You were forced into it after others had done it; it never came at first hands from you; I did not want it and would even now gladly be quit, but that cannot be. The reason for my work against your resignation is found in Master's order and naught else. His real reasons I know not. The reason for my constant effort to help you at Adyar is also in his order to me and not in any gratitude I feel personally for you. When you first resigned I was going to have it accepted here but by looking over the correspondence you will see a sudden alteration, and if you had my wires to Europe you would see they read that I had changed my plan, and had you been in London you would have seen me under the cross-fire of question why I altered, to which I replied nothing. And now to Mead you say I do not play with the cards on the table. That is mean and unfair. All my cards are out of my hands; they are in the hands of Master and I do not play a single one until they give it to me; and I notice they generally are trumps. What are the cards if you please that I keep back? You cannot say as they do not exist. The miserable seal is your's and not my card if you please. To show you where my cards are as stated, let me tell you that when the Congress (Chicago) was mooted I opposed it as folly and had no order, but at the last minute was told to go on and then I as suddenly altered and it looks like success, even the small one of having a good man come from India; I said to Master I did not know how to get the money in such times as these and he said (as he did to you under another name, that of "Serapis" in relation to de Palm's funeral) to never mind the money. The money has come and it takes a good deal. Is this game on the table or is it not? If it is not then you will have to blame Master and not me. Certainly if he had spoken sooner I could and would have written to you and got the little details you made so much fuss over fixed just as you liked. It was late when he spoke and I had to hurry.

(h) I asked him why he delayed Annie's trip, and he said I "would see, that in 1893 a necessity for it would come," and that necessity is here, a breach in the ranks not led by you, but [33] not prevented, for you are an older man on the spot and are the chief officer. It is a breach of interest to the T. S. and not to the E. S., and you have not dealt well nor wisely in it with me nor with the thing itself. Young men who act thus are fit for discipline. While you did not get the row up you have not as man and friend and older brother done well in it; you have insinuated against me; you have fostered by want of a good stand the idea that they think my presidency "conditional" (that is the word) and it a possibility that I may not have the office. But just as I knew what would happen to Harte when some years ago I wrote to you of him, so I know now what is to happen. I told Harte he would be out of there and his usefulness at an end in six months from my letter, and so it happened. This is more complicated, but all the same I have my information, not to be given out yet, it is not needed.

(i) When you came here I asked, for I had fears, what of you, and he replied, "He may come but do not urge it; if he does I will see; he will have a close squeeze but at the end will pull through."

(j) Recollect no one has before this had all these facts and to no one have I made these claims, though many have a suspicion of the facts and often exaggerate. I would not dare to make such claims for fear of the reaction *crescendo ad infinitum*. But I am telling you to see if I can make any breach in the miserable wall you have up. I do not mean that I want you to think I am in love with you, but want you to feel if possible that this whole game so far as I am concerned is played by Master and not by me. The moment he stops I stop and go to other fields, of which I know a few. It seems to me this puts it on another basis, and that it would be well for you to treat me fair and not go on doubting me. This is no threat but merely this, that if we can work in amity it is better than with a strain, for I tell you I will keep in the work with you, no matter what occurs, until Master withdraws, for I of myself am not competent for it. But with him I know the little evolution will go right as I have since 1875 to rely on. Just drop 1875 and begin with 1886 if it suits you better, and take it from that on and from now on and you will find it all right. I could have said all this before, but was not told to, and besides always found you sneering at me, and saw in your brain, into which I have often gazed, the doubts and the suspicions.

(k) As to the presidency, Master says to me that you down in your heart do not think I ought to be that official, and that [34] though you do not say it openly and inferentially and in a weak way deny it to Mead—though that is not a real denial—you have your eye on Annie Besant as the one you would like to see there. Well, I believe him. If he said to fall in with your plan I would do so. So, if you hear from him just tell him to tell me to fall in with that plan, and if he concurs to me I will go in for it with you. But it will not be done. Do not try it. You will fail, and you will not hear from him for I know just to what extent you do hear. Mind I am only speaking to you. If you tried it on your own hook you would make an enemy and it would not be me. Your best plan is to try and give me a good and not a bad character—that is, to alter your attitude. All the same, he does not say in words that I am to be president, and I have no concern with it.

(l) Now as to the general matter of India, here is what he has said to me in substance: “India is spiritually proud, that is why the Indian section is the weakest in the T.S.; the pioneer work of the past should have been followed up by using native agencies to get hold of devotion and devoted work in Hindu members; you (Judge) did well to point out one reason for a growing opposition to the T. S., but that is not the reason for apathy; why, all opposition that may be stopped is, and being stopped the native devotion latent in many of the members and to be met among those yet to serve as members should be brought out by any and all means and the Indian section shown how to help itself in this work; meanwhile we have used and are using many native agencies to sow the seeds of certain counteracting influences, some of which we referred you to.” This latter refers to certain reforms there of which I think you do not know as they are in another tongue but are going on. They have several times written to me just as several strangers to you and me in India have written me of late years. Some of them said their guru told them to write. One of the letters was in Sanscrit. The effect of these is to break down to some extent the very pride that is in the way, and some of the men who have gone into them may be brought to us and turn their energy for us. But, as he intimates, this can only be got at by native agencies. I asked if it was well to have a European General Secretary there and got no reply. But my opinion is it would be well for you to moot the idea of a native Secretary; there must be some such men and the sums paid for travel of Europeans would pay their salary for a long time. You may not like this idea but you ought not to make the [35] error of thinking such a man cannot be got. It cannot be true there is but one Hindu like Damodar.

Now I have said a good deal. Just another word. You are in error when you say I told you you would find a message from M. on the table at Avenue Road. I did not. I showed you in the cab a note of his on your letter “I sent him a message.” It is signed. After that I said he told me he had written you and I so stated. You have added to it about the table. That I did not say. And once more I deny all you said and think of me in respect to the seal. That is all I will say. Lastly as to the E. S. Reflect. Had it not been for the E. S. the T. S. would have split about us on the death of H. P. B. You do not know what people say, and it is madness to suppose you could save it. The E. S. saved it by infusing life and energy. I have not used the E. S. in any way. I never issue orders and if you have the idea I do or did, it is the biggest error you ever made. Note this, where the E. S. is strong there the T. S. is at work as in England and U. S., and from the latter the most money help to India that has not done anything for the E. S. Where E. S. is weak and small there the T. S. is weak, as in India with a roll of hundreds of branches and only 50 active. This is fact, my friend. Its influence is to make them work for T. S. and that is all. Yet you try to belittle a body that is for your advantage. Why don't you stay quiet and let us go on helping you and let me say, as I do, “Olcott is not in the E. S. for the reason that he has his own way of work and teaching, but he does not oppose it.” Why if true all you thought of me, why have I not used it to bolster up designs? Be warned, Olcott. It will make no crash. You may make one but it will be like pulling down the temple by Samson. If that is what would please you why do it—or rather try it.

Well good-bye and may the unseen influence of the Master make you read all this in the right light.

As ever yours,
(Signed) WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

This letter asserts:

1. Teaching in speech and writing from the Masters for four consecutive years—1875 to 1879; so that the Master's script would be familiar to the pupil.
2. Claims knowledge of Colonel Olcott and the whole of the T. S. obtained by occult means.[36]
3. Direct information from Master as to password in 1875, seal in 1891, message in 1892, as to Colonel Olcott's resignation in 1892 (a matter to be referred to again under Charge IV.), A.B.'s trip 1891 or 1892, Chicago Congress 1893, Presidency and India, date unknown; the general statement: "This whole game so far as I am concerned is played by Master and not by me. . . . I will keep in the work with you no matter what occurs until Master withdraws, for I of myself am not competent for it. But with Him I know the little evolution will go right, *as I have since 1875 to rely on*. Just drop 1875 and *begin with 1886*, if it suits you better, and take it from that on, and you will find it all right."

As against this claim of continued guidance, all Mr. Judge does being done by Master, we have a series of letters from 1877 to 1887, which draw for us the picture of a man struggling in darkness, bewildered, ignorant even of the writing of the very Master who is now said to have been teaching him in writing for years, and urging Colonel Olcott and others to give him information he cannot get for himself. It is the story of a struggle of which no man need feel ashamed, showing a tenacity and endurance worthy of admiration, often a submission and patience purely heroic; but it is utterly incompatible with the claim now set up.

Before I lay extracts from these letters before the Committee, I must ask whether the members will consider themselves bound to silence on this head? If not, I shall not read the statement in full, nor shall I under any circumstances consent to the publication of these extracts as part of my statement.⁵ They are from letters essentially private in their nature—though not so marked—and ought not, under any circumstances, to be given to the world.

(If any member objects to silence omit I, part of 6, 7.)

The darkness appears to have set in in 1877, for a note dated September 18, '77, runs:

The hell I have fallen into is made a deeper hell by being excluded from the acquaintance once enjoyed and always accounted the most valuable on earth. Is it possible to renew [37] it? If it is annoying to hear of it at all, and should there be an end desired altogether, it is mine to submit.⁶

Writing to Colonel Olcott from New York, April 23rd, 1879, he shews himself to be wholly dependent on Colonel Olcott for authoritative communications:

Nor do you say a word about what course we ought to pursue, except 'that much depends on you' and 'keep the Society alive.' It was promised that we should have instructions as to what to do, whether to hold

5. Mr. Judge wrote me, saying he had no objection to the public reading, and indeed should insist on it. [Note added, April, 1895.]

6. A letter dated October 17th, 1879, may explain the silence of these years, for in it Mr. Judge refers to an occult failure: "I have not failed for nothing. It was of use, and it enables me to write you in truth." [Note added, April, 1895.]

meetings or not, and what kind, if any, etc., etc. Now on these points we ought to have authoritative instructions if we are to be held responsible for orders being obeyed. If it were merely a question of judgment between you and me and Doubleday, why we could well enough decide. But as it stands I do not regard it as a question of judgment. Old Doubleday expects communications. They were promised him by someone, and as yet he has had none. Why couldn't something be sent him through the air? It would please him immensely, and cement him stronger to us and put him in just the condition of mind for working with us just as we wish him to. He comes uncomfortably close to me in his enquiries. I am sure no one would be hurt by this being done, if it can be done; the power expended would not be much.

On Jan. 3rd, 1880, Mr. Judge wrote a letter to the Master, and sent it to Colonel Olcott to be forwarded to the One to Whom it was addressed—a strange thing to do to one who is now said to have been occultly his own inferior all the time, and he being in direct communication. The letter was received by Colonel Olcott, who has held it since.

On August 5th, 1880, Mr. Judge wrote to Damodar, from New York, and shews that the Brothers were not in touch with himself. He writes:

Without doubt many of the brothers are daily in your vicinity; how I wish I could share them with you.

On January 12th, 1881, writing from New York and inscribing the letter to "H. P. B. and Co. Sirs and Gentlemen: Brothers," Mr. Judge acknowledges a little note sent to him and writes:

Now I would be very much pleased could I know from [38] whom it came, whether Kashmir or M.⁷ or who of all the long list of great ones. I was highly favoured with a picture of the latter, among others which I couldn't recognize, and have made an enlarged copy of his head, which now hangs on my office wall. I have also in a black walnut affair between the windows in an inner place the brass gong given me in 1878. But nothing ever comes there, of which I complain not, inasmuch as I suppose I am not able to receive anything.

The ignorance of the writing of "Kashmir and M." seems inexplicable, if there had been seven years—or even five—of close teaching by speech and writing, as now claimed. After describing his life, Mr. Judge goes on:

Now and then a few encouraging words from you would set me up.

And he shows that directions from the Master come to him through Colonel Olcott, by saying:

Let me ask in cold abstractness how much can we depend upon Olcott and his methods and when are we to know that he acts *ex cathedra*.

On July 26th, 1881, Mr. Judge, writing to Damodar from New York, after a description of his difficulties in his outer life, proceeds:

I am walking, too, in the dark, not knowing which way to turn. Once I had the honour and advantage of hearing wisdom from M., but that has ceased long ago. All I do now is to wait for the clap of doom which will come soon or late, allowing me freedom here, or initiating me into the degree beyond the grave. I do not even suppose M. would answer you in regard to me except in enigmatical terms, however much either of us desired. I do not mean I am walking in the dark not knowing *where* to, but only that I know not what I should do to help my progress and also keep my word of honour. . . . Will you dare to speak to M. for me? There will be no anger against you unless he has already forbidden it, and in that case I do not wish you to try. But if not prohibited, will you ask him whether he considers it worth while to send me through you a word of advice, or else his message that for the present it is unnecessary, and whether it is unavailing for me to entertain the smallest hope. Will you do this, my friend, and tell me whatever you may.

7. The Masters K. H. and M. [Note added, April, 1895.]

The darkness was still persistent on to 1883, for on May 15th of that year, Mr. Judge writes to Colonel Olcott from New York the following pathetic passage: [39]

I was thirty-two years old last April 13th, and I begin to feel that I must soon get on further. But the door seems shut. They told me once I put myself in hell, and no one else could get me out. Well, here in hell I lift up my eyes to those that are above and do not deny them. I am still as I always was, Olcott. Oh, how I wish the lane would turn and let me go on. . . .⁸ I have not heard from H. P. B. in a long, long time. Say, can't you, my only friend that I really can so call, tell me whether they ever bestow upon me a thought?

In 1884 it is still the same. He writes to Olcott from London, under date March 21st, 1884, the following:

One great question that has arisen with me is this: Here I have been and am yet a devoted adherent, and desirous of spreading Theosophy in the West, and there are many in the U. S.—more than here—who would take it up and boom it years ahead of the English people. If it is a philosophy for the benefit of humanity, and our duty is to try and “give the age a drift,” why has the West received no encouragement? There are forty-five T. S. in Rochester who are *devoted*. They fall every day at the feet of the Mahâtâmâs. In New York 'tis true but few are, but I have found some. Now then all this time I have received no encouragement, and have been hemmed in on all sides.

Still in 1886 is the same thing. Mr. Judge writes to H. P. B., under date September 3rd:

You know well that of all the Theosophs I have heard least from Masters. I suppose there must be good cause, either my fault or best for my development. Can you say? Will you say?

Up to 1887 he was not consciously guided in T. S. matters by the Master; for he wrote on May 25th of that year to Colonel Olcott from New York:

Do you ever hear from Damodar? and, Olcott, what do you hear, if aught, from [^] about the general course of the T. S.? Why don't you keep me informed?

Thus up to 1887, Mr. Judge, despite his present claims, relied on Colonel Olcott to obtain instructions from the Masters.

[40]

CHARGE II.

Untruthfulness, in denying that he has sent any letters or messages purporting to be from the Masters, whereas he has sent such by telegram and enclosed in letters from himself to Annie Besant and others.

The substance of this charge is that while Mr. Judge positively denied to Colonel Olcott, whom he knew to suspect him—the Colonel having previously charged him with forging Mahâtmic letters—that he had sent any, he had sent such letters and continued to send them. The evidence is his own letters of denial to Colonel Olcott; his own letters enclosing messages alleged by him to be from a Mahâtâmâ, and his telegrams.

8. “I feel the thoughts of M. and K. H. here in my head all the time, and cannot, if I would and I would not, drive them out. You cannot measure the disgust I feel for this country and society. It is rotten as putridity, and seems to grow worse daily. I feel its deposits on myself too and am restive with a constant longing to escape. I have tried to give up the Path, but fate drags me there, and conscience says I must not give it up, so I deem myself fixed in that at least.” (Added at wish of verifying committee, April, 1895.)

A. Proof that Mr. Judge repeatedly denied in the most explicit terms, having sent any letters or messages purporting to be from the Masters to anybody.

1. Under date April 26th, 1892, from Chicago, Mr. Judge wrote to Colonel Olcott as follows:

The 'important news from Lodge' I wired was as above 'change your policy.' It is straight. You must stop suspecting me. You are foolishly supposing I give out messages in T. S. or E. S. Enquire and you will find out that I never have. It is all my own and in myself and not given to others at any time.

2. On May 3rd, 1892, Mr. Judge again wrote to Colonel Olcott from New York, complaining of the stories that he accused Colonel Olcott of circulating against him. He says:

This tale could only come from you, for the fact is that no one has ever known me to say I ever heard from Master, and hence, as you made the charge out of your head to me in October, it comes from you, since no one else would have any idea of starting it.

3. Again, on June 1st, 1892, from New York, Mr. Judge writes to Colonel Olcott:

Now you are an impossible man. When I have told you I sent nothing and never imitation letters and have not that seal you refer to and which I do not know myself, why do you keep it up? You are proceeding on imaginings about me. I have not seen or heard of letters from except from you, yet [41] you go on with arguments like the philosophers who would show the king why five fish in a bucket would *not* make it overflow. Then you go on about paper you got in Kashmere. That I do not know about either. It's all Greek. Why is it not possible that some idiot is doing these things you seem to know, and I do not, and not be me. Who, in India, has letters of they say I sent them? I sent none. And although you keep this up so long you do not say any name to me. It is in your head and you can name no one who can say they got any letters false or true through me. You're out, my boy, and the grand fact you want does not exist, as there is no man to whom I have sent or pretended to send any letters, either false or fraudulent.

B. Proof that Mr. Judge did in fact repeatedly send both letters and messages purporting to come from the Masters, enclosed in letters from himself and by telegram to Annie Besant and others:

1. Telegram from Mr. Judge to Annie Besant, September 4th, 1891, as follows:

A message received from Tibet to the effect (that) H——— accept our congratulations for public stand about letters. Will forward you letters by this mail.

2. On the same date (September 4th, 1891) Mr. Judge wrote to Annie Besant:

The enclosed messages were received by me in that closed drawer I seldom open, as marked. I delayed the telegram to you because of my sickness and have cabled you to-day and now send the original. The message to you is great. I agree *of course*, and yet it does not go against my idea as expressed heretofore. I think it *was* a great card when you stated the *fact* and then said you would not permit exam. They must take it on your word. I think He cannot send yet except through me and that causes a want of agreement sometimes in dates.

Two messages, on the same sheet of paper, were enclosed in this letter, both authenticated with the "Panjab seal" and Mahâtmâ M.'s cryptograph. The first refers to matters on which I am pledged to secrecy; and the second is as follows:

W.Q.J. Tell H——— it was a good card and well played to assert about messages since Upasika went and to always refuse to submit proofs to the profane. Telegraph first and then send her this.

(Seal and cryptograph, etc.)

(*Endorsed in pencil: Recd. Sept. 2, W.Q.J.*)

[42] On October 26th, 1891, Mr. Judge cabled Annie Besant from San Francisco, as follows:

Letter from Master saying: H——— you are desired not to go to India. Remain where you are. There is great danger. There is something wrong with H. S. Olcott. Await further particulars by an early mail.
(Signed) Judge.

A week later Mr. Judge wrote to A. B. enclosing a long letter purporting to be from Mahâtmâ M., explaining the above telegram. This was the letter mentioned in above cable as “from Master.” Neither Mr. Judge’s own letter nor that enclosed are produced.⁹

On October 29th A. B. cabled and wrote B. K. to the same effect as above cable from Judge.

4. On October 2nd, 1891, Mr. Judge wrote to Annie Besant from Omaha, as follows:

As to India. Now you are not going and as He has often said one has not got to go there to see Him. So you are right. Yesterday or before I saw Him in that way on the train and a kind of note was left in my pocket for Sinnett, a copy of which I send you and the original goes to S.

The copy of the message sent to Mr. Sinnett was subjoined. The original of the above message was shown to Annie Besant by Mr. Sinnett, together with Mr. Judge’s covering letter.

5. On November 12th, 1891, Mr. Judge cabled from Chicago to Mrs. Besant as follows:

He says postpone not abandon on account of health, wishes you to consult Mennell. Endeavour to obtain certificate advising postpone use with Gen. Sec. Ind. Sect. It quite explains the case, take short vacation. Do you understand clearly? If not wire.

On the same date (November 12th, 1891) Mr. Judge wrote to A. B. from Chicago as follows: [p.43]

The reason why no message was sent before was my fault, for He says there are reasons why they must go by me, and I did not furnish the means till then. They must use human instruments all the time. But as I telegraphed to-day, word was sent to me last night very clear by way of help for you, for it appears you did not see just how to get around the difficulty. In the first place you look at it too sombrely. *Postponement* is a frequent thing. I raised \$1,500 for Olcott three years ago, but trip was put off and as good reasons were given no one objected. He () says your health is not in the best order, and that that is sufficient reason for the outside, and advised you to see Mennell and get a certificate to that effect so as to use in India, etc.

Vide letter Judge to Olcott of October 8th, 1892, where he gives another false reason for A. B. not going to India.

(6) On April 21st, 1892, Colonel Olcott received the following cablegram from Mr. Judge from New York:

Very important news from Lodge. Change is likely to take place in Gen. Sec. American Sect. policy April 24th. Must not divulge this telegram to anybody. Remain where you are.

And on the same date (April 20th, 1892) Mr. Judge wrote to Colonel Olcott enclosing a typewritten transcript of what purported to be the “important news from Lodge.”

9. The “message” dealt with E. S. T. matters partly, but chiefly with my journey to India. The “danger” was a predicted turning of Col. Olcott against the T. S. and H. P. Blavatsky. It had nothing to do with the idea, rightly characterised by the *W. G.* as “astounding nonsense,” that Col. Olcott intended to poison me. Mr. Judge knew nothing of this absurdity until I told him of it myself when I visited America later in the year, after my journey to India had been postponed in deference to the above “message.” So the *W. G.* is mistaken in alleging that I was warned not to imperil myself in the neighbourhood of Col. Olcott, and in supposing that this story, never heard of by any of us till after the Indian visit had been given up, had anything to do with its postponement. [Note added, April, 1895.]

The letter will be brought up under Charge IV.

(7) On December 20th, 1892, Mr. Judge wrote to Annie Besant:

I send you a little letter from I got which please return to me.

(8) Various sentences in the script ascribed to Mahâtmâ M., impressions of what purports to be His seal and cryptograph, are found upon various letters from Mr. Judge to Annie Besant, Babula, H. S. Olcott, Tookaram Tatyâ, Cooper-Oakley, Bertram Keightley, E. T. Sturdy, Manilal N. Dvivedi.

These are dealt with in detail in connection with other charges, and need only be alluded to here. Apart from these, enough direct evidence in Mr. Judge's own handwriting has been produced to amply prove the statement that Mr. Judge did deny that he ever sent messages from the Masters, and also to prove that he did in fact and repeatedly send letters and messages purporting to come from the Masters, enclosed in letters from himself and by telegram to Annie Besant and others.

[44]

CHARGE III.

Deception practised towards H. S. Olcott with regard to the Rosicrucian Jewel of H. P. B.

The substance of this charge is that Mr. Judge wilfully deceived his colleague, Colonel Olcott, and took advantage of the Colonel's forgetfulness to endeavour to convince the latter that he (Mr. Judge) was in direct and close communication with Mahâtmâ M., by stating to the Colonel as a message from Mahâtmâ M. a fact already known to Mr. Judge personally.

The evidence in support is a history of the Jewel, resting on the evidence of Colonel Olcott and Annie Besant, and a letter from Mr. Judge.

HISTORY OF H. P. B.'s R.C. JEWEL.

A.—H. P. B. possessed a Rosicrucian Jewel, supposed to have belonged to Cagliostro, in the shape of a silver and jewelled Phœnix, when in New York, 1875-78. This she took with her to India in 1878-9, and at Colonel Olcott's request she lent it to him, and it remained in his possession when H. P. B. finally left India in 1885.

In 1888, when Colonel Olcott came to England, he brought over a number of H. P. B.'s things for her, this Rosicrucian Jewel among them, and handed it over to her at 17, Lansdowne Road. She sometimes wore this Jewel afterwards, and it was among H. P. B.'s things after her death. Mr. Judge saw it among them when he came over to London in May, 1891.

In August, 1891, after Mr. Judge had returned to New York, I received a letter from him, on which was written an order in the Mahâtmâ M.'s script desiring me to send this Rosicrucian Jewel to Mr. Judge. I accordingly sent the Jewel carefully packed in a sealed packet to New York by Colonel Olcott (the Colonel knowing nothing of the contents of the packet), he handed the packet to Mrs. J. C. Ver Planck, who wrote to me acknowledging the receipt, and said she would lock it away. I also wrote Mr. Judge, telling him that I had sent the Jewel by Colonel Olcott.

[45] On September 12th, 1891, Mr. Judge, writing in the train, and dating "In Wyoming on the R. R.," wrote me:—

Yes, it is the silver phoenix. I will tell J. C. V. P. to keep the package in my safe.

The foregoing evidence establishes the following points:—

- (a) That Judge saw H. P. B.'s R.C. Jewel in London in May-June, 1891.
- (b) That in August, 1891, A. B. was directed in Mahâtmâ M's script to send the Jewel over to Mr. Judge, and did so per Colonel Olcott, notifying Mr. Judge to that effect.
- (c) That on *September 12th*, 1891, Mr. Judge knew the Jewel had been sent over to be delivered to Mrs. Ver Planck, whom he proceeds to direct to keep it in his safe.

B. In *October*, 1891, when Colonel Olcott was at the house of Dr. J. Anderson, in San Francisco, he was telling Dr. A. about H. P. B.'s Rosicrucian Jewel and the mysterious property possessed by the stones in it, of changing colour with the state of her health. In this connection the Colonel remarked that he had the Jewel at Adyar, and when he got back there would look and see if the stones had changed colour since H. P. B.'s death. Mr. Judge was present at this conversation. On hearing this last remark he said to Colonel Olcott:—

Olcott, the Master tells me to say that He has taken the Jewel away from Adyar, and that when you get back you will find it gone. Let this be a proof to you of the genuineness of the communications that I receive from the Mahâtmâs.

After his return to Adyar, Colonel Olcott recounted what had occurred to B. Keightley, who thereupon said that he had seen the Colonel give the jewel to H. P. B. in London in 1888 or 1889. His servant Babula corroborated, saying that he had himself put the jewel in the Colonel's trunk.

Colonel Olcott then wrote to Mr. Judge, reproaching him for giving the Colonel a bogus test.

In reply, Mr. Judge wrote, under date of June 1st, 1892, from New York, as follows:

Then about what I told you in Frisco. I told you then that that night when you mentioned to me the old symbol of H. P. B., Master said you would not find it in Adyar as you said. That is all I said. Well it has turned out true, for you say now that you did not have it after all. That is just what I told you and no more. Yet you make a lot of vague things out of it.

[46] The above evidence proves:—

- (a) That, knowing H. P. B.'s Jewel to be lying in his own safe at New York, and to have been conveyed to New York by Colonel Olcott who had received it from Annie Besant, Mr. Judge took advantage of Colonel Olcott's having forgotten that the Jewel was returned to H. P. B. in 1888, and of his ignorance of the fact that he had actually conveyed it to New York, to give Colonel Olcott a message from Mahâtmâ M. that *He* had taken away the Jewel, as a test proof of his own (W. Q. J.'s) communications with the Mahâtmâ.
 - (b) That even rejecting Colonel Olcott's account of what passed altogether, it is proved from Mr. Judge's own letter of June 1st, 1892, that he told Colonel Olcott, as coming from Mahâtmâ M. that very night in October, a fact that had been within his own knowledge for more than four months.
-

CHARGE IV.

Lack of straightforwardness re alleged Lodge message on Colonel Olcott's tenure of the Presidency.

The substance of this charge is the playing fast and loose with alleged authority from the Masters, asserting it to Colonel Olcott and at first concealing it from and denying it to George Mead and Annie Besant, who found themselves, with the European Convention, betrayed into a false position by ignorance of what had occurred.

The evidence is from Mr. Judge's own letters and telegrams, and the matter is so tangled that it is not easy to present it in an intelligible form.

Early in 1892 Colonel Olcott announced his resignation of the Presidency of the T. S., expressing his intention to remain in office only so long as should be needful for the winding up of certain important business matters.

In April of 1892, Mr. G. R. S. Mead was in America with Mr. Judge, and accompanied him to Chicago to attend the American Convention.

In a letter to Annie Besant from Mr. Judge on April 19th, 1892, from New York on various matters, there appeared at the [47] end the words in Mahâtmâ M.'s script: "Ordered to change his policy. M. ^ ."

On the 20th April, Mr. Judge wrote to Colonel Olcott from New York:

You will find in this something that will give you an idea of what I am going to do and which is necessarily put on separate sheet. It is strictly private between you and me if you please.

Enclosed was the following type-written statement; it will be seen that it is written about Mr. Judge, speaking of him in the third person; meanwhile on the 21st April Mr. Judge sent to Colonel Olcott a telegram, which he of course received long before this letter:

Very important news from Lodge. Change is likely to take place in Gen. Sec. American Section policy April 24. Must not divulge this telegram to anybody. Remain where you are.

There is no direct statement by Mr. Judge that the typewritten paper is a message from a Mahâtmâ, but it is of authoritative tone, states what Mr. Judge is "ordered" and "directed" to do, makes the resolutions of the forthcoming Convention to be arranged by Mr. Judge under order—"these are *his* orders"—and in the light of the telegram could hardly be taken by Colonel Olcott otherwise than as an authoritative document. It runs:

He has been recently ordered . . . to change his policy, for he sees that it is not time nor right nor just nor wise nor the real wish of the Lodge that you should go out either corporeally or officially. But he is in now a very strained position because of the people to deal with in other lands than the one he is in. He will cause it to be done as follows at the meeting in April—and has before this prepared for it—a resolution to be passed declaring first, that your resignation has been received; second, that the meeting notes that all the branches have in this land voted for him as the successor; third, that the meeting as in duty bound declares the vote of the section to be for the person selected by the branches; fourth, that however that vote is to be operative only in case that the old leader cannot be induced to remain at the demand of the most powerful section, and that he is directed to find out, to wait until the other Convention, to write to the old leader and ask him to revoke, to sway the others in July to do the same and in all ways to try and bring that about. This he is preparing for, and when he sees some of the other people will be able to do it with the

inside invisible help that will be given. The resolutions may not be in just [48] that form, but will be of that substance. His recent letter to you in a high and mighty tone is taken back, for no matter what he said he still has the old affection, but was like a woman trying to conceal it as you had thrown cold water on it by blind acts.

He does not see how the cause can go on right with the old leader out nor how he can take the office yet. He wants to clear the ground between you and himself more than ever and which is not yet clear. But also the resolutions will say that the meeting asks that the successor himself when the time comes shall be for life, like you, and will also ask that you in advance shall nominate him so that in case of sudden death the whole thing may be ready to hand. That will best be done thus (these are *his* orders only *to* him) by you as the first step making the nomination now and then after that the constitution being made to read that the nominated successor shall hold office for life or good behaviour. This is about all. As being hurried cannot make it more clear but does this in the hope that it will be clear to you.

The resolutions as sketched in the above were carried at the American Convention, and on April 26th, 1892, Mr. Judge wrote to Colonel Olcott from Chicago:

Before coming I was told that I must change policy. That was all. I thought it over . . . so I read my report and reported the resignation and section votes for me and stopped. A resolution was offered in the handwriting of Page, to the effect as sent per copy . . . (resolutions summarized). *Ergo*, you must therefore hold on *suspense*, until after I work the Londoners in July, and meanwhile declare that the circumstances as given by resolutions, etc., etc., compel you, out of respect to the two great sections, while waiting action of London, to hold the matter in suspension until after July . . . P.S.—The ‘important news from Lodge’ I wired was as above, ‘change your policy,’ it is straight.

On August 30th, 1893, in a letter quoting many orders from the Master, Mr. Judge wrote to Colonel Olcott:—¹⁰

He told me that I must treat you well, as an old servant who had done good work, and that I must try and prevent your resignation going into effect. His word is law to me, and hence I moved the resolutions here that made the call for you to take it back. . . . The reason for my work against your resignation is found in Master’s order and naught else.

[49] So we have here a direct order to prevent the Colonel’s resignation, resolutions sketched to that effect in an apparently authoritative statement, not by Mr. Judge, and the assertion that these are “his orders.” The letter of April 26th, to Colonel Olcott, seems to leave the orders out. On the same April 26th, 1892, Mr. Judge wrote to Annie Besant, giving an account totally inconsistent with the letters of April 20th, with enclosure to Colonel Olcott, and with letter of August 30th, 1893. He writes:—

Now about Convention and Olcott. First, I was told by Djk vaguely some days ago, that ‘I would have to change my policy.’ No more. Apparently left to me and time. So I came on here and presented report, giving resignation and votes on it. Then as I could not give the *facts* to the men here—I do not trust them, as it is *vital* that secrecy be observed—I had to sit. Buck, Page, La Pierre, and several brought forward resolutions which passed—thus (follow resolutions). I couldn’t do anything at all.

And on May 2nd, 1892, he wrote to Annie Besant:—

I do not know what you mean when you (say) ‘Master says you are ordered to change your policy.’ When was this said? I have been told, as I said to you, that I would have to change my policy. Has some word been sent to you? I have begun to alter it by the resolutions that were passed at the Convention, so that seems to be the right thing to do.

10. See p.29.

This was in answer to my enquiry as to the meaning of the words on Mr. Judge's letter of April 19th in the Mahâtmâ script.

On May 3rd, 1892, Mr. Judge wrote to Annie Besant as to the change of policy:

Frankly, I am standing in the dark, but in such moments I simply wait. . . . I've told you all I know.

On July 7th, 1892, Mr. Judge wrote to Colonel Olcott from London, approving his notice in *The Theosophist*; the European Convention was held, and no reason being given why the Convention should press Colonel Olcott to revoke, it accepted his resignation. Mr. Judge advised following the American resolutions, but laid little stress on the matter.

On August 30th, 1892, Mr. Judge wrote to Col. Olcott from New York:

Your telegram of to-day is received reading 'Transmits remains president.' This is all right and bears me out, so far, in the cable I sent to you long ago before you had your message, [50] that I was ordered to alter my policy. That alteration was to, from that date, work to the end that you should not go out. I presume you have not forgotten that. When I was at London I tried to get them to pass the same resolutions I got through here, for the sake of appearances if for no other reason, but they would not do it because you had given out that notice in *The Theosophist*, as they said that disposed of the matter, and they read it that you did not intend to revoke, while I read it just the opposite way. If you had not given that out I would have succeeded in getting them to follow America.

On the same day he wrote to Annie Besant:

At 10 a.m. to-day got a telegram from Olcott saying 'Transmits remains president.' That's all right. It means he revokes his resignation either on the ground of a message from or on our resolutions in fact but on pretence of a message. . . . Long before he said he got his message I privately wired him 'Am ordered to change my policy and want you to stay.' The words 'and want you to stay' are my own and not to be connected with the order I speak of in the first words of telegram. He will no doubt forget this as he always does. But if he says now that he has an order I shall assume he is acting under that impression and shall not enquire into genuineness of order.

In the September number of *The Theosophist* Colonel Olcott, cancelling his resignation, mentioned that under date of April 20th, Mr. Judge had sent him "a transcript of a message he had also received for me from a Master." This startled the London workers, as it made them think that they had unwittingly acted against the Master's will, and G. R. S. Mead wrote to Colonel Olcott:

The order you quote from is quite sufficient, and if we had had a ghost of an idea of the existence of such an order the resolutions passed would have been different. Judging from W. Q. J.'s letter he is as ignorant of this quoted matter as we were. Well, that's all right now, and as it should be.

A. Besant and G. R. S. Mead wrote to Mr. Judge, asking for some light, and under date September 15th, Mr. Judge wrote to them:

Briefly stated, the situation Europe and George are in is that although he was here in April, heard our deliberations, and although at July Convention in London I distinctly asked the Convention to pass similar resolutions to ours such was not done, and now things are different; and George intimates he [51] should not have been kept in ignorance. Ignorance of what?

Obviously ignorance that Mr. Judge had cabled to Colonel Olcott that he had important news from Lodge, and had sent Colonel Olcott a statement sketching beforehand the resolutions that were passed at the American Convention, bidding Mr. Judge sway "the others in July," as he would be able to do with the invisible help that would be given, and saying these were his orders. G. Mead was with Mr. Judge when all

this was done. In his letter of September 15th Mr. Judge further writes that he had told Annie Besant he was to change his policy.

“But I had no order to make Europe do this. If I had I would have tried. *I* had an order to *myself* alone to change *my* policy. . . . I had no line of policy outlined. I was ordered to change, and that’s all. I had to see how. . . . I think we were left to ourselves.”

On the same date Mr. Judge wrote to Colonel Olcott:

I do not believe the Master puts his hand out on all these occasions, as he has not in the particular case of your revocation.

On September 19th, Mr. Judge wrote to Annie Besant, who had again written, saying:

Your silence quite misled me, and that is scarcely wise. And it is most unfortunate that you should have wired Olcott so distinctly and have told me nothing.

Mr. Judge answered that:

I have not sent any telegram to Olcott that you should have seen and did not.

And went on to speak of a different telegram to the one referred to. He wrote:

If I had objective orders, or had been told to move European Section, I certainly would have done it . . . I never had any arrangement with Olcott, and I repudiate his assertions and insinuations. He has *not* revoked because I had orders. He *has* revoked because circumstances swayed his mind. . . . I did not let you go on ‘a road which you and Olcott privately knew was not to be followed.’ I do not know where you got such an idea. I used with him the same arguments I used with you. Is that an arrangement? I think not.

On September 26th, 1892, Mr. Judge again wrote, pointing to what he thought was a contradiction in Colonel Olcott’s statements in *The Theosophist* and to G. R. S. Mead, respectively:

[52] This re-reading of the extract makes me all the more positive that I only told Olcott what I told you, that is, that I was ordered to ‘change my policy’ and all the rest was my own argument and my own power of ‘seeing’ what was right in the premises.

The day before, September 25th, Mr. Judge had written to Colonel Olcott:

I never said I was told anything but to ‘alter my policy,’ the rest was my own view and what ‘he—W. Q. J.—saw.’

To summarize briefly the contradictions and concealments which nearly brought the Sections into conflict, it will be best to arrange in parallel columns the statements to Colonel Olcott and to the London workers.

TO COLONEL OLCOTT.

Representing it to be Master’s will that he should stay in office, and Mr. Judge working to that end under Master’s orders.

Telegram of news from Lodge: “Remain where you are.”

TO G. MEAD AND A. BESANT.

Representing himself as knowing only that he was to change policy, and passively yielding to circumstances as guidance.

“I have not sent any telegram to Olcott that you should have seen and did not,” and using another telegram as though the only one.

Statement sketching resolutions for Convention, and saying Judge was prepared for this beforehand.

Same statement saying Judge would sway the European folk in July. And this as part of "his orders."

Later, throwing light on the view Mr. Judge took of his position, we have him saying that Master told him to prevent Colonel Olcott's retirement, that because of Master's order he has moved the American resolutions, and that what he did was due only to Master's order.

That "he had no line of policy outlined." That he was told vaguely to change policy, "that's all." "I only told Olcott what I told you." "I used with him the same arguments I used with you."

"I had no order to make Europe do this." If he had "been told to move European Section I certainly would have done it."

He represented himself as helpless at the Convention, said that others brought up the resolutions, and "I couldn't do anything at all."

[53] This matter was rendered exceptionally serious by the position held by Mr. Judge at the time, as Vice-President with a resigning President, and his action brought about a complication which might have become serious, the General Secretary of the Indian Section being guided by the course of action given to Colonel Olcott as by authority, and the General Secretary of the European Section being influenced by the withholdal from him of the information that controlled the action of his brother Secretary. Whether the General Secretary of the American Section did, at the time, believe himself to be acting under orders as to the detailed resolutions of his Section, which turned out to be what in the document sent to Colonel Olcott it was said they would be; or whether this idea of acting under direct order from Master came to him only a year later I find it impossible to say. What is certain is that there was much wire-pulling done by the (for the time) acting chief officer of the Society, and into this the name and authority of the Mahâtmâs were drawn.

CHARGE V.

The use of a seal to substantiate certain messages supposed to be from a Master, which seal was not His.

The substance of this charge is the using by Mr. Judge of a seal, in such a manner and with such accompanying circumstances as to lead others to think that the impression had been "precipitated" phenomenally by a Mahâtmâ, and had not been impressed on the messages by Mr. Judge or by any ordinary means.

The evidence consists of a brief history of the seal in question, necessary to make the charge intelligible; of the documents on which it has appeared, so far as known to me; of Mr. Judge's knowledge of the seal and of his denial of such knowledge.

[54] The deductions drawn from this evidence will be given at the close of this section.

On the old letters of the Master that came through H. P. B., that I have seen—such as those possessed by Mr. Sinnett—no seal impression is ever added to the signatures. If this point be challenged I can call Colonel Olcott to give evidence on this head, and also Bertram Keightley.

Colonel Olcott, during his tour in Northern India, in 1883, had a brass seal-ring (similar to those produced) engraved with an imitation of Mahâtmâ M.'s cryptograph. This was done for him by a seal-maker living in the Chandni Chowk Street, in Delhi. Colonel Olcott drew the cryptograph, but drew it badly, and his faulty draught was copied; it is this error which renders all impressions from this seal recognisable at once. Colonel Olcott, on his return to Madras, gave the seal-ring to H. P. B., telling her that she might "send it to Father to wear on His watch-chain"; she at once pointed out the incorrectness of the drawing, resembling a W rather than an M. Another identification of impressions made by this seal has been made: Colonel Olcott, Rai B. K. Laheri and S. V. Edge, in January, 1893, searched Delhi for the maker of the seal. They found his brother, Alla Banda, and learned from him that the maker had died about eight months previously; he was shown a drawing of the seal impression, and an impression, and at once recognised his brother's work. Asked how he identified it, he answered: "Just as you would know your brother's handwriting, so I could detect my brother's seal-making by the peculiarities of its workmanship." This evidence was signed by Alla Banda in the presence of Rai B. K. Laheri as a notary public.

The first appearance, that I have heard of, of any impression from this seal-ring was on one or more envelopes of letters received by Countess Wachtmeister at Würzburg in 1885-6. Beyond this bare fact I have no information, and can give no particulars, having nothing but hearsay to go upon.

In the early part of 1888, Bertram Keightley, then residing with H. P. B. at 17, Lansdowne Road, saw this seal-ring in her possession, and on his asking H. P. B. what it was, she said, "Oh, it is only a flapdoodle of Olcott's."

On December 13th, 1888, Mr. Judge was staying with H. P. B. at 17, Lansdowne Road, and in a note written to Colonel Olcott from that address, Mr. Judge writes:

This course I know is also Master's judgment, and I confidently [55] trust that in concurrence he will put his seal upon this letter in some place.

The seal appears upon this note, and was recognized by Colonel Olcott when he received the letter as an impression from the brass seal-ring.

Its next appearance is on a cablegram, received by Bertram Keightley in New York, June 9th, 1890. When he arrived at *The Path* office he was told there was a cablegram for him, and he found it lying on the table in the inner office; as it was addressed "Judge, New York," it had of course been opened. This cablegram bore the word "Right," and the cryptograph of Mahâtmâ M., with a seal impression, at once recognized by him as that of the seal he had seen in H. P. B.'s possession early in 1888. This was the first time that B. K. had seen an impression of that seal, and he at once asked Mr. Judge whether he knew anything of the seal or writing on the cablegram. Mr. Judge denied all knowledge of either, and the presence of the seal and cryptograph had a decisive influence in causing Bertram Keightley to obey the instructions given in the cablegram.

The next appearance known to me of this seal, is in a letter from Mr. Judge to Bertram Keightley, dated from Avenue Road, May 29th, 1891.

It appears on a letter from Mr. Judge to Babula, from 19, Avenue Road, dated July 1st, 1891.

Upon a message purporting to come from Mahâtmâ M. to Colonel Olcott, and referring to a message to Colonel Olcott through Mr. Judge, which Mr. Judge had passed on in his own handwriting.

Again on a note referring to Colonel Olcott's proposal to sell some of H. P. B.'s things. This note was shewn by Colonel Olcott to Bertram Keightley at the time, and then replaced where found—in the opened envelope of a letter to Colonel Olcott from Australia, lying among a pile of others in Colonel Olcott's room on his table. Colonel Olcott then spoke casually to Mr. Judge about the seal he had had made in the Panjab with Mahâtmâ M.'s cryptograph and had given to H. P. B., wondering what had become of it, and saying he should regard as fraudulent any message bearing it. Two days after this the note above referred to, bearing an impression of this seal, had gone from the envelope in which it was left. I have not the exact date of this but it was early in July, 1891.

It appears on a message as to letters, September 4th, 1891, enclosed by Mr. Judge in a letter to Annie Besant.

[56] On a letter to Annie Besant, September 26th, 1891, authenticating message purporting to be from Mahâtmâ M.

On a letter to Tookaram Tatya from Mr. Judge, dated May 30th, 1891, from Avenue Road. This letter was sent by Tookaram Tatya to Mr. Judge for verification, the impression then being perfectly clear; it was returned by Mr. Judge to Tookaram Tatya with the impression rubbed out.

(In a letter to Annie Besant, dated April 18th, 1893, Mr. Judge writes:

If I were you, I would erase the seal from that little message . . . as the seal is gone, as D. K. said, it is nothing and adds nothing.)¹¹

On a letter to Tookaram Tatya from Mr. Judge, dated from London, July 6th, 1891, endorsing Mr. Judge with the words, "Help my colleague, work with him," in the script ascribed to Mahâtmâ M. and His cryptograph added.

Now in October, 1891, Colonel Olcott was in San Francisco with Mr. Judge, and he directly asked Mr. Judge if he had forged Mahâtmic letters to Annie Besant, and had got hold of the seal and used it fraudulently. Judge denied both imputations.

After this I know of no further impressions of this ring. Mr. Judge has repeatedly tried to dissuade Colonel Olcott from publishing the true story of the seal-ring, as in a letter written from New York on October 27th, 1892, in which he quotes against such publication the names of two well-known members of the Theosophical Society, and another urgent letter of October 31st, 1893.

In a letter to Colonel Olcott, written from New York on June 1st, 1892, Mr. Judge says that he has "Not that seal you refer to, and which I don't know myself."

Yet he had seen the impressions repeatedly on messages forwarded by himself, as in the message enclosed by him in his letter to Annie Besant, of September 4th, 1891, and mentioned in that letter.

The following matters are to be noted as bearing on the use of this seal by Mr. Judge:

- (1) That it does not appear on any communications ascribed to the Master before 1883. [57]
- (2) That it appeared on a letter sent to Colonel Olcott by Mr. Judge from London, at a time when it was known to be in H. P. B.'s possession, but would certainly not have been used by her to

11. This refers to the message since published, "Judge's plan is right." I omitted the message as being to E. S. T. [Note added April, 1895.]

authenticate to Colonel Olcott an opinion of the Master's, since it was "a flapdoodle of Olcott's," and would have had no weight with him.

- (3) That it subsequently appeared *only* in connection with documents to which Mr. Judge had access; the telegram to B. Keightley, the messages to Annie Besant, etc.; it is never, so far as I know, found in any letter coming from a place where Mr. Judge was not.
- (4) That the use of it ceased after Colonel Olcott's enquiry of Mr. Judge whether he had it and was using it fraudulently.
- (5) That Mr. Judge denied knowledge of it, after forwarding messages bearing it.
- (6) That a letter forwarded to Mr. Judge, and bearing a seal-impression, was returned by Mr. Judge with the seal erased, and
- (7) That Mr. Judge recommended Annie Besant to erase a seal on a message she held—a quite unreasonable suggestion if the seal were genuine, or believed by him to be so.
- (8) That Mr. Judge made many efforts to dissuade Colonel Olcott from publishing the history of the seal and a facsimile of its impression.

Lastly, it is proved that the impressions produced are impressions showing the peculiarities of the engraving on the seal-ring bought by Colonel Olcott from Alla Banda's brother, and that Alla Banda recognized an impression showed him as being made by a seal engraved by his brother.

[58]

CHARGE VI.

The sending of messages, orders and letters as if sent and written by Masters, such messages, etc., being proved to be non-genuine by:

- (a) *Error in matter of fact.*
- (b) *Threat based on mistake.*
- (c) *Triviality.*

Further the probability being against their genuineness and in favour of their being written by W. Q. Judge from:

- (a) *Their occurring only in letters from W. Q. Judge or in letters that had been within his reach.*
- (b) *The limitation of the knowledge displayed in them to that possessed by W. Q. Judge.*
- (c) *The personal advantage to himself, directly in some cases, and indirectly generally as being the only person through whom such written messages were received.*

Further the possibility of such imitation of known scripts by him is shown by imitations done by him to prove the ease of such imitations.

The substance of this charge is the sending of non-genuine messages, orders and letters purporting to come from Mahâtmâs, Personages in whose existence both Mr. Judge and the recipients of the messages believed. The evidence consists:—(a) of proofs that Mr. Judge sent messages and of the kind described; and (b) of proofs that the messages are not genuine.

- A. The fact that Mr. Judge did repeatedly send such messages, etc., is amply proved by his own statements in letters to Annie Besant, to H. S. Olcott, his own recent public declaration, and his own endorsement written on one such message.
- (1) Telegram to Annie Besant, September 4th, 1891.
 - (2) Letter to Annie Besant, September 4th, enclosing two messages, endorsed by himself, as received September 2nd. [p.59]
 - (3) Letter to Annie Besant, November 2nd, 1891, *re* message to Mr. Sinnett.
 - (4) Letter to Annie Besant, December 28th, 1892, enclosing message.
 - (5) Telegrams to Annie Besant, October 26th, 1891, from Master forbidding Indian tour, and November 21st suggesting excuses to be used.
 - (6) Letter from Mrs. Keightley reciting message May 3rd, 1894, at Mr. Judge's request.
 - (7) A number of messages in script assigned to Mahâtmâ M. written on Mr. Judge's letters or on letters from persons who were with him. These are detailed below.
 - (8) Telegram to Col. Olcott, April 21st, 1892.
 - (9) Letter to Col. Olcott, April 20th, 1892, enclosing typed slip.
 - (10) Mr. Judge's statement in his circular March 15th, 1894, that
 "I have on certain occasions repeated such to certain persons for their own guidance."
 - (11) Mr. Judge's own endorsement upon the two messages on same sheet of paper, enclosed by him to Annie Besant in his letter of September 4th, 1891.
- B. The fact that Mr. Judge did send messages, etc., purporting to be from the Mahâtmâs, being thus established, it remains to prove that these messages, etc., were *not genuine*.

The evidence in proof of this falls under two heads: (I) direct; and (II) indirect.

- (I) The direct evidence is based on the fact that whether the Mahâtmâs are regarded as really existing beings or not—it is impossible to regard as genuinely coming from Them messages containing: (a) error in matter of fact; or (b) a threat based on a mistake; or (c) mere trivialities; since such things are absolutely incompatible with the "Great Soul."

Therefore if it be proved that messages purporting to come from Them contain error in fact, threat or trivialities, it distinctly follows that such messages cannot have come from any Mahâtmâ and are therefore non-genuine. [60]

(a) Messages purporting to come from Mahâtmâs and containing errors in matter of fact:

- (1) In a letter from Mr. Abbott Clarke to Col. Olcott, dated October 17th, 1891, and stated in his letter of January 4th, 1892, to T. V. Charlou, to have been carried about by him during Mr. Judge's visit to him of that date, was contained a message in the script ascribed to Mahâtmâ M. and signed with His cryptograph, which reads as follows:—

Judge is not the forger you think and did not write 'Annie.' My seal is with me, and he has not seen it, but would like to. Both are doing right each in his own field. Yes—I have been training him and can use him when he does not know; but he is so new, it fades out often as it may in this letter from

an enthusiast. (Here follow some illegible words). *Facit per alium* applies to the *Lahore Brass*. No; it is not pencil.

(Signed with Mahâtmâ M.'s cryptograph.)

The context shows that the words "Lahore Brass" can only refer to the "Panjab Seal." Now Col. Olcott had told Mr. Judge of a seal he had made in the Panjab, he at the time thinking Delhi to be in that province. The writer of above was misled by the Colonel's blunder and gave to the seal the name of the great brass-working centre in the Panjab—Lahore. (This letter was opened at Adyar and forwarded thence to the Colonel.)¹²

(2) In a letter from Mr. Judge to Mr. Cooper-Oakley, dated New York, October 26th, 1887, Mr. Judge in a postscript hints that two writers in *The Theosophist* signing "Montague R. Moses" and "Viscomte de Figaniere" are one and the same person.

From the last word of this P.S. runs a red line at the end of which are the following words in the script ascribed to the Mahâtmâ K.H.:

[61] Which should not be used to force *my* or your theory on its readers. By order of Hillaryon.

These words seem to endorse and confirm the hint in the P.S. and, if so, are wrong as to a matter of fact, since the two writers in question were different people.

In a letter to Tookaram Tatya, dated July 6th, 1891, asking his good offices with Prof. Manilal Dvivedi in the Oriental Department, and written under the impression that Prof. Dvivedi had withdrawn, a message written on the margin in the alleged script of Mahâtmâ M. directs help to be given to Mr. Judge. Prof. Dvivedi, to whom this was sent, asks: "Why the Master cared to write the present two lines, for even before this letter itself was written all arrangements had been complete, and as many as 6 papers have been sent." The post between India and America with return is 8 weeks, and such a mistake of pressing for a thing already done might easily be made. But a message from a Mahâtmâ could not contain such error, supposing such a person to exist and to be endowed with powers and knowledge above that of ordinary men.

In a message sent to Annie Besant, through, Mrs. Keightley from Mr. Judge, after these proceedings began, there is an error of fact; the whole message is so hysterical as to be obviously from a lower source than the Mahâtmic:

Who has given Annie a message from the Master? Has she his writing and his signature? Has she seen him in the fleshly body? Has she his letters patent? Let her explain in public, as you are to do, her knowledge of Master, his ways and methods of communication to herself and through her to the T.S. If you are to be judged, so also is she to be. Make the proceedings perfectly [62] fair on both sides. Good will come out of this and not evil. When one steps into power, one must show from whence the power comes, else that person is a usurper and not a patentee.

Putting aside the extraordinary style of the above, and the fact that a Mahâtmâ could not need to ask such questions, we have the assertion of a communication through Annie Besant to the T. S. and a stepping into power on her part. No such communication to the T. S. through Annie Besant has ever been made, or claimed. No such step has been taken. Mahâtmâs do not make such mistakes. The phrase "If you are to be judged," etc., seems to be an echo of the Convention resolutions of San Francisco, and as no claims of being a medium of communication between

12. Endorsed "Received and opened by T. V. Charlu, November 24th '91." [Added April. 1895.]

Masters and other people have been made by Annie Besant, there is nothing to judge. No one claims any right to investigate or adjudicate upon Mr. Judge's private communications with Mahâtmâs; the charges are based entirely upon the use made of alleged communications.

(b) The threat based on a mistake appears in a letter from Mr. Judge to Col. Olcott, dated from New York, December 28th, 1891. The letter is a remonstrance on certain points and is hostile in tone, and on the margin appear the menacing words in the script ascribed to Mahâtmâ M:

I might tell him of your 'poison' interview with [———] M.

Two blunders are here: first the "poison interview" was a perfectly harmless conversation with an intimate friend on the properties of certain poisons; secondly, Mr. Judge knew of this interview prior to the date of the above letter under pledge of secrecy from Annie Besant, with in addition, a most injurious suspicion levelled at the Colonel in consequence of a dream the above-named friend had had some months later; [63] this was confided to Mr. Judge, as said, under plea of secrecy, and as Annie Besant did not believe the suspicion to be true, she certainly did not expect to see it as a threat in Mahâtmâ M.'s script. Moreover the statement is idle, as Mr. Judge already knew of the interview.

(c) Trivialities.

"Henry" with cryptograph, outside an envelope of a letter brought to Colonel by Mr. Judge.

On a letter to Annie Besant, January 22nd, 1892, for her to show Mr. Sinnett, "Tell date K. H." in script assigned to Mahatma K. H., and after "Do you think S. would snip off a bit," is written in the Mahâtmâ M.'s script. "Yes, M." Mr. Sinnett, however, declined to snip off a bit.

On a letter from Mr. Judge to Colonel Olcott's servant Babula, Mr. Judge signs himself "Your friend, William Q. Judge," and the words "your friend" are underlined in red and connected with "Yes" in the margin and cryptograph with Panjab Seal.

II. Indirect. The occurrence of such letters and messages, etc., since May, 1891, only in letters from Mr. Judge—enclosed in his envelope or written on his paper—and in letters that had been within his reach, as that of Abbott Clarke's.

The limitation of the knowledge displayed in so-called Mahâtmic messages to that possessed by Mr. Judge; thus, he told Col. Olcott at San Francisco that the Master had that night told him that the silver Phoenix was not at Adyar, while Mr. Judge had known for months that the Phoenix had been in H. P. B.'s hands, in Annie Besant's hands, and was then in his own safe.

The statement in his letter to Col. Olcott of August 30th, 1893, that:

As to the Presidency. Master says to me that you, down in your heart, do not think I ought to be that official, and that though you do not say it openly, and inferentially and in a weak way deny it to Mead [64]—though that is not a real denial—you have your eye on Annie Besant as the one you would like to see there. Well, I believe him.

This information has been given to Mr. Judge by myself, Col. Olcott having written to me that he would much rather nominate me as his successor.

The threat spoken of above, based on my own statement to Mr. Judge.

There is nothing I can find in any letter I have received or seen which goes beyond Mr. Judge's knowledge.

The personal advantage is direct as in the gaining of a jewel that had peculiar occult properties. Again in a letter to Tookaram Tatyá, a line in red is drawn from the signature to the words written in the margin in the script ascribed to Mahâtmâ M., "Help my colleague, work with him," signature and seal. And in a letter to Annie Besant from Mr. Judge, September 20th, 1891, "Be bold as he is and force the currents now and then," signature and seal.

The indirect advantage of being the only apparent channel of such communication, or a channel at all, is obvious.

The mechanical difficulty of such writing is nothing for Mr. Judge, and a curious illustration of his facility is found in an old letter to Judge Khandalavala, September 17th, 1884, in which he shows how easily signatures may be copied by producing those of Col. Olcott, Mme. Blavatsky and two others.

19, AVENUE ROAD,
REGENT'S PARK,
LONDON, N.W.
April 28th, 1895.

We, the undersigned, hereby testify:—

That we have inspected the documents and all the letters (with the exception of those addressed to Mrs. Besant and the one to Mr. Cooper-Oakley) referred to in the preceding Statement, which was prepared to be laid before the Judicial Committee of July, 1894;

[65] That we have carefully verified the extracts made, and find that the context does not alter meaning.

(Signed)

G. R. S. Mead (Gen. Sec. European Section), Bertram Keightley (Gen. Sec. Indian Section), A. P. Sinnett (Pres. London Lodge), John Maurice Watkins (Pres. Adelphi Lodge), O. Firth (Pres. Bradford Lodge), Christopher Corbett (Pres. Manchester Lodge), Hodgson Smith (Pres. Harrogate Lodge), W. H. Thomas (Pres. Middlesbro' Lodge), Thos. Williams (Pres. Bournemouth Lodge), W. B. Fricke (Pres. Dutch Lodge), Otway Cuffe (Treas. European Section), E. T. Sturdy, Herbert Burrows.

[67]

Part III.

STATEMENTS CONTAINING THE FACTS, TO
HAVE BEEN GIVEN BY WITNESSES.

[69]

STATEMENT BY COLONEL OLCOTT.

DURING the progress of an Indian Tour in 1883, I arrived on the 13th of November at a certain city in the Panjab (for the present I shall not name that city). Passing through the bazaar, I entered a seal-engraver's shop to see what sort of work they turned out. I was shown some proof impressions of Urdu Seals (specimens of which I have by me), seeing which an idea occurred to me, of sending through H. P. B., as a playful present to my Master M., a seal bearing a *facsimile* of his cryptograph. I thereupon got the seal made, paying 8 annas for the same. This seal I gave to H. P. B. on my return to Madras, with the jocular remark that she might send it to "Father"; we being accustomed to speak of the Mahâtâmâ as "Father" amongst ourselves. H. P. B., on examining the engraving, at once pointed out to me that the Master's cryptograph was not correctly drawn and I also realised then that this was so. For the sake of convenience I shall hereafter describe this seal as the "Panjab Seal."

I did not subsequently see the seal, but my impression is that H. P. B. kept it in her despatch box along with a lot of other things. The fault in the engraving of the seal is, however, well-known to me, and I could easily recognise any impression made with that seal.

I have very lately obtained information regarding the engraver of that seal by personally visiting the city and the shop where it was made.

While at London in July, 1891, some conversation occurred between W. Q. J. and myself about the expenses of the European Convention, and I proposed that as H. P. B.'s legatee I should sell some valuable articles of hers and give the money as her contribution towards those expenses. Judge then told me as from "the Master," that I need not trouble myself about it as "they" would see that the money was forthcoming, and that I would get a message about it. As I did not get any message soon, I spoke to W. Q. J., who replied that what he had already told me was all that he had heard from the "Master."

[70] The same day on returning from town and sitting down to my writing-table, I lifted a piece of blotting-paper, and under it found the following message written on paper. "I withhold the message until later" (cryptograph and illegible impression of seal).

Later, W. Q. J. left on my writing-table a note as follows:—

Dear Olcott, Master says he has sent you a message in a *queer* envelope and you are to look for it.

Upon searching I found in the ordinary envelope of a private letter, which I had previously received and which after reading I left open with other letters on my table, a piece of paper bearing writing in red pencil with cryptograph and a legible seal impression. This at once put me in mind of the "Panjab Seal." I showed the paper to Bertram Keightley and gave him a history of the seal. I then put back the paper in the envelope in which I had found it, and placed it on my table. The substance of this "Mahâtâmâ note" was to the effect that there was no need to sell H. P. B.'s jewels as money would be provided.

I thereupon spoke to W. Q. J. and asked him if he had seen among H. P. B.'s effects a certain seal (describing the "Panjab Seal" and telling the circumstances of its making in the Panjab, *but not naming the exact place*). Judge said he had not seen the seal, whereupon I remarked that I hoped no scoundrel would get possession of it, and use it to give colour to bogus "Mahâtâmâ messages," and I added that if ever I should see a message which bore the impression of that seal, I should of course know it to be fraudulent. (I did not at the time inform Judge that I had got the message about which he had written to me.)

After two days I again looked into the envelope for the paper (which I had replaced) but found that it was not there.

On reaching Colombo *en route* for Madras, on my way back from America and Japan in 1891, I received a packet of letters which had been forwarded to meet me. Among them was a letter from Mr. Abbott Clark, of Villa Park, Orange Co., California, bearing date 17/10/91. Inside the letter I found a slip of paper bearing a message in handwriting resembling that usually attributed to “Mahâtmâ M.” and his cryptograph. The paper employed was Cashmere paper, identical with a certain sample lot bought by me in Jammoo, Cashmere, in 1883, to be used in the *Theosophist* Office for packing books, being cheap [71] and strong. It is hand-made paper and some of it was taken by H. P. B. with her to Europe in 1886.

The message, which is written in red pencil and partly in black (and has no seal), runs thus, part being illegible:—

Judge is not the forger you think and did not write ‘Annie.’ *My seal* is with me and he has not seen it, but would like to. Both are doing right, each in his own field. Yes,—I have been training him and can use him when he does not know; but he is so new, it fades out often as it may in this letter from an enthusiast (here follow some illegible words). ‘*Facit per alium*’ applies to the *Lahore Brass*. No; it is not pencil.

(Signed with “Mahâtmâ M.’s” cryptograph).

The message presented two suspicious points. (I) It speaks of the “Panjab Seal” as “my seal” (*i.e.*, Mahâtmâ M.’s) and also mentions it as the “Lahore Brass.”

In reference to the making of the seal, I had simply mentioned to Judge the Province of the Panjab, and as Lahore is supposed to be the capital of the Panjab, the writer apparently thought he could safely call the seal the “Lahore Brass.” Unfortunately for him the seal was not made there.

The quoting of the maxim “(*qui*) *facit per alium (facit per se)*” is suspicious, and opens the door to any amount of fraud and deception.

I then caused a letter to be written to Mr. Abbott Clarke to inquire when he had posted the letter. He replied that although he wrote the letter on the 17th October, he had not posted it till the 20th through forgetfulness. He also mentioned that Mr. Judge was in the locality about twenty-four hours on October 17th and 18th.

In January, 1892, I received a letter from Mr. Judge dated 28/12/91, in which he complained that I had not written to him after leaving San Francisco. On opening the letter I found written across the first page, to the left, the following words in red pencil:—

I might tell him of your ‘*poison*’ interview with — [name given] —“M.”

This base insinuation greatly incensed me, and I wrote an indignant reply to W. Q. J., who, amongst other things, wrote me as follows:—“I have puzzled my head over your reference to ‘poison’ as if in one of mine; as I never referred to it I cannot catch on and have given it up in despair.”

[72] W. Q. J. and H. S. O. met at San Francisco in the first week of October, 1891, and were guests of Dr. J. A. Anderson. They conversed about various T.S. questions, among others, about A. B.’s recent public declaration that she had received letters from in the same handwriting as that of those received by H. P. B., Sinnett and others before H. P. B.’s death. O. put the question direct to J. if he had written the letters,

for the good of the T. S. and to help vindicate H. P. B.'s memory; telling him that he (O.) knew of his (J.'s) remarkable talent for imitating handwriting, that he had heard of his imitating some at Adyar, and saying that A. B.'s declaration had made a very deep sensation abroad. W. Q. J. denied emphatically that he had written the letters, or any of the sort. H. S. O. said he could easily understand how—if he had done it—it might have been done for a benevolent motive—however mistaken—and that, at any rate, the immediate effect had been strikingly great upon the public opinion regarding Theosophy. J. persisted in denying all agency in the affair. In the course of conversation he said that one might think H. S. O. did not believe in the existence of Masters at all; to which O. rejoined that as to that his belief had never changed for he knew of their existence. There was much conversation about H. P. B., her powers and policy, and J. told O. that he (O.) had never understood H. P. B. and never would.

O. said that he should never consent to be a party to bogus letters or messages to anybody or under any circumstances. He also resumed his remarks of London about the use by somebody, with fraudulent intent, of the Panjab seal, which he (O.) viewed as a shameful swindle, as the seal was not made to be used, and, to his knowledge, had never been used either by or for Mahâtmâ M.; it had been a mere bit of tomfoolery between himself (O.) and H.P.B., without the remotest idea that it would ever be used as if it belonged to M.

He said that if he should detect anybody using it he (O.) should expose him as a scoundrel.¹³ There was no wrangling between J. and O., nor did O. charge J. with having written the letters to A. B. for he had no facts to go upon; he simply asked him if he had done so. He certainly suspected J. of having written letters to others, possibly to A. B.—because of the false letters bearing his own Panjab [73] seal, which J. had warned him in writing that he would find on his table, and which he actually did find there, and which was removed after O. had told J. that he had himself caused the Panjab seal to be made as a joke with H. P. B., and that its appearance upon any alleged writing would stamp it at once as a fraud.

STATEMENT BY BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY.

In 1888, while living with H. P. B. in Lansdowne Road, she, being upon one occasion ill in bed, asked me to take out a small box containing some of her "occult possessions."

On searching the box I found a small brass seal engraved with a cryptograph somewhat resembling that of "Mahâtmâ M." I asked H. P. B. what it was, when she replied: "Oh, it is only a flapdoodle of Olcott's!"

The resemblance of the seal to "Mahâtmâ M.'s" cryptograph, coupled with H. P. B.'s remark, caused me to look very closely at the seal, and to photograph it very strongly on my memory.

While at New York in 1890, I received on the 9th June in that year, a telegram addressed to Mr. Judge, but intended for me. The telegram was opened in Mr. Judge's office, and then given to me. I found in the telegram the word "Right," written in red pencil with the cryptograph of Mahâtmâ M., and a seal impression like the one I had seen with H. P. B. I thereupon asked Judge if he had put the seal there; to this he replied that he knew nothing about it.

On 28th May, 1891, Mr. Judge wrote me a letter from London, and sent it on to Adyar, where it was received on 23/6/93. In my absence P. R. Venkatarama Aiyer received it, opened it, and then forwarded it to me at London. The concluding sentence of the letter is as follows:—

Masters watch us, and since May 8th have sent word in writing, so we must not lose our aspirations and our faith.

13. This same warning he (O.) repeated at various dates in letters to A. B., W. Q. J., A. F., and he thinks—Mrs. Arch. Keightley.

Over this para. was found the cryptograph of “Mahâtâmâ M.” in red pencil, and also an impression of the “Panjab Seal.”

While in London in July, 1891, when spending some hours at Avenue Road very shortly before the Convention, H. S. O. showed me a slip of paper in Judge’s handwriting, which notified H. S. O. that the “Master” had sent him a letter in it a “queer” envelope. H. S. O. said he could find no “queer” envelope, but in a common envelope lying open on his table, [74] he had found a slip of paper bearing a message in red pencil. This slip was shown to me. It seemed to be written in red pencil. The purport of the message was that there was no need to sell H. P. B.’s jewels, as money would be provided. To this message was affixed in black an impression of a seal, like the seal I had seen with H. P. B. H. S. O. then related to me in detail the story of how the “Panjab Seal” had come to be made. He further told me that he would tell Judge the same.

The supposed “Mahâtâmâ Message” was put back by H. S. O. in the same envelope in which he had found it; but two days afterwards on searching for the slip it could not be found there.

At Adyar, in December, I received a letter from Judge in which he warned me against Olcott, and said that H. S. O. would try to make me believe that J. was concocting bogus “Mahâtâmâ messages.” On opening this letter I found in it a small piece of a peculiar sort of tissue paper, such as is used to separate the sheets of type-writing transfer paper. On this slip were written these words:—

“Judge leads right; follow him and stick.” I showed this to Edge, who will confirm this statement. The letter and enclosure were lost when the despatch box was robbed in November of the following year.

THE PANJAB SEAL.

Rai B. K. Lahiri says that on Saturday, January 28th, 1893, he met at Delhi by appointment H. S. O. and S. V. E. The same meeting he and S. V. E. went with H. S. O. to the street called Chandni Chowk in Delhi in search of the engraver of seals from whom H. S. O. said he had purchased the so-called “Punjaub Seal,” in the year 1883. Upon enquiring at different shops, they found a man named Kutub Uddin, commonly called Alla Banda (“Servant of Alla”) it being the custom of the country to give a man some appellation designating his habits or personal peculiarities. The man is a maker and engraver of seals. Upon being questioned as to who were makers of brass seals in 1883, in Chandni Chowk, he mentioned among others his brother, who died about eight months ago in a cholera epidemic which carried off several of his fellow-craftsmen. R. B. K. L. then showed him a drawing of the impression of the Punjaub Seal and of the seal engraving itself, and he at once said—that is the work of my brother. Asked how he [75] could recognise it, he said: “Just as you would know your brother’s handwriting; so I could detect my brother’s seal-engraving by the peculiarities of its workmanship.” Both he and his brother had learnt their trade from one teacher, viz., their father, and his brother’s style was perfectly familiar to him. When his brother died, his working-tools and books of sample seal-impressions were sold, to whom he did not know but would enquire. He recollected that his brother had cast about 500 common brass seal-rings which he kept for engraving on the order of customers; they were strung on strings in his shop. His brother’s name was Badarroddin.

RAI B. K. LAHIRI,
*Chief Court Pleader and
Notary, Public, etc. etc.*

EMPRESS HOTEL, DELHI,
January 28th, 1893.

The above statements are correct.

Signed and declared in my presence,

RAI B. K. LAHIRI,

Notary Public, etc, etc.

DELHI, *January 28th*, 1893.

(*name in Urdu*) ALLA BANDA, Seal-maker,

DELHI, *January 28th*, 1893.

Signed in our presence by the said Alla Banda, who informed us that he had found the man who had bought his brother's working-tools and sample books; that the books being of no use to him, he had destroyed them. He handed us specimens of his brother's work and informed us that his seals were engraved for the purpose of making an impression in wax.

Upon showing the drawings of the "Punjaub Seal" and its impression to "Nisar Ahmeel," another seal engraver of Chandni Chowk, Delhi (see trade card): he at once said, "this is very common work, an engraving on brass, and the seal would not be worth more than four or eight annas. I work in stone and you had better enquire of the brass-workers. Two or three of the old brass-workers have died in the cholera epidemic." Thereupon we visited several shops and finally discovered Alla Banda.

H. S. OLCOTT,
RAI B. K. LAHIRI,
SYDNEY V. EDGE.

DELHI, *January 28th*, 1893.

[76]

THE ROSICRUCIAN JEWEL.

H. S. O.'s EVIDENCE.

In the first years of my acquaintance with H. P. B., when she and I were living in the same house at the then Headquarters of the T. S. in New York, she had in her possession, and frequently wore about her neck, a certain Rosicrucian jewel, composed of silver and set with stones, being a unique thing and greatly valued by her. This jewel she subsequently brought to India, 1878-79. Some years later I asked her to let me keep possession of it for a certain reason (that I might watch if its stones changed colour in sympathy with her changes in health), and it remained in my possession when she finally went to Europe in 1885.

In October, 1891, being at the house of Dr. J. A. Anderson of San Francisco, California, at the same time with W. Q. J., I was telling the doctor about the mysterious property of the stones in the aforesaid jewel, which changed colour with the state of H. P. B.'s health, and I remarked that I had the jewel at Adyar, and that when I got back I intended to look at it and see if it had changed colour since H. P. B.'s death. At this conversation W. Q. J. was present. Hearing my last statement, he professed to have a psychic communication from the Mahâtâmâ and said to me: "Olcott, the Master tells me to say that he has taken the jewel away from Adyar, and that when you get back you will find it gone. Let this be a proof to you of the genuineness of the communications that I receive from the Mahâtâmâs."

On the completion of my tour and arrival at Adyar I mentioned the above conversation to Bertram Keightley. Thereupon Bertram Keightley said that he had seen me give the jewel to H. P. B. in London in 1888 or 1889. I, however, made a thorough search for the jewel, and being unsuccessful asked my servant Babula if he could tell me where it was, he always having charge of my effects.

Babula at once reminded me that I had taken the jewel with me to London to give to H. P. B. in 1888, and he said that he had himself packed it in my trunk; I then remembered all the circumstances of the case, and that I had given it to H. P. B. as I had been afraid that it might be lost or stolen if kept at Adyar, and I did not want to bear the responsibility any longer.

[77] I then wrote to W. Q. J., reproaching him for giving me a bogus test, and on July 1st, 1892, W. Q. J. wrote me, mentioning our San Francisco conversation, thus: "Then about what I told you in 'Frisco, I told you then that that night when you mentioned to me the old symbol of H. P. B., Master said you would not find it in Adyar as you said, that is all I said. Well, it has turned out true, for you say now that you did not have it after all. That is just what I told you and no more, yet you make a lot of vague things out of it."

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY'S EVIDENCE.

During H. S. O.'s visit to H. P. B. in 1888, I was present in H. P. B.'s room when H. S. O. gave to H. P. B. the Rosicrucian Jewel, the stones in which changed colour with her state of health.

I remember the circumstance well because I had previously heard both H. S. O. and H. P. B. talk of this Jewel, and felt interested in it, especially as H. P. B. had told me that the Jewel once belonged to Cagliostro. While driving up to Adyar Headquarters from the harbour on his return, H. S. O. related to me his conversation with W. Q. J. in San Francisco, as follows:—

Olcott, Master says I am to tell you that he has taken away the Jewel, and you will not find it at Adyar when you get back. Let this be a test to you of the genuineness of the communications I receive from Master.

I at once reminded H. S. O. that he had given the Rosicrucian Jewel to H. P. B. as above described in 1888 in London. I was also present when Babula reminded H. S. O. that he (Babula) had himself packed the Jewel in H. S. O.'s trunk, when H. S. O. was going to Europe in 1888.

ANNIE BESANT'S EVIDENCE.

The Jewel referred to was occasionally worn by H. P. B., in 1889 and 1890, and was among her effects after her death; it remained with other things in my custody. I shewed it to Mr. Judge when he came to Europe in 1891. After he had returned to America, Colonel Olcott remained with us for a short time. During this time I received from Mr. Judge a letter, and on a blank space at the end were some words in red, in Mahâtma [78] M's script, directing me to send the Jewel to Mr. Judge. I wrapped the Jewel up and sealed it, sending it, according to directions subsequently sent me by Mr. Judge, by Colonel Olcott to Mrs. ver Planck (Mrs. Archibald Keightley). Mr. Judge wrote me, as stated in my presentment of the case. I heard nothing further about the Jewel until Christmas, 1893, when I found Colonel Olcott's and Mr. Keightley's statements, and Mr. Judge's letter, among the evidence submitted to me at Adyar. I then stated the above facts to Colonel Olcott, completing the story of the trick played upon him.

[79]

ADDITIONAL MATTER.

NOT PREPARED FOR THE COMMITTEE.

[81][Asked for by Mrs. Besant, to confirm statements in presentment of case.]

BOMBAY, 4th April, 1895.

MY DEAR SISTER A. BESANT,—In reference to the letters from brother Judge with the Master's reputed seal and initial I beg to state that I doubted their genuineness and had sent them back to him with the desire to know from him whether they were made by him or by the Master, and got them back with no satisfactory reply and the seal and the initial rubbed out. These letters are handed over to you to make use of when required.

Yours ever fraternally,
TOOKARAM TATYA.

I affirm that the quotations given from letters to myself from Mr. Judge are textually accurate, and are not changed in meaning by their context. Also that the words in the M. script are accurately given.

April 24th, 1895.

ANNIE BESANT

April 24th, 1895.

I hereby declare and attest that when Mrs. Besant was preparing the above statement last year (1894) for presentation to the Judicial Committee, I carefully examined the letters from Mr. Judge to Mrs. Besant mentioned therein and verified the accuracy of the extracts quoted, and the fact that the context in no way altered or changed the sense of these extracts. I also verified the presence of the marginal messages on some of them in the M. script and attest that the transcripts thereof as given in Mrs. Besant's statement are accurate.

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY.

STATEMENT OF ANNIE BESANT,
WRITTEN APRIL 24th, 1895.

I should have given before the Judicial Committee in July, 1894, evidence in confirmation of the presentment of the case, so far as it came within my personal knowledge. I add now an account of the "messages" received from Mr. Judge by me; I had thought the case against Mr. Judge sufficiently strong without these, and as I was presenting it myself, I desired to confine my evidence as much as possible to that which merely [82] filled up gaps in the evidence of others, and was absolutely necessary to complete a convincing case.

I am not able to produce documentary evidence; immediately after I learned from the Master, in Sept., 1893, that Mr. Judge had deceived me, in the shock of the disgust I felt, I destroyed the "messages," except those written on the margins of letters. Nearly a year later, just ere leaving for Australia, I destroyed all the letters I had received from Mr. Judge, as I could not carry them with me round the world, and would not risk their falling into the hands of others, in case of my death. I should not have produced any of them before the Committee, as any letter produced might have become public property in its entirety, and Mr. Judge's letters to me were all letters written from friend to friend, containing expressions of opinion regarding members of the T.S., and regarding his own experiences, which it would have been, in my opinion, dishonourable to make public. They did not throw any light on the deceptions practised, except in the extracts given in my presentment, and in one additional case given below.

The first “message” at Avenue Road was produced under the following circumstances, which I give because Mr. Judge, in a document issued by him to the Eastern School (Esoteric Section) in Europe, India and Australia, without my consent and sanction, and which, therefore, is not covered by any promise of secrecy, asserts himself to be a member of the Inner Group of that School. He gained admission by this message. He wrote a letter, asking if he might enter, and gave it to me, fastened down so that I did not see its contents, in his own room, asking me to place it for him in a little unlocked cabinet in H. P. B.’s room. I did so. On the evening of the same day, or the next morning—I forget which—he asked me to bring it back to him; I fetched it, and gave it back to him. He opened it and showed it to me, and it contained the word “yes” after his question, written in a writing different from his own, and lower down the words “and hope.” The writing in which these words were bore a resemblance, not very marked, to that of H. P. B. As Mr. Judge read us extracts from letters of H. P. B., speaking of him in very high terms, and sentences in the script of the Master received by him, and the claim, endorsed by a certificate, to be a chela of the Master of thirteen years’ standing (since 1875), his admission seemed reasonable, and we took the words written on his letter without challenge.

[83] The next “message” was on a slip of paper, in a packet of letters from H. P. B. to Mr. Judge, selected by myself from a larger number. I chose these letters for references contained in them to Mr. Judge, shewing H. P. B.’s high opinion of him, and the position she had given him as the head of the American Esotericists, under herself. Mr. Judge founded on these a claim to share with myself the Headship of the School, and I was only too glad that he should do so. When I read at a meeting the extracts from these letters, I found on raising one of them a small slip of paper, which I had not placed there; I was passing it over, not knowing how it came there nor what it was, when Mr. Judge challenged my attention to it; it was the “message” referred to by Dr. Keightley in an unauthorised, and therefore public E. S. T. paper, “W. Q. Judge’s plan is right,” in the M. script, with signature “M.” and seal. Mr. Judge, who was sitting close beside me while I picked out the letters, must have slipped the scrap into the bundle without my noticing his action; at the time, being void of all suspicion of his good faith, I accepted it as genuine. The seal on this missive was the one Mr. Judge asked me to erase, after the appearance of Messrs. Old and Edge’s article.

The next “message” was a note in the M. script, signed “M.” and sealed, placed in a letter of my own, asking for guidance on a private matter; my letter was locked by Mr. Judge into a drawer in his bedroom, and was given back to me by him, with the answer enclosed in my own envelope.

The next was a letter in the same script, shown to me by Mr. Judge, addressed to himself, and giving directions as to Mr. Keightley’s position in India.

Then came a few words in the script ascribed to Mahâtmâ K. H., written on a florist’s bill, which was in a gummed envelope left on my desk while I was out, Mr. Judge having been writing at a table near. It bade me ask Mr. Judge for some information.

Next was the sentence in the M. script, “He is true to us, to H. P. B. and you,” signed “M.” and sealed, written on the margin of a letter from Mr. Judge from Queenstown, on his way to America.

Then came the direction to send Mr. Judge the Rosicrucian Jewel, as already given, and shortly afterwards a fairly long letter in the M. script, with initial and seal, giving directions on E. S. T. matters, and enclosed in a letter from Mr. Judge.

[84] These were all I had received before I spoke at the Hall of Science, on Aug. 31st, 1891.

In September of the same year I received the congratulatory telegram and written messages referred to in my presentment, and very shortly afterwards, enclosed in a letter from Mr. Judge, a fairly long letter to the Inner Group in the M. script.

In the same month (I think) I received a letter from Mr. Judge, with a marginal “message” on the dangers of hypnotism, and bidding me lay stress on them in my lectures on the subject [p.40]; this was in the M. script and with initial.

In October came the telegram and letter stopping my Indian visit, as given in my presentment.

After this, there were few of these documents sent. When in America in 1892-93, I found some words in a writing not known to me, inside the flap of a closed (gummed) envelope of an English letter forwarded to me by Mr. Judge. I received also from Mr. Judge’s hands a letter in the M. script, with initial and seal, written on very light rice paper, and a few words in the same handwriting on the outside of a letter forwarded to me by Mr. Judge.

When at San Francisco early in 1893, I received a curious letter from Mr. Judge, written in a hand somewhat resembling that adopted by Master K. H., in which he claimed that the Masters wrote through him, using him as Their medium for writing, and dictating letters to him which he then wrote down. It is clear from subsequent events that in this letter, written when rumours were circulating against Mr. Judge, he made the first move towards preparing me for the idea that he sometimes wrote unconsciously, and sometimes consciously, messages received verbally, directly from the Masters.

While in New Zealand, I received another “message” in the M. script, but without initial or seal. This informed me that the darkness was nearly over. Within about a week a telegram came announcing the articles in the *Westminster Gazette!*

I have not seen any letters or messages received since H. P. B.’s death in the M. script, except those that have appeared on letters from Mr. Judge, or on, or in, letters that have passed through his hands.

[85]

“THE MAN IN THE STREET.”

In *Lucifer*, Vol. VIII., p. 517, appears the following entry under the heading “General Fund of the European Section.”

“H. P. B. per W. Q. J. £20.”

Those £20, consisting of two Bank of England notes of £10 each, were handed to the Treasurer of the European Section, Mr. E. T. Sturdy, at the European Convention of 1891 by Mr. W. Q. Judge. Mr. Judge stated to a number of members that he felt impelled to go out during the Convention, and was given the money by a “man in the street from H. P. Blavatsky.” These two notes were signed in red crayon with the supposed cryptograph of Master M.

In September, 1894, I wrote to Mr. Judge acknowledging the sum of £7 8s. 3d., the contribution of the American Section to the H. P. B. Memorial Fund, pointing out at the same time the sum compared very

unfavourably with the far larger amounts contributed by the European and Indian Sections. Mr. Judge replied with some general remarks, adding that the £20 given in 1891 were “in effect from the American Section.”

In the greatest surprise I instantly replied to Mr. Judge, pointing out that if such were the case it was exceedingly improper for him to have started the legend of the “man in the street”; warning him at the same time to be very careful to whom he sent such incriminating documents, and returning him his letter, saying that I did not wish to use it against him, and adding that I required no explanations.

I wanted no explanation, for I felt that no straightforward explanation was possible. I returned the letter, as I still thought at that time that Mr. Judge would in future steer a straight course, and that his long service had merited the straining of consideration to the utmost. Subsequent events have proved that my estimate of Mr. Judge’s character was erroneous, and I now make the facts public for the common safety.

In reply to this letter I received the following extraordinary “explanation” volunteered by Mr. Judge himself, in a letter not marked “private,” and dated October 14th, 1894.

[86] “I voluntarily wish to speak of the part of my letter about the £20. Those were given as said, and they are noted by Him with His name. I was the particular channel for the coming of it; I represented America then; I had no money; I wanted money for the fund; I applied for the money, and He got it and I delivered it. If you know any other facts you can make a theory if you like, but it will be wrong. The words ‘in effect’ cover for me all the facts in the case not otherwise expressed. To get that money force of some kind had to be used and some capital had to be drawn on, for the Adepts do not get money out of air, nor do they disturb the circulation of any place. It has to be right money, and whether it be turned into English or left any other way, it has to be at the first ‘right money’ and not stolen. To have taken it from the bank would have been theft. They have no English account, and all their money is under bonds that you cannot understand, or else we should long ago have had millions. He would not have then, and did not give it as for the European Section or the Indian; but the impulse and the ‘Yogi’s wish’ came from my side, and hence while it was from [^] it was ‘in effect’ from this Section, though then and now without their knowledge. I never could have said in public (to be misunderstood) that it was from this Section. It could not be made clear to the dull heads of the crowd in fifty lectures. It rested with me then to have said it was from me as for America, or to have said what I did say. Had I taken the credit it would have been true, both were true.”

In the first place the money was originally given to “the General Fund of the European Section,” and not to the “H. P. B. Memorial Fund.” In the second place, as I now learn for the first time, the two £10 notes were lent by Mrs. Besant to Mr. Judge. The legend of their being “given by a man in the street from H. P. Blavatsky” is thus an entire fiction.

G. R. S. MEAD.

I well remember the circumstances narrated by Mr. Mead and can confirm his account of what took place. Mr. Judge distinctly stated that the two £10 notes had been handed to him by “a man in the street” as from H. P. B.

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY.

[87] The two £10 notes were lent to Mr. Judge by myself; he told me that he had not the money himself, but that Master had promised it to him, to give in H. P. B.’s name, and he told me also of meeting a “man in the street” who had given him a peculiar feeling and was, he thought, connected with the Master; of course, he said nothing to me about receiving the notes from him, since he asked me to lend them to him, as he wanted to give the money that day from H. P. B. I saw the initial M on the corners of the notes the next morning after

they had been given. I never knew the notes were themselves supposed to have been obtained phenomenally until I to-day read Mr. Judge's letter to Mr. Mead, when I at once said that I lent the notes and was repaid shortly afterwards by Mr. Judge. The "force" used "to get that money" was a simple request to myself for a temporary loan, that the gift might be made before the Convention broke up.

ANNIE BESANT.

April 26th, 1895.

[88]

NOTICE.

If some definite action with regard to Mr. Judge shall not have been taken by the European Section before the meeting of its Annual Convention in July, we, the undersigned, shall—failing any full and satisfactory explanation having been made by Mr. Judge before that date, or his voluntary [sic] secession from the Society—propose and second at that Convention the following resolution:—

Whereas Mr. W. Q. Judge has been called on to resign the office of Vice-President of the Theosophical Society by the Indian, Australasian, and European Sections, but has not complied with their request; and

Whereas he evaded the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee of July, 1894, refused a Jury of Honour, and has since given no full and satisfactory explanation to the Society in answer to the charges brought against him;

Resolved: that this Convention of the European Section of the Theosophical Society unites with the Indian and Australasian Sections in demanding his expulsion from the Society, and requests the President-Founder to immediately take action to carry out the demand of these three Sections of the T.S.

ANNIE BESANT, F.T.S.
G. R. S. MEAD, F.T.S.

10. **Theosophy** (ULT), Vol. 10, 1921-1922, pp. 398-407.

The European Convention met at London on July 4, 1895. Dr. Mary Weeks Burnett from America was present and, upon invitation from Col. Olcott in the Chair, read a letter to the Convention on behalf of those members in the United States who dissented from the recent action of the American Convention, but Col. Olcott refused to read the letter above given from the newly formed Theosophical Society in America to the European Convention, saying, "I declare the thing out of order and not admissible." A sharp discussion ensued, and Mrs. Besant made a speech, concluding:

I would ask you (if the President-Founder would be good enough to waive his perfectly just and legal ruling) to allow the letter to be read, and then let it lie on the table, passing it over in absolute silence so to speak.

After further discussion Mrs. Besant made a motion to the same effect, which was carried and the President-Founder then read the letter from the Americans. Immediately a motion was made by Mr. F. J. Dick, of the Dublin Lodge, "That this convention do receive the communication with pleasure, and do draft a reply thereto." This motion was seconded and then debated. Finally Mrs. Besant moved as an amendment, "that the letter do lie upon the table." Her amendment was seconded by Oliver Firth. After further debate the Chairman put the amendment which was carried,—39 to 13—and accordingly the letter was "laid on the table." Next, Mr. E. T. Hargrove rose to a question of privilege and said that such treatment of the letter was a rejection, not only of the friendly overtures of their American brothers, but an abandonment by a majority of the European Section of the fundamental basis of all theosophical work—brotherhood; and called upon all who agreed with him to leave the hall. Accordingly a third of the Delegates and visiting Fellows retired, and proceeded to take steps to organize "The Theosophical Society in England," in affiliation with the T. S. in A., adopting the same Constitution and electing Mr. Judge their life-president.

The Convention of the European Section continued its sessions and finally, before its termination, adopted a *Resolution* as follows:

RESOLVED:—That this Convention regrets that the Theosophical Society in America should have addressed to it a letter of greeting containing much contentious matter, and in a form which makes it impossible to accept it officially, yet the delegates wish to assure their late colleagues in America of their hearty sympathy in all matters pertaining to the true principles of Theosophy and Universal Brotherhood.

We may conclude the historical aspect of the long struggle by a quotation from the "Executive Notice" issued by Colonel Olcott as "President-Founder of the Theosophical Society," from Zumarraga, Spain, dated as on June 5th, 1895, while on his return voyage to India, in which he advises the membership that he has received official notification from Mr. Judge as "President of the T. S. in America," of the changes made, and then goes on as follows:—

The only interpretation of the above acts and declaration which the undersigned, as one tolerably well acquainted with constitutional and parliamentary procedure is able to arrive at, is that *the American Section, exercising its indisputable right, in lawful Convention assembled* —

1. Voted to constitute itself a separate and completely autonomous Society, with its own title, constitution and by-laws, life-president and other officers; and has thus as effectually broken its relation with the Theosophical Society as the United States of America did their colonial relation with Great Britain on July 4th, 1776.

2. Voted to consider the Theosophical Society as a body existing *de facto* and not *de jure*; holding a name to which it is not legally entitled, and having no constitutional jurisdiction over the Sections, Branches and Fellows in America and elsewhere, now holding its charters and diplomas.

With the second only of these propositions as stated and numbered by himself, the President-Founder takes issue, and proceeds to argue the *de jure* as well as *de facto*, nature of the Theosophical Society. He concludes:

Finally the undersigned gives notice that Mr. W. Q. Judge, having by his own act lost his membership in the Society, is no longer its Vice-President, and the said office is now vacant.

While it would have been better if the work in hand could have been continued as heretofore in a spirit of unity and mutual reliance, yet the undersigned considers that a separation like the present one was far more prudent than the perpetuation of ill-feeling and disunity within our ranks by causes too well known to need special reference. The undersigned offers to his late American colleagues his best private and official wishes for the prosperity, usefulness and honourable management of their new Society.

H. S. OLCOTT,

“President-Founder of the Theosophical Society.”

Thus we have Colonel Olcott’s official recognition and acknowledgement of the legality and propriety of the action taken by the American Section in re-constituting itself the Theosophical Society in America, which he himself likens to the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776. This should be known of all theosophical students, because thereafter, till the day of his death, Col. Olcott continually referred, in his “Old Diary Leaves” and otherwise, to the “secession” of Mr. Judge and the American Theosophists, and Mrs. Besant to this day does the same. There is some excuse for Col. Olcott, for he had been a Civil War veteran, his heart was bound up in his beloved Society, and the falling bitterness of his failing years made his meditations liken the mighty struggle of the past to the Great Rebellion.

We promised to show, over their own signatures, that the conspiracy against Judge had its roots as far back as the beginning of 1893, while yet the co-partners in it maintained publicly an attitude of cordial good-will and respect towards him, and, privately in their relations with him, treated him as an intimate friend and associate in whom they had full confidence. This has been already done in the case of Mrs. Besant and Mr. Sinnett. In Olcott’s case it is certified by one simple and indubitable fact: At the Christmas-night conference at Adyar in 1893, Olcott showed and gave to Mrs. Besant the signed affirmation and statements concerning the celebrated “Panjab Seal.” The statement to which his signature is attached is dated *January 28, 1893*.

This leads to a discussion of the two things on which the whole “Judge case” rests for its “evidence” of bogus messages, which seemed so convincing to Col. Olcott, Mrs. Besant, and others, *after* Chakravarti and other Brahmins had played on the prospective tools (or victims, as one wills). First let it be understood that it is the clear and undisputed fact that a “seal” appeared on numerous “messages” attributed to Mr. Judge’s intervention, whether as “agent of the Masters” or as a “forger,” conscious or unconscious; second, that these messages were in the identical handwritings adopted and used in the “messages” received through H. P. B. during her long career. The “Judge messages” were unique in two respects as compared with all the wide range of “messages” received through numerous “psychics” after H. P. B.’s death: (a) some of them bore a “seal;” (b) they were *all* in the handwritings attributed from 1870 to 1891 to the “precipitations” of the Masters “M.” and “K. H.” It was the messages received *through H. P. B.* that Mr. Hodgson, the Committee of the Society for Psychical Research, their two handwriting experts, Mr. Sims and Mr. Netherclift, and numerous others, attributed to the “forgery” of H. P. B. herself and Damodar.

Had it not been for the “seal” and the “handwritings” there would have been no “Judge case;” for, although Six “Charges and Specifications” were drawn up, Mrs. Besant herself in her Statement before the London Convention, July 12, 1894, said plainly that the chief and only real ground for the “charges” was the “misleading form” of the Judge messages, and herself affirmed her belief that the “messages” were, *as to fact and substance*, genuine.

First: It is known that a “seal” appeared on messages very early; Dr. Franz Hartmann speaks of it in his Report of Observations, at Adyar—a pamphlet issued in September, 1884¹; the testimony in “The Case Against W. Q. Judge,” recites the “seal” on various messages received during the life-time of H. P. B., notably one received by Bertram Keightley at New York in 1890²; and, finally, as we shall quickly show, was testified to by Mrs. Besant, Countess Wachtmeister and others, as having been seen by them on messages received during H. P. B.’s time.

Second: As to the “Panjab Seal” itself, around which the “Judge case” hinged in connection with the handwriting problem. According to Col. Olcott’s “Statement” in “The Case Against W. Q. Judge,” he bought, in 1883, a “Seal” in imitation of the Master “M’s” “cryptograph”, and this imitation “seal” he gave to H. P. B. According to Bertram Keightley’s “Statement” he first saw this “seal” in 1888; H. P. B., being ill, asked him to get out for her “a small box containing some of her ‘occult possessions’”—the phrase “occult possessions” being used by Mr. Keightley in quotes in such manner as to give the impression that the words were H. P. B.’s, not his own. He opened the box at her request, and among other things saw this “seal”. On his asking her what it was, she replied, as he gives her words: “Oh, it is only a flapdoodle of Olcott’s.” Keightley says that the resemblance of this “seal” to Mahatma “M’s” “cryptograph” caused him, in connection with H. P. B.’s remark, to examine it closely and “to photograph it very strongly on my memory.” So strongly, according to him, that when he received the message in New York in 1890 (during H. P. B.’s life-time), he noted a “seal impression like the one I had seen with H. P. B.” The message was received in Mr. Judge’s office on a cablegram sent to Mr. Judge and therefore opened by Judge,—as Mr. Keightley had given Judge’s name and address for the receipt of messages to himself. Keightley goes on: “I thereupon asked Judge if he had put the seal there; to this he replied that he knew nothing about it.” Keightley seems *never to have asked H. P. B. about this “seal impression”*—or if he did he says nothing of it. Nor does he mention that *the cablegram itself*—on which the “precipitated” seal and message occurred—*was from H. P. B.* He saw H. P. B. within less than three months afterwards, so that he had a perfect opportunity to resolve his doubts, if he cared to avail himself of it.

After the date 1888, *note well*, there is no evidence of anyone ever having seen the “seal” itself; no evidence of what became of it; but it was *not* among H. P. B.’s possessions *after her death* when those were searched and examined. There was not then, and there never was, *anything whatever to connect Mr. Judge with the possession of this “Panjab Seal.”*

In August, 1891, *Path*, as narrated, was published an article by “Jasper Niemand,” then unknown as an identity, beginning with a “message from the Master,” alleged by the writer to have been received *after* the death of H. P. B., and “attested by His *real* seal.” We have earlier called attention to this word “real” in connection with the “seal.” Olcott wrote Judge, as told, and Judge replied with the “Interesting letter” published later on by Mrs. Besant in “Lucifer” for April, 1893. In that letter Judge tells Olcott he “knows nothing about” the “seal”—meaning thereby the “*Panjab* seal,” that, to Olcott’s suspicious mind, was proof positive that Judge had in some way gotten hold of the imitation seal and was using it to bolster bogus “messages” being produced by Judge to attract attention to himself as “Master’s agent.” No other explanation ever occurred to Olcott or to any of the others. When Judge denied that he had anything to do

1. On July 27th, 1895, Dr. Hartmann wrote to Judge from Hallein regarding “Master’s Seal”. “My attention has been called to an article in the *Lotus Bleu* (June) in which it is said that the letters of Mahâtma M. used to bear no seal at the time of H.P.B. If any one will look at page 2[9] of my *Report of Observations*, he will find it stated, that on February 5, 1884 I received a long letter bearing the seal of the Master, in Tibetan characters.” [*The Path*, Vol. 10, Sep. 1895, p.191.]

On page 29 in his **Report of Observations** he wrote: “I took the pincers and was about to close the drawer, when — there lay *in the drawer* a great envelope, addressed to me in the well-known hand-writing of the Master and sealed with the seal bearing his initials in Thibetan characters.”

— Compiler

2. See Chapter 6 in the SUPPLEMENT for the details regarding the message received by Bertram Keightley on June 9th, 1890. — Compiler

with the “Jasper Niemand” message, Olcott could only think Judge was lying to escape an *impasse*. He exchanged confidences with Walter R. Old, who had been a member of the E. S. T. Council and present at the Avenue Road Meeting of May 27, 1891, when the “W. Q. Judge’s plan is right” message had been received—with a “seal” on it. Old wrote that the E. S. T. had been reorganized on the basis of that message—a plain, unornamented falsehood, as we have seen, and shall further show. This was in the article “Theosophic Freethought,” for which Old and Edge were suspended from the E. S. T., as narrated. Now let us take Mrs. Besant’s own series of statements in regard to that message and its “seal,” etc.

(1) On July 6th, 1891, less than six weeks after the Meeting itself, Mrs. Besant drew up a statement which she sent to Mrs. Julia Campbell VerPlanck at New York City—Mrs. VerPlanck then well known Theosophically and who afterwards married Dr. Archibald Keightley, but was then entirely unknown to Mrs. Besant or anyone else except Mr. Judge as being identical with “Jasper Niemand.” Mrs. Besant’s statement reads:

London, July 6th, 1891.

I took from William Q. Judge, on the *afternoon* of May 27th, 1891, [the Meeting was held that *night*], certain papers selected from a number of letters in his possession. These I took one by one, read them, folded them up, *tied them into a packet*, and said I would read them myself to the Council, as they concerned Bro. Judge. I opened this packet myself in the Council meeting, in my place as chairman. I took up the papers one by one and read them (or parts of them) aloud, and on raising one of them saw a piece of paper lying between it and the next *that was not there when I tied them together*. After reading those remaining I took it up, and found it was a slip bearing some words written in red and signed with ^’s initials and *seal*. The words were: ‘W. Q. Judge’s plan is right.’

The paper is attached hereto.

ANNIE BESANT.

(2) In December, 1891, Mrs. Besant attended an E. S. T. meeting at the Astor House in New York City, with Robert Crosbie, Henry Turner Patterson, Thaddeus P. Hyatt, and William Main. There, the discussion turned, *inter alia*, on the “phenomena” occurring since H. P. B.’s death, the “message” in the *Path* for August preceding, and Mrs. Besant’s remarkable public statements in her “Hall of Science” speech on August 30, 1891, and, naturally, on the “Judge’s plan is right” message of May 27, 1891, to which, among others, she referred in that speech. *All four* of these gentlemen, all well-known Theosophists of unblemished repute, afterwards testified that Mrs. Besant “stated in the most positive and unqualified manner that the message from the Master which she found at a meeting of the Council of the E. S. in London amongst other papers, *could not have been placed there by Mr. Judge or anyone else.*”

(3) At Taplow, England, on the evening of June 15, 1893, Mrs. Besant met and talked with Dr. and Mrs. Keightley on the subject of this Council meeting, the incident being brought up by reason of the advance proofs from the “Theosophist” of “Theosophic Freethought.” Dr. and Mrs. Keightley were both members of the E. S. T., and very intimate personal friends at the time with Mrs. Besant as well as Mr. Judge. No action had as yet been taken in the E. S. T. on Old’s and Edge’s actions. In the discussion they asked Mrs. Besant “*what she had done with the parcel of letters between the time when she read and tied them together [in the afternoon] and the moment of taking them into the Council with her [in the evening].*” She replied that “*she had locked them in a drawer in her room, where no one could have access to them, and took them from there into the Council Meeting, and that they were not out of her possession for a moment.*”

(4) Very shortly after the above meeting Mrs. Besant drew up the E. S. T. circular dated “August, 1893,” which, signed by her and Judge, was sent to all members of the E. S. T. Very full extracts have already been given in this History from that circular but a portion was reserved for its appropriate setting. We give that portion now. Mrs. Besant first gives the historical background:

In *Lucifer* for the month of April, a letter by Brother Judge to an unnamed Indian member [Col. Olcott] was published. The letter was in reply to many others sent by the Indian members to him, and while dealing with particular questions was deemed by the editor of *Lucifer* [Mrs. Besant] to contain matters of general T. S. interest. In that letter Bro. Judge referred to a seal about which his correspondent had asked, and said in effect that he did not know if the Master was in the *habit* of using *the seal referred to*, but Bro. Judge did not state to the Indian [Col. Olcott] the fact that he (Judge) knew of an impression of the seal having appeared upon one or two occasions on letters from the Master to other persons; Bro. Judge not wishing to debate that question and also because—as he now again states to you—such a seal having appeared on letters from Masters to him in his own previous and personal experience was extraneous so far as *he* was concerned, though it did not invalidate any message.

As we have earlier quoted, Mrs. Besant goes on to discuss the Old-Edge article in the July *Theosophist*, gives their “foot-note” in reference to the “message” of May 27, 1891—that the E. S. T. was reorganized on the strength of that message with its “seal”—and to suspend Old and Edge for their breach of the School rules and discipline. She then says:

But the statement in the above foot-note is itself untrue. The reorganization of the School in 1891 was not based on a message from the Master; it was based on several letters and certificates from H. P. B. (see Council Minutes) explicitly making William Q. Judge her representative in America, and on one from her assigning to Annie Besant the position she was to hold after her (H. P. B.’s) death. These were in Brother Judge’s possession and were exhibited to the Council. Bro. J. D. Buck, one of the American Council, was also then in London. He, among others, suggested prior to the meeting a similar plan of reorganization to that proposed by Brother Judge, and Dr. Buck personally drew up just prior to the Council meeting the new form of the pledge. At the meeting of the Council the plan was submitted by Annie Besant with some of the passages from H. P. B.’s letters.

Mrs. Besant then goes on to give the text of a statement drawn up by herself and signed by herself and “such of the Councillors present [at the Meeting of May 27, 1891] whom we can reach at this moment.” This statement is dated “London, July 14, 1893,” and reads as follows:—

The plan for the reorganization of the E. S. T. rendered necessary by the passing away of H. P. Blavatsky, was laid before the English division of the General Council by *Annie Besant, who had in her possession a bundle of letters from which she read extracts.* These constituted William Q. Judge *H. P. Blavatsky’s representative with full powers* in America, and appointed Annie Besant as *Chief Secretary* of the Inner Group (the highest grade in the E. S. T.), and *Recorder* of the Teachings. These were the documents upon which the reorganization of the School was based, and the recognition of William Q. Judge and Annie Besant as Outer Heads was made. *The arrangement was rendered inevitable by these letters of H. P. Blavatsky, its Head, and nothing beyond her expressed directions was necessary to insure its acceptance by the Council. Towards the close of the proceedings a message was received from Master, ‘Judge’s plan is right.’ This was written on a small piece of paper found among the papers in the sight of all by Annie Besant. The message bore the impression of a seal, and the impression was recognized by Countess Wachtmeister and others as that of the Master, being identical with impressions on letters received during the life-time with us of H. P. Blavatsky.*

The message was received as a *most satisfactory sign of approval* of the arrangement proposed, but that arrangement was in no sense arrived at in consequence of it, being, as stated, based on H. P. Blavatsky’s own letters and accepted as *her directions.*

This statement is signed with the following names: Constance Wachtmeister, G. R. S. Mead, Annie Besant, Laura M. Cooper, W. Wynn Westcott, and Alice Cleather. Immediately following the statement Mrs. Besant appends a memorandum signed by herself, as follows:

I myself selected from among many letters of H. P. B.’s those referred to above, and tied them together. *There was no paper with Master’s writing bearing above words among them before the meeting.*

(5) It was concerning this “message” in particular, and others merely incidentally, that Mrs. Besant later made so many contradictory and bewildering statements during the dark days from the early fall of 1893 till the conclusion of the “Judge case.” Chakravarti was in London when this very circular of August, 1893, was sent out, but had not then gotten Mrs. Besant into his occult toils. Up till then Mrs. Besant was true to Judge, all Sinnett’s, Bert Keightley’s and Olcott’s insinuations failing to do more than make her “a little uneasy,” as she wrote herself in “The Case against W. Q. Judge.”

That pamphlet tells a pitiful and sorry tale to one who reads it in the light of the ordered facts out of her own mouth, as given in the foregoing numbered paragraphs, and in the light of the *Pledge, Rules and Book of Discipline* of the School. It is the proof of the corruption of Annie Besant, not of “forgery” by W. Q. Judge. She herself says (pp.12-13) that up to September, 1893, when she went to America in company with Chakravarti and Miss Müller “the idea was to me incredible that a man who had worked so devotedly . . . could deliberately imitate the scripts of the Masters. . . . Of evidence at that time I had none, only vague accusations, and so far was I from crediting these that *I remember saying that before I could believe Mr. Judge guilty, I should need the word of the Master, given to me face to face.*” To whom did she say that? Chakravarti?

At all events Chakravarti had gotten very close to her, as narrated, and had “magnetized” her many times so that she might be able to “see and hear the Master.” Mrs. Besant goes on:

. . . *The result was that I made a direct appeal to the Master, when alone, stating that I did feel some doubt as to Mr. Judge’s use of His name, and praying Him to endorse or disavow the messages I had received. . . . He appeared to me as I had so often before seen Him, clearly, unmistakably, and I then learned from Him directly that the messages were not done by Him, and that they were done by Mr. Judge The order to take action was repeated to me at Adyar [Christmas, 1893] . . . and I was bidden to wash away the stains on the T.S. ‘Take up the heavy Karma of the Society. Your strength was given you for this.’ How could I, who believed in Him, disobey?*

We do not doubt that Mrs. Besant “saw” and “heard” as she recites, any more than we doubt thousands of similar cases with which not merely the records of spiritualism and “psychic research” are filled, but those of every religion under heaven—and almost every religious sect. *Who was it she saw and heard; by what means and under what influences?* But if it were, as she thought, *the Master of H. P. B.*, one must wonder why that Master let her go on being deceived by “bogus” messages for more than two years after the death of H. P. B.; one wonders, too, why she should not have taken her first, her earliest doubts to Him, and why, if she could reach Him, “clearly, unmistakably,” she was under any necessity to get “messages” at second-hand, be it from H. P. B., from Judge, from Chakravarti, from Leadbeater, or any one else; and why her multitude of “messages,” all supposedly from the *same Master*, should give each other the lie, and lead her from one labyrinthine passage to another.

We have esteemed it our full performance of duty to give the *facts*, agreeable or the reverse, in such order and relation as the circumstances joint them together; to offer from those facts the conclusions and inferences that to us appear logically unavoidable. We have in all major and disputed matters given exact citations and copious references to accessible sources, so that each may verify and pursue any mooted point to its remotest ramifications. Where we have drawn on private documents not accessible to the ordinary student, we have scrupulously abstained from presenting them either as facts or as evidence, but have submitted them simply as inferences and deductions of our own.

For those *Students* who may seek some direct statement of H. P. B.’s teachings that might, perchance, afford a clue to the many perplexities and vagaries, let alone mysteries, of the recorded story, we may submit in addition to the numerous references given in the course of this Series, one of the numbered paragraphs from

chapter 12 of the second volume of “Isis Unveiled,” whose implications, if the facts there stated are correct, are almost limitless. After saying that “one phase of magical skill is the *voluntary* and *conscious* withdrawal of the astral form from the physical body,” she goes on to tell what such an adept or accepted chela, whether of the “right-hand” or the “left-hand” path may do by means of it:

To the movements of the wandering astral form *neither time nor space offer obstacles*. The thaumaturgist, thoroughly skilled in *occult* science, can cause his physical body to *seem* to disappear, or to apparently take on *any shape that he may choose*. He may make his *astral* form *visible*, or he may give it *protean* appearances. In both cases these results will be achieved by a *mesmeric hallucination of the senses*. . . . This hallucination is so perfect that *the subject of it would stake his life that he saw a reality*, when it is but a *picture in his own mind, impressed upon his consciousness by the irresistible will of the mesmerizer*.

Granting for a moment that these statements are of facts and powers in Occult Science, yet utterly *unknown*, however much believed in or pretended, outside the Hall of Occultism; granting that there are adepts and chelas of Black Magic as well as White, against whom the uninitiated are *powerless* at a certain stage of psychical evolution, as the unborn or new-born infant is powerless,—the extraordinary warnings and rules and disciplinary admonitions with which the writings of H. P. B. are strewn, become intelligible; the vagaries of those men and women, however sincere, earnest and able in a human way, who undertook the “ordeals of probationary chelaship” and did not adhere with strictness to the lines laid down for them to follow, become understandable. Masters *will* not help, because they *cannot* help, those who “wander from the discipline enjoined.” Vain as it is to attempt to reason with a drunken man, it is a thousand times more vain with the victim of “astral intoxication.” Or, as in the case of the insane in a mundane way, its characteristic symptom is the victim’s overweening self-assurance and his suspicions of those most near and dear to him, his fleeting trust only in those who agree with him. Self-contradictions, inconsistencies of thought, speech and action,—mean nothing to the victim of “astral intoxication.” To quote another of H. P. B.’s statements on this very subject—from “Occultism Versus the Occult Arts,” published in *Lucifer* for May, 1888, in preparation for the public announcement of the E. S. T.:—

. . . the voice of the MASTER can no longer be distinguished from that of one’s passions or *even that of a Dugpa* [Black Magician], . . .

And once being mistaken and having acted on their mistakes, most men shrink from realising their error, and thus descend deeper and deeper into the mire. And although it is the intention that decides primarily whether *white* or *black* magic is exercised, yet the results of even involuntary, unconscious sorcery cannot fail to be productive of bad Karma. Enough has been said to show that *sorcery is any kind of evil influence exercised upon other persons, who suffer, or make other persons suffer, in consequence*.

11. Introduction to Mr. Judge's Replies.

As a result of the Report by the Society for Psychical Research Edmund Garrett was convinced that Mme. Blavatsky was a fraud. By taking advantage of the latest rancor within the Theosophical Society he thought he could likewise expose that it too was a sham. He stated: "[m]y own part in the business is merely the humble one of seeing that they shall all satisfactorily 'get at' one another." He claimed that in the past he had often defended Besant in the press and that he regarded her position within the Society as "the strongest buttress of a fabric which she has now for some time known to be rotten at the base".

Garrett's series of articles, which appeared in the **Westminster Gazette**, drew great response from the Theosophists. He republished his articles as a pamphlet titled **Isis Very Much Unveiled, Being the Story of the Great Mahatma Hoax**. The first edition (119 pp.) was quickly replaced with a second (132 pp.) edition. Garrett's first edition contained letters from various Theosophists in response to his series, and also included Judge's **By Master's Direction** circular of November 1894. In the second (132 pp.) edition he added Judge's reply of November 26th, 1894, which was addressed to the editor of the **Westminster Gazette**. In his third edition (136 pp.) he omitted some of the letters from Theosophists but included Besant's January 15th, 1895, reply from the **Daily Chronicle**.

By late 1895 the members from London who supported Judge published their own 30 page pamphlet, titled **Isis and the Mahatmas**. It included Judge's November 26th reply as well as some correspondence which had appeared in the **Westminster Gazette** and "A Final Word to those who demanded Mr. Judge's resignation pending his detailed reply." Judge's final reply was delivered on April 29th, 1895 at the First Convention of the Theosophical Society in America held in Boston. Because he was too ill that afternoon to deliver "his explanation of charges that had been made against him in the last year and a half" Dr. Archibald Keightley agreed to read it to the Delegates. Judge's response was issued as a 29 page pamphlet titled **Reply by William Q. Judge to Charges of Misuse of Mahatmas' Names and Handwritings**.

— Compiler

12. **ISIS AND THE MAHATMAS.**

[Pamphlet (1895) reproducing the communications by W.Q. Judge.]

On December 3, 1894, the New York *Sun* printed the following letter from MR. WILLIAM Q. JUDGE, together with the text of his letter to the *Westminster Gazette*, in reply to the elaborate attack which appeared in the latter journal, under the title of "Isis Very Much Unveiled." MR. JUDGE'S reply was inserted in the *Westminster Gazette* of December 8 and 10.

MR. JUDGE'S REPLY.

To THE EDITOR OF *The Sun*.

SIR,—On Nov. 25th you devoted four columns of your editorial page to me, to the Theosophical Society, and to the "Mahâtmas," spreading before your readers so much that I would ask the favour of some space in your pages for a reply. It seems best to give you a copy of the reply sent to the London *Westminster Gazette*, and to ask you to insert that with these few preliminary words:

These three questions have been raised: (1) Have I been hoaxing the Society by bogus “messages from the Mahâtmas”? (2) Are there any such beings, and what are they? (3) Do the prominent Theosophists live by or make money out of the Theosophical Society?

[2] The last question is easily answered. No money is made; the entire work is a dead monetary loss to all of us; this is too easily proved to merit more words. The conclusion the worldly man will reach is that we are a lot of fanatics who are willing to spend all our money for a movement which destroys personal gain and glory; which makes all men appear as equally souls, thus destroying the power of the priest in earth or heaven, bringing the monarch and the proud to the same place as the beggar and the humble, if such be needed for discipline; which insists on universal brotherhood as a fact in nature due to the essential unity of all men; which says to every man that he is God in truth if he will but admit it; which explains the mystery of life and the cause, with the cure, of sorrow. Let us be such fanatics as this, but do not try to show that we are working for money or place.

A few notes on letters of mine are brought forward by those who cannot give any expert testimony on matters too occult for the eye, and it is said that because those notes are on my letters therefore they are out of my brain, mere jokes of a passing hour, and that they never emanated from a Mahâtma. I grant that in a court of law I could not prove they were from a Mahâtma. But I most emphatically deny that they are hoaxes of mine. The fact is that I have sent probably five hundred or more “messages from the Masters” to various persons all over the world during the last nineteen years; they cannot be traced. They are incorporated in letters written by me, in my hand, among the sentences of the letters, and never named as being such messages to those who received them. This has not been alleged against me, but I now give it out freely as a confession, if you please to so term it. But I have not tried in any way to manage the Society by such messages.

Suppose the charge is for the nonce admitted, what do we find? This curious fact, that although I know many men of large means who would believe me were I to hand them a “message from the Masters,” and who would give money for those, I have never done so, and never tried at any time to gain either power or money thus, when all the time the Society needs money. A person engaged at any time in the giving [3] out of bogus messages would do it where it would be most useful in a worldly way. But here there is no such thing. What motive is there, then, and what consistency of pretence can be found? A great howl has been raised over a few personal messages, and one relating to the retention of Colonel Olcott in office, and all the time the other five hundred messages are unknown and unfound. It seems to me the hoax is in the nature of self-delusion among those who hunt for hares’ horns. They strain at the letter and miss the truth all the time before them. I wrote to the editor of the *Westminster Gazette* as follows:—

[The text reproduced from this point was also published in **Isis Very Much Unveiled, Being the Story of the Great Mahatma Hoax**, by Edmund Garrett (pp.121-130). A comparison of the 2nd edition of same with the text which follows from **Isis and the Mahatmas** indicates one sentence was deleted (indicated in footnote), some words missing, others added or changed, and numerous variations in punctuation and capitalization in **Isis Very Much Unveiled**.]

[The following letter was also included in **Isis Very Much Unveiled**, but not in **Isis and the Mahatmas**:]

To the EDITOR of THE WESTMINSTER GAZETTE.

SIR,—You have published slanderous articles against the Theosophical Society, using me as the person; you have asked for a reply; I send it to you and ask that it be given place in your paper.

—Yours truly,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

Theosophical Society, American Section,

General Secretary’s Office, New York, Nov. 26.

[Continuing with the text from **Isis and the Mahatmas**:]

“SIR,—At the time your articles directed against the Theosophical Society under the above title were appearing, I was lecturing in the country, and only within a few days have I seen your last numbers. Time is required for writing on such a subject, and at this distance from London I cannot be accused of much delay. With the greatest interest and amusement I have read your long series of articles. The writer is an able man, and you and he together constitute one of the advertising agencies of the Theosophical Society. The immense range of your notices cannot be well calculated, and very truly we could never pay for such an advertisement. Do you mind keeping this part of my letter as all the remuneration we can give you for the work done by you in thus advertising the movement and bringing prominently to the notice of your public the long-forgotten but true doctrine of the possible existence of such beings as Professor Huxley says it would be impertinent to say could not exist in the natural order of evolution?”

“And while I look at it all as an advertisement, I cannot admire the treason developed therein, nor the spiteful, unworthy tone of it, nor the divergence from fact in many cases when it suited the purpose, nor the officious meddling in the private affairs of other people, nor the ignoring and falsification in respect to possible motive, made out by you to be gain by some of us, when the fact is that we are all losers of money by our work. That fact a candid person would have stated, and marvelled at it that we should be willing to slave for [4] the T. S., and always spend our money. Such a person would have given ‘the devil his due.’ You have suppressed it and lied about it, and hence it is not admirable in you, but is quite mean and low. You advertise us and then try to befoul us. Well, we gain by the advertisement, and the course of time will wipe off the small stain you try to paint upon us. When you and your ready writer are both dead and forgotten, and some of you probably execrated for offences not as yet exposed, we will still live as a body and be affecting the course of modern thought, as we have been doing for nearly twenty years.

“I am the principal object of your attack, though you also cruelly abuse a woman who has long enough fought the world of your conventional nation, and perhaps you expect me to either rise and explain, or keep silent. Well, I will do neither. I will speak, but cannot fully explain. Your paper is a worldly forum, a sort of court. In it there is neither place nor credence for explanations which must include psychic things, facts, and laws, as well as facts and circumstances of the ordinary sort. Were I to explain in full, no one would believe me save those students of the occult and the psychical who know psychic law and fact. Those who doubt and wish all to be reduced to the level of compass and square, of eye and word of mouth, would still be doubters. Nothing would be gained at all. That difficulty no intelligent person who has had psychic experience can overlook. That is why you are quite safe from a suit for libel. I assure you that had you published something not so inextricably tangled up with psychic phenomena I should be glad to have you in court, not to soothe wounded feelings I have not, but to show that our faulty law and so-called justice do sometimes right some wrongs.

“Let me first emphatically deny the inference and assertion made by you, that I and my friends make money out of the T.S., or that the organisation has built up something by which we profit. This is untrue, and its untruth is known to all persons who know anything at all about the society. No salaries are paid to our officers. We support ourselves, or privately support each other. I have never had a penny from the society, and do not want any. The little magazine, *The* [5] *Path*, which I publish here in the interest of the Society, is not supported by subscriptions from members, but largely by others, and it is kept up at a loss to me, which will never be repaid. I publish it because I wish to, and not for gain. Thousands of dollars are expended in the T.S. work here each year over and above what is paid in for fees and dues. The dues are but four shillings a year, and three times as much as that is expended in the work. Where does it come from? Out of our private pockets, and if I had a million I would spend it that way. My friends and myself give our money and our time to the Society without hope or desire for any return. We may be fanatics—probably are—but it is false and

malicious to accuse us of using the Society for gain. The only payment we get is the seeing every day the wider and wider spread of theosophical theories of life, man, and nature. I am ready to submit all our books and vouchers to any auditor to support these statements. And you were in a position to find out the facts as I have given them.

“It is also absolutely untrue, as you attempt to show or infer, that the society grows by talking of the Mahâtmas or Masters, or by having messages sent round from them. The movement here and elsewhere is pushed along the line of philosophy, and each one is left to decide for himself on the question of the Mahâtmas. ‘Messages from the Masters’ do not go flying round, and the Society does not flourish by any belief in those being promulgated! Nor am I, as you hint, in the habit of sending such messages about the Society, nor of influencing the course of affairs by using any such thing. Send out and ask all the members, and you will find I am correct. It is true that those Masters tell me personally what I am to do, and what is the best course to take, as they have in respect to this very letter; but that is solely my own affair. Could I be such a fool as to tell all others to go by what I get for my own guidance, knowing how weak, suspicious, and malicious is the human nature of to-day ? You are on the wrong tack, my friend.

“But you were right when you say that Mrs. Besant made a remarkable charge in respect to me. That is true, and Mr. Chakravarti whom you name is, as you correctly say, the [6] person who is responsible for it. That was told by Mr. Old to your writer³. Before she met Chakravarti she would not have dreamed of prosecuting me. This is a matter of regret, but, while so, I fail to see how you aid your case against me by dragging the thing in thus publicly, unless, indeed, you intend to accuse him and her of going into a conspiracy against me.

“There are two classes of ‘messages from the Masters’ charged to me by you and by that small section of the T.S. members who thought of trying me. One class consists of notes on letters of mine to various persons; the other of messages handed to Mrs. Besant and Colonel Olcott and enclosure found in a letter to Colonel Olcott from a man in California.

“I have never denied that I gave Mrs. Besant messages from the Masters. I did so. They were from the Masters. She admits that, but simply takes on herself to say that the Master did not personally write or precipitate them. According to herself, then, she got from me genuine messages from the Masters; but she says she did not like them to be done or made in some form that she at first thought they were not in. I have not admitted her contention; I have simply said they were from the Master, and that is all I now say, for I will not tell how or by what means they were produced. The objective form in which such a message is is of no consequence. Let it be written by your Mr. Garrett, or drop out of the misty air, or come with a clap of thunder. All that makes no difference save to the vulgar and the ignorant. The reality of the message is to be tested by other means. If you have not those means you are quite at sea as to the whole thing. And all this I thought was common knowledge in the Theosophical world. It has long been published and explained.

“One of those messages to Mrs. Besant told her not to go to India that year. I got it in California, and then telegraphed it to her in substance, later sending the paper. I had no interest in not having her go to India, but knew she would go later. The other messages were of a personal nature. They were all true and good. At the time I gave them to her I did not say anything. That I never denied. It was not thought by [7] me necessary to insult a woman of her intellectual ability, who had read all about these things, by explaining all she was supposed to know. Those who think those messages were not from the Master are welcome to doubt it, so far as I am concerned, for I know the naturalness of that doubt.

3. This sentence was not included in **Isis Very Much Unveiled**.

“When Colonel Olcott resigned I was first willing to let him stay resigned. But I was soon directed by another ‘message’ to prevent it if I could, and at once cabled that to him and went to work to have the American Section vote asking him to stay in office. As I was the person mentioned to succeed him, we also, to provide for contingencies, resolved that the choice of America was myself for successor. But when he revoked, then my successorship was null and void until voted on at another period not yet reached. But it is absolutely false that I sent an emissary to him when I found he was minded to stay in office. Ask him on this and see what he says. I leave that to him. Truly enough I made an error of judgment in not telling the influential London members of my message when I told Olcott. But what of that? I did not tell the Americans, but left their action to the dictates of their sense and the trend of friendship and loyalty to our standard-bearer. The English voted against Olcott by doing nothing, but I asked them in the same way as I asked the Americans to request him to revoke. They had their chance. As India had done the same as America, I saw the vote was final, as my message directed, and so I dropped it from my mind—one of my peculiarities. I certainly did not use any pressure by way of ‘messages from the Masters’ on anyone as to that, save on Olcott. And he reported a message to the same effect to himself. Did I invent that also? My message to him was copied by me on my type-writer and sent to him. I did it thus because I knew of spies about Olcott of whom I had warned him to little effect. One of those confessed and committed suicide, and the other was found out.

“A message was found in a letter from Abbot Clark, a Californian, to Colonel Olcott. This you say I made and put in the letter. I have the affirmation of Mr. Clark on the matter, which I send you herewith, to be inserted at this place if you [8] wish. It does not bear out your contention, but shows the contrary. It also shows that his letter to Colonel Olcott was opened in India by some other person before being sent on to Colonel Olcott. You can make what inference you like from this.”

The following is the affirmation referred to; one of the many proofs held by Mr. Judge and his friends refuting charges brought. It was published in the *Westminster Gazette*, but did not appear in the *Sun*: [See Conclusion for full text of Abbot Clark’s statement which, therefore, is not included here.]

[9] “Your statement about putting a question in a cabinet for an answer when I stayed in the room and Mrs. Besant went out, is false. No such thing took place; I deny that there was any such thing as a reception of ‘answers in a sealed envelope in a closed drawer.’ That is supreme bosh from beginning to end, and cannot be proved by anybody’s testimony unless you will accept perjury.

“At the same time I can now say, as the sole authority on the point, that several of the contested messages are genuine ones, no matter what all and every person, Theosophist or not, may say to the contrary.

“You have much talk about what you say is called the ‘Master’s seal.’ You have proved by the aid of Colonel Olcott that the latter made an imitation in brass of the signature of the Master, and gave it to H.P.B. as a joke. You trace it to her and there you leave it, and then you think I am obliged to prove I did not get it; to prove negatives again when it has never been proved that I had it. I have long ago denied all knowledge of the Master’s seal, either genuine or imitated. I do not know if he has a seal; if he has I have not yet been informed of it; the question of a seal owned by him as well as what is his writing or signature are both still beclouded. None of the members who have been in this recent trouble know what is the writing, or the seal, or the mark of the Master. It was long ago told by H.P.B. that the so-called writing of the Master was only an assumed hand, and no real knowledge is at hand as to his having a seal. I have seen impressions similar [10] to what you have reproduced, but it is of no consequence to me. If there were a million impressions of seals on a message said to be from the Master it would add nothing to the message in my eyes, as other means must be employed for discovering what is and what is not a genuine message.

“Seals and ciphers do not validate these things. Unless I can see for myself by my inner senses that a message is genuine I will not believe it, be it loaded with seals I do not know. As I know the thousand and one magical ways by which impressions of things may be put on paper, even unconsciously to the human channel or focus, I have relied, and ask others to rely, on their own inner knowledge, and not to trust to appearances. Others may think these little decorations of importance, but I do not. I never asked anyone at any meeting, private or public, to note or observe the seal-impression you give. Others may have done so, but I did not. Others may have gone into laboured arguments to show the value of such a thing, but I did not. The whole matter of this so-called seal is so absurd and childish that it has made me laugh each time I have thought of it.

“Now I can do no more than deny, as I hereby do absolutely, all the charges you have been the means of repeating against me. I have denied them very many times, for I have known of them for about two years and a-half. My denial is of no value to you, nor to those who think there is no supersensual world; nor to those who think that because conjurors can imitate any psychological phenomenon therefore the latter has no existence; nor to those who deny the possibility of the existence of Mahâtmas or Great Souls. These things are all foolishness to such persons, and I am willing to let it stay that way. Were I to go into all the details of all the messages you refer to, and were I to get from those who know, as I can, the full relation of all that is involved in those messages on my letters which I saw after the July ‘investigation’ was ended, I would be opening the private doors to the secret hearts of others, and that I will not do. Already I know, by means not generally accessible, altogether too much of the private hearts of many of these people, and have no desire to know more.

[11] “Some of the matters you cite are related to a private body once called the Esoteric Section, which is protected—nominally so, it seems, among your informants—by a pledge. The breaking of that by others gives me no right to add to their breach. I cannot, like Mr. Old and others more prominent, violate the confidences of others. His revelations cannot be analysed by me in public. He is in the position of those Masons who have attempted to reveal the secrets of Masonry; and either the public has listened to a liar or to one who has to admit that he does not regard his solemn obligation as worth a straw when it obstructs his purposes; in either case the information cannot be relied upon. His account and yours contain so many misrepresentations that none of it has any serious consideration from me.

“And Mr. Old’s revelations or those of any other members, amount to nothing. The real secrets have not been revealed, for they have not been put in the hands of such people; they have been given only to those who have shown through long trial and much labour that they are worthy to have the full relation of the plans of the Master-Builder exposed to their gaze. Let the dishonest, the perjured, and the vacillating go on with their revelations; they will hurt no one but themselves.

“Now as to the ‘investigation’ at which you have laughed. I grant you it was matter for laughter from outside to see such a lot of labour and gathering from the four quarters to end in what you regard as smoke. Now, my dear sir, I did not call the Enquiry Committee. I protested against it and said from the beginning it should never have been called at all. Must I bear the brunt of that which I did not do? Must I explain all my life to a committee which had no right to come together, for which there was no legal basis? It was called in order to make me give up an official succession I did not have; months before it met I said it would come to nothing but a declaration, written by me, of the non-dogmatic character of the Theosophical Society. My Master so told me, and so it turned out. Will you give me no credit for this foreknowledge? Was it guess, or was it great ability, or did it come about through bribery, or what? I was told to use the opportunity to procure [12] an official declaration that belief in Mahâtmas or Masters was not, and is not, one of the tenets of the Theosophical Society, and I succeeded in so doing. I might have been accused as an individual and not as an official member. But by the influence of the Mr. Chakravarti, whom you mention, the whole power of the

Society was moved against me, so as to try and cut me down, root and branch, officially and privately, so that it might thereby be made sure that I was not ‘successor to the Presidency.’ This is the fact. That is why I forgave them all, for it is easy to forgive; in advance I forgave them, since they furnished such a splendid official opportunity for a decision we long had needed. The odium resulting from the attempt to try occult and psychical questions under common law rules I am strong enough to bear; and up to date I have had a large share of that.

“I refused a committee of honour, they say. I refused the committee that was offered, as it was not of persons who could judge the matter rightly. They would have reached no conclusion save the one I now promulgate, which is, that the public proof regarding my real or delusive communications from the Masters begins and ends with myself, and that the committee could not make any decision at all, but would have to leave all members to judge for themselves. To arrive officially at this I would have to put many persons in positions they could not stand, and the result then would have been that far more bad feeling would come to the surface. I have, at least, learned after twenty years that it is fruitless to ask judges, who have no psychic development, to settle questions, the one half of which are in the unseen realms of the soul, where the common law of England cannot penetrate.

“The ‘messages from the Masters’ have not ceased. They go on all the time for those who are able and fit to have them. But no more to the doubting and the suspicious. Even as I write they have gone to some, and in relation to this very affair and in relation to other revelations and pledge-breakings. It is a fact in experience to me, and to friends of mine who have not had messages from me, that the Masters exist, and have to do with the affairs of the world and the Theosophical movement. [13] No amount of argument or Maskelyneish explanation will drive out that knowledge. It will bear all the assaults of time and foolish men. And the only basis on which I can place the claim of communications by the Masters to me, so far as the world is concerned, is my life and acts. If those for the last twenty years go to prove that I cannot be in communication with such beings, then all I may say one way or the other must go for naught.

“Why so many educated Englishmen reject the doctrine of the perfectibility of man, illustrated by the fact of there now existing Masters of Wisdom, passes my comprehension, unless it be true, as seems probable, that centuries of slavery to the abominable idea of original sin, as taught by theology (and not by Jesus), has reduced them all to the level of those who, being sure they will be damned any way, are certain they cannot rise to a higher level, or unless the great god of conventionality has them firmly in his grasp. I would rather think myself a potential god and try to be, as Jesus commanded, ‘perfect as the Father in heaven’—which is impossible unless in us is that Father in essence—then [sic] to remain darkened and enslaved by the doctrine of inherent original wickedness, which demands a substitute for my salvation. And it seems nobler to believe in that perfectibility and possible rise to the state of the Masters than to see with science but two possible ends for all our toil; one to be frozen up at last and the other to be burned up, when the sun either goes out or pulls us into his flaming breast.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

New York, Nov. 26th, 1894.

13.

“FIRST CONVENTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA. April 29th, 1895. MORNING SESSION.

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 by Dr. Buck, Chairman.

There was a large basket of flowers on the desk. . . . [Report of Proceedings T.S. in America, 1895, p.39]

Mr. Griscom then announced that at half past three that afternoon William Q. Judge would read, or have read for him, his explanation of the charges that had been made against him in the last year and a half. He then moved to adjourn *sine die*; this was seconded, put, and carried; and at 12:50 P.M. Dr. Buck as Chairman declared the adjournment of the first Convention of the Theosophical Society in America.”[p.44]

REPLY BY WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

TO CHARGES OF MISUSE OF MAHATMAS’ NAMES AND HANDWRITINGS.

(Read at Boston, Mass., on the afternoon of April 29, 1895, after the T.S. Convention, by Dr. A. Keightley on behalf of W. Q. Judge, before an informal crowded meeting of the Delegates and visiting members.)

For over twelve months the attention of the Theosophical Society has been taken up by serious charges made against me by a fellow-member. A mass of circulars, statements and letters has been poured forth about the case, and the greatest activity has been shown by the accusers in the effort to completely blacken my character and destroy, if possible, my usefulness. This activity and virulence seem to be confined to the European and Indian Sections, especially to the European.

I have already made three replies to these accusations, once in the *Westminster Gazette*, once in the *New York Sun*, and once in the formal statement made at the July European Convention.

Before the present attack vague charges were made for over a year. They came from India. But it was not until after the arrival in Europe of the Brahman delegate to the Religious Parliament at Chicago, and his resulting intimate acquaintance with Mrs. Besant, and after her arrival in India, that any definite form or great publicity was given to the accusations. She came to America with him, worked here with me at the Parliament, professing for me the old friendship and confidence but, I regret to say, having her mind full, (as I discovered afterward from herself) of her plan to accuse me subsequently and force me out of office. But she kept silent while here. Her own letters state the above fact of having in her mind this [18] matter at that time. When she arrived in India she notified me in letters of what was coming. They were to this purport: that the matter had been long on her mind; that she had concluded that communications through me, said to be from the Master, were not so but were forgeries by me; that I was a victim and led away by a *high example*, which meant, as I learned from herself, that H.P.B. was my “high example in fraud,” who had herself forged and authorized me to do the same; that this must be confessed and would be forgiven; that I must at once resign my office in the T.S. and E.S.; but if I would not give up my offices and confess she would lay evidence to prove my guilt before a Committee: she ended by informing me that she had been offered the Presidency of the Society and was considering it. At no time and in no letter to me did she ask for an explanation or denial, or propose that privately [2] we might explain and perhaps clear up obscurities. Her letters were of a sort that rendered quite impossible anything but flat denial and determined repulse.

In February, 1894, Col. Olcott sent me official notice that I was charged, as Vice-President, with misuse of the names and handwritings of the Mahatmas, meaning, forgery and humbugging of members by falsely pretending to receive and transmit messages from the Masters. Coupled with this—and showing the same

pre-judgment—were the alternatives of resignation for which was promised silence and hushing up of the charges, or, the trying of the case before a Committee meant only for trying the two highest officers of the Society for offenses in office. I at once telegraphed to Col. Olcott and Mrs. Besant denying the charge. Col. Olcott acted as notifier to me of the charge and Mrs. Besant acted as official prosecutor.

I immediately raised the objection that the charge regarding messages from Masters could not be tried because it would involve the T.S. in dogmatism; and the further objection that the proper place to try me was before my Branch as the alleged acts were not done by the officer, Vice-President. Both of these objections were held good by a unanimous decision of the Council of the T.S. consisting of Col. Olcott, B. Keightley and G. R. S. Mead; the Judicial Committee concurred in the decision.

But there was an object in accusing me as Vice-President. The chief prosecutor has said in the presence of many persons that she would not prosecute me as an individual, and that the object of the attack was to make me give up the Vice-Presidency and an office which she called “Successor to the Presidency” but which had no existence. Her letters make it quite plain that there was a plan that as soon as my resignation should be secured Col. Olcott would resign and Mrs. Besant be put up for the Presidency.

This method of attack, calling for the convening of such a prominent and important committee, created widespread and deep excitement in the T.S. for which I cannot be held responsible. The official decision shows that the charge should never have been made in that manner, but should have been before my Branch. The right way has never been adopted because they did not wish that mode. But by the newspapers, by circulars, by virulent public speeches, the prosecutors have continued the attack ever since, and have apparently succeeded in staining my character in the eyes of many people in all parts of the world.

The charge first mentioned having been duly notified to me, the prosecutor drew up what should be called the specifications, but which she and many others continue to call “charges.” They were laid before the Committee, but of course not tried. They were six in number but should have been less, as they are drawn in an unworkmanlike manner by an amateur. But since then several new cases have brought forward by others and furnished to London newspapers. For all I can tell the original prosecutor may have added new ones also.

[3] When the Committee fell through I was asked to try the matter before a Committee of Honor, which I refused. I have been asked to explain this refusal. That is easy. My friends of course would not be allowed to compose the entire body; my enemies were proposed for it; none of those mentioned, proposed, or available were occultists capable of trying the questions involved. The main, in fact the only real questions, were whether I was able to communicate with the Mahâtmâs, had I such communications, and were certain messages declared by me to be from Mahâtmâs really so or not. These could not be tried as if we were inquiring into a land case or a debt on a note; they must be tried by those *who know the Masters and know occultism*, or are willing to be guided by the laws and principles of occultism. Hence I refused the Committee. I gave as my outer reason one which was perfectly true, to wit: my witnesses and my case were not ready, I having known in advance that there could be no trial.

Now the accusations rest on documentary proofs. That is: upon letters written by me; upon memoranda not in my hand appearing on those letters; and upon other papers and memoranda, such for instance as an old cablegram to B. Keightley from H. P. B. of many years ago.

There is no testimony which had to be offered by any witness in order to sustain the six charges, except as to a conversation between Col. Olcott and myself, the witnesses there being Col. Olcott, Dr. Anderson and myself. The whole case on the side of the prosecution, legally consisted then in simply putting before the

judges the documents and the testimony to the conversation, unless they had experts on the question of handwriting, which they should have had.

But, although the charges rested on those documents, the prosecutors simply proposed to give extracts from my letters as suited them and did not propose to put in evidence the entire letters. Mrs. Besant also proposed to indulge in a long argumentative statement, not resting on evidence and such as no court of justice would admit save as a prosecutor's inflammatory address to a jury. This was to go in, according to the prosecutor-playing-lawyer, as a part of the proofs. This inflammatory and argumentative address the prosecutor has persisted in calling "the evidence." It is nothing of the sort.¹

Now, as I have already said in print, the prosecutors have kept from me all those documents during all the time I was in London, save at the last as I shall also show you; and they neglected, during that period, to give me any inspection of the papers, some of which were over ten years old and all of which I was expected to explain at the risk of my reputation. I speak advisedly, that the actions of those concerned raise a weighty presumption of deliberate intention not to let me see the documents. When I arrived, July 5th, I asked for the documents, for an inspection, and for copies. This was my right, and when we know the fact [4] that open enemies of mine, as well as the press, were given copies and facsimiles of the documents it was still more imperative for me to have them. They were promised but not given. Day after day the request was made and promise given but not fulfilled. At the meeting of the Committee I asked for the copies and for the inspection. Reflect that in the ordinary course of the dreams of the prosecutors, that was the day the papers were to be sprung on me and trial opened. At that meeting Mr. Burrows, representing Europe, declared that I ought to be furnished with copies, to which the prosecutor replied, "Certainly, why of course." But they were not furnished. On the 19th, my trunk being packed as I had to go to Liverpool to take steamer home, I made a final demand on Mrs. Besant for the papers and inspection. She said, "But I have given them to Col. Olcott the legal owner." By the way he was not the legal owner of my letters to H.P.B. I went at once to Col. Olcott, reiterated to him the demand, and he said, "Oh, why, I've just sent them to India." "What," I said, "when did you?" "Just now, they are all packed up and gone off." "Why Olcott," I said, "you are not going there for two months, why did you do so? I must see them." I then went back and told Mrs. Besant what Olcott said, and that I would go to the newspapers and put the thing in the press as my nearest redress. She then ran to Col. Olcott's room in the next house. In a few minutes she returned and said it was now all right. I then went back to Olcott's room, Dr. Buck being with me—it was then late in the afternoon—and Olcott informed me that he "had made a mistake, they were in his despatch box." Then in his room I hurriedly examined what papers he had, and took rapid shorthand unverified copies of a few of the shorter ones. Two or three were long letters of mine to H.P.B. and Damodar of years ago; some were long, to Olcott, and one, a long one, contained also a sheet of type-written matter by me which is involved in one of the charges. These I could not copy, and I distinctly told him I was only making memoranda and he must furnish me with copies. He promised then, in Dr. Buck's presence, to send me the copies. To this day it has not been done. Recollect that all of the papers were allowed to get into the hands of W. R. Old, who made complete copies, took facsimiles, and furnished both to a newspaper inimical to Theosophy and Theosophists. Recollect also that when I had but the general main charge and no details, enemies and newspapers on the Pacific Coast were publishing details sent them from the Indian Headquarters people. And further, three months before the expected trial I wrote the prosecutor demanding full particulars and specifications, ending with these words:—

"As a Theosophist I call your attention to the fact that although you and the President know that I have for a long time demanded facts and particulars, I have not yet received them, and that under these charges are facts alleged which I must have time to meet and should be apprised of; and that your action on its face

1. She has published this just a week after the reading of this explanation.

pettifogs the whole case, as if you wished to entrap me [5] when away from my station as I will be in London. From spiteful enemies on this coast (California) I learn through the daily papers some of the particulars, and yet from you and the President, after months of questioning, I obtain nothing but these vague and indefinite charges." In reply I received a copy of her statement for the committee containing incomplete extracts from the documents. I did not want this paper. It was an inflammatory address. It was my intention to object to the reading of such a paper full of assumptions. Others as well as Old, the *Westminster Gazette*, Coleman, Shroff—all enemies and some not members of the T. S. even—have had the documents, or seen them, or had copies. A Parsee Judge in India writes that for some years he has been conversant with them. This he recently wrote to Dr. Hartmann. It would seem that fear, or a despicable plan to try and entrap me, has made the prosecutors refuse these copies to me. Lastly Col. Olcott, writing me February 26, 1895, finally violating the promise made, says:

I don't know where you get your law from, but hang me if I ever heard of an accused who has been furnished with a copy of the charges pending against him expecting that the documentary proofs in the hands of the Prosecuting Attorney shall be given him before the issue is on for trial. By quashing the trial last July you rendered the papers in my hands non-valid so far as the case stood at that stage. I have *given* copies to nobody: Old's copies were taken by him before the action began and while he was the custodian of the documents *prior* to their coming into *my possession*. He had no right to take them or to use them. How many duplicates he may have made and given out I cannot imagine.

Very queer Theosophy and Brotherhood this letter indicates. He gave all the papers to these people; he doesn't seem to care how many of my enemies may have copies to use and to distort, but it is very certain he is not going to furnish any to me. His law is wrong, for any tyro at the bar knows well that inspection and copying of documents before trial—even the photographing of them—is a legal right. But, surely, Theosophists should not be more strict than legal procedure is. It must be obvious then, that not having the documents, my present explanation cannot be full and complete in all details. I will not be entrapped by attempting to recollect written papers not before me.

Let us now take up the six charges filed by the prosecutor. At the sitting of the Committee a virtue was made of a formal withdrawal of charge No. 1. But I will print it. Indeed it lies at the base of the whole attack as it was intended to destroy my credibility, so that, no faith being given me, it would be easy to build up assumptions for everything and throw suspicion on perfectly innocent acts. The reason given for withdrawing this was that it meant the using of my old private letters to H.P.B., and the prosecutor did not like to face English condemnation of this. This was pure conventionality, for surely the use of my letters to H.P.B.—which I was ready anyhow to concede—was harmless when compared with the violent attack on my good name and [6] fame which the prosecutor was carrying on and has for a year continued quite as virulently. The paper of so-called charges is as follows. It follows no rule of legal, military, or ecclesiastical procedure with which I am familiar. The real charge was the one sent me by Col. Olcott of *misuse of Mahâtmâs' names and handwritings*; these so-called charges should have been in the form of proper specifications under the main charge.

CHARGES AGAINST WILLIAM Q. JUDGE V.P., T.S.

1. Untruthfulness, in now claiming uninterrupted teaching from and communication with the Masters from 1875 to the present time, in flagrant contradiction with his own letters written during this period, letters in which he states that he has no such communications, and asks certain persons to try and obtain communications for him.
2. Untruthfulness, in denying that he has sent any letters or messages purporting to be from the Masters, whereas he has sent such by telegram and enclosed in letters from himself to Annie Besant and others.

3. Deception practised towards H. S. Olcott with regard to the Rosicrucian jewel of H.P.B.
4. Lack of straightforwardness *re* alleged Lodge message on H. S. Olcott's tenure of the Presidency.
5. The use of a seal to substantiate certain messages supposed to be from a Master, which seal was not His.
6. The sending of messages, orders and letters, as if sent and written by Masters, such messages, etc., being proved to be non-genuine by
 - (a) Error in matter of fact.
 - (b) Threat based on a mistake.
 - (c) Triviality.

Further, probability being against their genuineness and in favour of their being written by W. Q. Judge, from

- (a) Their occurring only in letters from W. Q. Judge, or in letters that had been within his reach.
- (b) Their cessation when challenge was made as to their genuineness.
- (c) The limitation of the knowledge displayed in them to that possessed by W. Q. Judge.
- (d) The personal advantage to himself, directly in some cases, and indirectly generally as being the only person through whom such written messages were received.

Further, the possibility of such imitation of known scripts by him is shown by imitations done by him to prove the ease of such imitation.

(Signed) Annie Besant.

March 24, 1894, S.S. "Peninsular," Indian Ocean.

No. 1 is almost too absurd to be noticed. It is intended to show that I lied in respect to being in communication with Adepts, Mahâtmâs, or Masters, and of course to prove a general untruthfulness. Their argument is that because I wrote Col. [7] Olcott in 1894 that I had been helped by Masters and been in communication with them ever since 1875, and had written H. P. B. and Damodar later than 1875 asking for news from Masters, expressing despair, saying the old channel seemed cut off, and that I of all the Theosophists was getting least, therefore I was a liar and was not in communication with the Masters. This is childish. The letters expressed the feelings of the day they were written. They were true. One has his periods of despair. I had when first left here alone. A man cannot always be up to the highest notch. To say that I got the least of all when I did not know what others were getting was only an irritable exhibition of jealousy on my part. Even the greatest of seers have times when all is black, when they might write that everything was cut off; but next day or week the clouds would be all gone. Though I am not a great seer, I am subject like my fellows to changes of feeling. I had periods of darkness very often in those old days. But they went away and the old guidance and help were resumed. The letters themselves assert the facts of guidance and help. So too the recent letter to Olcott is true. It does not mean that every instant I heard from Master. Letters between friends are not so strictly construed as that. It was a last attempt to bring him round and out of what I thought his jealousy of me. Singular pertinacity they have displayed in hunting out these letters—even if withdrawn at the last moment by the prosecutor who had asserted publicly a belief in exactly what I wrote to Olcott, that Master had guided and helped me. But who can know anything of this but myself. All I can do is to point to the work in T.S. of nearly twenty years which has not been barren of result, and this I am compelled to say from the position I have been forced into.

No. 2 is also of untruthfulness. It should have been a specification under No.1. This is either based on error as to what I said or is a deliberate misconstruction. But I have no copy of the connected documents. I am charged with denying that I ever sent letters or messages purporting to be from Masters. I have not denied this, because I sent several such messages. But I denied having sent them *in the Society*. This denial is I believe in a letter to Olcott, and I still make the same denial, although since the charges I have sent messages

to members privately. Many other points are referred to in the letter, as I was endeavoring to show him that he could not find anywhere any evidence that I used messages from Masters as pressure in the business of the Society. All my friends who were intimate with me knew that I had sent messages from Masters and had claimed some as such, but this was done privately, about private business or about the business of the E. S., and not in or about the T.S. For “*in the T.S.*” means officially, or to officials, or quasi-officially, or upon business of the organization. Otherwise every private, or business, or social letter from one member to another would be “in the Society”—and that is absurd.

Charge No. 3 is that I deceived Col. Olcott about a Rosicrucian Jewel. This jewel is a silver emblem set with imitation gems. [8] It is an extended compass within which is a phoenix and a ruby cross. It has a top forming a coronet. It was supposed to be Rosicrucian and belonged to H. P. Blavatsky. It was among her effects in London in 1891 and was given to me by Mrs. Besant. At the same time there was also found by Mrs. Besant a small silver object which she thought was a thing of great power; this she kept. The charge about this jewel is as contemptible as the preceding ones. The conversation which I had with Olcott in California about this emblem was to be used against me by the simple process of inserting a few words which would make it a deception or attempt at mystification by me. As Col. Olcott is quite wrong in his assertion that the conversation took place in the presence of Dr. Anderson, and as his memory is quite defective as many know, my account will have to be taken as the right one. In July 1894, in London, I prevailed on Col. Olcott to join me in a written statement regarding this matter so that we might have for future use and to remedy forgetfulness an unalterable statement. It is as follows:

Re Rosicrucian Jewel. William Q. Judge and Col. H. S. Olcott hereby together agree in writing that the following states what said JUDGE said to said OLCOTT in October, 1891, in San Francisco, about Rosicrucian Jewel of H. P. Blavatsky at Dr. Anderson’s house.

W. Q. Judge says: “Col. Olcott having stated that the jewel was at Adyar, I went into my room adjoining. In a few moments I came back to Col. Olcott’s room and said to him, ‘Colonel, Master says I may tell you that the jewel is not in Adyar, and you will not find it there’. No more was said and not a single word was uttered by me to the effect that Master had taken the jewel away.”

Col. Olcott says: “My recollection of the incident differs from the above. At the same time, as I have no notes of the conversation made by me at the time, it is but fair to say that my memory is as likely to have misled me as Mr. Judge’s or Dr. Anderson’s to have misled them. The scene occurred, to the best of my recollection, in Mr. Judge’s bedroom, which adjoined and connected with mine; the persons present were Dr. Anderson, Mr. Judge and myself, and we were talking together in a desultory way awaiting the summons to dinner. I described to Dr. Anderson the well-known Rosicrucian jewel which H. P. B. used to wear and which had the mysterious property that the rows of crystals in it would change color, from white to brown or green, when H. P. B. was out of health. I said that on returning to Adyar I should examine the jewel to see whether the crystals had resumed their proper hue or had perhaps turned black since H.P.B.’s death. Judge, who was standing next to me with folded arms, turned and said: ‘Olcott, the Master tells me that you will not find the jewel at Adyar. . . . This will be a test for you of the genuineness of my communications.’ The blank space [I have left] I should be disposed to, fill with words to indicate that the Master had [9] taken it away, but my memory fails me in this respect and I will not venture to say that such words were spoken. The clear impression made on me, however, and that which remains, is that Judge was giving me a test of his power to get communications from the Masters; and to satisfy my doubts on this point, as soon as I got to Adyar I hunted for the jewel, and then discovered that I had myself taken it to London in 1888 and returned it to H.P.B. herself.”

H. S. Olcott.

London, July 18, 1894

Dr. Anderson makes a statement in writing denying that any such conversation took place in his presence or hearing, or any about the jewel. [And at the reading of this paper at Boston, April 29, 1895, before about 200 people, Dr. Anderson rose and publicly denied Col. Olcott's statement as to his (Dr. A.'s) presence.]

We therefore have two witnesses, Dr. Anderson and myself, contradicting Col. Olcott on an important point: hence his account is all doubtful.

A little more of the inside history of the incident is this. The conversation took place just before we went to sleep. Both were undressing and Olcott, who was to leave for Japan next day, spoke of many matters. He finally mentioned the Rosicrucian jewel and stated it was at Adyar. It was among my effects at that date and I wondered whether to tell Olcott and whether, if I did, he would demand it. So I went into my room and asked: "What shall I do?" The reply I got was "You can tell him it is not there and he will not find it there." If I had simply told him that, and not added the fact that the Master told me I might so tell him, this absurd charge would not have arisen. With lapse of time Col. Olcott added many particulars, as is common with those who are not very careful. The "folded arms," the "waiting for dinner," the "explanation to Anderson," are all imaginary. Inasmuch as Olcott and I had for twenty years held together the same belief in the same Master, with whom, through H.P.B., I had come in contact only a few months after he had, I naturally told him that Master had just spoken to me, adding what he said. But Olcott's mind was suspicious, and he did not believe I could hear from Master, so he put my words down to boasting or mediumship. During the same visit to California he one day referred to Mrs. Besant's statement that she had received messages from Masters, which declaration had made a stir in England, and he accused me of cooking the messages, saying: "Judge, that was a ten-strike of yours, but I advise you not to do it again."

To this I replied, that any messages given by me to Mrs. Besant were genuine ones, at which he laughed. Then he said that when he heard of her direct assertion in public, that she had received such messages, he thought I had done it. Now, with such ideas about me, it is natural that he should distrust whatever I might say on occult subjects; and this has ever been the case with him wherever I have been concerned.

No. 4. A charge of lack of straightforwardness in regard to a [10] Lodge message on Col. Olcott's tenure of the presidency at the time of his resignation. This is not correctly stated in the charge, for the message from the Master therein referred to is about Olcott's resignation, and not about his tenure of the presidency.

Why this charge was made up I do not know. Both Olcott and Besant admit that I got a message from the Master about the matter. Yet this item made a great and disagreeable impression on some of the London *Lucifer* household of July last. There is some sort of purely technical English conventionality involved in it which I do not understand. They seemed to think that because I had a message from Master by which I guided my own conduct and which I communicated to Olcott, the other person concerned, therefore I did wrong in not also giving it to them, and in allowing them to follow their own nature about his remaining in office. But I was neither obliged nor ordered to tell them. As this charge involves a long letter to Olcott and a page of typewriting I leave open to correction the explanation I now make.

A great deal has been said about this resignation question. Indian and Californian calumniators have accused me of sending a bogus message to Olcott demanding his resignation, but I have been silent. But as it is now made as basis of a charge against me, and as agreements made respecting silence have been broken, I shall give facts to which hitherto I have not referred. It was to this event and the doings round about the resignation Miss F. H. Muller referred in an inflammatory speech against me last December at a meeting at Adyar, India, in the presence of Mrs. Besant and Col. Olcott who sat and listened to the untruth uttered by the speaker. She said I had before that made a serious charge against Col. Olcott so as to get him out of the Presidency. Those

sitting by knowing this to be false said nothing. Is this true Theosophy to sit silent in such a case. It is about time then that something should be said.

When no resignation was thought of and Olcott had just returned to India from the United States and Australia, Mrs. Besant hurriedly took steamer for New York, previously cabling me an ominous message. She arrived here and informed me that she had come over in such haste in order to lay before me as Vice-President and as the only person she had confidence in, a very grave accusation against Col. Olcott which, if true, not only required his resignation but made him out to be an exceedingly bad man, unfit to be President of the Society for a single hour. She said she was certain of the truth of the charge. And she demanded that I should write him asking his resignation. I took pains to have her repeat the details and charge to some of my good friends in New York, so that I should not be alone in the case. We cross-questioned her as to the facts and as to source of her information. She went over it all in detail and with particularity, and insisted on all and made out a very apparently clear case. We were disposed to give her credit since the matter did not apparently involve herself or her feelings. She had arranged that a London member, a man of means, would go to [11] India as special messenger so as to avoid all risks from spies at Adyar. It was then finally decided that I had better lay the matter before Olcott because I was Vice-President and an old friend of Olcott, and ask him whether, if the charge were true, he had not better resign. But I did this against my inclination and judgment, under great pressure and being also somewhat convinced by Mrs. Besant's arguments. The special messenger delivered the letter and, although the charge was denied, Col. Olcott put in his resignation of the Presidency.

Later, however, I found for myself that Mrs. Besant had acted hurriedly, impulsively and injudiciously, and that no such letter should have gone from me to Col. Olcott. The resignation was still pending nevertheless and the American April Convention was near at hand. Then, at that date, I was informed by the Master that it was "not wise, nor time, nor just" that Olcott should go out, and that I must change the policy I had outlined in view of the resignation going into effect, and endeavor to get Olcott to revoke. I had had to outline distinctly for my guidance a policy to cover the whole field of Theosophical administration because in a very short time if nothing interfered I would have become President. No matter what my private feelings and desires were I was compelled to adopt a policy regarding all matters connected with the Indian headquarters, with the expenses there, with changes which judgment showed me were essential, and with many other matters. So, the direction to "change policy" which included my favoring or opposing Col. Olcott's retirement, was very significant.

This direction I immediately began to follow, writing to Olcott in type-written form a portion of what I had been told. The basis of this charge is that type-written paper. And I was very much relieved myself by the order to go the other way, because as all my near and intimate friends know, there was so much to be done in America I did not want to take the Presidency. I find also that at that date Mrs. Besant received a letter from me, across one corner of which were these words, signed by the Master, "*Ordered to change his policy.*" By the way it is curious to note that this particular message which is in the form of writing to which the prosecutor objects and has charged me with forging, has not been incorporated into the charges. The type-written message to Olcott was enclosed separately in the letter. I sent it thus because I was so directed. Intellectually speculating (as is natural) on the reasons for such direction, I came to the conclusion that it was because of the presence of the spies and traitors around Col. Olcott, which fact I had long before discovered psychically. I may refer you to the *Path* where I printed articles on a Plot against the T. S. solely on this information. Subsequent confessions and the suicide of the defaulting T.S. Treasurer proved that my information was correct. These spies were friends of our enemies and they opened as many of his letters as they could. And at the same time, or near it, that I sent the message to Olcott telling him to revoke, he also received, he says, in India a message himself to [12] the same effect. This he said was a voice just as he was

waking from a dream. My message was received while I was in possession of all my waking senses. That is just the difference between the two: in substance they were alike.

At the April Convention I succeeded in having resolutions passed asking him to revoke; but I used arguments only and no pressure. I said nothing to anyone of having any direction or message although there were many who would have been glad to hear it and accept at once. If I am or was ambitious for office as was and is charged against me, here was the very best opportunity to have taken the position of President, as the present prosecutors were then favorable to me and against Col. Olcott, and with America and Europe I could have out-voted India. This however was not desired by me, and I thought more of pushing the American work than of taking all the offices in the Society. The actual fact and act conclusively prove that I did not want the office. As the Indian Section was also in favor of revocation I dismissed that matter from my mind as settled, especially as I saw clearly that he would revoke.

Later in July I went to the London Convention. But nearly all the influential ones at Headquarters disliked Olcott intensely then. They said they were glad he was going out, and they rather resented the Americans trying to make them vote the other way. I found myself hemmed in, with all of them from Mrs. Besant down, unwilling to listen to my arguments and appeals to brotherhood and to Olcott's long record. Not one was in favor of him. I was then directed not to say anything to them about the message, but to let them act upon their own judgment as I had done all that was necessary to have them do the way that America had done. A notice then came from Olcott which I regarded as a loophole for his dignified revocation, but they said no, and when the Convention met, it of course voted on this in accordance with Headquarters influence—against Olcott.

Afterwards the staff at London learned that I had the message, and they criticised me for not giving it also to them. Even Olcott wanted to know why I had not used it to make the Section vote right. He forgot that in the outer matters of the T. S. no one had any right to use such occult messages as pressure; I did not use it in America, nor should I in Europe, and anyway I was forbidden to use it privately. A great deal of doubt and suspicion have arisen among those at Headquarters in London about this matter, but I have given you all of it. I can see nothing in this attack but the working of wounded pride on the part of the few who have taken it up at London. But, the charge on it is *lack of straightforwardness*. Now as I at once told Olcott, the person concerned, I was guilty of no lack of straightforwardness. To twist it round so as to punish me for not telling all my private affairs to the London staff is childish nonsense. Or else the item was introduced to build up a mass of things small and great against me, so that my case might be made so bad that few if any of my statements on the chief matters to follow would be believed.

[13] The remaining two charges are meant to include that particular part of the attack which is based upon the assertion that I have manufactured and delivered bogus messages from the Masters. The fifth in order avers that I have employed a certain seal, alleged to be not Master's seal, to give a fictitious substantiation to some of these supposedly bogus messages. In the first place, it is impossible to prove that I have used a seal to substantiate messages, even though on the messages there appears an impression of a seal, for no man ever saw me use such a seal. Col. Olcott, Mrs. Besant and Bertram Keightley have united to prove that Col. Olcott had had made, in India, a brass seal, which was an attempted imitation of the signature said to be that of the Master, and that he gave that brass object to Madame Blavatsky. Their testimony is that the last person who saw or knew anything about that brass object is Bertram Keightley. It is not traced to my possession; there is not a scintilla of evidence to show that it ever was in my possession; and I do not think any American court would require me to prove a negative, that it is not and has not been in my possession. But I assert as I have from the beginning that I have not this object, that I never have had it, and that I know nothing whatever about it as an object except what I learn from the testimony of those three persons.

It is around this seal and the impressions resembling and supposedly taken from it that most of the confusion has arisen.

The seal itself has been confounded with the impression taken from it and that with its semblance by precipitation. It is well-known to a great many Theosophists,—such for instance as Countess Wachtmeister, B. Keightley, A. Keightley, Mrs. Cooper-Oakley, George Mead, C.F. Wright and numerous others, that the impression on paper, now said to be that of this seal manufactured for Olcott, has appeared and been seen on messages from the Masters coming through H.P.B., on envelopes from her and other papers connected with her. The impression grew to be called “The Master’s Seal” in London. It was so-called by most of the persons I have named, and it is quite evident that, just as in the case of writing, the Masters adopted two forms of English writing for use in the Theosophical Society, so this seal impression was adopted to be used after the signature of one of them whenever he saw fit. Only those who are wholly ignorant of occultism, or those who have merely a theoretical knowledge of it would say “the Master’s real seal” and “the imitation of the Master’s seal,” because no person has ever seen the Master’s seal, either knowingly or unknowingly. He has a seal, but it has never been shown in the Theosophical Society. His real seal is as unknown as is the form of his real writing, which certainly is not English.

This particular seal impression was one to which I paid no attention for a long time, having seen it but few times during the life of H.P.B., and when I did first see it, I looked at it merely as a mark which she had chosen to impress on the paper for some purpose of her own, until I discovered that it had been adopted for use under the sanction of the Master. It was in 1888, I think, [14] when she told me distinctly that these impressions, made by occult power, were so adopted. And in that year, I sent to America to one person, an F.T.S., at H.P.B.’s request, one of the said impressions made by her on the slip of paper on which it appeared, as a souvenir, at the same time stating to him, as authorized by her, that it was “the Master’s seal,” meaning of course seal-impression. This was perfectly correct; and it is one of the pieces of “evidence” which the prosecutors were hoping to adduce with their own interpretation. I have said in print before now, in *Lucifer*, that I knew nothing about the Master’s seal, and that the appearance of any quantity of seals on letters or documents was of no consequence to me unless I myself knew the truth about the documents. These perfectly true statements have been misconstrued by the prosecutors into meaning that I assert ignorance of this particular brass object and its impress, however made, whether directly from it or by occult power, and that I denied a well-known fact that the seal-impression was known to me.

The first piece of writing by me, upon which this seal-impression appears, is—I think—a letter sent to Col. Olcott in December, 1888, from London. The impression is on a blank part of the paper and, as I recall it, there is no reference to it in the letter. This letter was written with Madame Blavatsky’s pen, ink and paper, upon her desk and remained there some little time. There is no mention of the Masters in the letter and I certainly deny, most absolutely and solemnly, having put that impression there. My explanation is that Madame Blavatsky caused the impression to appear by occult power on the paper, as I have seen her often do with other marks and impressions.

After H.P.B. disappeared from the scene, some of the precipitated messages appearing on my letters to the persons I shall name, have this seal—also precipitated—upon them, and some have not.

The rumor has been started that I wrote to London asking Mrs. Besant to erase all seals from letters, papers or messages of mine, and I am asked to explain. I fail to see what difference it makes or what it proves if I did ask to have that done. For if I am assumed to be the fraud Mrs. Besant wishes to make out—a fraud engaged in humbugging her—then I certainly would not expose myself by asking her to erase proofs of fraud. Such a request in this case would rather appear to be evidence of innocence, for it now appears clearly that it is impossible to trace the seal of brass to my possession, while on the other hand they do trace it, first to

Col. Olcott and then to Bertram Keightley with the probability of its being in Mrs. Besant's house. And as B. Keightley and Mrs. Besant are hand and glove in this prosecution, the circumstances are more against them than against me.

But I deny that I asked to have all these seal marks erased. If I wrote to Mrs. Besant asking her to erase any one certain seal mark, then I shall be able to explain why that single request was made, but cannot do so until I see the letter. If the word is [15] in the plural by having the letter *s* added to the word seal, or if it says "all," then I say that forgery by alteration has been committed upon my letters for the purpose of aiding the prosecutors.

Before going any further it is absolutely necessary to make a statement about myself which hitherto I have refrained from making. And now it would not be made were it not that the prosecutors have forced me into the position where I must either state this or be silent: and I am also directed to make it. The prosecutors and their friends try to make people think that it is impossible that W. Q. Judge could have any occult powers and that this case can be decided outside of occult lines. This is improper and impossible. The whole matter has to be examined from the standpoint of occultism—or magic. Well, I have to state, that during all the years since 1875 I have been taught much about occultism by the Masters and their friends, and have been shown how to produce some phenomena, among others the precipitation of writing for the Masters at certain times. This is always in the form to which the prosecutors most foolishly object. These teachings began—notwithstanding ignorance of it on the part of Col. Olcott, who takes pains to say he knows nothing of it, and that I am probably a medium—in 1875 with H. P. B. In that year, the first precipitation done through me, was effected in New York. Madame Blavatsky told me not to inform Col. Olcott of what I was learning, because of certain special reasons she explained to me but which I need not explain here. From that time he knew nothing of what I was learning or doing with her. And, from that time on, with exceptions when I was physically in unfit condition, or when I allowed doubt, jealousy or other defects of character to interfere, I have been in communication with the Master and friends of his, receiving help and direction from him and them in my Theosophic work and sending for him, very frequently,—I may say hundreds of times—messages to friends and correspondents, without identifying them all as such. But it must not be supposed that because I could do this, and receive help, I could never make a mistake. Those who know sufficient about occultism and spiritism are aware that mistakes arise in consequence of the working of the physical brain which is being used. Often some of one's own peculiarities, even what might be called trivial idiosyncrasies, can and do creep into the message which is reported, but it is very certain that the substance, the main idea, and, in the case of the Theosophical Movement itself, the exact idea, is never confused.

Now taking up the next charge, that I have sent such messages pretending them to be from the Master although in reality, as alleged, emanating from myself, it appears that eight affirmations, or grounds, or bases, are cited by the prosecutor in support of the charge. The first two are entirely false in fact. They allege, first, error in matter of fact and second, a threat based on a mistake. I have, as a matter of fact made no error in any of these messages and no threat whatever is made, either based on a mistake or otherwise. The first alleged error is that in a message [16] said to have been sent by me, the brass seal previously referred to is called "the Lahore brass." About this I know absolutely nothing. The alleged message was found by Col. Olcott in a letter from Abbott Clark, of California, at a time when I was in California, it is true, but Abbott Clark swears that I could not have done anything with his letter, and that he carried it around in his pocket for some time after it was written, while he waited to procure stamps for mailing it, and did not post it until after I had started for the East. It is in evidence, as admitted by the prosecutor, that the letter in which this message was found was opened in Adyar and forwarded from there to Col. Olcott. There were at that time, in Adyar, certain spies and enemies, who gave out information to those who wished to hurt the Theosophical Society and those persons opened letters not addressed to themselves. I cannot repudiate as a fact Mr. Abbott Clark's letter in which this appeared, but I can and do emphatically repudiate, *in toto*, the message alleged

to have been made by me. In the statement made by the prosecutor, it is taken for granted, as if proved, that I was misled by Col. Olcott's speaking of the Punjab and that I therefore came to the conclusion that the seal had better be called, in this alleged bogus message, "the Lahore brass." The fact of the matter is that I know nothing about Lahore, or the Punjab, and all my knowledge of this brass seal, considered as an object, is derived from Col. Olcott's testimony, together with that of Bertram Keightley. Abbott Clark says:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

April 21, 1894.

I, ABBOTT CLARK, a member of the THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, do hereby state and affirm as follows:

I have seen it stated in the newspapers that it is charged that I wrote Col. H.S. Olcott in 1891 to India and that in that letter was some message not known to me and that Col. Olcott replied asking where William Q. Judge was at the time and that I replied he was in my house.

The facts are: That in 1891, Mr. W.Q. Judge was lecturing in this State and I was with him at Santa Ana and that I had no house, and never had, being too poor to have one. Bro. Judge stopped at the hotel in Santa Ana, where he came from my home, my father's house, at Orange, where he had been at dinner, and at Santa Ana I arranged his lecture, and I stayed at my Aunt's in Santa Ana; while in the hotel a conversation arose with us in which I spoke of Theosophical propaganda among the Chinese on this coast, and Bro. Judge suggested that I write to Col. Olcott as he knew many Buddhist Theosophists and might arrange it better than Bro. Judge, and I then myself wrote to Col. Olcott on the matter showing the letter after it was done to Bro. Judge to see if it should be improved or altered and he handed me back the letter at once. I put it in my pocket and kept it there for several days waiting for a chance to buy stamps for postage as I was away from any post office. Bro. Judge left by himself the morning [17] after I wrote the letter and went to San Diego and the only time I saw him again was in the train, just to speak to him on his return, after about four days and the letter was not mentioned, thought of, nor referred to.

I assert on my word of honor that Bro. Judge said nothing to me about any message pretended to be from Masters or otherwise, and so far as any reports or statements have been made relating to me herein different from the above, they are absolutely false.

From India I got a reply from Adyar T.S. Office from one Charlu saying he had opened my letter in Col. Olcott's absence, and had forwarded it to him; and Dharmapala told me he had seen letters from me to Olcott on the matter, received in India away from Adyar. The said Charlu in reply also asked me where Bro. Judge was when the letter was written, and I wrote that he had been at my house on that date, which is true as above stated, Orange being but three miles from Santa Ana, as I thought Charlu wished to have Bro. Judge's dates, but thought also the questions put were peculiar from such a distance. I never got any reply to my sincere first question in that letter about propaganda from him, and never any reply of any sort from Col. Olcott. When Dharmapala was here he did not bring any message in reply from Olcott, but referred to recollecting speaking with Olcott about a proposal from California to work with the Chinese. And Charlu did not speak of any enclosure in said letter. A year later I again wrote on the same matter to Col. Olcott which was answered by Gopala Charlu, now dead, saying but little if anything could be done by him. To all this I affirm on my honor.

(Signed) ABBOTT CLARK

WITNESS SIGNATURE,

(Signed) ALLEN L. GRIFFITHS.

E. B. Rambo.

The next alleged error of fact is this. I wrote a letter to Mr. Cooper-Oakley in 1887—at which time he was editing the *Theosophist*—in which I hinted that two ostensibly different writers in the magazine employing two signatures, were really one and the same person; from the last word in the letter about this matter, a red line runs to a marginal message, the words written in blue—“which should not be used to force my, or your, theory on its readers. By order of Hilarion”—after which are some hieroglyphics. The prosecutors claim that this writing is like that of the Master K.H. The fact of the matter is that it is not, nor was it intended to be. It is a precipitation, made by a friend of mine—to wit, the said “Hilarion”—and was intended, as any person can see, who does not intend to twist and distort everything, to cast a doubt on my statement that they are by one and the same person. This I have learned directly by asking the said “Hilarion” what is the fact. Neither Col. Olcott, nor Mrs. Besant, nor any of the prosecutors, know “Hilarion”; they have heard of him vaguely and even spell his name wrongly. They even have two ideas as to what is his handwriting. But this particular inscription is a precipitation [18] of his handwriting by himself. He certainly knows what he meant.

The next alleged error of fact is that in a letter of mine to Tookaram Tatya, in 1891, there is a short red message asking him to “help my colleague, work with him” signed by the Master. This is alleged to be bogus. They say that it was intended to make Tatya help me with Prof. Dvivedi in the Oriental Department when, as a matter of fact, the said Professor had already written his letter of acceptance to me. This is simply, to my mind, nonsense. In the first place, the message is genuine. It is a precipitation and, of course, it was made through me. My letter was about the Oriental Department, but what I wanted was that Tatya should help me in the whole matter as it was to extend over a long period of time. And I was then negotiating for more than one professor; B. Keightley, at Adyar, having actually, at the time, hired an additional one. As the Master had given to me, before this date, a photograph of his picture and had endorsed on it a sentence calling me his “colleague,” it is hardly strange that he should use those words to Tookaram Tatya. The insinuation made by the prosecutor is that I was referring only to Prof. Dvivedi. Most certainly I know to the contrary.

The next charge is that a message makes a threat, on the basis of a mistake. The letter is to Col. Olcott, in 1891. The words of the message, which are in red, are “I might tell him of your poison interview with . . . (name omitted here.)” The explanation thereof is this. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that that sentence was precipitated in that letter, through me, without my knowledge at the time. It is unfinished, but would have been completed but for the alteration of conditions at the time and various hindrances unnecessary to relate. It grew out of the fact of Mrs. Besant’s explicit statement to me that a certain person (whose truthfulness we had no reason to doubt) had thrown out hints about Col. Olcott’s being a man capable of administering poisons, and her further averment, at the same time, that Madame Blavatsky had hinted the same thing to her. This is not the first time Mrs. Besant has made to me accusations of a serious character against other persons. The statement did not command my credence, but at the same time I was disturbed by it and it caused some grave questions to arise in my mind. It influenced me to endeavor to procure from occult sources information on the subject, and I did obtain at least partial information. All this caused the precipitation of that incomplete message in the letter, which would have been finished and been a good deal longer were it not for the disturbance of the conditions necessary for its completion. It would then show that the Master might tell, or explain, to me about the poison interview which had been a weight on my mind but that the doubts and suspicions then existing on both sides prevented any useful messages being sent for mutual use. The person who should have least reason for surprise at the revelation in this explanation is Col. Olcott, for I have a letter from him in 1892 in which he says:

[19] What do I mean by “poison”? well you will learn in time; the simple fact is that certain people had the damnable wickedness and impudence to hint that I might use it on third parties. Damn them.

The “people” he referred to were in England.

The next averred reason is “triviality.” The prosecutors choose to say that they know what a Mahatma would write under all circumstances. One “triviality” is the name “Henry”; another to “tell a date”; another “Do you

think S. would snip off a bit from a message?" Answer "Yes." The prosecutor declared that Mr. Sinnett declined to "snip off a bit," but the fact is that, afterwards or at that time, Mr. Sinnett did "snip off a bit" which he caused to be submitted to me, through Bertram Keightley, to learn what I would say about it. Dr. and Mrs. Keightley are witnesses to this fact. The prosecutors seem to think that if a message is not immediately and apparently applicable it is bogus. Another alleged triviality is the appearance on a letter from me to a servant of Madame Blavatsky in India, after her death, of the word "Yes," in red, on the margin, connected with a statement in the letter that I was his friend. What nonsense this all is.

The next reason given to show, in the opinion of the prosecutor, that all the messages are bogus, is that they only occur in letters from me, or on paper that I have touched, or at least had near me. In a court of law, perhaps this would be a good reason, perhaps also those whose mechanical minds do not permit them to know occultism may so esteem it. But, as a matter of fact, if the messages occur only in that way, it means that I am the only person through whom, at present, they can occur, and if they do not occur in conjunction with the prosecutors it is because they are not persons through whom such manifestations can happen. In other words: with what person should they occur if not with me?

It is further averred as another alleged reason for the charges against me, that the receipt of the messages by those persons ceased when a challenge was offered as to their genuineness. It is perfectly certain that, as soon as the prosecutors showed their hands, challenged messages, expressed doubts and alleged suspicions against me, no more messages would be delivered to them, except under special circumstances. They stopped of course, in regard to these personalities, but they did not stop in other places and cases where repellant suspicions did not exist and where they have still been received whenever occasion demanded and conditions permitted it. The only exception to this has been that, by order, one message was sent to Mrs. Besant after the attempted settlement in July, 1894. It was a short message, coupled with a statement that it was sent to her without explanation and for her to find out whether it was written, manufactured, precipitated, or what not. To this day she does not know whether it was written by hand in waking consciousness, or a state of trance, or a half-cataleptic condition, or automatically while conscious, or precipitated from the Akasa;—but she has written to certain persons in America that she has decided it is bogus.

[20] The next reason given is that the messages only display such knowledge as I possess. I do not know how well informed the prosecutors are as to the limitations of my knowledge. They cannot know its extent and the statement they make is untrue. They first take up the matter of the Rosicrucian jewel—to which I have already referred—and attempt to show that the limitation of knowledge in the message was my knowing that I had the jewel. But the fact is that what I was told by the Master was advice that I might tell Olcott he could not find the jewel. It was not offered to Olcott as a statement of information given me by the Master.

The next reason advanced is that I gain an advantage from these messages, inasmuch as they tend, says the prosecutor, to make people think that I am the only person through whom they can come. This, to my mind and certainly to those hundreds of persons who know me and my work in America, seems to be a childish as well as ignorant statement. The messages are few in number. They are sent privately. They do not direct anything to be done for my benefit. They were never published by me. I never referred to them in public. I never gave out that I could get messages until these people, by their false accusations, forced me to make the avowal. In every way these messages have been a source of annoyance to me and it is a sincere satisfaction to myself that they have to be stopped in respect to those persons who have shown themselves incapable of understanding either them or me. Others, in America, can and do get messages from the Masters.

The last item brought forward by the prosecutor should, if a good piece of evidence, have been produced in the beginning of the charges. It is a letter written by me when I was in India in 1884, to the Parsee Judge Khandalavala, at the time of the Coulomb charges against Madame Blavatsky. He had written to me asking

me to look at the originals of the published letters, if possible, and give him my opinion. I did see some of those letters and wrote to him on the subject, which was whether any of those letters could have been tampered with. In the middle of the letter I gave him four samples of imitations of handwriting which I say are written by a friend, the words being “*witness these, by a friend,*” after which follow bad imitations of Col. Olcott’s, Madame Blavatsky’s and other signatures. I also refer to a clever forgery, by Mme. Coulomb, of Dr. Hartmann’s handwriting. This letter proves nothing whatever except that I wanted to show this man that forgery could be committed. The prosecutor has hoped to make it appear by this letter, that the execution of a forgery was nothing to me. But if it be put forward to sustain that view, it is weak, because the imitations in it are poor, whereas the prosecutors say that my alleged imitations in messages are perfect. It could be used against me by suppressing the words, “witness these, by a friend.”

A number of other charges have been brought forward that I imposed on Mrs. Besant, Bertram Keightley, and meetings of Theosophists, and allegations have also been made of attempts to [21] impose on Colonel Olcott. Of these I will take up those that are not actually puerile. There is a note in pencil of my own to Colonel Olcott which is published in the *Westminster Gazette* reading as follows:

“Dear Olcott, Master says he has sent you a message in a queer envelope and you are to look for it.” This is quite true. I did write that to Olcott because that was said to me. The same newspaper publishes what purports to be a facsimile of an alleged bogus precipitation, reading: “I withhold the message until later,” connecting this with my pencil note. I have not seen the drawing from which the newspaper plate of this was made. There was a genuine message to that effect in 1891 to Olcott and for this reason:

On one of Olcott’s letters to me, received just before his arrival in London from Australia, I found on its corner a short line from the Master saying to me, “I have sent him a message,” meaning Olcott. This I showed to Olcott in a cab in which he and I rode up to the Headquarters on his arrival. He read it, and saying, “I have not received it yet,” handed it back to me. Later he asked me again about it and I think I said I did not know yet; at that time the above quoted message came.

Another charge is that a telegram to Bertram Keightley in New York at my office, had on it the word “right” in red in the accepted script, together with an impression of the seal and the Master’s signature. The prosecutors state that this message was opened by me first and then marked by me, after which they say Keightley read it. It is quite possible that if this message was sent to my name over the cable I opened it first. But, I emphatically deny placing those marks upon it. Its subsequent history is that Madame Blavatsky recovered it in London by producing it suddenly before B. Keightley and several others, after his return to London. Mr. Claude Falls Wright, who was present, says briefly that,

In my presence and that of B. Keightley, Countess Wachtmeister, and Kenneth Austin, H.P.B. at London, immediately after the arrival of Bert Keightley, took a piece of cigarette paper and looking Bert in the face, while blowing him up for his loss of the telegram, suddenly said with a half smile, ‘Bert, would you like a telegram; wouldn’t you like a telegram, Bert?’ She rubbed the piece of paper between her fingers as she spoke [48] and then *unfolded it into the lost telegram!* On it were several of the very seal marks about which there has been so much dispute. Bert Keightley claimed the telegram, but she insisted upon its being handed around to the rest of us, desiring us to examine it closely saying, ‘Look, those are the Master’s marks, look, you may have some day to know them again.’ Then she went on to say that we might mention the matter to anybody we chose, except Judge, for, she said, he does not want to be associated in any way with phenomena.

(Signed) CLAUDE FALLS WRIGHT.

Clearly if I am a fraud about this seal and seal-mark, then so was H.P.B.

[22] Another false charge is about a paper which turned up at a private meeting. On this were the words, in the accepted script, "Judge's plan is right." This paper was discovered by Mrs. Besant among the other papers directly after reading the plan proposed by Judge.

This message was precipitated then and there through me. I have it now. The *Westminster Gazette* tries to show that it was a prestidigitation by me, but let me read you the statement signed by even my present official accuser and other friends. This has already been given out to the public, so that I am not violating any confidences.

The plan for the reorganization of the E.S.T. rendered necessary by the passing away of H. P. Blavatsky, was laid before the English division of the General Council by Annie Besant, who had in her possession a bundle of letters from which she read extracts. These constituted William Q. Judge H.P. Blavatsky's representative with full powers in America, and appointed Annie Besant as Chief Secretary of the Inner Group (the highest grade in the E.S.T.), and Recorder of the Teachings. These were the documents upon which the reorganization of the School was based, and the recognition of William Q. Judge and Annie Besant as its Outer Heads was made. The arrangement was rendered inevitable by these letters of H.P. Blavatsky, its Head, and nothing beyond her expressed directions was necessary to ensure its acceptance by the Council. Towards the close of the proceedings a message was received from Master, 'Judge's plan is right.' This was written on a small piece of paper found among the papers in the sight of all by Annie Besant. This message bore the impression of a seal, and the impression was recognised by Countess Wachtmeister and others as that of the Master, being identical with impressions on letters received during the life-time with us of H.P. Blavatsky.

The message was received as a most satisfactory sign of approval of the arrangement proposed, but that arrangement was in no sense arrived at in consequence of it, being, as above stated, based on H.P. Blavatsky's own letters and accepted as by her directions.

(Signed)

CONSTANCE WACHTMEISTER,
G.R.S. MEAD,
ANNIE BESANT,

LAURA M. COOPER,
W. WYNN WESTCOTT,
ALICE CLEATHER.

I myself selected from among many letters of H.P.B.'s those referred to above, and tied them together. There was no paper with Master's writing bearing above words among them before the meeting.

ANNIE BESANT

LONDON, *July 14, 1893.*

Claude Falls Wright makes the following statement:

At the meeting of the Councillors of the E.S.T. held in the Blavatsky Lodge Hall at 19 Avenue Road, London, England, on the afternoon of Wednesday the 27th May, 1891, a message from [23] the Master among documents read by Annie Besant was found by her in full sight of all present. Annie Besant was sitting at a small table several feet distant from the group of Councillors, who sat opposite her while she read the documents. William Q. Judge was not seated by her at the time, but among the group and on the left side of the hall. Annie, after reading the plan proposed by Judge, went on to read a paper on which were the words, 'Judge's plan is right.' Mr. Judge asked her to read that again as he did not understand it to have been among the other papers. She did so, and then for the first time seemed to comprehend that it was a message that had just been sent. On the paper were the signature of the Master and the seal-mark I had seen on papers received and precipitated by H.P.B. Annie then stated that she had had the documents previously for some time in her possession and that this paper was certainly not among them when she brought them into the room, and they

had not left her hands. The Countess Wachtmeister then asked to see the paper, and having examined it said, 'Yes, that is Master's seal-mark!' The slip was then handed round to all.

(Signed) CLAUDE FALLS WRIGHT.

NEW YORK, *April 24, 1895.*

Dear Mr. Judge: At the meeting of the E.S. held at the Astor House, subsequent to H.P.B.'s death, sister Annie Besant stated, in the most positive and unqualified manner, that the message from the Master which she found at the meeting of the Council of the E.S. in London, amongst other papers, could not have been placed there by you or any one else. Her statement was so unequivocal, and made so forcibly, as practically to preclude question or discussion.

Yours most sincerely,
HENRY TURNER PATTERSON

I agree to the above as being what Mrs. Besant said.

THADDEUS P. HYATT.

Mr. Patterson's statement is correct.
464 CLASSON AVE., BROOKLYN, *December 6th, 1894.*

WILLIAM MAIN.

Afterwards, again in America, Mrs. Besant reiterated this statement and confirmed it before a great many persons at different [51] meetings. The evidence of these persons is procurable. The statements made in the *Westminster Gazette* as to this matter are from beginning to end either garbled or foolish or false.

What remains of any importance are messages delivered by me to Mrs. Besant. These I have never denied. I delivered them. They were genuine. She is and always was incapable of deciding as to their genuineness, having to rely on me or others. She has publicly admitted that she thinks their gist or contents were from the Master—hence genuine. She then went further than her knowledge would warrant in saying that they were not [24] precipitated by the Master, and admitted that she did not know in what way they were made. Her opinion either way on this matter is, however, of no consequence, as she has no means of her own of deciding anything about the occult side of such matters. She having, according to her own statement, deluded the public by saying she had had messages from the Master which I in fact delivered to her, perhaps she is deluding the public now. Also, while accusing me of deluding her by allowing her to think that the Master had personally precipitated the message delivered to her, it does not seem to strike her or her friends that her public statement in the Hall of Science, to which she pledged her sanity, her intelligence, and her integrity—was precisely in effect the same offence with which she charges me. By thus personally pledging herself she made the public and Theosophists think that she had received these messages directly instead of through me. I did not tell her to do so, nor did I lead her to think anything about the messages, and I do not consider it fair for her and her friends to have made this a strong point against me in her public statements.

All the messages I delivered to her were private and for her direction and every one was genuine. I do not make these statements for the purpose of hitting at Annie Besant or any one else, for I have no desire to do that and nothing to gain by it; but I think it has now become a matter of necessity that the Theosophical public at least should be informed more fully on these points.

I made a clear and true statement at the July Convention and Mrs. Besant made another statement, it being agreed then by her most solemnly that these should finish the matter and that it should not be carried any further. I made my statement very briefly, in perfect good faith, so as to make it as easy as possible for her. I could have explained then just as well as now, but did not do so because I was directed to wait.

For those of us who believe in the existence of the Masters and their exalted character and ethics, there are, in this case, absurdities, dilemmas and contradictions created by Mrs. Besant—and spread by her friends over the world as against me—which should dispose of her charges while they leave her in a pitiable light.

She and her near associates admitted as late as July last that I was a friend of the Master, that he helps me, that I not only heard in the past from him but had heard up to near that date; she said to many that she knew all the above to be true, and that I not only was helped and guided by the Master but that he had shown himself to her through my physical personality. Further than all that, she publicly admitted that the contents of the Master's messages given to her by me were in fact received by me from the Master. She also admitted that in September, 1893,—which is after the dates given for the alleged wrongful acts—the Master sent me a message of thanks for and approval of all my work in the field of Theosophy. This certainly would [25] include messages sent on his behalf. And she also knew that H.P.B. gave me a photograph of the Master's picture on which he signed a sentence calling me his colleague.

Yet in face of all these facts and admissions she pursues me all round the world with charges such as I have been dealing with, while she privately claims that the same Master directed her to so pursue me.

Now, if she is right, then it must follow that the Master she portrays is a Mephistopheles who wishes to destroy those who in any way trust or follow him. She makes him in September, 1893, thank me for my acts, and some few months after, she has him egging her and others on to try and convict me of forgery and false pretence, with a destruction of my character added as a final possible result. But if we take her admissions about me and my genuine messages and my standing, as true, and construe them with our best reason, as we must, then she and her coadjutors are all wrong from beginning to end.

Again, if she denies the genuineness of the photograph and its inscription, she has to charge H.P.B. and myself with conspiracy and fraud in getting up the inscription, the handwriting of which is H.P.B.'s, the signature being the Master's.

(Loud Applause.)

At this point Dr. J. A. Anderson moved the following resolution which was carried by acclamation and with loud applause:

That this meeting considers the explanation and reply just read for Brother Judge perfectly satisfactory, but that so far as we who are present are concerned, it was not necessary.

[26]

LODGES OF MAGIC

From *Lucifer*, vol. 3, p. 92-93, editorial by H.P.B.

“We have been asked by a correspondent why he should not ‘be free to suspect some of the so-called “precipitated” letters as being forgeries,’ giving as his reason for it that while some of them bear the stamp of (to him) undeniable genuineness, others seem from their contents and style, to be imitations. This is equivalent to saying that he has such an unerring spiritual insight as to be able to detect the false from the true, though he has never met a Master, nor been given any key by which to test his alleged communications. The inevitable consequence of applying his untrained judgment in such cases, would be to make him as likely as not to declare false what was genuine and genuine what was false. Thus what *criterion* has any one to

decide between one ‘precipitated’ letter, or another such letter? Who except their authors, or those whom they employ as their *amanuenses* (the *chelas* and disciples) can tell? For it is hardly one out of a hundred ‘occult’ letters that is ever written by the hand of the Master, in whose name and on whose behalf they are sent, as the Masters have neither need nor leisure to write them; and when a Master says ‘I wrote that letter’ it means only that every word in it was dictated by him and impressed under his direct supervision. Generally they make their chela, whether near or far away, write (or precipitate) them, by impressing upon his mind the ideas they wish expressed, and if necessary aiding him in the picture-printing process of precipitation. It depends entirely upon the chela’s state of development, how accurately the ideas may be transmitted and the writing-model imitated. Thus the non-adept recipient is left in the dilemma of uncertainty, whether if one letter is false all may not be, for as far as intrinsic evidence goes, all come from the same source, and all are brought by the same mysterious means. But there is another and far worse condition implied. All the so-called *occult* letters being supported by identical proofs, *they have all to stand or fall together*. If one is to be doubted, than all have, and the series of letters in the ‘Occult World,’ ‘Esoteric Buddhism,’ etc., etc., may be, and there is no reason why they should not be in such a case, — *frauds*, ‘clever impostures,’ and ‘forgeries’ such as the ingenuous though stupid agent of the ‘S.P.R.’ has made them out to be, in order to raise in the public estimation the scientific acumen and standard of his ‘Principals.’”

[27]

PRECIPITATION.

From *Five Years of Theosophy*, pages 518-521. Signed “Anon.”

“The work of writing the letters in question is carried on by a sort of psychic telegraphy; the Mahâtmâs very rarely write their letters in the ordinary way. An electro-magnetic connection, so to say, exists on the psychic plane between a Mahâtmâ and his chelas, one of whom acts as his amanuensis. When the Master wants a letter to be written in this way, he very often draws the attention of the chela, whom he selects for the task, by causing an astral bell (heard by so many of our Fellows and others) to be rung near him, just as the despatching telegraph office signals to the receiving office before wiring the message. The thoughts arising in the mind of the Mahâtmâ are then clothed in words, pronounced mentally, and forced along currents in the astral light impinge on the brain of the pupil. Thence they are borne by the nerve-currents to the palms of his hands and the tips of his fingers, which rest on a piece of magnetically prepared paper. As the thought waves are thus impressed on the tissue, materials are drawn to it from the ocean of akas (permeating every atom of the sensuous universe) by an occult process, out of place here to describe, and permanent marks are left.”

(This extract may also be found in *The Theosophist*, vol. 5, page 64, where the article is unsigned, and therefore perhaps by H.P.B.)

Hints on Esoteric Theosophy, No. 2, pp. 42-43, quoted in vol. 4, *Theosophist*.

Supplement for June 1883, p. 9 — has the following which bears on (“2”).

“Koot Humi, though a fair English scholar, educated in Germany and England, and quite able to write good English, would doubtless, from want of practice, have found, at any rate at first, some trouble in writing to us had he not been able to use the brains of others. And it is not only that in English he can write like an Englishman; he can write in any and every language known to any of his disciples as well as any of them can, even though he may not himself *know* in the ordinary sense of the term, one word of that language. For he formulates the ideas he desires to express, impresses them by the power of his will on the brain of those whose services he avails himself, and then reads off the verbal exposition that arises from that brain in response to that impression, and has all he requires. Of course to enable the Adept to utilize thus another

person's brains, that other must have been placed in the strictest magnetic relation with him, and must have become his true disciple . . .”

The *Path*, vol. 7, p. 381 — article “H. P. Blavatsky on Precipitation.” The entire letter of H.P.B. bears on the subject, though citations are difficult. Here are two (p. 383, line 28, from top of page).

[28] “It is very rarely that Mahâtmâ K.H. *dictated verbatim*, and when He did there remained the few sublime passages found in Mr. Sinnett's letter from Him. The rest — he would say — write so-and-so, and the Chela wrote often without knowing a word of English, as I am now made to write Hebrew and Greek and Latin, etc.”

p. 384, line 11, from top of page.

“Suppose . . . received an order from his Master to precipitate a letter to the . . . family, only a general idea being given to him about what he has to write. Paper and envelope are *materialized* before him, and he has only to form and shape the ideas into *his* English and precipitate them. What shall the result be? Why *his* English, his ethics and philosophy — his style all round. A *fraud*, a *transparent fraud!* people would cry out, and if any one happened to *see such paper before him* or in his possession *after it was formed*, what would be the consequences?”

Theosophist, vol. xiv, pp. 577-578 “Old Diary Leaves.”

“For, just as the successive occupiers of the H.P.B. body only modified its habitual handwriting, but did not write their own” . . . etc. A note to this says:

“A very curious fact is to be noticed in this connection, viz., that the ‘Mahâtmâ M.’s’ handwriting, which was so carefully scrutinized by the S.P.R., their experts and agents, and said to resemble that of H.P.B., was a coarse, rough script something like a collection of chopped roots and brushwood, while the handwriting of the same personage in the ‘Isis’ MS. and in the notes he wrote me, was totally different. It was a small fine script, such as a lady might have written, and while generally resembling H.P.B.’s own handwriting, yet differing from it so as to present an appearance of distinct individuality, which enable me to recognize it as that personage’s MS. whenever I saw it.”

p. 580, of *Theosophist*, vol. xiv, “Old Diary Leaves.”

For, remember that probably no one has ever received a line in English from a Master in his own normal handwriting and written by him in the usual way . . . etc.”

Sinnett's “*Incidents in the Life of Madame Blavatsky*,” p. 206.

In a letter written to her family, H.P.B. gives information as to how she wrote “Isis,” either that her Master dictated to her what she should write, or that her “Inner Ego,” or “Luminous Self” wrote for her.

Lucifer, vol. 3, p. 146, letter of Master K.H. to Col. Olcott.

“Since 1885 I have not written nor caused to be written, save through her agency (H.P.B.) direct or remote, — *a letter or a line* [29] *to anybody in Europe or America*, nor have I communicated orally with, or through any third party. Theosophists should learn it. You will understand later the significance of this declaration, so keep it in mind.” . . .

The *Path*, vol. ix, p. 18, article “Conversations on Occultism,” paragraph “Precipitation by Masters.” H.P.B. says —

“If you think Master is going to be always precipitating things, you mistake. Yes, he can do it. But most of the precipitations are by chelas who would seem to you almost Masters. I see His orders, and the thoughts and words He wishes used, and I precipitate them in that form; so does . . . and one or two more. . . . Now you know that Masters’ handwritings, peculiar and personal in Themselves, are foreign both as to sound and form — Indian sorts, in fact. So They adopted a form in English, and in that form I precipitate Their messages at Their direction. . . . The message has to be seen in the astral light in *fac-simile*, and through that astral matrix I precipitate the whole of it.”

NOTE: An original 29pp. copy of the pamphlet was used in this document.

REPLY BY WILLIAM Q. JUDGE To Charges of Misuse of Mahatmas’ Names and Handwritings was reprinted by The Theosophy Company as a 53 page pamphlet titled **Two Replies By William Q. Judge**.

14. **Lucifer**. “On the Watch Tower” Vol. 16, June 1895, pp.269-270.

[In this editorial Annie Besant gives her version of what happened to H.P.B.’s ring after her death.]

A persistent attempt is being made by Mr. Judge and his adherents to circulate statements which they hope will injure me under cover of the E. S. T. pledge of secrecy. One of these is the false statement that “I have evidence of my own to prove that Mrs. Besant has now turned from H. P. B. and thinks she was largely a fraud.” This is being circulated by Dr. Archibald Keightley, in letters sent to members of the E. S. T. in England. Some of these, indignant at the secret circulation of so false a statement, have sent on his letters to me. I mention this publicly, in the hope of provoking the publication of the “evidence,” for love and duty alike prompt me to vindicate the memory of H. P. B. whenever I know it to be attacked, and the circulation of the statement that I regard her as “a fraud,” will injure her in the minds of many. Another story is so funny that it deserves publicity. In a letter from Mr. Judge, dated January 24th, 1895, there is a P.S : “As a friend I would advise you to be careful in statements as to H. P. B.’s ring; you do not possess it.” When I read this, I prepared for the circulation of a new myth, and I have just received a letter from America in which I am told that Mr. Judge, at a meeting of his School, in January last, “made the remarkable statement that by some peculiar means he came into possession of the ring which belonged to H. P. B., and that the one you have is a substitute.” The facts as to the ring are very simple. H. P. B. often told me that I was to wear it after her death, in place of the duplicate she had given me in 1889. There were but the two large rings, the one she wore and the duplicate she had made for me, and these two are distinguishable by some very slight differences, only perceptible on close examination. I was absent when H. P. B. left her body, but she told Mrs. Cooper-Oakley that the ring was for me, and after her death it was drawn from her finger and locked up till I reached home, when it was given me, and I put off the duplicate and put on hers. It has never since left me, and I wore it continuously till the summer of 1893, tied on my finger by some threads of silk, because it was too large for me; in the summer of 1893 I bought a gold ring to fit inside it, and so obviate the necessity of tying it on. The duplicate ring she gave me I gave to Mr. Judge, after he arrived in London in 1891, and this is the one he is showing as H. P. B.’s ring. Such are the simple facts which are apparently being developed into “The myth of the Ring.”



Impression from H.P.B.'s Signet Ring.

Regarding H.P.B.'s Signet Ring.

The story of H.P.B.'s ring and Besant is most intriguing. Perhaps, because of the excitement at the time, no one noticed the significance of such a trivial incident as is here hypothesized.

If we are to accept the claim (as reported by Besant in her June 1895 editorial in **Lucifer**) that H.P.B. did tell Mrs. Cooper-Oakley to remove the ring from her finger after her death and give it to Besant — why would H.P.B. have wanted Besant to have the ring? Could there have been an occult significance?

Blavatsky gave W.Q. Judge her ring to wear for a day to help him clear up his constitution when he spent time with her in France in 1884 and was going through a particularly difficult period. It was obviously a powerful talisman.

It has been documented that Besant *never* took H.P.B.'s ring off, and she happily displayed it on just about every photo opportunity she had. It is ironic that just prior to going to the Parliament of Religions in Chicago she decided to have the ring fitted in the summer of 1893. This was at the same time that Chakravarti arrived in England and took up residence at Avenue Road. It was shortly after his arrival that she adopted him as her new guru.

Regarding this period, Dr. Archibald Keightley wrote: "I lived at Headquarters during Mr. Chakravarti's visit there and knew from Mrs. Besant, from him and from personal observation, of his frequent magnetisation of Mrs. Besant. He said that he did it to 'coordinate her bodies for work to be done'."²

Would he have been able to magnetize her if Besant had been wearing the ring?

— Compiler

2. **The Path**, Vol.10, June 1895, p.99.

15. Addendum regarding the origin of H.P.B.'s ring.

There are a number of stories in print regarding the origin of H.P.B.'s ring, which is also commonly referred to as H.P.B.'s signet ring.

In **Old Diary Leaves**, (First Series), 1895, pp.346-347, Olcott gives the following version of how H.P.B. came to have this ring:

One evening, when our writing-room was full of visitors, she and I sitting at opposite sides of the room, she motioned to me to lend her a large signet *intaglio*³ that I was wearing that evening as a scarf-ring. She took it between her closed hands, without saying anything to anybody or attracting any one's attention save mine, and rubbed the hands together for a minute or two, when I presently heard the clink of metal upon metal. Catching my eye, she smiled, and, opening her hands, showed me my ring and along with it another, equally large but of a different pattern: the seal-tablet also being of dark green bloodstone, whereas mine was of red carnelian. That ring she wore until her death, and it is now worn by Mrs. Annie Besant and is familiar to thousands. The stone was broken on our voyage out to India, and if I remember aright, the present one was engraved and set at Bombay.

In **The Theosophist**, Vol. 52, August 1931, p.662, C. Jinarajadasa provides the following version of the origin of H.P.B.'s ring:

The story of H.P.B.'s ring, as narrated to me by the late Miss Francesca Arundale, is as follows. When H.P.B. in 1884 was living at 77 Elgin Crescent, London, W., with Miss Arundale and her mother, she wanted a signet ring, and Miss Arundale offered to have it made for her. H.P.B. consented, and gave the design — the double triangle, and below it the Sanskrit word [Sanskrit character] Sat, Truth. Miss Arundale then asked H.P.B. if she minded if she (Miss Arundale) had a similar ring for herself. H.P.B. had no objection. Two very dark green, almost black, agate stones were cut with the design, both exactly alike. H.P.B.'s seal was set on a heavy gold ring, the stone mounted on an oval frame with a hinge, so as to be the lid for a very shallow locket. Miss Arundale's was set in a lighter ring. Miss Arundale wore her ring always, and at her death it passed to her nephew, Bishop G.S. Arundale, who lately presented it to the E.S. Archives.

The above version is summarized and repeated in **Blavatsky Collected Writings, 1883-1884-1885**, Vol. 6, (1975), "Chronological Survey", p.xxxiv.

But the first recorded visit of H.P.B. with the Arundales in 1884 was June 29th. In **The Word**, Vol.15, April 1912, p.18, in a letter to Laura Holloway in March 1884, while in Paris, W.Q. Judge wrote the following concerning H.P.B.'s ring:

For several days I have had until yesterday the most awful blues that ever were. So bad indeed that H.P.B. was very much worried. . . . She gave me to wear all day her talisman ring which is of great value and strength. It has a double triangle and the Sanscrit for "life" on it. This helped me. . . .

In **A Short History of The Theosophical Society**, compiled by Josephine Ransom, 1938, p.90, the ring's history is summarized as follows:

One evening [H.P.B.] asked the Colonel to lend her the large signet intaglio he was wearing as a scarf-ring. She took it between her hands and when she opened them there were two rings, but the second was of a different pattern, though equally large. The seal tablet was of green bloodstone, whereas the Colonel's was of red carnelian. This bloodstone was broken on the voyage to India, so a new one was engraved and set in

3. From: **Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary, Unabridged, 1977 edition**: (1.) A design or figure carved or engraved below the surface (2.) a gem or stone ornamented with such a design or figure; as opposed to *cameo* (3.) a die cut to produce a design in relief.

Bombay. H.P.B. wore this ring till she passed away. It was then handed on to Dr. Annie Besant, and is now worn by Dr. G.S. Arundale.

In **The Passionate Pilgrim, A Life of Annie Besant**, by Gertrude Marvin Williams, 1931, p.205, the story is:

Madame had left Annie her intaglio ring. It was a large green stone, flecked with veins of blood red, and engraved with the exotic symbols used by occultists through the ages: superimposed triangles within the circle of a serpent swallowing his tail and the Sanskrit characters for SAT — life. It was a gift, Madame had said, from her Indian guru. Annie Besant always wears it, and displays it prominently in her photographs. With the years, legends have gathered round it, and it is supposed to be endowed with extraordinary powers.

In **Lucifer**, Vol. 16, June 1895, p.270, Annie Besant wrote the following:

The facts as to the ring are very simple. H.P.B. often told me that I was to wear it after her death, in place of the duplicate she had given me in 1889. There were but the two large rings, the one she wore and the duplicate she had made for me, and these two are distinguishable by some very slight differences, only perceptible on close examination. I was absent when H.P.B. left her body, but she told Mrs. Cooper-Oakley that the ring was for me, and after her death it was drawn from her finger and locked up till I reached home, when it was given me, and I put off the duplicate and put on hers.

In the editorial “Ninety-Five Years” in **The Canadian Theosophist**, Vol. 7, August 1926, pp.112-113, it is recorded that Claude Falls Wright, Madame Blavatsky’s secretary in her last few months, and who was with her when she died, gave an entirely different story of the “ring” to a group in Toronto, Ontario, Canada on his last visit a few weeks before his death.

[Mr. Wright] took the ring that was on [H.P.B.’s] finger and gave it to Mr. Judge, who had been appointed by the Inner Council, in accordance with Madam Blavatsky’s instructions, head of the E. S., while Mrs. Besant was appointed recorder of the teachings. Mrs. Besant’s ring, said Mr. Wright, was given to her by Madam Blavatsky as the result of numerous requests made for such a favour by Mrs. Besant. Madam Blavatsky told Claude Wright, he said, after she had been bothered on the subject, to go to a jeweller and have a duplicate of her ring made. This he did, going to a jeweller in Cornhill, London. The ring was duly presented and duly worn as it is today. The ring that went to Judge is now worn by Mrs. Tingley who got it along with all the other talismans and trumpery of the Madison Avenue Headquarters.

In **The Canadian Theosophist**, Vol. 8, August 1927, pp.112-113, James Morgan Pryse offered his recollection of the facts in “The Rings of H.P.B.”. He lived at London Headquarters at the time of Blavatsky’s death, had conversed with her daily and taken her around the garden in her wheel-chair when she grew feeble.

Three rings, two of them talismanic and one merely a finger-ornament, have been the subject of controversy among Theosophical gossips who love to pose importantly as the possessors of “inside information” about events in the T.S., although they could not possibly know anything about them at first hand. Thus one ex-Tingleyite (whose followers unblushingly advertise him as “a pupil of Mme. Blavatsky and W.Q. Judge”—although he never met H.P.B. and was only superficially acquainted with Mr. Judge—put in circulation a story that Mr. Judge, when in London, appropriated H.P.B.’s ring, which upon his death passed into the possession of his “successor.” This baseless fabrication fits in with the wicked legend, coming from the same source, that Mr. Judge purloined the manuscripts of two unpublished volumes of the S.D. Mr. Judge was too honest to take things that did not belong to him, and he never had H.P.B.’s ring.

The first “magic” ring was worn by H.P.B., who called it “the Master’s ring.” One evening, during conversation, H.P.B., speaking of this ring, which she showed me, said that there had lately been a “lump” on her eyelid. “But,” said she, “I rubbed it with the Master’s ring, and it went away.” She illustrated her statement


by rubbing with the Master's ring the eyelid from which the sebaceous nodule had been erased. This ring is now in the possession of my stanch and dear old friend, Mrs. Annie Besant.

The second "magic" ring was worn by Mr. Judge. It was said to contain (so Mr. Mead informs me) "a sample of M's tobacco." This ring is now in the possession of my old friend and colleague, Mr. G. R. S. Mead.

The third ring was worn by Mrs. Besant. It is a jeweller's copy of H.P.B.'s ring; the "Old Lady" had it made for "A.B."—who was, as H.P.B. once told me quite proudly, "her personal pupil." This ring, sad to say, ultimately fell into the hands of a person whom a non-theosophical magazine has dubbed, with brutal frankness, "the Boob Baiter of San Diego."

Mr. Mead wrote me that after the death of H.P.B. "there was a swap of amulets and magic-box rings: A.B. got H.P.B.'s, Judge got A.B.'s, and I got Judge's." Long afterward, after the falling out between Mrs. Besant and Mr. Judge, and the later estrangement between Mr. Mead and Mrs. Besant, Mr. Mead in view of the many absurd and baseless rumors and reports that were then, as now, current amongst gullible partisans—facetiously spread abroad the legend that Mrs. Besant's and Mr. Judge's rings had been "occultly changed, so that Mr. Judge had the real article, viz.. H.P.B.'s potent finger-circlet of magical power," and Mrs. Besant "had her own small-beer *apotropaion* back again!" This satiric and implausible fabrication was taken seriously by credulous partisans opposed to Mrs. Besant, who were only too glad to believe that she had been deprived of "the Master's ring."

After wearing Mr. Judge's ring for a month or so, Mr. Mead, who told me that he "hates rings," laid it by. So I made bold to ask him to let me have it; but he seems to have a suspicion (from what has happened to its wearers) that its magical virtue is the reverse of *apotropaic*, precipitating rather than averting bad luck, for he answered: As to the ring—perhaps I may send it to you. Though, there again, I don't want to do you an injury!" Yet both he and I loved William Q. Judge like a brother, and remember him with affection, even though we suffered cruelly through his disastrous dabbling in psychism and mediumship.



APPENDIX

B



THE PRAYAG LETTER

Table of Contents ~ Appendix B

1. Letter No. CXXXIV [134] from Dehra Dun. Friday Nov. 4th 1881. (a.k.a., The “Prayag Letter”)
The Mahatma Letters To A.P. Sinnett, Second Edition, pp.461-464. 125-126
2. “The Theosophical Society As Related to Brahmanism and Buddhism.”
“To The Brahmins of India.” **The Path**, Vol. 8, May 1893, pp.52-56. 127-129
3. **By Master’s Direction**, E.S.T., November 3, 1894. 130-137
4. “A Mahatma’s Message To Some Brahmins.”
The Path, Vol. 9, March 1895, pp.430-431. 138-139
5. “Postscript.” **The Theosophist**, Vol. 16, April 1895, pp.475-476. 140-141
6. “Adepts and Mediums.” **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, May 1895, pp.133-136. 142-143
- 7a. Introductory paragraph from **The Theosophical Movement 1875 - 1950**, p.250. 144
- 7b. **Report of Proceedings, Ninth Annual Convention, American Section T.S.,
AND First Convention, Theosophical Society in America,**
Boston, April 28-29, 1895, pp.16-17. 144
8. “East and West.” **Lucifer**, Vol. 16, May 1895, pp.185-194. 145-149
9. “H.S. Olcott vs. H.P.B.” **The Path**, Vol. 10, June 1895, pp.81-83. 150-151
10. “Dr. Hartmann Reads the ‘Postscript’.” **The Path**, Vol. 10, June 1895, pp.96-97. 152
11. “The Prayag Letter.” (Letters by A. Besant and W.Q. Judge)
Lucifer, Vol. 16, July 1895, pp.375-379. 153-156
- 12a. “H.P.B. Was Not Deserted By The Masters.”
Theosophy (The Path), Vol. 11, April 1896, pp.14-18. 157-159
- 12b. “CORRESPONDENCE.” “*To The Editor of Theosophy*” from A.P. Sinnett.
Theosophy (The Path), Vol. 11, July 1896, pp.122-123. 160
- 12c. Letter from A.P. Sinnett to Alexander Fullerton.
First published in the **Boston Herald**, April 27, 1895.
Reprinted in **Theosophy**, Vol. 10, October 1922, pp.394-395. 160-161
13. “Messages From The Masters.” **Theosophy**, Vol. 8, January 1920, pp.67-70. 162-164
14. Note on the “Prayag Letter”. **Theosophy**, Vol. 10, October 1922, p.407. 164

1. Letter No. CXXXIV [134] from **The Mahatma Letters To A.P. Sinnett**, Second Edition, pp.461-464.

Dehra Dun. Friday. 4th [Nov. 1881].

Arrived only yesterday, last night late from Saharampur. The house very good but cold, damp and dreary. Received a whole heap of letters and answer yours first.

Saw at last M. and showed him your last or rather Benemadhab's on which you have scratched a query. It is the latter Morya answers. I wrote this under his dictation and now copy it.

I wrote to Sinnett my opinion on the Allahabad theosophists. (Not through me though?) Adetyarom B. wrote a foolish letter to Damodar and Benemadhab writes a foolish request to Mr. Sinnett. Because K.H. chose to correspond with two men, who proved of the utmost importance and use to the Society they all—whether wise or stupid, clever or dull, *possibly* useful or utterly useless—lay their claims to correspond with us directly—too. Tell him (you) that this must be stopped. For ages we never corresponded with anyone, nor do we mean to. What has Benemadhab or any other of the many claimants done to have a right to such a claim? Nothing whatever. They join the Society, and though remaining as stubborn as ever in their old beliefs and superstitions, and having never given up caste or one single of their customs, they, in their selfish exclusiveness, expect to see and converse with us and have our help in all and everything. I will be pleased if Mr. Sinnett says, to everyone of those who may address him with similar pretensions the following: “The ‘Brothers’ desire me to inform one and all of you, *natives*, that unless a man is prepared to become a thorough theosophist *i.e.* to do as D. Mavalankar did,—give up entirely caste, his old superstitions and show himself a true reformer (especially in the case of child marriage) he will remain simply a member of the Society with no hope whatever of ever hearing from us. The Society, acting in this directly in accordance with our orders, *forces no one to become a theosophist of the Hind. Section*. It is left with himself and at his choice. It is useless for a member to argue ‘I am one of a pure life, I am a teetotaller and an abstainer from meat and vice. All my aspirations are for good etc.’ and he, at the same time, building by his acts and deeds an impassable barrier on the road between himself and us. What have we, the disciples of the true *Arhats*, of esoteric Buddhism and of Sang-gyas to do with the *Shasters* and Orthodox Brahmanism? There are 100 of thousands of Fakirs, Sannyasis and Saddhus leading the most pure lives, and yet being as they are, on the path of *error*, never having had an opportunity to meet, see or even hear of us. Their forefathers have driven away the followers of the only true philosophy upon earth away from India and now, it is not for the latter to come to them but to them to come to us if they want us. Which of them is ready to become a Buddhist, a Nastika as they call us? None. Those who have believed and followed us have had their reward. Mr. Sinnett and Hume are exceptions. Their beliefs are no barrier to us for they have *none*. They may have had influences around them, bad magnetic emanations the result of drink, Society and promiscuous physical associations (resulting even from shaking hands with impure men) but all this is physical and material impediments which with a little effort we could counteract and even clear away without much detriment to ourselves. Not so with the magnetism and invisible results proceeding from erroneous and sincere beliefs. Faith in the Gods and God, and other superstitions attracts millions of foreign influences, living entities and powerful agents around them, with which we would have to use more than ordinary exercise of power to drive them away. We do not choose to do so. We do not find it either necessary or profitable to lose our time waging war to the unprogressed *Planetaries* who delight in personating gods and sometimes well known characters who have lived on earth. There are Dhyan-Chohans and “Chohans of Darkness,” not what they term *devils* but imperfect “Intelligences” who have never been born on this or any other earth or sphere no more than the “Dhyan Chohans” have and who will never belong to the “builders of the Universe,” the pure Planetary Intelligences, who preside at every *Manvantara* while the Dark Chohans preside at the *Pralayas*. Explain this to Mr. Sinnett (I CAN’T)—tell him to read over what I said to them in the few things I have explained to Mr. Hume; and let him remember that as all in this universe is contrast (I cannot translate it better) so the light of the Dhyan-Chohans and their pure intelligence is contrasted by the “Ma-Mo Chohans”—and their

destructive intelligence. These are the gods the Hindus and Christians and Mahomed and all others of bigoted religions and sects worship; and so long as *their* influence is upon their devotees we would no more think of associating with or counteracting them in their work than we do the Red-Caps on earth whose evil results we try to palliate but whose work we have no right to meddle with so long as they do not cross *our* path. (You will not understand this, I suppose. But think well over it and you will. M. means here that they have no right or even power to go against the natural or that work which is prescribed to each class of beings or existing things by the law of nature. The Brothers, for instance could *prolong* life but they could not *destroy* death, not even for themselves. They can to a degree palliate evil and relieve suffering; they could not destroy evil. No more can the Dhyan Chohans impede the work of the Mamo Chohans, for *their* Law is *darkness, ignorance, destruction* etc., as that of the former is Light, knowledge and creation. The Dhyan Chohans answer to *Buddh*, Divine Wisdom and Life in blissful knowledge, and the Ma-mos are the personification in nature of *Shiva*, Jehovah and other invented monsters with Ignorance at their tail).

The last phrase of M.'s I translate is thus. "Tell him (you) then that for the sake of those who desire to learn and have information, I am ready to answer the 2 or 3 enquiries of Beninadhab from the Shasters, but I will enter in no correspondence with him or any other. Let him put their questions clearly and distinctly to (you) Mr. Sinnett, and then I will answer through him (you)."

I send you my uncle's letter just received by me. He says (as my translation of his Russian letter shows) that he wrote to you the same. Whether you received it or not, I know not, but I send you this. If it is identical with yours then send me back mine. I suppose that by this time it is pretty well proved that I am *I*—and not someone else; that my uncle being now adjunct (or asst.) Minister of the Interior, is a personage who by signing his name in full can certainly be trusted, unless, indeed, the *C.* and *M.* and your friend Primrose invent a new version and say that we have *forged* the documents. But my uncle says in his official letter to me that the Prince Dondovhof is going to send me an official document to prove my identity, and so we will wait. His other *private* letter I cannot translate as its phraseology is far from complimentary for Mr. Primrose in particular, and the Anglo-Indians who insult and vilify me in general. I will ask the Prince to write to Lord Ripon, or Gladstone *direct*.

Your's in the love of Jesus

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Why the deuce does the "Boss" want me now to go to Allahabad? I can't be spending money there and back for *I have* to go by Jeypur and Baroda and he knows it. What all this means is more than I can tell. He made me go to Lahore and now it's *Allahabad!!*

2. **The Path**, Vol. 8, May 1893, pp.52-56.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
AS RELATED TO BRAHMANISM AND BUDDHISM.

The subjoined circular has been sent by me to as many Brahmins as I could reach. I have purposely used the words "Brahmins of India" in the title because I hold to the view of the *Vedas* and the ancient laws that the Brahmin is not merely he who is born of a Brahmin father. In America lack of accurate knowledge respecting Indian religions causes a good deal of misapprehension about Brahmanism and Buddhism, as very many think Buddhism to be India's religion, wherea [sic.] in fact it is not, but, on the contrary, the prevailing form of belief in India is Brahmanism. This necessary distinction should be remembered and false notions upon the subject dissipated as much as possible. Buddhism does not prevail in India, but in countries outside it, such as Burmah, Japan, Ceylon, and others. The misconception by so many Americans about the true home of Buddhism if not corrected may tend to cause the Brahmins to suppose that the T. S. here spreads abroad the wrong notion; and no form of religion should be preferred in the T. S. above another.—W. Q. J.]

TO THE BRAHMINS OF INDIA.

144 MADISON AVE, NEW YORK, April 5, 1893.

MY FRIENDS:—

In the English Theosophical magazine, *Lucifer*, for the month of February, 1893, is an admirable article by Rai B. K. Laheri of Ludhiana, Punjab, in which he asks his fellow Theosophists to remember that no religious form of belief should be prominently brought forward or disparaged by members of the Theosophical Society, and his words appeared at the very time I was contemplating a fraternal letter to you to show you that that Society is not engaged in any attempt to bring forward the Buddhist religion. I was the pupil and intimate friend of H. P. Blavatsky who founded the Theosophical Society; I took part with her in its first organization; I was conversant with her sleepless devotion and untiring zeal in the work she wanted that Society to do, which was to follow out the plan laid down for it by some of your own Indian Rishies, the Mahâtmas who were her Gurus; I was told by her in the very beginning of that work that her object as directed by her Guru was to bring to the attention of the West the great truths of philosophy contained in the old books and thought of India; I know that her first friends in the work in your country, even before she left this one, were Indians, Brahmins, sons of Aryavarta: hence my sensitiveness to any misapprehension by you of its purposes or of its supporters can be easily understood by you. I am not a Christian nor a member of any religious body; as I was born out of India in this incarnation I could not be a Brahmin under your present laws; but if I am anything I am a follower of and believer in the *Vedas*; I have therefore a peculiarly deep interest in the philosophic and religious literature of the Indian Aryans, am in strong sympathy with its convictions and spiritual quality, and have in all ways, but especially for the last seven years in my own magazine, the *Path*, labored constantly to bring its treasures to the attention of students in this Western World.

Having, then, this triple devotion,—to the teaching of Indian sages, the ideals of the Messenger of your own Rishies, and the welfare of the Theosophical Society, it will be evident to you why the evil so strongly felt by my honored Brahmin co-worker, Bro: Laheri, and by myself should lead me, as an individual and as Vice-President of the T. S., to address as many of you as these words can reach. The evil is this: that a suspicion is spreading through the Brahmin community that the Theosophical Society is losing its impartial character as the equal friend to all religions and is becoming distinctly Buddhistic in its sympathies and affiliations. And the evil is not a mere mistake as to fact: it is evolving the practical consequences that interest in the Society diminishes among its natural friends in Brahminism, that they hesitate to enter its membership or coöperate in its work, and that they withhold the aid without which the priceless treasures of their literature, so indispensable to the efforts we Theosophists are making to throw light upon the great problems of

existence now agitating the Western mind, and thus unite East and West, cannot be used in the spiritual mission the ancient Rishies have approved. In brief, Brahmins will not sustain the Theosophical Society if they believe it a Buddhistic propaganda; nor can they be expected to. No more could Christians, Mahommedans, or Parsees.

Although, as I am unreservedly convinced, this evil is due to misapprehension, it must none the less have had some cause to originate it. I believe this cause to have been threefold. First, the name *Esoteric Buddhism* given to one of our books. This book, as many of you know, was the first important attempt to bring the truths of real Indian spiritual philosophy to the knowledge of Europe and America. But it was not Buddhism. It was first named *Fragments of Occult Truth*, and might just as properly have been published with the title *Esoteric Brahmanism*. Its enormous circulation and influence, both on a constant increase, show the readiness of the Western mind for just this teaching. But its title, adopted from lack of a more accurate term at the time, has naturally led many to suppose it an exposition of mere Buddhism, although its author, Mr. Sinnett, has been at pains to explain the contrary and Madame Blavatsky has also pointed out the mistake.

Second, the well-known membership in the Buddhist Church of Col. Olcott, President of the Theosophical Society, and his earnest efforts to unite the two schools of Buddhism, as well as to popularize their teaching and to restore the temple at Buddha-Gaya. And yet you must remember that Col. Olcott was himself invested by Brahmin authorities with the Brahminical thread, the highest possible evidence of confidence in his character, and that he has recently lectured with enthusiasm on the essential unity of the inner teachings of Buddha with your own religion. Nor should any of us forget that any personal predilections for his own faith are as much the right of the President as of any private member of the Society; and that the very Constitution of that Society, the Constitution he himself was active in shaping, forbids the identification of the Society by any officer or member with his personal beliefs in either politics or religion. Those of you who know Col. Olcott must be aware how utterly he would repudiate any wish, or even willingness, to thus abuse his official station.

Third, the incautious remarks of Buddhist members of the Society. No doubt such have at times been made, and in the warmth of personal zeal or in momentary forgetfulness of the scrupulous impartiality a true Theosophist owes to all other lovers of truth, our Buddhist friends have occasionally used comparisons which were unwise. Yet even here we need remembrance that absolute fidelity to the highest ideal, ceaseless prudence in speech and pen, total faultlessness as to tact and wisdom, are not vouchsafed to any body of religionists or to any individual of them. In this, as in other departments of human conduct, there will be lapses of discretion, and it would be unfair to refuse to an inconsistent F. T. S. the allowance we concede to an inconsistent citizen or an inconsistent moralist. Certainly it would be unfair to antagonize the Society because some of its members proved defective in its spirit.

It is my conviction, then, that the suspicion which has thus interfered with the Society's work and impaired your own interest in it has no real basis. And I think you will share it if you recall such additional facts as these:—the explicit statements of the Society in its Constitution; the absolutely unsectarian spirit and proclamations of its great Head, Madame Blavatsky; the total freedom from sectarian affiliation exhibited in the actual conduct of the Society; the whole-souled devotion to its mission of many, both in East and West, who are not Buddhists in belief; the eager effort by many after all the light and truth your invaluable literature contains; the unqualified welcome given by Western Theosophists to such of your co-believers as they have been privileged to meet in their own lands. And possibly you may give weight to the unreserved assurance from myself, who have been close to Madame Blavatsky from the first and in constant conference and coöperation with her, an active worker in the Society and familiar with its history and genius, that it has not been, is not, and is most unlikely to become the organ of any sect or faith, the thing essential to its operations, nay, even to its existence, being the most absolute catholicity of thought and sympathy and

respect. And I may go further, assuring you also that no one would more immediately, sternly uncompromisingly, ceaselessly resist the contrary policy than would I. I use these words in their fullest significance.

And so the purpose of this letter is to invite a revival of your confidence in the Theosophical Society. In many of you it has never declined. Where it has done so I would restore it. In my own country and in Europe the interest in the work of the Theosophical Society and in Indian philosophy and thought has had an expansion in the last few years which is simply amazing. I can hardly give you adequate idea of the change in the press, in public sentiment, in private study. The Society itself is growing steadily. In America we have seventy-three Branches and shall have seventy-five before this reaches you. Only one is really moribund. This means an increasing zeal for Oriental truth. More expositions of Eastern philosophy are demanded. The three editions I myself published of the *Bhagavad-Gita* have been exhausted, and a fourth is just coming out. Ancient Aryan ideas and views of life are permeating the land and moulding the convictions of its people. We need help to increase and fix them. Much of this can come only from yourselves and others in India. By your own identification with the Society you can strengthen it for its local work, aiding it to dissolve the barriers between religions and sects and to enliven fraternal feeling through all, assisting in the attempt to uplift higher ideals among your countrymen. And if you cannot join the Society, you can help it by countenancing its work. On our behalf you can transmit those valued treatises which throw light on the great problems of destiny which concern us and you alike, and can thus take part in the truly philanthropic work of giving truth to those who need and ask it. We who are, with you, fellow-seekers after light and aspirants after progress know the joy of sharing our treasures with the sincere, and we invite you to give us more towards such sharing. Like you we are workers in the Rishees' cause, and we seek the most efficient aids in that work. If you do not give this aid or if you continue to rest under the wrong impression I have spoken of above, you will interfere with a work that is for the direct benefit of India and of your religion. For our work is meant also to bring the attention of the West to the philosophical and religious truths of the Sacred Books of India, to the end that India may be helped to lift itself up once more to spiritual heights of power and thus in its turn benefit the whole race of man. It is only by teaching the West the soul-satisfying philosophy of the ancient Aryans that we can lead them on as parts of the human family, and as, indeed, perhaps the very nations where some of you may be drawn by Karma to incarnation in some future life. By having a wrong impression of the work of the Society you will be led to speak against it and to throw your powerful influence in the scale opposite to it, and thus very materially hold it back.

I invite you to communicate freely with me in answer to this letter, and to give the letter itself the widest circulation possible among Brahmins. I shall arrange for its translation into a native tongue. And so with respect and sympathy and fraternal spirit, and with the hope that these words may avail to correct an error which has distressed and alarmed me, I am

Your friend, however distant,
WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

3. *E.S.T.* November 3, 1894.

STRICTLY PRIVATE AND ONLY FOR E.S.T. MEMBERS.



E. S. T.

FROM WILLIAM Q. JUDGE,

144 Madison Ave., New York City.

3 November, 1894.

BY MASTER'S DIRECTION

I now send you this, all of it being either direct quotations from the messages to me, or else in substance what I am directed to say to you, the different details and elaborations being my own. I had hoped that no such statement would be necessary, but the hope was vain. I have put off writing it since March, 1894, when I issued a circular to the Theosophical Society regarding certain charges which were made against me; but now I am obliged to send this or else to fail in the performance of my duty to you and to the whole T.S. movement, of which the E.S.T. is the real heart. In March this letter seemed to me to be as necessary as it is now, but I was then directed to wait for the conclusion of the matter of the charges made against me, as those had to be first settled and disposed of for the benefit of the constitutional organization. I have since seen the wisdom of this direction, for had I said then what I say now the whole matter would have been mixed up in every way. We have now to deal with the E.S.T. and with our duty to it and to each other; and among those others, to Mrs. Besant.

This is issued in the E.S.T. under the protection of the pledges made by all its members. It is impossible to see them and converse with them, and I have to take the risk of print. If the matter becomes public it will be the fault of those who are not able to keep their pledges, and not my fault nor Karma.

First let me tell you briefly of the E.S.T. foundation and history, and of the Inner Group.

I am not a pledged member of the E.S.T. and never made a pledge in it, as my pledges were long before to the Master direct; I was one of its founders, with H.P.B. ^, and she at the beginning made me manager and teacher in it from the first, under her, for the American part especially. You can remember all she said of that. I wrote the rules of the E.S.T. myself in London in 1888 at H.P.B.'s request and under the direction of the Master. Those were not altered by her, but after reading them and further consulting the Master she added some general paragraphs. I am the only one standing in that position. Mrs. Besant and all other members are pledged and certified in the ordinary way. The E.S. was started in November, 1888. In May, 1887, I sent the following to H.P.B. ^ from New York:

18th May.

DEAR H.P.B. — Please reply to this. So many people are beginning to ask me to be Chelas that I must do something, so I have drawn up the enclosed paper which you can send me with some formalities on it as you think right to do so — or whatever I ought to have. If you do not think so, then please tell me in what way I had best proceed.

I know a good many good ones who will do well and who will form a rock on which the enemy will founder, and this plan would encourage them. So fiat something. As ever,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

Enclosed paper:

To WILLIAM Q. JUDGE: — You are directed to draw together all those persons, members of the Theosophical Society in the U.S., who have or express the desire to serve the cause of the Blessed Masters. This you are to do with the understanding in writing in every case that the persons taken are not thereby made Chelas of the Masters, but simply that they are thus given a chance to make a preliminary trial of themselves, and in each case you will take from the applicant an expression in writing, before making your private register of the names, that they well understand the basis on which you thus take them. Nothing is promised; each will have just what he or she deserves — no more, no less. And all must be faithful to the Cause, to Masters, and to the founders of the Theosophical Society.

Given [etc.]

H.P.B. ^ replied that I might go ahead without the paper and soon she would do something else. Later, at the time she was explaining in London the plan of the E.S.T., I telegraphed her asking her to “make public the Inner Section”. That telegram was received in the presence of Dr. Keightley and others. She then told me to come to London and help, which I did. The E.S. was founded on the exact lines of the above papers. I do not wish to place myself on the high level of H.P.B. ^, but in Occultism of Master’s Lodge a lower Chela is often used as the instrument for pointing out even to such a great character as H.P.B. ^ the times and seasons and sometimes the plan. That I did in this case, and by the direction of the Master. H. P. B.’s promulgations followed the ideas and also the words in part of my paper.

An Inner Group was later on formed by H.P.B. ^ at London, so that she might give out teachings to be recorded by the members, and, if possible, teach them practical occultism. Of this Mrs. Besant, with George Mead to help her, was made the Secretary, because she had great ability in a literary way, was wholly devoted, and perfectly fit for the task. But this did not make her a *Teacher*. And even when she bid adieu to H.P.B. ^ on her leaving Europe for America in April, 1891, the very last thing H.P.B. ^ put into her hands as she left her presence, into which she never again entered, was the sealed statement that made her *Recorder* of the teachings. H.P.B. ^ knew that she would not live to see Annie Besant again, and if she were to have been constituted a “Teacher”, that would have been the time to give her the position. But she did not. The death of H.P.B. ^ destroyed of course any further value in the office of “Recorder”. I am a member of the Inner Group, and have been since 1891. It was needless to speak of this before now.

The conversations of H.P.B. ^ with the Inner Group were taken down in a more or less fragmentary form by the different members in notes, and later Mrs. Besant and George Mead wrote them out as Secretaries. I have a complete copy of these, and so has each member of the Inner Group, and those copies comprise all the “Instructions” left in the possession of Mrs. Besant or the Inner Group. In my possession and within my control is a large body of Instructions given to me all the time from 1875, which I shall give out and have given out, as far as I am directed. Read page xix of *Secret Doctrine* (Introduction to vol. I), where H.P.B. ^ says she taught Colonel Olcott and two Europeans. I am one of the latter. Colonel Olcott is the old standard-bearer, and has been the medium for teaching, himself having Chelas whom he has instructed, but always on the lines laid down by the Master through H.P.B. ^ He was selected by the Master to do a certain and valuable work not possible for anyone else, and he was never taken into the E.S. by a pledge, for, like myself, he was in the very beginning pledged directly to the Master. His main work has been that great and far-reaching work in the world, among not only ordinary people, but with kings and rulers, for the sake of this cause which the Masters knew he was to do for them.

Mrs. Annie Besant has been but five years in this work, and not all of that time engaged in occult study and practice. Her abilities as a writer and speaker are rare and high for either man or woman, her devotion and sincerity of purpose cannot be doubted. She gave many years of her life to the cause of the oppressed as she understood it: against the dread blight of materialistic belief in herself, she worked thus without hope in a

future life and in every way proved her altruistic purpose and aim. Since 1889 she has done great service to the T.S. and devoted herself to it. But all this does not prevent a sincere person from making errors in Occultism, especially when he, as Mrs. Besant did, tries to force himself along the path of practical work in that field. Sincerity does not confer of itself knowledge, much less wisdom. H.P.B. and all the history of occultism say that seven years of training and trial at the very least are needed. Mrs. Besant has had but five. Mistakes made by such a disciple will ultimately be turned to the advantage of the movement, and their immediate results will be mitigated to the person making them, provided they are not inspired by an evil intention on the person's part. And I wish it to be clearly understood that Mrs. Besant has had herself no conscious evil intention: she has simply gone for awhile outside the line of her Guru (H.P.B.), begun work with others, and fallen under their influence. We should not push her farther down, but neither will the true sympathy we have blind our eyes so as to let her go on, to the detriment of the movement. I could easily retire from the whole T.S., but my conceptions of duty are different, although the personal cost to myself in this work is heavy, and as I am ordered to stay I will stay and try my best to aid her and everyone else as much as possible. And the same authority tells me that "could she open her eyes and see her real line of work, and correct the present condition in herself as well as the one she has helped to make in the T.S. and E.S.T., she would find herself in mental, physical and spiritual conditions of a kind much better than ever before, for her present state is due to the attacks of the dark powers, unconsciously to her".

And now it becomes necessary under instructions received to give the members of the School some account of the things behind the scenes in connection with the recent investigation attempted at London upon the charges against me.

The two persons around whom its noise arose are Mrs. Besant and myself. Prior to that in 1891, after the death of H.P.B., Col. H. S. Olcott, the President, was the center of a disturbance due to his resignation, and that disturbance was due to the same forces working from behind to try and disintegrate the T.S. by causing its old-time President to leave office before his death. The recent troubles centered around us because I was made the object of an attack in the guise of an attempt to purify the Society, and Mrs. Besant was thrown forward as the official accuser of myself — a friend who was certified to her by H.P.B., her teacher, and well known as working for the T.S. for many years. All this needs light, and the best interests of Mrs. Besant and of the E.S.T. demand that some of the secret history shall be given out, however disagreeable it may be, in order that the very purgation which was improperly directed to the wrong quarter shall take place now. The difficulty arose when in January or February Annie Besant finally lent herself unconsciously to the plot which I detail herein; but prior to that (from August, 1893), those managing that plot had begun to work upon her.

The plot exists among the Black Magicians, who ever war against the White, and against those Black ones we were constantly warned by H.P.B. This is no fiction, but a very substantial fact. I have seen and also been shown the chief entity among those who thus work against us and who desire to destroy the whole movement and especially to nullify the great work which H.P.B. began for the Western nations. These Black Magicians have succeeded in influencing certain Brahmans in India through race-pride and ambition, so that these, for their own advantage, desire to control and manage the T.S. through some agent and also through the E.S.T. They of course have sought, if possible, to use one of our body, and have picked out Mrs. Besant as a possible vehicle. One object of the plot is to stop the current of information and influence started by H.P.B. by deflecting thought back to modern India. To accomplish this it is absolutely necessary to tear down the tradition clustering around the work of H.P.B.; her powers and knowledge have to be derogated from; her right to speak for the Masters has to be impugned; those Masters have to be made a cold abstraction; her staunch friends who wish to see the real work and objects carried on have to be put in such a position as to be tied hand and foot so as not to be able to interfere with the plans of the plotters; it has to be shown that H.P.B. was a fraud and forger also. These men are not the Chelas of our Masters.

The name of the person who was worked upon so as to, if possible, use him as a minor agent of the Black Magicians and for the influencing of Mrs. Besant is Gyanendra N. Chakravarti, a Brahman of Allahabad, India, who came to America on our invitation to the Religious Parliament in 1893. At the first sincerely desirous of helping the race by bringing to the American people the old truths of his forefathers, he nevertheless, like so many before him, permitted ambition to take subtle root in his heart. Fired with the ambition of taking position in the world as a Guru, though doubtless believing himself still a follower of the White Brotherhood, he is no longer in our lines; on the contrary, his mediumship and weakness leave him a vehicle for other influences also.

He was then a Chela of a minor Indian Guru and was directed to come to America by that Guru who had been impressed to so direct him by our Master. That he was not a Chela of our Master he distinctly admitted to several persons, among others to me. While in that relation he was telepathically impressed in Chicago with some of the contents of a message received by me from the Master. It corroborated outwardly what I had myself received. It was however but a part and was moreover deficient in matter, Chakravarti himself being only aware of it as a mental impression, and I am informed that at the time he was not fully aware of what he was doing. His ability to be used as an unconscious vehicle was made known to me when he was made to receive the message. Although he was not fully aware of it, not only was the whole of his tour here well guarded and arranged, but he was personally watched by agents of the Masters scattered through the country unknown to him, who reported to me. On several occasions he has taken people into his confidence, believing that he was instructing them, when in fact they were observing him closely for the Lodge, helping him where right, and noting him fully, though they did not tell him so. This was also so in those parts of his tour when he believed himself alone or only with Mrs. Besant. His report of the message is as follows:

“You should tell Judge that we are satisfied with his work in America. He has our best thanks for his exertions in the field of Theosophy. He should try his best to keep always in the light of his higher nature, and thus alone he will be able to find out truth from its shadow. Thus alone he will be able to shut out the powers of darkness that every now and again try to smother his true and noble self which is pure and sincerely devoted to us.”

I informed Mrs. Besant in September, 1893, of the message. But afterwards, when Mr. Chakravarti's work under me was finished, and when ambition, aroused through that visit, had grown strong, he tried to destroy the effect of that message on Mrs. Besant's mind by cunningly construing it to mean that, although I was thus in all things commended, yet the last part of it contradicted the first and supported the charge of forgery and lying. This is madness when not deliberate. The psychological delusion of Mrs. Besant is also here shown: for she said that perhaps I would rely on that message to refute the charges, and if I should, the last paragraph of it was the part that would go to show that the Masters knew I was guilty. She accepted the cunning construction, permitting herself to think that the Master could commend me for all the work I had done, of which the pretended acts of forgery would be a part, and at the same time send me a delusive message, part of which was to be immediately used as condemnation if brought forward by me. If I was guilty of what I was accused, then Master would be shown as conniving at forgery and lying — a most impossible thing. The only other possibility is that Mr. Chakravarti and I “got up” the message. But he and Mrs. Besant have admitted its genuineness, although she is perfectly unable herself to decide on its genuineness or falsity. But further, Mrs. Besant admitted to several that she had seen the Master himself come and speak through my body while I was perfectly conscious. And still further, H.P.B. gave me in 1889 the Master's picture, on which he put this message: “To my dear and loyal colleague, W. Q. Judge”.

Now, then, either I am bringing you a true message from the Master, or the whole T.S. and E.S.T. is a lie, in the ruins of which must be buried the names of H.P.B. and the Masters. All these stand together or they fall together. Let it be proved that H.P.B. is a liar and a fraud, and I will abandon the T.S. and all its

belongings; but until so proved I will remain where I was put. Lastly, as final proof of the delusions worked through this man and his friends I will mention this: Many years ago (in 1881) the Masters sent to the Allahabad Brahmans (the Prayag T.S.) a letter which was delivered by H.P.B. to Mr. A. P. Sinnett, who handed a copy over to them, keeping the original. It dealt very plainly with the Brahmans. This letter the Brahmans do not like, and Mr. Chakravarti tried to make me think it was a pious fraud by H.P.B. He succeeded with Mrs. Besant in this, so that since she met him she has on various occasions said she thought it was a fraud by H.P.B., made up entirely, and not from the Master. I say now on Master's authority that it was from the Master, and is a right letter. Only delusion would make Mrs. Besant take this position; deliberate intention makes the others do it. It is an issue that may not be evaded, for if that letter be a fraud then all the rest sent through our old teacher, and on which *Esoteric Buddhism* was made, are the same. I shall rest on that issue; we all rest on it.

Mrs. Besant was then made to agree with these people under the delusion that it was approved by the Masters. She regarded herself as their servant. It was against the E.S.T. rules. When the rule is broken it is one's duty to leave the E. S.T.; and when I got the charges from her I asked her to leave it if it did not suit her. The depth of the plot was not shown to Mrs. Besant at all, for if it had been she would have refused. Nor was Col. Olcott aware of it. Mrs. Besant was put in such a frightful position that while she was writing me most kindly and working with me she was all the time thinking that I was a forger and that I had blasphemed the Master. She was made to conceal from me, when here, her thoughts about the intended charges, but was made to tell Mr. B. Keightley in London and possibly few others. Not until the time was ripe did she tell me, in her letter in January, from India, asking me to resign from the E.S.T. and the T.S. offices, saying that if I did and would confess guilt all would be forgiven and everyone would work with me as usual. But I was directed differently and fully informed. She was induced to believe that the Master was endorsing the persecution, that he was ordering her to do what she did. At the same time, I knew and told her that it was the plan there to have Col. Olcott resign when I had been cut off, the presidency to be then offered to her. It was offered to her, and she was made to believe it was the Master's wish for her "not to oppose". She then waited. I did not resign, and the plot so far was spoiled for the time. The delusion was so complete that she did not take the pains to contradict the rumor sent out by others, attached to her name, that Master ordered her to do as she did. Why? Because the Brahmans and their agents had made her silent. Showing the delusion further, note this: She wrote me that I must "resign the office of successor to the Presidency", the hint being that this was one of the things Master wanted me to do. *The fact was I had no such office and there was no such thing to resign.* The Master knew it, and hence he never ordered it. She felt and expressed to me the greatest pain to have to do such things to me. I knew she so felt, and wrote her that it was the black magicians. She replied, being still under the delusion, that I was failing to do Master's will.

Her influencers also made her try psychic experiments on me and on two others in Europe. They failed. On me they had but a passing effect, as I was cognizant of them; on one of the others they reacted on health, although she did not desire any harm at all: she was made to think it best and for my good. She then sent word to these people that she had not succeeded. This is all the effect of pure delusion; the variance between such things and her usual character is shown in her all the time writing me the most kind letters. In all this Mr. Chakravarti was her guide, with others. She was writing him all the time about it. He went so far as to write me on a matter he was supposed to know nothing of: "No matter what Annie may do to you as Co-Head of the E.S., she means you no harm". He must have known what she was doing from her. It was quite true, and I knew why it was true that she meant no harm — she was deluded.

Informed as I was of all these inside facts, I drew up under Master's direction my circular on the charges in March, 1894, and there outlined what would be done. It was all done as I said and as the Master in March told me would be the case. The London investigation ended as Master predicted through me in my circular,

and for the benefit of the T.S. But all that time the conspirators used all means against me. They had all sorts of letters sent me from India with pretended messages from the Masters asking me to resign and confess. One of those was anonymous and signed "A Brahman who loves you". I know the author. The object of these things was to confuse my mind if possible and render me unfit to act at all, while they went on with the plot and the influencing of Mrs. Besant. But Master kept me informed and told me what steps to take. He even told me that, much as it might seem the contrary from the official papers, Col. Olcott would be the central figure and the one through whom the adjustment of the matter would come. This also turned out true.

The Master says that the T.S. movement was begun by Them in the West by western people, and that it is not Their desire to turn it into a solely eastern movement nor to have us run after the present East and its exoteric teachers; they confirm the statement so often made by H.P.B. that there are not to-day in modern India any true Initiates teaching the people; that cyclic law requires the work in the West for the benefit of the world; that They do not live in India, and that They find it very hard to break down the walls of theological and other prejudices in the East; that the Egos of the West include many who helped to make the religion, the philosophy, and the civilization of the ancient East; that the new race is being prepared for in the West, and to divert thought back to the teachers of to day in the East would be dangerous; that many Initiates have remained with the West as *Nirmânakâyas* for its help in its destiny, and that through the great work in the West the whole East as well as West will be benefited. And They say that if the task of raising up the almost suffocated spirituality of India could have been done by working wholly there and thus benefiting the West, the time spent by the Messengers of the Lodge in the West was wasted. They also say that Nature's laws have set apart woe for those who spit back in the face of their teacher, for those who try to belittle her work and make her out to be part good and part fraud; those who have started on the path through her must not try to belittle her work and aim. They do not ask for slavish idolatry of a person, but loyalty is required. They say that the Ego of that body she used was and is a great and brave servant of the Lodge, sent to the West for a mission with full knowledge of the insult and the obloquy to be surely heaped upon that devoted head; and they add: "Those who cannot understand her had best not try to explain her; those who do not find themselves strong enough for the task she outlined from the very first had best not attempt it". The T.S. and its devoted members should so pursue the aim that the great work may at last be accomplished, so that when the next great Messenger shall arrive the obstacles that were found in 1875 will not be there, to be again overcome only through long years of effort.

A distinct object H.P.B. had in view I will now on the authority of the Master tell you. The work of the dark powers and their conscious and unconscious agents is against this object. They wish to defeat it. It is an object of the highest value and of the greatest scope, unrevealed before by H.P.B. to anyone else that I know of, though possibly there are those to whom she hinted it. All her vast work in the West, with western people, upon western religions and modern science, was toward this end, so that when she comes again as Messenger — as hinted at in the *Key to Theosophy* — much of the preparatory work should have been done by us and our successors. It is, *the establishment in the West of a great seat of learning where shall be taught and explained and demonstrated the great theories of man and nature which she brought forward to us, where western occultism, as the essence combined out of all others, shall be taught*. This stupendous object the Black Lodge would prevent. And even the exoteric theological Brahman would also prevent it, because it will in the end obliterate that form of caste which depends alone on birth, for there will be developed those whose inner vision will see the real caste of the inner man and put him down in a lower one for his discipline if he is not truly in his place. To-day the four natural castes are all confused, and those who are black within strut about as keepers of the key to the shrine of truth, when in fact they should be lower down, as learners. Shall her great object be worked against by us and its foundations overthrown? Never, if the vast powers of the Masters can be drawn to its support; never, if we are faithful to our pledges and to our trust.

I also state, on the same authority, that H.P.B. [^] has not reincarnated. That Ego is quite conscious and working toward the final accomplishment of the end in view, which depends very largely upon the members of the Theosophical Society, and on their loyalty. If the plotters succeed, the Black Lodge will win by turning our thoughts to the modern East with its Yogis and Fakirs, its hide-bound castes, its subtle and magnificently intellectual theology, its Hatha Yoga and all the dangers attending that.

In some minds this question has arisen: “Why does not the Master objectively communicate directly at one and the same time with Col. Olcott and all these others, so as to stop all trouble, and by bringing about a clear understanding smooth out all difficulties?” To do this would be contrary to the rule and dangerous for us. The force given out by doing it would allow — through the law of equal reaction — a similar amount of force to the Black Lodge, who also would be thus shown those who were involved. Greater trouble would follow. This law is well known. How often has H.P.B. [^] said that, while such exercise of power cannot hurt the Adept, it arouses the sentinels at the threshold, who then precipitate themselves on the unprotected neophyte. Were it now done, then all the hundreds connected with us would be targets for assaults, on this plane of desires and passions, by the dark powers. The Masters protect us while we are still without our own weapons, by keeping themselves on the spiritual plane — save to those who have obtained the means for self-protection. And in this is much information as well as warning. It is not well to vibrate a string that you want to raise up to a high note, unless you are strong enough to stand the consequences of its inevitable vibration to one equally low. At that low point lie the dark forces, and the vibrations rouse them up. We must be sure of the below before we try to go to the above. Practices, such as the Indian books are full of, lead to unwise vibrations, before we are ready. When we are encased in the steel of true devotion it will be time to try those experiments.

We are all therefore face to face with the question whether we will abide by Masters and their Messenger on the one hand, or by the disrupting forces that stand on the other, willing to destroy our great mission if we will but give them the opportunity.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

I, having read the foregoing and the order below, declare that it agrees with my knowledge of the facts (except that I know nothing about Mr. Chakravarti) and with the design of H.P.B. [^] and the basis of the organization, and I therefore endorse it all.

J. D. BUCK, F.T.S.

Member of the Judicial Committee.

3 November, 1894.

E.S.T. ORDER.

I now proceed a step further than the E.S.T. decisions of 189[1]*, and, solely for the good of the E.S.T., I resume in the E.S.T. in full all the functions and powers given to me by H.P.B. [^] and that came to me by orderly succession after her passing from this life, and declare myself the sole head of the E.S.T. This has been already done in America. So far as concerns the rest of the E.S.T. I may have to await the action of the members, but I stand ready to exercise those functions in every part of it. Hence, under the authority given me by the Master and H. P. B. [^], and under Master’s direction, I declare Mrs. Annie Besant’s headship in the E.S.T. at an end.

* In a copy of this document (probably Albert E.S. Smythe’s), 1894 has been corrected to 1891. This makes sense in view of what follows. See May 27, 1891 entry for more details.

But in order to preserve our solidarity as much as possible, I hereby, for the present until need for other arrangement shall arise, continue in existence under my direction for the Eastern Division of the E.S.T., the Council which was composed by Mrs. Besant in London at the time of her departure for Australia and India in August, 1894.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

4. **The Path**, Vol. 9, March 1895, pp.430-431.

A MAHATMA'S MESSAGE TO SOME BRAHMANS.

A copy of the letter hereunder printed was sent me in 1893 by the Brahman gentleman mentioned therein, whose full name is Benee Madhab Battacharya and who was at one time president of the Prayag T.S. at Allahabad. He sent it to me after the publication of my "Letter to the Brahmans" in order to try and show me that the T. S. was in fact a Buddhist propaganda. The original is in the possession of Mr. Sinnett, who informed me not long ago that he thought he had it among his papers but had no leisure to look for it. I print it now for reasons which will appear. It reads:

Message which Mr. Sinnett is directed by one of the Brothers, writing through Madame B[lavatsky], to convey to the native members of the Prayag Branch of the Theosophical Society.

The Brothers desire me to inform one and all of you *natives* that unless a man is prepared to become a thorough Theosophist, *i.e.* to do what D. Mavalankar did—give up entirely caste, his old superstitions, and show himself a true reformer (especially in the case of child-marriage), he will remain simply a member of the Society, with no hope whatever of ever hearing from us. The Society, acting in this directly in accord with our orders, *forces no one to become a Theosophist of the Second Section*. It is left with himself at his choice. It is useless for a member to argue 'I am one of a pure life, I am a teetotaller and an abstainer from meat and vice, all my aspirations are for good, etc.', and he at the same time building by his acts and deeds an impassible barrier on the road between himself and us. What have we, the disciples of the Arhats of Esoteric Budhism and of Sang-gyas, to do with the Shasters and orthodox Brahmanism? There are 100 of thousands of Fakirs, Sannyasis, or Sadhus leading the most pure lives and yet being, as they are, on the path of *error*, never having had an opportunity to meet, see, or even hear of us. Their forefathers have driven the followers of the only true philosophy upon earth away from India, and now it is not for the latter to come to them, but for them to come to us, if they want us. Which of them is ready to become a Budhist, a *Nastika*, as they call us? None. Those who have believed and followed us have had their reward. Mr. Sinnett and Hume are exceptions. Their beliefs are no barriers to us, for they have none. They may have bad influences around them, bad magnetic emanations, the result of drink, society, and promiscuous physical associations (resulting even from shaking hands with impure men), but all this is physical and material impediments which with a little effort we could counteract, and even clear away, without much detriment to ourselves. Not so with the magnetic and invisible results proceeding from erroneous and sincere beliefs. Faith in the gods or god and other superstition attracts millions of foreign influences, living entities and powerful Agents round them, with which we would have to use more than ordinary exercise of power to drive them away. We do not choose to do so. We do not find it either necessary or profitable to lose our time waging war on the unprogressed *planetaries* who delight in personating gods and sometimes well-known characters who have lived on earth. There are Dhyan Chohans and Chohans of darkness. Not what they term *devils*, but imperfect intelligences who have never been born on this or any other earth or sphere no more than the Dhyan Chohans have, and who will never belong to the 'Children of the Universe', the pure planetary intelligences who preside at every Manvantara, while the Dark Chohans preside at the Pralaya.

Now this is a genuine message from the Master, allowing, of course, for any minor errors in copying. Its philosophical and occult references are furthermore confirmed by the manuscript of part of the third volume of the *Secret Doctrine*, not yet printed. We know also that Master K. H. informed Mr. Sinnett and others that he was an *esoteric Budhist*; H.P.B. declared herself a Buddhist; on my asking her in 1875 what could the Masters' belief be called she told me they might be designated "pre-Vedic Budhists", but that no one would now admit there was any Buddhism before the Vedas, so I had best think of them as Esoteric Buddhists.

But I am informed that Mrs. Besant has several times privately stated that in her opinion the letter first above printed was a “forgery or humbug” gotten up by H.P.B. I know that Mr. Chakravarti has said the same thing, because he said it to me in New York. It is for Mrs. Besant to deny the correctness of my information as to what she said: she can affirm her belief in the genuineness of the letter. If she does so, we shall all be glad to know. If she merely denies that she ever impugned it, then it will be necessary for her to say affirmatively what is her belief, for silence will be assent to its genuineness. I affirm that it is from one of the Masters, and that, if it be shown to be a fraud, then all of H.P.B.’s claims of connection with and teaching from the Master must fall to the ground. It is now time that this important point be cleared up.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

5. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 16, April 1895, pp.475-476.

POSTSCRIPT.

We stop the press to make room for some needed comments on an article by Mr. Judge in the March number of the *Path*, of which advanced proofs have been kindly sent us from New York. Under the title "A Mahatma's Message to some Brahmans," the author quotes an alleged "message which Mr. Sinnett is directed by one of the Brothers, writing through Madame Blavatsky, to convey to the Native Members of the Prayag [Allahabad] Branch of the Theosophical Society." It was written, if I remember aright, about 1881, and a copy was sent to Mr. Judge, he tells us, in 1893 by a Brahman Theosophist—an old and respected friend of ours, to whom the original was shown and a copy furnished by Mr. Sinnett at the time of its issue. The message is one of the most transparently unconvincing in the history of Mahatmic literature. It bears upon its face the seal of its condemnation. It is an ill-tempered attack upon the Brahman gentleman's orthodoxy, under the guise of a general threat that none of his caste can approach the Masters save by "giving up entirely caste," . . . "old superstitions" . . . "faith in the gods or god," etc.; it repudiates all interest by the Adepts in "Shasters and orthodox Brahmanism," and asks "which of them is ready to become a Buddhist, a *Nastika*, as they call us." Mr. Judge asserts that "this is a genuine message from the Masters, allowing, of course, *for any minor errors in copying*;" and concludes his comments on the document by saying:

But I am informed that Mrs. Besant has several times privately stated that in her opinion the letter first above printed was a 'forgery or humbug' gotten up by H. P. B. I know that Mr. Chakravarti has said the same thing, because he said it to me in New York. It is for Mrs. Besant to deny the correctness of my information as to what she said: she can affirm her belief in the genuineness of the letter. If she does so, we shall all be glad to know. If she merely denies that she ever impugned it, then it will be necessary for her to say affirmatively what is her belief, for silence will be assent to its genuineness. I affirm that it is from one of the Masters, and that, if it be shown to be a fraud, then all of H. P. B.'s claims of connection with and teaching from the Master must fall to the ground. It is now time that this important point be cleared up.

It certainly *is* time; and, since this does not bear upon the pending issues which the undersigned will shortly have to judicially dispose of in London, he will help towards the clearing up so far as he can. He picks up the gauntlet for the honor of the Masters and the benefit of the Society.

In so many words, then, he pronounces the message a false one, and if this is likely to shatter H. P. B.'s oft-declared infallibility as the transmitter of only genuine messages from the Masters, so let it be: the sooner the monstrous pretence is upset the better for her memory and for a noble cause. For many years past, the writer has been battling for this principle, and though rewarded for his good motive and true loyalty to his old colleague, with secret hatred and public protest, he reiterates, for the hundredth time, that H. P. B. was as human and fallible as either one of us, and that what she wrote and taught, and what was written through her, should be judged strictly on its intrinsic merits and by no standard of presumed authority. If the message be really fictitious, it does not follow that H. P. B. consciously falsified; the simple theory of mediumship has explained many equally deceptive and even more exasperating messages from the invisible world: and she herself has written and said to the spy Solovioff, that at times she was possessed by evil influences. We know all the weight that such a suggestion carries, and yet repeat it in the full conviction that the discoveries of hypnotic science have already furnished proof of its entire reasonableness.

The putative 'message,' moreover, grossly violates that basic principle of neutrality and eclecticism on which the Theosophical Society has built itself up from the beginning; and which the self-sacrificing action of the Judicial Committee, at London last summer, vindicated, to the satisfaction of all the Sections. Is it not absurd, then, to imagine that any Master, in even the most casual relations with the Society, would indulge

in this insulting attack upon Brahmanic philosophy—the embodied quintessence of his own Secret Doctrine—and demand, as the price of intercourse with the Lodge, that the Brahman should repudiate his religious beliefs, cast aside his splendid Scriptures and turn Buddhist? How Mr. Judge could have overlooked this palpable proof of fraudulency is incomprehensible. It was a cruel disservice to the dead to revive the letter. Can it be that his imagined ‘loyalty’ to H. P. B. has ended in making him as blind to her human weaknesses as certain most honorable and well-meaning Spiritualists are to the staring falsity of many pretended spirit photographs, drawings and letters? Be this as it may, the moment that the dogma is established that the genuineness of H. P. B.’s series of Mahatmic letters depends upon the acceptance of such a fraud as the above, the Society will have to find another President, for it would soon become the game-preserve of rogues.

H. S. OLCOTT.

ADYAR, *March 27th*, 1895.

6. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, May 1895, pp.133-136.

ADEPTS AND MEDIUMS.

IN *The Theosophist* for April appears a “postscript” by Colonel Olcott, repudiating the letter sent by one of the Masters through H. P. B. to certain Brahmans, which was published by Mr. Judge in the April *Path* and declared by him to be genuine. Colonel Olcott asserts that the communication contains “palpable proof of fraudulency” in that he thinks it to be “an ill-tempered attack” on Brahman orthodoxy, and that, moreover, it “grossly violates that basic principle of neutrality and eclecticism on which the Theosophical Society has built itself from the beginning.” There are many, however, who differ absolutely from the Colonel in their opinion of this letter, and consider it to be one of the finest of the series. It is reprinted in a recent pamphlet issued to many members of the T. S., who will be able to judge for themselves. It is a candid but just criticism, not of the spirit of the Brahmanic philosophy, but of the hard forms, castes and creeds which have grown up around it, and which it was H. P. B.’s mission to break up and sweep away from all religions.

Colonel Olcott twice misquotes from the letter a very important word. He says that it asks the Brahman to “repudiate his religious beliefs, cast aside his splendid Scriptures and *turn Buddhist*” ! Italics are mine. And again he quotes a passage thus: “which of them is ready to become a Buddhist, a *Nâstika*, as they call us.” The word used in the letter is “Budhist,” not “Buddhist.” Why, does he so misquote it when H. P. B. has so carefully explained the radical difference between the two words? Owing to the impression conveyed by the title of Mr. Sinnett’s book, *Esoteric Buddhism*, that Theosophy was only a form of Buddhism, she explained in her Introduction to *The Secret Doctrine* that Buddhism is the religious system of ethics preached by the Lord Gautama, and named after his title of Buddha, “the Enlightened,” while Budha means “wisdom” or knowledge (Vidya), the faculty of cognizing, from the Sanskrit root “budh,” to know. She further said that Buddhism is not correctly spelt or pronounced in English, and should be Buddhaïsm. The word Nâstika means, according to *The Theosophical Glossary*, one who does not worship or recognize the gods and idols.

Colonel Olcott advances the theory, which both he and Mrs. Besant have already applied to the case of Mr. Judge, that H. P. B. was a medium not always responsible for what was given through her. He is driven to invent this miserable and insulting excuse in order to avoid accusing her of conscious fraud. This theory is untenable, and to prove it I cannot do better than quote from an article by Jasper Niemand, entitled, “Judge the Act, Not the Person,” which appeared in *The Path* of July, 1889. The writer there says:

What difference is there between the instrumentality of H. P. B. and that of any transmitting medium? There is that radical difference which exists between the two extremes called by us poles. H. P. B. is an Adept; the other not. The Adept is such by virtue of the active principle. The medium is such by virtue of the passive principle. . . . H. P. B. is an active, conscious agent, acting through will power, having attained the power of perfect registration and trained concentration, able *at all times* to give a full account of all she knows, and one fitted to the development of the questioner, one responding to his physical, astral or spiritual sense. She is learned, acute, profound; disease of the body has not impaired her work, its quality, quantity, or her fidelity to it. The great proof is thorough comprehension, to the fullest depth, of all she has taken or received, AND THE BODY OF H. P. B. IS HER OWN INSTRUMENT; SHE EVEN HOLDS IT BACK FROM DISSOLUTION. [Capitals mine.— B. C.]

The medium theory being disposed of, a second question arises out of the position taken up by Mrs. Besant, Colonel Olcott and others.

Granting that H. P. B. was a Messenger from the Masters, would those Masters Whose name had once been taken in vain ever use the same instrument again?

The answer is undoubtedly No. All that has been written by H. P. B., by W. Q. Judge, by Jasper Niemand and others on the rules of occult training, on the qualifications necessary for real chelaship, on the sacred relations between Master and chela, prove that such a thing is utterly impossible. H. P. B. has written that all the so-called “occult” letters must stand together or fall together. Yet it is sought to get rid of what is not approved by inventing theories which throw mud at the Masters and Their Messenger, and which violate the cardinal rules of Occultism. This is a question for those to whom the existence of Mahâtmas is a fact or a matter of personal belief, and that is why the charges against Mr. Judge can never be tried without fixing the dogma upon the T. S. Those who take teaching and advice from one whom they believe to be a Messenger of THE LODGE cannot say that some is true and some false. They may test by their intuition and assimilate what they can, but they may not attempt to put the seal of their paltry condemnation upon that which does not seem to them to be good. H. P. B. once wrote in *Lucifer* that “a member of the E. S. who receives instructions emanating from the Masters of the Occult Philosophy, and doubts at the same time the genuineness of the source, or the honesty of the humble transmitter of the old esoteric doctrines —LIES TO HIS OWN SOUL, AND IS UNTRUE TO HIS PLEDGE.” [Capitals mine.—B. C.]

Hear also this extract from “the words of great Teachers,” given by H. P. B. to her pupils as “the golden stairs up which the learner may climb to the Temple of Divine Wisdom”:

. . . . A LOYAL SENSE OF DUTY TO THE TEACHER, A WILLING OBEDIENCE TO THE BEHEST OF TRUTH, ONCE WE HAVE PLACED OUR CONFIDENCE IN, AND BELIEVE THAT TEACHER TO BE IN POSSESSION OF IT. . . .

We have, then, these definite facts before us at last—I speak to those only who believe in Mahâtmas and that they communicate through chosen disciples.

1. That both H. P. B. and Mr. Judge are accused of making bogus messages.
2. That it is admitted that genuine messages were delivered by H. P. B. and Mr. Judge *after* those which are alleged to be false.
3. That the charges cannot be gone into before the T. S. without fixing the dogma of the Mahâtmas upon it.

Finally Colonel Olcott asserts that the question of this letter to the Brahmans does not bear upon the issues which [he thinks] he will have to judicially dispose of in London. I say that it is the fundamental and only issue, the complaint in both cases being identical at the root, and the step that the President has now definitely taken shows more clearly than ever that H. P. B. is the real centre of attack, and through her the movement she sacrificed so much to call into being. Once let her image be dimmed, once let her integrity be shaken, and it will be but the beginning of the end. For remember that *Esoteric Buddhism* was built on some of the “occult” letters, and that *The Secret Doctrine* will lose its foundation stones if H. P. B. was not true as steel to her trust.

So let the indomitable loyalty of William Q. Judge to his Teacher and ours be the keynote to our action, and let us help him to keep unbroken the links which bind us to the Head and Heart of our movement, without whom it would not exist to-day.

BASIL CRUMP.

7a. **The Theosophical Movement 1875 - 1950**, p.250.

Mr. Judge's report as General Secretary contained the usual information on the work of the preceding year. It briefly rehearsed the charges against him, the meeting of the Judicial Committee in July, 1894, the *Westminster Gazette* articles, the subsequent proceedings at Adyar involving the resolutions demanding his "resignation" and an "explanation." On all this his report says:

. . . . I have replied, refusing to resign the Vice-Presidency.[He elsewhere explained that he regarded resignation as a confession of guilt.] And to the newspaper attack I have made a provisional and partial reply, as much as such a lying and sensational paper deserved. . . . But I have an explanation, and I renew my declaration of innocence of the offenses charged. As I have said in London and since, the messages I delivered, privately, are genuine messages from the Master, procured through me as the channel, and that the basis of the attack on me is unbelief in my being a channel.

7b. **Report of Proceedings, Ninth Annual Convention, American Section T.S., AND First Convention, Theosophical Society in America**, Boston, April 28-29, 1895, pp.16-17.

RESOLVED: First, that the American Section consisting of Branches of the Theosophical Society in America, in convention assembled, hereby assumes and declares its entire autonomy and that it shall be called from and after this date "The Theosophical Society in America."

Second, that the administration of its affairs shall be provided for, defined, and be under a Constitution and By-Laws, which shall in any case provide for the following;

- (a) A Federation of Branches. . . .
- (b) That William Q. Judge shall be President for life, with power to nominate his successor; and a Vice-President, Treasurer, and Executive Committee, elected yearly.
- (c) Autonomy for Branches in local affairs.
- (d) A yearly Convention with equitable representation.
- (e) Territorial Committees for propaganda, without power to legislate.
- (f) The declaration that every member has the right to believe or disbelieve in any religious system or philosophy consistent with Universal Brotherhood and declare such belief or disbelief, without affecting his standing as a member of this Society, each being required to show that tolerance for the opinions of others which he expects for his own.

. . . .

RESOLVED, that the Theosophical Society in America hereby recognizes the long and efficient services rendered to the Theosophical Movement by Col. H. S. Olcott and that to him belongs the unique and honorary title of President-Founder of the Theosophical Society, and that, as in the case of H. P. B. as Corresponding Secretary, he can have no successor in that office.

8. **Lucifer**, Vol. 16, May 1895, pp.185-194.

EAST AND WEST.

It is a strange thing to find the West pitted against the East, as we now see it, in the desperate attempts of Mr. Judge and his adherents to make a general struggle, and so prevent the minds of men from being fixed on the question of the truth or falsehood of the definite charges brought against Mr. Judge. This attempt to stir up strife between the Sections of the Society, whose glory it had hitherto been to bring Eastern knowledge within Western reach, began in Mr. Judge's notorious circular of Nov. 3rd, 1894. It was continued in *The Path* for March, '95, in a challenge to myself concerning an alleged Mahâtmic letter, and is again taken up in an article most inappropriately headed, "The Truth about East and West," in *The Path* for April. The letter is as follows:

Message which Mr. Sinnett is directed by one of the Brothers, writing through Madame B[lavatsky], to convey to the native members of the Prayag Branch of the Theosophical Society.

The Brothers desire me to inform one and all of you *natives* that unless a man is prepared to become a thorough Theosophist, *i.e.*, to do what D. Mavalankar did—give up entirely caste, his old superstitions, and show himself a true reformer (especially in the case of child-marriage), he will remain simply a member of the Society, with no hope whatever of ever hearing from us. The Society, acting in this directly in accord with our orders, *forces no one to become a Theosophist of the Second Section*. It is left with himself at his choice. It is useless for a member to argue 'I am one of a pure life, I am a teetotaler and an abstainer from meat and vice, all my aspirations are for good,' etc., and he at the same time building by his acts and deeds an impassable barrier on the road between himself and us. What have we, the disciples of the Arhats of Esoteric Buddhism and of Sang-gyas, to do with the Shasters and orthodox Brahmanism? There are 100 of thousands of Fakirs, Sannyasis, or Sadhus leading the most pure lives and yet being, as they are, on the path of *error*, never having had an opportunity to meet, see, or even hear of us. Their forefathers have driven the followers of the only true philosophy upon earth away from India, and now it is not for the latter to come to them, but for them to come to us, if they want us. Which of them is ready to become a Buddhist, a *Nastika*, as they call us? None. Those who have believed and followed us have had their reward. Mr. Sinnett and Hume are exceptions. Their beliefs are no barriers to us, for they have none. They may have bad influences around them, bad magnetic emanations, the result of drink, society, and promiscuous physical associations (resulting even from shaking hands with impure men), but all this is physical and material impediments which with a little effort we could counteract, and even clear away, without much detriment to ourselves. Not so with the magnetic and invisible results proceeding from erroneous and sincere beliefs. Faith in the gods or god and other superstition attracts millions of foreign influences, living entities and powerful Agents round them, with which we would have to use more than ordinary exercise of power to drive them away. We do not choose to do so. We do not find it either necessary or profitable to lose our time waging war on the unprogressed *planetaries* who delight in personating gods and sometimes well-known characters who have lived on earth. There are Dhyān Chohans and Chohans of darkness. Not what they term *devils*, but imperfect intelligences who have never been born on this or any other earth or sphere no more than the Dhyān Chohans have, and who will never belong to the 'Children of the Universe,' the pure planetary intelligences who preside at every Manvantara, while the Dark Chohans preside at the Pralaya.

I will deal first with the "message."

On this Mr. Judge writes: "I am informed that Mrs. Besant has several times privately stated that in her opinion the letter first above printed was a 'forgery or humbug,' gotten up by H. P. B." Mr. Judge's information is inaccurate, as for the most part it is, and as information gained by his methods is likely to be. I do not regard the letter as genuine, *but I have never attributed it to H. P. B.* I was first shewn a copy of the

letter by Mr. Judge in the summer of 1893, and he then expressed to me strong doubts of its genuineness; nor was I the only person to whom he expressed those doubts. He had then no idea that all H. P. B.'s claims hinged on this obscure letter, now "first above printed," as he strangely asserts they do.

My disbelief in the genuineness of this letter is based, as apparently was Mr. Judge's in '93, on the errors it contains, and the unmannerly tone which pervades its early part. "The Brothers desire me [who?] to inform one and all of you *natives*"—this first sentence condemns it. For the two Masters Who used H. P. B. as Their messenger, are both "natives", and would scarcely say contemptuously "*you natives*" in addressing Their countrymen. Next, H. P. B. constantly advised Hindus to keep their caste rules, as hundreds of them can testify. Child-marriage is not an essential part of Hinduism, and the blunder of making it so shews ignorance. What the Masters have to do with the Shâstras is pretty evident from the direction of Them to aspirants to study Manu, and from the reverence with which Their disciple, H. P. B., regarded the *Bhagavad Gîtâ*, the Upanishads and the Purânas, and the use she made of them. Further, H. P. B. did not muddle up the ancient Secret Wisdom, or Bodha, with the comparatively modern exoteric religion called Buddhism, the followers of which from their materialism are termed Nâstikas. She writes: "When we use the term *Buddhists*, we do not mean to imply by it either the exoteric Buddhism instituted by the followers of Gautama-Buddha, nor the modern Buddhistic religion, but the secret philosophy of Sakyamuni, which in its essence is certainly identical with the ancient wisdom-religion of the sanctuary, the pre-Vedic Brahmanism."[†] Again she speaks of this ancient Buddhism as the "one mother-trunk, the once universal religion, which antedated the Vedaic ages—we speak of that pre-historic Buddhism which merged later into Brahmanism."[‡] She complains of the confusion (shewn in the letter under consideration) made between the system taught by the Buddha and the secret knowledge,[¶] and says that the secret teachings of Buddhism and Brahmanism are the same, and that the Buddha only taught them to a select circle of His Arhats.[§] Instead of denouncing "faith in the Gods" as a superstition, H. P. B. professed it, and constantly wrote of these divine Entities in *The Secret Doctrine*, speaking of the "highest Deities,"^{**} of the Entities so "immeasurably high that, to us, They must appear as Gods, and collectively—God."^{††} The Dhyân Chohans, accordingly to the same teaching, have passed "through the human stage."^{‡‡}

These facts seemed to me to necessitate the rejection of the letter as being in flagrant contradiction with H. P. B.'s teachings, and it is certainly no more supported by the third volume of *The Secret Doctrine*, which was placed in my hands by H. P. B., than by the other two. Why so wild an assertion, which will be proved false by the forthcoming publication of the third volume, should be made, I do not know.

To take now the main question. Mr. Judge says India is not the whole East, that Master K. H. has said India is degraded and her ancient spirituality suffocated, that education is making Hindus materialistic, and that he calls the Buddha his great patron. These statements are true, but they are partial and therefore misleading. India is not the whole East, but she is the cradle of the Âryan race; she is degraded, her spirituality is

[†] *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 142.

[‡] *Ibid*, 123.

[¶] *Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 2, 3rd ed.

[§] *Ibid*, pp. 3, 4.

^{**} *Ibid*, p. 142.

^{††} *Ibid*, p. 157.

^{‡‡} *Ibid*, p. 132.

dormant, and *Western* education is materialising her. Nevertheless what is the testimony concerning her of the very Master quoted? In the passage given (*Occult World*, p. 86, 4th Ed.) words are omitted that change the whole tone. The Master writes: "I am first to thank you on behalf of the whole section of our fraternity that is specially interested in the welfare of India for an offer of help whose importance and sincerity no one can doubt. Tracing our lineage through the vicissitudes of Indian civilization from a remote past, we have a love for our motherland so deep and passionate that it has survived even the broadening and cosmopolitanizing (pardon me if that is not an English word) effect of our studies in the laws of nature. And so I, and every other Indian patriot,* feel the strongest gratitude for every kind word or deed that is given in her behalf. Imagine, then, that since we are all convinced that the degradation of India is largely due to the suffocation of her ancient spirituality, and that whatever helps to restore that higher standard of thought and morals must be a regenerating national force, every one of us would naturally and without urging, be disposed to push forward a society whose proposed formation is under debate, especially if it really is meant to become a society untainted by selfish motive, and whose object is the revival of ancient science, and tendency to rehabilitate our country in the world's estimation. Take this for granted without further asseverations. But you know, as any man," etc. Later, in the same letter, He writes: "The same causes that are materializing the Hindu mind are equally affecting all Western thought. Education enthrones scepticism, but imprisons spirituality. You can do immense good by helping to give the Western nations a secure basis on which to reconstruct their crumbling faith. And what they need is the evidence that Asiatic psychology alone supplies." And a few lines later He speaks of the "primitive soul-satisfying philosophy of the Âryans"—not of Turks and Arabs, so oddly included in "the East." On p. 99, He writes sadly: "Such is unfortunately the inherited and self-acquired grossness of the Western mind, and so greatly have the very phrases, expressive of modern thoughts, been developed in the line of practical materialism, that it is now next to impossible either for them to comprehend, or for us to express in their own languages, anything of that delicate, seemingly ideal, machinery of the Occult Kosmos. To some little extent that faculty can be acquired by the Europeans through study and meditation, but—that's all." So far from implying that India is finally to go out, He says of "the revival of our ancient art and high civilization" that they are "sure to come back in their time and in a higher form," and speaks of Their knowledge—in curious contrast with the spurious letter above quoted—as "the gift of the Gods" (pp. 102, 103). Just before the passage quoted on education, He says that with the study of the ancient science and philosophy "the greatest evil that now oppresses and retards the revival of Indian civilization will in time disappear" (p. 93), thus implying the revival instead of the extinction of India. And in a letter from the Master of our Masters, speaking of the working for brotherhood, He exclaims: "Oh for the noble and unselfish man to help us effectually in India in that divine task. All our knowledge, past and present, could not be sufficient to repay him."

On December 14th, 1893, Mr. Judge was apparently wholly at one with the view expressed above of the bad effect of Western education, for he wrote: "I think if Hindu young men knew the real rottenness of the West, they would not be wishing to follow her as they do."

One passage from H. P. B. will be enough to show how she regarded modern India. It occurs on p. 253 of *The Path*, December, 1886: "Unless radical reforms in our American and European Societies are speedily resorted to, I fear that before long there will remain but one centre of Theosophical Societies and Theosophy in the whole world—namely, in India; on that country I call all the blessings of my heart. All my love and aspirations belong to my beloved brothers, the Sons of old Âryavarta—the motherland of my Master."

Until May, 1893, at least, Mr. Judge was apparently quite in accord with this view of India, and in his *Letter to Some Brahmans of India*, published in *The Path* for that month, he puts the matter so admirably that I cannot do better than quote his words:

* "You natives"!

I was the pupil and intimate friend of H. P. Blavatsky, who founded the Theosophical Society; I took part with her in its first organization; I was conversant with her sleepless devotion and untiring zeal in the work she wanted her Society to do, which was to follow out the plan laid down for it by some of your own Indian Rishis, the Mahâtmâs who were her Gurus; I was told by her in the very beginning of that work that her object as directed by her Guru was to bring to the attention of the West the great truths of philosophy contained in the old books and thoughts of India; I know that her first friends in your work in your country even before she left this one, were Indians, Brahmins, sons of Aryavarta; hence my sensitiveness to any misapprehension by you of its purposes or of its supporters can be easily understood by you. Having, then, this triple devotion—to the teaching of Indian sages, the ideals of the messenger of your own Rishis, and the welfare of the Theosophical Society—it will be evident to you why the evil so strongly felt by my honoured Brahmin co-worker, Bro. Lahiri, and by myself, should lead me, as an individual and as Vice-President of the T.S., to address as many of you as these words can reach. The evil is this: that a suspicion is spreading through the Brahmin community that the Theosophical Society is losing its impartial character as the equal friend to all religions, and is becoming distinctly Buddhistic in its sympathies and affiliations. And the evil is not a mere mistake as to fact: it is evolving the practical consequences that interest in the Society diminishes among its natural friends in Brahmanism, that they hesitate to enter its membership or cooperate in its work, and that they withhold the aid without which the priceless treasures of their literature, so indispensable to the efforts we Theosophists are making to throw light upon the great problems of existence now agitating the Western mind, and thus unite East and West, cannot be used in the spiritual mission the ancient Rishis have approved. In brief, Brahmins will not sustain the Theosophical Society if they believe it a Buddhistic propaganda; nor can they be expected to. No more could Christians, Mahomedans, or Parsees.

Ancient Aryan ideas and views of life are permeating the land and moulding the convictions of its people. We need help to increase and fire them. Much of this can come only from yourselves and others in India. By your own identification with the Society you can strengthen it for its local work, aiding it to dissolve the barriers between religions and sects, and to enliven fraternal feeling through all, assisting in the attempt to uplift higher ideals among your countrymen. And if you cannot join the Society, you can help it by countenancing its work. On our behalf you can transmit those valuable treatises which throw light on the great problems of destiny which concern us and you alike, and can thus take part in the truly philanthropic work of giving truth to those who need and ask it. We who are, with you, fellow-seekers after light and aspirants after progress, know the joy of sharing our treasures with the sincere, and we invite you to give us more towards such sharing. Like you, we are workers in the Rishis' cause, and we seek the most efficient aids in that work. If you do not give this aid, or if you continue to rest under the wrong impression I have spoken of above, you will interfere with a work that is for the direct benefit of India and of your religion. For our work is meant also to bring the attention of the West to the philosophical and religious truths of the sacred books of India, to the end that India may be helped to lift itself up once more to spiritual heights of power, and thus in its turn benefit the whole race of man.

Mr. Judge is, of course, at liberty to change his mind, and instead of saying that without Brâhmanical help the Society cannot do its work, and that much of the help can come only from the Brâhmins, he may say that the East is a mere store-house, holding treasures “that the West alone can make avail of and teach the East how to use.” But that is no reason why those of us who stand on the old lines should also shift our ground. The facts that Indians were against Mr. Judge's election as Colonel Olcott's successor, and that they were the first to discern the frauds that were being practised on the Society; and later the strong stand taken by India against Mr. Judge, explain his change of position and the bitterness with which he now attacks her; but that is a merely personal question and should not change the policy of the Society. For years Mr. Judge has been trying to get hold of India, but all his attempts have failed, and the failure has naturally embittered him against those he can neither win nor master. But this is a passing and trivial matter, whereas the spiritual destinies of Humanity are bound up with India. If indeed she is to go down into “the engulfing blackness

of ruin," she carries with her the rest of mankind; hence the stress laid on the value of the work of one who could revive her spirituality. It may be that the great sweep of the Kali Yuga may plunge the world into darkness; but let us at least not co-operate with this, let us to the very last struggle against it, for no force is wasted, and the energies which cannot prevent the plunge into materialism will avail to bring the world again upwards to the light, when the cycle has run its course.

ANNIE BESANT.

NOTE. An article in *The Theosophist* of October, 1883, written by Mr. Judge under the *nom-de-plume* of "An Ex-Asiatic,"* taken with some comments by H. P. B. on an article by a Hindu in the December issue, may throw some light on this question, as shewing whence proceeds the "Western Occultism" for which we are asked to exchange the pearl of Eastern Wisdom, and the probable Teachers of the new School to be set up. Mr. Judge asserted that the American Revolution was guided by "the Adepts who now look over and give the countenance of Their great name to the Theosophical Society," and that "the great Theosophical Adepts" influenced Thomas Paine, "hovered over Washington, Jefferson, and all the other brave freemasons," etc., and "left upon the great seal of this mighty nation the memorial of Their presence." A Hindu wrote a sarcastic comment on this article and H. P. B. added some notes. She wrote: "Why should our correspondent make so sure that 'the views advanced fall in entirely with those held in general by the Theosophical Society'? The Editor of this periodical, for one, disagrees entirely with the said views, as understood by our critic. Neither the Tibetan, nor the modern Hindu Mahâtmâs† for the matter of that, ever meddle with politics, though They may bring their influence to bear upon more than one momentous question in the history of a nation—Their mother-country especially. If any Adepts have influenced Washington or brought about the great American Revolution, it was not the 'Tibetan Mahâtmâs' at any rate: for These have never shown much sympathy with the Pelings of whatever Western race, excepting as forming a part of Humanity in general. Yet it is as certain, though this conviction is merely a *personal* one, that several Brothers of the Rosie Cross—or 'Rosicrucians' so-called—did take a prominent part in the American struggle for independence, as much as in the French Revolution during the whole of the past century. We have documents to that effect, and the proofs of it are in our possession. But these Rosicrucians were Europeans and American settlers, who acted quite independently of the Indian and Tibetan Initiates. And the 'Ex-Asiatic,' who premises by saying that his statements are based upon his own personal responsibility—settles this question from the first. He refers to Adepts *in general* and not to Tibetan or Hindu Mahâtmâs necessarily, as our correspondent seems to think." Further down she again speaks of the impossibility of any regicide being inspired by "any Adept—let alone a Hindu or Buddhist Mahâtmâ," and says "we Eastern Theosophists." These statements may help some to realise that there are Adepts working on other lines than Those Who sent H. P. B. as Their Messenger, and that there is really a great School of Western Occultism, known as "Hermetic," "Rosicrucian," and under other names. But those of us who prefer to follow the Eastern Path ought not to be blamed, as we should not blame those who prefer the Western. For my own part, it was H.P.B. who showed me the Light, and I follow the Eastern Path of which she opened the gateway to me, with no feeling against any who prefer the Western Path. In fact, I know the latter is more attractive to the Western mind, as being more "practical," and as following external methods that readily awaken the astral senses; the practical, materially scientific Western shrinks from the rigid discipline and long, silent patience demanded by Eastern Teachers, from the method that works from within outwards, and for long shows no "results."

* ["*The Adepts in America in 1776*"].

† Compare this with Mr. Judge's allegation that the Masters "confirm the statement so often made by H. P. B. . . . that there are not to-day in modern India any true Initiates teaching the people."

9. **The Path**, Vol. 10, June 1895, pp.81-83.

H. S. OLCOTT vs. H.P.B.

IN THE April *Theosophist* Col. Olcott makes public what we have long known to be his private opinion—a private opinion hinted at through the pages of *Old Diary Leaves*,—that H.P.B. was a fraud, a medium, and a forger of bogus messages from the Masters. This final ingrate's blow is delivered in a Postscript to the magazine for which the presses were stopped. The hurry was so great that he could not wait another month before hurling the last handful of mud at his spiritual and material benefactor, our departed H.P.B. The next prominent person for whom we wait to make a similar public statement, has long made it privately.

Col. Olcott “stops the press” and rushes off the Postscript, “for the honor of the Masters”. He wishes to defend those Masters, who sent H.P.B. as their messenger, by declaring that she “cooked up”, forged, and humbugged with, a long and important message to Brahmans at Allahabad in 1881. The Colonel is H.P.B.'s first Western disciple, ignorant to this day of practical occultism and not able to propound a question to the Masters; never heard of Masters except through H.P.B. He now preserves the honor of Masters by blackening the character of their messenger. Splendid defence, this, of the Masters!

How does he explain the long silence of the Masters since 1881 on the subject? And another very pertinent question is this: How does this “defender of the Masters” explain his own silence in 1881 and since? He was present when the message was sent and knew of it. If he knew then that it was bogus why did he not divulge? If he did not know then, was it because he was unable to tell? If he has since been told by one of the Masters—*à la* Besant in the Judge case—will he kindly let us know which of the Masters told him, and when?

All these questions ought to be answered, and many proofs given by him showing the least occult ability to decide on false or genuine messages, because he has attempted to classify H.P.B. with frauds, forgers and mediums. Hence the Masters who sent her are put by him in similar categories. Observe that the forgery now alleged by him was at the very time H.P.B. was giving out from the Masters the series of messages which have become known to all. If we believe him, then the delivery by this irresponsible medium of one false message must throw doubt on every message. Certainly Col. Olcott is no occultist whose decision we will accept. Each of us will be left to decide for this, that, or the other message according to fancy. Olcott does not like the one in question because he lives in India, and it is too gallingly true. Perhaps others may like it, and not be willing to accept other messages that contradict their partisan view of the London Lodge papers or metaphysics and science. For my part, the message in question testifies to its genuineness by its text, except for those who are hit by it, or those who have the Indian craze and think themselves Brahmans, or those whose self-interest and comfort are against it.

The message condemns bigotry. The persons to whom it was sent were then of the most theologically bigoted families. They were wondering, like Pharisees, how it was possible that the Mahâtmas could communicate with a beef-eating, wine-drinking Sinnett and not with them, who took no such things and never shook hands. To these very points, to their superstitions, to their upholding idolatry, to the horrors of caste, the letter adverts. The whole letter rings true and strong. Were one at all disposed to join Olcott in his absurd explanations by mediumship, this letter is the one that would be selected as true.

If for a moment we accept this view of H.P.B. put forward by Olcott then there is, as she published herself, no certainty about any message. Who is to decide? If she hoodwinked with one message, all may be the same—bogus—and the great force and strength derived from a firm belief in Masters will be swept away, because she, their first messenger to us, is made out a fraud. All this is precisely what Olcott *et al* wish to

do. He cannot tolerate the idea that H.P.B. was greater than himself, so he throws around her memory the dirty cloak of tricky and irresponsible mediumship. That done, anything can be explained and anything accounted for.

Well, for my part, I will not accept such nonsense, Col. Olcott being incompetent to decide on Mahâtmic messages on occult lines, and being a disciple of H.P.B. is certainly much below her. His present utterance settles nothing about her character, about her mediumship or about the message; but it does serve to brand him as an ingrate and to place him plainly in view as one who calls that great teacher a fraud and a medium.

Now let the next and the next come on, so that we may have the lines clearly drawn and the hypocrisies unveiled.

MRS. A. BESANT vs. H.P.B.

Mrs. Besant has sent an advance copy of an article to appear in *Lucifer* entitled "East and West". It is a very long article devoted chiefly to William Q. Judge, but in it she takes up the message from the Master to the Allahabad Brahmans, which Col. Olcott deals with in his April Postscript. *She says the message is not genuine*, and thus walks beside Col. Olcott in abuse of H.P.B., for everyone with correct information knows that the message came through H.P.B.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

10. **The Path**, Vol. 10, June 1895, pp.96-97.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DR. HARTMANN READS THE "POSTSCRIPT."

"MY DEAR JUDGE:—What is the matter? Has the world become struck with blindness, and does the President of the T. S. not know what Theosophy is? Have all the lectures of Mrs. Besant been after all nothing but eloquence mixed with gush? Do our own Theosophical writers only repeat parrot-like what they hear, but without understanding?"

"I ask these questions because I received a letter from Col. Olcott, in which he calls my attention to a certain presidential "postscript" in the April number of the *Theosophist*, and having at last sent for that journal, I find that the "postscript" refers to the well-known "*Mahâtma Message to some Brahmans*" published in the *Path*. It seems almost incredible how anybody, to say nothing of a president-founder, could misconstrue and confound that message so as to understand it to mean that the Brahmans should "repudiate their religious beliefs, cast aside their splendid scriptures, and turn Buddhists!" in other words, that they should give up one orthodox creed for the purpose of assuming another. I never imagined it possible that anybody could not see the plain meaning of that letter to some Brahmans, in which the Master asks them to strive to *outgrow* their orthodox beliefs and superstitions, faith in gods or a (separate) god, and to attain *real knowledge*."

"Great must be the power of Mr. Chakravarti and his orthodox colleagues, if they can spread so much darkness over Adyar. The very air in that place seems to be reeking with envy, jealousy, conceit and above all ingratitude. Persons (such as Hübbe Schleiden) who for many years have been making a living by huckstering the truths they learned from H. P. Blavatsky and trading them off as their own inventions, now turn upon their benefactors like wolves."

"For years it has been preached and written in all theosophical papers, that blind belief in a doctrine (based upon the supposed respectability of the person who teaches it), is not *self-knowledge*; that we should neither reject a doctrine nor blindly believe it, but strive to attain to the true understanding of it. And now after these many years the cry is heard among the "prominent" members of the T. S.: '*Where, oh where is a person whose respectability is so much assured, that we may blindly believe what he says and save ourselves the trouble of thinking for ourselves?*'"

"It seems to me, that the present row in the T. S. is an absolutely necessary test, to show who are and who are not capable of grasping the spirit and essence of theosophy, and to purify the T.S. of those elements incapable of receiving the truth. Let those who need doctrines, be they brahminical or otherwise, depart in peace. Let them rejoice in the conviction of their own superior morality, which is the product of the delusion of self. The true theosophist knows that the condition necessary for the interior revelation of truth is neither the acceptance nor the repudiation of doctrines, nor the belief in the respectability of Peter or John, but the sacrifice of self and that love of the Master which alone forms the link of sympathy between the Master and the disciple, and whose purity consists in being unselfish."

Yours very sincerely,
F. H."

HALLEIN, April 25, 1895.

11. **Lucifer**, Vol 16, July 1895, pp.375-379.

THE PRAYAG LETTER.

MR. JUDGE challenged me to give my opinion on this letter, but—acting within his right as Editor—excluded from the columns of the *Path* my answer to his challenge. Not only so, but he reverses my answer—and this is outside his right as Editor—by saying that I allege the message to be non-genuine, “and thus walks beside Col. Olcott in abuse of H. P. B.” In my answer I said very distinctly: “I do not regard the letter as genuine, *but I have never attributed it to H. P. B.*” (italics in article), and I went on to give my reasons, drawn almost entirely from H.P.B.’s own writings, for not regarding the letter as authentic. I do not complain that Mr. Judge should suppress my answer, nor that he should convey to his readers’ minds the opposite of my statement about H. P. B.; for I know that it is necessary to his position that I should be represented as attacking my dear friend and teacher, and that those who do not see my own words should be confirmed in their belief in this industriously-propagated delusion.

The publication of the letter, if it should be regarded as from H. P. B., may do some harm to the Theosophical Society in India, and will certainly injure her memory, as it is in flagrant contradiction with her definite and published teachings. The recipients of it wisely kept it to themselves, and thus little harm was done by it, beyond the shutting out of the Theosophical Society of a few men who would have been useful members. The gentleman who sent it to Mr. Judge is much distressed at the use that has been made of it, and the best that can now be done to repair the mischief is to publish Mr. Judge’s own letters about it, which will show how anxious he was a short time ago that it should not be regarded as anti-Brâhmanical.

His second letter is an admirable one, and puts the matters in question in a very clear light. In the third, two points are interesting; one, that in January, 1894, Mr. Judge frankly stated that he was not in a position to ask as to the genuineness of the letter, and the second his statement that the channel through which a message comes may distort the intended meaning of it—a view which, from the context, was intended to depreciate this particular message, and which, taken in conjunction with Mr. Judge’s present declaration that the message came through H. P. B., seems to put him in the position taken by Col. Olcott, and for which he so bitterly attacks the latter.

ANNIE BESANT.

LETTER I.

LONDON.
July 4th, 1893.

DEAR SIR,—I beg to thank you for writing to me and enclosing a copy of a message sent some years ago to the Hindu members of the Prayag Theosophical Society. On reading yours I at once felt a confidence that you were making me a correct report of the matter, but as important interests and probably events are involved, I deemed it my duty to examine the original, so that I might be able to say I had seen that with my own eyes. That examination I cannot make in time for the next mail, and have therefore to beg your indulgence and allowance of delay in replying directly to your questions. Being here in London to attend a convention of the Theosophical Society, yours was forwarded to me from New York.

I have read your letter with very great interest. But I do not retreat from my circular, nor do I think the letter you copy for me alters either the circular or the position of things. It was not because you or others were professors of orthodox Brahmanism that that letter spoke as it did; nor was it because Buddhism in its exoteric sense is the religion of the Masters. The letter distinctly speaks of esoteric Buddhism, and that must be the same as esoteric Brahmanism. I should be forced to conclude that the writer of that letter was neither

an exoteric Buddhist or Brahman. Further than the above, for many years I have known that the Masters are neither of above.

I would ask you to wait a little longer until I have seen the original here and formed my views a little more.

I am,

Sincerely,

(Signed)

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

LETTER II.

THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, AMERICAN SECTION,
GENERAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
HEAD QUARTERS: 144, MADISON AVENUE,
NEW YORK.

September 28th, 1893.

MY DEAR SIR,—This letter should have gone some weeks ago, but by a curious accident after having written it, it was rolled into the back of my desk, in a manner which prevented me from getting it, and thus I have had to re-write it as I had no time to take my desk apart. I promised in London to answer you more at length. I have read your letter very carefully, and beg to say:

(1st) Inasmuch as you have never published the message you copy, it cannot be possible that that message is the cause of any opposition from the Brahmanical community, however much effect it may have had on you.

(2nd) I think you are altogether mistaken in supposing that the letter quoted asks any one to become a *Nastika*. I do not think it does. If you construe esoteric Buddhism to be the same as outside Buddhism, you might be right, but the whole of the letter speaks of inner Buddhism, which to my knowledge and from my investigation, is the contrary of *Nastikism*. The reference in the letter to Buddhism and *Nastikism* is, I think, meant for irony and nothing more.

(3rd) If you will look at the matter from an entirely outside point of view, not as an orthodox Brahmin but simply as a thinker, is it not quite true that there are thousands of “fakeers,” Sannyinis, and Sadhus leading the most pure lives, and yet being as they are in the path of error, never having had an opportunity to meet, see, or even hear of any of the Rishis? This is because these devotees follow a set of practices based upon some particular system of religion, and that clouds their minds from the real truth. It is the same with the Buddhist devotees who, sticking to a particular system of metaphysics, are clouded as to the truth. It must also be the same with many Brahmins. Is it not true that a sincere belief may be erroneous, and that its very sincerity will prevent the believer from seeing the highest truth? Furthermore, is it not a fact, that the Rishis, sages and Mahatmas are above all systems of Philosophy, Metaphysics and Religion? This is stated in the Vedas. It seems to me that in the letter quoted the intention was to show that many Brahmins who depended too much on orthodoxy could not get at the final truth, however sincere.

I believe most firmly in the Mahatmas, Masters of Wisdom, and that they are not confined to any particular race or time, and that they look down from the very height of truth, and see that in order to reach them the devotee must rise like them above all systems, and be able to see the truth under all. The Brahman has the greatest opportunity, because his religion is nearest the truth, but it is necessary for him to pierce through so-

called orthodox teachings, and try to find the truth underneath, even though he continues as a Brahman to follow outwardly all the practices which custom enjoins.

The Brahmans have before them this fact, that centuries ago the Rishis were plainly visible and spoke with them, but now-a-days they do not. What is the reason? There must be a reason, and the reason can doubtless be found by you in your own Shasters. I have not altered my opinion since reading your letter. I still think that the destiny of India is to give truth to the world, but that truth must be found underneath of all ceremonies and all practices. It is for the Hindus to find out how they should act, so as to bring back again the glorious supremacy in spiritual matters which India once held in fact.

I sincerely trust that you will not find it necessary to publish the letter, since it might lead to too much misunderstanding with men who are not as capable as yourself, and as the Bhagwat-Gita says, we should not confuse the mind of the ignorant. I beg to offer you the assurances of my fraternal regards.

Sincerely,

(Signed)

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

LETTER III.

THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, AMERICAN SECTION,
GENERAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
HEADQUARTERS: 144, MADISON AVENUE,
NEW YORK,

January 12th, 1894.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have your letter of the 27th of December, replying to my letters of respectively July 4th and 28th of September. I feel much honoured that you have taken so much trouble to write me about this matter.

Respecting the letter in question, I was not able to see the original, as Mr. Sinnett was too busy to find it, and was not able to recollect all the details, and I could not wait in London long enough so as to secure his further attention.

I would like to put the case a little differently from yours, thus:

(a) I asked the Brahmans to co-operate with me in the Theosophical Society.

(b) I said that the Theosophical Society was not in favour of Buddhism as against every other religion, and that it could not be called a Buddhist Propagation Society. The question as to whether the Theosophical Society is, or is not, a danger to Brahmanism I do not think I raised in that way, for I am not sufficiently acquainted with the whole world to know whether the Society might or might not in some respect be a danger to that religion or any other. What I attempted to say was as stated above, and to that I still adhere. I know that Mrs. Besant, Mr. Fullerton, Mr. Mead, myself, and many others are sympathizers with Brahminism, and not with Buddhism, and knowing this, I am qualified to state that the Society is not a Buddhist Society, and should not be looked at with prejudice by the Brahmans, because they thought it was Buddhist. I do not think that the message referred to is inconsistent with this opinion, for if you assume the message to be from one of those personages, it only gives the opinion of that personage. Hence I am not able to give any opinion yet on the question of the genuineness of the message, nor am I qualified to ask the direct question which you request me at the end to do. Supposing that such a question was asked, and the answer came that it was genuine, I do not see myself that it would make any difference in my position, as if such an answer was given I should not alter my beliefs nor my present attitude which personally is favourable to Brahminism, but as

an official is neutral to all religions. I should think that this position which I have outlined now in my letter would be sustained as a mere matter of academic discussion by any of your friends with whom you are accustomed to discuss, and I would be very glad to have you discuss it with them if you see fit.

I knew that you did not mean ill to the Theosophical Society, although I am not well acquainted with you, and am very glad to have you state this to be the fact, *and also very glad to know that you are not in any hurry to publish the message.* I am also extremely delighted to have you as a Hindu, and as a Brahman, state that you believe that there are Mahatmas. You are, of course, quite justified in saying, if you so think, that the particular Mahatmas in question do not exist, or are of the sort which you believe in. But I do not regard even that as dependent upon that particular letter in question. I suppose you take the same view I do in regard to the question of letters and the messages from Mahatmas or sages, that it may often happen that the channel through which they come may distort the intended meaning, and that actual letters written by such personages are rare, because of the great forces which such an act on their part would engender; certainly if one of them actually wrote a letter with his own hands, no one except the most ignorant could fail to feel its force; and yet in such a case it might be quite possible that they, being above all religions, as the Vedas proclaim, might say in their wisdom something that would be contrary to the views of any religionist, whether he were Brahman or not.

I think the Theosophical Society is doing a great deal of good for the religion of India, and that it will be found in the years to come to do more and more, and certainly the present tour of Mrs. Annie Besant, who is a believer in Brahmanism, and not in any sense a Buddhist, is arousing a great deal of spiritual interest in your own country for which I am sure you will not be ungrateful. Please accept the assurances of my brotherly regard.

Yours truly,
(Signed) WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

[The italics in above letters are in the original. — Compiler.]

12a. **Theosophy (The Path)**, Vol. 11, April 1896, pp.14-18.

H.P.B. WAS NOT DESERTED BY THE MASTERS.

THERE are certain things connected with the personality of the great leader which have to be referred to and explained every now and again even in a Society whose effort is as much as possible to avoid the discussion of personalities. Sometimes they are disagreeable, especially when, as in the present instance, some other persons have to be brought in. And when the great leader is H. P. Blavatsky, a whole host of principles and postulates as to certain laws of nature cluster around her name. For not only was she one who brought to us from the wiser brothers of the human family a consistent philosophy of the solar system, but in herself she illustrated practically the existence of the supersensuous world and of the powers of the inner and astral man. Hence any theory or assertion touching on her relations with the unseen and with the Masters she spoke for inevitably opens up the discussion of some law or principle. This of course would not be the case if we were dealing with a mere ordinary person.

Many things were said about H.P.B. in her lifetime by those who tried to understand her, some of them being silly and some positively pernicious. The most pernicious was that made by Mr. A. P. Sinnett in London in the lifetime of H.P.B., and before the writing of the *Secret Doctrine*, that she was deserted by the Masters and was the prey of elementals and elemental forces. He was courageous about it, for he said it to her face, just as he had often told her he thought she was a fraud in other directions.

This theory was far-reaching, as can be seen at a glance. For if true, then anything she might say as from the Masters which did not agree with the opinion of the one addressed could be disposed of as being only the vamping of some elementals. And that very use was made of it. It was not discussed only in the charmed seclusion of the London Lodge, but was talked of by nearly all of the many disciples and would-be disciples crowding around H.P.B. It has left its mark even unto this day. And when the total disagreement arose between H.P.B. and Mr. Sinnett as to the relation of Mars and Mercury to this earth, and as to the metaphysical character of the universe—H. P. B. having produced an explanation from the Master—then the pernicious theory and others like it were brought forward to show she was wrong, did not have word from the Master, and that Mr. Sinnett's narrow and materialistic views of the Master's statement—which had been made before the alleged desertion and elemental possession—were the correct ones. The dispute is imbedded in the *Secret Doctrine*. The whole philosophy hangs upon it. The disagreement came about because Mr. Sinnett held that his view of one of the letters from the Master received in India—through the hand of H.P.B.—was the correct view, whereas she said it was not. He kept rigidly to his position, and she asked the Master for further explanation. When this was received by her and shown to Mr. Sinnett he denied its authenticity, and then the desertion theory would explain the rest. He seemed to forget that she was the channel and he was not.

Although wide publicity was not given to the charge then, it was fully discussed by the many visitors to both camps, and its effect remains to this day among those who of late have turned in private against H. P. B. Among themselves they explain her away very easily, and in public they oppose those who adhere firmly to her memory, her honor, and the truth of her statements about the Masters and their communications to her. They think that by dragging her down to the mediocre level on which they stand they may pretend to understand her, and look wise as they tell when she was and when she was not obsessed. This effort will, of course, be unsuccessful; and some will think the matter need not be brought forward. There are many reasons why it should be discussed and left no longer as a secret poison: because it leads to a negation of brotherhood; to an upholding of ingratitude, one of the blackest crimes; and, if believed, will inevitably lead to the destruction of the great philosophy broadly outlined by the Masters through H.P.B.

If, as claimed by Mr. Sinnett, H.P.B. was deserted by the Masters after they had used her for many years as their agent and channel of communication, such desertion would be evidence of unimaginable disloyalty on their part, utterly opposed to their principles as stated by themselves. For when the advisability of similar desertion was in Mr. Sinnett's mind many years before, when he did not approve of H.P.B.'s methods of conducting the movement in India, Master K. H. emphatically wrote him that "ingratitude is not among our vices," asking him if he would consider it just, "supposing you were thus to come," as H.P.B. did, and were to "abandon all for the truth; to toil wearily for years up the hard, steep road, not daunted by obstacles, firm under every temptation; were to faithfully keep within your heart the secrets entrusted to you as a trial; had worked with all your energies and unselfishly to spread the truth and provoke men to correct thinking and a correct life—would you consider it just, if, after all your efforts," you were to be treated as you propose Mme. Blavatsky should be treated? But this warning evidently produced only a transient effect, for in a few years' time, as stated, Mr. Sinnett came to the conclusion that his suggestion had been acted upon to an even greater extent than he had originally intended. At first he had only wished that H.P.B. should be put on one side as channel between himself and the Master, leaving a newly organized T.S. to his own management under those conditions; but he afterwards thought that H.P.B. had been put on one side as a channel of any sort so far as the Masters were concerned. This wholesale later desertion would mean that in the meantime Master K.H. had entirely changed in character and had become capable of gross ingratitude, which is absurd. Masters are above all things loyal to those who serve them and who sacrifice health, position and their entire lives to the work which is the Master's; and H.P.B. did all this and more, as the Master wrote. To take the other view and imagine that after years of such service as is described in the above quotation, H.P.B. was left to be figuratively devoured by elementals, would prove Masters to be merely monsters of selfishness, using a tool not made of iron but of a wonderful human heart and soul, and throwing this tool away without protection the moment they had done with it.

And how about the members and more faithful disciples who were left in ignorance of this alleged desertion? Would it have been loyal to them? They had been taught for years to look with respect upon H.P.B. and the teachings she gave out, and to regard her as the Masters channel. They received no warning that the plan Mr. Sinnett had for so long carried in his mind could possibly be carried out, but on the contrary often received personally from the Masters endorsements of H.P.B.'s actions and teachings. Those who harbored constant doubts of her veracity were reproved; and yet it would seem for no other apparent reason than a necessary correction by her of Mr. Sinnett's wrong interpretation of earlier teachings she was abandoned by her old teachers and friends who had spent years in training her for just this work!

So the whole of this far-fetched supposition is alike contrary to brotherhood and to occultism. It violates every law of true ethics and of the Lodge, and to crown its absurdity would make the *Secret Doctrine* in large measure the work of elementals. Deserted before the explanation of Mr. Sinnett's mistakes appeared in that book, H.P.B. was obsessed to some advantage, it may be thought! But in fact a great depth of ignorance is shown by those who assert that she was deserted and who add that elementals controlled her, doing the work for her. They do not know the limitations of the elemental: an elemental can only copy what already exists, cannot originate or invent, can only carry out the exact impulse or order given, which if incomplete will cause the result to be similarly incomplete, and will not start work unless pushed on by a human mind and will. In no case is this elemental supposition tenable.

The ignorance shown on this point is an example of the mental standing of most of H.P.B.'s critics. Materialists in their bias, they were unable to understand her teachings, methods or character, and after badly assimilating and materializing the ideas they got originally from her, they proceeded to apply the result to an explanation of everything about her that they could not understand, as if they were fitting together the wooden blocks of several different puzzles. But if in spite of all reason this view of desertion were to be accepted, it would certainly lead in the end, as I have said, to the destruction of the Theosophical philosophy.

Its indirect effect would be as detrimental as the direct effect of degrading the ideal of Masters. This is clearly shown in the *Secret Doctrine*.

After pointing out in her “Introductory” to the *Secret Doctrine* (p. xviii) the preliminary mistake made by the author of *Esoteric Buddhism* in claiming that “two years ago (*i.e.*, 1883) neither I nor any other European living knew the alphabet of the Science, here for the first time put into scientific shape,” when as a matter of fact not only H.P.B. had known all that and much more years before, but two other Europeans and an American as well;—she proceeds to give the Master’s own explanation of his earlier letters in regard to the Earth Chain of Globes and the relation of Mars and Mercury thereto, (vol. i, pp. 160-170, *o.e.*) Mr. Sinnett himself confesses that he had “an untrained mind” in Occultism when he received the letters through H.P.B. on which *Esoteric Buddhism* was based. He had a better knowledge of modern astronomical speculations than of the occult doctrines, and so it was not to be wondered at, as H.P.B. remarks, that he formed a materialistic view of a metaphysical subject. But these are the Master’s own words in reply to an application from H.P.B. for an explanation of what she well knew was a mistake on Mr. Sinnett’s part—the inclusion of Mars and Mercury as globes of the Earth Chain:

“Both (Mars and Mercury) are septenary chains, as independent of the earth’s sidereal lords and superiors as you are independent of the principles of Daumling.” “Unless less trouble is taken to reconcile the irreconcilable—that is to say, the metaphysical and spiritual sciences with physical or natural philosophy, ‘natural’ being a synonym to them (men of science) of that matter which falls under the perception of their corporeal senses—no progress can be really achieved. Our Globe, as taught from the first, is at the bottom of the arc of descent, where the matter of our perceptions exhibits itself in its grossest form. . . . Hence it only stands to reason that the globes which overshadow our Earth must be on different and superior planes. In short, as globes, they are in *coädunition but not in consubstantiality with our Earth*, and thus pertain to quite another state of consciousness.”

Unless this be accepted as the correct explanation, the entire philosophy becomes materialistic and contradictory, analogy ceases to be of any value, and both the base and superstructure of Theosophy must be swept away as useless rubbish. But there is no fear of this, for the Master’s explanation will continue to be accepted by the large majority of Theosophists.

And as to H.P.B. personally, these words might possibly be remembered with advantage: “Masters say that Nature’s laws have set apart woe for those who spit back in the face of their teacher, for those who try to belittle her work and make her out to be part good and part fraud; those who have started on the path through her must not try to belittle her work and aim. They do not ask for slavish idolatry of a person, but loyalty is required. They say that the Ego of that body she uses was and is a great and brave servant of the Lodge, sent to the West for a mission with full knowledge of the insult and obloquy to be surely heaped upon that devoted head; and they add: ‘Those who cannot understand her had best not try to explain her; those who do not find themselves strong enough for the task she outlined from the very first had best not attempt it.’”

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

12b. **Theosophy (The Path)**, Vol. 11, July 1896, pp.122-123.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To The Editor of THEOSOPHY:—

Dear Sir,—In your issue for April I observe an article entitled “H. P. B. was not deserted by the Masters,” in which certain statements are made concerning myself which it seems my plain duty to correct. I am represented as having said that “in the lifetime of H. P. B. and before the writing of the *Secret Doctrine* she was deserted by the Masters and was the prey of elementals and elemental forces.” Also that I told Mme. Blavatsky “to her face . . . that she was a fraud in other directions.”

I never said anything of the kind, and I never in my life called Mme. Blavatsky a “fraud.”

The accusation is doubly absurd because for many years past and since before the period referred to I have had means of my own for knowing that Mme. Blavatsky had not been deserted by the Masters, and I know that she was in their care up to the last day of her life. That condition of things should not, it is true, be held to imply that every word Mme. Blavatsky wrote was inspired and that every statement she made was correct. No impression connected with the Theosophical movement can be more erroneous than the notion that persons who may be in true psychic touch with the Masters are therefore guided by them in every act of their lives. Every one so circumstanced works under the law of individual responsibility and has abundant opportunity for making mistakes. Of this freedom Mme. Blavatsky availed herself largely, for example in connection with her unfortunate misapprehension of the teaching about the planetary chain. But I have dealt with that subject in other writings and do not seek to argue the question in your pages afresh.

It is to be regretted when Theosophical students are misled about the teachings of occult science in reference to cosmology, but after all the bearings of those teachings on individual spiritual progress concern us much more immediately. I merely write now to dissipate the delusion on which Mr. Judge’s article is founded, and to express at the same time my great regret that his latest utterances concerning myself should have been colored by stories as to my sayings and mental attitude that were entirely untrue.

A. P. SINNETT.

London, May 6, 1896.

[I insert the above communication, in spite of the fact that Mr. Judge is no longer with us to answer Mr. Sinnett’s objections to statements made in the article “H. P. B. was not Deserted by the Masters.” I well know that if Mr. Judge had been alive he would have been most anxious to accept the statements made by Mr. Sinnett in the above letter, though I am also well aware that Mr. Judge’s authority for his original position was Mme. H. P. Blavatsky herself.—ED.]

12c. **Theosophy**, Vol. 10, October 1922, pp.394-395 and **The Theosophical Movement 1875-1950**, pp.258-259.

The reply of Mr. Sinnett to Mr. Judge’s article was a *public* denial of the charge. Privately, in 1895, shortly after publication in the *Path* of the Prayag Letter, he wrote to Alexander Fullerton a full account of his “suspicions” of H.P.B. This letter, which was obtained by the Boston *Herald* and printed on April 27, 1895, was as follows:

. . . I have known for a great many years that many letters in the Mahatmas’ handwriting, coming through Madame Blavatsky herself were anything but what they seemed.

The trouble in this respect began about the year 1887, when Madame Blavatsky was in this country [England] and desirous of carrying out many arrangements with the society in London of which I personally disapproved. To my surprise I received through her letters in the familiar handwriting of the Mahatma K.H. which endorsed her views and desired my compliance. These gave me great distress at the time, though I did not at first suspect the *bona fides* of their origin.

The flavour of their style was unlike that to which I had been used during the long course of my previous correspondence with the Mahatma, and gradually my mind was forced to the conviction that they could not be really authentic. A year or so later, when the Coulomb scandal had for the moment almost overwhelmed Madame Blavatsky's influence here, I visited her in her retirement at Wurzburg, and in the intimate conversation that ensued she frankly avowed to me that the letters to which I have above referred had not proceeded from the Mahatma at all.

She had in fact procured their production in order to subserve what she conceived to be the right policy of the society at the time—falling into the fatal error of doing evil that good might come. There is no room for supposing that I am mistaken in my recollections of what passed. These are clear and definite, and were the subject of much conversation between myself and theosophical friends at the time.

Moreover, at a somewhat later date, when Madame Blavatsky was staying at Ostende, I again referred to the matter, and said that I considered myself to have been hardly used, in so far as my deepest sentiments of loyalty to the Mahatma had been practiced upon for purposes with which he had nothing to do. Madame Blavatsky, I remember, replied: "Well, you were not much hurt, because, after all, you never believed the letters were genuine. . . ."

With publication of these views, it was evident that of the four theosophists prominent before the world after H.P.B.'s death—H. S. Olcott, A. P. Sinnett, William Q. Judge, and Annie Besant—only one, Judge, was faithful to her and to her ideals.

13. **Theosophy**, Vol. 8, January 1920, pp.67-70.

MESSAGES FROM THE MASTERS

UNDER the title of *Letters From the Masters of the Wisdom*, Mrs. Besant's Theosophical Publishing House has issued a small volume containing a number of the Messages from the Masters of H. P. B. to various persons during the period from 1881 to 1888. There is a Foreword by Mrs. Besant, and there are Notes, mostly historical, by Mr. C. Jinarajadasa, who transcribed the Messages, some from originals at Adyar, and others from copies in the possession of various persons. Aside from the possible minor errors of transcription there is no doubt in our mind as to the genuineness of these particular Messages. The important portions of the contents of most of them were printed many years ago in the various Theosophical publications of the time. Those publications have been practically inaccessible to students for years, so this magazine began reprinting in 1912 their valuable contents, and this labor of love has been continued through all the intervening years and will go on. In this way many students have been helped in their studies and applications of the noble philosophy imparted by H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge. Amongst other reprints THEOSOPHY has republished these old Messages from the Masters, and in its pages will be found numerous Messages either unknown to Mrs. Besant and Mr. Jinarajadasa, or, for reasons best known to themselves, not included by them in the volume under review.

Letter I of the volume was originally published in *Lucifer* for August, 1896. Letter XL, the last in the volume, is an extract of a single sentence, as follows: "You have still to learn that so long as there are three men worthy of our Lord's blessing in the T. S., it can never be destroyed." Mr. Jinarajadasa's Note 59, referring to this Message says, "I have not been able to trace the original letter in which this occurs, but it is reprinted in *The Theosophist*, November, 1907, p. 167. It seems passing strange to us that Mrs. Besant and Mr. Jinarajadasa should not be "able to trace the original letter in which this occurs," seeing the many claims made by them and on their behalf of Theosophical knowledge and Occult powers. Every old student who is at all familiar with history, theosophically speaking, and particularly every probationer, even, of the Second Section, should have been able to recognize and identify instantly this Letter. It was embodied in a *Memorandum*, issued by H. P. B. in the early part of 1890, and the circumstances of its receipt and its text were given by her. The same *Memorandum* contained very long extracts from another Message from the Master, and other matter of extreme importance. As the entire subject matter referred to things entirely at variance with Mrs. Besant's conduct from 1894 to the present time, it may very well be that she has forgotten the Source. Such things happen under Occult law. Certainly we know, at all events, that she once knew that which Mr. Jinarajadasa says he has been unable to trace.

What that subject matter was can be fairly well inferred by the thoughtful, even if uninitiated Theosophist, familiar with the course of Theosophical history since 1881-1888, the dates of the Letters included in the volume. And it relates to the very matter contained in Letter XIX, from the Master K. H. to Col. Olcott, given in full in this volume—the *status and position of H. P. B. from the standpoint of the Masters*. Full extracts from this letter were published in *Lucifer* for October, 1888, their authenticity certified to by Col. Olcott. Still larger portions of the Letter were contained in a circular pamphlet sent out by H. P. B. at the same time "To Theosophists." Both the *Memorandum* and the Letter XIX were part of the cycle of events connected with the public *Notice* of the formation of the E. S. T. and the reincarnation under that name of the true Theosophical Society, on the one hand; and, on the other, the dark side of the cycle, with the Coulomb case, the S. P. R. Report, the desertion of H. P. B. publicly or privately by leading Theosophists, culminating in the savage accusations of Mabel Collins and Professor Eliot Coues on the good name and faith of H. P. B. and W. Q. J. The storm of 1889 within the Society presaged the cyclone of assaults in 1894-5 by Col. Olcott, Mrs. Besant, Mr. Sinnett and others on the Occult status of H. P. B. and the reputation of Mr. Judge.

We would respectfully suggest to earnest and sincere members of Mrs. Besant's Society for the sake of their Society, whose motto is, "there is no religion higher than Truth," that they should invite, request, urge, demand if need be, of Mrs. Besant that she publish in full, *verbatim et literatim*, *first*, the letter from H. P. B. to Col. Olcott, dated April 11, 1885, the original of which is in her possession; *second*, the Report of a conversation between the Master and H. P. B. at the same period, the original of which is in her possession; *third*, the letter from H. P. B. to Mr. Judge, dated March 27, 1891, a copy of which is in her possession. All these are of the utmost importance to Theosophists at large, but particularly important to those sincere members of Mrs. Besant's Society who have been led to believe (a) that Col. Olcott spoke with knowledge and authority in regard to H. P. B.; (b) that Mrs. Besant's society is *the* theosophical society; (c) that Mrs. Besant is the "Successor" of H. P. B.

While we are on this subject it may, perhaps, be well to refer to another Message from the Masters not included in Mr. Jinarajadasa's compilation, but one we must assume to have been well-known to him, and which we *know* to have been well-known to Mrs. Besant. In March, 1895, Mr. Judge published in *The Path* "A Mahatma's Letter to Some Brahmins." This was a Message from the Master, writing through H. P. B., to the Prayag Branch of the T. S., at Allahabad, India, in 1881. Copies of the Message had been in circulation from hand to hand for many years and orthodox Brahmins of India were (and still are) very bitter over the Master's plain speaking in that Letter. Both Col. Olcott and Mrs. Besant had been stating privately that H. P. B. was a "medium," irresponsible, and the deliverer at times of "cooked" and bogus messages. To put a stop to these stabs in the dark at the memory and status of H. P. B., Mr. Judge published this Message, declared it genuine and invited Col. Olcott and Mrs. Besant to go on record publicly. Col. Olcott "stopped the presses" of *The Theosophist* to declare in a "Postscript" in the April number, 1895, that the message was fraudulent and H. P. B. a mere irresponsible medium. In *Lucifer* for May and July, 1895, Mrs. Besant says, "I do not regard the letter as genuine." Long afterwards, however, Mrs. Besant admitted the genuineness of the source and substance of this celebrated "Prayag Letter," in *The Theosophist* for January, 1909. And at the very time Olcott wrote his savage denunciation of H. P. B.'s good faith as the Messenger of the Masters, he not only had in his possession Letter XIX referred to above, but a direct letter from H. P. B., written in 1881, on the matter. This letter is in Mrs. Besant's possession.

But Mrs. Besant never in any way reproved either Col. Olcott or Mr. Sinnett for their calumnies and slanders in regard to H. P. B. and Mr. Judge. On the contrary she remained in full amity and accord with them theosophically, shared in their accusations, and has never since acknowledged her terrible mistake except in a roundabout way, as above, and as in her conversation with Mr. H. W. Percival of New York. It was due to her, and Olcott, more than to any and all others, that H. P. B. and W. Q. J. remain to this day belittled, obscured, defamed, before many Theosophists, and before the world as charlatans and forgers. Col. Olcott is dead, without ever having retracted his charges except in private to one person. Mrs. Besant is still living, but in the natural course with but a few years before her departure. She has never lacked in courage and sincerity, however great her mistakes and errors which have so many times laid her open to influences that have rendered her career so ruinous to the work of the true Theosophical Movement. She still has time and opportunity to use her powerful voice, her wide influence, her high courage and her great abilities to aid in the noble task of restoring before the world the true status of H. P. B. and W. Q. J. True, this will necessarily involve the admission of her own inconsistencies and mistakes, but what of that? She has done it many times before, and what nobler course can be taken by the brave and sincere, even if mistaken and misguided Soul? "Arise, then, O Atlantean, and repair the mischief done so long ago!"


Every true student of Theosophy owes a debt alike to Mrs. Besant and to Mr. Jinarajadasa for bringing these Messages together in accessible and handy form. Who knows what it may lead to? The time is propitious, the necessity never greater, the opportunity, therefore, never so near, for Theosophists of every ilk and persuasion, high and low, to turn once again to the Message of the Masters, both the Message embodied in

these “Letters,” and that larger Message embodied in every line written, every work performed, every example set, by Masters, by H. P. B., by W. Q. J. Thus may we all become the better able to help and teach others, and all draw closer to the realization of the great First Object—the formation of a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood without distinction of race, creed, sex or condition,” among those who call themselves *Theosophists*.

14. **Theosophy**, Vol. 10, October 1922, p.407.

Note on the “Prayag Letter”

We promised, in speaking earlier of the “Prayag letter” to show that Mrs. Besant long afterwards admitted its substantial genuineness. The evidence will be found in the “Theosophist,” Volume XXX, pp. 368-9, January, 1909, in “Echoes from the Past,” under the caption, “The Allahabad Letter.” It contains, along with some ingenious remarks (by Mrs. Besant presumably, since they are unsigned), the text (with certain omissions) of a letter of H. P. B. to Col. Olcott (not named in the article), dated November 25th, 1881, in which the essential statements are verified, though with the same reservations as made by Mr. Judge in publishing the “message.” In perusing H. P. B.’s letter, the reader must remember that the “Prayag message” created a fierce resentment among the Brahmins, and that Olcott was wild in consequence, thinking the “message” would upset all his work in India. Not alone the Brahmins were deeply offended but Mr. Hume told the Council of the Prayag T. S., that the Master who would send such a letter as that was “no gentleman.” It would seem he was psychically “overheard” by that very Master Himself—another “phenomenon”—for Letter XXX in the book, “Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom,” refers to this very incident, among other matters.



APPENDIX

C



HISTORICAL SKETCH

Table of Contents ~ Appendix C

1. “Historical Sketch of The Theosophical Society.” <i>From the Records of the T. S., from 1875 to the present day.</i>	169-174
2. “Historic Theosophical Leaves.” The very first pages from the Minute Book of the Theosophical Society, in the handwriting of John Storer Cobb. Photographic plate (facsimile) of the September 8 th , 1875, MINUTES.	174-175 176
3. “The Theosophical Society.” INSIDE FACTS AS TO ITS ORGANIZATION.—A <i>DE FACTO</i> BODY.—THE REAL T. S. IN NEW YORK.— THE PRESIDENT STILL A DELEGATE TO FOREIGN LANDS, AND HOLDING OVER IN OFFICE.	177-180
4. Mrs. Keightley addresses the Ninth Annual Convention of the American Section T.S., First Convention of T.S. in America, and explains why there is a need to change the By-laws, followed by Proclamation drafted by Mr. Spencer.	181-183
5. Elliott B. Page’s Diploma, signed by Abner Doubleday as pro tem President of The Theosophical Society of New York. The First American Branch established in St. Louis, Missouri. Photographed copy of the first Charter issued for an American Branch of the T.S.	184 184 185
6. A circular letter issued by members of the T.S. in New York and Brooklyn, through HENRY T. PATTERSON, F.T S. Signed by 121 F.T.S. members. It was unofficial, and an individual declaration of views.	186-190
7. “The American Board of Control” by Compiler; Facsimile of its Seal. Notes with regard to the Applicants for fellowship.	190 191
8. Application for Fellowship in the T.S. by Henry T. Patterson. The T. S. Obligation form.	192 193
9. Application for Fellowship in the T.S. by George D. Ayers. The T.S. Obligation form.	194 195
10. Application for Fellowship in the T.S. by Jerome A. Anderson. The T. S. Obligation form.	196 197
11. Application for Fellowship in the T.S. by Abbott B. Clark. The T.S. Obligation form.	198 199
12. Application for Fellowship in the T.S. by Edward B. Rambo. The T.S. Obligation form.	200 201
13. Application for Fellowship in the T.S. by Myron H. Phelps. Secretaries and Branch Presidents please note:	202 203
14. Application for Fellowship in the T.S. By Joseph Hall Fussell. Secretaries and Branch Presidents please note:	204 205

15. Diploma issued by The Theosophical Society in America*, to Charles A. Lazenby. 206
16. Sketches of Adyar Headquarters by William Q. Judge.
 “Habitations of H.P.B.” **The Path**, Vol. 7, June 1892, pp.71-75 207-211
 “Headquarters at Adyar in 1882.” **The Theosophist**, Vol. 52, August 1931, p.658 210-211

* The T.S. in A. was sometimes called the “Hargrove Group”. After the organization under Katherine Tingley was renamed “The Universal Brotherhood” in 1898, Hargrove and others fought to regain control over the name “Theosophical Society in America” which had been adopted at the Boston Convention in 1895. — Compiler

1. The following report was read by Mr. Wade to the Delegates gathered for the Ninth Annual Convention of the American Section T.S. on Sunday afternoon April 28th, 1895. (The First Convention of the Theosophical Society in America was held April 29th). It was published in the **Report of Proceedings** [pp.18-24], along with "Legal Opinion by Geo. D. Ayers, Counsellor-At-Law, Boston, on The Statement of Facts Relating to The Theosophical Society" [pp.52-53]. Following the Convention(s) Fred J. Dick issued a 20-page pamphlet on June 3rd, 1895, titled **What Is The Theosophical Organization?**, which included both.

[18] HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

From the Records of the T. S., from 1875 to the present day.

At a meeting held in the rooms of H. P. Blavatsky, 46 Irving Place, New York City, Sept. 7, 1875, it was agreed to form a society for the purpose of occult study.

Upon motion of William Q. Judge, Henry S. Olcott was elected chairman of this meeting, and upon motion of H. S. Olcott, William Q. Judge was elected secretary of the same.

Adjourned to Sept. 8, 1875.

Pursuant to adjournment, a meeting was held at the same place, Sept. 8, 1875.

Upon motion of William Q. Judge, it was voted that H. S. Olcott take the Chair.

W. Q. Judge was elected secretary.

"The Chair then called for the names of those persons present who would agree to found and belong to a society such as had been mentioned. The following persons handed their names to the Secretary: Col. Olcott, Mme. H. P. Blavatsky, Chas. Sotheran, Dr. Chas. E. Simmons, H. D. Monachesi, C. C. Massey of London, W. L. Alden, G. H. Felt, D. E. de Lara, Dr. Britten, Mrs. E. H. Britten, Henry J. Newton, John Storer Cobb, J. Hyslop, W. Q. Judge, H. M. Stevens." (From the original minutes of the meeting.)

Upon motion, a committee of four, including the Chairman, was appointed "to draft a constitution and by-laws, and to report the same at the next meeting."

Adjourned to Monday, Sept. 13, 1875, at the same place.

The original minutes of the next meeting are erroneously dated "Monday evening, September 18th, 1875," instead of the 13th, which was the true date; and this error was copied by Col. Olcott in his "Old Diary Leaves," *Theosophist*, Dec., 1892, p.131.

Sept. 13, 1875, a meeting was held, pursuant to adjournment. H. S. Olcott acted as Chairman, and C. Sotheran as Secretary. The Committee on "Preamble and By-laws" reported progress.

"At the suggestion of the Committee it was upon motion

"*Resolved*, That the name of the Society be THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY."

A committee to select meeting rooms was appointed.

"Several persons then gave in their names, or were proposed for membership, and upon motion it was "*Resolved*, That these persons be added to the list of founders."

Adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

Pursuant to a notice dated at New York, Oct. 13, 1875, signed "Henry S. Olcott, President, *pro tem*." ("Old Diary Leaves," Dec., 1892, p.135), a meeting was held at 206 West Thirty-eighth Street, Saturday, Oct. 16, 1875, "to organize and elect officers," as stated in the notice.

Eighteen persons were present.

The "Preamble and By-Laws" were laid upon the table and ordered printed.

[19]Adjourned subject to the call of the Chair. H. S. Olcott was Chairman and J. S. Cobb, Secretary.

Saturday, Oct. 30, 1875, the Society met at 206 West Thirty-eighth Street, Henry S. Olcott in the chair and J. S. Cobb acting Secretary.

Mott Memorial Hall, 64 Madison Avenue, New York City, was selected as the Society's meeting place. By-laws were adopted and a committee was appointed "to complete the work upon the Preamble, with power to adopt and print the same as the Preamble of the Society."

“It was resolved, that the election of officers be now proceeded with. Upon motion, it was resolved, that at the same time a counsellor-at-law be elected to act as Counsel to the Society.”

Officers were elected as follows:—

President, Henry S. Olcott.

Vice-Presidents, Dr. S. Pancoast and G. H. Felt.

Cor. Secretary, Mme. H. P. Blavatsky.

Recording Secretary, John Storer Cobb.

Treasurer, Henry J. Newton.

Librarian, Charles H. Sotheran.

Councillors, Rev. J. H. Wiggin, R. B. Westbrook, LL. D., Mrs. Emma Hardinge Britten, C. E. Simmons, M. D., and Herbert D. Monachesi.

Counsel to the Society, William Q. Judge.

“Upon motion, it was

“*Resolved*, that we now adjourn to meet at Mott Memorial Hall, on Wednesday, Nov. 17, at 8 P. M.”

In the *Theosophist*, Nov. 1890, p. 66, Col. Olcott says: “On the latter occasion (Oct. 30), an adjourned meeting was appointed for the formal inauguration of the officers, and the opening address of the President. Thus the executive life of the society dates from the evening last specified.” (Nov. 17.)

There is nothing in the minutes of the meeting of Oct. 30, 1875, to indicate that the “formal inauguration of the officers” was postponed to Nov. 17.

For historical purposes, we will give the entire minutes of the “meeting held at No. 64 Madison Ave., on Wednesday, Nov. 17, 1875.

“The meeting was called to order at 8.15 P. M., Henry S. Olcott, President, in the chair. The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved; and the Rev. Geo. H. Hepworth and Mrs. Charles Sotheran were nominated for fellowship.

“Letters from Vice-President Geo. H. Felt, and Mr. D. G. de Lara, expressing regret at their absence from the meeting, were then read; after which the President delivered his inaugural address, at the conclusion of which it was moved by Treasurer Newton, that a vote of thanks be presented to the President for his able address, and that the address be printed.

“Moved by T. F. Thomas, as an amendment, that the address be stereotyped and five hundred copies be printed for immediate distribution. This amendment being accepted by Treasurer Newton, the resolution, as amended, was put to the meeting and carried unanimously. Upon motion, it was resolved that we now adjourn. (Signed) H. S. Olcott, President; J. Storer Cobb, Rec. Sec’y.”

In the *Theosophist*, December, 1892, p.139, the colonel says: “Thus the Theosophical Society, first conceived of on the 8th of September and constitutionally perfected on the 17th of November, 1875, after a gestatory period of seventy days, came into being and started on its marvellous career.” Yes, it is true that from the 8th September to 17th November is 70 days, but the rest of it is not true. The Theosophical Society was “first [20] conceived of” Sept. 7, according to the record in the *Theosophist*, November, 1892, p.68; and it was “constitutionally perfected” Oct. 30, 1875, according to the minutes of the society; but that would only be fifty-three days.

Quoting again from the *Theosophist*, December, 1892, p.136, “Inadvertently, in our first published document, the *Preamble and By-Laws of the Theosophical Society*, the 30th of October was given as the date of organization.” The title-page of the original “Preamble and By-Laws” of the Theosophical Society says that it was “organized Oct. 30, 1875,” and that was and is in accord with facts.

The “gestatory period of 70 days” was, apparently, only thought of after several years, as we find the “Rules” etc., of the Theosophical Society, printed at p.179 of the *Theosophist* for April, 1880, headed with the statement: “The Theosophical Society, or Universal Brotherhood. Formed at New York, U. S. of America, October 30, 1875.”

The By-Laws adopted provided that “Nominations for fellowship shall be made in writing by two Fellows in good standing at a regular meeting of the Society, and referred, without debate, to the Council,

which shall vote thereon not sooner than 30, nor later than 60, days thereafter.” Also that “no alteration in the By-Laws of the Society, and no substitution of others in their place, shall be made unless offered in writing at a stated meeting of the Society, at least one month prior to final action and adoption, by a vote of two-thirds of the fellows present.”

Regular meetings of the Society were held at New York, from time to time, and minutes kept. In 1878, Mr. Cobb, the Recording Secretary at the time of organization, was sent to London, where in June of that year he established the “British Theosophical Society.” His commission, which we insert for historical purposes, was as follows:

“To the Corresponding Fellows of the Theosophical Society in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Greeting:—

“Know ye, that the aforesaid Society, by its President and Council, doth hereby commission John Storer Cobb, LL.D., as its special representative, to call a meeting of Corresponding Fellows at the city of London, on the first Thursday of December, or such other day of the present year as may be most convenient, for the purpose of organizing a Branch Society to be known as the ‘British Theosophical Society’; to represent the President of this Society at the same; to administer to such as may not have previously taken it, the obligation of secrecy; and to impart the grips, passwords, and signs by which Fellows may know each other in case of need. And we do enjoin upon you that you be faithful and discreet in all that pertains to your relations with this Society and with the Branch Society for whose organization this shall be your Warrant.

“In testimony whereof, we have caused these presents to be signed by the proper officers and sealed with the seal of the Theosophical Society, at the City of New York, in the year 1887 [1878], and of the formation of this Society the second.

H. S. OLCOTT, *President.*

[SEAL] ALEXANDER WILDER, R. B. WESTBROOK, *Vice-Presidents.*

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Corresponding Secretary.*

A. GUSTAM, *Recording Secretary.*”

In the *Theosophist* for November, 1890, p.67, Col. Olcott says: “They ultimately organized in the year 1878, with the help of Dr. Storer Cobb *as my official delegate.*” As was seen above, Mr. Cobb was the “delegate” of the T. S. and not of its President.

“Mr. C. C. Massey was elected President. In November of the same year it was resolved that the title of the Society should be, The Theosophical Society of London, a branch of the Theosophical Society of the Arya Samaj of Aryavart.” (Report of the 1st Annual Convention of the “Theosophical Society in Europe,” p.36.)

In a letter quoted in the *Theosophist* for July, 1882, Supplement, p.8, Swami Dayanand Saraswati said: “Afterwards they sent me a diploma, as it was then intended to make the Theosophical Society a BRANCH of the Arya Samaj of Aryavarta Of course, neither the Arya Samaj nor the T. S. was to be considered a branch of the other, but only the Vedic Section of the T. S.”

[21]Correspondence was held by the New York Society with the Swami in 1878, with the result that many members of the T. S. were given diplomas certifying to membership in “The Theosophical Society of the Arya Samaj of Aryavart.”

In the latter part of 1878, Col. Olcott and Mme. Blavatsky were appointed a “Committee of the T. S.” in New York, to visit foreign lands and report to the Society. The *Theosophist* for October, 1879, Vol. I., No. I, p.1, first item, says: “For the convenience of future reference, it may as well be stated here that the Committee, sent to India by the Theosophical Society, sailed from New York, Dec. 17, 1878, and landed at Bombay, Feb. 16, 1879, having passed two weeks in London on the way.” In same vol., p.95, Col. Olcott says he “came to India with two English colleagues and their learned Corresponding Secretary, Madame Blavatsky. They came only expecting to study eastern religion and Yoga Vidya, and report their discoveries to the Western Theosophists.” On arrival in India, the Colonel had their pictures taken and sent to America, endorsed by him “the delegation to India.” The Society in New York consisted of over 40 members at this time. From Oct. 30, 1875, to Jan. 1, 1879, all alterations of the By-Laws were made in regular and formal manner by the Society in New York, which organization was kept up for some seven years or more, as originally constituted.

What purported to be “Revised Rules of the Theosophical Society” were adopted at Bombay in October, 1879, by a body which called itself the “General Council of the Theosophical Society.” There was published in the *Theosophist* for April, 1880, Volume I., page 179, “The Theosophical Society, or Universal Brotherhood. [Formed at New York, United States of America, Oct. 30, 1875.] Principles, Rules, and By-Laws as revised in General Council, at the meeting held at the palace of H. H. the Maharajah of Vizianagram, Benares, 17th December, 1879.” To this was subjoined the statement “Revised and ratified by the Society at Bombay, February the 26th and 28th, 1880. Attest, Kharsedji N. Seervai, Joint Recording Secretary.”

Just what sort of a “roving commission” was given the “Committee sent to India” does not appear in the records, but authority to admit active members could not have been given without amending the By-Laws, and no such amendment was made. The fact is, as has been shown above, that when the Committee left New York they went “only expecting to study Eastern Religions and [Y]oga Vidya, and report their discoveries to the Western Theosophists”; and Swami Dayanand says of them, as quoted in supplement to June *Theosophist*, 1882, p.6, “They came to India as students, but have set themselves up as teachers, by establishing a Society of their own which has proved of no practical good to India.”

Col. Olcott has, in many places, tried to show that when the Committee sailed away, the New York Society went into “innocuous desuetude,” which is “United States” for *Samadhi*. In the *Theosophist* for December, 1892, p.139, he says: “Mr. Judge, General Doubleday, and their associates in the original T. S., whom we left in charge on leaving for India.” “We” did not leave anybody in charge. Gen. Abner Doubleday was elected President, *pro tem.*, by the Society, to serve during the absence of the President; and this election was never revoked, and the position was legally held by the General up to his death. This authority was exercised more than three years after the departure of the Committee, as is shown in the *Theosophist*, November, 1882, Supplement, p.2, where it says, “Prof. A. L. Rawson, LL. D., F. T. S., as delegated representative of Major-General A. Doubleday, Acting-President of the (New York) T. S., organized at Rochester, N. Y., on the 27th day of July, the local Branch for which a charter had been duly issued from the Bombay Headquarters.” The application for permission to form this Branch is given in full in the Supplement to April, 1892, *Theosophist*, p.2, from which we quote: “. . . hereby make application to the Parent Society in New York, [22] for a charter, with permission to form a branch association, to be known as ‘The Rochester Branch of the New York Theosophical Society.’”

A letter printed in July, 1882, *Theosophist* (Supplement, p.17), is prefaced: “From Major-General Abner Doubleday, U. S. A., President *pro tem.*, Theosophical Society, New York.”

At a meeting held in New York, March 22, 1882, “the initiation of Mr. John F. Oakey was then proceeded with,” as is stated in the minutes.

In Supplement to November, 1883, *Theosophist*, p.22, Elliott B. Page, then President of the St. Louis T. S., says their members “were initiated (June 5, 1883) by Frank Kraft, who acted by authority of a special resolution passed by the Council at New York.” All of which goes to show that the activity of the original Society was kept up.

A great deal of confusion has existed as to the “Parent” Society. That the T. S., as such, was founded and organized at New York, Oct. 30, 1875, there can be no doubt, and it would naturally follow that the New York Society should be considered the “parent”; and it was considered at least one of them, as we find an item in the supplement to December, 1882, *Theosophist*, p.8, “Mr. John H. Judge, Acting Recording Secretary of the New York (Parent) Society. . . .”

But then it is not so strange that a society, as well as a respectable person, should have two parents, and we have many references in the early volumes of the *Theosophist* to an Indian one. At page 8 of the Supplement to June, 1882, *Theosophist*, is a letter signed “One of the Hindu Founders of the Parent T. S.”

The time was ripe for such a *Movement*, and it quickly spread from New York to England, where it was first carried by Mr. C. C. Massey, one of the founders, and then the “Committee” introduced it to India and other Eastern countries. Then, as now, it easily took root everywhere.

Independence of Branches and Lodges has been claimed from the beginning. The Simla Eclectic T. S. always asserted it, as did the London Lodge which succeeded the British T. S. Mr. A. P. Sinnett, in a letter

addressed to Col. Olcott (Rep. of the 4th Convention of Europ. Section, p.39), said “. . . I was glad to receive a letter from you recognizing the London Lodge as standing on an independent footing.” H. P. B. in *Lucifer*, Vol. IV., p.509, says: “. . . Sections and Branches like the ‘London Lodge’ and others, which *are autonomous*.” (Again p.508), she says: “H. P. Blavatsky will always bow before the decision of the majority of a Section or even a simple Branch; but she will ever protest against the decision of the General Council, were it composed of Archangels and Dhyān Chohans themselves, if their decision seems to her unjust or untheosophical, or fails to meet with the approval of a majority of the Fellows.”

Again, same page, she says: “There is no longer a Parent Society; it is abolished and replaced by an aggregate body of Theosophical Societies, *all autonomous*.” The italics are hers.

When the British Section was formed, the London Lodge refused to go into it and claimed its independence, which was allowed; it voluntarily became a part of the “Theosophical Society in Europe” in 1890, but withdrew in 1891, saying: “Clinging with great tenacity, however, to the principle of autonomy, it will now revert to its former status, and while heartily in sympathy with all bodies recognized as parts of the world-wide Theosophical Society which Mme. Blavatsky and Col. Olcott founded, it will not take any share in the administration or control of any other Branches.” (Rep. of 1st Ann. Conv. T. S. in Europe.)

In July, 1890, the following appeared in *Lucifer*, Vol. VI., p.428:

“NOTICE.—In obedience to the almost unanimous voice of the Fellows of the Theo-[23]sophical Society in Europe, I, H. P. Blavatsky, the originator and Co-Founder of the Theosophical Society, accept the duty of exercising the presidential authority for the whole of Europe; and in virtue of this authority I declare that the Headquarters of the Theosophical Society in London, where I reside, will in future be the Headquarters for the transaction of all official business of the Theosophical Society in Europe.

“H. P. BLAVATSKY.”

In a letter dated May 17, 1893, written by Col. Olcott to Mr. Judge, he says:—

“If you want separate Theosophical Societies made out of Sections, have them by all means. I offered this years ago to H. P. B., and even to A. P. S. [Sinnott].”

Though perhaps out of place here, we cannot refrain from quoting the following tribute from Col. Olcott to Mr. Judge: “Though so very much my junior in both age and experience, I liked him from the first; and have always fully appreciated his excellent qualities, as they developed themselves in the course of time. The crowning proof of my regard has just been given in my accepting him as my successor in office; which I hope he may fill even more acceptably than I have.” (*Theos.*, Nov., 1892, p.73.)

The Theosophical Society, as representing the *Theosophical Movement*, is the result of evolution and growth. Those who gathered together in September and October, 1875, in New York, had not the remotest idea of the present lines upon which the movement is conducted.

The second clause of the first sentence of the Preamble which H. S. Olcott wrote, said “they seek ‘to obtain knowledge of the nature and attributes of the Supreme Power and of the higher spirits *by the aid of physical processes*.” The italics are in the original.

In *Theosophist*, November, 1890, p.67, he quotes the second clause of the sentence, but not the first, and says, “I drafted this document myself.” Probably H. P. B. knew what she was about, but certainly the others did not. They were after “proof of the existence of an ‘Unseen Universe,’ the nature of its inhabitants, if such there be, and the laws which govern them and their relations with mankind.” (Preamble.) They all thought that in Mme. Blavatsky they had found an extraordinary medium, nothing more; and the Colonel has not recovered from that delusion to this day, as witness his “Old Diary Leaves.”

The connecting links between the original Society in New York and the present Federation of Branches in this country are all complete. The earlier Branches were formed by delegates from New York, and they established the old “Board of Control,” which was superseded in regular form by the present Federation known as the “American Section T.S.,” all done by delegates from the Branches, as is shown by continuous minutes kept in a book that is still used for that purpose.

From a careful consideration of all the facts as above set forth, it follows: That the T. S., *as an organization founded at N. Y. in 1875*, never had any existence outside of New York City, and could not, and cannot, have. Its By-Laws were adopted by a vote and could only be changed by a like vote. They sent a delegate to London and he founded a *new* society there. They sent a "Committee" to India and they founded a new Society there. They were to "investigate and report," but as yet they have not rendered their report.

By formal "resolution," the original Society was named "The Theosophical Society," but at different times we find, "The Theosophical Society of the Ayra [sic] Samaj of Aryawart"; "The Theosophical Society, or Universal Brotherhood," and now "The Theosophical Society *and* Universal Brotherhood."

None of the various sets of "Rules," "Principles," "By-Laws," "Constitutions," etc., promulgated from time to time by alleged "General Councils," were ever sub-[24]mitted to the members of the Society in New York, and that Society never voted on *any* of them. They were never even submitted to any of the Branches, nor to any convention of delegates of Branches, anywhere, and are not binding on any one. No body representative of all the *Branches* ever elected Col. Olcott "President for life," and no such body ever "appointed" William Q. Judge Vice-President. Col. Olcott simply announced such appointment to the alleged "General Council," and the Convention of the Indian Section, and they "ratified" it! The whole business, *as an organization comprising all the Branches in the world*, is a "flapdoodle" from beginning to end.

To what conclusion are we then to come? Simply this: THE UNITY OF THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT DOES NOT DEPEND UPON SINGLENES OF ORGANIZATION, BUT UPON SIMILARITY OF WORK AND ASPIRATION; and in this we will "KEEP THE LINK UNBROKEN."

2. **The Path**, Vol. 9, April 1894, pp.1-3.

HISTORIC THEOSOPHICAL LEAVES.

FIRST LEAF.¹

From the Minute Book of the Theosophical Society the leaves here used are taken. The first is the very first page in the handwriting of Bro. John Storer Cobb, now in the city of Boston, U. S., done by him at the time from the notes in pencil taken during the meeting. A plate has been made of it by photographic process, thus giving a fac-simile, but slightly reduced in size so as to fit the PATH. There is a very small error to be noted. The proceedings were in fact thus: the persons named being present, Bro. William Q. Judge rose and assumed the place of Chairman and at once proposed Col. Olcott as permanent Chairman, which motion was carried as noted. The error is in not giving Bro. Judge as the chairman for the first few moments. This meeting was held at the rooms of H. P. B. in Irving Place, New York. As Col. Olcott has passed beyond this point in his "Old Diary Leaves", it is thought these leaves will add to the historical interest of his narrative.

SECOND LEAF.

The next leaf selected from the same book is of the meeting of September 18th, 1875, ten days having elapsed while the Committee on Name was at work. This minute shows the selection of our present name. It reads as follows:

1. Frontispiece of **The Path** Vol. 9.

MEETING HELD AT 46 IRVING PLACE ON MONDAY EVENING,
SEPTEMBER 18th, 1875.

Mr. George H. Felt continued from the previous meeting, September 8th, the interesting description of his discoveries on the Cabala, which were illustrated by a number of colored diagrams. After a discussion thereon, matters in reference to the proposed Society were made the order of the day.

Col. H. S. Olcott presided and Mr. Charles Sotheran acted as Secretary. The Committee on Preamble and By-Laws reported progress, and Mr. D. E. de Lara read a paper which he had been requested to write for the Committee.

At the suggestion of the Committee it was upon motion

RESOLVED, that the name of the Society be "The Theosophical Society".

Upon motion it was

RESOLVED, that a committee be appointed to select suitable rooms for the meetings of the Society and report at at [sic] the next meeting.

The chair appointed the Rev. J. H. Wiggin and Mr. Charles Sotheran, and upon motion the chair was added.

Several persons then gave in their names, or were proposed for membership, and upon motion it was

RESOLVED, that these names be added to the list of founders.

Upon motion it was

RESOLVED, that we now adjourn, subject to the call of the chair.

H. S. OLCOTT, *Chairman.*

JOHN STORER COBB *for*

C. SOTHERAN, *Secretary.*

THIRD LEAF.

After two meetings held October 16 and 30, the one at which the President delivered his inaugural address was held at the rooms selected at 64 Madison Avenue. This minute is on page seven of the book. The rooms are those occupied for some time by the Aryan Theosophical Society, and are known as Mott Memorial Hall, a medical library and meeting place. While delivering the address Col. Olcott stood at the right side of the platform that is south of it, and H.P.B. sat among the hearers on the north side of the room. These little particulars will interest historians and lovers of particularity. The record is as follows:

MEETING HELD AT No. 64 MADISON AVENUE, ON WEDNESDAY,
NOVEMBER 17th, 1875.

The meeting was called to order at 8.15 P. M. Henry S. Olcott, President in the chair

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved; and the Rev. George H. Hepworth and Mrs. Charles Sotheran were nominated for fellowship.

Letters from Vice-President George H. Felt and Mr. D. E. de Lara expressing regret at their absence from the meeting were then read, after which the president delivered his Inaugural Address.

At the conclusion of which it was

MOVED by Treasurer Newton that a vote of thanks be presented to the president for his able address, and that the address be printed.

MOVED by T. F. Thomas as an amendment, that the address be stereotyped and five hundred copies be printed for immediate distribution.

This amendment being accepted by Treasurer Newton, the resolution as amended was put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

Upon motion it was resolved that we now adjourn.

H. S. OLCOTT, *President.*

J. STORER COBB, *Recording Secretary.*

Meeting held at
No 46 Irving Place

on
Wednesday evening, September 8th. 1875.

In consequence of a proposal of Col. Henry S. Platt, that a society be formed for the study and elucidation of Occultism, the Cabala &c, the ladies and gentlemen then and there present resolved themselves into a meeting, and, upon motion of Mr. W. L. Judge it was

Resolved, that Col. H. S. Platt take the chair.

Upon motion it was also

Resolved, that Mr. W. L. Judge act as secretary.

The Chair then called for the names of those persons present, who would agree to found and belong to a society such as had been mentioned. The following persons handed their names to the Secretary:

Col. Platt, Miss H. P. Marotchy, Chas. Sotheran,
Dr. Chas. E. Simmons, H. D. Monachein, C. C. Mearney
of London, W. L. Alden, G. H. Felt, D. E. deLaroy,
Dr. Britton, Mrs. E. H. Britton, Henry J. Newton, John
Horer Cobb, J. Woodley, W. L. Judge, Miss Stearns

Upon motion of Herbert D. Monachein, it was
Resolved, that a committee of three be appointed
by the chair, to draft a constitution and by-laws, and to
report the same at the next meeting.

Upon motion it was

Resolved, that the chair be added to the committee.

The Chair then appointed Messrs. H. J. Newton, H. M.
Stevens, and C. Sotheran to be such committee.

Upon motion it was

Resolved, that we now adjourn until Monday
Sept. 13th, at the same place, at 8 P. M.

H. S. Platt Chairman.
William L. Judge Secretary.

3. A similar statement of facts was presented at the Ninth Annual Convention of the American Section T.S. and First Annual Convention Theosophical Society in America, Boston, Mass., April 28-29, 1895 where Mr. Wade read a "Historical Sketch of The Theosophical Society" before the delegates at the Convention. Following the Annual Convention, a 20-page pamphlet titled **What is the Theosophical Organization?** was issued on June 3rd, 1895. This pamphlet also included a "Legal Opinion of Geo. D. Ayers Counsellor-at-Law, Boston, On The Statement of Facts Relating to the Theosophical Society" where Mr. Ayers presented 13 facts supporting W.Q. Judge's position based on the records of the T.S.

[**The Path** Vol. 10, 1895, pp.55-60.]

[55]

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

INSIDE FACTS AS TO ITS ORGANIZATION.—A *DE FACTO* BODY.—THE REAL T. S.
IN NEW YORK.—THE PRESIDENT STILL A DELEGATE TO FOREIGN LANDS,
AND HOLDING OVER IN OFFICE.

THESE facts are extracted from a paper prepared for the Convention at Boston in April, 1895. The historical documents and records used in the preparation of the matter are: the original minutes of the T.S. ; the original constitution; the records published in India, Europe and America from time to time; *Old Diary Leaves*—not considered however as wholly reliable—original documents drawn up and signed as far back as between 1875 and 1878.

STATEMENT OF FACTS.

1. At a meeting held in the rooms of H. P. Blavatsky, 46 Irving Place, New York City, September 7, 1875, it was agreed to form a Society for the purpose of Occult Study. Upon motion of William Q. Judge, Henry S. Olcott was elected Chairman of this meeting, and upon motion of H. S. Olcott, William Q. Judge was elected Secretary of the same. Adjourned to September 8, 1875. This is asserted as the facts by those who were present.

2. Pursuant to adjournment, a meeting was held at the same place September 8, 1875. It is with this meeting that the minute book begins. Upon motion of William Q. Judge it was voted that H. S. Olcott take the Chair, and upon motion it was voted that William Q. Judge act as Secretary. Upon request of the Chair, sixteen persons handed their names to the Secretary, as agreeing to found and belong to such a society. A committee of four, including the Chairman, was appointed "to draft a constitution and by-laws and to report the same at the next meeting". Adjourned to Monday, September 13, 1875, at the same place.

3. Pursuant to adjournment, a meeting was held September 13, 1875. H. S. Olcott acted as Chairman and C. Sotheran as Secretary. The Committee on "Preämbles and By-laws" reported progress. It was resolved that the name of the Society be "The Theosophical Society". The Chair appointed a committee to select meeting rooms. "Several new members were nominated and upon motion those persons were added to the list of Founders". The meeting adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

4. Pursuant to a notice dated at New York, October 13, 1875, signed Henry S. Olcott, President *pro tem.*, a meeting was held at 206 West 38th street, October 16, 1875, "to organize and elect [56] officers". Eighteen persons were present. The report of the Committee on "Preämbles and By-laws" was laid on the table and ordered printed. The meeting adjourned to October 30, 1875, at the same place. H. S. Olcott was Chairman, and J. S. Cobb, Secretary.

5. October 30, 1875, the Society met pursuant to adjournment. Mott Memorial hall, 64 Madison Avenue, New York City, was selected as the Society's meeting place. By-laws were adopted, but with the proviso that the "Preämbles" should be revised by a committee and then published as the "Preämbles of the

Society”. Officers were elected as follows: President, Henry S. Olcott; Vice-Presidents, Dr. S. Pancoast and G. H. Felt; Corresponding Secretary, Mme. H. P. Blavatsky; Recording Secretary, John Storer Cobb; Treasurer, Henry J. Newton; Librarian, Charles Sotheran; Councillors, Rev. J. H. Wiggin, R. B. Westbrook, LL.D., Mrs. Emma Hardinge Britten, C. E. Simmons, M.D. and Herbert D. Monachesi; Counsel to the Society, William Q. Judge. Adjourned to November 17, 1875.

6. The Society met in Mott Memorial Hall, November 17, 1875, pursuant to adjournment. The President read an address and after the transaction of business, adjourned to December 15, 1875.

7. It is probable that Col. Olcott selected this as the date of organization, because of his inaugural address, but it is not correct and he had no authority to do so. About this time members fell away and there was no quorum.

8. A few odd meetings were held until 1878. The minute book was mislaid. Resolutions were made by two or three persons writing them out and declaring them passed.

9. In the year 1878 H. P. Blavatsky and H. S. Olcott were appointed a “Committee of the Theosophical Society” to visit foreign countries and report. The *Theosophist* for October, 1879, vol. i, No. 1, p. 1, first item, says: “For the convenience of future reference, it may as well be stated here that the Committee, sent to India by the Theosophical Society, sailed from New York December 17, 1878, and landed at Bombay, February 16, 1879, having passed two weeks in London on the way”. In the *Theosophist* for January, 1880, vol. i, p. 95, Col. Olcott says he “came to India with two English colleagues and their learned Corresponding Secretary, Madame Blavatsky. They came only expecting to study Eastern Religion and Yoga Vidya and report their discoveries to the Western Theosophists”, which were the Society in New York, consisting of over forty members at this time.

[57]10. Before the departure of their Committee to foreign countries, the Theosophical Society elected General A. Doubleday as President *pro tem.*, to serve during the absence of the President. This election of President *pro tem.* was never revoked; nor was the appointment of this Committee. On arrival in India H. S. Olcott had their pictures taken and sent to America endorsed by him “The Delegation to India”.

11. Meetings of the Theosophical Society were held at New York for some years after the departure of the Committee, and were presided over by General Doubleday and William Q. Judge.

12. From October 30, 1875, to December, 1878, all alterations of the By-laws were made in regular and formal manner, by the Society at New York.

13. These By-laws provided that new members could not be elected until after thirty days’ consideration of their application.

14. The original organization was kept up at New York certainly until after January 1, 1882.

15. What purported to be “Revised Rules of the Theosophical Society” were adopted at Bombay in October, 1879, by a body which called itself the “General Council of the Theosophical Society”, but had no legal existence whatever. There was published in the *Theosophist* for April, 1880 (vol. i, p. 179): “The Theosophical Society or Universal Brotherhood. Principles, Rules, and By-laws as revised in General Council, at the meeting held at the palace of H. H. the Maharajah of Vizianagram, Benares, 17th December, 1879”. To this was subjoined the statement: “Revised and ratified by the Society, at Bombay, February the 26th and 28th, 1880.—Attest: Kharsedji N. Seervai, Joint Recording Secretary”. This meeting at Benares

was merely one held by H. S. Olcott without notice and was irregular. It was here that Col. Olcott worked out the resolution that declared him President for life. The original Constitution fixed his term at one year and was never amended. The so-called ratification at Bombay was irregular and amounted to nothing.

16. None of the admissions to membership nor any alterations of the By-laws adopted at the instigation of the Committee sent to foreign lands were in accordance with the By-laws of the Theosophical Society in force at the time. The legal By-laws were adopted by a vote of the Society in New York and could only be changed by a like vote. None of these alterations of the By-laws were ever submitted to the Society in New York and that Society never voted on any of them.

17. From December, 1878, down to the present time, various [58] sets of "Rules", "By-laws", and "Constitutions" have been promulgated by alleged "General Councils", but none of them have ever been adopted in accordance with the only By-laws of any validity.

18. No lapse of time, no passive assent, and no active assent given in ignorance of the legal status of the case, would confer any validity upon the otherwise illegal acts of the President or of the Committee to foreign lands or those claiming to act through or under them, or either of them.

19. Up to 1880 members were admitted to the Society in New York in accordance with the By-laws.

20. Before H. S. Olcott and H. B. Blavatsky went to India the name of the Society was altered in New York, in the manner which prevailed after members had dropped off, to "The Theosophical Society of the Arya Samaj of Arya Vart". This made it a Branch of the Arya Samaj, over which Dyanand presided. Diplomas were printed thus and issued as late as September, 1878, with Dyanand's name and seal printed on them.

21. In India, again, Col. Olcott, in the same manner as before, altered the name of the Society back to the old style by striking off "of the Arya Samaj of Arya Vart". If the Society properly voted to change in New York to the Arya Samaj, it certainly never voted to reconsider.

22. Before the departure to India in 1878 the Recording Secretary was sent to London to form the British Theosophical Society. He did this and Dr. Wyld presided over that for a time. This body finally became, it is asserted, the "London Lodge", now controlled by Mr. Sinnett.

23. The London Lodge has always claimed to be autonomous, has continued its work, always claiming to be perfectly independent of the President, the parent Society, the Section in which it is, the Constitution, and all and every person and body whatever. This anomalous position has been always recognized and permitted by the President, and also by the European Section in which that Lodge is. This is finally exhibited in the letter from the Lodge, found in the Proceedings of that Section for 1894.

24. When H.P.B. for the last time settled in Europe, she autonomously, independently, and at the request of the Europeans (except the London Lodge), founded "The Theosophical Society in Europe", of which she was President. After she had made her declarations, Col. Olcott issued a paper so as to seem to approve of what had been done. On these was built up the present European Section.

[59]25. An examination of the records from the beginning to the end of 1893 shows that there is no record whatever of the election of William Q. Judge as Vice-President of the T.S. In July, 1894, at London, Col. Olcott and the Indian General Secretary upon William Q. Judge's raising the point, decided that they would assert that the record was defective and could be cured by stating the fact that such Vice-President had been

elected in India many years before, and it was so ordered in Council. But as the meeting at which said election took place—if it ever did—was not one participated in by those who could bind the whole Society, and as the real T. S. existed in New York, if anywhere, it follows that William Q. Judge was not regularly elected Vice-President.

The following by Col. H. S. Olcott occurs in a letter from him to W. Q. Judge, dated May 17th, 1893: “If you want separate T.S. Societies made out of Sections, have them by all means: I offered this years ago to H. P. B., and even to A. P. S[innett]”.

In July, 1894, at London, he enunciated the same idea and plan to W. Q. Judge and Dr. Buck, after the dismissal of the Committee.

26. From a consideration of the above statement of facts it follows that:

(a) The present existing so-called “General Council of the Theosophical Society” has merely a *de facto* status and not a legal one, as it has grown out of and upon wholly illegal proceedings.

(b) The By-laws adopted October 30th, 1875, and such amendments thereto as were made according to the terms of those By-laws, are the only legal ones at present in force and the only ones having any validity whatever.

(c) The Theosophical Society formed at New York in 1875, never had any legal existence outside of the United States and cannot have except upon amendment of the By-laws.

(d) The Theosophical Society was founded at New York, September, 8, 1875, by some eighteen persons, and there was no such Society founded November 17, 1875, that being simply the date upon which the President delivered his inaugural address.

(e) The present existing so-called “Theosophical Society and Universal Brotherhood”, with its officers and “General Council”, has no legal connection with “The Theosophical Society” founded at New York, September 8, 1875.

(f) The authority of the so-called “General Council of the Theosophical Society and Universal Brotherhood” over members, Branches, and Sections, who have submitted to it in ignorance of the real facts in the case, exists only so long as its authority is [60] not called in question, but when so called in question it ceases to have any lawful authority whatever.

NOTE. A diploma made and issued in due form in 1883 [1882] to a member in St. Louis, was signed by Gen. Doubleday as President *pro tem.*, and William Q. Judge as Recording Secretary. This shows the Society as then active in New York. We will print next month a reproduction of this diploma.

4. **Report of Proceedings, 1895.**

FIRST CONVENTION
THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA.
Held at Boston, April 28-29, 1895
April 29th, 1895.

MORNING SESSION.

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 by Dr. Buck, Chairman. There was a large basket of flowers on the desk and Dr. Buck said:

As a fitting crown for the work that was done yesterday, the Convention has presented to Mr. Judge this beautiful collection of flowers. Not daring to trust himself to respond to you, he desires me to express his very sincere thanks and appreciation. There are many things in life which are best expressed by silence, and I certainly could not undertake to elaborate upon this theme to this audience on the present occasion. I can assure you, and I am requested to assure you, that Mr. Judge appreciates from his heart of hearts your relation to him and his to you. (*Great applause.*)

Mrs. Keightley desires the attention of the Convention for a few minutes. I shall put it under the head of Unfinished Business. She has some items which she wishes to go upon the record in order that we may not go before our *confrères* all over the world in a false or incomplete light.

And I, in behalf of the Convention, thank the press of the city for the very fair report of the proceedings of our Convention yesterday. They have put us in as good a light as I think would be possible. (*Applause.*)

MRS. KEIGHTLEY: Mr. Chairman, Friends: To complete for use in foreign lands the record of this Convention, it appeared to me that three of the questions which were asked yesterday have not been sufficiently replied to. Of course, you are aware that the local minds, knowing the local issues, and knowing also the whole record, and having had the opportunity of attending the Convention, apprehend very quickly. To you the three questions have been quite sufficiently answered, but to me, who have been a resident in foreign parts for several years and to some extent comprehend the trend of opinion and knowledge there, they have not had a sufficiently clear reply to go upon the record of the Convention. I ask the indulgence of the Convention for a few moments in order to complete that record, and I hope not unnecessarily.

Mr. Fullerton is not here to-day, but it is an instance of just recompense. I have often sat under my brother Fullerton in church, when I had not the opportunity to reply to him,—when he was the clergyman and I the disciple, but I have now an opportunity to reply to him in his absence.

He said that our Constitution had not been invaded, nor our rights. We do not think it necessary to answer that,—the theosophists of this first Constitution of the Theosophical Society in America one and indivisible, and I hope eternal.

Now, the rights under that Constitution were originally invaded by a kind of dogma which the General Secretaries of India and England were very prompt to recognize, and which Col. Olcott subsequently recognized at the Judicial Committee, so that according to the official proceedings there was a violation of the Constitution. It should be clearly set forth that this was the case.

Secondly, in a letter of the President, Col Olcott,—the original official letter to Mr. Judge,—I have not got it here, but I quote from it, and quote correctly, I think,—he said that if Mr. Judge did not meet the inquiry then proposed, he should resign all his offices in the Theosophical Society, not only of Vice-President, but all his offices. Then the court of inquiry met, but it did not proceed, partly because it was based on a violation of our platform, and partly because those present recognized that those charges could never be proved. They were reduced to the question whether Mr. Judge had a right to use a certain handwriting. They acknowledged, however, that he could not be tried, and the matter was dropped. It has now been reöpened, and reöpened without giving the accused the necessary papers with which to make a reply. That has been denied in part, but the President has now recognized it. Is this a violation or not of our rights?

That seems to me quite plain, and expulsion on that basis is now being demanded. Is not that a violation of constitutional rights? What reason had we for doing this?

[40] Now the reason: It seems simple, and yet it will not be simple to those who have not been present at this Convention. When we came to look into the record of the Society itself, it was found to the great surprise of those concerned, that this record was not legally complete, and therefore, it became necessary for the Society to recognize that fact. The word "secession" has been uttered in this hall, but it cannot be uttered in fact and in truth. We are the mother root; we cannot secede from ourselves. We find on examination of the record that the links between us and the other sections or branches established, owing to the early confusion and haste, were not properly instituted. You have before you the history of the churches, the Greek Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Church of England; each one, taken alone, claims that it is the right one. The historical links are missing. When this Society, which we hope to eternalize, goes further forward in the centuries, perhaps there will be the same claim "the links are missing." Let us complete the links.

The third question was, "What are we to get by it?" It is a strange question. We get, in the first place, our reaffirmation of brotherhood, because it is not brotherly to love this condition of affairs. We have an historical example of this question being asked, "What will we get by it?" and "What will the world get by it?" by Pontius Pilate, and he washed his hands of it. What do we get every time our flag flashes its color line up the mast? We get the reaffirmation of freedom. But apart from that, we get this: It establishes our Society on a broader and firmer basis, asking others to join us, and it seems to me that counts; it must count everywhere.

Then, again, in the question of brotherhood, there are many embryo Christs; the world always crucifies them. The Judas of the brethren goes forth untouched by them and executes himself under the shadow of the grim law, which is truth. And I think that the dignity, the patience, the forbearance, and the brotherhood of this Convention, gives the world something and the world gains by it.

And those, I think, are the answers to these questions. I trust that on this basis of the reaffirmation of our brotherhood, we may make this Theosophical Society one, eternal and indivisible throughout all lands and throughout all time. (*Applause.*)

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen: This morning I became impressed with exactly the same feeling which Mrs. Keightley has just so eloquently expressed to you, viz., that this Convention, this newly-organized Society, should make some announcement to the world in general of its position other than that contained in its formal Constitution and By-Laws and in the Resolutions by which it became a Society. And it is possibly a singular coincidence that I should have jotted down these notes for submission to you, following as they do upon Mrs. Keightley's suggestion.

I desire to offer the following proclamation, and shall move its adoption.

PROCLAMATION.

The Theosophical Society in America by its delegates and members in first Convention assembled, does hereby proclaim fraternal good will and kindly feeling toward all students of theosophy and members of theosophical societies wherever and however situated. It further proclaims and avers its hearty sympathy and association with such persons and organizations in all theosophical matters except those of government and administration, and invites their correspondence and coöperation.

To all men and women of whatever caste, creed, race or religious belief, whose intentions aim at the fostering of peace, gentleness and unselfish regard one for another, and the acquisition of such knowledge of man and nature as shall tend to the elevation and advancement of the human race, it sends most friendly greeting and freely proffers its services.

It joins hands with all religions and religious bodies whose effort is directed to the purification of men's thoughts and the bettering of their ways, and avows its harmony therewith. To all scientific societies and individual searchers after

wisdom upon whatever plane and by whatever righteous means pursued, it is and will be grateful for such discovery and unfoldment of Truth as shall serve to announce and confirm a *scientific basis for ethics*.

And lastly, it invites to its membership all those who, seeking a higher life hereafter, would learn to know the *Path* to tread in this.

[41] The Proclamation was sent to Committee on Resolutions for report.
The Report of Committee on Constitution and By-laws was then presented.

Mr. Judge: Mr. Chairman: I move we take the Report up, article by article, and consider them separately and adopt them or not as we see fit.

The motion was put to vote and carried.

The Constitution was here read by Secretary Wright, amended and adopted, at 11:32 A.M., article by article.

[The Constitution of The Theosophical Society in America then follows. — Compiler]

5. In the June issue of **The Path**, Vol. 10, 1895, p.92, the following appeared.

A PARENT T.S. DIPLOMA.

“On the opposite page [below on this page] will be found a photographed copy of a diploma made and issued in due form in Jan., 1883 [Dec. 1882]. This is the diploma we referred to in an article in May issue under the title ‘The Theosophical Society.’ It is of course only one of many, but is introduced here to substantiate the statement in that article that the parent T.S. was active in New York as late as 1883 [1882], Abner Doubleday being then its President *pro tem* in the absence of Col. Olcott, the delegate to India.”

The Theosophical Society

OF NEW-YORK

*admits Elliott B. Page, to the number of its Fellows.
In Witness it has issued to him the present Diploma signed
by the President pro tem. and Recording Secretary at New-
York, on the nineteenth day of December, in the year 1882.*

*Abner Doubleday
pro tem. President*

*William Leadley
Recording Secretary.*

The First American Branch.

The first American Branch of the Theosophical Society was established in Saint Louis, Missouri. Elliott B. Page had developed a great interest in Theosophy and was moved to apply for permission from the Founders to establish a Branch in St. Louis. His request was promptly granted and he and his associates received the Charter for The Arjuna Theosophical Society, dated September 17th, 1882. The Arjuna T.S. was also the first to erect an auditorium exclusively for Theosophical purposes. A photographed copy of the Charter (from **World Theosophy**, Vol. 2, No. 9, September 1932, p.705) is provided on the next page.

— Compiler

[FOUNDED AT NEW YORK, 17TH NOVEMBER 1875]

The Theosophical Society AND UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD.


To all to whom these presents may come,

Greeting


Know Ye, that it being expedient that a Branch of our said Society shall be established at, Saint Louis, in the State of Missouri, U.S.A, and an application having been made to that effect, and approved. Now Therefore we, the undersigned President, and Corresponding Secretary, for and on behalf of the General Council and by virtue of the authority of the Society do hereby give to Elliott B. Page of the said place and his associates full power to organize a Branch of the Theosophical Society, at the aforesaid place, the same to be known as

The
Arjuna Theosophical Society,
and to be subject to the jurisdiction of the Parent Society.

In Testimony whereof we have signed these presents with our names, and affixed the Society's Seal at Chiddquaters, India, this 17th day of September in the year 1882 and of the Society's foundation the Seventh.



Corresponding Secretary



President

6. [The following circular was first issued in December 1894, with the following introductory note. It was published as a pamphlet in January 1895 with a new introduction, and included the names of those supporting the views expressed.]

The following circular letter has been issued by members of the T. S. in New York and Brooklyn, through HENRY T. PATTERSON, F. T. S., and is submitted for the signatures of those members desiring to so express themselves. It is unofficial, and an individual declaration of views. It is requested that an opportunity be given for all members to unite in this matter, but without the delay of Branch action—this being a personal expression.

Kindly return this circular without delay, with signatures, to

EDWARD B. RAMBO,
418 Market Street, San Francisco, Cal.

464 CLASSON AVENUE.

BROOKLYN, January 1st, 1895.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY:

BROTHERS AND SISTERS:

Deeming it the duty of a member of the Theosophical Society, which has Brotherhood as its foundation, to speak as a brother in behalf of WILLIAM Q. JUDGE, a fellow theosophist who has been attacked without and within the Theosophical Society, I have taken on myself to write this circular and have asked those who have signed to append their names. There are thousands, I am sure, in the Society who, if I could easily ask them, would also sign it. All recipients of this are invited to return to me if they see fit a signed copy or to notify me that they may be quoted as endorsers of this circular.

H. T. PATTERSON, F. T. S.

After working steadily and unflinchingly for the Theosophical Society for nineteen years, the charge was publicly brought against William Q. Judge, Vice-President of the T. S., that he had “misused the names and handwritings of the Mahatmas”—in other words he was charged with forgery of the names and writing supposed to be those of the Mahatmas, for the purposes of mystifying his fellow-members and of gaining power for himself in the Society. To buttress this charge and make it seem plausible and possibly true, subsidiary charges of untruthfulness and deception were added to the main one. The highest and most powerful committee in the T. S. was summoned to try these charges in July, 1894, a committee which could only be convened for a most extraordinary occasion, as this was deemed to be. The committee met, preceded by a meeting of the Council of the T. S. These two bodies, and the President decided that the charges could not be tried as laid and the proceeding was quashed. It is therefore first apparent that the charges should never have been thus brought nor the excitement of calling such a committee ever started in the minds of the members of the T. S. At the European Convention, then in session, the matter was declared closed by a resolution then passed after statements made by accuser and accused.

An examination of the charges disclosed the extraordinary fact that, so far as respects alleged false messages from Mahatmas, the instances proposed to be dealt with by the Committee were, as far as can be gathered, five in number, that is to say —(a) letters to Col. Olcott from Mr. Judge on the margin of which were memoranda, and in which was a paper writing, neither being in the handwriting of Mr. Judge; (b) a letter to Mr. A. J. Cooper-Oakley on the margin of which was a memorandum in blue referring to the contents of the

letter, and not in Mr. Judge's handwriting and signed "by order of Hilarion." followed by some hieroglyphics; (c) a letter to Mr. Tookeram Taty of Bombay, from Mr. Judge, with a memorandum on the margin not in Mr. Judge's handwriting; (d) a letter to a low caste Hindu servant from Mr. Judge on the margin of which was a memorandum not in Mr. Judge's handwriting; (e) messages said by Mr. Judge to be from the Mahatmas handed by him to Mrs. Annie Besant, which he admitted at the Convention he had handed her and which fact he had never denied. We call this fact extraordinary because it seems that after all the fuss and sensation in three continents, the cases of but five persons were proposed to be cited where the mystification and humbugging were said to have been attempted. For, in order to believe the charges, we have to conclude that the accused must be a man who would naturally use mystification of others with "messages from Mahatmas" among the persons and in the Districts where such mystification would result in substantial aid or benefit to himself. But the contrary is the case, for, in America, where Mr. Judge's work has been, there is no production of such messages; and conversation with influential and wealthy members discloses the fact that no mystification was attempted, and that he had for years steadily kept in the background as much as possible all personal reference to the Mahatmas. American members have generally believed that Mr. Judge could and did have communication with Mahatmas, but that belief is not due to claims made by him.

The charges then lay quiet for a time until an English newspaper republished the whole affair sensationally with additions and with fac-similes of evidence, saying they had the whole thing from one who was a member of the Inner Group of the E. S. T., and showing that the informer had gone so far as to claim to give out also matters that were protected by the private pledge of the E. S. T.—thus, as to those matters, putting all E. S. T. members in a position where those private things could not be discussed publicly. This newspaper also published a private circular issued in the E. S. T., which must have been given out by a member of the E. S. T. This publication aroused new discussion and several members of the Society in London began to clamor for Mr. Judge's resignation of his office and for an instant explanation by him, although any tyro in occultism knows that such matters cannot be explained to the public, and every attorney of a month's standing is aware that the appearance of memoranda on a letter does not in any way prove they were done by the writer of the letter when they are not in the writer's handwriting. This second disturbance showed another extraordinary and saddening fact, that is, that a number of members were willing first, to go back on the solemn decision of the Council and Judicial Committee and second, to hound in public at the demand of a sensational newspaper one of our oldest, best and most unselfish workers—Mr. Judge—while hardly a word of condemnation was given to those who had violated honor, common decency and brotherly feeling. This is saddening in our T. S. after nineteen years of effort toward Brotherhood in deed and thought. We have thought that these actions were to be properly designated as "pernicious activity."

But in December, 1894, the Dublin Lodge T. S., of Ireland, issued a brave, a timely circular, concluding thus:—"We feel a sense of shame, that, when demands have been made for instant explanation (by Mr. Judge) or else expulsion and disgrace, no word even of gratitude for past services has come from those making them. We think also that if our longest tried, our best and bravest worker is to be brought before the tribunal of the world at the demand of sensation-mongering journals, a demand echoed by those he worked for, it is time for us to be a little less hypocrites by expunging one of the objects of our Society and talk of brotherhood in that connection no more."

These declarations of our Irish brothers we applaud, and are glad that Mr. Judge's fellow-countrymen and fellow-townsmen were the first to thus publicly rise against the tide of jealousy and unbrotherliness. Their circular was signed by some hundreds of members in Europe. We would now, on behalf of the American members, but unofficially, add our voice to Ireland's and bear testimony to the constant self-sacrifice, the constant unflagging zeal, the indomitable resolution and unflinching will for work to benefit others, which our brother, William Q. Judge, has shown. We do so, not because it is needed in the American Section, but

because we fear that silence may perhaps be construed into acquiescence in the course pursued by those who have attacked him. Not as partisans do we speak, but chiefly because we believe that the attack on brother Judge is an onslaught against the whole Theosophical Society, and that supineness on our part, in any longer delaying an active defence of one who has long fought for us and the Cause we hold dear, may become a crime and may aid the disintegrating force represented by those of our fellows who keep up the fight against him.

We do not think the charges can be proved or disproved. We think that, if we have any confidence in our brother due to his nineteen years of service, we must accept his statement that he has never misused the names and handwritings of the Mahatmas, has never attempted to mystify anyone, has never used any “wrong methods.” We have full confidence in him and believe him to be free from blame in the matters charged against him. And we go further, and say, that if he should declare—which as yet he has not—that he himself wrote every message and memorandum cited against him and that he was authorized to do so by the Masters, we would accept the explanation as sufficient. For, it is well-known and has been for years that those Beings use agents for such messages and but seldom personally write or precipitate, and that the handwritings called those of the Masters are not their handwritings, but were forms adopted for use in receiving and transmitting matter from them. This was long ago stated by H. P. Blavatsky who is our original authority for the “names and handwritings of the Masters,” and she also has said that even the names applied to the “Masters” are not their real names. We therefore agree with the statement published by Mr. Judge in the *New York Sun*, in November, that the proof for occultists, or those who believe in occultism—as to the matters in dispute—begins and ends with Mr. Judge. And, for that reason, we accept as final his statement, made at the July Convention of 1894, which has already been published.

The two oldest workers in the T. S. are Col. H. S. Olcott and William Q. Judge. Alike, they have for nearly twenty years worked for the T. S. without any reward and at great personal loss and physical injury. But we speak now of Mr. Judge. He has spent his time and all the money he could earn over his personal necessities for the T. S. for all these years. He has worked night and day for it and all its interests: carried on his magazine in its service at a loss: started the *Aryan Press*, which was followed by the *London Press*, began the *Forum*, the *Branch Papers*, the *Oriental Department*, the *Correspondence Class in America*, which were immediately imitated in other sections because they were good forms of activity: written thousands of letters, corresponding constantly with enquirers and members everywhere and never for himself, but always for their benefit and to help them in study: fostered every helpful effort for the furtherance of Theosophy: lectured constantly for branches: spent his own money for Branch rent and Society expenses when it had no money: constantly refused to advertise or puff any improper book: often advised members against buying books that would do them no great good while their sale would increase the business of the *Path*: encouraged the American Section so that its contributions to Col. Olcott’s centre at Adyar out-strip all others and have become, as Col. Olcott has said, “the chief reliance” of headquarters: gave up valuable experienced printers out of his own press so that they might go and work for the press at the London Headquarters. He combined and united his *Path* and *Press* business into one place so that by co-operating with the General Secretary and the E. S. T. in America it might be possible to procure and keep up the valuable T. S. headquarters in New York, where the money received from his own business of publishing is paid back again to the Society in rentals which keep up the property, and without which we could not accomplish what we are now able to do. He arranged every detail of all these and a mass of other matters, all the time continuing his immense correspondence, writing articles for the magazine, for the press, and writing books also for our use; and never during all these years asking or receiving a single cent of pay directly or indirectly, for services or time, never absent from his work and never behind in any respect. The list of his works is endless, monumental, it shows us an untiring soul, an immense and indomitable will, a power to work in adversity as well as in prosperity, a total ignoring of himself for the benefit of his fellow-members. This is not the conduct of a charlatan, not of the self-seeker. It is that of one of those brave and long tried souls who have fought their way down

through the vistas of time so that they might have strength to battle now for those who may be weaker. These qualities, these works, these services, and the character they all disclose are what have attracted around him in America many men and women of culture, earnestness, industry and some of wealth, who are willing to stand by him, glad to work with him and none of whom have been "mystified" in any way whatever. Here where he works and lives, and not elsewhere, is to be sought the evidence about his true character. Not among our enemies, not in sensational journals glad to gratify envy or jealousy for the sake of sensation, should any Theosophist look for anything about any worker for the T. S. Cause no matter who.

And finally we believe that Brother Judge was selected for the work he has done and is doing by some Power or Intelligence greater than ours and that it would be a crime to place in his way the little irritating obstacles which small-minded people are too willing to place before the strong and unselfish. Let us not be misled by critics and skeptics on the outside who, aided by newspapers, would divert our works and gladly egg us on to further and worse exhibition of unbrotherly spirit among ourselves; who would constitute themselves our judges when we ought to be proceeding with Theosophical propaganda and not be wasting time and energy in pursuing any Theosophist. Let us drop once and for all this jealousy and carping at our brother, let us go on for the future confident that nineteen years of such work as we have touched upon cannot possibly produce a danger for the time to come, let us illustrate in our lives that brotherhood which our Society promulgates.

H. T. Patterson	Duncan C. Ralston	Emma Comstock
H. S. Fernandez	Vespera Freeman	Albert Kappes
A. F. Osborne	H. Alfred Freeman	Victor C. Carroll
Sarah W. Cape	Leah M. Fitzgerald	A. H. Spencer
Mary E. Hart	Wm. E. Gould	O. K. Kramer
Anna M. Stabler	Jno. M. Pryse	J. E. Sutterlin
Elizabeth C. Mayer	J. H. Salisbury	Ulela W. Laird
Joseph H. Fussell	F. L. Mathez, Jr.	N. M. Dombaugh, U. S. N.
Sara P. Churchill	D. Nicholson	Ernest O. Kramer
Joseph Whitney Ganson	Harry Steele Budd	Gabriel Magnusson
Vittoria Cremers	Thomas Edgar Willson	Julius Nohe
C. A. Griscom, Jr.	Harold W. Percival	Percy Woodcock
Eleanor Bradford Hooper	T. Richard Prater	Leila L. B. Hunt
Laurita Thornton Hooper	Elliott B. Page	M. J. McBride
Henry N. Hooper	Katharine Hillard	E. B. Guild
Katherine Tingley	Allis F. Hascall	L. Parmly Brown
E. Aug. Neresheimer	Genevieve Ludlow Griscom	C. Thurston
Emilie Spencer	H. A. Bunker	Geo. M. Coffin
Isabell C. Morris	Mary E. Swasey	Georgia L. Leonard
Miriam M. du Pre	Louise J. Kirkwood	Arthur Tregina
Mamie A. Maschmedt	Ida N. Copp	Marie H. Tregina
Geo. E. Wright	Sarah F. Gordon	Robt. L. Lerch
L. F. Wood, M. D.	Adelaide A. Deen Hunt	Susan Lerch
A. L. Harris	S. A. Morris	Mary Pauline Trewitt
E. M. Tozier	Joseph Klein	Harriet E. Townsend
E. D. Stow	Emanuel Glick	Frances E. Burns
T. B. Clatworthy	Alexis C. Ferm	Mattie F. Stamper
Lily A. Shaw	Thaddeus P. Hyatt	Theresa Cracauer
O. Tyberg	Maude Ralston	A. S. Pinkham
Marjorie M. Tyberg	Wm. Main	Rebecca J. Douglass

S. Stern
 Edward B. Rambo
 S. Hecht
 Robert Crosbie
 Mary H. Wade
 Louis F. Wade
 Henry Harney
 C. J. Linderholm
 Anita Dunbar Hunt
 H. C. Harris
 W. T. Hanson

Albert E. S. Smythe
 Annie B. Rowell
 Julia H. Coffin
 Edmund Weston
 Mary E. Cragin
 H. W. Cragin
 Horace L. Stiles
 Eulalia McColcord
 Mary L. Bennett
 Ada Louise Townsend
 Marian F. Gitt

Mary Douglass
 Charles Eisig
 Clara Davis
 Eder Z. Dailey
 Christian W. Fulling
 J. Philip Knoche
 Geo. D. Ayers
 M. L. Guild
 Burcham Harding

7.


The American Board of Control.

On May 13th, 1884, Col. Olcott issued a "Special Order" from London establishing the American Board of Control. He appointed Wm. B. Shelley and Mrs. Josephine W. Cables (President and Secretary respectively of the Rochester Branch), G.F. Parsons, Elliott B. Page, T.M. Johnson, Gen. A. Doubleday and Dr. J.H.D. Buck as members of the Board, leaving it to them to agree upon a Chairman and Secretary. The Board was to act as a central administration and management for The Theosophical Society in the United States.

On April 27th, 1886, William Q. Judge wrote to Col. Olcott explaining the difficulties with Elliott Coues who had been added to the Board by Olcott and had been highly recommended by him as well to be its President. Judge had demanded Coues' resignation from the Board for promoting "secrets" and astral body business, bells and other things, and not promoting one word of philosophy.

After many meetings and discussions it was decided at a meeting of members held in Cincinnati on October 30th, 1886, that the American Board of Control be abolished. Judge was, upon motion of E.B. Page and seconded by Dr. Buck, unanimously elected General Secretary and Treasurer. During the days the ABC was active many Application forms were accepted and stamped with their seal. A photographed copy of the seal is included below.

— Compiler



A facsimile of the Seal used by the American Board of Control.

Notes with regard to the Applicants for fellowship:

Note on Henry T. Patterson's Application form: "On probation for 3 mos. from Oct. 25, 1887 in Aryan TS at his desire." This is one of the early Applications accepted after the American Board of Control was dissolved. The Application was endorsed by William Q. Judge and Samuel Hicks Clapp who had been a member of the American Board of Control.

(Henry T. Patterson's Application has been reproduced so as to represent as closely as possible the actual size of the original form as well as the discoloration of the original paper over the years due to its acid content. This background has been eliminated on the other examples of Applications reproduced herein.)

George D. Ayers was the President of Malden T.S. in the Boston area. He wrote the "Legal Opinion of Geo. D. Ayers Counsellor-at-Law, Boston, On The Statement of Facts Relating to The Theosophical Society." This paper presented 13 facts supporting W.Q. Judge's position based on the records of the T.S.

Jerome A. Anderson was a Doctor of Medicine and a prominent member of the T.S. from the Pacific Coast. He was one of Judge's strongest supporters and a witness to many critical incidents involving Judge and his accusers.

Abbott B. Clark was another prominent member from the California coast. He was present and involved in a number of incidents and was a strong supporter of Judge. His statement of support of Judge is included in Appendix A in "Reply By William Q. Judge To Charges of Misuse of Mahatma's Name and Handwritings."

Edward B. Rambo was another West coast supporter of Judge. See Aug. 16, 1897 in the Chronology for more details.

Myron H. Phelps was a lawyer and member of the Aryan T.S. He supplied a written legal opinion in support of Judge's claims that the President and the Vice-President of the T.S. could only be tried by a Judicial Committee for official misconduct, and that the accusation brought against Judge did not qualify. His legal opinion was presented at the July 7th, 1894, General Council Meeting held in London and accepted.

Charles A. Lazenby was a well-known Canadian author and theosophist who also became a member of The Theosophical Society in America (the Hargrove group) in the 1930s. This Diploma, issued December 17th, 1932 and signed by Charles Johnston as Chairman of the Executive Committee, is an example of the diplomas issued to their members.

— Compiler

8.

on petition for 3 mos from Oct. 25 1887 in Aryant at his desire.



THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

APPLICATION FOR FELLOWSHIP.

Admitted by Aryant

I, Henry S. Patterson

being in sympathy with the objects of the Theosophical Society, and acquainted with its rules, hereby make application for admission as a Fellow thereof.

I understand the objects of the Society to be as follows: 1st.—To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed or color. 2d.—To promote the study of Aryan and other Eastern literature, religions and sciences. 3d.—To investigate unexplained laws of Nature and the Psychical powers of man.

My application for Fellowship has never been rejected by this Society nor by any of its branches.

Henry S. Patterson

146-150 Centre St

New York N.Y.

POST OFFICE ADDRESS.

We, the undersigned Fellows of the Theosophical Society,

hereby certify that

a candidate for admission to the said Society, is a person who, to the best of our belief, will be a worthy member of the same.

Dated at this 26th

day of October 1887

William Judge F.T.S.

Samuel Hicks F.T.S.

William Judge F.T.S.

Registered

SECRETARY AMERICAN BOARD OF CONTROL

W.S. Co

Admitted

The Application must be accompanied with the Initiation Fee, FIVE DOLLARS, and the Annual Subscription of TWO DOLLARS.

2054

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.



OBLIGATION.

1. *Henry J. Patterson*

an applicant for Fellowship in the Theosophical Society, do hereby give to the President and Fellows of the said Society, MY MOST SOLEMN AND SACRED PROMISE UPON HONOR that I will not, under any circumstances, betray to unauthorized persons the signs and pass-words of the Society; that any information concerning the legitimate work or researches of the Society which may be communicated to me as a member of the Society, in confidence, I will faithfully keep secret, allowing no one, under any pretext, or by any threat or promise, to extort the same from me; that I will abstain from doing anything that may bring dishonor upon the Society, its members, or myself; and that to the best of my ability I will work for the furtherance of the declared objects of the Society.

Henry J. Patterson

Dated at *Cincinnati* this *26th*

day of *October* 188*7*

In presence of

.....
.....



THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

APPLICATION FOR FELLOWSHIP.

I, George D. Ayers

being in sympathy with the objects of the Theosophical Society, and acquainted with its rules, hereby make application for admission as a Fellow thereof.

I understand the objects of the Society to be as follows: 1st.—To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed or color. 2d.—To promote the study of Aryan and other Eastern literature, religions and sciences. 3d.—To investigate unexplained laws of Nature and the psychical powers of man.

My application for Fellowship has never been rejected by this Society nor by any of its branches.

George D. Ayers.

Malden

Massachusetts

POST OFFICE ADDRESS.

We, the undersigned Fellows of the Theosophical Society,

hereby certify that George D. Ayers a candidate for admission to the said Society, is a person who, to the best of our belief, will be a worthy member of the same.

Dated at Malden this 7th day of September 1885

This Application must be accompanied with the Initiation Fee, FIVE DOLLARS, and the Annual Subscription of TWO DOLLARS.

Frank S. Collins.

F. T. S.

[Signature]

F. T. S.

Registered Elliott B. Page.

SECRETARY AMERICAN BOARD OF CONTROL.

Admitted December 14th 1885 by Frank S. Collins, F. T. S. Malden

7028

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

W. P. Woodhull
W. P. Woodhull



OBLIGATION.

I, *George D. Ayere*


an applicant for Fellowship in the Theosophical Society, do hereby give to the President and Fellows of the said Society, MY MOST SOLEMN AND SACRED PROMISE UPON HONOR that I will not, under any circumstances, betray to unauthorized persons the signs and pass-words of the Society; that any information concerning the legitimate work or researches of the Society which may be communicated to me as a member of the Society, in confidence, I will faithfully keep secret, allowing no one, under any pretext, or by any threat or promise, to extort the same from me; that I will abstain from doing anything that may bring dishonor upon the Society, its members, or myself; and that to the best of my ability I will work for the furtherance of the declared objects of the Society.

George D. Ayere

Dated at *Malden* this *17th* day of *December* 188*5*

In presence of

Frank S. Foster
William A. ...



THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

APPLICATION FOR FELLOWSHIP.

I, James A. Anderson, M.L.
 being in sympathy with the objects of the Theosophical Society, and acquainted with its rules, hereby make application for admission as a Fellow thereof.

I understand the objects of the Society to be as follows:
 1st.—To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed or color. 2d.—To promote the study of Aryan and other Eastern literature, religions and sciences. 3d.—To investigate unexplained laws of Nature and the Psychical powers of man.

My application for Fellowship has never been rejected by this Society nor by any of its branches.

by

J. A. Anderson

POST OFFICE ADDRESS.

4 Cold Fellows Bldg.
San Francisco

We, the undersigned Fellows of the Theosophical Society, hereby certify that J. A. Anderson a candidate for admission to the said Society, is a person who, to the best of our belief, will be a worthy member of the same.

Dated at San Francisco this 4 day of Oct 1887

Admitted

This Application must be accompanied with the Initiation Fee, FIVE DOLLARS, and the Annual Subscription of TWO DOLLARS.

William J. Judge F. T. S.
William J. Judge F. T. S.

Registered

SECRETARY AMERICAN BOARD OF CONTROL.

✓ 1/10

1214

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.



OBLIGATION.

1. *J. A. Anderson*
an applicant for Fellowship in the Theosophical Society, do hereby give to the President and Fellows of the said Society,
MY MOST SOLEMN AND SACRED PROMISE UPON HONOR that
I will not, under any circumstances, betray to unauthorized persons the signs and pass-words of the Society; that any information concerning the legitimate work or researches of the Society which may be communicated to me as a member of the Society, in confidence, I will faithfully keep secret, allowing no one, under any pretext, or by any threat or promise, to extort the same from me; that I will abstain from doing anything that may bring dishonor upon the Society, its members, or myself; and that to the best of my ability I will work for the furtherance of the declared objects of the Society.

J. A. Anderson
 Dated at *San Francisco* this *4th*
 day of *Oct* 188*7*

In presence of

.....

Admitted 14 day of March 1889, by Thomas Goetting, President in Charge, Paul Ford



THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

APPLICATION FOR FELLOWSHIP.

I, the undersigned, being in sympathy with the objects of the Theosophical Society, and acquainted with its rules, hereby make application for admission as a Fellow thereof.

I understand the objects of the Society to be as follows: 1st.—To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed or color. 2d.—To promote the study of Aryan and other Eastern literature, religions and sciences. 3d.—To investigate unexplained laws of Nature and the Psychical powers of man.

My application for Fellowship has never been rejected by this Society nor by any of its branches.

Name, Abbott B. Clark

POST OFFICE ADDRESS. San Diego,
California.

We, the undersigned Fellows of the Theosophical Society, hereby certify that Abbott B. Clark a candidate for admission to the said Society, is a person who, to the best of our belief, will be a worthy member of the same.

Dated at San Diego, California this 17th day of March 1889

Entrance fee of Branches is fixed by them.
Fees to be remitted to General Secretary with this application:
For members at large, entrance fee \$1.00, Diploma 50 cts., annual subscription \$1.00, total \$2.50; for Branch members the Branch Secretary will remit \$1.50.

Julia G. Besse F. T. S.
Anne J. Patterson, M.D. F. T. S.
William [Signature]
Registered GENERAL SECRETARY AMERICAN SECTION, T. S.

1894

1894 THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,



OBLIGATION.

I, the undersigned, an applicant for Fellowship in the Theosophical Society, do hereby give to the President and Fellows of the said Society, MY MOST SOLEMN AND SACRED PROMISE UPON HONOR that I will not, under any circumstances, betray to unauthorized persons the signs and pass-words of the Society; that any information concerning the legitimate work or researches of the Society which may be communicated to me as a member of the Society, in confidence, I will faithfully keep secret, allowing no one, under any pretext, or by any threat or promise, to extort the same from me; that I will abstain from doing anything that may bring dishonor upon the Society, its members, or myself; and that to the best of my ability I will work for the furtherance of the declared objects of the Society.

Abbott Clark

Dated at *San Diego, Calif.* this *17th* day of *March* 188*9*

In presence of

Julia G. Beszac
Anne J. Patterson.

The above obligation has reference more particularly to the signs and pass-words of the Society. They can be conferred by Presidents of Branches, by Councillors and certain authorized persons.

Admitted 30th day of March 1889, by Exalted Gate Lodge of The T.S.,
Allen, Oregon, U.S.A. No. 100 of T.S.



THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

APPLICATION FOR FELLOWSHIP.

I, the undersigned, being in sympathy with the objects of the Theosophical Society, and acquainted with its rules, hereby make application for admission as a Fellow thereof.

I understand the objects of the Society to be as follows:
1st.—To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed or color. 2d.—To promote the study of Aryan and other Eastern literature, religions and sciences. 3d.—To investigate unexplained laws of Nature and the Psychical powers of man.

My application for Fellowship has never been rejected by this Society nor by any of its branches.

Name, Edward P. Rauby

POST OFFICE ADDRESS. 418 Market St.
San Francisco Cal.

We, the undersigned Fellows of the Theosophical Society, hereby certify that Edward P. Rauby

a candidate for admission to the said Society, is a person who, to the best of our belief, will be a worthy member of the same.

Dated at San Francisco this 28th

day of July 1889.

Entrance fee of Branches is fixed by them.
Fees to be remitted to General Secretary with this application:
For members at large, entrance fee \$2.00, Diploma 50 cts., annual subscription \$1.00, total \$3.50; for Branch members the Branch Secretary will remit \$1.50.

Sarah A. Harris F. T. S.
Chas. H. Hayes F. T. S.
William D. Judge
Registered GENERAL SECRETARY AMERICAN SECTION, T. S.

5484

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,



OBLIGATION.

I, the undersigned, an applicant for Fellowship in the Theosophical Society, do hereby give to the President and Fellows of the said Society, MY MOST SOLEMN AND SACRED PROMISE UPON HONOR that I will not, under any circumstances, betray to unauthorized persons the signs and pass-words of the Society; that any information concerning the legitimate work or researches of the Society which may be communicated to me as a member of the Society, in confidence, I will faithfully keep secret, allowing no one, under any pretext, or by any threat or promise, to extort the same from me; that I will abstain from doing anything that may bring dishonor upon the Society, its members, or myself; and that to the best of my ability I will work for the furtherance of the declared objects of the Society.

Edward P. Rauba

Dated at *San Francisco* this *28th* 5

day of *February* 188*9*.

In presence of

Allen Griffiths
Chas. H. Hyles

The above obligation has reference more particularly to the signs and pass-words of the Society. They can be conferred by Presidents of Branches, by Councillors and certain authorized persons.

Aryau

Pd. 90.



THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

APPLICATION FOR FELLOWSHIP.

I, the undersigned, being in sympathy with the objects of the Theosophical Society and acquainted with its rules, hereby make application for admission as a Fellow thereof.

I understand the objects of the Society to be as follows: 1st.—To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, or color. 2d.—To promote the study of Aryan and other Eastern literature, religions and sciences. 3d.—To investigate unexplained laws of Nature and the Psychical powers of man.

My application for Fellowship has never been rejected by this Society nor by any of its branches.

Name in full,

Myron H. Phelps

POST OFFICE ADDRESS IN FULL.

*Temple Court
7 Beekman St
New York*

We, the undersigned Fellows of the Theosophical Society, hereby certify that *Myron H. Phelps* a candidate for admission to the said Society, is a person who, to the best of our belief, will be a worthy member of the same.

Dated at *New York* this *4th*

day of *June* 1890

Entrance fee of Branches is fixed by them. Fees to be remitted to General Secretary with this application:— For members at large, \$3.50; for Branch members the Branch Secretary will remit \$1.50.

William Judge
F. T. S.

Alexander Fullerton
F. T. S.

Registered

William Judge
GENERAL SECRETARY AMERICAN SECTION, T. S.

(OVER.)

Admitted 10 day of June 1890, by Aryau F.S. *William Judge*

W. J. Judge T.S.
6042

Entered 25/8/90 5761

Secretaries and Branch Presidents please note:

- (a) In the case of Members-at-large admitted by a Branch President, he should fill the first blank with the date, and fill the second with his own name and his title as President, followed by the words "At large" thus: "Admitted [date of admission] by [name of President and Branch T. S.]——At large."
- (b) In the case of Members admitted by and to a Branch, the President or Secretary should fill the blanks so that they may read, Admitted [date] by [name of Branch] T. S.
- (c) In the case of Members-at-Large admitted by the General Secretary, the blanks are filled by him.

Upon the admission of a Member-at-large by a Branch President or of a Member to a Branch, the Application, together with the proper fees, should be IMMEDIATELY sent by the President or Secretary to the General Secretary. This makes the dates in the latter's record-book consecutive, and also avoids mistakes and delays arising from the reception of papers signed by persons of whose membership the General Secretary has not been informed.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE,
General Secretary,
P. O. Box 2659, New York.

W. J. Judge

Vertical handwritten notes on the right margin, including the number 10.

Admitted 17th day of Nov. 1890, by Law, Secy At Large



THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

APPLICATION FOR FELLOWSHIP.

I, the undersigned, being in sympathy with the objects of the Theosophical Society and acquainted with its rules, hereby make application for admission as a Fellow thereof.

I understand the objects of the Society to be as follows: 1st.—To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, or color. 2d.—To promote the study of Aryan and other Eastern literature, religions and sciences. 3d.—To investigate unexplained laws of Nature and the Psychical powers of man.

My application for Fellowship has never been rejected by this Society nor by any of its branches.

Name in full, Joseph Hall Fussell
POST OFFICE ADDRESS IN FULL, ~~130 W 43rd St~~ 106 Macouck St, New York, Savannah Ga.

We, the undersigned Fellows of the Theosophical Society, hereby certify that _____ a candidate for admission to the said Society, is a person who, to the best of our belief, will be a worthy member of the same.

Dated at NY this 16 day of Sept 1890.

Entrance fee of Branches is fixed by them. Fees to be remitted to General Secretary with this application:— For members at large, \$2.50; for Branch members the Branch Secretary will remit \$1.50.

Rufus J. Bryan
F. T. S.
William Judge
F. T. S.

Registered William Judge
GENERAL SECRETARY AMERICAN SECTION, T. S.

(OVER.)

At Large

6306

6121

Handwritten notes

Secretaries and Branch Presidents please note :

- (a) In the case of Members-at-large admitted by a Branch President, he should fill the first blank with the date, and fill the second with his own name and his title as President, followed by the words "At large" thus: "Admitted [date of admission] by [name of President and Branch T. S.]——At large."
- (b) In the case of Members admitted by and to a Branch, the President or Secretary should fill the blanks so that they may read, Admitted [date] by [name of Branch] T. S.
- (c) In the case of Members-at-Large admitted by the General Secretary, the blanks are filled by him.

Handwritten notes

Handwritten notes

Upon the admission of a Member-at-large by a Branch President or of a Member to a Branch, the Application, together with the proper fees, should be IMMEDIATELY sent by the President or Secretary to the General Secretary. This makes the dates in the latter's record-book consecutive, and also avoids mistakes and delays arising from the reception of papers signed by persons of whose membership the General Secretary has not been informed.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE,
General Secretary,
P. O. Box 2659, New York.

Handwritten notes

Handwritten notes

FOUNDED AT NEW YORK,

NOVEMBER 17TH, MDCCCLXXV.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA



"THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH."

ADMITS *Charles A. Lanyon* to the number of
its Fellows. In Testimony Whereof, it has issued to him the present
Diploma, in the *seventh* Month of its *Thirty-second* Year.

New York, N. Y. May 27th 1907

Ada Gregg Secretary



Charles Johnston
Chairman: Executive Committee.

15. Sketches of Adyar Headquarters by William Q. Judge.

The following illustrations are reproduced from sketches by William Q. Judge during his stay at Adyar in 1884. After leaving New York in early February 1884, Judge stayed in London waiting for word from Col. Olcott as to when he could meet H.P. Blavatsky, Col. Olcott and others in France. Their ship left India for Marseilles on February 20th. Judge arrived in Paris on March 25th, 1884 and at 11P.M. on March 28th he and others met H.P. Blavatsky and Col. Olcott at the train station. After spending time in France helping H.P.B. with **The Secret Doctrine**, at the end of June Judge left from England for India. He arrived at the Bombay harbor at 8:30A.M. on Tuesday, July 15th, 1884. Since there was no urgency at the time to proceed to Adyar, Judge accommodated his hosts by lecturing along the way — arriving at Adyar on August 10th, 1884.


The sketches and the descriptions of the buildings are from **The Path**, Vol. 7, June 1892, pp.71-75.

— Compiler.

HABITATIONS of H.P.B.

NO. 2.


In the *Path* of 1890 (vol. v, April) a view was given of the Headquarters building at Adyar as it appeared after alteration and the addition of the library wing. It need not be repeated here, as H.P.B. did not reside in it subsequent to the alterations, but was residing in London. The changes consisted in filling in the spaces at each side of the *porte cochère*,² thus turning the latter into an entrance, and adding rooms at each end of the building in front. Col. Olcott also constructed an additional building, on the ocean side, for the Oriental Library. Some changes were made in the roof by the raising of the top of what was called the “occult room”, which had a sloping roof when H.P.B. lived there, as the illustration on next page will show.



2. A grand opening or door permitting horse drawn carriages to pass through while under cover. — Compiler.

[72] This picture is reproduced from an accurate sketch made on the spot in 1884, the point of view being as you come up the drive from the entrance gate.³ It shows the front of the building as it faces the compound, and runs down to where the library building now stands. The *porte cochère* spoken of above is seen in perspective. It gave a grand air to the front, but has been absorbed by the alterations. The whole building was, in 1884, of a white color, appearing at a distance like a marble structure, but in reality is constructed of brick plastered white, as is very usual in India. It was purchased some years ago by subscription, and is now free of debt. Standing in a compound—or grounds—of some 21 acres, it is a very fine place, and if its counterpart were found in this country the cost would be very large, whereas in India its value is small by comparison with American properties. The Adyar River flows along behind the house not more than ten feet away. It is not a river of any consequence, its mouth being generally closed with sand through which the stream percolates into the ocean; and at this season of the year the water is very low and the odor from the mud rather disagreeable, but at full seasons it is a delightful little creek, as we would call it.

Just appearing over the ornamental balustrade which encloses the roof is the front of H.P.B.'s own room, which led into the [73] shrine-room shown in the second picture. Her room was an addition to the building, and in a way served to join the two towers which rise at the back corners at either end. The stairs of the tower illustrated was the means of communication with her apartment, although the other tower had also a stairway, and another stairs was made running directly into the lower rooms at the library end. But these were not completed in June, 1884, when she was in Europe, as Monsieur Coulomb suspended work as soon as Mme. Blavatsky and Col. Olcott had gone to London, and began at once to construct the *ex post facto* trap-doors which he hoped to ruin the Society with, and at the same time to turn over some honest pennies of the missionaries for his so-called *exposé*.




3. The illustrations to these articles are all by William Q. Judge except the process plate in No. 1.

That part of the compound extending from the entrance gate on the highway was full of mango trees, and through them the driveway brought you up to the house and under the *porte cochère*. Alighting there, a short flight of steps took you up to the entrance hall, where the floor was of black and white marble. Here there were two tables, sofas, and some chairs, and on the floor many a night slept Damodar K. Mavalankar, of pleasant memory, together with several others, including Ananda and Babajee.

Part of the end of the building on the side near the main road is given here. It is a continuation of the corner seen in the first cut. The tower finishes the river end of the building, and the river itself can be just seen at the back. On the top is the occult [74] room with the extension or verandah. The roof of the "occult room" was slanting and tiled in red, the plaster being tinted yellow. In this was the shrine. It was entered from the other side, and, being a few feet lower than the rooms used by H.P.B., a short flight of steps ran down into it. In the tower is a winding brick stairway, and opening on that was one window of the occult room. This window was made into a cupboard, the back of which looked on the stairs. This back was altered by M. Coulomb after H.P.B.'s departure so as to have a sliding panel as a part of his conspiracy. It was not workable, however. The whole upper part of the house was, in fact, a patchwork devoid of regularity.

Damodar's room was in this tower at the top as you came up the narrow stairs. It was from that little room the famous "shrine" was stolen on the night after its removal from the wall in the "occult room". A corridor, as you might call it, ran across the back of H.P.B.'s rooms from tower to tower, open to the river and giving a view of the little island opposite and the long queer bridge which carries the highway across the river. The small picture shows this bridge, which was painted pink.

Opposite beyond the bridge can be seen among the trees other large houses, as the vicinity was once in great



demand before the trade of Madras declined. Every evening at sunset large flying foxes would rise up in great numbers from the direction of the city and fly over to Adyar to feed during the night on the mango and other fruit-trees in the vicinity. Many of them stopped on the Headquarters grounds.

This is reproduced from a photograph of the back of the building taken from the little island at the right of the bridge picture. It shows the other tower, companion to that in which was Damodar's room. The lower floor under the roof was the back part of the middle of the building, and was occupied by the *Theosophist* magazine. Trees and shrubs almost hid the view. A plastered embankment ran for a short distance along this side so as to protect the foundations.



[75] These pictures give a very correct idea of the house when H.P.B. lived in it, but all has now been changed by the addition of the Library and by various changes in the roof which Col. Olcott put into effect after the desecration of the place by the Coulobms, so that now the old “occult room” is a thing of the past, not to be revived until another great personage such as H.P.B. was shall have come and been revealed to us.

THE WITNESS.

Additional information from **The Theosophist** Vol. 52, August 1931, p.658.

NOTE: The sketch depicting the *porte cochère* preceded the following article.

Headquarters at Adyar in 1882.

The house, at the time of its purchase, was called Huddleston Gardens, with land covering 28 acres. As with many houses built then for Europeans, the steps of the *porte cochère* or carriage porch led to a large hall, which served as a drawing room and a dining room. On either side were bedrooms. The house had also a large room at the back, looking on the river. On all sides were verandahs. The hall was 42½ feet long by 23 feet broad, and the front verandah 85 feet long and 7 feet broad.


Colonel Olcott transformed the hall and verandah to make an impressive and beautiful meeting hall, with the finest acoustics for such a large ball. The front verandah was thrown outwards to a distance of 18 ft. beyond the pillars past the porch. The verandah roof was raised 5 ft., and extended over the new part. With steel girders to support the new roof, the old pillars were abolished.

Later, at H. P. B.’s death, the hall was further extended towards the garden by building a small alcove nearly 7½ feet square for H. P. B.’s statue. Underneath the statue, those portions of H. P. B.’s ashes which had been

allocated to Adyar and London now lie buried. This alcove now holds Colonel Olcott's statue by the side of that of H. P. B.


The room on the roof seen in the picture was H. P. B.'s bedroom. Next to it to the left (not seen in the picture), and four steps lower, was the "Shrine Room".

Headquarters lies exactly north and south, Adyar river flowing from west to east into the Bay of Bengal. The statues of the Founders look to the north. The estate now covers 262 acres. (Picture reproduced from *The Path*, June 1892.)



APPENDIX

D



LETTERS FROM W.Q. JUDGE
TO E.T. HARGROVE

Table of Contents ~ Appendix D

(The following letters from W.Q. Judge were originally published in **The Theosophical Quarterly**.)

Part I. Vol. 28, April 1931; pp.314-326.	217-227
Introduction by E.T. Hargrove.	217-220
Letters, August 18 th , 1893 to December 15 th , 1893.	220-227
Part II. Vol. 29, July 1931; pp.35-45.	228-236
Comments from E.T. Hargrove.	228-229
Letters, December 27 th , 1893 to June 6 th , 1894.	229-236
Part III. Vol. 29, October 1931; pp.107-122.	237-249
Examination of facts by Hargrove of the July 1894 Committees.	237-246
After Judge's return to New York: August 7 th , 1894 to Oct. 20 th , 1894.	246-249
Part IV. Vol. 29, January 1932; pp.238-247.	250-257
Following the Judge "trial" in London and the attacks of the Westminster Gazette . Insightful comments by Hargrove on post Committee hearings in London.	250-253
Letters, November 19 th , 1894 to December 28 th , 1894.	253-257
Part V. Vol. 30, July 1932; pp.27-38.	258-267
Examination of facts as a result of Besant's oratory skills and the resolution passed by the Indian Convention demanding for Judge to resign.	258-261
Letters, January 18 th , 1895 to August 5 th , 1895.	261-267
Letter from W.Q. Judge. (Dated May 20 th , 1895.) [from Letters That Have Helped Me]	265-266
Part VI. Vol. 30, October 1932; pp.122-129.	268-275
After visiting his parents in England Hargrove returns to New York.	268
Letter, August 23 rd , 1895 to October 11 th , 1895.	268-275
Part VII. Vol. 30, January 1933; pp.206-212.	276-281
The members in Boston, and Hargrove's return to the lecture circuit.	276
Letters, October 16 th , 1895 to November 19 th , 1895.	276-281
Part VIII. Vol. 31, July 1933; pp.31-35.	282-286
Hargrove goes to stay with Judge in Aiken, South Carolina.	282
Letters, November 27 th , 1895 to December 19 th , 1895.	282-286
Part IX. Vol. 32, January 1934; pp.198-205.	287-293
Hargrove with Judge in Aiken, South Carolina.	287-288
Letters, January 7 th , 1896 to January 31 st , 1896.	289-291
The last days of W.Q. Judge.	291-293

"The THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY is the official organ of the original Theosophical Society founded in New York by H.P. Blavatsky, W.Q. Judge and others, in 1875.

We wish to make it clear that we have no connection whatsoever with any other organization calling itself Theosophical, headed by Mrs. Besant or others, nor similar bodies, the purpose and methods of which are wholly foreign to our own.

EDITORS, THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY."

[314]

LETTERS FROM W.Q. JUDGE

I.

To appreciate these letters and the events that called them forth, a certain amount of background must be supplied.

In 1875, members of the White Lodge, through their agent and messenger, H. P. Blavatsky, founded the Theosophical Society. Of necessity, at the instigation of the Black Lodge, working through human tendencies, the Society was attacked on all sides, chiefly in the person of H. P. Blavatsky, until the day of her death in 1891. Her death, however, did not mean that the Black Lodge ceased its efforts to disrupt and destroy the Society, and the Cause of which she had been the undaunted representative and standard-bearer. The Black Lodge works, not only through the envy, ambition, vanity and other evils in unpurified human nature, but also through organizations the spirit and purposes of which are self-seeking, sectarian, unscrupulous, and which are built upon the vanity and love of power of their membership. Of such organizations, the most subtle in their opposition to the work of H. P. B. had been certain groups of Brahmins in India; for the Brahmins are a caste, an hereditary priesthood, which considers it has an exclusive right to occult knowledge, and which deeply resents its attainment, and especially its dissemination in any form, by non-Brahmins. This is why the Brahmins drove Buddhism out of India,—Gautama Buddha, who was of the Kshatriya or Warrior caste, having attained the highest Wisdom independently of them, and then having thrown the door to its attainment wide open to people of all castes and races. The Masters, of whom H. P. B. was the mouthpiece, of course clearly recognized this situation from the beginning, and, characteristically, forced the issue into the open not very long after H. P. B. arrived in India. Through her, one of them sent a message to a group of Brahmins in Allahabad, who had joined the Theosophical Society for their own purposes. The message is of lasting significance in connection with the attacks on Judge. It began: “Message which Mr. Sinnett is directed by one of the Brothers, writing through Madame B[lavatsky], to convey to the native members of the Prayag Branch of the Theosophical Society.” The message continued: “The Brothers desire me to inform one and all of you *natives* that unless a man is prepared to become a thorough Theosophist, *i.e.* to do what D[amodar] Mavalankar did—give up entirely caste, his old superstitions, and show himself a true reformer (especially in the case of child-marriage), he will remain simply a member of the Society, with no hope whatever of ever hearing from us.” The rest of the message, with Judge’s illuminating comment, is given in *The Path* of March, 1895 (vol. IX, p. 430). It was, in fact, blunt notice to the Brahmins of India that their system was opposed to the principles of the White Lodge and of Theosophy, and, with few exceptions, the Brahmins never forgave and never forgot it.

[315] After H. P. B.’s death, Judge became the standard-bearer. If proof of this were needed, it is found in the fact that attacks, formerly levelled at her, were now turned against him,—and exactly the same kind of attacks from exactly the same source. The instruments used were different: that was all. Vanity and jealousy existed; these were used. Love of power and “occult” ambition existed; these were used. Personal resentment existed; that was used. Nothing could have been accomplished, however, without Mrs. Besant, who, although young in Theosophical experience and membership (she had joined the Society in 1889), was a great orator with an international reputation, and who, furthermore, held a position which gave her much influence with members of the Society in Europe and India, where Judge was but little known. So, through the instrumentality of Mr. Bertram Keightley—at that time General Secretary of the Indian Section, closely associated with Colonel Olcott at Adyar—a very able and cultured Brahmin of Allahabad, Professor G. N. Chakravarti, was selected by several Sabhas or associations of Brahmins to represent them at the Parliament of Religions held in Chicago as part of the World’s Fair of 1893. As he was a member of the Allahabad or “Prayag” Branch of the Theosophical Society, he spoke in that capacity also.

There are many thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, among the vast population of India, who possess

genuine occult powers—of a kind. They have inherited knowledge, passed on by word of mouth, under stringent conditions, from countless generations of yogis and wonder-workers. Most of them can produce, by the cultivated power of will and imagination, what can best be described as collective hallucination; many of them are skilled in the use of Mantras, that is to say, briefly, the use of intoned words to effect changes in magnetic and psychological conditions.

One great difference between the White Lodge—which is trans-Himalayan and which includes men of many different races—and these schools of occultism in India, is that the White Lodge will not permit the development or cultivation of “powers” until the whole nature has been purified spiritually and purged of selfish motive, while the Brahminical and other occult schools in India, though some of them claim the same standards, have in fact lost the spirit and meaning of selflessness, and encourage the cultivation of “powers” regardless of the spiritual condition of the neophyte,—that is, so long as he obeys the letter of the laws of Manu and of caste. The result is that the “powers” ultimately developed by members of the White Lodge are spiritual and eternal, and are infinitely greater on higher planes than those developed in the Indian schools, which are psychic and transitory, though dazzling both to their possessor and to onlookers.

It will be understood by all older students of Theosophy, that if anyone had been connected, through H. P. B., with the White Lodge, and, later, had sought and accepted occult instruction from a representative of a different school, Brahminical or other, the immediate result would have been to sever that aspirant’s connection with H. P. B.’s Masters.

[316] None of which is said to detract from the occult accomplishments of Professor Chakravarti, which in many ways were remarkable, as the present writer could testify from personal observation and experience when Chakravarti was in London; it is said in order to explain how it was that someone who had not yet visited the Orient, who was quite a beginner, and who was avid of occult powers, might easily have been “captured” by such a man—literally fascinated—and how commonplace and unpromising Judge might have seemed in comparison, with his “kindergarten” talk about duty and work and moral discipline, his unqualified disapproval of psychic development, and his cold manner to emotional and adoring women. In any case, Chakravarti captured Mrs. Besant in less than two months: a masterly achievement,—of a kind. He sailed from India in June, 1893, spent two months in England, and had securely laid the foundation for all that followed by the time he sailed for New York with Mrs. Besant on August 26th. She both sought and received occult instruction from him, not only then, but over a period of years. It was this, incidentally, that paved the way for the “occultism” of Leadbeater, the succeeding influence,—the last and most terrible step in the *descensus Averni*.

Chakravarti played his cards with consummate skill and with considerable audacity. During his stay in America (September, 1893), he told Judge that H. P. B.’s message from Masters to the Allahabad Brahmins (to “you natives”) was a “forgery or humbug” (see *The Path*, vol. IX, p. 431). Gradually he inoculated Mrs. Besant with the conviction which, after much association with Olcott in India, she finally voiced as her own in conversations with Judge in July, 1894,—namely that, first, “H. P. B. had committed several frauds for good ends and made bogus messages; second, that I [Judge] was misled by her example; and third, that H. P. B. had given me permission to do such acts.” Judge adds (see *The Path*, vol. IX, p. 432): “I peremptorily denied such a horrible lie, and warned her that everywhere I would resist such attacks on H. P. B. These are facts, and the real issue is around H. P. B.”

The real issue *was* around H. P. B.; but Judge’s enemies knew it would be impolitic openly to attack her; that it would be far easier to undermine her—really, to destroy the latest effort of the White Lodge—by a flank attack on Judge: so all the public agitation was against him, while criticism of her and of her methods was circulated privately, in whispers. Olcott was an exception. While attacking Judge as savagely as any of

them, he tried to undermine H. P. B. by a method best described as that of “affectionate” belittlement. His *Old Diary Leaves*, many of which were published at that time, might have been entitled, in the dreadful parlance of to-day, “The De-Bunking of H. P. B., by her Only Friend.”

Behind it all, the Black Lodge; the rest was human nature at its worst: a sorry spectacle. But against that dark background, it will be seen from Judge’s letters with what a pure, selfless and serene light he shines, and with what power. That this may be seen, is the reason and the only reason these letters are published. We are not concerned with the dead; let the dead bury them; they are doing so. They have long since ceased, for the most part, their attacks,[317]—thinking of him, instead of themselves, as dead. (Such confusions exist in that world.) Well,—he lives, as this 28th volume of the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, among other things, proves; and that we who knew him and worked under him, and who could desire nothing better than to work under him again, also love him, is a fact there is no gainsaying. But to love him is easy for us who knew him, because we were given every reason, not only to trust him absolutely, but to recognize his one-pointed devotion to H. P. Blavatsky and to the purposes of the Lodge of which she was the Messenger; it would have been inexcusable if we had failed to see at least something of his greatness, and of his subordination of all personal considerations to the welfare of the Work to which he had dedicated his life. We knew from actual contact and experience—by their private as well as public behaviour—that in comparison with those who maligned and slandered him, he was as big as the ocean. Simply by being what he was, he revealed their pettiness, their vanity, their intense and bitter worldliness. But there are not many, to-day, who knew him. Necessarily, owing to the passage of time, to a majority of those who read the QUARTERLY, he is little more than a name; and while most members of the Society know that H. P. B. spoke and wrote of him as a *chêla* of many years’ standing (and she wrote of no one else in those terms), and while all members know what his place and position in the Movement were,—comparatively few have a vivid picture of him as a man, of his methods, and of his reaction to the evils which beset him,—and they are entitled to this if it can be given to them.

No better means to that end can be imagined, in our opinion, than the publication of these letters, dashed off, as they were, in the midst of battle, and revealing far more of the real man than any amount of reminiscence. That they do not reveal the whole of him is inevitable, for an Occultist is many-sided always, and, in the words of Paul the Initiate, becomes “all things to all men”, depending upon their personal condition and need. Thus, the early volume of *Letters That Have Helped Me*, having been written to a very different person, express sides of Judge’s nature which should be combined with the sides which these later letters manifest.

Extracts from them have already been published in the second volume of *Letters That Have Helped Me*, but while, to some QUARTERLY readers, such passages will be familiar, it will be found, I believe, that they gain much added significance when read with their original context.

* * * * *

In 1893, when the earlier of these letters were written, the recipient was a Templar, a member of the Middle Temple in London, supposed to be studying law, but actually giving most of his time to work for Theosophy, helping at the London Headquarters at 19, Avenue Road, writing reviews for *Lucifer*, lecturing at Branches, and so forth. He had joined the Theosophical Society in the late summer of 1891, before meeting any of its members, and a few months before his twenty-first birthday. He had met Mr. Judge at the Convention of the European Section in July, 1892, and had been very deeply impressed. [318] Behind Mr. Judge’s simplicity of demeanour, the boy had felt something great, and had loved it. Not attempting to define it at the time, it became easy, in later years, by recalling the impression, to see that the “something great” to which his whole heart had gone out, with a trust and devotion which never wavered, was not only a memory, but a sense of the man’s extraordinary detachment from self, and singleness of purpose. Judge spoke (impossible to recall what he said, though the look in his eyes remains vivid) as if from some place of absolute stillness. “Judge”,

said the boy to himself, "is an Occultist." For one so young, both in years and in the work, such a verdict may have been presumptuous; but in any case he backed the opinion with everything he had or hoped for, and I am thankful to this day that he did.

More work in and around London, for another year, and still more time given to Theosophy and still less given to the law. Judge arrived again for the Convention (1893), and on this occasion I saw more of him. Judge gave me a copy of *The Ocean of Theosophy*, and wrote in it: "To Ernest Hargrove, from William Q. Judge: The light within is the only light which lighteth every man who cometh in the world; the Mahatmas and the light within are not different." "I was told to write that," Judge said, a year or two later in America.

With an English boy's shyness, I kept my devotion to myself, and left it to Judge to make the first advances as it were. This was partly out of respect, but was also due to ignorance of the fact that an Occultist is bound by the laws of the Lodge and of the spiritual world, and *must* leave it to the aspirant to declare himself. It was not until the air became thick with rumours adverse and hostile to Judge, that the boy's blood began to boil; and I wrote, not assuring Judge of my loyalty, for that would have implied the possibility of doubt, but with some direct reference to the attack of Walter R. Old which Colonel Olcott had published in *The Theosophist*. It was to this letter that Judge replied as follows:—

New York,
August 18th, 1893.

My dear Hargrove,

I have your letter with the suggestion for reprinting of *Path* articles, and thank you for it. I have considered it before, and one result was *Letters that Helped*. Other matter could be got out and perhaps one way would be to make another edition of the *Letters* and add to it. But the obstacle has been money as of that I have very little and don't know where to get it. But am sure that at the right time the needed money will come for the purpose. I am running so many things and the expenses of so many persons now that I do not dare to count it up as I might be appalled. I will keep your idea in mind just as I have some others packed away.

Yes, the Old business is already "a back number", stale and unprofitable. I have found that work tells. While others fume and fret and sleep, and now and then start up to criticize, if you go right on and work, and let time the great devourer do the other work, you will see that in a little while the others will [319] wake up once more to find themselves "left", as we say here in the land of slang. Do then that way. Your own duty is hard enough to find out, and by attending to that you gain, no matter how small the duty may be. The duty of another is full of danger. May you have the light to see and to do. This letter is not private, and if you like to read it to anyone else you may do so.

Tell H. T. Edge* to remember to work to the end to make himself an instrument for good work. Times change, men go here and there, and places need to be filled by those who can do the best sort of work and who are full of the fire of devotion and who have the right basis and a sure and solid one for themselves. My love to all.

As ever yours,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

The Theosophical Congress to which Mr. Judge refers in the next letter, was part of the Parliament of Religions at Chicago, the sessions of which began on September 11th. The Congress itself was held on the 15th and 16th. Among others who spoke were Mr. Judge, Mrs. Annie Besant, Professor G. N. Chakravarti and

*. One of the younger workers at the Headquarters in London.

Mr. Dharmapala. Meetings were held in halls seating 3,000 people, and were so crowded that many were turned away. The head-lines of newspaper reports of the Parliament mentioned Theosophy to the exclusion of all else, though most religions and innumerable denominations and sects were represented.

Mrs. Besant and Professor Chakravarti returned to London in the early part of October.

September 20th, 1893.

My dear Hargrove,

Am very glad to hear from you and do not mind what you do with the letter which I sent you. It is all right. I am so hurried with this long absence at the Congress that I can only drop you a note. The Congress was an immense success in every particular. I now have to go to work at getting up the report.

Sincerely in haste,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

October 5th, 1893.

My dear Hargrove,

Notwithstanding your request that I should not reply to yours enclosing the letter for the *Path*, I do so as I have a moment to spare,—not merely to excuse myself for not using the thing, but for the general idea involved. It is better not to notice this spirit to which you refer. Let them croak, and if we keep silent it will have no effect, and as there has been trouble enough it is [320] better not to make it any worse by referring to it. The only strength it has is when we take notice. I write this so as to prevent you if possible carrying out the idea in your letter any other way. You are quite right, but it is better policy for all of us who are in earnest and united to keep still in every matter that has any personal bearing. Such is my excuse for writing.

Sincerely as ever,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

As the weeks passed, and as doubts of Judge and even of H. P. B. began to be expressed openly, though as yet sadly, at the London Headquarters, I finally boiled over, or, rather, my intensity of feeling for Judge, brought to a head by the veiled forebodings or open criticism which I heard around me, aroused greater inner effort, and broke through some of the barriers between myself and my own soul,—with two outer results. First, under the nom-de-plume of “Che-Yew-Ts [ng]”, I wrote an article entitled “Some Modern Failings” which was sent to *Lucifer* and which was published immediately. This had repercussions to which Judge refers in later letters. Second, and far more important, with these barriers removed, I lost much of my reserve (and, from a *worldly* standpoint, whatever sense I may have had), and figuratively hurled myself at Judge’s head, asking to be allowed to work with and for him on any terms or conditions. If I could have gone to America—or to Timbuctoo—to work for him, I would cheerfully have camped out in the street. The place where I was—the home of most kind and generous parents, with all the freedom I could want to work for Theosophy in England—seemed like exile: where Judge was, was “home”.

In reply to a letter which attempted to express something of that spirit, and which obviously, from the nature of the answer, must have been sufficiently specific, Judge wrote:

October 7th, 1893.

Dear Hargrove,

I have your good letter and my dear boy you may be as full and free and frank with me as you like. It is good for the soul and good for us both.

Well now, just at this minute I do not know exactly what to say. I like you and would like to have you work here, but cannot see the ground clear as yet. Why not take up an easy and fluidic position in the matter. An occultist is never fixed on any mortal particular plan. So do not fix your mind as yet on a plan. Wait. All things come to him who waits in the right way. Make yourself in every way as good an instrument for any sort of work as you can. Every little thing I ever learned I have now found out to be of use to me in this work of ours. When the hour strikes it will then find you ready; no man knows when the hour will strike. But he has to be ready. You see Jesus was in fact an occultist, and in the parable of the foolish virgins gave a real occult ordinance. [321] It is a good one to follow. Nothing is gained, but a good deal lost by impatience. Not only is strength, but also sight and intuition.

Certainly if you ever could in justice to all your affairs and to the T. S. come to America, then I should be glad to see you, but am not yet able to say come now. If you adopt the attitude I mentioned above, the time if it is ever to come will show itself to you and to me. But all the time you can be preparing for doing good work in any and all directions. You should become familiar with the T. S. history, genius and record. Labor-saving accomplishments are good to have. Ease of manner and speech are of the best to have. Ease of mind and confidence are better than all in this work of dealing with other men, that is with the human heart. The more wise one is the better he can help his fellows, and the more cosmopolitan he is the better too. Now is all this clear. In fine, I should welcome you. But you should know facts. At present I could not sustain you physically from lack of funds. But if at any time the Lord let you come, not as a burden that way, then of course it is all right. But decide nothing hastily. Wait, make no set plan, wait the hour to make the decision then, for if you decide in advance of the time you tend to raise a confusion.

All the work you now do for the administrative part of the work in Europe is good for the future. We shall always want those who know that sort so as to save and guide this old bark of T. S. So have patience, courage, hope, faith and cheerfulness.

As ever yours,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

Try to get the *inner* sense of Bhagavad Gita up to 4th Chapter. Put it in practice if you can every moment, and it will give great results that you really seek. J.

If you want to kill desire or the like, take your *mind* off it and you will succeed.

The next letter is remarkable because Judge, when he wrote it, knew perfectly well that Mrs. Besant, under the influence of Professor Chakravarti, had already in heart and purpose turned against him, as she had turned from her trust in H. P. B. It was because she had not as yet openly committed herself, and might still, at the eleventh hour, turn back to the path of loyalty; it was because he wanted to give her every opportunity to do this, and had, furthermore, trained himself to do all things from moment to moment, on a basis solely of what was right and generous and true,—that he demanded, of those who trusted him, “loyalty in heart and fact and thought to A. B. in her absence.” It was a supreme achievement of his own loyalty and magnanimity.

Mrs. Besant left London for India in October, 1893, arriving at Colombo, where Colonel Olcott met her, on November 9th. They reached Adyar on [322] December 20th. Professor Chakravarti had left for India a week before Mrs. Besant. She met him at Allahabad early in 1894. It was while there, with him, that she wrote

to Colonel Olcott (February 6th) asking that charges be formulated officially against Judge.

October 19th, 1893.

Dear Hargrove,

Now that Annie is going, London should take thought.

(a) Loyalty in heart and fact and thought to A. B. in her absence. Criticism should be abandoned. It is no good. Co-operation is better than criticism. The duty of another is dangerous for one whose duty it is not. The insidious coming of unbrotherly criticism should be warned against, prevented, stopped. By example you can do much, as also by work in due season.

(b) Calmness is now a thing to be had, to be preserved. No irritation should be let dwell inside. It is a deadly foe. Sit on all the small occasions that evoke it and the greater ones will never rise to trouble you.

(c) Solidarity.

(d) Acceptation of others.

(e) Moderation in respect to H. P. B.; not to drag her name too often to the front and thus provoke an attack. Time to repel attack is when it is made. A danger lies here as if not watched we might have an anti H. P. B. sect.

Good luck, adieu.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

Judge was full of quips. It was characteristic of him to bestow ever-varying *sobriquets* on his friends. The “(Jennings)”, with which the next letter begins, is explained by some connection he had once jocularly drawn between myself and Hargrave-Jennings, author of the well-known book on the Rosicrucians.

The “Chinaman”, of the second sentence, was Judge’s way of referring to “Che-Yew-Ts [ng]”, the nom-de-plume to which reference has already been made. George R. S. Mead was the Assistant Editor of *Lucifer* at that time. For a sufficient explanation of this incident, see *The Path*, vol. IX, 1894-95, pp. 401, 434.

November 7th, 1893.

Dear Hargrove (Jennings),

Am glad to get your letters and know that you are all right. The style of the Chinaman, George tells me, reminds him of K. H. This is a compliment. It will show you how important it is never to let the thing out as it has gone so far as that. It is quite possible that some of K. H. inspiration came at the time, for such things do happen. Some persons are able to get good inspiration from various causes and there is no reason why you should not be the one in this case. At any rate the thing has done good.

[323] As to the other matter, I understood well enough, and there will be no need to explain these things to me. If you remain on your present basis I will understand all the time. Foolish notions come to all of us, but foolish devotions apparently lead often to good things. By experience you will be able finally to see the truth more clearly.

Your idea to finish up the law is a good one, for in this age we all have to have some ostensible means of

support, and at the same time legal study well done does one good and gives the mind a good bent. I never found my 20 years of law did me anything but good.

Now could I get you as a regular sender of news to *Path*? I do not mean long windy letters, but cold facts, hence one month but little and another more. Examine the *Path* and see how we do up the American notes in *Mirror* and follow that model, and if there is nothing to say, leave it unsaid. If you conclude to do this, send the matter off each month so as to get here by the 15th at latest. It should not be in form of a letter, but paragraphs of facts, and it should not go into reviews of literature nor newspapers. I will reserve right to cut out what is not wanted.

Sincerely as ever,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

I had written to Judge about a letter shown to me by Mrs. Cooper-Oakley, in which she had expressed some innocuous criticism of another member. It seems likely, from the nature of Judge's reply, that before writing to him I had spoken of the matter to others, with the youthful and most foolish idea of creating a better understanding, and of being "helpful". In any case, his reply taught me, and may teach others, a valuable lesson.

November 25th, 1893.

Dear Hargrove *né* Jennings,

I got your letter.—Now my dear fellow do read that part of the New Testament where it tells about the little member the tongue and what it can do. For the love of heaven do not take any tales or information from any person to any other. The man who brought news to the king was sometimes killed. The surest way to make trouble out of nothing is to tell about it from one to another. Construe the words of the Gita about one's own duty to mean that you have nothing to do in the smallest particular with other people's fancies, tales, facts, or other matters as you will have enough to do to look out for your own duty. All that you wrote me I knew long ago and also forecasted it without using any other faculty than my knowledge of human nature, and I can now assure you that I see nothing in it unless people will insist on making things out of what is small. I will not meddle in this. There is nothing in it at all to be touched. We must be simply calm.

And while it was not wrong to see C. O.'s letter to me, yet having seen it, I would have at once forgotten it. Too much, too much, trying to force harmony. [324] Harmony comes from a balancing of diversities, and discord from any effort to make harmony by force.

Some psalmist or other gospel sharp said that "all men are liars", in which I agree. We all are makers of lies from the fact that we never are able either to show our correct selves to others, or to gain from their words a correct estimate of them or what they are trying to say. This leads to trouble, and hence the other gospelite said our communications should be Yea, Yea and Nay, Nay, for more than these cometh of evil. These are not intentional lies of ours, but they often have as much ill effect as the real article.

I think it was well for you to go and mix with "the democrats", as we should not even have the appearance of exclusion. Democrats are queer too, and given to enlarged fancy very often. But the mass of the world is made up of these. And at heart they are good and perceive the truth; hence the saying, "vox populi vox dei".

I sent no telegram to use discretion in general, but sent to George one about a particular article that, as to its publication he could use his discretion. Now in this instance you see that was an affair wholly between him

and me, and anyone seeing it could gain no right idea unless they knew all about it. In all such things I never meddle, but say to myself it is none of my affair at all, and I wait till it comes to me and thank God if it never arrives. And that is a good rule for you. Well, this is all I can say. Finis. There's nothing in it. Bombinans in vacuo.

As ever,

WILLIAM Ț.

Have just got your letter in which you say you have made up your mind just about as above written, to attend very strictly to your own duty, and am glad. We all differ and must agree to disagree, for it is only by balancing contrary things that equilibrium (harmony) is obtained. Harmony does not come through likeness. And as Mrs. K[eightley] is very different from the rest, and also more exposed in consequence of working so much with me, it is easier to hurt her. If people will only let each other alone and go about their own business quietly, all will be well. It is difficult to prevent yourself from being mixed up, but it is one's duty to try and find one's duty, and not to get into the duty of another, and in this it is of the highest importance that we should detach our *minds* (as well as tongues) from the duties and acts of others whenever those are outside our own. If you can find this fine line of action and inaction, you will have made great progress.

WILLIAM Q. J.

December 2nd, 1893.

Dear Hargrove,

I have your interesting letter, interesting as it offers us the probability of a visit from you in April. We should be delighted to have you, and have you read an address from Europe and speak for yourself.

[325] The matter of the Convention is now on once more, as we must prepare, and a point arises as to the place. It is not always in the same place. Has been generally in Chicago as that is central, but last year there was a cry from California and we are in some doubt if we did not agree to it then for this year, as a condition for New York last year. If we decide on California, would that make any difference to you? It is 5 days from here; expense we can consider after. That makes 10 days all told extra from here. Could you do it, leaving the matter of cost out of the question? Let me know of this, or rather find out, if you can, how you will stand on the matter of coming, for I presume if you got off to go to the U. S. for the purpose, the little additional matter of California would not be much in the way, except on the point of money. So look at it in the first place irrespective of the costs. There would be no charge for hotels, as here you stop with me, and elsewhere would go to other members. Perhaps also I can do something in the line of the cost, for last time Mead was here I paid some of his shot to the west.

I would like to have something definite from you, for time flies and we are now near the new year. I hope you will be able to come. If even you did not go out there, you might stop and work here while I was away, for we have things in such a way that I can find work for you. I can't find work for all as they do not pan out well, but for such as thee I can.

All the rest you say is good. Am glad all looks well. It would always look well if each and all minded their own things and kept the mind free from all else. At any rate if you do not come over here I will see you again in London in the summer.

As ever yours,

WILLIAM Q. J.

As a guru or “adjuster”—what some people would call a spiritual director—Judge was marvellous. He had a way of changing conditions by creating atmospheres, and often without any direct reference to the condition he wanted to affect. The following letter illustrates this. As explained previously, I had written an article the authorship of which was not known to the people around me. I heard it attributed to various Adepts and chêlas, and wrote to Judge for further light. Even then I realized that his letter was a kindly way of saying, “Do not be an ass”. It helped me, thereafter, to judge things on their merits, regardless of their real or supposed origin.

December 13th, 1893.

My Dear Hargrove,

I think all you say of work and devotion is good, and you will agree with me that if we all the time looked after our own particular duty it would save trouble. Yes, I like the Chinaman’s article very much and hope to see more. Where did he fall from? But now, to ask me if I know all about him is,—well it’s absurd my boy, as I do not know the universe and bother less. I like an article [326] and then I don’t care a welsh rabbit who wrote it, for I have long known that even the most unworthy may be inspired to write now and then, and the desire to find out who is who is no use. But I do know one thing and that is that Jasper Niemand is not the Chinaman nor is X nor W. Q. J. nor is W. Q. J., Jasper. This I do know, that is I know it inside, for of course on the legal plane of strict evidence I know nothing of the Chinese or of his blessed article. It makes me laugh all this about authors. Why once I wrote a thing under a cock and bull name and had a man bring it to me and say how fine, and that’s what I should think, when I had said the same thing to him myself. Well I simply chuckled inside.

All here well except me, as my liver is a perennial source of variety and amusement, le liver s’amuse; avez vous le livre de mon chef?

Clairvoyant doctor says my liver is swelled inside. If it bursts good by, and you may have my old derby hat number seven. It might go on over your plug. More power to you.

As ever,

WILLIAM Q. J

I had written to Judge that the Chinese nom-de-plume was being taken too seriously and too authoritatively, and that I had decided not to use it again. From the fact that he wrote me immediately after his letter of the 13th, it may be that he did not wish the effect of that letter to last too long.

The “London letter” was my attempt to comply with his request for monthly notes of Theosophical news to be published in *The Path*.

He wrote:

December 15th, 1893.

Dear Rosicrucian,

Glad to hear. London letter O. K. When printed you can see what I cut—not much.

Good that China is to go. Such is the U. S. law. It is dangerous, for if discovered—and you would be—the slump would be very bad.

George is so struck by Chew that if he found it out, it would hurt him, and it won't do in merry England.

Good luck to thee. If you feel like a Chew article for *Path* now and then under another n. d. p., I'll use it if you like.

I'm in great haste.

As ever,

WILLIAM W.[†]

[†]. When writing informally and intimately, as in this letter and that of November 25th, Judge often used the sign of Jupiter to represent the Q. and J. of his initials.

[35]

LETTERS FROM W.Q. JUDGE

II.

Neither the spirit nor the significance of these letters can be appreciated without an understanding of the circumstances in which they were written. It is greatly to be hoped, therefore, that readers of this instalment will refer to what was said, by way of introduction to the series, in the last issue of the QUARTERLY (April, 1931), page 314 *et seq.*

From the date of the first to the last (June 6th, 1894) of the letters now given, the attacks on Judge were steadily becoming more open and more virulent. Mrs. Besant and the Countess Wachtmeister, who had arrived in Colombo during the early part of November, 1893, were met there by Olcott, who escorted them, by slow stages, to Adyar, where they arrived in time for the Convention toward the end of December. Mrs. Besant had “gone native” almost as soon as she set foot in India, adopting an imitation of native dress, and in every possible way proclaiming herself Hindu. So far as her lecturing engagements permitted, she was hurrying to Allahabad, where Professor Chakravarti, whom she had adopted as her occult instructor, awaited her. It was while at Allahabad, on February 6th, 1894, that she handed to Olcott the formal request he wanted, namely, to direct, as President of the Society, “that the charges made” against Judge, “with reference to certain letters and sentences in the alleged writings of the Mahâtmas”, “shall be formulated and laid before a Committee” of the T. S. Olcott wrote officially to Judge next day, enclosing a copy of Mrs. Besant’s demand, and offering him “the following options”: (1) either resign all offices in the T. S., or (2) submit to a trial by a Judicial Committee of the T. S., which would make public the whole of the proceedings in detail. Olcott added that as he would like to know Judge’s decision before Mrs. Besant left India, “I would ask you to kindly cable me the word ‘first’ if you choose to resign; or ‘second’ if you demand the Committee”! Judge’s stand in this matter is set forth clearly in his letter to me of February 26th. Olcott’s suggestion that Judge might prefer to resign was intended, of course, for “the gallery”, as even Olcott knew Judge too well, just as a man (he knew nothing about him as an Occultist), to suppose him capable of any such thing.

It cannot be repeated too often that the objective of the Black Lodge, which instigated and engineered these attacks, was the destruction of H. P. B.’s reputation, as a woman, but chiefly as Lodge Messenger, and, as a direct consequence, the nullification of her life’s Work, which constituted the chief outer effort of the White Lodge in the nineteenth century. The attacks on Judge, who was known to have been her pupil, and who claimed, rightly, to be following [36] in her footsteps, both in spirit and in method,—were aimed at her, through him. Judge knew it, and all who loved and trusted him, knew it also.

Colonel Olcott had played most creditably an essential and difficult part in the early days of the Movement; but the trouble was that he knew it, and came to think of himself as more important than H. P. B. His attitude in this respect, complicated matters greatly for her during the last years of her life—as all members of that period well knew. He had imagined that, in the event of her death, he would occupy the centre of the theosophical stage without a peer. When she died, his vanity was deeply affronted by the recognition given to Judge; and Judge was H. P. B.’s most powerful and most faithful defender. Olcott felt instinctively that this was a reflection upon himself, and it galled him. He desired, on the one hand, to exalt himself by belittling H. P. B. (as he attempted to do in *Old Diary Leaves*); and Judge balked him there. He was jealous of Judge, on the other hand, because Judge, compelled by Olcott himself to balk him, won increasing admiration by his manner of doing so.

It was the same old story of unregenerate human nature,—not only in Olcott’s case, but in the case of all those, without exception, who laid themselves open to be used as tools in this infamous campaign. Because they were willing tools, they thought that they were conducting it, but actually, as a campaign, it had been

devised, well in advance of execution, by those whose hatred of the White Lodge over-shadowed all minor hatreds, whether of H. P. B. or of Judge.

Meanwhile Judge worked and worked and worked—for Theosophy. As these letters prove, he spared himself no pains, overlooked no detail in *his* campaign, the single purpose of which was to consolidate and complete the vast enterprise of H. P. B. It filled him with despair that those who ought to have done likewise were giving their time and energies to personal resentments and jealousies—or to personal devotions; but he refused to be diverted from his course, refused to protect himself, refused to attack his enemies, convinced that truth would prevail in the end, as it will. In those days some of us would have given our lives if he could have been vindicated at once; but he was in no hurry; and now, neither are we. When H. P. B. is recognized for what she was, Judge will be also: not before, because the two stand or fall together. They are inseparable.

E. T. H.

NEW YORK, December 27th, 1893.

Dear Hargrove,

I can now speak definitely in respect to the April Convention here. It will be held at San Francisco near the end of April. Frisco is 5 days away by rail. That makes 10 days from London—say 11. That makes 22 for travel there and back. Could you do it? Such a trip would benefit you in body and mind as well as spreading another T. S. rope across the world. If you come over, here are items to attend to:

- (a) Appointment to represent European Section.
- [37] (b) Address prepared from European Section and signed by the General Secretary.
- (c) Your own address as representative.
- (d) A couple of papers or lectures ready on T. S. subjects, one being short, say 40 minutes. As many in reserve as you like.
- (e) Informing me in advance so that I can assign you a place for a talk on some theosophical subject. This I must know in advance for program.
- (f) Inquire to see if you are to bring over any boxes or things from 19 [Avenue Road] to *Path* or T. S. here.
- (g) Some good photos of yourself for use possibly (positively) with the newspapers. Those you bring, but one is to go out ahead to the Coast through me.

Even should Bert [Keightley] insist on coming, it makes no difference as that would only possibly cut out the representation. But if you are coming and announce it long enough in advance, he is not likely to wish to duplicate, as it would not do. Besides I don't think he wants to go so far over as Frisco, —and he was there years ago.

This is all I can think of in relation to the affair.

With best love

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

Judge used a typewriter, when available, for much of his personal correspondence. “The machine” of the next letter, refers to that.

Khandalavala was an Indian Judge. He had contributed an article to Colonel Olcott's magazine, *The Theosophist*, indirectly attacking Judge, which I had mentioned with disgust in a letter to Judge.

NEW YORK, February 6th, 1894.

Dear Hargrove,

After using the machine for a time it goes well. Try it.

Am glad to hear from you and to get the news. Silentio, my dear, is almost as good as patience. He laughs best who does it last, and time is a devil for grinding things. Do not fear for me; no way. I am not in pain nor will I be. A defeat even would be a sort of new sensation and thus a relief, but I do not expect it. It will be the same old grind all the while. And “yoiung” chickens with swelled heads do not run the universe for any great length of time, for whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. See? As to such men as Khandalavala they are prominent by reason of official position in the Government, but they do not form a majority at all; they are not even types in the Indian Section [of the T. S.]. I know thus. Haven’t much to say. You are all right. Use the time in getting calmness and solid strength, for a big river is so, not because it has a deep bed, but because it has VOLUME.

As ever thine,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

[38]

NEW YORK, February 8th, 1894.

My dear Hargrove,

Just a line about the Convention. There is to be held at the same time at Frisco, a midwinter Fair (now on), with a religious parliament annex, and we are in it by and large with two days for talk. It will meet on the 19th, so you must be over in time to get there by that date. We may want you to swell around at that as a “furriner”, so you will have to see the Chinaman as to a paper. The subjects are: “The Wisdom Religion the basis of all religions”; “Reincarnation”; “Necessary unity of Religion, Philosophy and Science”; “Karma, the immutable Law of Cause and Effect.” Let me know at once the one you take. This, mind, is extra to the Convention, so you must be ready also with things for that. You are now to be initiated into real rushing work in the land of the free, so be bold and strong and don’t mind, for you will be protected and come through all right. How do you like the prospect? We shall have lots of fun, and you will meet so many whole souls you will never want to live in London any more. Good bye and good luck to thee. In haste—as ever the same,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

On the back of the envelope containing the following hurriedly-written letter, Judge wrote: “Want your biography for Faces of Friends. No escape.”

The “splendid picture” of the postscript was the photograph I had sent him in compliance with his request.

NEW YORK, February 23rd, 1894.

Dear Ernest T.,

Enclosed is Convention notice. You do not speak at Rel. Parl. but you ought to be here 1st April so as to go with us. Let me know soon. Mrs. J., Buck, myself and you go together. We may have to start by April 5th from N. Y. so as to do up some places.

I gave Mrs. K. by this mail a small certificate for you.

Times h'is 'ard, but Karma takes care of its own. Come along to Convention and have a good time and we'll get well acquainted.

Love and devotion
Common sense and *justice*.

As ever,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

Splendid picture.

NEW YORK, February 26th, 1894.

My dear Hargrove,

I have now found out all about the trip to California and send you information so that you can decide your dates and let me know at once in order that I may be able to buy the ticket from here. You can pay me for it when you arrive. I must buy it before March 31st in order to take advantage of low rate. [Hargrove took advantage of Judge's offer and arrived in New York on March 31st, 1894. See March 31, 1894 entry for more details.— Compiler]

[39] The midwinter Fair at Frisco is reducing rates on the R. Rs. They offer ticket good till July 30th from N. Y. to the Coast and return for \$123.70, the sleeper being about \$40. extra going and coming; that makes about \$164.70 without any meals. This will give you a good notion of the probable cost. I buy the tickets here, right through, sleepers and all. We shall go from here viâ St. Louis to Los Angeles, where we shall break off for a day extra and then go up the coast to Frisco, and back viâ another route touching at Salt Lake and Denver and Chicago and home. This takes in a good bit of the U. S., as San Diego is really the most southern city near to Mexico.

We must leave here early in April so as to have enough time, but I must know right off so as to buy the tickets before the rate is raised again. This rate is an enormous reduction and is on all the roads so as to attract people to the midwinter Fair. Is it not lucky for us? So now let me know. I have billed you all about and sent your phiz to Frisco and they are "making you up" for the papers. As I asked for a picture and you sent me two with no word to the contrary, I made use of it thus though it is a very nice piece of art work to be flinging around the place.

* * * * *

Please note for your use. The T. S. is a body with no creed, and under its constitution no one has the right to enforce or to authorize a belief. Hence it is unconstitutional for a T. S. committee to sit on or consider a question which raises the existence or powers of the Masters; and so the T. S. has no right to have a committee to decide if anyone ever used the name, fame, or hand of a Master, right or wrong. If they try this, they violate the constitution and make a definite dogma by the decision either way of such a committee. Sit on this question as a lawyer. It is vital.

Good bye, good man, and good luck. I stopped the Chinaman in time, eh?

As ever,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

Elliott B. Page, a very old member of the Society, referred to in the following letter, was manager of the Theosophical publishing and book business at the Headquarters in New York.

NEW YORK, March 2nd, 1894.

Dear Hargrove,

This will probably be the last chance to write.

(a) Wire me if you are going to be here in time to leave with us on the 3rd.

(b) Push up the persons named in Page's letter so they will send you the stuff in time.

(c) Have all the packages marked with your own name, and have as many as you can in your cabin, for when Stabler came back her packages did not turn up for three days. You will have a cabin to yourself and there is plenty of room underneath the berth.

[40] (d) Bring notes with you of your own life for the purposes of *Path* articles. Your plate is here and it is very good.

(e) Have letter of greeting from the European Section sure, as well perhaps as another from the London household [at 19 Avenue Road], and any others you can get from the Continent.

(f) All right about the articles you have mentioned. Bring all your notes of old lectures as you may need them. It may be that you will not speak at the Parliament, as they have cut us down a lot, but the stuff will be just as good for the Convention. The basis of religions is splendid for the Convention, as I have none on that, and they need it, and the Christ idea is also for a second day as they need that too, and it will take with the public.

I hope there will be no hitch in your coming, as I am banking a lot on you though I have not said much.

Good bye then, and good luck as ever,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

English notes are easily cashed here, or gold, or bill to a bank.

The Countess Wachtmeister, who had been appointed to represent the Indian Section of the T. S. at the San Francisco Convention, and I, as delegate of the European Section, travelled on the same ship to New York, where we arrived on March 31st. The Countess had accompanied Mrs. Besant and Olcott on their recent tour in India, and had returned to London somewhat in advance of Mrs. Besant so as to reach San Francisco in time. She was an old member of the Society, and had lived in close contact with H. P. B., so Judge—always thinking of his members—promptly set her to work, and incidentally myself, by calling upon us to speak at the regular Tuesday evening meeting of the Aryan T. S. in the hall at 144 Madison Avenue, then the Headquarters of the T. S. in America.

Judge's solicitude for his members was intense. In his eyes it was nothing short of a crime if older workers, especially those visiting America from abroad in some official or public capacity, failed to give of their best. In reply to a letter from Jasper Niemand (Mrs. Archibald Keightley), asking him to be less "cold" to Mrs. Annie Besant than he had been during the latter's visit to this country with Professor Chakravarti in September, 1893, Judge had written: "It is true Annie suffered through my cold and hard feelings. But it was her fault, for I say now as then to Annie, that she, absorbed in Chakravarti, neglected my members, who are my children, and for whom I wanted her best and got her worst. That made me cold, of course, and I had to fight it, and didn't care if Annie did not like it: I have no time to care. I am glad she has gone to India. It

is her trial and her chance, and when she gets back she can see for herself if she is able to prevent the 'big head' from coming on as has happened with others."

In justice to the Countess Wachtmeister it should be said that Judge had no [41] such ground for complaint against her, as she worked indefatigably throughout her visit, doing more than was asked of her, as Judge thankfully recognized.

On the Thursday after the Aryan meeting, Judge and Mrs. Judge, the Countess Wachtmeister, and I, left New York for San Diego. Our party was joined en route by Dr. J. D. Buck of Cincinnati. We travelled, I think (for at that time all American railroads were alike to me), by the Southern Pacific; in any case we passed through Little Rock, Arkansas, because I well remember Judge's subsequent enjoyment when a member of the Society, residing in Little Rock, who met us on the train as we passed through, pointed to a building in the neighbourhood and said with evident pride: "The largest lunatic asylum in the country!"—or words to that effect. Judge seized upon this incident as an introduction to an American peculiarity, enjoying its humour, of which the local member was totally unaware, but perhaps anxious that I, on my first acquaintance with the country, should not gain a wrong impression. "They are like that", he said, "but they are real people none the less: the salt of the earth."

I was impressed by the way Judge practised what he had preached in his letter to me of October 7th (see the April, 1931, QUARTERLY, p. 321). Instead of seeking every possible opportunity, real or imagined, to instruct others—the dreadful way of some people—he was constantly creating opportunities to gain information that would be of use to him in the Work, his one unceasing concern. The train would stop, for instance, on account of a "hot box." Judge would disappear, to return later with the explanation that he had been talking to the engine-driver, and had picked up this or that fact from the man's experience which illustrated some theosophical principle and would perhaps serve as an illustration in a lecture, or in an article for *The Path*. Judge had read a great deal, but was not a bookworm, and used his reading as a background for his unceasing study of *life*, especially of human nature, which, he said, was the main business of the practical occultist. On the train, he spent most of his time writing. There were innumerable letters to be written, in addition to articles and editorial work for *The Path*. Both Mrs. Judge and the Countess were admirable travellers, uncomplaining, always punctual, tactful, and making the fewest possible demands on Judge's time. After our arrival on the Coast, when the stream of visitors was almost incessant, Mrs. Judge accomplished wonders by steering them away, without hurting their feelings, when intermissions were really necessary.

Judge had wonderful eyes, with infinite depths behind them,—depths of tenderness, of strength, of perception. They were luminous eyes; sometimes veiled, especially with strangers, and at other times flashing out with marvellous power and light. They could express everything,—the whole gamut of feeling; or they could express absolutely nothing, as he wished. When he was amused, they danced. As I remember him, he rarely laughed, and then, silently; but his smile was radiant—it was a beautiful smile—and revealed all kinds of things, perhaps intense pleasure, perhaps intense enjoyment of some humorous incident. For part of the distance on the journey to San Diego, there was [42] no dining-car on our train, and we stopped somewhere in the Mojave Desert for lunch or supper. As I paid the waiter, a raw-boned Westerner, for my share of the meal, I made some remark, intended to be sympathetic, about having to live in a desert, with nothing but stifling, hot sand for miles around. The man's retort, perhaps intended to put the "furriner" in his place, was instant: "No stinkin' vegetation in these parts, thank God!" How Judge enjoyed that!

Travelling in such close association with the Countess Wachtmeister made things a trifle awkward, for me in any case. I had seen a good deal of her at Avenue Road and at the office of the T. P. S. in London; I was indebted to her for having been the first to speak to me of steps leading toward the possibility of chéliship: I had great respect for her personally: but I had good reason to suspect that her attitude toward Judge

reflected Mrs. Besant's; so I was compelled to distrust her thoroughly, and of course could not in any way refer to "the row" in her presence. Judge treated her as if she must necessarily feel as he did,—that nothing counted or mattered, except work for Theosophy. I could understand that, but when, later, he encouraged her to visit, quite alone, as many Branches as possible and to stay as long as possible, without any fear whatever, so far as I could see, that she would, perhaps unconsciously, spread doubts of his integrity,—I was distinctly worried and told him so. His reply was that she greatly interested the members with good, helpful and authentic stories of H. P. B.; that her visits to small towns and Branches would stimulate an interest in Theosophy, and that she would do more good than harm, even supposing she were capable of harm. It was yet another instance of his bigness of view, of his detachment from personal considerations, and of his one-pointed devotion to Theosophy in and for itself. To what extent she responded temporarily to his generosity of attitude, I do not know. She was completely a gentlewoman in the old and true sense of the word, and although she remained with Mrs. Besant after the "split", I never heard that she attacked Judge.

We arrived in Los Angeles on the evening of April 10th, and went straight to a Branch meeting at which Judge, Buck, and I spoke. Next day, Judge and I started early for San Diego, and arrived there at one o'clock. After lunch, we addressed a large Branch meeting and met the members until five. This was followed in the evening by a public lecture in Unity Church, when we spoke upon "The Aim of Life". So it continued, day after day, without intermission. I was young and sufficiently able-bodied, besides which the experience, for me, was novel, but Judge had been doing the same kind of thing for years, and was already suffering from the premonitory symptoms (wrongly interpreted by doctors as "liver") of his last illness. How he stood it, is not easy to explain, except on the ground that his intensity of devotion kept his body going without the slightest sign of mental or nervous fatigue.

From San Diego, back to Los Angeles, and more lecturing and interviews, and so to San Francisco, where the Religious Parliament, at which Judge and Buck spoke, immediately preceded the Convention.

Judge was received with enthusiasm everywhere, either because of, or in spite of, attacks in the newspapers, which naturally made the most of the [43] stories circulated from Adyar against him. At the first session of the Convention, Judge announced that Olcott, as President of the Society, had notified him that he, Olcott, had suspended him as Vice-President; whereupon the following resolution was carried unanimously, all present, except Judge, rising spontaneously to make their protest more emphatic:

That this Convention, after careful deliberation, finds that such suspension of the Vice-President is without the slightest warrant in the Constitution, and altogether transcends the discretionary powers given the President by the Constitution, and therefore, is null and void.

And this Section, in Convention assembled, hereby expresses its unqualified protest against the said illegal action by the President of the Society, and can see no necessity for such action, and that even did the Constitution contain any provision for a suspension, it would have been wholly needless and unbrotherly, inasmuch as by the Constitution the Vice-President has no duties or power save in case of the death, resignation, or accusation of the President.

Olcott's action had revealed the animus which inspired him, and which inspired the others with whom, by this time, he was hand in glove as against Judge. The delegates and members assembled in San Francisco recognized this animus, and felt rightly that Judge was being persecuted. It made them angry, and it is some comfort to know, after the passage of all these years, that I did my small best *not* to lessen the anger. Yet the anger was contained and quiet. Judge well knew the reaction that follows an emotional outburst, and always did his best to check "demonstrations."

Dr. Jerome A. Anderson, the President of the San Francisco Branch, and author of well-known books on Theosophy, then read resolutions in regard to the charges against Judge of "misuse of Mahâtmas' names and handwritings", and asked that these resolutions be submitted for the consideration of the proper Committee;

but the Convention would not tolerate delay, and insisted upon passing them, as read, by a rising vote. The fact was (and is) that these resolutions were too completely logical and crushing to admit of debate, even if there had been any desire for it. In substance they set forth that *whereas* Olcott, Annie Besant, A. P. Sinnett and others had at various times claimed to have heard from the alleged Mahâtmas, and that Olcott by request was making arrangements for an official inquiry by a Judicial Committee to try the question whether Judge had “misused the names and handwritings of the Mahâtmas”; and *whereas* the Constitution provided freedom for all as to beliefs, and that no dogma of any kind could be officially recognized by the Society; therefore *Resolved*: that the opinion of the Convention was that the President’s action was uncalled for, unconstitutional, illegal, and improper; that the Convention re-affirmed the right of all to believe or disbelieve in the Mahâtmas or Masters; and then thanked William Q. Judge for his work and expressed full belief and confidence in him.

Then followed the gem of the Convention,—a resolution to the effect that if, in the face of the protest of the American Section, an investigation were to be carried on, then Olcott, Annie Besant, A. P. Sinnett, and others should be [44] investigated also, and that they should be compelled to show their commission from the Mahâtmas and to divulge what they know thereon, and to show the truthfulness of their claims thereon.

Lastly it was resolved that in the opinion of the American Section only a body of Mahâtmas appearing at the session of the Judicial Committee could decide whether or not any communication was or is a genuine or fraudulent Mahâtmic message.

It can be imagined with what enthusiasm these resolutions were carried. They supplied a much-needed counterblast to the intrigues and threats of Judge’s enemies, and The Theosophical Society of to-day—the continuation and exfoliation of the old American Section—can afford to be proud of its record on that occasion. The best of good Karma was made by the loyalty, clarity of perception, fearlessness of protest, and strict adherence to principle, of the membership of 1894. Incidentally, the individual who inspired the demand that everyone should be investigated while they were about it, deserved great credit both for his keen recognition of the logical issue, and for his sense of humour!

The Convention then proceeded with its order of business, including a public meeting in Golden Gate Hall at which Judge, the Countess, Buck and I spoke. Judge, who spoke last, concluded his speech with these words: “Theosophy is the Reformer of Religions, the Justifier of Conscience, and the Mediator between Science and Religion; it is our present and future, our life, our death, and our immortality.”

Judge’s voice was not strong, though his intonation was pleasant, clear and virile. He was not an eloquent speaker, in the ordinary sense of the term; he used hardly any gestures; his style was simple, without a shadow of display; he said what he had to say, naturally and without effort; but he carried conviction, as few do, because of the intensity which he embodied,—the force of a restrained but consuming devotion, the compression of a steel spring. And on this occasion his audience, though consisting mostly of strangers, seemed to sense something great, something heroic, in Judge as a man; for not content with a storm of applause at the end of his speech, there were loud calls for “Judge” from all parts of the Hall, much to the astonishment of the T. S. members who were present. Judge, I think, was rather embarrassed as he stepped forward and bowed; but some of us blessed the people who did it. It was a reminder that the Olcotts and Besants and their kind, were not the only people in the world.

Meetings, morning, afternoon and evening of the next day, immediately after which Judge sent me to lecture and meet members in Santa Cruz and San José, while he visited Oakland, returning to San Francisco to deliver another public lecture, before proceeding to Sacramento where I rejoined him. On May 1st we arrived at Portland, Oregon, for more lectures and meetings, and then went to Seattle. Judge much preferred

this northern part of the West Coast, to its southern reaches. He told me that Seattle had been built on the site of an ancient and great city, and that he believed the Puget Sound neighbourhood [45] would become, in time, one of the most important centres in the United States, commercially in any case.

From Seattle, to my indescribable disappointment, I was called back to England on account of illness there—needlessly, as it happened. Judge was not at all pleased, and I much regret now that I did not complete the tour with him, as he travelled—meeting members and lecturing wherever he stopped—to Victoria, B. C., Port Townsend, back to Seattle, Tacoma, Olympia, Portland, and so to Chicago and New York by way of Salt Lake City (a large public meeting in the Salt Lake Theatre), Aspen, Denver, and Omaha.

Throughout his long journey, with the “investigation” ahead of him in London, Judge not only edited and wrote articles for *The Path*, but carried on his immense correspondence with members all over the world—encouraging and guiding the inner efforts of some, and the outer activities of others; supervised the publishing, book-selling and printing business conducted at Headquarters; kept a close watch on the lecturing and organizing work of Burcham Harding in Massachusetts and Connecticut, of Dr. Griffiths in the West, and of Claude Wright in the South, and never lost touch with the Countess Wachtmeister who continued her lecturing tour through America for several months. It was an extraordinary performance. Judge was determined to turn evil into good, and to use the attacks against himself for the ultimate benefit of the Work.

I of course wrote to him as soon as I reached London, receiving the following letter in reply:

NEW YORK, June 6th, 1894.

Dear E. T. H.,

Just got your first. Thanks. But I am soon coming. I shall say but little. Take my advice and say nothing now. You cannot in England talk as you did here, save on general T. S. matters. So keep quiet until you see what to do. I feel too that J. C. K. will get well. I always thought so. But the pain and agony for so long are awful. Delivered yours to Mrs. Judge. She will write you. I do not know if I shall have you on the Coast or not. Seems to me if we can get a sure man more known and older, it will have better effect. This is not against you, but you know how people are. I am dubious. But will settle it all when I get over. Till then revoir.

W. Q. J.

[107]

LETTERS FROM W.Q. JUDGE

III.

In reply to Olcott's official letter of February 7th, 1894, from India (see THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, July, 1931; p. 35), in which he had peremptorily notified Judge that in view of Mrs. Besant's charges against him, he must either resign all offices in the T. S. or submit to trial by a Judicial Committee,—Judge had cabled immediately (March 10th): “Charges absolutely false. You can take what proceedings you see fit; going to London in July.”

On March 15th, 1894, Judge issued a circular letter addressed, “To all members of the Theosophical Society”, and headed, “Charges against William Q. Judge”. In it he said that he was bringing certain facts to the attention of members “so that surprise and perhaps confusion may be prevented.” He did not mention Mrs. Besant by name, but tried to cover her, for the time being, by the phrase: “the assertion is made in India that I have been guilty of ‘misuse of the names and handwriting of the Mahatmas.’ ” He told of Olcott's action; gave the wording of the cable in reply, just quoted; denied the truth of the charges explicitly and unqualifiedly, and then said that although he would never object to a proper investigation by competent persons,—“on constitutional and executive principle I [Judge] shall object from beginning to end to any committee of the Theosophical Society considering any charge against any person which involves an inquiry and decision as to the existence, names, powers, functions, or methods of the ‘Mahatmas or Masters.’ ” “I shall do this”, he said, “for the protection of the Theosophical Society now and hereafter, regardless of the result to myself,” because any decision would establish a dogma in a Society which must at all costs be kept free from dogmas.

This letter of March 15th not only inspired much that was done at the San Francisco Convention, described in the last instalment, but had important repercussions in London.

In the letter to me of June 6th, 1894 (see p. 45 of the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, July, 1931), Judge had written that he was “soon coming” to London. He was coming from New York, after his exhausting visits to the many Branches of the Society between the West and the East Coast, to face Mrs. Besant, Colonel Olcott and his other accusers before the so-called Judicial Committee. He arrived at Southampton, accompanied by Dr. J. D. Buck of Cincinnati, several days before the Committee was due to assemble. Dr. Archibald Keightley and I met them at the dock and travelled with them to London. Judge was obviously very tired and frail. Dr. and Mrs. Keightley were anxious that he should stay with them at Richmond, so as to avoid the inimical atmosphere at Avenue Road; but he insisted that it was his duty to stop at Headquarters, where he remained throughout all the hideous weeks preceding and following [108] “the Trial”. Dr. Buck stayed there also. Only on a few occasions, and then for not more than an hour or two, did Judge escape to Richmond “to be with friends”.

It had been assumed both by Mrs. Besant and by Olcott that the Judicial Committee would put an end to Judge as a factor in the Theosophical Society. Instead of this, when the Committee met, it was *they* who were on the defensive, and not Judge,—as any one can see by referring to the report of the Proceedings, and of the European Convention which followed, published officially, in the same terms, both in *The Path* and *Lucifer*. There were four main contributing reasons for this—to them—unexpected outcome.

First: although Annie Besant's influence, as time passed, was sufficient to turn the majority of English members against Judge, the immediate situation was that while Judge was very little known in England, except as an American, which was not in his favour in those days, most English members knew how disloyal Olcott had been to H.P.B., and how much she had suffered at his hands, during the last years of her life. It would not be too much to say that they disliked him, many finding his transparent vanity and jealousy

positively mortifying in the President of the Society. In this case, to make matters worse, he had violated the most elementary principles of fair-play, and English people, as a rule, object to that: it is against their code.

In an official letter dated March 20th, 1894, to Judge, as General Secretary of the American Section, Olcott (following the receipt of Judge's cable of March 10th) had announced that the Judicial Committee would convene at "our London Headquarters on the 27th June next." In another official letter of the same date, Olcott had informed Judge that, "as the accused party . . . you are entitled to enjoy the full opportunity *to disprove* the charges [unspecified] brought against you." These two letters were dated on the day Mrs. Besant left India for London.

In their haste to give Judge his death-blow, they had lost all sense of the decencies: they had acted as if it were permissible to call a man a liar and a cheat, and then, without furnishing him with any Bill of Particulars, to haul him into Court and demand that he prove the contrary. There were many members who knew well the established rule of British law that charges must be based upon alleged facts, and that the accused must be supplied with these allegations, before he can be called upon legally to disprove them; so that Olcott's assumption, in an official letter, that charges not even formulated were as good as proved, and that Judge would be allowed to disprove them if he could,—made a most unfavourable impression.

Second: Mrs. Besant's public accusation of Judge, before giving him an opportunity to refute the charges privately, distinctly jarred, *at first*, on the rather muddled idea of "brotherly obligation" which most members in England had absorbed. It took Mrs. Besant some little time to educate them into the conviction that "obligations", no matter how explicit, must be interpreted as expediency requires. It was fortunate for the Movement that Judge maintained the exact opposite, for in America, in any case, there still are many who [109] know that by his fidelity to H.P.B. under that head as in all other respects, he saved the "nucleus" from destruction.

Third: Mrs. Besant and Olcott had blundered tactically in allowing the General Secretary of the Indian Section, Bertram Keightley, who was both weak and obstinate, to leave India ahead of the procession of Judge's accusers. He arrived in London some time before she did, and, with Chakravarti no longer at his elbow, temporarily fell under the influence of George R. S. Mead, General Secretary of the European Section.

George Mead, by this time suspicious of everyone—not only of Judge, but of H.P.B., Olcott and Annie Besant also—was still trying to be neutral. He had seen, both that Olcott had been unfair, and that the effect of Judge's circular letter of March 15th, could not be ignored. He pointed this out to Keightley, who had been educated as a lawyer, and who found it easy to concede this, because, although he hated Judge (the reasons are on record), it was far from his desire to exalt Olcott; in fact, he was rather glad of an opportunity "to put Olcott in his place". If he wished to exalt anyone, it was Chakravarti, with himself (Keightley) as next President of the T. S. and Chakravarti's representative; and as his double or triple purpose could be accomplished only by destroying all trust in H.P.B. and Judge, it was necessary to use Olcott as a means to that end, but no further. The result was that Keightley joined Mead in an official letter, dated March 27th, which explicitly convicted Olcott of a series of violations of the Constitution of the T. S. in his handling of the Judge matter, reminding him that they were "members of that General Council of the Theosophical Society from which, as recited in Art. VI, Sec. I, you 'derive your authority' as President of the T. S., and to which, as therein provided, you 'are responsible for its exercise'." This put Olcott on the defensive. He was told publicly that his official letter of February 7th "contains no copy in writing of any charges, does not give the names of the persons who bring such, and even contains no specific statement of what are the exact charges brought"; further, "that in officially giving Mr. Judge the alternatives of resigning all his offices in

the T. S. or submitting to the inquiry proposed, you have again departed from the procedure laid down by the Constitution”, and that “by so doing you place yourself officially in the position of having prejudged the case and virtually announce before any inquiry has taken place or even any specific charges have been formulated, that you believe Mr. Judge guilty.” The attitude of these two men, members of the General Council, seriously threatened Olcott’s position, as well as depriving him and Mrs. Besant of the hope that, between them, they could stampede a majority of the Judicial Committee.

Fourth, and even more disconcerting, was Judge’s own attitude,—totally unexpected as the event proved. Not content with, though standing squarely on, the principles enunciated in his letter of March 15th, and elaborated in the American Convention Resolutions, which, for the most part, were legal principles; not content, either, with a mere denial of the acts charged against him (misuse of Masters’ names and handwritings), he put his accusers into a terrible predicament by declaring further, as Olcott found it expedient to admit when speaking [110] in Judge’s presence,—“that Mahatmas exist, are related to our Society and in personal contact with himself [Judge]; and *he* [Judge] *avers his readiness to bring many witnesses and documentary proofs to support his statements.*” Those words are from Olcott’s long defence of himself, read by him before the Committee,—Olcott immediately adding: “You will at once see whither this will lead us”! Well,—Olcott and Annie Besant in any case saw that it might lead *them* into the very opposite of what they wanted. So it was they, not Judge, who “backed water” and who brought the “Inquiry” to naught. “Candour compels me to add”, Olcott protested, further on in the same prepared statement (“Candour”! He was admitting what everyone knew), “that . . . Mr. Judge has travelled hither from America to meet his accusers before this Committee, and announces his readiness to have the charges investigated and decided on their merits by any competent tribunal” (see official Report).

Mrs. Besant, from that day to this, has deliberately misrepresented these facts. She has declared repeatedly that Judge evaded a trial by raising legal technicalities,—a thoroughly characteristic perversion of the truth.

The meeting of the Judicial Committee was preceded, on July 7th, by a meeting of the General Council, with Olcott, Bertram Keightley, Mead, and Judge (Judge not voting) present. They ruled that “the Judicial Committee has no jurisdiction in the premises to try him [Judge] as Vice-President upon the charges as alleged.” This meant that Olcott, having officially convened a Judicial Committee to try Judge as Vice-President, now officially declared that it could not try him. No wonder that his effort to “save face”, Chinese fashion, was laboured and lengthy! But the Committee, having been convened, had to meet. It met in the Blavatsky Hall, at 19 Avenue Road, on July 10th.

“Present: Colonel Olcott, President-Founder, in the chair; the General Secretaries of the Indian and European Sections (Mr. B. Keightley and Mr. G. R. S. Mead); Delegates of the Indian Section (Mr. A. P. Sinnett and Mr. E. T. Sturdy); Delegates of the European Section (Mr. Herbert Burrows and Mr. W. Kingsland); Delegates of the American Section (Dr. J. D. Buck and Dr. Archibald Keightley); Special Delegates of Mr. Judge (Mr. Oliver Firth and Mr. E. T. Hargrove); Mrs. Besant and Mr. Judge were also present.” James M. Pryse was selected by the American Delegates to sit in place of the General Secretary (Judge), American Section.

As I have said, Olcott’s chief preoccupation, by this time, was to defend and excuse himself, and also, by instinct, to gain time. Mead, still trying to be neutral on March 27th, and even now “playing fair” in his official capacity, had become definitely anti-Judge. He had sought an interview with Judge some days before, at which Judge, as he told me later, had tried to show Mead his “real heart”; but Mead had approached him with his hard, dry mind, full of suspicion,—a mind already darkened with disloyal suspicions of H.P.B. He was incapable of understanding the heart of a great Occultist, and could interpret it only in

terms of himself. Judge's deep humility and simplicity were utterly beyond him. He could see neither that, nor Judge's intense desire to help him.

[111] Judge's enemies shared two outstanding characteristics: they entirely lacked humour, and they were devoid of mysticism. (Olcott thought that he loved humour, but this was because he enjoyed comic songs and practical jokes.) All that is necessary is to read what they have written.

As a rule, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*; but some of these dead still think they are alive; so now is the time to speak, rather than later, when the more painful evidences of death will have been removed. "Illogical", some will perceive. Yes, truly; but I am referring to Kama Loka.

Of Bertram Keightley, perhaps enough has been said already. Never again, it is rumoured, did he leave the elbow of Chakravarti; never again, till he meets a furious H.P.B., will he know that Day and Night are different.

Sinnett, bitterly anti-Judge (Judge had vigorously supported H.P.B. in her dispute with Sinnett about the Earth Chain of Globes),—Sinnett ended his days with a vicious attack on H.P.B., repudiating her from the root up.

Sturdy had come specially from India to join in the condemnation of Judge. A pupil of H.P.B.'s, he had distrusted her even before she died, and his distrust, thinly concealed, had grown until he concealed it no longer. Inevitably he welcomed the attack on Judge as an opportunity to justify his disloyalty to her.

Herbert Burrows, anti-Judge, was a Socialist and Agnostic who had remained a Socialist and Agnostic when he followed Mrs. Besant into the Society in 1889. He was still following her, though he ceased to do so in a few months, and resigned from the Society a year later, for reasons as personal as those which led him to enter it. Mrs. Besant, he wrote (see *The Path*, January, 1896, p. 328), "Mrs. Besant *knows* that both Col. Olcott and Mr. Sinnett believe Madame Blavatsky to have been fraudulent; but she has had as yet neither the moral courage nor the honesty to say so. On the contrary, she quotes them in *Lucifer* as the all-round staunch and firm upholders of H.P.B., while at the same time she upbraids those who wish the real truth known as besmirchers and practical traitors". Burrows, through whom ran a streak of honesty, had till then lived in the delusion that Mrs. Besant was incapable of saying one thing and meaning another. No delusion could have been less excusable.

William Kingsland, anti-Judge, representing the European Section for that and no other reason, was a solitary, provincial person, whose idea of Theosophy was a static, intellectual concept, consisting chiefly of triangles and squares which never moved after they had once been neatly arranged on paper. To-day he pretends to "know" that Judge was guilty of the charges brought against him; but he knew and knows nothing of Judge whatever.

Buck was pro-Judge,—but such a weak reed! Coming from America as Judge's friend and supporter, a man of excellent presence and an experienced speaker, he might have done much to carry the spirit of the San Francisco Convention into the London Headquarters. But he was cowardly and was cowed. Vain, and a great "respector of persons", he wanted to be "friends all round"; was for peace at any price, willing and anxious to compromise in every direction. Bold in San Francisco, he crumpled in London, and instead of being a help, Judge found him a burden. He reminded me of Bismarck's description of Lord [112] Salisbury: "A man of wood, painted to look like iron." He never deserted Judge during Judge's lifetime, but when he died, years after Judge, it is doubtful if he knew in whom or in what he believed.

If, in London, in 1894, Buck had been charged with moral cowardice, he might well have defended himself on the ground that Judge was urging all his friends—as readers of his letters will have seen—to work for “solidarity”, for the T. S., and not to bother about him nor to counter-attack. And the truth is that very few of his friends realized instantly that Judge’s duty was not necessarily theirs; that it is one thing for a leader to adopt such an attitude about himself, and a very different thing for his friends and followers to take him at his word. Failure to understand that elementary principle of Theosophy, was not, however, the cause of Buck’s attitude. He was weak and he wobbled.

Next on the list, as a delegate of the American Section, stands the name of Archibald Keightley. Everyone knows where he stood, not only then, but to the end of his long life. Loyal to H.P.B., and equally loyal to Judge, he never wavered, and was the greatest support and comfort to Judge throughout those dreadful days. Mrs. Keightley (Jasper Niemand) was distressed beyond words that serious illness kept her temporarily out of the fray. Devoted to Judge, she did everything she could, but it was not until later that she was able to fight for him, as her whole soul longed to do.

For the selection of Oliver Firth as one of Judge’s personal representatives, I was largely responsible. Judge declined to select anyone. Firth was a rough Yorkshireman, who knew nothing of Judge, one way or the other; but he had plenty of courage, and I believed he would stand for fair play at the “Trial”, which he did; and that was the essential need.

James M. Pryse (though now he belittles Judge and all others, except himself) at that time was pro-Judge. He was courageous, but unfortunately carried no weight whatever because of his advertized psychism and general crankiness.

Ever since the summer of 1893, when Brahminical influence had descended upon the London Headquarters, and when occult “stunts” had been performed *and lines laid down*,—the atmosphere at Avenue Road, in both houses, had at times been appalling. Now, when the Committee finally met, the atmosphere was so tense with evil that it was rigid,—a *rigor mortis* in comparison with which the rigidity of a corpse would seem vibrant. For the Black Lodge had captured the last outer centre of H.P.B.’s work, just as they had captured Adyar years before. The atmosphere was made still worse by the cold fury of those who, for the moment, had been balked of their prey: the plot against Judge had miscarried—had in any case been checked—and those behind the scenes would be compelled to begin their campaign anew. Both Annie Besant and Olcott, for the reasons previously explained, had been put on the defensive, while Judge was still fighting desperately to keep the organization of the T. S. intact—in so far as that was possible without sacrificing principle—and, in the nature of things, as H.P.B.’s successor, was still doing his utmost to help and save his accusers. Struggling in this carefully prepared centre of enemy forces, it is a [113] revelation of Judge’s detachment that he survived the strain. He was contending against an influence which may be compared to a cold, *palpable* and immensely powerful will, trying to paralyse your own, though in this case the entire hall was filled with it. Judge, of course, was the target.

Olcott, as Chairman, read his opening address, which, as stated already, consisted entirely of self-justification. In the official report, it filled three and a half pages, with less than one page given to the balance of the proceedings.

Following Olcott’s address, Mead, for our information, read the minutes of the General Council meeting of the 7th. Olcott was then requested to lay before the Committee the charges against Judge. They were wholly indefinite and inadequate, and would have been thrown out by any grand jury in any part of the English-speaking world.

The official report states that the charges having been considered by the Committee, the following resolutions were passed:

That although it has ascertained that the member bringing the charges and Mr. Judge are both ready to go on with the inquiry, the Committee considers, nevertheless, that the charges are not such as relate to the conduct of the Vice-President in his official capacity, and therefore are not subject to its jurisdiction.

That this Committee is also of the opinion that as a statement by them as to the truth or otherwise of at least one of the charges as formulated against Mr. Judge would involve a declaration on their part as to the existence or non-existence of the Mahatmas, it would be a violation of the spirit of neutrality and the unsectarian nature and Constitution of the Society.

These resolutions in effect confirmed the stand of the San Francisco Convention, and so, as I have stated, the aim of Mrs. Besant and Olcott had, for the moment, been frustrated,—except to the extent that their evil-speaking, still unchecked, would necessarily continue to poison uncritical and credulous minds.

Both Judge and Annie Besant spoke on several occasions in the course of the proceedings, though what they and others said was not included in the official report. Judge, in spite of his exhaustion, spoke as if he were in no way concerned personally,—rather as if he had been taking part in that sort of thing, all his life. Mrs. Besant's attitude I found revolting. She spoke as if she, the accuser, were the victim. Even in Judge's presence, she diffused self-pity. It seemed like rank hypocrisy until one remembered that she lived in a world of glamour, totally blind to her motives, one half of her saying anything to maintain her status in the eyes of her followers (at that time, of Chakravarti also), and the other half habitually convinced that she was sacrificing her all for Truth's sake, thus keeping vivid that picture of herself as hero and martyr which she had worshipped in a sort of ecstasy throughout her life.

The Convention of the European Section of the T. S. was held two days later—on July 12th and 13th—in the same hall. When Judge arrived, after Olcott's opening speech, he was greeted with prolonged applause,—the feeling of members for the moment drifting his way, with resulting uneasiness among [114] his accusers. At the evening session on the 12th, both Annie Besant and Judge read prepared statements on the subject of the charges, hers filling three pages, and his, one page, of the printed report. Her statement was entirely self-excusatory. To state the situation plainly, she was in a dreadful hole, and was doing her best to wriggle out of it. In an effort to make it appear, so far as possible, as if she had not attacked and condemned a brother Theosophist, she said that she wished it “to be distinctly understood that I do not charge and have not charged Mr. Judge with forgery in the ordinary sense of the term, but with giving a misleading material form to messages received psychically from the Master in various ways without acquainting the recipients with this fact.”

Mrs. Besant then declared:

I regard Mr. Judge as an Occultist, possessed of considerable knowledge and animated by a deep and unswerving devotion to the Theosophical Society. I believe that he has often received direct messages from the Masters and from their chélas, guiding and helping him in his work. I believe that he has sometimes received messages for other people in one or other of the ways that I will mention in a moment, but not by direct writing by the Master nor by His direct precipitation, and that Mr. Judge has then believed himself to be justified in writing down in the script adopted by H.P.B. for communications from that Master, the message psychically received, and in giving it to the person for whom it was intended, leaving that person to wrongly assume [who was responsible for such a childish assumption?] that it was a direct precipitation or writing by the Master Himself, that is, that it was done *through* Mr. Judge but done *by* the Master.

So far as precipitation was concerned, it was impossible, as Judge said, either to prove or to disprove whether precipitation had been the means used, or not, as that could be determined only by someone “able to see on that plane.” As to the second means specified by Mrs. Besant, what evidence could she possibly have

produced that messages were *not* “done” *through* Judge by the Master,—as had happened so often in the case of H.P.B.? On the face of it, an ordinary eye-witness of the writing of such a “message” could not have told whether, at such times, H.P.B. was writing it, or whether it was being “done” by a Master through her; it is equally clear that even a *good* clairvoyant could not have been certain, seeing that, on the one hand, either the Master or H.P.B. could have inhibited the clairvoyant’s psychic vision, or, on the other hand, H.P.B., if she had wished, could have created a visible image of a Master in the astral light which would have been seen by the clairvoyant as the actual “doer” of the “message”. It would seem, from Mrs. Besant’s statement, that she had not so much as heard of these possibilities, and it is certain that she never even pretended that there were eye-witnesses, whether clairvoyant or not, when Judge wrote his “messages”.

It came to this: if she had said, “Chakravarti assures me that ‘messages’ transmitted by Judge were not ‘done by the Master’, and that is all I know [115] about it”,—she would have been telling the truth. Unfortunately for the Work, *the truth* is the last thing she was willing to tell.

She regarded Mr. Judge “as an Occultist”, she said; but she regarded Chakravarti as the equivalent of a Master. Therefore she believed Chakravarti as against Judge, and not only as against him, but as against H.P.B. and in defiance of every obligation she had assumed. It had been an elementary test of loyalty, and she had failed (a second failure at that point, to be followed by a third); while, so far as “messages” were concerned, she was not only as incapable then as she is now of telling the difference between the real and the unreal, or of recognizing different grades of chêlas and Adepts, but of telling the difference between the White and the Black varieties.

Mrs. Besant’s statement suggests that her mental picture of the transmission of a “message” was three-fold and fixed:

- (1) A Master in Tibet might choose to write a “message”, disintegrate it, and then precipitate it in New York, London, or elsewhere;
- (2) He might choose to instruct a chêla to do the work of disintegration and precipitation for him;
- (3) He might choose to travel from Tibet in his astral body, and enter the body of a chêla in some other part of the world, and use the brain and arm of that chêla in order to write a “message”.

All of these methods had been used in the course of the Movement since 1875, but all of them, in their different ways, were extravagant, as they required a greater expenditure of force, and on lower planes, than was necessary; and it must be remembered that the use of occult forces by the White Lodge *on lower planes*, opens the door to the Black Lodge on those same planes, often to the peril of the intended beneficiary. Spiritual law decrees that the higher the plane on which a Master exerts his influence, the less reaction is there in this world; the nearer the chêla can *ascend* toward the Master, the easier, simpler, and, in the occult sense, the less costly is the method of communication between them.

From the very beginning, *all* methods of communication had been used, from the highest and most spiritual, to the most concrete. It was one of the necessities of H.P.B.’s original mission that she should perform phenomena, in part as a weapon in her campaign against the errors of Spiritualism, and in part because a materialistic age could not be approached, much less impressed, except in that way. As time passed, however, the need for this diminished; the “precipitation” of messages was nearly discontinued, and methods far simpler—in a sense more spiritual also—came to be used with increasing frequency. Although these less “phenomenal” methods could be employed only in the case of a very highly trained instrument, the very fact

that they were less “phenomenal” meant that they did not appeal in the same way to those who, like Sinnett, Mrs. Besant and the generality, not only were materially-minded, but entirely ignorant of occult procedure.

Mrs. Besant does not seem even to have taken into account a fourth method, standing, as it were, between the three already outlined, and the more spiritual; [116] that is: a Master might choose to control a chêla’s arm from a distance, and thus produce a “message” in “his own handwriting”. When that was done, the chêla would have been entrusted with specially magnetized paper, to be kept for that purpose. It was claimed (which really means “admitted”) by Judge’s enemies that H.P.B. *had* entrusted Judge with a supply of Tibetan or similar paper. Surely a little common sense might have solved most of Mrs. Besant’s problems,—if she had been able and willing to rely upon that instead of upon Chakravarti.

As to the more spiritual methods: the first of Judge’s letters in this present instalment—that dated August 7th, 1894—is written in blue pencil; a part of it is in the well-known script of Master K. H., and it is headed (not without a touch of humour, considering that Judge had but recently returned to New York from the “trial” in London)—“*non precipitado*”. Yet that letter was not written by any of the methods outlined above, and is none the less as “genuine”, in the occult sense, as anything that has appeared in Theosophical literature. Mrs. Besant’s entire thesis was that if those parts of the letter, written in the K. H. script, had been written on a separate slip (worse, if written on an unusual kind of paper), and if I had been fool enough to imagine, at first, that Master K.H. had precipitated the slip for my delectation and titillation, then, if I chose to conclude later that it had not been precipitated, I should have been in a position—properly, theosophically, and without violating my “brotherly” obligations—to charge Judge with fraud. Could anything be more absurd, more outrageous,—and less theosophical?

All of Judge’s enemies had an acute sense of separateness, which was unfortunate for them. When they attributed the same sense to Masters and chêlas, it became equally unfortunate for the Movement.

To resume the narrative, Mrs. Besant concluded her statement by saying:

If you, representatives of the T. S., consider that the publication of this statement, followed by that which Mr. Judge will make, would put an end to this distressing business, and by making a clear understanding get rid at least of the mass of seething suspicions in which we have been living, and if you can accept it, I propose that this should take the place of the Committee of Honour [suggested by Herbert Burrows in the hope it might give Mrs. Besant what she wanted, after the negative outcome of the Judicial Committee], putting you, our brothers, in the place of a Committee. I have made the frankest explanation I can: I know how enwrapped in difficulty are these phenomena which are connected with forces obscure in their workings to most; therefore how few are able to judge of them accurately, while those through whom they play are not always able to control them. Now I trust that these explanations may put an end to some at least of the troubles of the last two years, and leave us to go on with our work for the world, each in his own way. For any pain that I have given my brother in trying to do a most repellent task, I ask his pardon, as also for any mistakes that I may have made.

It would seem impossible that Mrs. Besant could have been sincere when [117] expressing a wish to “put an end to this distressing business”, since, almost immediately, she caused to be distributed a circular headed “Occultism and Truth”—to which reference will be made later—which was a vicious slap at Judge, and within two weeks was sailing for Australia, empowered by Olcott (in a document dated April 27th, or as soon as he had received the official protest of Mead and Keightley of March 27th) “to organize a Section or Sections”, and “to authorize the formation of Branches”,—so as to make sure of a majority vote against Judge on the General Council when the time came to renew her onslaught against him.

The tone of Judge’s statement is strikingly different. He did not speak of his “brothers”; he did not call Mrs. Besant his “sister”; he apologized for nothing and expressed regret for nothing. He said:

Since March last charges have been going round the world against me to which the name of Annie Besant has been attached, without her consent as she now says, that I have been guilty of forging the names and handwritings of the Mahatmas and of misusing the said names and handwritings. The charge has also arisen that I suppressed the name of Annie Besant as mover in the matter from fear of the same. All this has been causing great trouble and working injury to all concerned, that is, to all our members. It is now time that this should be put an end to once for all, if possible.

I now state as follows:

1. I left the name of Annie Besant out of my published circular by request of my friends in the T.S. then near me, so as to save her and leave it to others to put her name to the charge. It now appears that if I had so put her name it would have run counter to her present statement.

2. I repeat my denial of the said rumoured charges of forging the said names and handwritings of the Mahatmas or of misusing the same.

3. I admit that I have received and delivered messages from the Mahatmas and assert their genuineness.

4. I say that I have heard and do hear from the Mahatmas, and that I am an agent of the Mahatmas; but I deny that I have ever sought to induce that belief in others, and this is the first time to my knowledge that I have ever made the claim now made. I am pressed into the place where I must make it. My desire and effort have been to distract attention from such an idea as related to me. But I have no desire to make the claim, which I repudiate, that I am the only channel for communication with Masters; and it is my opinion that such communication is open to any human being who by endeavouring to serve mankind affords the necessary conditions.

5. Whatever messages from the Mahatmas have been delivered by me as such—and they are extremely few—I now declare were and are genuine messages from the Mahatmas so far as my knowledge [118] extends; they were obtained through me, but as to how they were obtained or produced I cannot state. But I can now again say, as I have said publicly before, and as was said by H. P. Blavatsky so often that I have always thought it common knowledge among studious Theosophists, that precipitation of words or messages is of no consequence and constitutes no proof of connection with Mahatmas; it is only phenomenal and not of the slightest value.

6. So far as methods are concerned for the reception and delivery of messages from the Masters, they are many. My own methods may disagree from the views of others, and I acknowledge their right to criticize them if they choose; but I deny the right of any one to say that they know or can prove the untruthfulness of such messages to or through me unless they are able to see on that plane. I can only say that I have done my best to report—in the few instances when I have done it at all—correctly and truthfully such messages as I think I have received for transmission, and never to my knowledge have I tried therewith to deceive any person or persons whatsoever.

7. And I say that in 1893 the Master sent me a message in which he thanked me for all my work and exertions in the Theosophical field and expressed satisfaction therewith, ending with sage advice to guard me against the failings and follies of my lower nature; that message Mrs. Besant unreservedly admits.

8. Lastly, and only because of absurd statements made and circulated, I willingly say that which I never denied, that I am a human being full of error, liable to mistake, not infallible, but just the same as any other human being like to myself or of the class of human beings to which I belong. And I freely, fully, and sincerely forgive any one who may be thought to have injured or tried to injure me. To which I sign my name.—William Q. Judge.

Finally, Bertram Keightley moved and Buck seconded these resolutions:

That this meeting accepts with pleasure the adjustment arrived at by Annie Besant and William Q. Judge as a final settlement of matters pending hitherto between them as prosecutor and defendant with the hope that it may be thus buried and forgotten, and:

That we will join hands with them to further the Cause of genuine Brotherhood in which we all believe.

Thus ended the “Judge trial”,—the beginning rather than the end of the campaign which his enemies, and the enemies of H.P.B.’s Work, waged against him. As already explained, the Black Lodge was the power behind the scenes; but those whose moral weaknesses laid them open to that influence, were none the less responsible. Without the actors on the stage, the Black Lodge would have been impotent.

The account I have given is a mere outline. There are records in connection with this period, which have never been printed, and some day, when the Lodge is ready, the whole story will be told; but not till then.

[119] The first letter Judge wrote to me after his return to New York reveals *his* reaction from the “trial”, and shows very clearly where *his* heart and interest had been centred, both then, and as he considered it in retrospect. Parts of the letter, as I have said, were in the script of Master K. H. I had written to Judge, shortly after his departure, expressing myself with considerable vehemence on the subject of what he refers to as “that absurdity in circulars called ‘Occultism and Truth’”,—a circular which had been issued immediately after Mrs. Besant and Olcott had declared, each in his own way, that the “trial” and their “statements” were “a final settlement” of the Judge matter, and which, none the less, they caused to be printed in the same issue of *Lucifer* as that which contained the official report of the “trial” proceedings. The circular did not name Judge, but, signed by Mrs. Besant, Olcott, Sinnett, B. Keightley, Leadbeater (known at that time only as a “heeler” of Sinnett’s), Sturdy, and Wynn Westcott—all of them Judge’s avowed enemies—it explained elaborately how sad the mistake of supposing that the end justifies the means, and that Truth is unimportant. “Finding that this false view of Occultism”, the circular continued, “is spreading in the Theosophical Society”—a statement as false as it could be—the subscribers quoted “a weighty utterance by a wise Indian Disciple” (Chakravarti), containing platitudes about “the Divine Light which is Truth Sublime”, and left it to be clearly understood that although Judge had been “let off” for the moment, members should not allow themselves to be contaminated by his bad example. It is significant that the thing was not signed by George Mead. There was a distinct limit to the unfairness he could then tolerate, and in this case it was too obvious that Judge’s enemies were trying to stab him in the back.

NEW YORK, August 7th, 1894.

Non precipitado

Dear Ernest,

Nothing is doing. Everybody is simmering and adjusting to the queer official circular.

Now my dear boy this is, as I said, an era. I called it that of Western occultism, but you may give it any name you like. But it’s Western. The symbol is the well intended American republic which was seen by Tom Paine beforehand “as a new era in the affairs of the world.” It was meant as near as possible to be a brotherhood of nations, and that is the drift of its Declaration and Constitution. The T. S. is meant to be the same, but has for many years been in fight and friction. It has now, if possible, to come out of that. It cannot be a brotherhood unless each, or some, of its units becomes a brother in truth. And *brother* was the noble name given in 1875 to the Masters. Hence you and I and all of us must cultivate that. We must forgive our enemies and those who assail us, for only thus can the great brothers properly help by working through us. There seems to be a good deal to forgive, but it is easily done inasmuch as in 50 years we’ll all be gone and forgot.

Cut off then thoughts about those “foolish children” until harmonious vibrations [120] ensue to some extent. That absurdity in circulars called “Occultism and Truth”, let go. I publish it, and have deliberately refrained from jumping at such a grand chance. So you see, forgive, forgive, and largely forget. Come along then, and with me get up as fast as possible the feeling of brotherhood.

Now then, you want more light and this is what you must do. You will have to “give up” something. To wit: have yourself called half an hour earlier than is usual and devote it *before* breakfast to silent meditation in which brood upon all great and high ideas. A half hour! surely that you can spare. And don’t eat first. If you can take another half *before* you go to bed, and without any preliminaries of undressing or making things

agreeable or more comfortable, meditate again. Now don't fail me in this. This is much to give up, but give it up recollecting that you are not to make all those preparations so often indulged in by people.

If by any god's chance you should flittingly or otherwise see me, please calmly note all appearances and let me know all about it. This is necessary for me.

K. H. said thus:

The best and most important teacher is one's seventh principle centred in the sixth. The more you divest yourself of the illusionary sense of personal isolation, and the more you are devoted to the service of others, the more Maya disappears and the nearer you approach to Divinity.

Good-bye then, and may you find that peace which comes from the Self.

WILLIAM 24.

The "circular" referred to in the next letter is the same "Occultism and Truth". Judge published it in *The Path* with the comment he now condenses.

When he says "8 months is a long time", he refers to the interval which it had been decided should precede my permanent departure for America.

"Alec" was Alexander Fullerton,—a thorn in Judge's side, still working at the Headquarters in New York, though as disloyal as he could be. He had helped Judge greatly in earlier days, both in editing the *Path* and in routine correspondence, and Judge held on to him to the last, hoping against hope that he might yet be able to pull Fullerton through.

NEW YORK, August 14th, 1894.

My dear Ernest,

I have yours just as you go off to France. Say, look here, never growl at anything you have to do. If you have to go as you do to see your folks, just take it as a good thing you have to do, and then it will redound to the good of them and yourself, but if it is a constant cross, then it does no good and you get nothing. Apply your theories thus. I got that circular, and had already sent it to the printer with note to say that it was all right and that we had thought the T. S. knew it well long ago, but a good thing could not suffer by repetition. So you see your and my idea are like. It is simply folly, and the way to do is [121] to keep at the right work and all the wrong work will go to pot. It is a contest of smiles if we really know our business.

Am glad you presided for it gave you a chance, and also gave you the beginning of a prestige. Let it be so again. You will probably have some other chances later like it, as 8 months is a long time.

The news as to Julius and A.K. is good. I have none. I think she will be better. It is a hard fight with such a nature.

All solid here. I have heard from California, and they are gay. They see that the March circular did the business, and are pleased to let the old man [Olcott] have his point of suspension. Countess is doing well. She has just written begging for some light on Manas, which I have sent her!! That is also an omen, as was the presidency by you of the B.T.S. [Blavatsky Lodge.]

Never be afraid, never be sorry, and cut all doubts with the sword of knowledge. Well, good luck and good bye. Alec is off in the country, and that is good, for he was not well.

Adios as ever,

WILLIAM Ț.

Your sketch for *Path* is abominable yet has to go in. It omits your birth, etc. and the date of your entry to T. S. In fact it is rotten with absence of dates, except a fool date of some old chap in the bygone centuries.

“Chayskeed” is a delightfully fantastic jumble of “Che-Yew-Ts [ng’s Kid”.

Beneath his signature to this letter, Judge had drawn a hand, pointing to the sign of Jupiter, and had then written: “Theosophical Astrology”.

NEW YORK, September 29th, 1894.

My Dear Chayskeed,

I have your long letter. I thank you for it. It’s all right. I know how the clouds come and go. That is all right too. Just wait, as the song says, till they roll by. I cannot write much as I am off to Boston tomorrow for some days. Beginning the campaign of reintegration. It was planned last April and now it begins. Any work of the sort you can do, good. Don’t let the machinery be seen. Yes, I will write the book and it will be read and widely too. As for all those questions, I cannot reply now, and later will forget, but I will see you at night and you will get the information. Anyway you are right that struggling is wrong. Do it quietly; that is the way the Masters do it. The reaction the other way is just as you say. So you see your intuition is all right. Follow it to the end and look for the light. You will get it. Lines and nets are weaving all around of two sorts; you are in our sort. It is spreading all the time. It will benefit you. We are not alone, and we are not deserted at all, but the Master has so much wisdom that he is seldom if ever the prey of reactions. That is why he goes slowly. But it is sure. Hence some of us are being kept back for our own good.

Arouse, arouse in you the meaning of “thou art that”, Thou art the self. [122] This is the thing to think of in meditation, and if you believe it, then tell some others the same. You have read it before, but now try to realize it more and more each day, and you will have the light you want.

Yes, I want articles. I printed that other and it is out today. Send more; if I can’t use them all, you will have the practice. So go on and conquer.

If certain queries arise, put them down, headed “query”, and send to me. I will file and use them from time to time, and perhaps in the book. Read or get a crumb from my other letters for news, as I have no time now for more. I try to help you all I can, and if you will look for wisdom you will get it sure, and that is all you want or need. Write all you like. If you can send now and then any jottings in shape for *Path* (for “Mirror”), do so, but send them by themselves so they will not be mixed with letters. No one sends those, so there is a chance.

Best love to you now and forever in the cross roads of life.

WILLIAM Ț.

In his letter of October 20th, “A.F.” stands for Alexander Fullerton; “the chinaware party” stands for Che-Yew-Ts [ng (see the April instalment of these letters); “Julius” was a pen-name used by Mrs. Archibald Keightley.

NEW YORK, October 20th, 1894.

My Dear "Sir",

Have yours and article. Look here, I fear that A. F. will have to be told who the chinaware party is; he suspects it now. How funny to see the old articles reprinted by those who think they are so wise and know your mind and soul so well. Ha, ha. I will use the matter of course, and if I do not, will send it back; but I guess what I get from your place will have small chance to go back.

I am touring the section and driven to death. Am on the path of reintegration and did big work Boston and other places. When the devil begins again he will find much in the way. They will begin again, and will try it here too, you bet. But with the help of the gods, we'll lick them.

Tell Julius that I am not going to use that heart-shaped symbol at all, but another sort of thing that I am waiting for. I will let her know in time, first of all. It shall be done, but how, I am now not able to say. It is good news you give. I hope the good end of all her trouble is near. Now best love to you and proceed right on the line you have in mind. It is good. Think of me when you want to know, and if it be the time I am in bed you will get it sure, and if I am awake, then probably. Good bye as ever thine Sir,

24.

[238]

LETTERS FROM W.Q. JUDGE

IV.

It must be difficult for present-day members of The Theosophical Society, who have joined our ranks since Judge's death, but who have grown up, theosophically, in "the Judge tradition", to realize that leading members and officers of a Society calling itself Theosophical, could have conspired against a fellow-member and brother-officer whom they had called their friend; could secretly have collected "evidence" against him, and then—to make such conduct worse—could have lacked the common decency, the honesty, the courage, to go with their "evidence" personally to the man they were accusing, to ask him for his explanation, before pronouncing him, even in their own minds, guilty. Yet that is exactly what Mrs. Besant, Olcott and others did and failed to do. Not one of them even claimed to have asked Judge for an explanation *before* condemning him. It was and is manifest that to treat any friend like that, was not only a violation of every theosophical principle, but proof that those who did it lacked—honour. His accusers *hid* their suspicions and their "evidence" until they imagined that their "case", as they called it, was sufficiently convincing, and then, suddenly, out of a clear sky, Mrs. Besant, as spokesman, wrote from a great distance (from India) and demanded that Judge resign! Not content with this, Mrs. Besant went so far as to claim that H.P.B.'s great Master approved her action,—Master M., the embodiment of chivalry, who, through H.P.B., as recently as 1889, had inscribed his own picture: "To my dear and loyal colleague, W. Q. Judge."

It is, as I have said, almost incredible; but it is true,—and those who did it were pledged to serve the cause of brotherhood![‡]

"By their fruits ye shall know them." It is not surprising that the organization of which Mrs. Besant made herself the President, is and always has been rent by dissension: envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness, its one lasting product; internecine strife, its perpetual condition.

Following the Judge "trial" in London, Mrs. Besant hurried to Australia, there to work up a new "Section" of the Society so as to insure a majority vote against Judge on the General Council whenever she might deem it safe to renew her frustrated attack. Judge, meanwhile, after a brief rest at the home of the Griscoms near New York, did as he was urging others to do, and started a vigorous "campaign for Theosophy" by lecturing for Branches in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, Maryland and elsewhere.

The next public event of outstanding importance was the publication, in [239] the London *Westminster Gazette*, of the so-called evidence against Judge. Mrs. Besant had allowed Walter R. Old to retain copies of all the letters and papers which she, Olcott, Bertram Keightley, and Old himself, had collected. No one would have paid any attention to Old if Mrs. Besant had not adopted his "evidence" and merged it with her own. Old had been a clerk in Birmingham, England, where he had dabbled in "magic" of a shady and childish sort, to be finally rescued, not long before her death, by H.P.B., who gave him room and board at Avenue Road in an effort to set him on his feet. Old was a vain little man who, having studied "parlour conjuring", was prepared to explain theoretically how all occult phenomena might be produced without the employment of any occult power whatsoever,—just by trickery. It is an explanation which has always appealed to the half-educated, popular mind. Applying it, to his own complete satisfaction, to the phenomena connected with Judge—incidentally attributing to Judge the training and skill of a professional conjurer, none of which, it should be needless to say, did Judge possess—Old carried his "evidence" and his "explanations" to a rather brilliant young journalist named Edmund Garrett, who at once saw his opportunity: Theosophy,

‡. See the reprint in this issue of the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, of a pamphlet entitled *A Forgotten Pledge*, which deals directly with this subject, and which also gives particulars covering the foregoing statements.

since the death of H. P. B., had been much in the public eye; he, Garrett, would expose it, once and for ever, as a gigantic fraud.

Reading Garrett's articles again to-day, it is not easy to see why they produced so shattering an effect in England. They are cleverly written, it is true, but are based entirely upon two big assumptions: first "everybody knows" that H.P.B. was a fraud; second, her pupil, Judge, necessarily was a fraud also. There were no such occurrences as "occult phenomena"; no such people as Adepts and Masters. Conjuring tricks, or quite ordinary tricks, without any conjuring, explained everything. But his chief weapon was ridicule, which he poured unstintedly upon everyone concerned,—including Mrs. Besant. This filled her with amazement and indignation, and especially with fury against Judge,—as if Judge were responsible!

"I propose to show", wrote Garrett, "that Mrs. Besant has been bamboozled for years by bogus 'communications' of the most childish kind, and in so ludicrous a fashion as to deprive of all value any future evidence of hers on any question calling for the smallest exercise of observation and common sense."

Mrs. Besant was stung, not by the attack on H.P.B. or on Theosophy, but by the ridicule of her own personality; and a proof of this stands out in the nature of her reply to Garrett's attacks. This reply, which she entitled "The Theosophical Society and 'The Westminster Gazette'", was published in the London *Daily Chronicle*, and then in her own magazine, *Lucifer*, where it covered ten and a half pages. It did not contain one word in defence of H.P.B., not one word in defence of Theosophy or the Society: it gave half a page to the defence and praise of Chakravarti, and the remaining ten pages to the defence and vindication of herself.

So far as the general membership in Europe was concerned, the effect of the *Gazette's* attack was to make them run like rabbits. There were honourable exceptions, but a large majority of the Branches (Lodges) passed resolutions [240] calling upon Judge to reply at once to the accusations against him, and meanwhile to resign his office as Vice-President of the Society. The English members of that day could not bear being ridiculed,—and the *Westminster Gazette* was very widely read. The friends of members were inclined to say to them, "Well, *now* are your eyes open!" and as the members did not like this, they shielded themselves by repudiating Judge.[¶] It is only fair to add, however, that many more might have stood their ground unflinchingly if their leaders in England had set them that example. "Avenue Road", with Mrs. Besant as its centre, represented "authority", and European members, having accepted that "authority", were unable to look beyond the person and position to the Principle and the Truth. They were tested, and most of them failed,—exactly as members in America were tested a few years later. In 1894, members in America, who had grown into the unfortunate habit, always condemned by him, of accepting Judge as their "authority", followed him. In 1898, most of them did as European members had done four years earlier: unable to recognize and follow a Principle, they followed Mrs. Tingley after she had failed.

Nearly all members, on both continents, believed in Masters, or said they did; nearly all of them wished, more or less, to draw nearer to Masters. They had been told from the beginning that the only right of the aspirant for chéliship is to be tried; they had heard it stated a thousand times, on every kind of "authority", that a genuine desire for the Truth, regardless of personalities, preferences and prejudices, is essential in discipleship; they believed, theoretically, that it is the inner Light "which lighteth every man that cometh into the world", and that we should prove all things and hold fast that which is good; they believed, or thought they did, that "discrimination between the Real and the unreal" is one of the necessary qualifications,—yet, when the test came, they shut their eyes and clung to "authority" for fear of making a mistake. Neither in Europe nor in America was the test difficult. The treatment of Judge by Mrs. Besant spoke for itself; Mrs. Tingley's attempt to make the Society a department of her "Universal Brotherhood", with herself as supreme

[¶]. See again the reprint in this issue of *A Forgotten Pledge*.

“Leader and Official Head”, spoke just as loudly. No one is ever tested beyond what may rightly and fairly be expected of him. Even Mrs. Besant, in 1893, after she had surrendered herself to the highly magnetic influence of Chakravarti, and, in that condition, “heard” the Master’s voice telling her to take action against Judge and “to wash away the stains on the T. S.”, with the tell-tale addition: “Your strength was given you for this”,— even Mrs. Besant *might* have laughed. Strong! It was Judge’s effort to get her to stand on her own feet, which, as much as anything, threw her into the arms of Chakravarti. Strong! Of course she would have laughed,—if she had not believed it true. Yet, as a test, it was very simple: Masters do not flatter; Chakravartis do.

Well,—the majority of members failed, and it certainly is not for us to cast stones at them, for we, in other ways, doubtless have failed too, and perhaps as badly,—except, let us hope, for one vital difference: that we have seen our sins as sins, and have done our utmost to atone for them. “For this, O friend [241] Vaddha, is the advantage of the discipline of the Noble One, that he who looks upon his sin as sin, and makes amends for it as is meet, he becomes able in future to restrain himself therefrom.”

There is this, also, to be said on behalf of the rank and file of those who went under in 1894 and 1898: the greatest emphasis had always been laid, and rightly laid, on loyalty to friends and leaders. The unfortunate “Che-Yew-Ts [ng’s” remarks on the subject in *Some Modern Failings*, almost inevitably, perhaps, had been interpreted in Europe as an appeal for loyalty to Mrs. Besant rather than to Judge. Many are slow to learn the difference between loyalty, and stupid, superstitious, blind acceptance of all that some older student may utter. They know, sometimes, the evils of self-opinionatedness, of intellectual conceit, and of what Judge called “the teaching perch”, and their dread of those hideous weaknesses makes it difficult to find that hair-line, that razor’s edge, which, we have always been told, are similes for the Path,—with a precipice on either side as further discouragement for the timid.

Even those who survived the test in Europe in 1894, and who realized that Judge stood for Theosophy, for H.P.B. and the Lodge, needed constant readjustment and moral support. Incapable of doubting Judge, some of us were inclined to take far too seriously the effect of the Garrett attacks on the membership-at-large, and were wondering, at times, if the cause of Theosophy in England were not irretrievably ruined. This was no mood in which to fight *constructively*, and Judge—who knew directly, as Foch saw by reflection, that no one is beaten until he thinks he is—relied chiefly upon Archibald Keightley, Mrs. Keightley and myself to begin at once to rebuild what Mrs. Besant was destroying. Ill with what proved to be his death-illness; keenly sensitive as every great Occultist must be; intensely human; full of the deepest solicitude and sense of responsibility for the very people who were attacking him; realizing to the quick that he had tried to give them his real heart and that they had flung it back at him with bitterness and contempt,—Judge suffered intensely, as everyone who loved him knew. Yet, for our sakes, and, above all, because he knew that the result of H. P. B.’s mission and her reputation as Lodge Messenger depended, on this plane, solely upon *his will*, he dominated his personality and its feelings, and created time and strength for the writing of letters which ring with power, cheerfulness, and the determination to wrest victory from every appearance of defeat. The valour of that man’s heart is almost beyond belief. What he endured, still remains to be written. He who, “of all Chêlas, suffers most and demands, or even expects, the least”—as H.P.B.’s Master had written of him—having been tried as by fire through years of loneliness, of inner “desolation” (as mystical books speak of it), and every kind of outer obstacle and incubus, had forged for the service of Masters a will of flame and steel which he now used, not only to keep the Movement in being, but to project it forward to today and to our unknown to-morrows.

Let no one think, then, because he wrote with so light a touch of things in themselves tragic (the failure and degradation of souls), that he felt as lightly. He wrote to reinforce a young man upon whom he relied somewhat to pass on [242] to others the spirit of these letters; and he knew his “subject”, knew how to inspire

and stimulate and yet steady a youthful but inexperienced enthusiasm. He was an artist in that, as in so much else. Polished phrases and pious sentiments would have left me cold; Judge made me think and feel and act, made me meditate and reach up to heaven for whatever of fire I could seize there, that I might add that little to his consuming zeal for the Work,—the great Work of Masters in the world. Judge dashed off these letters like lightning; for a score of reasons, I loved them, and love them now; they are the letters of *a man*; and if anyone should think that they fall short of “the ideal”—considering the conditions and the need which evoked them—all I can say is: Think again.

The “old material”, to which Judge refers in the following letter, was the “evidence” collected by Olcott, Walter Old, Bertram Keightley, and Annie Besant, which she had intended to produce and publish at the time of the “trial” in London (see the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, October, 1931; pp. 107-122), in the expectation that this would put an end to Judge as a power in the Theosophical Society.

The “centre” to be formed was at 62, Queen Anne Street, London,—a house rented by Dr. Archibald Keightley, where he and Mrs. Keightley lived, and where, on the ground floor, he had his consulting rooms and medical laboratory.

The American Asiatic and Sanskrit Revival Society was organized by Judge “for historical and scientific research in the ancient literature of India and other Asiatic countries”, for “the collection, preservation, and translation” of Indian and other Asiatic manuscripts, and “to promote the revival of Sanskrit learning in India.”

NEW YORK, November 19th, 1894.

My dear Son Keed:

Right you are. It is all a tempest in a tea pot from which we shall come all right, and the others who are not worthy will be burned below and above. My dear fellow take the ideas which you get from me underground and which you feel. In this case quiet work and steady confidence are all that Master wants for the present. Do not splurge too soon. Be strong as you are and go on with the work among the members, as you are, as much as you can, and while you may explain facts do not let anyone see bitterness or partizanship. Do not get hurried. Let Master alone now until I give the word, as I have here and there. All will come right. It is a big fight. The present attack is due to the dark side using the old material, and when it is done, then we can come in and do the other. At the present time Master could not come out with anything directly, for if he did, things would only be worse. The tiger will have a “smaile” on his face all the time as he has now. It will be no use to bring a suit at all. It is well for you to write me all the time so as to work off the force, and it will go to its effect, but be careful what you say to others by the pen. Re-read your letters after a day or so, and then condense and smooth out, or else they will get you to say something that will be no good.

The present row as you can see has dished up several persons, and matters are gradually coming to a head, so that, which King, Bensonian, will be very plain, and we shall all in the end be better off.

Of course what I said to Julius [Mrs. Keightley] to form a centre is right, and has been going on. This is not to be made a public thing, but no one can tell what will be the result. I can imagine a few possibilities. If at that centre all hurry and all partizanship are entirely laid aside, the forces for the Lodge will gather and circulate from there to all parts. Remember that partizanship is not good, and is different from steady and strong loyalty. Infuse all with that idea. God knows I should like to be there, but I must not stir long from this point, so, though I lecture, I come at once back here. It is expensive but necessary.

Perseverantia O puer! You are right. You can see some light where it is. Follow it and stay by it. Do you understand me? Do you see how confirmatory it is that Master made me do the circular and order just when these devils were at the *Gazette*, and lo Chakky [Chakravarti] is named, as he deserved, by both. Minds must work, and all we have to do is to let them. The American Asiatic Society was begun November 17th, '94, and you will have a prospectus soon . . . ten dollars to come in . . . and perhaps you will see a connection between it and the western seat of learning that Master told me of, and which all those high and mighty intimates of H.P.B. never suspected as being in her mind. Let us laugh a bit, my son, and proceed with the making up of the design on the board.

Well, I can say no more. Help at lists, and get names and addresses as you can, so we may have a list as complete as possible in case the blessed council will not come down.

Love to all, and to you my best as usual.

As ever,

WILLIAM Q. J.

NEW YORK, November 23rd, 1894.

Dear Ernest,

I only scribble this so as to send you some good steady forces for yourself. Hold it to your forehead a while. All is well. Armies are on the march for us. The rot and rubbish must be cleared out by the weight of that hand [Master M.'s], and then some work can be done.

Adios,

WILLIAM Q.

NEW YORK, November 26th, 1894.

Say Keed,

This is the most amusing scrape we ever were in. What an immense "advert." this is. Why, man, we couldn't buy such a thing. Proofs. Proofs [244] be d—d. What proof did they ever get from H.P.B.? None. The *Sun* gave me five columns of respectful editorial mention. Dished me up in fine style. Will try to send it for an evening over the carpet in the hall of magic at 62 [Queen Anne Street]. There are "buzzrs" in the air there. They are "moine". Let all those who enter there be inoculated.

Now see here, my boy. Just laugh and forget all the little details of persecution, prosecution, perversion, prevarication and all that, and set your grey matter steadily to work at the question, "How can we in any way, small or large, everywhere make use of this thing for the benefit of propaganda?" That is the question. It must be done. Don't let the leprosy of the Park [Regents Park, the district in which Avenue Road was situated] make you think that propaganda is dead in England. Devise, devise, devise, and have someone or yourself execute all sorts of things for propaganda: letters, articles, speeches, what not.

Also throw out now all over the land, and through Europe wherever is a little chance, some line in a letter. Not a personal letter, but some letter that will carry the idea. Urge that this row shows, and my attitude shows, that the T. S. does not call for belief in Masters, and that the doctrine of their existence is in evolution, and that it kills original sin invented by theology. I have written to the rest to go to work on the idea of propaganda, and to stop as far as possible dwelling on the row and the persons in it. Try by all means, and get others to do so also, to make 62 and its successor the real centre there, that is, not by way of

opposition, but a centre where the real thing goes from. The old lady's line [H.P.B.'s] is hooked on there, and at 19 [Avenue Road] the blackies have their paw on everything little and big. Hence there is a stream of dirty light or colour going out from there that spreads disintegration all over the [European] Section. Something must be done to offset that, and I see no other place for it to go from, as it is now, than 62. 6 and 2 make 8, and 8 is my own number. Queer but true and not mere accident. Work it up my boy. I'd come and help, but they are trying to smash this centre, for if they could the whole edifice goes down. Would go over now but for that.

Have regular theosophical meetings at the place on some night in the week. Take Tuesday, my own night, for Mars, for this is war. That will synchronize with here [the meetings of the Aryan T. S.]. Have good meetings. Get good solid heart things out. If this is given out by no name in particular, it will soon be crowded. Better begin by invitation so as to control it. Capacity is not large, and besides I don't want a raft there. How is it down stairs? Have the meeting not by syllabus but as if impromptu, but all the same well arranged. Begin with A.K., then Julius, then you, then Alice [Mrs. Cleather, who had not yet turned against Judge] and James [J. M. Pryse, of whom the same was true], and I tell you, my dear, by the next month or so you will have just what we need. It can get notice in the papers if the right social reporter be obtained. Now all details I leave to you and Julius and dear old boy Archie, but get the thing done. That's all. As everly thine,

WILLIAM Q. J.

[245] The letter of December 3rd was written by Judge in pencil, evidently in great haste and at great speed (he could write with amazing rapidity). Following the "Keed", he wrote the Sanskrit (Devanagari) equivalent for "Jr.", signifying "Junior", and instead of a Roman "J." as signature, he wrote that in Sanskrit. Charles Johnston told me that the Sanskrit lettering was perfectly formed, in spite of the speed and boldness of the writing, and that he had known other cases of Judge's fluent use, not only of Sanskrit, but of various Indian scripts.

NEW YORK, December 3rd, 1894.

Dear Keed [Jr.],

All right. Laugh, why I laugh forever. Keep in mind rebuilding and constructive works, for we shall need all we can do.

Letter to H.S.O. all right, only be very careful.

Wire all right. Write as good and perhaps better.

Sun of to-day prints me in full. Enclosed. Read and laugh. WORK, WORK, WORK. Cast no one out of your heart.

As ever,

[J.]

The first part of the following letter refers to the efforts of Mrs. Besant's supporters at Avenue Road to extricate themselves from an embarrassing position: they had practically certified articles I had written under the *nom de plume* of "Che-Yew-Ts [ng]", as the work of a Chêla, if not of an Adept; they were then confronted with the fact that I, an ardent supporter and follower of Judge, had written those articles. Unable to undo

what they had previously said and written, they invented the explanation that I must in some way have “stolen” those articles. They were mistaken!

Judge’s reference to the cover of *Lucifer* is explained by the fact that it had recently been changed from that approved and used by H.P.B., to a plain cover without any drawing of “The Light Bringer”.

The postscript refers to H.P.B.’s letters to her relatives in Russia, which were appearing in *The Path*. They were being translated from the Russian by Mrs. Charles Johnston (Vera Jelihovsky), but I was supposed to correct the resulting English, and to be responsible generally for their preparation for the press.

NEW YORK, December 9th, 1894.

Dear Keedji,

Received yours in which you tell me of the wondrous lie they got up *re* your “steal” of Chew. Well, my boy, all right. As we have the proof, we can wait. But be careful to remember that when Mead asked me about the first articles, I then did *not* know who was the writer, and so told him. Next they will lie me. But there is a fine rope that stretches through the universe which now and then knots itself into hard kinks, and sometimes a knot gets caught about [246] a person’s (K)neck, and thereupon he is hung. So don’t worry. Those who are to be caught in a kink of this rope will be all the sooner if we let them alone. Then we can cut them down and save their lives. Ha! ha! in order to prove you a thief, they must trot out the real Chew. Funny, too, if you play on the name it will sound like Chew-your-blood, or tsang. But yet remember I told you I saw trouble in that thing.

Your remarks upon the poems are all right. The real explanation is that an effort was made to dictate the real thing to the amanuensis, who really does hear now and then, but prejudice, education etc. came in, and also other things. But it is fair. You show good judgment and discrimination in your analysis, which was sent me.

Now Sir, about the “beast” story and J.C.K. It is rot, and best treated with contempt, because if dwelt on it gets too important. The opinion of A.B. is not worth a d—n, and everybody will someday hold the view of the *Westminster Gazette* on that head. Really good, nice people are not affected by such rotten lies. Its just like A.B.’s story that W.Q.J. is a black magician, etc. It will kill itself by its fatness. Further, Mead, C.O. [Mrs. Cooper-Oakley] and Co. are very rapidly showing their total actual incompetency as experts on such questions. They don’t know the colour of a thought. Were it blue they would guess it to be green.

Of course it hurt J.C.K. to hear the lie, but such lies react on the liars. They will also be a background for her splendid work at 62, Queen Anne Street.

And that leads to this. I tell you very plainly that J.C.K. ought not to let herself be too well known to all. She is too sensitive, and it injures her. Reserve is a good thing, for one like her may go too far with such a multitude as is now beginning to flock. That’s one reason why I made Arch my agent. J.C.K. does better work as my little Cossack who plants things while others don’t look. Don’t misunderstand. If J.C.K. got to be personally and urgently sought after, she would be killed. I will try to explain this to her.

As to using sentences from my letters: use anything that’s not personal matter. J.C.K. knows that. Her decision was right.

Keep your eye on the *Irish Theosophist*. Write for it now and then, and ask J.M.P. to do so also. I have a scheme. Guess it? Perhaps it will only be a dream. But, the new cover of *Lucifer* is too “respectable”.

Well, adios dear boy,

As ever,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

Try to get H.P.B.'s Letters a month ahead. Not on hand yet for January, and they ought to be. Should be here by the 5th of each month at latest, as they head the issue.

NEW YORK, December 18th, 1894.

Dear Keedji,

Item: A.F. [Alexander Fullerton] has in next *Path* an article, "Real Reason", [247] in which he says the reason persons object to any F.T.S. having actually heard from ^ [the Master] is jealousy. Its great, and from him! I took it. Am not writing much this mail.

"The loyalty of which you have had evidence is a vast underlying bubbling force; the others will overdo somewhere, and then many who honestly decided against you, will turn completely to your side." ^a

As ever,

WILLIAM Q. J.

This letter was addressed to Dr. Keightley, and was then handed by him to me, as it was two letters in one. "There" refers to the upstairs sitting-room at 62, Queen Anne Street.

Fred J. Dick was Secretary of the Dublin Lodge,—devoted to Judge, and a most faithful member.

NEW YORK, December 28th, 1894.

Dear Arch,

I reply to you soon. Dear Boy, I'm so banked with letters I don't know what to do. You all seem to be doing right all the time. Hold fast. Let all hold tight. Dick's plan has been seething in my mind for two weeks, and is a good one.

Dear Ernest,

Thanks my son. Yes, I was there. I go each 5 p. m.—seen or seen not—the wires buzz. All is well. The future is good though the present seems rocky. Rotten ships founder on rocky bottoms.

Read that little vision on first page of a recent *Path* signed "Amaran". It applies to this and the coming months.

Good for the Propaganda Committee!

Say, make a note of this: I approve, encourage and endorse all and every work for spread of Theosophy.

Make a try for the common people. It's feasible perhaps; it is necessary.

As ever,

W. Q. J.

[27]

LETTERS FROM W.Q. JUDGE

V.

The next outer event of consequence, following the attacks of the London *Westminster Gazette* in the autumn of 1894 (see the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, January, 1932, pages 238-247), was the Adyar Convention, at the end of December, 1894. It was a disgraceful performance, but served a useful purpose in so far as it helped to convince Judge's friends that to have any relations of any sort with people who could sponsor such a travesty of Theosophy, would be fatal to the work of H.P.B. and to the Society which her Masters had founded. Olcott had occupied the Chair, and, as the published reports show, had permitted Judge, who still was Vice-President of the Society, to be called every bad name that his excited enemies could extemporize. He was a "fraud", a "deceiver", a "common impostor", a "villain" and so forth. Not a word of protest from Olcott, as Chairman, or from Mrs. Besant as participant. Without a single exception, everyone present seems to have been delighted. Much of it was mere screeching, Miss Henrietta Müller—who had accompanied Chakravarti and Mrs. Besant from London to the Parliament of Religions in Chicago in 1893—supplying a good share of it; and she was well qualified, being a "wild woman" by nature and selection, who, like Mrs. Besant, had "gone native" in India, and who used to travel with Hindu youths whom she had adopted. Bertram Keightley did his best, but his vocabulary was insignificant in comparison. Even the Countess Wachtmeister, whose psychism made her peculiarly susceptible to contagion of that kind—to mob hysteria—joined in the general chorus.[§]

It was Mrs. Besant herself, however, who, on this occasion, did more than anyone to fill us with down-right disgust; and it was not because she was abusive—she was not abusive; she displayed, and loudly displayed, all the resignation of a Christian martyr. Having attacked Judge publicly, having done her utmost to bring dishonour on his good name, and having succeeded in that to a considerable extent so far as the general public were concerned,—she now, though the direct cause of that dishonouring, paraded it as a grievance against her victim! "I am bound to tell you", she informed her audience, "that on every platform on which I shall stand, I shall be met with this difficulty as to dishonour." Then she went on (and it was this that finished us): "I will bear it, I will face it, and stand by the Society despite the difficulty". Having pilloried her "brother", she was prepared to endure, nobly, heroically, the shame of having a "brother" in the pillory!

[28] As a result of all this oratory, the Indian Convention passed a resolution "That the President-Founder be and is hereby requested to at once call upon Mr. W. Q. Judge, Vice-President, Theosophical Society, to resign the office of Vice-President." Not long afterwards, when she had returned to London, Mrs. Besant announced, jointly with G. R. S. Mead, that "If some definite action with regard to Mr. Judge shall not have been taken by the European Section before the meeting of its Annual Convention in July, we, the undersigned", shall then move that the Convention unite "with the Indian and [specially created] Australasian Sections in demanding his expulsion from the Society." The alternative was an "explanation" by Judge, such as Mrs. Besant might consider "full and satisfactory", of her charges against him, "or his voluntary secession from the Society."

After this came the Convention of the American Section, which was held at Boston on April 28th and 29th, 1895. I was not present, as it was clearly my duty to remain in London while Dr. and Mrs. Keightley were absent in America, representing a number of European Branches at the Convention. It is evident, however,

§. In an earlier instalment of these Letters, I said that "I never heard that she [the Countess Wachtmeister] attacked Judge". It would have been more accurate to say that anything I may have heard or known of that sort at the time, made no lasting impression on me, one way or the other. This was because, in comparison with others, she was innocuous, and, though deplorably misled, was sincere. The fact is that she issued several pamphlets and circulars, the intention of which was to injure Judge's theosophical reputation. In later years, she repudiated Mrs. Besant and resigned from the Adyar Society.

from the published report of the proceedings, fully confirmed at the time by the reports of friends who were participants, that the spirit and tone of the speeches were in marked contrast to the vulgarity and licence of the exhibition at Adyar. This, of course, was due to Judge's influence and example of many years. As he says in his letter to me of May 2nd, Mrs. Besant was ignored. But the Theosophical principles she had violated were not ignored; neither were her political manoeuvres. The American members had had enough; besides which they realized that the salvation of the Movement depended upon ridding the Society of those who, for nearly two years, had consistently proved their contempt for H.P.B., and for the essentials of all that H.P.B. valued, taught, and loved. Hence, when Clement A. Griscom, at the first morning's session, presented the report of the Committee on Resolutions declaring the autonomy of the American Branches under the name of "The Theosophical Society in America", the whole roomful of delegates and members rose and cheered to the echo. The enthusiasm was not only intense but passionate. This was partly because all those present knew that they were defending and vindicating Judge, as well as defending and preserving the Society.

The resolutions as read and passed can be found in *The Path* magazine of May, 1895, on page 66. Based in part upon historical and legal premises, the reason immediately preceding the major resolution was: "Whereas, conditions contrary to the principle of Universal Brotherhood have arisen within the Theosophical Society which would prove fatal to the continued existence of said Movement; therefore be it Resolved"—that the American Section T. S. then and there declare its entire autonomy.

Those of us who, with any degree of understanding, favoured this action in 1895, and who have followed the history of "residue" societies, including that of Adyar, from that time to this, could not adequately express our thankfulness that Judge had the courage and wisdom to consent to the elimination of the [29] gangrened elements before it was too late. The Movement, and we personally, owe our lives, in the real sense, to the action taken at that Boston Convention.

The resolutions, which were lengthy, were passed by 191 votes (of delegates) against 10, at the first afternoon session. The only personal reference they contained (except the appointment of Judge as President for life, "*with power to nominate his successor*") was extraordinarily generous, and shows how loyally Judge clung to the hope that Olcott, at the eleventh hour, might rise to the occasion: "Resolved, that the Theosophical Society in America hereby recognizes the long and efficient services rendered to the Theosophical Movement by Col. H. S. Olcott, and that to him belongs the unique and honorary title of President-Founder of the Theosophical Society, and that, as in the case of H.P.B. as Corresponding Secretary, he can have no successor in that office." That Olcott, instead of rising to the occasion, sank to it, and kept on sinking, distressed Judge greatly.

For the benefit of those who think they know all about Mrs. Tingley, even at that time—and they are many, some of them denouncing her as already a "little dugpa", and Judge as being "under her thumb"; some of them exalting her to the rank of H.P.B. or higher—it is worth noting that she attended the Boston Convention; made a short speech; that Judge glared at her with deep displeasure while she spoke and after she resumed her seat; and that at the end of the session he called her to him and rebuked her so severely that she wept. . . . And now for their proponents to fit that fact into either of the two "final conclusions", "inner lights" or "occult revelations," which I have specified!

After the Convention had adjourned, the delegates and members again assembled (April 29th, at 3.30 p. m.) "to listen to a written explanation of the charges against William Q. Judge of forging 'Mahatma messages'." Judge said his health would not permit him to read the paper himself, but that Dr. Keightley would do it for him, adding that the explanation had been purposely kept back until the final action of the Convention should be known. Dr. Keightley then read the paper, which occupied one hour and a half, to an audience which paid

the deepest attention. The six charges made by Mrs. Besant were given in full and answered *seriatim*. At the conclusion of the reading there was long and loud applause, after which it was moved and carried:

That the meeting considered the explanation perfectly satisfactory, but that, so far as those present were concerned, it was entirely unnecessary.

This explanation was printed in pamphlet form as soon as possible, and was distributed to members throughout the world, whose names and addresses were known at Headquarters in New York.

All eyes were now fixed on the Convention of the European Section to be held in London on July 4th, 1895. Judge's friends knew, by this time, that in Europe they would be outnumbered by about three to one. Those of us who had been members of the Blavatsky Lodge in London, had realized this some time before, when resolutions had been passed, in spite of our vehement protests, calling upon Judge to resign. Our answer then had been to withdraw, and to form a new Branch, called the H.P.B. Lodge, which met at 62 Queen Anne [30] Street under the Presidency of Dr. A. Keightley. It seemed likely that our only recourse at the coming Convention would be to take similar action. We were determined, however, to fight to the last ditch for the principles of Theosophy which Judge was so splendidly upholding. This involved making it as clear as we knew how, first, that he was upholding them, and, second, that his accusers were dragging them in the mud. As it turned out, the attitude adopted by Olcott and Mrs. Besant when the Convention met, made our task relatively easy; for Judge, as President of the Theosophical Society in America, had addressed a Letter of Greeting to the European Theosophists, in which, after referring to the action taken by the American Theosophists at Boston, he said that while autonomy would have been brought about in any case before long "as an inevitable and logical development", it had been hastened "by reason of what we considered to be strife, bitterness and anger existing in other Sections of the Theosophical world which were preventing us from doing our best work in the field assigned us by Karma". The last paragraph read as follows:

Let us then press forward together in the great work of the real Theosophical Movement which is aided by working organizations, but is above them all. Together we can devise more and better ways for spreading the light of truth through all the earth. Mutually assisting and encouraging one another, we may learn how to put Theosophy into practice so as to be able to teach and enforce it by example before others. We shall then each and all be members of that Universal Lodge of Free and Independent Theosophists which embraces every friend of the human race. And to all this we beg your corporate official answer for our more definite and certain information, and to the end that this and your favourable reply may remain as evidence and monuments between us.

It was a challenge. When the Convention met, Olcott as Chairman, informed the delegates that this Letter of Greeting had been received (there was no concealing the fact, as many of us had copies in our possession), but that he would not read it. "I declare the thing out of order and not admissible", he said.

Several of us jumped to our feet to protest against the chair's ruling, pointing out that it was untheosophical, unreasonable, and illegal. Mrs. Besant realized that a tactical blunder had been made, and, while referring to her ally's ruling as "perfectly just and legal", suggested that he allow the letter to be read, "and then let it lie on the table, passing it over in absolute silence so to speak"! The letter was then read, after which F. J. Dick of the Dublin Lodge quickly moved: "That this Convention do receive the communication with pleasure and do draft a reply thereto". More speeches. The plan had been to silence us, but it was not our purpose to be silenced. Mrs. Besant moved as an amendment: "That the letter do lie upon the table". This was carried by 39 votes against 13 (only delegates voting). There was but one step left to us, and that [31] was to raise a "question of privilege", which I now did (and still have the little book on "Rules of Order" from which this useful idea had been gleaned). Asking Judge's friends to speak with me by rising from their seats, which they did, we protested against the action of the Convention in rejecting the address presented to us by the Theosophical Society in America, thus declining to accept the hand of brotherhood which had been held out to us,—this action signifying "the final abandonment by the majority of this Section of the

fundamental basis upon which we are working”, which made it a farce to continue together, “since we are not working for the same object.” “We protest, and I believe for the last time. We shall now leave the meeting.” Whereupon a number of members marched out, headed by Dr. Keightley. We assembled again promptly at the home of Lady Malcolm of Poltalloch, an old member, and a fearless and loyal soul, whose sense of justice had been outraged by the way Judge had been treated. There we organized “The Theosophical Society in Europe”, electing Judge its President,—and at once cabled to him a summary of what had happened.

Judge died on March 21st, 1896, about fourteen months after he wrote the following letter. During all that time he was fighting consciously for his life, determined to complete, if he could, certain things he had begun,—the development of certain individuals, included. The disease which ostensibly killed him was tuberculosis of the lungs. In 1881, and again in the summer of 1882, he had spent some time in Carúpano, Venezuela, on business, and had suffered severely from Chagres fever, a malignant type of malarial fever which often leaves a predisposition to tuberculosis in its trail; but he could have continued to repel that physical attack with ease, as he had done for years, if it had not been for a far worse strain on his vitality, namely, the strain of his resistance to the efforts of the Dark Powers to kill him,—the venomous hatred of his persecutors and slanderers, *once his close associates*, supplying the lines of contact for the major onslaught. These efforts culminated during the winter preceding the Boston Convention.

NEW YORK, January 18th, 1895.

Dear E.T.H.,

I am so sick just now that I cannot send any letters. Take it all for granted. My Chicago trip was all right and useful, but this is my ordinary death year, and hence I am just waiting until the Rubicon is passed.

So good-bye.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

I have done nothing yet about Chew Y.-T.

With the following letter, Judge enclosed a long clipping from the New York *Sun*, quoting *The Path*, and making good-natured fun of him on account of “Mahatma messages.”

[32]

NEW YORK, January 21st, 1895.

Dear Mr. Keejid né Chewsan,

A heap of yours are unanswered and I fear will not be, for I am too overwhelmed with things and correspondence. If there are any matters I must reply to, or on which you want a short indication of my idea, please adopt this plan following. When I have a lot of letters to read I get it mixed. Plan: on a piece of paper put the points, separate slip from letter, and mark it *Ques.* or “For Reply”. I need just that sort of thing. Ask the others to do the same. Needn’t leave room. I’ll fix it to answer.

Look here. When I write I mean what I say, and not what may be inferred. So do your part to prevent inferences. I haven’t had a thought of condemning anyone at 62, nor of dampening ardour. That’s all inference and imagination; do all you can to arouse the idea of taking me as I write, and not by assumption. Otherwise I shall be continually bothered. — has gone to a lot of trouble to show me that — didn’t do this and that. I don’t need this. I never infer; I go on what I *know*. I’ve trusted everything to you people, and what greater proof can I give of entire confidence and reliance? This really is my only gloom,—that an

incorrect notion such as the above should be there. But I assume it is effect of reaction and strain, and hope it will pass.

I altered the current Screen of Time and rewrote it, affixing the Chew Yu letter.

To Julius I have given the reasons and the new plan. You had better see that, so as to get the idea for all it may be worth.

We shall now have to explain and make clear about West and East, and Western Occultism—the Western wave etc.—so as to destroy the idea A.B. [Mrs. Annie Besant] is spreading that I wish to create disunion. I will try to send an advance letter about this for all. Gradually the truth as to India must come out. Plenty of stuff in K.H. and H.P.B. papers for it. So all good explanations will be wise. India is not to be “downed”, but we must show the actual evolutionary importance of the Western wave.

You are all doing well and I thank you all. You must all be patient for I am walled in and have but slim cash and time. Later we will get into some real good system.

Good-bye, good love and good luck, as ever,

WILLIAM Q. J.

On this plane, Judge was the Guardian of the whole Society, and felt deeply responsible for all its parts. He had inherited that responsibility directly from H.P.B., and it had become greater with his own continued inner growth. It was, therefore, both his duty and desire to avoid what we then referred to colloquially as “a split”, so long as there was a ray of hope for his enemies. That they were his enemies, as well as enemies of the Society, complicated his task. If they had attacked and persecuted some other member of the Society, instead of himself, he could and would have acted against them, drastically, from the beginning. As it was, the initiative, under occult law, could not come [33] from him. He *had* to be “ordered”—one might almost say “pushed”—by other members of the Great Lodge before consenting to cut off the gangrened membership. Further, “orders” received by him directly, had to be confirmed by similar “orders”, from the same source, sent to him through others. None of this has been understood or taken into account by those who have attempted to criticize his procedure at that time. They have revealed nothing except their own ignorance,—including their ignorance of the truth that to be bound by occult law is equivalent to being bound by the finer shades of honour.

Judge’s friends were not bound as he was. Their duty was entirely different. Those among them who had any real insight knew well that *Judge was the Society*, just as H.P.B. had been the Society during her lifetime; they knew that to save him would save the Society, and that it could not be saved in any other way.

Some people find this principle difficult to understand. I have heard Christians say: “Christ is Christianity”, and other Christians object on the ground that this ignored the Church. A student of Theosophy ought to know that it takes only one real Christian to make a Church, and that, in the same way, it takes only one real Theosophist (which implies a great deal) to make a Theosophical Society,—and that without the reality, the organism is a danger and a snare.

It followed that several of Judge’s friends had advocated a “split”, long before he was willing to entertain the idea. His letter of March 10th, which follows, was the first intimation we, in London, received, that he had consented finally to an “operation” on the body entrusted to his care.

March 10th, 1895.

A.K., J.C.K., E.T.H. (and others).

I have changed my plans because of information and instructions from ^a in regard to an American split; and that information is being confirmed not only by reflection but also by facts. The fact J.C.K. gives about the insane proposition of Sturdy and Co. confirms. They are all mixed up and incapable of leading, and to remain tied to them means years of strife and bitterness. A.B. [Mrs. Annie Besant] is determined to destroy me, and hence we must get apart, for U.S. is the real T.S., and their rot and rioting over there under A.B. is something we must separate from. So, I am now in the split party, though I have not as yet said so openly. I have told a few only. Previously I was against talk of split, proposing that April Convention should stand for unity, after passing certain resolutions, and then see what the other two [Sections of the T.S.] would do.

This is what [^] says: Write London and tell them to write to, or see, the different parts, and ask what steps they (such places or Lodges) are prepared to take in reference to the U.S. April Convention, not only on the question of separation and affiliation, but as well on sending delegate or delegates to America. Give them directions if they do not know.

Well, I don't think you need instructions. The more resolutions you can bring [34] with you, the stronger we shall be. If Europe will not delegate you—and of course you would not accept if determined to go a way it [the European Section] would not sanction—you can get some Lodge or Lodges or centres to delegate you specially to represent them. Ireland of course; Sweden and others I of course do not know about, but you will know. I suppose the form of resolution on the special point can only be that if U.S. splits, they will affiliate. But you are competent to draw that up.

The chief reason some will have for “no split” is sentimental,—a desire not to split the T.S. But it is already split, and the Sturdy thing shows what it will come to for certain. So you must meet that the best way you can. If you meet one or two *safe* persons who say that J. [Judge] was against it, you can say you have reason to believe I changed my mind.

As ever,

WILLIAM Ț.

The memorandum dated April 1st, 1895, was enclosed with a letter addressed either to Dr. A. Keightley or to me: I do not remember which. In any case, I have the original, which is in Judge's handwriting, though with occasional modifications.

April 1st, 1895 — ^a For letter to —.

Tell him that you have watched events, have waited, have given the persecutors, the destroyers of Theosophy every chance, and now the hour has come when it is no longer possible for you to remain with them. To what are you pledged? For what through centuries have you worked? For the Theosophical Movement, or, the spiritualizing of the race. That movement is now endangered by the state of the T.S., which cannot be cured by any further temporizing. The only part of the T.S. that has any theosophical vitality is the group of American Branches. It is their duty to cut themselves off, or like good apples in a barrel with rotten ones, they will be rotted. Remember the picture of the T.S. as a tree torn by the roots and cast upon an arid plain. Quite true you may keep alive this organization for some three years, but it would be a period full of bitterness and strife, ending in the ruin of the Theosophical Movement. Even now, as you know, they are trying to undermine you in your own place. By striking at you, the centre, they are striking at Theosophy. This the Dark ones know, and are pushing that poor woman [Mrs. Besant] on, while she and her friends are

working for their own self-righteous ends as they suppose. The Dark ones know that such as they cannot head nor carry on a real movement. Waste no more thoughts on them; devote all your helpful thoughts to those brave souls who have stood, who have worked for Theosophy and not for themselves, who have seen through those illusions, who have not mistaken hypocrisy for truth. The others will have to be left to learn the lessons of their experience so that those may profit them in other lives under similar temptations.

[35]

NEW YORK, April 25th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

Off tomorrow to Boston with A.K. and J.C.K., and so will not be able to write you much yet.

Fullerton leaves us for good on Monday and, until we get in good running order, Claude [Wright] will sit at the seat of the Recording Angel with me to supervise him. It does not seem that A.F. will ever get back. He is the victim of (a) narrow mind (b) worship of A.B. (c) messages received through sources unauthorized, etc. *ad inf.* The London crowd [Avenue Road] will gloat and hug themselves, but, first, it is a distinct gain for the American work, and, second, they will not (later) relish the fish they have caught. God help them both.

If Arch will remember we will devise a plan for the relief of Lucknow (62 Q.A. Street) by some alteration. Sound out carefully and see how it will go if the Council has to report direct to me. That, by increasing expense here, would take some of the funds there to here. It is but tentative.

Well, I must go. You do not need more. I am with you daily in thought.

As ever,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

Alexander Fullerton had been a thorn in Judge's flesh for some years, though he had done useful routine work in the T.S. office. Self-assertive and invariably "off-side", Fullerton's "worship" of Mrs. Besant led him to distrust Judge, and to seek other sources of occult information. He made contact with psychics, who, like all psychics, occasionally got things straight, and occasionally crooked, and, being himself unable to discriminate, he was left in a state of hopeless confusion. The "messages" referred to by Judge in his letter of May 2nd, and in the earlier letter of April 25th, had been received by Fullerton through these sources.

As to "the proposition" to which Judge refers: during all this period, I had become more anxious than ever to work for Theosophy under Judge in America. I knew, however, that my family would disapprove, and as I dreaded telling them that I wanted to leave home permanently for this purpose, I imagined all sorts of expedients, submitting my various plans to Judge for his approval. Judge did not approve, and although, as I discovered later, he had been anxious for me to "take root" in America with as little delay as possible, he discountenanced any form of "short cut", and waited for Time to show me what to do.

There is a valuable lesson in this connection in his letter of June 14th: the man who jumps overboard in order, as he hopes, to serve the Lodge, must jump on his own initiative. He will never be told to jump. He must assume entire responsibility for all consequences, both to himself, and to those he loves or to whom he is indebted. No man yet has ever been asked to sacrifice anything—position, career, money, leisure, friendships—for the Work, by any representative of the Lodge. Only a pseudo-occultist would be capable of that. More: if the aspirant be conscious of making any sacrifice at the time, or if ever thereafter [36] he should look back and regret what he had done, or should come to regard his decision as having been a sacrifice,—his act would necessarily be rejected as nullifying itself, and he would be written down as a

failure. He must give himself and his all as the one thing in the universe he desires to do; and even “give” is misleading, for the man *takes*.

NEW YORK, May 2nd, 1895.

My dear Ernest,

I have your letter of the 17th of April.

Of course Fullerton’s second message is “rot”, as he has found out for himself. He is all broken up, has withdrawn from his first message, opposed our proceedings in Boston, spoken against me and left this office for good—I say “for good”, because I will not let him come back.

I read at the Convention my reply to the charges, which will be printed as soon as I can get them going on it. I have no copy to send to you, but I will try to send you a copy of the resolutions adopted at Boston.

I wish you would say to those people, or any one else, not to start around attacking A.B. If she comes to their Lodge, let them do what they wish, but they ought not to go out of their way to attack her, or to defend me against her. If she could be thoroughly ignored, it would be better, but that is hardly possible. At Boston Convention she was ignored, and her name came up so little that we can’t remember it at all.

As ever yours,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

Just got your reply to the proposition. Let it wait. I do not think your plan of an offer from here is good. It will be a boomerang later. Better to act quite bluntly than to make an obstacle. Don’t be in a hurry yet. Time will show you what to do.

Don’t you think that if some Englishman were to circulate the historical sketch, or the *idea* of autonomy in England, there would be some fun in July? Olcott’s office is really open; he was never elected for life, and it’s his duty to call for election of himself or someone else.

As ever,

W.

[This next letter was not part of the Letters to E.T. Hargrove. It was published in *Letters That Have Helped Me* (“Book III”, 1946 ULT edition, p.185). The letter is included chronologically here because of its historical importance. The publication mentioned below is REPLY BY WILLIAM Q. JUDGE TO CHARGES OF MISUSE OF MAHATMAS’ NAMES AND HANDWRITINGS. (*Read at Boston, Mass., on the afternoon of April 29, 1895, after the T.S. Convention, by Dr. A. Keightley on behalf of W. Q. Judge, before an informal crowded meeting of the Delegates and visiting members.*) See Appendix A for complete text.— Compiler]

[Cincinnati] May 20, 1895

Dear Bro. _____

I am away from home for my health [which is] much hurt by others’ hate. * * *

Besant has had what ought to be her last say, and I read to the delegates at our Conv’n my explan’n of the charges—my last word. It will soon be published.

I wish we could all ignore Mrs. B once and for all. She lives by fighting or flattery now. But what blasphemy to say that, even be I guilty, the Master would stoop so low as to bid her hound me over the world trying to

murder my character. *I pity her in her next life*. It will not be I who will then annoy her but the hundreds who have been insulted and outraged by her acts and words ag'st me. Instead of one she will then have hundreds of enemies and obstructions.

Well, goodbye and best wishes. . . .

Yours,
William Q. Judge

The following letter was postmarked: Cincinnati, Ohio.

June 14th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

There was no need for me to write you because we communicate other ways. But — wrote me now and then as if I should tell you one way or the other if you should come here. At least it read that way to me. No such responsibility should be put on me as that I must tell you to come, or be the active compeller, so to say. Each must decide such a thing for himself. And I think you know that as well as I do. I do not assume, mind you, that you have any such idea, but write about it because of what was said.

[37] Claude [Wright] is now running the T.S. office in my absence, as it appears I shall have to stay away a considerable time. I am on the move like a pilgrim. But I am better a little each day. Been with Dr. Buck for a month. Don't give away the address. Address will remain 144 Madison Avenue for all.

What you report about the spread of ideas there on the points of autonomy etc. is good. I thought something must come of it, for all Englishmen are not like those idiots we know. It would be monstrous if no one there took up such manifestly right notions. Perhaps the July current may carry them where they didn't expect. I send an address to them [for the Convention of the European Section: see the introduction to this instalment] which will react whether accepted or rejected; and I have seen to it that Olcott is well peppered. He *may* do the right thing, but no one can tell, as he lives solely for his own skin and no more. Independent Sections is an idea that has been in his brain, and may revive. Let us hope so. He will dislike our [illegible word] but the *fact* is that he and I are the sole remaining legal officers of T.S., and both are "holding over".

Don't fret my dear. It is a crescendo demand in the case of A.B. which she will never be able to fill.

Let us forget the devils as often as possible in between the periods when it is necessary to fight them.

That sentence in N.T. [*Northern Theosophist*], "The Unity of the Theosophical Movement" etc., taken from the Historical Sketch, is from ^ How many suspect it I wonder.

I decided not to notice the lies of that traitor Fullerton. People are tiring here of circulars and proofs. What are really wanted now, are time and work. Nothing else will accomplish much.

Say, don't use such poor ribbon on your typewriter, and don't put black deep ink on other side. It prevents comprehension of text, and it backs up one against the other when they sink through.

I hope Sweden will stick. July 5th get A.K. to cable to New York a few descriptive words. Buck and a lot of us are going to be anxious to know.

No, the Americans don't know the situation with you, and they don't want to. No time. They couldn't understand the mind at work any more than Spencer does, much as he thinks he perceives. He will have done good anyway.

Well, good-bye my dear boy.

As ever

W.

On July 20th I had written Judge that I had taken the plunge, had arranged matters with my parents, and was sailing for New York at an early date.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., August 5th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

Today, at noon, I received here yours from Barmouth of July 20th. Hence you can see you will hardly get this. It will leave tomorrow and take fourteen [38] days to go, which will take it to August 20th. So I will send to 144 Madison Avenue, N. Y., a letter to be held, and delivered to you on arrival.

Your questions. Dear Boy you're funny,—you make me "luff". I do not approve of such an idiotic thing as for you to stop a couple of days in New York, and then rush off 2000 miles to see me. It is right good to want to do this, and I fully feel it, but my boy it is *not wise*, and hence not duty. There is too much to be done and we must use the time well. It would waste a lot of space to come right after me. For the territory is large and you should do some of it. And quite two weeks should be spent in New York and Brooklyn. Interviews have to be managed etc. Then you should go up to Boston, if they want you after writing them, because I detached Harding from there to go to Central States. You have to renew old and make new acquaintances. If Boston doesn't want you, then there are Columbus, Dayton, Toledo and Cincinnati to be taken in, and from there to Chicago etc. I cannot now tell what is best beyond the above, and there's a good deal of work in it. After Chicago and vicinity, it may be well to make a trip to Minneapolis and St. Paul and down from there viâ Sioux City. C.F.W. [Claude Wright] knows that route. It would take you to Omaha and could go on to Kansas City or to Salt Lake. Plans for Colorado come later. If at that time I am out here, you could easily arrange it. Dismiss all precipitancy, which is "bad hurry", even though we hurry in proper cases.

Before arrival, if you get this in London, or at once on arrival in New York, you should write, with C.F.W., to Boston etc., so as to lay pipe and have your regal presence known. And of course at once to me so I may know plans. Lecture fund assists in these things.

What I want to work at is a Napoleonic propaganda at which I hoped to, but can't, assist. But Harding and Griffiths are doing part. We have to fill the air with Theosophy and T.S. in America, so that the others will wake up to find themselves *nil*. And I quite forgot. It is essential that before you go West you should go to Toronto to help, and as you are so really English! you would do good! This would cut off part of New York and Boston stay. We have to pour in force at those points where there are splits. Then on way back from there, are some places (see map).

When you get to U. S. you will probably find lots of work and invitations waiting you.

Well, au revoir,

Best love,

W.

[122]

LETTERS FROM W.Q. JUDGE.

VI.

Starting from London on August 24th, 1895, I arrived in New York in due course, and found this letter from Judge awaiting me:

August 23rd, 1895.

Dear Boy,

When you get this, I shall probably be in Cincinnati with Buck. That will alter the tone of former letter. For if you wish you can arrange to see me there—unless I go to New York. So, better find out by wire or otherwise first. It is not far. Have no hurry.

Best love,
W.

A few days later, this letter reached me:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, September 2nd, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

My wire not to come yet, was sent because a letter of Griscom's hinted that you would come right here. Privately (*entre nous*) it is not convenient here now because of absence of a person and ill health of another, and that there is no place for you to sleep. You and Claude [Wright] have hurried matters, although I asked you not to do so, and to wait until we could communicate. It is true my second letter spoke of coming here, but I did not then know what to do. That did not alter the suggestions of the first.

Second. It is a \$50. outlay, when poverty is the mode,—and for no good reason.

Third. There is no telling where I may go, at this critical point ["critical", in view of Judge's physical condition].

Fourth. No possible T.S. work can be done here; all people still away. And the other plans proposed are the same now. You had better do as I said first—don't alter my original plans—that is, work around Aryan [T.S. Branch], H.P.B., Brooklyn, Newark, Yonkers, etc., which will use up a couple of weeks or so. In the meantime, we shall have heard from each other.

I want to see you as much as you do me, and was very near running over to New York, but we must wait. There is no telling what may occur. So have patience. I must (again *entre nous*) ask you to beware of the precipitancy of C. F. Wright, even in this matter of route. If anything definite has been said to them (T.S. Branches, such as Toledo, etc. named), you had better have wires sent calling off arrangements until later.

It is best to work around New York until September 15th or 25th, and then you can arrange other places. People in this country stay away from towns [123] until September 25th to October 1st. Consequently you could do nothing valuable. Besides, I want you, *ab initio*, to become acquainted with (all if possible) our N.Y. and vicinity members before you go anywhere. That is our solid base of persons, and I don't want you to skip off as proposed. This is the *real* inside reason, and now you will know how to proceed. *Time enough* must be taken for it; and it being the beginning of things, it is of vastly more importance than coming here.

As ever thine,

W.

Meanwhile I was doing my best to carry out Judge's instructions, speaking at the Branches in New York and vicinity, and meeting as many members as possible. In those days, we went from Branch to Branch, often giving the same lecture, with the same title, in each, and attempting to answer all questions that might be put to us by people in the audience. It appears from a notice in *The Path* that typewritten copies of a lecture entitled "The Brethren of the Flaming Heart", which I gave at a meeting of the "H.P.B." Branch, were sold at 50 cents "for the benefit of the Headquarters Lecture Fund". I should like to obtain a copy.

It was not until long afterwards that I more than half understood Judge's "inner reason" for wishing me to meet all the people in New York—his "solid base". Judge had plans the execution of which was made impossible by his premature death.

The next letter I received from Judge was postmarked Cincinnati.

September 4th, 1895.

Dear E.T.H.,

Just got your first letter since you "struck" America. The enclosed [a letter from Burcham Harding] will also give you an idea. You see he is regularly with the Central States Committee, and we must not muddle the work. He will get to the places in Ohio (also on the Central States Committee) by the right time of year. So (no matter what we may do about our meeting) I think after you have thoroughly done the work of connecting with all—if possible—the units at our centre, plans may be by way of New England and Canada instead of these centre states. No telling and no hurry.

Of course do not tell my inner reason for your meeting all there,—but you can say that you wish to know as many as you can.

As to cash: O.K. We'll discuss that.

I want you to know some of the people *well*—E.A.N., C.A.G., Spencer, Dr. Guild, Patterson, Main, etc. Also, diplomatically, pay some little attention to Elliott B. Page [an old and valued member, in charge of the book and publishing department, who was inclined to be touchy].

By following my suggestions on your intuition, you will see it work with a *long reach forward*.

As to cash again: even so, my boy, you must learn to know how to make [124] *all your dollars* do the most work. Hitherto you had no chance that way. That is one reason why I have had so much done on so little money.

As ever with love,

WILLIAM W.

My health-chances better. I've almost paralyzed the bacilli tuber's.

The next letter was addressed to me, "care of C. A. Griscom, Jr., Esq., Flushing, Long Island", who had opened his home to me at Judge's suggestion, and with whom my relations were always of the closest.

“The G.D.” mentioned by Judge was “The Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn,” of which Dr. W. Wynn Westcott (“W.W.W.”) was one of the leading lights, with MacGregor Mathers as “Supreme Magus”. The G.D. specialized in “magic”,—astral and not always innocuous. Many members of the T.S. who resided in the north of England—Pattinson among them—were affiliated with it. H.P.B. had tolerated this sort of double allegiance in the hope that an understanding of Theosophy would end in the conversion of those who had been misled. Judge had no use whatever for the G.D., and none for its leaders. Bulmer was at that time the editor of *The Northern Theosophist*.

[Postmarked] CINCINNATI, OHIO, September 7th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

Just have yours. I go very carefully in those cases where I can't see the people. Bulmer *is* partly what he (C.) says. The G.D. should be called G.D. with an F. added. W.W.W. hates W.Q.J., and Pattinson is queer with a liking for W.Q.J. I know most of them. They are players.

Ah! Glad you helped C.F.W. Help when you can.

Each time you go to meet people be inside of Kew heart and strongly see Master and — with you. You see already you have caught a hair line out to the N.W. 1500 miles by meeting those people.

Am glad no definite plans had to be revoked.

Yes, my boy, you must fully realize that this continent, as you say, is in an awful hurry, and you must get into the silence of calm so the hurry won't see you. If it nips you, you will lose too much force.

I may run off for two or three days to examine Asheville, N. Carolina, as a place to go to, and then will be able to say what I will do.

Entre nous, it is on the cards that I might go first to New York, in which case I would then see you. Indiana is going to shout for you. Don't promise.

Say—I have not yet sent a greeting to Europe. Will you draft and send me a short condensed one. At the same time try your hand and send me *points* you would propose in an “encyclical” by me to the U.S.T.S. Of course that will, when done, go all over. I will make it a state paper. Don't neglect present campaign for this.

It will be nice if I go to New York before starting south. If I were rich I would have you with me for a while.

[125] If 'ere long—at the proper time—you could take in New Haven, it *might* be well; but it's a doubtful case anyhow. We have some rottenness there.

Do you think it too late to send greeting to Europe?

As ever,

24.

[Postmarked] CINCINNATI, OHIO, September 12th, 1895.

Dear E.T.H.,

Why of course you are to see me before you either start off, or start to stay right there. I am waiting for events. And you were *not* to see me at any risk to the first few days or weeks.

Will you mail the enclosed to Mrs. Malcolm?

I do not suppose you will accept the Bunker invitation. There is a slight row coming on at Frisco. Even were you at Frisco to stay, I should be of the opinion it would not be wise for you to stay at Bunker's.

I had, just before your letter, sent on to C.F.W. my reply to the European letter. Let him show it to you. If you like, send it to Bulmer and *I. T.* [*Irish Theosophist*].

That idea for an article about not leaning on another is good. Why don't you seize the inspiration and do me an article for *Path* of, say, 1000 words. It would go in November and must come to my hand before insertion. If C.F.W. speaks to you about "Four Sins in Occultism", tell him there are seven; don't mention me.

Now look here. There is yet a residuum of the A.B. [Annie Besant] excitement and row in you. It is no use. We don't care a d— about her or what she does or is. She's almost forgotten. There is no danger of reactions nor anything. We are just forging ahead, and she is a back number.

Yes, I am mending; but it is slow, slow, slow.

Enclosed cutting is to give you an idea of the peculiar boastfulness of America. You must get to understand all these things.

Haven't had nerve yet enough to write fully to Arch and Julia.

As ever,

W.

Following Judge's instructions, I destroyed the letters he wrote me between September 12th and the date of the next one printed (October 4th). He was writing confidentially about people I was meeting or expected to meet, and about other private matters affecting the Movement.

ASHEVILLE, N. C. October 4th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

In haste. Address me

c/o Miss Gano,

Asheville, N. C.

So far all well. Have some things to say later.

As ever,

W.

[126] By now I had begun a lecturing tour which lasted for more than three months. Arriving in Boston on September 29th and lecturing there that evening on “Theosophy and the Theosophical Society”, I spoke next day at Lynn, then again in Boston, then at Cambridge, Medford, Malden, at Boston again more than once, at Somerville, Lowell, and so to Providence, before proceeding to Syracuse, Buffalo and Toronto, on my way west and south. Everywhere I was received with the utmost kindness, both by the local members of the T.S., and, chiefly thanks to them, by the local press. The usual procedure was a Branch meeting in the afternoon and a public lecture in the evening, followed in many cases by a visit to the editor of some local newspaper, in whose office I would write a report of my lecture,—a very brief experience having proved that reporters, with the best of intentions, found either me or Theosophy, or both, entirely too much for their uninitiated minds.

It was the custom in those days for a Branch to entertain a duly accredited lecturer from Headquarters, each Branch doing its best to spare him (or Headquarters) the expense of hotel bills. Some local member would volunteer to act as host. Further, a collection would be taken up, privately and locally, to provide a railroad ticket to the next Branch to be visited. Occasionally a Branch, knowing that the Branch next to be visited was poor, would contribute extra money to supplement the efforts of its “neighbour”, —separated from it, perhaps, by a day’s journey or more. This method made for economy, but, as a new experience, was distinctly embarrassing, no matter how anxious one might be to adapt oneself to conditions, or to “play the game” according to rule.

I wrote fully to Judge, describing my experience, and doing my best to bring out its more humorous aspects in the hope that, ill as he was, he might derive some amusement from the “situations” which developed. Judge knew all the people I was meeting, and knew them well; so, as I was aware, he would see the reaction on both sides, and motives, occasionally, to which at the time I was blind. In one or two homes, where I was most hospitably entertained, the family was divided up the middle, for and against Theosophy,—and I did not know in advance, which was which. We would sit down for supper, a father, a mother, and perhaps half a dozen children, some of them grown-up. Some would look glum, some, cheerful. I speculated, mentally, as to the awful row they had had before I was invited to stay with them. Anyhow, which was which! It did not follow in the least that those who looked glum were “anti”. One thing was sure: I must do my utmost to make a sufficiently good impression, partly for the sake of Theosophy and of Judge, but partly also for the sake of the “pros” in this particular family. It was hard work,—much harder work than lecturing. (Yet all of it was a pleasure,—inspiring, splendid, invigorating. I have no recollection of fatigue. Great forces were being let loose, and the tide, in 1895, was still rising.) In some cases there were no servants, for many of our members were poor, and I found it difficult to reconcile myself to being waited on at table by my hostess. When conversation became too arduous—for to have talked about Theosophy might have let loose a devastating explosion—I learned to fall back upon the charms and splendours of the local [127] Court House, or of any other local feature to which my attention had been called on my way from the railroad station, with as many questions as possible along similar lines.

In one or two cases, local members undertook to “test me out”. True, they had heard this and that in the young man’s favour, but some of them “came from Missouri”, and they were not going to believe all they heard, even if Judge was supposed to have said it. In one place an incident occurred which I find most amusing in retrospect—and which I have no doubt entertained Judge greatly when I reported it to him—but which at the time I classified as a decided nuisance. The leading member was a woman doctor, dour and rather alarming. By some strange freak of fate, she had a very pretty daughter. On the day after my arrival, the mother announced peremptorily that her daughter would take me for a drive into the country. The mother knew that the girl was safely and happily engaged to be married. I did not know it until later. It was not the custom in my part of the world (this was a long time ago) for an unmarried girl to take a man for a drive. The least sign of unwillingness would, however, have been an offence. It was a miserable drive, with intense

effort on both sides to make it appear enjoyable. If only I had known she was engaged: we could so easily have talked about *him*. I racked my brains, and doubtless she racked hers, poor thing. She was not interested in Theosophy: only in him. Finally back to the mother, who received us grimly, as if to say to me: "Now I have caught you". Yet if ever a girl exonerated a man, I am sure that when her mother questioned her, that girl exonerated me. I only hope she had the courage to tell her mother that if there was any more driving to be done, *she* would not be the victim.

There was more excuse in another case for a "testing out" process. The previous visitor from the New York Headquarters (a man I always liked well enough personally), had a lively imagination and a general feeling that it was part of his function to *know*. Consequently, when asked by some local members how their meetings could be kept free from elementals (!), he had answered, promptly and glibly: "Turn some chairs upside down, and place these, at intervals, in a circle round you". Somehow this did not sound just right to the inquirers, who in due course wrote to Judge, reporting their question and the answer, and asking for further light. Judge was angry and said so. He told the inquirers exactly what he thought of such "occult instruction", and he told the offender from Headquarters that he would never again be permitted to visit Branches unless he stopped such foolishness for ever. This had happened not very long before my visit, and, presumably, led the same group of members to put their heads together in an effort to concoct a question that would give me—and themselves—a corresponding opportunity. I knew nothing about this at the time, but when they propounded their question (I think it was based upon something in *The Secret Doctrine*, with elementals and Hierarchies all confounded), it seemed to me that there was only one possible reply, namely, that I had not the least idea what the answer was, and that they had better write to Judge and ask him. Before I left, one of them told me why they had [128] asked the question, and its origin, adding that he thought I might like to know that I had "passed". Judge confirmed his part in the story when I met him later at Aiken. How he hated insincerity, bluff, pretence, and the least shadow of deception. He was one of the most scrupulously honest men I have ever known. As often happens, his accusers attributed to him, that which they were,—but of which he was incapable.

Crosbie and the others mentioned in the following letter, were members of the Boston or neighbouring Branches.

October 6th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

Received yours from Boston and glad to know you get on so well; also that you found force. Tell them who it is you identify it with.

Private. Events are moving. C.F.W. has hatched a new idea for him. It is old with me. And I have encouraged him as will also the others. It is to hire a well-known hall regularly for Sunday mornings, and he to carry on the "services", so as finally to get if possible a big crowd. This of course involves a good deal which he in his red-headed hastiness does not see. But it's good anyway, and if successful will benefit the T.S. very much. But I do not want you to make solid engagements further ahead than one month. You can keep a month ahead all engaged. I do not mean *this* month, but simply have no further ahead of any day than one month, engaged. As you reel off a week, then add another week to make the month. Do this without giving any reasons save that that is your present method. Do you understand?

There is no more to say so I'll stop. Funny cognomens here. Two samples: Stickleather; Swigegood.

Fine climate so far. Dry and dusty place. Am known here and my arrival is in paper and I am "in feeble health". What an adjective!

Keep up your courage and “glory be to America”.

Tell Crosbie, Ayers, Wades, Guild and Somersall, of the dissolution of—, and the general reasons and its real life anyway, and get back the symbols, which send — to keep for me.

As ever, 24.

The “agreement with Wade” of the next letter refers to a promise I had made, and which I had promptly reported to Judge, to help Wade by contributing an article occasionally to a little magazine which he published, or planned to publish, on behalf of Theosophy in New England.

Always I carried Judge’s last letter with me in my pocket. It helped me, I believed, to keep in touch with him. But I was making a desperate effort to keep a Petty Cash account, as I knew that would be his wish, and, for lack of other paper within reach, frequently used his envelopes for such entries as I find on this: “Porter .15; paper .5; Car .25”: not a bad form of Yoga in the circumstances.

[129]

October 11th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

1st. That agreement with Wade: what’s done is done, and it will have to go. But hereafter make no such plans without consulting me, as you do not know place nor people. And do not make any more with Wade. All your work should be for the centre, and not for those who split the energy up while poor *Path* languishes and things are low. We can’t stop Wade, for he is a sort of bull. [Judge liked him none the less. Wade had tremendous energy and enthusiasm.] But we can put on brakes elsewhere. I did not give him the general permission he says. It was that I might do so in every case if I were asked in advance; and it was not contemplated that he should go in for independent publishing which can only succeed by an undercut of *Path* or rivalry, since the public (T.S.) is the same. So much for that.

If the energy expended on the Boston paper, on the Toronto *Lamp* and *Pacific Theosophist* were put into booming the *Path*, we might then have a good large magazine and be able to pay for certain necessary service which now we have to do without. [Judge was never in a position to employ a stenographer at Headquarters.]

That part of yours which has reference to the book on Occultism (another is on Karma), I unreservedly accept. I was wishing for that. Go ahead and write up—as you get now and then an hour—what you think about it, the plan, etc., etc. In *Path* you know I have a lot of stuff, “Conversations on Occultism”, between Sage and Student. Jot your ideas down on paper the same size always, and file them between some boards or in a leather cover. We will keep them all there; and the Conversations ought to be cut out of *Path* and put in there. They will breed ideas.

Here is one idea on the publishing part: to get up a subscription edition on better paper, larger margin and better binding, at a higher price than the general edition. The general edition should be of two prices, say \$1.00 and 0.50. Put that into the receptacle.

As to me, I feel that in time I will do more work of that kind than going about.

I hear from Claude that — says A.B. now declares H.P.B. faked up the telegram phenomenon with my aid. I wonder if true. But I do not place much reliance on those London tales. They all fell out wrong as to Burrows and what he would do. What a model ass he is.

Well, best luck. Let me know how you really feel in the work and among the people.

24.

[206]

LETTERS FROM W.Q. JUDGE

VII.

The lecturing tour was continued. After Toronto, Buffalo was again visited; then Jamestown (a lecture in the Independent Congregational Church); then Sandusky. On November 1st, Toledo, with two lectures in the Unitarian Church, which were reported at length and in a most friendly way in the local newspapers. From the 6th to the 10th, at Fort Wayne, with three public lectures besides other meetings, the newspapers again most friendly. Next, Columbus, lecturing twice in the Y.M.C.A. Hall, and so to Cincinnati, with lectures and meetings from November 13th to 18th, under the auspices of Dr. Buck. Following this, came St. Louis, Kansas City, Memphis, Nashville, and New Orleans (December 9th), where three public lectures were given, the third attended by just ten times as many people as the first (40 to 400), as the result of an attack on Theosophy in one of the local papers. Finally, before reaching Aiken, S. C., where Judge was then staying, lectures were given and meetings held at Macon, between December 17th and 22nd.

Ill as he was, and in constant pain, Judge followed all this with intense and active interest, as his letters show. Theosophy was the passion of his life. He created a current—very deep and therefore almost invisible except in its effects—which carried along with it all those who shared even a glimmer of the same love with him.

It was at Providence, I think, that the members charged admission to one of my lectures, turning over to me, as a contribution to the Headquarters' Lecturing Fund, after paying for the hall, tickets, and advertizing, the ten dollars to which the following letter refers with such amusement.

Judge encouraged me to write to him fully and freely about the different Branches and the members I met, and later, when I stayed with him at Aiken, checked my impressions at length. "The Bostonians" of the present letter included especially George Ayers (Malden), Louis Wade and Robert Crosbie. Wade, although a "bull", as Judge had remarked in an earlier letter, had a touch of genius and a delightful sense of humour,—a characteristic which the others lacked. Like the others, he was self-opinionated, but more amenable because fundamentally free from conceit. Crosbie, with a gentle, pleasing personality, was very psychic, and took his psychism seriously, which of course impressed the feeble-minded. Judge, knowing how "impressionable" Crosbie was, did what he could to safe-guard the situation, both for the Work's sake and for Crosbie's, and, while he lived, held things in check; but after Judge's death, there was trouble, and Crosbie left Boston under a cloud. Some years later, in California, he announced himself, or allowed himself to be announced, as a chëla of Judge's, which was nonsense, for he was no more that than was Wade or Ayers, or Purman of Fort Wayne or Wright of Chicago or Thurston of [207] Providence or any other of the fifty men upon whom Judge counted, but whose understanding of his inner life—as he painfully realized—was nil. Although Crosbie perhaps did not suspect his own motive, the fact is that this claim insured him a comfortable living for the rest of his life,—an extraordinary kind of "chëlaship"!

At the time of my visit to Boston, however, Crosbie, although President of the Branch, was merely one worker among many, and the Branch as a whole was probably the largest and most active after the Aryan of New York. Wade alone would have supplied the fire and energy for a dozen Branches, while the average of the membership was extraordinarily good.

[Postmarked] ASHEVILLE, N. C, October 16th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

Just got yours from Syracuse. You will get one at Buffalo. C.F.W.'s lecture was a success, although only 175 people were there, where 1,500 ought to be.

Ha! ha! your first money? Is it so? If so, do tell the Ks. That \$10 fruit of your brain and your bent legs is worth 500. Glad of it. It is an omen—good. How did you feel over it, and did you make an ass of yourself in the way you took, just as Cæsar gently, all too so, put back the crown?

Your judgments of the Bostonians are correct. Richardson is what you say. Oh it's a strong movement. At that instant, as I wrote, my jigaree exploded a loud and fine metallic crack close by.

Good Lord, what a world. I am (for a long time) much occupied thinking of the mental development of the day, and how we might best affect it more. It is a big question, and I don't think the T.S. can by any means do it alone. There's an idea in me struggling to get out. Do you get it? I can't yet. But it is high and mighty. I don't think India is in it at all, but Europe and U. S. If I could only get at it. We are a lot of poor devils anyway, so go on and lecture.

Adieu,

24.

Judge enclosed the following undated note with a letter received by him from W. W. Harmon, President of the Malden Branch, requesting me to convey his answer either orally or in writing. It is a good indication of the way Judge handled "Branch troubles".

Harmon.—Express sorrow. It must be obvious that I can do nothing unless I can use names. Will he therefore consent to my saying to Ayers and anyone else he names as the offender, that he has so written, and thus focus the matter. There is no other way. I have given no orders, suggestions or indications there to anyone, save that I disapproved bad business policy and debts. Or, take another way. Say boldly to those you [Harmon] mean, that you [Harmon] have written me that letter. Surely 3 or 4 can't be a majority.

[208] Following the Boston Convention of April, 1895, the reorganization of the Movement which resulted, and the election of Judge as President of the Theosophical Society in Europe, he was called upon to deal with many Constitutional and similar matters which arose in the various national sections. As a lawyer, he did not always find the procedure followed, either logical or simple, as this note witnesses:

These, received from —, are forwarded E.T.H. as he has a hand in the matter. When done with them, send on to C.F.W. as by request of W.Q.J. so that they may be filed among my European T.S. archives (if any). As usual they have gone ahead piecemeal, and it will all be a patchwork like the laws of England. Oh gawd!

No news.

As ever,

24.

Judge's enemies never tire of asserting that he "consulted mediums" and was "guided" by them. Judge did not consult mediums, and although he was pursued by psychics with their special revelations, he practised what he preached, and "tested all things" with unfailing detachment and clarity. Mrs. McKinstry was one of those who have been named as "influencing" him. The following letter should indicate how absurd the accusation is. Judge had sent me some of her lucubrations—partly, for me to practise on—and the opinion I sent him, with my reasons for it, which Judge approved, would not have pleased their author.

[Postmarked] ASHEVILLE, N. C., October 26th, 1895.

Dear Chew Yew,

Read enclosed and then return to me. The envelope is the one in which came the paper by Omega. It was sent over to me by —, who seems affected by it. I am not, but see ignorance and fraud in it. I want your intuition also on it, and on the affair which C.F.W.'s letter details. Be as clear about the Omega thing as you were about McKinstry. Meant to write you a long letter but can't. Just got yours from Toronto. I send this to Stevens [Buffalo]. I want Omega paper back soon, as I may want to use it in *Path* some way.

As ever,

24.

As explained in an earlier instalment, lecturing tours were supposed to pay for themselves, each Branch visited contributing the cost of transportation to the next Branch. I had sent Judge a statement of expenses and receipts, adding: "I yet have 2 dollars surplus on travel excluding the \$50" [advanced by the Headquarters' Lecturing Fund, when I started from New York]. Judge, on a slip, wrote: "Does this mean you have the 50 yet? If so, why not say so; I cannot tell." It did mean that: but how he hated ambiguity!

[209]

[Postmarked] AIKEN, S.C., October 29th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

Don't feel well, so write briefly. Yours about Harding, and enclosing the financial statement, I was to reply to by wire. But on reading it I think it unnecessary to wire. You and Harding will not clash even if you do meet. But you cannot expect payments by Columbus, Dayton or Toledo. Toledo alone paid in \$168 to the Committee Harding is under.

Before you plan beyond Kansas City I want you to let me know. I have to write to Lopez in New Orleans. There is a Branch at Macon, Georgia, not far from here; they are active and good. Please write C.F.W. for particulars as to places between Kansas City and New Orleans.

Be sure at Cincinnati to say nothing about money. They are large, but poor, and most of it falls on few, who are just now hard up.

I know your trip is going off well, and hope you will get all valuable experience possible out of it.

The financial statement is very encouraging, is it not? God looks after his sparrows and hawks.

What you say of Toronto kickers is what I thought. It is true of all. Don't spit on or kick any such, but don't go off to labor with them. If there is a ghost of a show for such to return, it will be voluntary. Glad you thus again agree fundamentally with me. There is a similar condition in Toledo, only the kickers are self-satisfied prigs.

Well, I'll get down to a longer letter later. Meanwhile I am always regarding you and your shadow on the wall.

As ever,

24.

[Postmarked] AIKEN, S. C., November 4th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

The enclosed from your folks was misdirected by Claude. It was at a time he was sending me many letters. I got it this a.m., and send it out to you the same p.m. There is only one mail out per day.

I am away in the rear with my *Path* work, and not yet have had time to write you. Have you yet received from me "Omega's" paper?

Harding says that Columbus wants only one; so if you like, avoid it.

I hear that Sturdy brought over Vivekananda to London from here, and the sly fellow is now smashing at Theosophy. It will do good, as all such attacks do, though the faithful are now and then scared. Arch and J.C.K. say the throat-cutting still goes on—God bless them. It was really a good thing that the Burrows ass didn't bray until he did. He has done those people much wounding indeed. In various other ways, hell is threatened to the crew all round.

[210] Well, adieu again, and may you be blessed.

As ever,

W.

[Postmarked] AIKEN, S. C., November 5th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

Just got your article. Thanks. Very good. But it's less than 2 pages. I am stuck all the time. For each article try and make 3 pp. at least, or 1,500 words (500 to the printed page). It is very timely. Write as often as a good idea strikes, and if I get a small stock on hand, all the better. We must get in now and then, article or articles on some striking point. There are several.

Now I like the yellow ruled paper your article is written on, and wish you would send me some or tell me where to get it. I don't want much at first as I wish to try it.

Just glance at what I have to do medically:

Water, drink 4 times a day. Carbon pills.

Hepar Sulph. and Phos.—homeopathic.

Oxygen, inhale 3 times.

Lynosulfite, inhale as often as you can.

Listerine, gargle to try to stop sore throat.

Some d— thing after meals.

Hot treatment nightly.

Be in the open air all the time.

Where does the *Path*, etc. come in.

As ever,

W.

[Postmarked] AIKEN, S. C., November 5th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

It is delightful to get that letter from Toledo returning Omega's paper. Am very glad to see that you are succeeding. But I expected it. Two things are being thereby done. You are doing them good and getting

experience yourself. And it is not at all subsidiary that you are making personal acquaintance with our people. That will be needed in the future. Besides, it becomes a fine connecting thread with each one. And among them you will find some men whom it will be well to have as friends.

I know your experience exactly with letters and private talks. They are such idiots. It is the personal element, and you must always look out. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." A gentle reply is enough. Not every question has to be answered. And if I could I would not reply to *any* letters from women, except on business. Give them no holy talk in letters: it reads badly afterwards. [211] I am simply telling you my ideas, as it is possible you know all this yourself.

Make yourself especially kind and friendly with Buck, and be as nice as possible with the family. I do not say this because you wouldn't, but for other reasons. As I know nearly all the people you are seeing, I have considerable fun with myself about it, as I can see exactly the effect. All you have to do is to see it does not hurt you via vanity, and, second, that you do not get contemptuous.

Now my boy one person in writing, casually said you stooped a little. Ha! ha! You must look out for this; and you *must* draw up to the last inch. How many years will it take to drive the fact into your head that, aside from health, you look better when all your inches are straight? And this holy war demands the use of every element and factor. If you do not fix this matter we will call you, "The stooping Theosophist". The person who spoke of this is Mrs. Fenton, who wanted an explanation of the wonderful thing, etc. [This did not refer to the stooping!] I told her it was the impression of the picture on her senses, and not to make mystery, and that it was recorded of Webster and others that they changed when speaking on great subjects.

I will write to Constance [one of my sisters, a devoted member of the Society, who died a number of years ago]. [Constance Hargrove joined the Blavatsky Lodge on November 9th, 1891. — Compiler]

Now for Omega. I think you are right. I can't catch the clues, but your analysis is so good it must be true. My own judgment was that the writer knew a lot by reading, but not enough to avoid a lot of errors, and that the list of names would be a grand clue to some one. There is gush in it also. It is singular that — was to some extent taken in by it. I wrote yesterday saying the paper was bosh, but couldn't go into your details as I knew no one. I discarded A.P.S. [Sinnott], I.C.O. [Mrs. Cooper-Oakley] etc., one after the other. Have no news from the New York episode. Guess you are right there too, as the large money could only exist in summerland, and no one who knows me would dare to think they could have any influence in this case by any talk of money.

I feel very pleased and justified in you after this reply on Omega. You may know why, and you may not; the fact remains.

As to your father, I can't say. When I first heard of him I felt he was not a long liver, but in "the matter of hyleg", or of life and death, no prognostication is reliable.

Can't say much as to W.Q.J. Varying days. Much bronchial cough; fits of indigestion; bad nights; good days. Damn mess. Voice gone absolutely, etc. Got the digestive tract all squee-gee and am trying to right it. Look out for yourself and see that you have good digestion and good enough exercise. Doesn't seem that climates are of any value. I haven't got better anywhere but in Cincinnati and New York, neither having any climate to speak of.

Your southern trip will not be so much as the others. You have only Memphis, Nashville, Macon, New Orleans, Washington and Baltimore. The south [212] is petrified in orthodoxy, and is full of niggers. It has

always been weak for T.S. But I expect great good to result from your work even there. You must say I sent you to these places. I hope I shall be near enough to see you. If I am here when you are in Macon, that is not far from here. Good-bye.

As ever,
 24.

[Postmarked] AIKEN, S. C., November 15th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

I enclose question for *Forum*. Will you please write out a good answer and send on to C.F.W. for *Forum*, saying I asked you to do so.

Haven't time to-day to write at length. But I am full of "ideas". The Masonic is, yes, an old scheme; yet it is not given up.

Toledo also writes. The good you are doing is splendid. Don't think of it, but of Master and that friend of yours.

As ever,
 24.

I was in St. Louis when I received Judge's next letter, forwarded to me by Dr. Buck from Cincinnati.

[Postmarked] AIKEN, S. C., November 19th, 1895.

Dear Chewytz,

Don't know where this will catch you. This last from you was done in Columbus and posted Cincinnati. I will send this to J.D. [Buck].

The enclosed I send you to read and destroy now that a sufficient time has elapsed. It came with the fool paper ["Omega's"]. It is a sign I do not like that this mistake was made,—to give so much attention to it. What is the cause, do you suppose?

I have millions of things to say to you that I can't write. I believe I will stay here long enough for you to come here. That will be on way back and I suppose by coming from Macon. I propose that you stay here a week with me, and we can then pow wow to satisfaction. The food and beds here are good, and I don't think all their boarders will be here by that time.

Don't know what you can do at St. Louis. It needs some men of different calibre and stratum. That is the trouble. Some poor devil will some day have to sacrifice himself by going there for a space to try to work it up.

It seems to me you ought now and then to send to your sister at any rate a good newspaper report about you.

Well, no other things. Don't forget a *Path* article.

As ever,
 24.

[31]

LETTERS FROM W.Q. JUDGE

VIII.

The introduction to the letters published in the January issue of the QUARTERLY, covers most of the present series. I was still travelling and lecturing, trying to keep Judge informed of all that happened, and to entertain him in so far as it was possible to extract amusement from incidents of "the campaign". If, when I met and stayed with him at Aiken, I had had wit enough to show him the envelopes of his letters, covered as they were with evidence of my unaccustomed but continued efforts to keep a record of my expenditures, he would have been more amused than by anything I could have written to him. On the envelope of the first of the present letters, addressed to me in the care of J. Frank Knocke, Esq., Kansas City, he would have found that breakfast cost 90 cents, dinner 70 cents, tip at lunch (no record of the lunch itself) 10 cents, tobacco (some of us, following the example of H.P.B., still "rolled our own") 16 cents, and an undecipherable abbreviation, \$1.30, with a (?) following it as an admission either of fallibility or despair.

[Postmarked] AIKEN, S. C., November 27th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

All yours received. Excellent, and delightful to me.

Review *Brother of the Third Degree* by all means: 175 words only. Better send to Griscoms to go in with the rest, but you have to sign it E.T.H. In forwarding to them, say I asked you.

Yes, I've been haunting you with my numerous thoughts.

The St. Louis work will some day have to be repeated. We must not let it go. It is the strongest Catholic centre in the U. S. We will talk it over if we meet here. Did people of the name of —— come at all around? If so, it is only another act of toadyism. You do not mention them. They could do the Branch good, for they are wealthy and up in society. It is the old story.

I have written to Dr. Lopez, New Orleans. I suspect that Branch is one that lives on its own very badly nourished vitals. You will have to seek some hole in the cuticle to inject the auric gold. In all this do not forget you are me and acting for me.

Now when you are on the way to this spot you must let me know in advance so that I can arrange. If here at that time I want you to stay a week or so. These "ifs" are because I am not fixed here, and an accident might send me back to New York. In that case it will be even better.

Do not credit news about me save what you get from myself. Exaggeration, misobservation and lying are the diseases of the day.

Yes, I think often of that book. We must soon get at it. Times are marching on. I have not yet had the monition to get out that circular to the Branches.

[32] Do you watch yourself in respect to praise and attention, and their effect on you? This is very important at your stage of the game.

James Pryse is coming soon. I can manage him if no one else can, and it was so prearranged by the powers some years ago.

Well, good-bye dear boy,
As ever,
24.

James Pryse was really devoted to Judge at that time, winning all hearts that felt as he did, my own included. He wrote in Judge's defence, and, later, in tribute to Judge's memory, with a simple and beautiful eloquence which is as moving to-day as when it flowed from the depths of his soul; and because he is not what he was, but, like the church of Ephesus, has left his "first love", I include here as a memorial to the man I then knew, part of his tribute to the man (Judge) whose unshakable and grateful loyalty to H.P.B. set an example which some of us would like to feel, when death comes, that we had tried to emulate. At times I wonder how many of Judge's former friends, when they meet him "over there", will care to look him in the eyes. He will forgive them, but will they be able to forgive themselves?

. . . In his recognition of the presence of the Divine in all things, and in his patient acceptance of existing conditions, lay the strength of William Q. Judge. Memories of the ancient glories of mankind were his, and visions still more glorious of man's distant future; yet he worked contentedly with the homely materials at hand, told the old truths in a new way adapted to the times, simply, unpretentiously, and neither offending against the spirit of the age nor making those truths appear commonplace and ignoble. He knew the workings of the human heart and mind apart from all the changing conditions of civilizations; and he reconciled the dreamy mysticism of the East with the surging activity of the West. Ignoring the external phases of life, he strove, not to bring about a return to the ancient order of things, but to restore the essential principles of religion which had become obscured in this age of transition, so that out of the confused elements of the mighty West a nobler system might be formed, and a loftier temple to Truth be builded, than ever Antiquity knew.

To this end he patiently toiled and taught, unweariedly. Against all the adverse conditions of this crude age of conflicting forces, against the treachery of friends, and against the opposition of the powers that war against man's spiritual progress, he finished the work that was given him to do, even though the results of that work still lie in the distant future.

When the Gnosis is known once more among men; when the temple of the Mysteries is restored; when, turning from all idolons, men become as of old, adorers of the Beautiful, the True, and find within themselves that divine nature which this dark age has hidden, then it will be recognized that the strong hand of William Q. Judge prepared the ground and gathered the material for that mystic temple for which any building of marble or granite can be no more than a symbol.

In his death he triumphed. As, in many an ancient legend, the dead hero becomes a star in the heavens, so in the apotheosis of this hero let us see the star that foretells the Dawn of a new day of the Sacred Mysteries on this the newest and yet the oldest of earth's continents.**

[Postmarked] AIKEN, S. C., November 29th, 1895.

Dear Ernest,

I enclose a paper which speaks for itself. I want you to read it carefully, [33] but soon, and give me your opinion as to propriety, probable result and contents of text. I will say frankly I don't like this sort of thing, though long expecting it. There is a lurking desire to manage and to go on with these meanderings, often maunderings.

** "The Morning-Star of the Mysteries", by James M. Pryse; *Theosophy*, July, 1896.

Return paper with your comments and at *same time* write separately any letter as usual that I can let Mrs. J[udge] see.

As ever,

2.

Mrs. Judge died on April 17th, 1931.

In its issue of January, 1931, the Adyar (Mrs. Besant's) magazine began the publication of some confidential letters written by Judge to Olcott in 1877 and 1879, after H.P.B. and Olcott had left New York for India. In these and subsequent early letters, Judge poured out his heart to Olcott (the older man), with intimate, personal details of the misery of his relations with Mrs. Judge, whom he had married before he had heard of Theosophy, or had met H.P.B., or had begun to "find himself". To have published such letters at any time would seem a strange proceeding,—although, on second thought, when people crown themselves publicly with tiaras of occult Initiations, they must necessarily have dispensed themselves from trifles such as ordinary good taste. Not to have waited until Mrs. Judge was dead—to have published such letters during her lifetime (in the February and March as well as January issues)—seems to suggest that the dispensation carried much further,—into the region of things "simply not done". Mrs. Besant might plead ignorance as to whether Mrs. Judge was alive or dead, but would fail to add the damning truth that she did not care. If she had cared, she would have found out,—easily.

The publication of those letters from Judge to Olcott ceased in December, 1931, with a letter dated July 15th, 1884. Why were no later letters published? The answer is simple. In an "Editorial Note" following the last letter printed it was stated that: "The letters were published with two objects: first, to give new matter to the historians of the Theosophical Society and Movement, who are many [if that had been the motive, why stop with the letter of July, 1884?]; second, to show how futile is the attempt made by some Theosophical organizations to dethrone Colonel Olcott from his rightful place by the side of H. P. Blavatsky and put in his place W. Q. Judge. . . . Nor is there the slightest sign that Mr. Judge ever doubted in any manner Colonel Olcott's position as the leader and his, W. Q. Judge's, as the loyal assistant." In brief, and brushing aside the disingenuousness, these very early letters were published in an effort to show that Judge looked up to Olcott as a superior, while their publication ceased with the letter of July, 1884, because later letters would increasingly have proved the opposite, and would have defeated Mrs. Besant's purpose. Judge had met H.P.B. in France during the spring of 1884, when on his way to India; he arrived at Adyar toward the end of July, while Olcott was in Europe, and it did not take him long to discover that Olcott's native vanity had grown since the early days in New York until Olcott had become disloyal to H.P.B.—[34] a disloyalty which became notorious in 1888, and which went from bad to worse until Olcott died in 1907. Everyone, with any inner knowledge of the Movement, knows that while Olcott was going downhill, Judge was steadily fighting his way uphill, from one degree of attainment to another.

The fact is that the publication of those letters proved nothing, except, first, the truth of a great Master's statement, through H.P.B., that Judge, "of all Chêlas, suffers most and demands or even expects the least"; and, second, that Adyar has not learned, and never will, that honesty is the best policy.

As Mrs. Judge is no longer living it is now possible, and, in view of Mrs. Besant's "indiscretion", necessary, to state the essentials: Mrs. Judge was a very ordinary woman, Judge was a very extraordinary man; he was an occultist and an ascetic, Mrs. Judge was not; he married her when he was very young, and regretted it as soon as he "broke through"; she resented his devotion to Theosophy, and, as a woman, was intensely and foolishly jealous. In other words, she regarded him as her lawful property, and so, inevitably, made herself a heavy burden in Judge's life. Yet, *in her way*, she was devoted to him, and, during his last illness, never spared herself in her efforts to alleviate his suffering. Judge, from first to last, was infinitely patient and

considerate; he took her with him wherever he went when this was at all possible, and did his utmost to reconcile her to what she regarded as her unhappy fate. She cared nothing about Theosophy (though after his death she spoke differently), and Judge took pains to keep her from contact with its deeper aspects, for which, as he knew, she was totally unfitted. Fortunately, his closest friends in the Society went out of their way to be friendly to her, and in some cases she appreciated this and responded, making his life much easier and her own less full of complaint. It would be unfair to blame her: brought up in Brooklyn, as a strict Methodist, she married a man she thought she knew, to discover later, when the real Judge came to the fore, that she had married a total stranger.

The letters immediately following that last given were marked “Confidential”, and contained personal instruction, both inner and outer, the latter in regard to the future of the Society, involving persons and their characteristics,—none of which can be published. In one of these letters Judge wrote: “Jowett might be told that while it is all right to stand behind the Branch [Nashville], he ought to let them get on their feet, even if they seem to see disaster: he can step in at last. If he coddles it too much, it won’t be any good.” It was Judge’s aim always to make every Branch, every department of the Work, and every individual member, self-supporting, materially, morally and intellectually.

[Postmarked] AIKEN, S. C., December 19th, 1895.

Dear Boy,

Just got your last from Atlanta and Macon, and am rejoiced you are so near.

You ask me to reserve Christmas. If you knew how vast is the dullness, you would feel quite safe as to “reservations”. There is nothing to do and nowhere [35] to go, and you *can’t* do anything with the day but get indigestion; and that I shall not attempt.

After the final success at New Orleans it seems rather a pity you did not stay longer. I shall be glad to learn from you how you got on as to contributions since last reported.

N. B. My object in this is to have you prevent any of the Macon members coming over here with you to see me, which they might do if they know I am here. Tell them I can see no one, and the trip would be waste of time. The little talking I do is reserved for you. And you do not expect any conversation. If they did come, I would not see them.

After your stay here, if you did not include Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, I want you to. Your friend Opperman [President of the Branch in Belgium] has, I hear, come over to live in Pittsburgh within the past few days. The people need attention, and one or two bubblings must be burst.

Entre nous: we leave here same time as you do, to go to Cincinnati, then to see [Dr.] Buchman, Fort Wayne, and then to New York. Climates are no good. Our routes are almost at right angles; so we will part here and you go by Seaboard.

Oh: try in Macon to buy me a small good oil whetstone for my penknife. A piece of white Arkansas stone is the thing. By “small”, I mean not over 4 inches.

On your return to New York, Griscom wants you to stay with him till you find your own place. That place will be with me, as we are going to take a small house or a flat. So remember that you are thus bound. The charge for living made to you will help me keep the house, and we shall have the satisfaction of being together. You had best accept Griscom's invitation.

Good-bye. No more and we shall meet.

As ever,

Y.

[198]

LETTERS FROM W.Q. JUDGE

IX.

The concluding words of Judge's letter of December 19th, 1895, from Aiken, S. C., were: "No more and we shall meet" (see the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, July, 1933). I was at Macon, Ga., where, on December 22nd, the very active local Branch, in spite of Macon's comparatively small population, provided an audience of over 600 people, in the Academy of Music, to listen to my lecture on Theosophy. Newspaper reports were friendly, and Judge, when he heard of it, was pleased, for in those days, numbers and publicity still counted. We were sowing widely, scattering seeds of the Ancient Wisdom in every corner we could reach. Not many of us realized then, as Judge did, that out of the thousands who not only listened, but for a time joined the ranks of the Society, it would have been against the order of Nature for more than a handful to bear fruit.

As soon as I could leave Macon, I joined Judge at Aiken, and had the delight of spending two weeks with him in the boarding-house where he and Mrs. Judge were staying. Judge's voice was very weak; it hurt him to talk; but as the love of his life was the Theosophical Society and the Movement, he not only *had* to know the particulars of my lecturing tour, with impressions of the members I had met, but *had* to comment for my information, and "for the future", as he put it, when I begged him not to tire himself in this way. (It should be remembered that he died on March 21st, only three months later.) He used to come to my room and sit on the bed, cross-legged, yogi fashion—the soles of his feet turned up—and talk of things he wanted me to know, of things inner and outer, vital in the real and often hidden life of the Movement. Already showing signs of exhaustion, constantly struggling with his cough, it seemed none the less as if he could not, would not die, so strong and steady, clear and one-pointed, was the inner flame of his purpose; and always the same marvellous smile, springing from his eyes,—quiet, like sunrise behind hills. Uncomplaining, single-hearted, he fought on, hoping to live that he might complete the work he had begun. Often we talked of the book on Occultism, for which he had asked me to collect material: it was needed, he said; there were so many perversions, misunderstandings, of the real thing.

He had not a spark of vanity in him: and that, above all, was the trouble with his enemies, as it is the trouble to-day with those who discuss him from a pedestal of superiority, deciding where he was right and where he was wrong,—in an effort to show, by hook or crook, to a little circle of admirers, their own acumen, or "spiritual" attainment, or vast experience, that in any case they may shine in their own eyes, and, if God be good, in the eyes of others also. How small they are, against the memory of his greatness!

He was still able to take short walks, and occasionally we tried the streets of Aiken for this purpose; but they were "full of niggers", as he said,—which [199] would not have mattered if it had not been for the amazing rudeness (at that time, in any case) of the coloured population, and for occasional attempts to jostle us off the pavement, which both of us found intolerable. So we deserted the streets and took to the woods, agreeing that the North is often unfair to the "Southern attitude" toward negroes, Northerners failing to recognize the difficulties which arise when white people, outnumbered, live side by side with a race which, as a race, is inferior (the exceptions, both ways, merely emphasizing the rule).

No man ever worked harder for the ideal of brotherhood than Judge; but he was not one of those addle-headed dreamers who think that all men are born equal, or that distinctions of race, creed, sex, caste and colour, properly accepted, are any obstacle to a genuinely theosophical relationship.

Judge's personality was Irish, and, racially, on the plane of his personality, he disliked the English; but his dislike of the English on that plane was nothing in comparison with his dislike, on another plane, of the Irish in himself: "that Irish boy", he called it privately, with disgust. He was, in other words, incapable of real prejudice,—able to see things for what they were, recognizing inferiority here and superiority there, with

entire detachment. Standing with him once on a balcony of the old Star and Garter Hotel at Richmond in England, we saw Queen Victoria drive by in an open landau. He had not seen her before, and was deeply interested. "A remarkable woman", he said; "a very remarkable woman"; then, after a pause: "She has extraordinary *presence*". It was no small tribute, coming from him. How he would have hated the tribe of present-day, professional belittlers!

Judge left Aiken on January 9th, and, after spending two weeks in Cincinnati with Dr. Buck, and over a week in Fort Wayne, arrived in New York on February 3rd. I had been obliged to leave Aiken in time to lecture in Washington on the evening of January 7th, proceeding from there to Pittsburgh, then to Wilkesburg, to Philadelphia, and so to New York, where I arrived on January 19th, most gladly accepting Mr. Griscom's kind invitation to his home.

While in Washington I received this,—Judge's mind still intent upon "things to be done", but with a twinkle in his eye as he bestowed on me yet another sobriquet.

[Postmarked] Aiken, S. C. January 7th, 1896.

Dear Orator,

I forgot to say that we wish to bring out a pamphlet, same series as *Devachan*, on Reincarnation, to be made up from *Path* articles, etc. The last one, "Doctrine of Rebirth", is a good one; and there is one by [Dr.] Anderson. You will have to look these up also, when you get to New York, and let me know about it.

All well, as ever,

Y.

[200]

Important and Confidential.

[Postmarked] CINCINNATI, O., January 16th, 1896.

Dear Ernest,

There is a small room on the top story of 144 [Madison Avenue] which has a Yale lock. In it are the following: . . .

Now then: I want to give up the room to the Trustees. Take large sheets of wrapping paper and twine (Look out for —'s curiosity). Do up the old robe and ask Griscoms (Mrs.) to take charge of it for me.

Nobody knows what's in the room, no matter what they may suspect; so don't tell them.

Well good bye and

As ever,

Y.

[Postmarked] CINCINNATI, O., January 19th, 1896.*Confidential.*

Dear Ernest,

Without waiting to hear from you: I have thought over the matter of the Chickering Hall lectures [Claude Wright had been lecturing there, every Sunday morning], and my opinion is—you had better, if asked by W. [Wright] to take part or take up, *refuse*.

If he is going to give up, he should be allowed to do so. I do not think they are of enough consequence to call for the expenditures they require of all sorts to make them go right.

As ever,

24.

Nothing definite about plans. My throat bad, and cause of aphonia discovered therein—three months old.

To understand the reference to Mrs. Besant in the next letter, it is necessary to keep in mind that K.H. ^ had written to Olcott in August, 1888, that he had not written to or communicated with anyone, *except through H.P.B.*, since 1885; that Sinnett, suspecting H.P.B.'s integrity, but still believing in the existence of K.H., had been determined to establish his own independent line of communication with K.H., and, with that end in view, had mesmerized his wife and others, putting them into "trances", and had thus secured what *he* regarded as authentic teaching and guidance from the K.H. of *The Occult World*,—all the more authentic, in Sinnett's estimation, because the instruction, thus obtained, invariably confirmed Sinnett's preconceptions and prejudices, especially his rooted conviction that the planets Mars and Mercury belonged to the Earth chain of globes, and that he was supported in this by K.H. as against H.P.B. On the appearance of *The Secret Doctrine* in 1888, Sinnett had bitterly resented [201] H.P.B.'s correction of his views on this subject; relations between them had become very strained, and for some time before H.P.B.'s death, in May, 1891, Avenue Road and Sinnett's group had kept at arms' length. Very shortly after H.P.B.'s death, however, Annie Besant privately approached Sinnett. She did this because, "all intellect" and not in the least spiritual (as H.P.B. had written of her), she was avid of phenomena and had resented Judge's refusal to indulge her craving and his insistence that she must seek and find the "inner light" and thus become a "self-moving wheel". For a brief period, Sinnett captured her, as so many men had, and as so many were still to do. Thus it came about, as an after-effect of Sinnett's influence, that in *Lucifer* of December, 1895, Annie Besant reversed her earlier statements (see *The Path* of December, 1893, p. 270), "corrected" H.P.B., and, incidentally, led me to explode against her in a letter to Judge, to which he replied as follows:

[Postmarked] CINCINNATI, O., January 20th, 1896.

Dear Ernest,

Will you please attend to the enclosed matter of German application. I enclose my reply written in copying pencil, so that it can be press copied.

Claude [Wright] has pretended to attend to these European matters, but I have no confidence. I asked him to get (a) book to enter matters done as President of T.S.E., (b) copying book for these letters. Find out if he has them, and use them. The record should have quite a number of entries. But he has never informed me about it. If he hasn't them, then you procure them please.

Yours from Philadelphia received. It is amusing; they are amusing.

But may I ask if you thought it a reply to my request for copy [to write me] *re* squashing B. [Mrs. Besant]? I don't see *Lucifer*. You must write me the stuff and I'll alter to suit me [This was done. See *The Path*, March, 1896, p. 362]. I wish to ignore her, but I can't ignore the point. It is vital in the philosophy. I would not name her other than "editor of *Lucifer*".

I am feeling badly all the week with stomach and throat. Latter no better. We shall leave here in a few days and go up to Fort Wayne.

— of Philadelphia writes a mawkish note deploring the correction made in *Path* about American Section and bolters. Is he the duck you spoke of?

As ever,
2.

P. S. Think of the European laxity. It is now six months since Convention, and I have had no copy of adopted form of charter or diploma. If I had it, I could reply better to Reuss.

[Postmarked] FORT WAYNE, IND., January 29th, 1896.

Dear Ernest,

Am too sick to write. You are too previous about sending a delegate to London in July. That is not occultism. Not the time to think of it now.

[202] Received the stuff *re* Mars and Earth, and will use it when I get better.

N. B. The yellow stone in the little filagree box is *not to be handled*. Tell the Gs [Griscoms] if they have it.

Coryn: My letter in reply from him is to the contrary. He is pleased. Says that's the sort of one he likes. I tell you there is too much disposition to *make* friction and to get even.

Watch C.F.W. [Claude Wright] when around and tell me if he seems overburdened with work.

Weather here very nice and warm. I found out where the robe is o.k., so you need not bother. Thanks for all the trouble you took.

As ever,
2.

[Postmarked] FORT WAYNE, IND., January 30th, 1896.

Dear Ernest,

Re letter to — of India. Better point out also the affiliation clause in our Constitution and say that can be done. If they would take a bold stand, there might be a good deal done there. Suggest it. He and his Branch would have as much right as a thousand to declare themselves an Indian T.S.

Just received the *Path* article and the Bernhardt matter. Thanks. Am a little better and will read them soon.

We need a pamphlet (in the “envelope series”) and I wrote Page [manager, under Judge, of the Publishing department] on it—about Reincarnation. It will consist of reprints from *Path*, e.g., Miss Wakefield’s article and some of mine and Anderson. Please ask Page if he wrote Miss Wakefield.

I don’t know what headway you are making with all the various things, as you don’t say. Nor do you send any note or memo of anything for “Screen”. Has no point arisen at all?

As ever,

W.

[Postmarked] FORT WAYNE, IND., January 31st, 1896.

Dear Ernest,

We leave here on Monday and shall arrive Tuesday at Grand Central. Please meet me with a carriage to hold you also. I would rather that the people did not come to the station. Will probably go to the Lincoln House and do not care on Tuesday to have anyone but you and possibly Griscom call. I am worse—in voice—than at Aiken, and positively cannot speak.

Will give you particulars in telegram before leaving, as to time of arrival.

[203] If Claude says he wants to come up, I do not care to have him as I shall have to write what I want with him. But don’t tell him this.

As ever,

W.

It was on February 3rd, at 6 p. m., that he arrived in New York, driving from the station to the Lincoln Hotel, where he had decided to stay until a suitable apartment could be found for him. He was far more ill than when I had left him at Aiken some three weeks earlier: he was much weaker, his cough was more frequent, his digestion gave him greater pain, he could barely whisper. But he insisted upon my spending an hour or more with him daily, while he went over details of the Work in its many ramifications. When he could, he whispered his comments or directions; at other times he wrote notes on scraps of paper,—such as: “*Forum*. If possible relieve C.F.W. of the *Forum*, and take entire charge of it, either at once or by degrees.” “*Path*. You must attend to it. Articles to come are yours and Buck’s. I can’t finish mine I fear. I have Miss Hillard’s. You must write Screen of Time.” He thought of everything; I must have a desk at 144 Madison Avenue, then our Headquarters; so another note says: “Your desk is to be in Correspondence Class room, 3rd floor. Desk belongs to W.Q.J. Use it.” He was indefatigable, unconquerable; and the explanation was simple: his zeal, springing from so great a love for the Work that so long as he could think he must think first of that, always of that, and then, from the same source, find strength to pass on to others, by some means or other, the thought he willed into action. I can imagine a dying mother, unable to move, still tending her little one like that.

No matter how ill, he always got up and dressed as usual, refusing to stay in bed; but, with rare exceptions, he could not receive visitors. He sent for Mrs. Griscom, wanting to see her, and he saw Mr. Griscom, so loyally devoted to him, several times.

While Judge was at the Lincoln and I was spending part of every day with him, reporting on what had already been done to carry out his instructions, upon what remained to be done, and receiving further directions from him—every branch of the work being covered—I did not realize that he was dying. I did not even think of it as a possibility: he was so intensely alive in heart and mind, so vibrant with energy. Nor did I realize the extent to which his long illness had frayed his nerves; if I had, I should not have allowed myself to become rather discouraged at times by my inability always to please him. His patience and self-control were really marvellous, but I knew that my inexperience and stupidities were occasionally a trial to him, and then doubtless I looked as well as felt crestfallen.

This childish reaction was stopped completely by a letter which I received, addressed to me at 144 Madison Avenue, postmarked February 20th, the [204] envelope of which was in Judge's writing. The "letter" itself was in a modified script which I well knew, and read as follows:

Ernest—Never mind his nerves which have been exposed a long time. He is really pleased with what has been done and especially with the way you did the Screen. ^a

I had the grace to be ashamed of myself for making such a message necessary, or, if not necessary, for having drawn on the compassion of one whose generosity is unending but whom I might have spared.

It was a relief to Judge when, finally, an apartment had been found for him (he hated hotels), and his furniture had been moved into it. It was on the third floor of 325 West 56th Street. He, Mrs. Judge and I drove there on the afternoon of February 22nd. From that day he grew weaker and weaker. Some two weeks before his death his doctor warned him that unless he would consent to give up all work, he would throw away his only chance to recover. Judge consented, but the first effect of such a change in his whole life's practice was to make his condition worse: there was danger of an immediate collapse. His cough was incessant; he could no longer lie down; he would doze with his head on his arms on the back of a chair. Absolutely uncomplaining, he never lost his magnificent power of endurance and self-control.

On the morning of March 19th, I had gone to the T.S. Headquarters at 144 Madison Avenue as usual, although much worried by Judge's appearance (as already stated, I occupied one of the rooms in his apartment). In the early afternoon I received a telegram: "Go to Twenty-Ninth Street railroad office; get full particulars all Florida resorts, trains, tickets, sleepers; then come home.—W. Q. Judge." When I returned, he whispered that if he could "only get to some place where he could sit in the midst of sunshine and flowers", he might yet perhaps recover. Not long afterwards, while I was sitting by the sofa on which he half sat and half reclined, watching him as he dozed, the "Rajah" suddenly came to the fore, and with his unmistakable force said, among other things: "There should be calmness. Hold fast. Go slow".

On Friday, the 20th, Mrs. Judge and his sister, Miss Emily Judge, persuaded him to have a professional night nurse. She came, but he would not have her in his room! It made me laugh; it was so characteristic; it was one of the things in him that I loved.

In the afternoon he got some broken sleep. It was after this that he told me he was "away most of the time"—had I seen him "come back just then?" That night, Miss Emily Judge was obliged to go home, and as Mrs. Judge badly needed rest, it became my privilege to sit with him from about ten until about three o'clock on Saturday morning. During that time he dozed, though rousing himself every half hour regularly for his medicine. He was fighting to the last ditch: it was his duty. Unselfish to the end, he told me every time I gave him his medicine, to go to bed at once; what was I up so late for?—with that rare [205] smile of his. Numerous excuses were invented, at which he again smiled his old smile. At about three, Mrs. Judge took my place, but at six she called me, saying that Judge wished to see me at once. When I went to him he whispered asking me to go immediately to fetch a doctor, a specialist, who had been called in previously to consult with his regular physician. I realized now, if I had not done so previously, that we were at the last

ditch; so I tore through the streets to the home of this famous specialist, and, when no one answered the doorbell, rang it furiously for half an hour without ceasing, until at last he appeared,—only to refuse to see Judge on the ground that to do so in the absence of his regular physician would be contrary to professional etiquette. I pleaded, breathlessly; but the fact that a man's life was at stake did not affect him.

Hurrying back to the apartment, I found Judge in the same condition, sitting bolt upright on the sofa—facing it. Telling him the result of my call, I suggested the name of another specialist; but now he refused to see any doctor. At about 8:30 I left his room to ask the nurse if she thought anything could be done, but at about ten minutes to nine Mrs. Judge rushed in, calling us to come at once. I found him still sitting upright, but with the clear mark of approaching death on his face. In three minutes he quietly breathed his last.


Thus seemed to die “the greatest of the Exiles”,—a warrior of the Lodge. As I wrote at the time: “He passed from comparative inactivity into the full use of his powers; from constant physical pain into a state where *that* pain was only a memory. For him, death had no terrors, brought with it no separation. So we who loved him have no cause to mourn, but instead should rejoice that he is set free at last.”

The truth is that Judge, “dead”, went out of his way to make it evident to some of us that he was very much alive. We could not have doubted it, but his generosity of love demanded expression, and found it.

The debt we owe him is beyond calculation. The existence of the Society to-day is due primarily to his labour and sacrifice, and to the light he passed on. H.P.B. had hewn a track through primeval forest, and, to do so, had been obliged to use dynamite and axe. Judge turned her track into a paved road: he was the great consolidator. Both built their own memorials: H.P.B., her *Secret Doctrine* and *Voice of the Silence*; Judge, that living nucleus, one of the fruits of which is the thirty-two years' existence and growth of the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, and the continuance, so far into the twentieth century, of the Work of the Lodge which Masters inaugurated in 1875. In Palestine, many centuries ago, the Master Christ dominated cyclic law,—in his case, *a major cycle*. Not since then has even the hundred-year cycle been over-ridden, until that which Judge left behind him, as the flowering of his effort, became the means of similar opportunity.

Gratitude is never easy to express, but the least I can say is that I personally owe him, directly or indirectly, all that I value in life.

E.T.H.



APPENDIX

E



CONTENTIOUS LETTERS

Table of Contents ~ Appendix E

1. Letter from William Q. Judge to “Editor *Irish Theosophist*.”
“The Charges Against William Q. Judge.”
The Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, February 1895, pp.85-86. 299
2. “Truth and Occultism.” By Archibald Keightley.
Keightley includes letters of support for Judge’s character.
The Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, March 1895, pp.89-98. 300-305
3. Letter from Archibald Keightley to G.R.S. Mead dated March 19th, 1895.
The Vahan, Vol. 4, April 1895, pp.4-5. 306-308
4. Response by G.R.S. Mead to A. Keightley’s letter.
The Vahan, Vol. 4, April 1895, p.6. 309
5. “The ‘Chinaman.’” By Annie Besant.
The Vahan, Vol. 4, May 1895, pp.4-5. 310
6. “THE JUDGE CASE.” “Final Refusal to Give Copies of Documents to Accused.”
Letter from W.Q. Judge. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, May 1895, pp.132-133. 311
7. “Adepts and Mediums.” By Basil Crump.
The Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, May 1895, pp.133-136. 312-313
8. Letter from E.T. Hargrove “*To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.*”
Letter dated April 17th, 1895. Vol. 3, May 1895, pp.137-140. 314-317
9. Letter from Gordon Rowe and Walter H. Box “*To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.*”
Letter dated May 2nd, 1895. Vol. 3, May 1895, p.140. 317
10. Letters from E.T. Hargrove “*To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.*”
Two letters, dated May 14th and May 31st, 1895. Vol. 3, June 1895, pp.160-164. 318-321
11. Letter from Roger Hall “*To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.*”
Letter dated May 25th, 1895. Vol. 3, June 1895, pp.164-165. 322
12. “The Legend of ‘Che-Yew-Tsang.’” Introductory remarks by G.R.S. Mead.
Letter dated May 21st, 1895 from J.C. Keightley “*To the Editor of THE VĀHAN.*” 323-324
13. Letter from Herbert Burrows “*To the Editor of THE VĀHAN.*”
Letter dated June 19th, 1895. Vol. 4, July 1895, p.4. 325
14. Editorial comments by G.R.S. Mead. 325-326

1. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, Feb. 1895, pp.85-86.

[85] THE CHARGES AGAINST WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

EDITOR *Irish Theosophist*:

A long and sustained attack has been made on me and charges have been brought forward by Mrs. Besant, and in *The Westminster Gazette*, which it is thought I should reply to more fully than I have as yet. A very good and decisive reason exists for my not making that full reply and explanation, and it is time Theosophists should know it. It is as follows:

[86] I have not been furnished with copies of the documentary evidence by which the charges are said to be supported. These documents—being letters written by myself and some of them ten years old—have been in the possession of Mrs. Besant from about February, 1894, to July 19th, 1894, and open enemies of mine have been allowed to make copies of them, and also to take facsimiles, but they have been kept from me, although I have demanded and should have them. It must be obvious to all fair-minded persons that it is impossible for me to make a full and definite reply to the charges without having certified copies of those documents.

I arrived in London July 4th, 1894, and constantly, each day, asked for the copies and for an inspection of the papers. Mrs. Besant promised both, but never performed her promise. The proceedings and the Convention closed July 13th, and for six days thereafter I daily asked for the copies and inspection, getting the same promise with the same failure, until July 19th, when I peremptorily demanded them. Mrs. Besant then said she had just given them to Colonel Olcott, to whom I at once applied. He said he had sent them all to India. I at once told this to Mrs. Besant, saying I would give the facts to the daily papers, whereupon she went to Colonel Olcott, who said he had made a mistake as they were in his box. He then—I being in a hurry to leave from Liverpool on the 21st—let me hastily see the papers in Dr. Buck's presence, promising to send me copies. I had time to copy only two or three short letters. He has never fulfilled that promise.

These facts the members should know, as they ought at last to understand the animus under the prosecution. I shall not reply until I have full certified copies. It would seem that I am in this matter entitled to as much opportunity and consideration as my open enemies have had.—Yours,

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

New York, Jan. 25th, 1895.

2. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, March 1895, pp.89-98.

[89]

"TRUTH AND OCCULTISM."

IN *Lucifer* for February, 1895, p.442, occurs the following statement by Mrs. Besant:

"Before I left England in July I had received from Dr. Buck the assurance of his conviction—reiterated by him to Countess Wachtmeister in America—that Mr. Judge had received so severe a lesson that there would be no more of these red pencil missives. . . ."

The following correspondence between Countess Wachtmeister and Dr. Buck covers the above and other assertions. Comment would be inadequate and useless.

[COPIES.]

"BRISTOL HOTEL, COLOMBO.

"Dec. 21st, 1894.

"DEAR DOCTOR BUCK,—Do you remember telling me that I was right in believing that W. Q. Judge had acted in a fraudulent and deceitful manner in sending out spurious orders and messages, that you intended to pull him through the convention at whatever cost to honour, but that afterwards you would give him a piece of your mind, telling him that such messages must cease for the future. You told me this in Dr. Jerome Anderson's house in San Francisco. You may imagine, therefore, my disgust when I saw your name attached to this unjustifiable attack of W. Q. Judge's on Annie Besant. You know her to be innocent and the other one to be guilty, and yet you can endorse this abominable lie. No words of mine are sufficient to express my indignation at such conduct. As you have said to Annie Besant exactly the same as you have said to me I do not feel myself bound to secrecy on this matter, for by telling her (the accused) you have made it public. Stand before Master's portrait and ask Him what He thinks of your

[90] conduct, for Master is truth Himself; how, then, can He approve of that which is untrue and false. I am sorry for you with all my heart.

(Signed) "CONSTANCE WACHTMEISTER."

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

"I have this day received a letter from Countess Wachtmeister, of which the above is a verbatim copy. Aside from the insulting tone of the letter, which I pass by, I hereby declare upon my honour that the above statements are from beginning to end fabrications. There is not a word of truth in any single statement therein contained. I not only made none of the above statements to the Countess or to anyone else, but no such conversation ever occurred, nor did the Countess ever say to me or in my hearing that she herself believed Mr. Judge guilty. She was entirely non-committal on the subject when I saw her in San Francisco, and when, later, she was entertained for a week at my house in Cincinnati. By what means, or with what motive, the Countess has arrived at her present attitude and made these statements, is beyond conception. To the present day I do not know and have no means of knowing the source or methods of Mr. Judge's communications with Masters, but have supported Mr. Judge solely on my own knowledge of his work and character, deeming the matters involved in the said communications incapable of proof or disproof. I have never said to anyone that in these matters Mr. Judge is 'guilty' or 'innocent,' because I do not *know*, and as I see no means of knowing I have no 'belief' and do not care, but go on with the legitimate work of the T. S.

(Signed) "J. D. BUCK, M.D., F.T.S

"Cincinnati, Ohio, U. S. A., Jan. 21st, 1895."

"MY DEAR COLONEL (OLCOTT),—You are at liberty to make what you can and whatever use you please out of the foregoing. Further communication from me is unnecessary and would evidently be useless. If I had made those statements I should stand by them, for where I am known I have never been accused of

cowardice, or of being a liar or a sneak. Strangers will, of course, believe what they please, as it is a matter of veracity between the Countess and myself.

“Sincerely and fraternally yours,

(Signed) “J. D. BUCK.”

Mrs. Besant having written Dr. Buck under date of Dec. 25th, 1894, from Adyar:

“My poor friend, you told me you would take the karma of defending Judge even at the cost of truth.”

[91] Dr. Buck replied, drawing a line under the words, “*even at the cost of truth*”:

“The underlined portion is not mine, as you will see by referring to my letter just before I sailed for London. That means, if words have meaning, that I would disregard known truth or wilfully prevaricate to uphold Judge. I never knowingly did such a thing, or said it, or thought it.”

Dr. Buck then enclosed a copy of the above from Countess Wachtmeister, and continues:

“. . . See how these things go. When will we come to an end of them? This statement by the Countess is without a single fact to stand on, but taken with yours will be believed and go against Judge. I tried on several occasions to draw her out on the question, but she was as mum as an oyster, never once admitted Judge’s guilt, only said, ‘It will all come out right.’ I never said to anyone that Judge was guilty or I believed him guilty, but always ‘I do not know,’ and have defended him solely from what I do know, viz., his great work and general character, leaving the rest without prejudice one way or another. It seems to me that you might understand this position whether you approve it or not. We are in an awful whirl, my dear good sister; let us not even unconsciously multiply difficulties. So in regard to Judge’s statements in regard to you and Chakravarti. I do not *know*. It would have to be proven to become for me a basis of action, and had nothing to do with my going with Judge in E. S. Some of the things you have done I do not understand. I cannot reconcile them, therefore I do not condemn you or acquit you. I leave them absolutely in abeyance, believing you have ‘tried to follow truth’ and do right, and the motive is far more important than the act. The outer whirl of matter will vanish as soon as we all get right inside. May the good law hasten the day. Here is the statement, word for word, occurring in a letter I wrote you dated June 10th, 1894: ‘I would take the karma myself of *condoning a fault in Judge*, rather than see him humiliated so he could work no more, or to have the T. S. divided on the question of his guilt or innocence, as there is great danger of its becoming if we are not very wise and prudent.’ We have not been ‘wise and prudent,’ and the division that I saw and tried in every way to prevent has come. But you must see the difference between ‘taking the karma of condoning a fault to save a brother and save the society,’ and as you quote me, ‘You (I) would take the karma of defending Judge *even at the cost of truth*,’ or, as the Countess puts it (out of whole cloth, for I never said anything of the kind to her), that I ‘intended to pull him through the convention *at whatever* [92] *cost to honour*.’ I did not ‘pull him through the convention’ or try to; there was no occasion, as the convention was unanimous in his support. Of course if you and the Countess so repeat these statements they will seem to justify your course, and strengthen your cause and hurt Mr. Judge and his supporters. Need I say more than *they are wholly untrue* and that you and the Countess have either entirely forgotten, or are willing to so entirely misconceive and therefore misrepresent my motives and sentiments. I am not personally aggrieved, because I am not in the front, only a worker in the background, trying to help all who work in Master’s cause. But these things intensify the feelings against Judge, and seem to justify the attack by showing how mean are the motives and basis of action of his supporters.

“America will disregard all these *accusations* (not ‘disregard truth and honour’) and support judge for his splendid work and character as we know it. The evidence we have for him is far stronger than the evidence yet brought against him. . . .

“Sincerely yours,
(Signed) “J. D. BUCK.”

On page 456 of *Lucifer* Mrs. Besant says:

“Let me say I had drawn up six charges to lay before the committee. Under each of these charges I had drawn up the evidence on which the charge depended. I had made what would be called a brief; the charges were the indictments, and the evidence was practically the speech of the counsel stating what the charges were. My only deviation from the legal action was this—that I sent a complete copy of the whole statement that I proposed to make, to Mr. Judge; that, I knew, was outside the legal duty, but I did it in order that the case might be met upon its merits, that he might know everything I was going to say, every document I was going to use, and every argument I was going to employ.”

Much virtue is continually claimed for sending Mr. Judge the little that was sent him in regard to the charges. The course followed is alleged to be a deviation from the legal procedure for the benefit of Mr. Judge. It was a deviation, but not in the sense implied by Mrs. Besant. Quite the reverse. I am professionally informed that the procedure in an action of law is as follows:

1. A statement of the complaint must be sent to the defendant. This Mrs. Besant did, though vaguely. Her statement consisted of the six charges and a specification of documents upon which they were based.
2. A full statement setting forth the purport of all the documents upon which the complaint is founded must be sent to the defendant. [93] This Mrs. Besant did not do. She sent a partial statement insufficiently setting out *some* of the documents only and entirely omitting others which, according to the specification, were intended and therefore had to be used, unless the defendant consented to their withdrawal. This partial statement Mrs. Besant calls her prosecutor’s brief. Here, therefore, she departed from legal procedure and entirely in her own favour.
3. The defendant must put in what is called a “defence.” This Mr. Judge did even before the second item of procedure was taken by the plaintiff.
4. The plaintiff must give full opportunity for the defendant and his agents to inspect and take copies and extracts and facsimiles or photographs of all documents intended to be used against him, and no document can be used except those produced. This Mrs. Besant did not do and never has done.
5. At least six weeks, sometimes six months or more, are allowed before the trial for the preparation by the parties of their respective evidence and witnesses. It has been forgotten that the genuineness of all documents has to be proved on oath unless admitted to be genuine by the opposite party. If evidence is required from abroad the Court will postpone the trial until it can be obtained. The fact is that Mrs. Besant delayed taking procedure No. 2 until Mr. Judge was actually leaving the U. S. A. to attend the trial, the date of which had already been fixed. This was a flagrant injustice which would not be tolerated in any Court of Law. No opportunity whatever was given for inspection and copying documents before the trial. This also is a gross breach of even legal procedure.

And now Mr. Judge is (*vide Vâhan*, March, 1895) arraigned before the whole Society on charges which it has not seen, on evidence supplied neither to the Society nor to the defendant.

I suppose it to be upon the strength of Mrs. Besant's statement in *Lucifer*, as above quoted, that Mr. Mead is issuing an official statement, advance copy of which has been sent to me, as member of the Executive Committee, in which, in reply to Mr. Judge's official letter saying that he has no copies of the evidence, Mr. Mead replies that Mr. Judge has copies of all that was to be used against him. I at once notified Mr. Mead that the above statement was not true, and gave my reasons (in part) therefor. But as I now find other advance copies have been sent out, and Mr. Thomas Williams has published the same incorrect statement in *Light*, I am obliged to make public contradiction of the above. The facts are as follows:

Mrs. Besant sent Mr. Judge: (a) a rough specification of some [94] seventy-eight exhibits (letters, telegrams, etc.) as evidence in support of six charges. I say "some seventy-eight," because such items as the following occur:

"Various sentences written in Judge's letters to A. B., Babula, Olcott, Tookeram, Cooper-Oakley." Allotting in all such cases *one* letter to each person named, there are seventy-eight pieces of evidence. But there is nothing to show whether there are one or a dozen such letters to each person. This specification in my hands is a certified copy of the original one sent to Mr. Judge in New York.

(b) Mrs. Besant sent also what she calls "a brief." It contained many arguments based upon many assertions. In this brief were quotations from a few of the seventy-eight pieces of "evidence." I am told by three persons who have seen this brief that there are under a dozen pieces of evidence given. These latter are *all* the copies of evidence which Mr. Judge has or has had, and this is the way in which Mr. Judge has known "every document I was going to use," or has had, as Mr. Mead says, copies of all that was to be used against him. It cannot be denied that Mrs. Besant intended to use against him all the seventy-eight or more pieces of evidence quoted, for the six charges and rough specification were the official documents to be used before the T. S. Judicial Committee, not one of which could subsequently be withdrawn by Mrs. Besant, or anyone else, at their own discretion. I have not seen this brief, as Mrs. Besant required Mr. Judge to give his word of honour that he would show it to no one (Dr. Buck having previously seen it), and told several of us that she had ordered it to be burned when the matter was supposed to be settled. It now appears that Miss C——, who is not a T. S. official, has it in charge and has shown it to members. Three members who have seen it pledge their honour to the statement that it contains under a dozen of the pieces of evidence.

Moreover, Mr. Judge has not even *seen* all the evidence. None of that which is the property of Mr. Bertram Keightley was even shown to him!

Furthermore, Mrs. Besant at Richmond, in July, 1894, promised Mr. Judge, in the presence of Mr. Mead, Dr. Buck, Mr. B. Keightley, Mrs. A. Keightley and myself, that he should have copies of all the evidence. Why did she so promise if, as is now said, Mr. Judge had knowledge of every document and copies of the evidence before leaving America? As a portion of this conversation is now being used against Mr. Judge and is distorted, I here give the real context. *Other parts of that conversation have yet wider bearing:*

Mr. Judge asked Mrs. Besant if she would then give him back his [95] letters, which were the so-called evidence, seeing that the closing of the matter was under consideration. It was evidently useless to talk about bringing the matter to a conclusion, if the alleged evidence was to be promptly handed over to one of his avowed enemies, who would naturally have continued the office of prosecutor, even if that office had been laid down by Mrs. Besant. In reply to Mr. Judge's question, Mrs. Besant said that they were not all hers to give. The question was not so strange as it is made to appear, as Mrs. Besant and Mr. B. Keightley were, with Colonel Olcott, owners of the bulk—if not all of the evidence so-called. Colonel Olcott had been and was consulted on this head. Mr. Judge then said, in almost these exact words:

"Well, Annie, if the case was reversed, I would take the consequences of returning you *your* letters under the same circumstances. However, will you give me copies?"

Mrs. Besant consulted Mr. Mead by a look and Mr. Mead said:

“Why, yes, Annie, I think Judge ought to have copies.”

Mrs. Besant then agreed that the copies should be given. Four of the seven persons present remember this as here set forth. The copies NEVER have been given, and the statement made by Mr. Judge in his letter, published by Mr. Mead in *The Vâhan*, and in *The Irish Theosophist* for February, 1895, is in every particular correct.

Mr. Judge is being asked to reply to charges based upon letters and telegrams beginning 1875 down to the present day, often very vaguely specified, as in the extract above, part of which he has not even seen. And when he makes his very natural and necessary demand, untrue statements are made in regard to him.

In any case it is not only unjust, but contrary to every code of common fairness, to endeavour to prove charges such as those brought against Mr. Judge on the strength of brief extracts from supposed letters. Everyone must know that carefully selected extracts can be made to prove almost any villainy. It is significant that Mrs. Besant admitted to many persons in July, 1894, that she was aware these charges could not be actually proven against Mr. Judge.

Mr. Judge has not at his command the lists of the Theosophical Society kept at Adyar, as have his accusers, the statements even of Mrs. Besant and my step-uncle, Mr. Bertram Keightley, being circulated all over the world by those lists, so that I must ask members who receive this statement of Dr. Buck and myself to circulate it as widely as possible.

Lucifer, p.466, Mrs. Besant again says: “Further, by the carelessness of Mr. Judge’s agents, this circular has been sent to an expelled [96] member of the E. S. T. in India. . . .” There is also much being said about a “quasi-private” circular and so forth.

I beg to say that copies of a circular were sent to Mrs. Besant’s E. S. T. Council (ten, I think, in number) and the I. G., with the exception of Mrs. M——. These were the only copies signed—and in an unusual manner—by Mr. Judge. One of these *signed* copies was published in part (I do not say whether correctly or incorrectly) by *The Westminster Gazette*, and the exact signature reproduced. These were *the only signed copies* except my own. Mrs. Cleather and Messrs. Pryse and Coryn had and have their copies. Therefore one of the remaining members of Mrs. Besant’s own E. S. T. Council published the circular to which she refers. Moreover, if any such circular was sent—and of this we have no proof—to an expelled member in India, that is the fault of Mrs. Besant’s London agents, who failed to notify the American office of such expulsion—as is both the rule and necessity. I have the lists, with every name marked, by which a circular was sent out, and if Mrs. Besant will give the name to impartial referees, I am willing to place the lists in their hands. It remains to be proven (*a*) to whom the circular was sent and (*b*) by whom; for the member of Mrs. Besant’s Council who published a circular in England may have also sent it to India.

In the above I do not commit myself to any statement as to whether the document referred to by Mrs. Besant as in the public prints is or is not a paper of the E. S. T., as publication and reference to such paper by Mrs. Besant or any other do not justify me in breaking my pledge. I do, however, feel justified in saying that all the nonsense about the “circulation of private slanders under the sacred obligation of secrecy” comes grotesquely from Mrs. Besant, who circulated a “private” statement, with special safeguards against discovery, as to Mr. Judge’s guilt over six months ago, and after promising to say nothing to anyone until Mr. Judge should be in England. And I positively deny that there is, either in the two circulars so published or in any E. S. T. document or circular, any statement that Mrs. Besant is consciously doing wrong, or under black magicians, or more than a “*possible* vehicle,” or is one herself. There are no “appalling” statements,

and there is decided tribute to the original intention and the work of Mrs. Besant All that is said on this head by Mrs. Besant is quite hopelessly exaggerated. I would urge members who are interested in the matter to compare Mrs. Besant's version of these "appalling" statements with whatever has actually been written by Mr. Judge. Let them go over the papers for themselves and then decide.

[97] In regard to the so-called Council message of "Judge's plan is right," I have Mrs. Besant's own statement, written, dated and signed *at the time*, to the effect that no one had or could have had access to the papers among which this missive was found, but herself. She made also statements at various times—the last one in May, 1893, to Messrs. Main, Patterson and Hyatt, of Brooklyn, Mr. Crosbie, of Boston, Mrs. A. Keightley and myself, that it was absolutely impossible for Mr. Judge or anyone else to have access to those papers and place the slip among them. With the exception of Mr. Crosbie, I have the statements of the above persons attested, and all are in writing. I could produce over a score more by simply asking for them. Mrs. Besant has never defended Mr. Judge from this charge.

At the Adyar Convention, December, 1894, Miss Müller publicly accused Mr. Judge of having tried, some years ago, to force Col. H. S. Olcott to resign the Presidency of the T. S. This is utterly untrue. Both Mrs. Besant and Colonel Olcott knew it to be untrue. They knew who it really was who took action against Colonel Olcott with a view to force him to resign from the Presidency. They knew it was not Mr. Judge, and that the action in no way originated in America; but Mrs. Besant and Colonel Olcott permitted this false charge to be publicly made against Mr. Judge, in their presence at Adyar, and said no word to exonerate him.

These are some of the discrepancies which I and others shall later be called upon to point out. Very much to my regret—for all must be wearied with the constant reiteration of charges against Mr. Judge, and the consequent necessary defence—I cannot longer remain, by my silence, an accomplice in a great wrong. But the action of Mr. Mead in canvassing the European Section, and that of Mrs. Besant in her *Lucifer* publications, compel me to point out one or two of these misstatements, which, together with personal attacks, by letter and otherwise, upon almost all those who openly express belief in Mr. Judge's innocence, compel me to break—in some degree—my silence before the general public.

After the above had gone to press I received the March *Vâhan*. Mr. Mead says on p.3 that his "memory is defective" as regards the request made by Mr. Judge, at the meeting of the Judicial Committee, for copies of the evidence. The memories of Messrs. Kingsland, Firth and Sinnett are also, he says, defective on this point. Against this I can only place my own positive recollection and the equally positive recollection of Mr. E. T. Hargrove and Mr. Jas. M. Pryse.

I would further state that the conversation I have referred to as [98] taking place at Richmond, at which the special demand was made for at least copies of the evidence, is that which Mrs. Besant refers to in her letter in *The Review of Reviews* for February, quoted by Mr. Mead in *The Vâhan*. This meeting, in a sense private, has been made use of as against Mr. Judge by Mrs. Besant in the above letter. I cannot, of course, remain silent in regard to it any longer, and have given a part of the conversation as it actually occurred.

ARCHIBALD KEIGHTLEY.

3. **The Vahan**, Vol. 4, April 1895, pp.4-5.

[4]

62, QUEEN ANNE STREET,
CAVENDISH SQUARE, W.*March 19th, 1895.*

SIR,

Your remarks in THE VĀHAN for March as General Secretary of the European Section of the Theosophical Society in regard to the position taken up by Dr. Coryn, Dr. Zander and myself, necessitate reply. The Executive Committee of the European Section is supposed to conduct the affairs of that Section between Conventions, and you, the Executive officer of that Committee, have publicly charged three of your fellow members as follows: "Dr. Keightley, Dr. Zander, and Mr. H. A. W. Coryn have accepted Mr. Judge unqualifiedly. That is to say, they hold that he is acting under direct orders from higher sources in this matter. Mr. Judge says that he cannot resign because those higher sources have not so directed. These three members of the Committee, therefore, must support Mr. Judge in this. They have no choice. They must support Mr. Judge in all his policy. What chance then is there for any proposal contrary to Mr. Judge's wishes to be taken into consideration by these three gentlemen?"

What proof have you that these three gentlemen have accepted Mr. Judge "*unqualifiedly*," or that they hold that he is acting in the manner named by you, in "*all this matter*?" To the contrary, I state:

(a) Mr. Judge issued the following to the E.S.T. so long ago as March, 1892; he has repeated it constantly in private letters and has ordered its repetition:

"Members must carefully remember that the School has no official connection with the Society (Theosophical Society), although none are admitted who are not Fellows of the Theosophical Society. Hence the Theosophical Society must not be compromised by members of the School. We must all recollect that the Theosophical Society is a free, open body. So if one of the Heads is also an official in the Theosophical Society, his or her words or requests as such Theosophical Society's official must not under any circumstances be coloured or construed on the basis of the work of this School.

"This caution is necessary because some members have said to the General Secretary of the United States Section of the Theosophical Society that they regarded his words as such official to be an order. This is improper and may lead to trouble if members cannot see their plain Ethical duty under the Pledge. They are surely to work for the Theosophical Society, but must also use their common sense *and never let the Theosophical Society become dogmatic.*"

(b) Dr. Zander, Mr. H. A. W. Coryn and myself do undoubtedly hold that, in certain respects claimed, Mr. Judge is the agent of a Master. This is a matter of belief, to which belief we have an absolute right, and you have undoubtedly no right to accuse, arraign or persecute members of the Theosophical Society in matters of belief. But to imply that any orders have been issued to others in regard to the Theosophical Society is dishonest confusion of the issue. Moreover, your assertions as quoted above are false. We challenge you to prove them. You are unable to do so. You have made a gratuitous and false assertion and I so state it to be. I also demand that you either give proofs of your assertion, or confess yourself unable to do so.

(c) These gentlemen and myself are bound only by our duty to the Constitution, to Theosophy and to justice. The Council of the European Section in Convention appointed us members of its Executive Committee, our functions being defined by the Constitution of the European Section. That Constitution cannot be altered save by Convention after due notice to the Lodges.

Having accepted office these gentlemen were bound to uphold the Constitution, receiving their office as a trust from the Council, or to resign their office.

You have thus publicly insinuated that we have proved false to that trust and that you are therefore entitled to set aside those members of the Executive Committee who do not give you their “warm approval.”

As General Secretary you state that were you to resign or die or to hand over your keys to Mr. Judge’s supporters, “you will have this Section under Mr. Judge’s thumb.” This is another insinuation that Dr. Zander, Mr. H. A. W. Coryn and Dr. Keightley are false to their trust and opposed to the perfect autonomy of the European Section. The converse of the statement naturally means that the Section is under your thumb, or under that of somebody allied with you. We [5] might as justly claim in regard to you what you claim in regard to us.

If the Council will refer to January VĀHAN to which you allude, it will be seen that the action we have taken is entirely based on the Constitution and on nothing else. The Constitutional points there raised have never been met. They cannot be removed. Hence you, as General Secretary of this Section, and your fellow Committee men who approve you, are acting from the basis of personal opinion and not from that of the Constitution. We do not question your *personal* right so to ignore the Constitutional points raised. It is a matter for the Council of this Section to decide. But we maintain and will always maintain our view, to wit, that the first duty of an officer of the Theosophical Society is to the Constitution of that body, and to nothing else. The Constitution expresses the view and aim of the whole Section. It represents the spirit of freedom by providing that the will of the entire Section, as such, shall be duly carried out. The mind that strives to gain its own end by accusing others of seeking shelter behind a Constitution, is really raising an outcry that those others will not consent to illegal measures. Were Mr. Judge, or any other man, the guiltiest of the guilty to my certain knowledge, I would have that man tried, legally, properly, or not at all. And if it be demanded that I, as a man and as an officer of the Theosophical Society, shall consent to, or shall by silence recognise any indirect means of punishing any offender, I state here and now that others must be found to do such dirty work. I will have none of it.

(c) In the VĀHAN for March I find the Gen. Sec. for this Section advocating the publishing of Mrs. Besant’s “prosecutor’s brief” against Mr. Judge. What! Refuse to the Vice-President copies of the evidence against him, and publish an incomplete and one-sided brief against him to the world? Is the Section aware that, even legally, all such evidence has to be sworn to? That the prosecutor’s brief consists of but few pieces of evidence *in full*, and a number of extracts from the exhibits entered as the evidence to be brought? That none of this evidence once entered as such can be legally withdrawn? And finally, that I offered to the General Secretary the opportunity of seeing the list of charges and evidence, and of verifying for himself my statement that the prosecutor’s brief contained by no means all, and that, consequently, Mr. Judge had not copies of the evidence? Mr. Mead preferred to issue an incorrect statement, based upon another incorrect statement by Mrs. Besant, sending merely a curt acknowledgment of my letter on a postcard. The statement by Mr. Mead, that Mrs. Besant intended to bring nothing else forward, and that he, Mr. Mead, would for his part be only too glad to have that much answered, is a ludicrously inadequate conception of the situation.

It is not Mrs. Besant or Mr. Mead who are to be satisfied. Only childish pomposity could take up such a view. Certain charges and certain evidence were entered, and these cannot be withdrawn at the pleasure of any individual. Why does not the prosecutor fulfil the legal requirements, and give copies of the evidence in full to the accused, and so end this disgraceful situation? What English gentleman can consent to all this illegal shirking?

Mrs. Besant admitted to several persons that the charges cannot be proved. But that is no reason why full copies of the evidence should be persistently withheld from the accused. And we demand that the General Secretary of the Section give full explanation of his course in thus endeavouring to cover the illegality and the injustice of Mrs. Besant's proceedings. When all the requirements of justice and law are fulfilled, then and then only would the Theosophical Society have the right to come to a definite conclusion, always under the Constitution, in the case of Mr. Judge. I should be the last man to oppose any Constitutional adjudication, whether it did or not accord with my personal view of the case.

(d) Dr. Zander, Mr. H. A. Coryn and myself do not resign from the Executive Committee inasmuch as:

1. We received our offices from the European Section in Convention assembled, and can only resign them to that body.
2. Convention not being far distant, our retention of office does not at all affect the situation, as:
3. Being in the minority by one (Mr. Mead), and being also disregarded by the General Secretary, we do not impede the work, whereas, on the other hand, we do represent the views of a large number of members, who would otherwise be without representation.

(e) And now I would like in my turn to ask you, Mr. Mead, the following question:

1. Are you, or are you not, concealing from the Section of which you are the Executive officer, facts in relation to the *origination* of Mrs. Besant's action against Mr. Judge—facts of psychism and of the active and prominent part taken by Mr. Chakravarti therein—which facts, if known to the Section, could to a large extent affect the view taken by a large majority of the members?
2. Are you, or are you not, directly or indirectly assisting, or concealing the fact that you concur with Mrs. Besant in carrying out directions received from, or by Mr. Chakravarti?
3. Have you, or have you not, concealed from the Council of this Section a fact which is perfectly familiar to you, namely, that so far back as January and April, 1894, Mrs. Besant came to the conclusion—and so stated in writing and in conversation—that Mr. Judge was a victim of H. P. Blavatsky, who (occasionally?) indulged in forgery? Hence, are you, or are you not, officially concerned in procuring the conviction of a “victim” (!) of H. P. Blavatsky?

I beg that you will reply to these questions without tergiversation or avoidance of the main issue, in order that the Council of this Section may be as fully informed as myself.

Sincerely,

ARCHIBALD KEIGHTLEY,
M.A., M.D. (*Cantab.*)

To the Editor of THE VĀHAN.

4. **The Vahan**, Vol. 4, April 1895, p.6.

Response by G.R.S. Mead to A. Keightley's letter.

[6] Alas, poor me! I hope there will be some rags left on my back by the time the Convention meets in July. I insinuate nothing, I state quite clearly what I have to say.

I assert that Dr. Keightley, Mr. H. A. W. Coryn and Dr. Zander have accepted Mr. Judge's E.S.T. circular and "order" of Nov. 3rd. If, under the present circumstances, this is not an "unqualified" acceptance of Mr. Judge and his methods, we had better reform the English language. Dr. Keightley's present letter proves the rest of my contention.

The Executive Committee is divided on the Judge case; I therefore appeal to the Section. This is a very plain and simple fact, which requires no argument. My action cannot be a violation of the Constitution of the Section, for there is nothing in the Constitution providing for such a condition of affairs.

The "first duty of an officer of the Theosophical Society" is, I conceive, devotion to the interests of truth. The General Constitution of the Society, as it at present exists, has proved itself inadequate, and the present difficulty has to be decided by the makers of that Constitution—the members of the Society. The ultimate appeal is to the moral sense of all the members. I can hardly believe that Dr. Keightley can seriously object to such an appeal.

In the last number of *The Irish Theosophist* (p.93), Dr. Keightley writes: "And now Mr. Judge is (*vide* VĀHAN, March, 1895) arraigned before the whole Society on charges which it has not seen, on evidence supplied neither to the Society nor to the defendant."

I conclude, therefore, that Dr. Keightley wishes the evidence to be supplied to the Society. But when I declare my intention of using my best endeavours to bring this about, Dr. Keightley overwhelms me with objections, as though the last thing he desired was the publication of a document which he confesses he has never seen, and yet speaks so confidently about. It is time for all of us to have this document before us. If it is so unfair, so weak, so paltry, it will be all the easier for Mr. Judge to refute it. But it is very difficult for me to satisfy a colleague who makes such contradictory requests as my present correspondent.

Finally, as to Dr. Keightley's questions; what if I were to turn round the questions, and with the requisite alterations put them to my correspondent with regard to his own attitude and Mr. Judge? I have many questions to ask, but I refrain. I take my stand on the merits of the case, and not on side issues.

1. Before I reply, I must ask Dr. Keightley to be so good as to state what "facts" he refers to.
2. I have received no directions from or by Mr. Chakravarti, directly or indirectly. I concur with no one as to their directions. I am standing entirely on my own feet, and would make the same stand under similar circumstances, whether the formulator of the case was Mrs. Besant or anyone else of proven integrity.
3. I decline to assist Dr. Keightley in attacking H. P. Blavatsky.

G. R. S. MEAD.

5. **The Vahan**, Vol. 4, May 1895, pp.4-5.

[4]

The "Chinaman."

I see that a most unjustifiable use has been made of my name in connection with the articles written by Mr. Ernest Hargrove under the pseudonym of Che-Yew-Tsang. The facts are simple. Mrs. Keightley sent word asking me to go up to her sitting-room, where I found her with Mr. Hargrove and Dr. Keightley; she said, "I have a present for you, here is a Chinaman who will do you any service." She then said she trusted to my honour not to mention to anyone that Mr. Hargrove had written under the above *nom de plume*, and only told me, trusting to my good faith. I asked why Mr. Hargrove, who was so intimate with Mr. Mead, should wish to conceal his identity, and he said that he wanted the article to stand on its own merits, and that if he were known as the writer it would be judged only by his personality. I answered that of course anyone who liked to do so could write under a *nom de plume*, but that I thought that, working with Mr. Mead in the same office as Mr. Hargrove was working, Mr. Mead would feel that he had been deceived and treated unfairly: Mr. Hargrove still argued that Mr. Mead would not be unbiassed in his judgment if he knew the writer, but finally said he would choose some opportunity of telling Mr. Mead, and explaining why he had sent his article under a *nom de plume*. This he never did. Mrs. Keightley did not propose that Mr. Mead should be told, nor did I use the absurd words put into my mouth. On the contrary, I advised Mr. Hargrove to tell Mr. Mead, though I considered he had the right to use a *nom de plume* if he chose, like many other writers.

The matter was at the time a very trivial one, and it only became really important when "The Chinaman" masqueraded as a real person, allowed people to regard him as an Oriental mystic, and intervened as such, with an implied claim to authority, in the dispute about Mr. Judge. When I found the unfair use to which the originally harmless *nom de plume* was being put, I resolved to say that I knew it to be only a *nom de plume*, but I should not have revealed Mr. Hargrove's identity, as I was told it as a secret, and unfair as it was to trap me without my consent, I felt none the less bound.

The two references to "The Chinaman" in November, 1893, and January, 1894, were made by me, and I did not regard the use of the *nom de plume* as an offence. It became an offence only when Mr. Hargrove continued its use, knowing that the people with whom he was working regarded the articles with that signature as coming from a person of authority. The "very private experiences" were not very private, or I should not have written them to Mrs. Keightley, but they were personal. I included Mr. Hargrove in the persons to whom they might be told, partly because he was so intimate with Dr. and Mrs. Keightley, and partly because I regarded Mr. Hargrove as a young man of very great promise, of exceptional promise from his devotional and religious spirit. I am not without hope that, if he should escape from the psychic current which has whirled him away, he may yet redeem that promise, [5] and do good service to the Theosophical Society.

ANNIE BESANT.

I must ask my friends in the Theosophical Society not to accept as mine the many extraordinary and false statements put into my mouth by Dr. Keightley and others, during my absence from England. I cannot contradict them one by one, and it would be idle to do so, as inventiveness is unlimited, and contradictions would be continuous. All these attacks are made on me and on others merely to cloud the real issue, "Did Mr. Judge, or did he not, commit frauds?"— A.B.

I have just read *The Plot against the Theosophical Society*, containing Dr. Keightley's latest remarks. I am amazed at the absolutely baseless assertions they contain. What has happened to my old friend I do not know, for I recognize neither his style nor nature in the printed words which will remain to his discredit. — G.R.S. MEAD.

6. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, May 1895, pp.132-133.

[132]

“THE JUDGE CASE.”

FINAL REFUSAL TO GIVE COPIES OF DOCUMENTS TO ACCUSED.

In order to give the prosecutors every opportunity I wrote in February to Colonel Olcott, asking again for copies of the written documents in his possession forming the basis of Mrs. Besant’s charges, and reminded him of his promise at London last July to send me the copies. While doubtful as to the result, I thought that perhaps he would see the propriety and wisdom of giving me the copies. But it is now quite evident that no intention ever existed to deal fairly. He replies under date of Feb. 26th, 1895, as follows:

“MY DEAR JUDGE,

“. . . I don’t know where you get your law from, but hang me if I ever heard of an accused who has been furnished with a copy of the charges pending against him, expecting that the documentary proofs in the hands of the prosecuting attorney shall be given him before the issue is on for trial. . . . I have given copies to nobody; Old’s copies were taken by him before the action began and *while he was the custodian* [italics mine.—J.] of the documents *prior* to their coming into my possession. He had no right to take them or to use them. How many duplicates he may have made and given out I cannot imagine. . . .—H. S. O.”

[133] The *law* requires inspection and copies of letters if demanded by the accused; Theosophy and brotherhood would not require less than law.

It is singular that Mr. Old was the “custodian before” Olcott got the letters, when many of them were letters to Olcott himself. This part of the letter is, of course, untrue—to call a spade by its name. He calmly admits that Old as an enemy was allowed to take copies—Olcott having handed the originals over to Old out of his despatch box—and shows he does not care really how many duplicates were made. But the accused cannot have the copies.

It may be that as Olcott is coming to London this summer “to settle the Judge case,” as he says himself, he is keeping the copies from me because of some new campaign he is aiding the virulent prosecutors to begin.

The Theosophical Society has become, in Europe and India, a detective bureau, an organization for assaults on character, for punishments, and has ceased to be a portion of the real theosophical movement.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

7. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, May 1895, pp.133-136.

[133]

ADEPTS AND MEDIUMS.

IN *The Theosophist* for April appears a “postscript” by Colonel Olcott, repudiating the letter sent by one of the Masters through H. P. B. to certain Brahmans, which was published by Mr. Judge in the April *Path* and declared by him to be genuine. Colonel Olcott asserts that the communication contains “palpable proof of fraudulency” in that he thinks it to be “an ill-tempered attack” on Brahman orthodoxy, and that moreover, it “grossly violates that basic principle of neutrality and eclecticism on which the Theosophical Society has built itself from the beginning.” There are many, however, who differ absolutely from the Colonel in their opinion of this letter, and consider it to be one of the finest of the series. It is reprinted in a recent pamphlet issued to many members of the T. S., who will be able to judge for themselves. It is a candid but just criticism, not of the spirit of the Brahmanic philosophy, but of the hard forms, castes and creeds which have grown up around it, and which it was H. P. B.’s mission to break up and sweep away from all religions.

Colonel Olcott twice misquotes from the letter a very important word. He says that it asks the Brahman to “repudiate his religious beliefs, cast aside his splendid Scriptures and turn *Buddhist*!” Italics are mine. And again he quotes a passage thus: “which of them is ready to become a Buddhist, a *Nâstika*, as they call us.” The word used in the letter is “*Budhist*,” not “Buddhist.” Why does he so mis-[134] quote it when H. P. B. has so carefully explained the radical difference between the two words? Owing to the impression conveyed by the title of Mr. Sinnett’s book, *Esoteric Buddhism*, that Theosophy was only a form of Buddhism, she explained in her Introduction to *The Secret Doctrine* that Buddhism is the religious system of ethics preached by the Lord Gautama, and named after his title of Buddha, “the Enlightened,” while Budha means “wisdom” or knowledge (Vidya), the faculty of cognizing, from the Sanskrit root “budh,” to know. She further said that Buddhism is not correctly spelt or pronounced in English, and should be Buddhaism. The word *Nâstika* means, according to *The Theosophical Glossary*, one who does not worship or recognize the gods and idols.

Colonel Olcott advances the theory, which both he and Mrs. Besant have already applied to the case of Mr. Judge, that H. P. B. was a medium not always responsible for what was given through her. He is driven to invent this miserable and insulting excuse in order to avoid accusing her of conscious fraud. This theory is untenable, and to prove it I cannot do better than quote from an article by Jasper Niemand, entitled, “Judge the Act, Not the Person,” which appeared in *The Path* of July, 1889. The writer there says:

“What difference is there between the instrumentality of H. P. B. and that of any transmitting medium? There is that radical difference which exists between the two extremes called by us poles. H. P. B. is an Adept; the other not. The Adept is such by virtue of the active principle. The medium is such by virtue of the passive principle. . . . H. P. B. is an active, conscious agent, acting through will power, having attained the power of perfect registration and trained concentration, able *at all times* to give a full account of all she knows, and one fitted to the development of the questioner, one responding to his physical, astral or spiritual sense. She is learned, acute, profound; disease of the body has not impaired her work, its quality, quantity, or her fidelity to it. The great proof is thorough comprehension, to the fullest depth, of all she has taken or received, AND THE BODY OF H. P. B. IS HER OWN INSTRUMENT; SHE EVEN HOLDS IT BACK FROM DISSOLUTION.” [Capitals mine.—B. C.]

The medium theory being disposed of, a second question arises out of the position taken up by Mrs. Besant, Colonel Olcott and others.

Granting that H. P. B. was a Messenger from the Masters, would those Masters Whose name had once been taken in vain ever use the same instrument again?

The answer is undoubtedly No. All that has been written by H. P. B., by W. Q. Judge, by Jasper Niemand and others on the rules of occult

[135] training, on the qualifications necessary for real chelaship, on the sacred relations between Master and chela, prove that such a thing is utterly impossible. H. P. B. has written that all the so-called “occult” letters must stand together or fall together. Yet it is sought to get rid of what is not approved by inventing theories which throw mud at the Masters and Their Messenger, and which violate the cardinal rules of Occultism. This is a question for those to whom the existence of Mahâtmas is a fact or a matter of personal belief, and that is why the charges against Mr. Judge can never be tried without fixing the dogma upon the T. S. Those who take teaching and advice from one whom they believe to be a Messenger of THE LODGE cannot say that some is true and some false. They may test by their intuition and assimilate what they can, but they may not attempt to put the seal of their paltry condemnation upon that which does not seem to them to be good. H. P. B. once wrote in *Lucifer* that “a member of the E. S. who receives instructions emanating from the Masters of the Occult Philosophy, and doubts at the same time the genuineness of the source, or the honesty of the humble transmitter of the old esoteric doctrines—LIES TO HIS OWN SOUL, AND IS UNTRUE TO HIS PLEDGE.” [Capitals mine.—B. C.]

Hear also this extract from “the words of great Teachers,” given by H. P. B. to her pupils as “the golden stairs up which the learner may climb to the Temple of Divine Wisdom”:

“. . . A LOYAL SENSE OF DUTY TO THE TEACHER, A WILLING OBEDIENCE TO THE BEHESTS OF TRUTH, ONCE WE HAVE PLACED OUR CONFIDENCE IN, AND BELIEVE THAT TEACHER TO BE IN POSSESSION OF IT. . . .”

We have, then, these definite facts before us at last—I speak to those only who believe in Mahâtmas and that they communicate through chosen disciples.

1. That both H. P. B. and Mr. Judge are accused of making bogus messages.
2. That it is admitted that genuine messages were delivered by H. P. B. and Mr. Judge *after* those which are alleged to be false.
3. That the charges cannot be gone into before the T. S. without fixing the dogma of the Mahâtmas upon it.

Finally Colonel Olcott asserts that the question of this letter to the Brahmans does not bear upon the issues which [he thinks] he will have to judicially dispose of in London. I say that it is the fundamental and only issue, the complaint in both cases being identical at the root, and the step that the President has now definitely taken shows more clearly than ever that H. P. B. is the real centre of attack, and through her the [136] movement she sacrificed so much to call into being. Once let her image be dimmed, once let her integrity be shaken, and it will be but the beginning of the end. For remember that *Esoteric Buddhism* was built on some of the “occult” letters, and that *The Secret Doctrine* will lose its foundation stones if H. P. B. was not true as steel to her trust.

So let the indomitable loyalty of William Q. Judge to his Teacher and ours be the keynote to our action, and let us help him to keep unbroken the links which bind us to the Head and Heart of our movement, without whom it would not exist to-day.

BASIL CRUMP.

8. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, May 1895, pp.137-140.

[137]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

*To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.**April 17th, 1895.*

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—April *Lucifer* calls for a word or two of comment. Mr. Bertram Keightley sets forth “with extreme reluctance” to “controvert” certain statements made by Dr. Archibald Keightley, who is at present in America. It is probably not for the first time in the history of the Theosophical Society that letters have been written “with extreme reluctance.” But Mr. B. Keightley, in his letter to *Lucifer*, is particularly careful to controvert nothing. He vaguely disputes Dr. Keightley’s account of the legal procedure which Mrs. Besant did *not* follow, but does not say which item set forth by Dr. Keightley—who had been professionally advised in regard to what he wrote—is, in his own opinion, incorrect; nor does he give what he considers to be the proper procedure.

Mr. B. Keightley next promises members that they will soon have “the whole of the evidence in their hands”—but in regard to this point I need only refer your readers to the pamphlet recently issued, *The Plot against the Theosophical Society*, where the nature of the proposed publication is explained. The “whole of the evidence” is, of course, nonsensical. Mr. B. Keightley is not reckless enough to assert that Mrs. Besant’s prosecutor’s “brief,” which Mr. Mead proposes to publish, contains copies of the seventy-eight and more exhibits specified as the “evidence” against Mr. Judge. Mr. B. Keightley *knows* that the “brief” does not contain copies of “the whole of the evidence.” Why does he go out of his way to make a statement which is not correct, and which is calculated to delude a number of members?

The next paragraph of his letter is ingenious. At the meeting at Richmond, in July, 1894, Mr. B. Keightley says that “Mrs. Besant did not ‘promise Mr. Judge that he should have copies of all the evidence’ *in the sense of any undertaking to provide him with such.*” Has Mr. B. Keightley discovered a way of promising to give something to someone, without implying an “undertaking to provide him with such”? That is what he asks us to believe. Must we believe it? That would be a Jesuitical promise; would it be Brahmanical?

Then in regard to what took place at the Judicial Committee: Mr. B. Keightley’s memory is “in entire accord” with the memories of Messrs. Mead, Kingsland, Firth and Sinnett. That is unfortunate, for a reference to the March *Vâhan* shows that he is in accord with emptiness. Mr. Mead there says that his “memory” is “defective” as to what took place, and the other members I have named were “defective” with him, if we are to accept Mr. Mead’s statement. But Mr. B. Keightley so phrases his assertion as to lead the unwary to imagine that he remembers something; whilst, in fact, he says that, like Mr. Mead, he remembers nothing. Is that Brahmanical? Mr. Judge, Dr. Keightley, Mr. James M. Pryse and myself have a positive recollection of a request being made by Mr. Judge for copies of the so-called evidence. Does Mr. B. Keightley imagine that his bad memory affects our statement?

[138] Mr. B. Keightley wisely makes his next paragraph unintelligible. But in spite of italics and a “*verb. sap.*” at its close, he in no way disputes Dr. Keightley’s statements that (a) the circular of Nov. 3rd was given to *The Westminster Gazette*, either directly or indirectly, by one of Mrs. Besant’s own E. S. T. Council; (b) that if it was sent to an expelled member in India—a fact not yet proven—this was due to the carelessness or laziness of Mrs. Besant’s London office, which did not inform the New York office of such expulsion, and (c) that in no case could Mr. Judge have had anything to do with sending it out.

I may add that such care was taken to avoid sending the circular to expelled members in India, that to this day some twenty Indian members have not received a copy for fear that they too might come under that head. This was done because those who sent out that circular, myself among them, were aware of much recent

carelessness at the London office in Avenue Road, and were also aware that Mrs. Besant considered a large proportion of the members in India what she called “untrustworthy.” Without knowledge of our own to go upon, we were obliged to trust to some extent to her opinion, and therefore did not send to a considerable number, as I have said.

But this should show that both Mrs. Besant and Mr. B. Keightley, in mentioning this circular at the Adyar Convention as “quasi-privately circulated,” were either deceived, or were using what I will call personal imagination to further their end and aim and aspiration of expelling Mr. Judge from the Theosophical Society. Here I do not mean that Mr. B. Keightley has a positive aim and end of the sort; I refer to him rather as faithful Echo. But I do assert that Mrs. Besant has made the expulsion of Mr. Judge a clause in her creed. Does not Mrs. Besant’s communication to the February *Lucifer* prove this? Did not Mrs. Besant write to London in a letter that was received on Feb. 4th, 1895, that “if the European Section will back up the Indian Section, Mr. Judge will be expelled from the Society in July, as he ought to be”? And this in spite of the emotion-moving conclusion to Mrs. Besant’s *Daily Chronicle* letter, in which she said that Christ ate with sinners, and that she would take no part “in trying to ostracize him (Mr. Judge) from future work *in the Society.*” Was this change in Mrs. Besant’s attitude due to longer residence in India?

Mr. B. Keightley’s last three paragraphs he perhaps intends as a joke, but I would suggest that joking has necessary limits, and that to speak of the “evidence *produced* against him (Mr. Judge) last July” savors too much of a “joke” once perpetrated on a man by his younger brother, who swore a criminal information against him “just for the fun of the thing.”

Before leaving Mr. B. Keightley I should like to point out to him, as also to Mrs. Besant and Mr. Mead, a phrase in Colonel Olcott’s letter published in the same issue of *Lucifer* (April), in which the Colonel lays down the following as one of the “conditions” under which he will confide to Mrs. Besant “the documents” to be used against Mr. Judge: “On the conditions of . . . your placing your statement and the evidence in the hands of the General Secretary of the European Section for distribution to Branches and members, AND OF HIS SUPPLYING A CERTIFIED COPY OF THE EVIDENCE TO MR. JUDGE FOR HIS INFORMATION AND USE.” And so Colonel Olcott recognizes the fact that up to the present day Mr. Judge has no such copies, and that Mr. Judge’s statement to that effect is correct. And will Mrs. Besant and [139] Mr. Mead (the latter acting on Mrs. Besant’s assertion) now apologize for their reiterated misstatements to the contrary effect? I doubt it.

It is still possible to laugh heartily and good-naturedly at many of the absurdities committed by those who are so vigorously hounding Mr. Judge, as Dr. Keightley laughs in his “Luciferian Legends,” but now and then it is not easy to restrain a feeling of great and almost irrepressible indignation at their method of carrying on this nineteenth century man-hunt.

It is, however, of interest to note that the prosecutors are not agreed as to the crimes (?) about which complaint is made. Compare the following statements:

MRS. BESANT.

It is stated by Mr. Judge that “I practised black magic on Mr. Judge and two others.”—*Should Mr. Judge Resign?* p.11

Mr. Judge’s circular “contains unproven accusations of the most shocking character — namely, of black magic—against a T. S. member,

MR. B. KEIGHTLEY.

“Now even Mr. Judge himself does not accuse Mrs. Besant of any wilful wrong-doing On the contrary, he throughout alleges that she is deluded, ‘has had herself no conscious evil intention.’ . . .”

It should be noted that the above statement was made by Mr. B. Keightley in his circular on A

. . . and against myself. . .” —*Lucifer*, p.466, February.

Common-Sense View, etc., AFTER the diametrically opposite statement had been circulated by Mrs. Besant. But the difference was adapted to support a different argument, it may be urged!

A word or two in regard to Mr. Mead. As junior editor of *Lucifer* he devoted much space in the March “Watch-Tower” to calling me many names. Now that did not interest me, and there is no reason why it should have done so. I wondered for a few moments whom it could interest, but presumed that Mr. Mead knew his readers better than I—for I am very rarely one of them—and so went on with my work. Mr. Mead praised my writings, but I have quite forgiven him that. It was the worst there was to forgive! But I have no intention of entering into that matter so far as Mr. Mead thought it concerned myself. I only wish to point out that he endeavoured to draw into his scurrilous and silly defence of himself the name of a lady who has taken no public part in any of these proceedings; that the lady’s husband (Dr. A. Keightley) then wrote a letter of protest, utterly disproving Mr. Mead’s attempted insinuation and showing that Mr. Mead’s statements in regard to this lady were (a) untrue, (b) vulgar, (c) libellous. This letter appeared in the April *Lucifer*. Did Mr. Mead apologize for his previous misstatements? Did he withdraw his insinuation of deception? He did neither, and I hardly expected that he would. He thought the natural protest of a gentleman and a husband under such circumstances “too ridiculous to need a reply.” It would, of course, appear to be so to Mr. Mead. Constant practice must make it a matter of trivial importance to accuse other people of fraud, deception and so forth. Protest against such false insinuations and accusations would certainly then appear absurd. For if one were to judge by a standard of ordinary behavior it would appear that Mr. Mead no longer takes into account the truth of the accusation he makes. That, to him, is of [140] no importance; what is of importance is *that the accusation shall be made*. Yet I am quite well aware that it would be foolish to judge Mr. Mead from the standpoint of ordinary behavior. Thank Heaven, it is not my duty to judge him at all, and I think that his action is largely explained by nervous over-strain and loss of balance. He is excited and does not think, so we will wish him a quick recovery and better luck in the future.

But a statement made by Dr. Keightley in his letter to the junior editor is disputed by “B. K.,” apparently as co-junior editor. Dr. A. Keightley wrote: “Mrs. Besant was informed [as to the personal identity of Che-Yew-Tsäng] immediately on her return from the Chicago Congress, and it was by her express desire (reiterated in her letters from India) that you [the junior editor] were not told.” To this “B. K.” volunteers a footnote: “This last statement has been expressly and emphatically denied by Mrs. Besant in recent letters” (p. 160).

To this I can only say that I absolutely refuse to believe such a thing of Mrs. Besant until I see it clearly stated over her own name. If I ever see that I shall have something more to say.

It is a minor point, and certainly does not concern either myself or the morality of my past actions. But it concerns a clear statement made by Dr. Keightley which I know to be true, and to which a secondhand denial is given by “B. K.” It would be superfluous to endorse Dr. Keightley’s statement. If it is called in question at any time ample endorsement will be forthcoming.

But how I wish that *Lucifer* would check its down-hill career of licentious slander; how I wish it would return to its original purpose of propagating Theosophy! We must all hope that *Lucifer* may usefully survive, but the facts are ominous and call to mind the ancient saying that “those whom the god would destroy he first makes mad.”

Fraternally yours,

ERNEST T. HARGROVE.

25, Lancaster Gate, Hyde Park, London, W.

[It should be noted that the above was written on April 17th, being received in Dublin on the 18th—long before the appearance of the May *Vâhan* and of Mrs. Besant's "brief" against Mr. Judge. These further confirm several of Mr. Hargrove's statements.—ED.]

9. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, May 1895, p.140.

To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.

May 2nd, 1895.

DEAR BROTHER,—We send you herewith the monthly report of this Lodge and trust you will be able to find room for it in your magazine. Unfortunately we are precluded from the pages of *The Vâhan* by the censorship now being exercised by its editor; for this identical report was sent to *The Vâhan* for insertion, only to be mutilated by having every word that referred, in terms of trust and loyalty, to W. Q. Judge cut out.

We would take this opportunity of suggesting that you should at once start an "Activities Column," and invite reports from all those Lodges and Centres which, in supporting Bro. Judge, are unable to get their reports inserted in *The Vâhan*. It can no longer be said that *The Vâhan* is an official organ of the European Section. We trust you will see your way to adopting this idea.

We are, dear brother, fraternally yours,

103, Bow Road, London, E.

GORDON ROWE,
WALTER H. BOX, **A** Hon. Secs.

10. Two Letters from E.T. Hargrove to **The Irish Theosophist** (May 14th and 31st, 1895), Vol.3, June 1895, p.160.

[160]

To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.

May 14th, 1895.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—Mrs. Annie Besant has succeeded in breaking her own record. Very soon after the death of H. P. B. we see her rushing over to America, bringing accusations against Colonel Olcott, clamoring for his removal. Omitting minor instances, we next find her writing of H. P. B. as largely responsible for the “crimes” of her favorite pupil. In both cases acting privately and speaking of both Colonel Olcott and H. P. B. meanwhile in the highest terms, for the benefit of the public. After informing several persons that Mr. Judge was a “forger,” under promises of secrecy, we next find her publicly attacking him, and one by one all those who do not agree with her in this respect are added to her little list of criminals—Dr. Archibald Keightley being the latest addition. Fortunately there is too much of comedy in the situation to permit of serious indignation for any length of time.

In the April issue of *Lucifer*, Dr. Keightley wrote in regard to Che-yew-Ts [ng and Mr. Mead’s travesty of events in relation to the writing of “Some Modern Failings.” Dr. Keightley stated that it was at Mrs. Besant’s express desire that Mr. Mead was not told as to the personal identity of the writer. “B. K.” volunteered a footnote to the effect that Mrs. Besant denied this statement. In the May issue of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST I wrote that I must refuse to believe such a thing of Mrs. Besant until I saw it over her own name. This was because I knew Dr. Keightley’s statement in regard to Mrs. Besant’s connection with the matter to be correct in every detail.

And now, in the May *Vâhan*, Mrs. Besant offers this denial for whatever it may be worth. She flatly contradicts Dr. Keightley’s account, and giving this as her only instance, bases upon it one of her characteristic accusations, amounting to a charge of wholesale lying—namely, that Dr. Keightley has been circulating “many extraordinary and false statements” about her during her absence from England.

I do not write in order to defend Dr. Keightley. It would be simply absurd to offer a defense when Mrs. Besant is the only accuser and the only witness. It would, in any case, be absurd to defend him from a charge of such a nature. But it is a good instance of the mental delusion from which Mrs. Besant would appear to be suffering. It is, in any case, my duty to state the facts.

Dr. Keightley wrote in “Luciferian Legends”: “We therefore suggested that Mrs. Besant be told who the Chinaman was. This was done on the evening of Friday, Oct. 6th, 1893, in our sitting-room at 17, Avenue Road, Mrs. Besant, Mrs. Keightley, Mr. Hargrove and myself being present. Mrs. Keightley, who has always had a loyal regard for Mr. Mead, then suggested that Mr. Mead be told. Mrs. Besant opposed this, on the ground that the feelings of Mr. Mead would be hurt. . . . However, Mrs. Besant adding, ‘Do not tell these children’ (referring to Mr. Mead and other residents at headquarters), it was then agreed that no one should be told.”

As stated by Dr. Keightley, I was present during the whole of that conversation, naturally following it with the closest attention, making a note of it in my diary that same evening (thus being able to supply the date), and I give my word of honor that Dr. Keightley’s account as above set forth is accurate in every detail.

[161] And what does the fourth person present say? In the May *Vâhan* Mrs. Besant denies the above account, putting forward an exactly opposite statement, asserting, “On the contrary, I advised Mr. Hargrove to tell Mr.

Mead.” The fact is, the whole of Mrs. Besant’s first paragraph does not contain a word of truth, and the only correct statement made in it is the short sentence: “The facts are simple.”

Here you have three people. Mrs. Keightley (Jasper Niemand), Dr. Archibald Keightley and myself, the word of each being at any time at least as good as Mrs. Besant’s, agreeing perfectly as to what transpired, stating that they have often referred to that conversation since, and now contradicted by the only other person present—Mrs. Besant. That should be sufficient in itself. But there is much more to say. It is not simply a question of veracity, three to one. It is a question of common-sense.

It should, at least, be evident that Dr. and Mrs. Keightley and myself must be totally disinterested in the matter. It is trivial in itself. It is only of interest as a side-light on Mrs. Besant’s state of mind. Her approval or disapproval of my action as Che-Yew-Tsang conveys nothing to me. Her approval would certainly not imply that my action was right; her disapproval could not possibly show that it was wrong. I alone am judge of that, and I am not interested in the opinions of those who do not know the facts. No one could imagine that either Dr. or Mrs. Keightley are personally interested. No other two members have made greater sacrifices for the Theosophical Society, both financially and otherwise. No two other members could have less to gain by association with it; few have as much to lose, for in a worldly sense we do so lose—in England at all events.

I do not believe that Mrs. Besant deliberately says what is false, but I make it a distinct issue that either she is hopelessly deluded and confused, or that Dr. and Mrs. Keightley and myself are deliberately lying. It is impossible to conceive that we can have collectively forgotten, or collectively “made a mistake.” It is either an unmitigated lie or it is true.

Examine the probabilities, apart from the fact that there are three witnesses against one, and that the accuracy and memory of that one have already been very seriously questioned. Mrs. Besant asserts that she advised me to tell Mr. Mead, and that I agreed to do so. (1) Mrs. Besant was at that time one of the outer heads of the E. S. T., of which I was a member. Those who know me must be aware that in a case of that sort, where no question of right or wrong was involved, I should have at once followed Mrs. Besant’s advice, and with as little delay as possible, if she had advised any such thing. (2) If Mrs. Besant’s version be correct, I failed to keep my alleged promise to her, by not telling Mr. Mead. Why, then, did she not mention the matter to me, either verbally or by letter? I find an entry in the diary which I then kept, that on Sunday, Oct. 17th, 1893, eleven days after Mrs. Besant had been told who the writer was, and two days after the first article had actually appeared—I had a long conversation with Mrs. Besant in “H. P. B.’s room” at 19, Avenue Road; that I then gave Mrs. Besant an outline of what I proposed to say in my next article; that I consulted her as to whether it should be sent in for the November or for the December issues of *Lucifer*; that she told me she knew that most of the “I. G.” regarded her as a “deluded psychic,” etc.; but no question about telling Mr. Mead, although I had had eleven days in which [162] to do so after having told her that it should be done. Did my alleged “failure to perform” cause her much anxiety?

(3) Repeating the question: Why did she not mention her alleged wish or advice again, seeing that she knew I had not told Mr. Mead and that many enquiries continued to be made as to the writer of “Some Modern Failings”? I have shown that, although talking future articles over with me, she never suggested such a thing. And how was it that in her letters from India, both to Dr. and Mrs. Keightley and myself, she said no word of reminder? As was shown in “Luciferian Legends,” Mrs. Besant wrote in reference to “the Chinaman,” and in a tone of very distinct trust and friendship; but no mention of telling Mr. Mead, only the words, “But don’t give them [Mr. Mead and others] the letter, as I have put ‘the Chinaman.’” In a letter to myself, dated Jan. 16th, 1894, after the appearance of the second article in *Lucifer*, Mrs. Besant wrote: “I did not think the Chinaman’s second article up to the level of his first [I did not wonder!]. . . . He will not mind the friendly

criticism.” Mrs. Besant then adds: “Mrs. Keightley’s influence, and the Doctor’s, have been invaluable at Headquarters, as indeed I felt sure would be the case.” But no word of reminder of my alleged unfulfilled promise; no question as to whether I should not tell Mr. Mead. Not a word!

Is more needed? Then take this sentence of Mrs. Besant’s from *The Vâhan*: “. . . but I should not have revealed Mr. Hargrove’s identity, as I was told it as a secret, and *unfair as it was to trap me* without my consent, I felt none the less bound.” Italics mine. The letters quoted in “Luciferian Legends,” and the facts given above, must seem strange as coming from one who had been “trapped unfairly”! Or is this more of “the Christ who ate with sinners”? If so, it was out-Christing Christ, I would suggest. But consider the matter further: Mrs. Besant says she was “trapped unfairly” on Oct. 6th. The first article was then in proof only. *Lucifer* did not appear till Oct. 15th. If she felt she had been trapped, why not have stopped the appearance of the article? It would have been easy. It was what would have been done *if* Mrs. Besant had been “trapped unfairly.” Those who know her know this. And I assert that Mrs. Besant gave no verbal promise of secrecy in any shape or form. She was not asked for any promise, nor did she volunteer one. There was an understood “promise of secrecy” on the part of Dr. and Mrs. Keightley, as well as on the part of Mrs. Besant, as I stated in *The Path*. But there was no verbal promise given in any case, and all assertion as to “trusting” to anyone’s “honor” bears its absurdity on its face. In this I directly contradict Mrs. Besant. But it is not merely a question of contradiction. A few days after Mrs. Besant had been told, and had *not* promised secrecy verbally, Dr. and Mrs. Keightley left for the north of England. I wrote them, pointing out that Mrs. Besant had given no promise. I wondered if she would tell Mr. Chakravarti. Telling Mr. Mead would have been one thing; telling Mr. Chakravarti quite another. Mrs. Keightley replied on behalf of herself and Dr. Keightley. I still have that letter. She wrote that any formal promise would be a “crude superfluity.” Remembering Mrs. Besant’s words at the time she was told, I at once agreed to this view. But how account for this letter if Mrs. Besant had been asked for or had given her word of honor that she would keep the matter private?

The thing is absurd. I repeat again that there is not a single word [163] of truth in the whole of that long paragraph under the heading, “The Chinaman,” in May *Vâhan*. Mrs. Besant seems to go through some such sub-conscious process as this in “remembering”: What *would* I have said?—arguing from her present state of consciousness. Then this “would have said” immediately becomes “did say.” She is utterly confused—and I do not wonder at it.

The Case against W. Q. Judge is full of similar instances. Accusation gone mad. A volume might be written on the subject, but I should hope the above is sufficient.

One word more as to a pamphlet just issued by the Countess Wachtmeister, entitled *H. P. B. and the Present Crisis in the Theosophical Society*. I am not surprised at its having been written, but surely it was published without the consent of the Countess Wachtmeister’s friends! It consists almost entirely of what H. P. B. is supposed to have said to the Countess some years ago. One extract from a letter is given to which I will refer later. I am obliged to flatly contradict one statement she makes. On page 10 of her pamphlet she says: “Mrs. Archibald Keightley also confirmed this statement [that H. P. B. had reincarnated], telling me that she had seen and conversed with H. P. B. in her new body. This autumn Mrs. Keightley said to me that she had been mistaken in her vision.” Taking the last statement first, I can only say that I was present during the whole of that conversation, which took place in the drawing-room at 62, Queen Anne Street, in the autumn of 1894. I was calling upon Dr. and Mrs. Keightley at the same time as the Countess and her son. Dr. Keightley was present. I sat between Mrs. Keightley and the Countess during the greater part of the conversation between them, and close beside them during the remainder. I heard every word that was said, and I absolutely deny that Mrs. Keightley said what the Countess puts into her mouth. If asked by the Countess to repeat that conversation, I will do so. She may remember some statements she made in regard to the occupants of 19, Avenue Road.

In regard to the first part of her statement: I was not present when Mrs. Keightley is alleged to have made this very remarkable and highly improbable statement. But at Maidenhead, when staying at Miss Müller's with Mr. Mead, the Countess and others, very shortly after this conversation is alleged to have taken place, the Countess gave me an entirely different version of it which flatly contradicts her present account. I did not say a word about it to Mrs. Keightley, but some weeks later she herself told me what she had said to the Countess, and this version agreed exactly with what the Countess had before told me. So I have the Countess's first version, confirmed independently by Mrs. Keightley, which absolutely contradicts her statement as made in her recent production. I therefore conclude that all the other hearsay which the Countess volunteers, from conversations with H. P. B. to those with Mr. Judge is, to put it mildly, faulty.

But the Countess does quote one letter which is of interest, and I thank her for doing so. She supplies a missing link. In the Preface to *The Case against W. Q. Judge*, p. 10, Mrs. Besant says: "It was these experiences, related to her by me, that H. P. Blavatsky wrote to Mr. Judge under date March 27th, 1891: 'She hears the Master's voice when alone, sees His Light, and recognizes His voice from that of D—.'" Mrs. Besant quotes this as a complete sentence, without asterisks to show the omission of words. It is put forward as a sentence [164] by itself. Now turn to what the Countess gives as the whole sentence, and notice the words left out by Mrs. Besant, who is so very particular about other people's "lack of straight-forwardness" that she cannot exist in the same Society with one whom she merely *accuses* of such a thing. Turn to the omitted words: "She [Mrs. Besant] *is not psychic nor spiritual in the least—all intellect*, and yet she hears Master's voice," etc. Italics mine. But why did Mrs. Besant quote as a complete sentence what was only part of one? Why did she leave out those very pregnant words, "*She is not psychic nor spiritual in the least—all intellect*"?

Bah! Why will not people try to purify themselves before trying to crucify others for alleged "lack of straight-forwardness." "If it were not for delusion such action could only be called hypocritical." But I would to God they would stop these slanders and leave others to go on with the work. It may here and there be momentarily amusing, but such amusement becomes monotonous. Here are thousands crying out for these eternal verities, for a knowledge of Karma and Reincarnation, and the time is taken up by attacks on Mr. Judge and his friends and in necessary refutation and defence. I say it is a shame. Let us go on with the Work, the Work, and leave time and great Karma to do the other work of scavenging if any at all be needed. Let us think of those who have not yet heard of Theosophy, and these petty attacks would soon be stopped and forgotten.—Fraternally yours,

E. T. HARGROVE.

25, Lancaster Gate, London, W.

I certify that I have seen the originals of all the letters quoted or cited by Mr. Hargrove, and that these quotations are correctly given.

BASIL CRUMP, *Temple*.

May 31st, 1895.

As Mrs. Besant's article in the May *Vâhan*, containing the above-mentioned incorrect assertions and accusations, required comment in the same journal, I wrote a letter to the editor endorsing Dr. Keightley's statement of fact. This I did well in time for the June issue, according to the usual rule. Mr. Mead had not the common courtesy to acknowledge the receipt of this letter, nor, as I now see, did he insert it. Is it possible that he thinks Mrs. Besant's attacks no longer require reply? Or must we take this as further proof that Mr. Mead is only interested in ventilating any accusation against one of "Mr. Judge's friends," since he will not insert an answer? Courtesy from our executive officer I have ceased to expect.

E. T. H.

11. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, June 1895, pp.164-165.

[164]

To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.

The following interesting letter is sent for publication, with the writer's consent:

MY DEAR —,

I have been away in the North or I would have written to you sooner *re* the statement lately published above the signature of the Countess Wachtmeister concerning Annie Besant's claim to supersede W. Q. Judge. As I have now read it I think my testimony may have some weight with those who were with us in the Lansdowne Road days, when first the E. S. was formed.

[165] I was sitting one afternoon with H. P. B. in the back part of the ground floor room of 17, Lansdowne Road; she was telling me about her disease, which was then beginning to grow very troublesome; she said she knew she must soon leave us. I asked her about the filling of the void and said it would be, so far as an ordinary man could judge, impossible adequately to fill it. She answered that W. Q. Judge was her favorite pupil and would worthily bear her mantle when she was gone. Shortly after he came over on a visit and she introduced me to him, saying distinctly that he was her destined successor. After he had gone back to America she always spoke of him in the same way to me and, I have no doubt, to others who were seeing her nearly every day. As for the letter quoted by Countess Wachtmeister, where H. P. B. couples Annie Besant with W. Q. Judge—she evidently hoped that all would proceed normally, and that no karmic flood would burst forth to whirl away a good woman on an evil tide; still, she seemed to know that some serious disturbance would surely occur after her departure. In this connection I asked her if she meant to reincarnate immediately; she answered that she would not do so but would be able to help in the good work better as a Nirmânakâya. This help is especially needed now that loyal support seems denied even to him who has been bearing the brunt of Philistine attack for so many years. But happily Judge is not yet surnamed Belisarius.—
Yours sincerely,

ROGER HALL.*

10, Southchurch Avenue, Southend, May 25th, 1895.

* William Alexander Roger Hall joined the Theosophical Society through the Blavatsky Lodge. His application is dated November 11th, 1888. Thomas. B. Harbottle and Bertram Keightley endorsed it. With H.P. Blavatsky, he co-endorsed two applications from Spain on May 22nd, 1889.

12. **The Vahan** Vol. 4, July 1895, pp.3-4.

[The following article dated May 21st, 1895, by J.C. Keightley, was also published in the **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, June 1895, pp.158-159. Included in the **I.T.**, but not included here, is another short note by J.C. Keightley in reference to Countess Wachtmeister's misunderstanding.]

[3] The Legend of "Che-Yew-Tsang."

[I had hoped that members would at last see the advisability of relieving THE VĀHAN of the incubus of controversy which has obsessed its pages for so many months, and would have gladly seized the announcement in the last number as a signal for the putting an end to personal matters. This, however, does not seem to be a universal desire, and so with much regret I print the following correspondence. This correspondence must now cease, and I further give notice that, if I am still in the editorial chair with the new volume, I shall cut out all such correspondence and also the controversial opinions of Secretaries embodied in Lodge reports.—G.R.S.M.]

To the Editor of THE VĀHAN

DEAR SIR,

Having read in THE VĀHAN for May, 1895, the statement of Mrs. Besant in regard to the "Chinaman" episode, I ask your editorial courtesy in order to say, definitely and clearly, that that statement, as such, is totally incorrect. I do not use the word "untrue," because, to my mind, that word would imply a conscious moral perversion on the part of Mrs. Besant, while I do not know—I have no means of knowing—what her state of consciousness is. When working with or for Mrs. Besant, whether in America or in England, I always required from her her directions *in writing*, in order to guarantee myself against her constant forgetfulness and her characteristic inability to admit herself to be mistaken—an inability which I was wont to call her "sun-spot." No human soul can maintain itself above its own experience for any great length of time; my experience inclines me to the belief that Mrs. Besant, when she changes her mental attitude, forgets much of what she thought and said under the influence of a prior state of consciousness. Examples of this on her part are not wanting, even from the English press. Hence I say advisedly that *the statement*, as such, is not true to fact.

Mrs. Besant herself requested that Mr. Mead be not told who the Chinaman was, and in response to my suggestion to the contrary, she gave as her reason, Mr. Mead's "feelings," and also the prevalent jealousy of the members of her household at 19, Avenue Road, in regard to the relations between herself and others. She used the words: "Do not tell these children." No promise of secrecy was asked from her at that interview, or ever, so far as my knowledge goes, but I understood that the usual *editorial* inviolability was implied. It was not worded.

Mrs. Besant sent me a letter from India, quoted in "Luciferian Legends," addressed inside to Dr. Keightley, the Chinaman and myself. In that letter she requests that it be not shown to Mr. Mead and two others (named; one, another employé of her own), because she had named the Chinaman. If *we* had asked her to keep the matter private, if the wish for secrecy towards these persons was *ours*, why ask *us* not to show them the letter?

If Mrs. Besant asked Mr. Hargrove to tell Mr. Mead of his identity, and Mr. Hargrove failed to do so, why her praise of Mr. Hargrove's moral worth in letters to me from India much later?

As to the matter of jealousy, I have a letter from Mrs. Besant which goes into that subject in relation to 19, Avenue Road with clear and kindly criticism of her household.

While I cannot ignore facts—and facts of record—it is not my present wish to publish these letters, which are of a personal character; but on my return to England I contemplate some arrangement for their inspection by some honourable person, under the auspices of the General Secretary for Europe (yourself); in the midst of a sudden and deep family affliction, I cannot now give my mind to such matters.

It was my hope that the literature of contention would pass into oblivion without the smallest contribution from me. Let others fulfil their Karma uninterrupted by my intrusion. But the attack of Mr. Mead upon Mr. Hargrove, and that of Mrs. Besant upon Dr. Keightley for telling the truth as known to him, leaves me no alternative if I would maintain the right of others to have justice. May I be pardoned the suggestion that there are persons of private life to whom truth and honour are none the less vitally dear because they do not make of them professional adjuncts? “I would have you to know I’ve an honour of my own, as good as yours, though I don’t prate about it all day long, as if it was a God’s miracle to have any. It seems quite natural to me; I keep it in its box till it’s [4] wanted.” So says one of Stevenson’s most living characters.

There are also those whom it is necessary to impugn and impeach—in the interests of the present self-righteous outbreak—because they will not forget that noble saying of Master K. H. in the letters of *The Occult World*:

“. . . We see a vast amount of difference between the two qualities of two equal amounts of energy expended by two men, of whom one, let us suppose, *is on his way to his daily quiet work*, and *another is on his way to denounce a fellow-creature at the police station*, while the men of science see none; . . .”

The italics are mine. We are, all of us, in danger of forgetting those early landmarks set up to direct pioneers upon the true Theosophical path; why not study them afresh then?

In conclusion, I beg to say that as my daily word is my word of honour to me, and as I strive ever to bring that more and more into accord with the unseen laws which alone are true, I can only affirm that the above is a true account of what took place (before three witnesses), such as I would give—and will give when desired—under oath in a court of justice. But I have no desire to influence others in their free choice between the true and the untrue facts. Right discrimination is their privilege. It is only attainable by the abandonment of the personal view.

Sincerely yours,
J.C. KEIGHTLEY

“Aeola,”
Wayne P.O.,
Penna., U.S.A.
May 21st, 1895.

13. **The Vahan**, Vol. 4, July 1895, p.4.

To the Editor of THE VĀHAN.

DEAR SIR,

In the *Irish Theosophist* for this month is a long letter from Mr. E. T. Hargrove in which he expressly and categorically denies the declarations made by Mrs. Besant in THE VĀHAN for May, that she never desired Mr. Hargrove to conceal his identity as the “Chinaman” from Mr. Mead. There is also a statement from Mrs. A. Keightley to the same effect. Four people, Mrs. Besant, Mrs. Keightley, Dr. Keightley, and Mr. Hargrove, were present at a particular interview. Three of them flatly contradict the other, and that other flatly contradicts them, on a subject about which it seems there could be no possible mistake. As an outsider, it is impossible for me to come to any conclusion on the subject, and I can only say that somebody comes perilously near lying.

But it leads me and many other members of the T. S., as I know, to look closely at a very important side of this discreditable business. I do not here criticise Mr. Hargrove’s action in writing the Che-Yew-Tsang articles in the way he did. I have my own opinion about it, which I am not ventilating now. Mr. Mead’s opinion of it, however, was that it was practically a fraud (*Lucifer* for March last) and that he was thereby led to build up a legend and deceive his fellow students. He held that Mr. Hargrove was guilty of duplicity and that his methods were “Judge” methods.

Now this exceedingly unpleasant further fact has to be faced, that Mrs. Besant knew of this alleged duplicity. About that there is no dispute. But she held her tongue, and allowed Mr. Mead and others to hug to their hearts the delusion that “Che-Yew-Tsang” was a great occultist. Now I want to say quite plainly that that was condoning the fraud, if fraud there were. And I say it for the sake of asking this question as a member of the T.S.: How much more of this sort of thing has there been? How often have the ordinary members of the T. S. been blinded and hood-winked in this way with the knowledge of those who should have known better? One important case at least I know of, where teaching has been given out as from the Master. The whole thing makes one rather sick.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT BURROWS.

68, Aberdeen Road,
Highbury Park, N.
June 19th, 1895.

14. **The Vahan**, Vol. 4, July 1895, pp.4-5.

[4] [It is perfectly absurd to try to make Mrs. Besant responsible for the floating of the Che-Yew-Tsang Legend, as she left England shortly after the appearance of the first article, Oct. 15th, 1893; in fact, she was only in England for a fortnight between her return from America and her departure for India. No one objects to the simple use of a pseudonym; but myth-making of the kind complained of is detestable, and the gravest of dangers in a Society where conditions for such legend-building are so easy.

Mr. Hargrove threatens me with the publication of my letters to the fictitious Chinaman: I hereby give my full consent to the publication of my notes anywhere and everywhere. I should, however, as a friend, advise Mr. Hargrove not to do so; it would only too clearly demonstrate the danger and heartlessness of the legend-

building of which I complain. I append a letter which did not help me to get at the truth, and which may throw some light on the making of legends.


At the end of May or beginning of June, 1894 (the letter is not dated) I received the following from Mrs. Keightley (“Jasper Niemand,” etc.), written from Richmond to me at Harrow.

“I wanted to see you to say what I now write; I am asked by the ‘Chinaman’ to say that Mr. Judge was told who that writer was some three months ago, and said he (W. Q. J.) had already denied all knowledge of the authorship to you, and should say no more. The ‘Chinaman’ does not wish it to be thought that W. Q. J. then knew what he now knows, *i.e.*, ‘whose *hand* wrote down the articles.’ I am also requested to say that ‘A. B. does not know who the author was, any more than the writer knows.’ I had these words written down so as to give them carefully to you. The writer wishes me to say also that the articles [5] were greatly over-rated, perhaps owing to the incog. and mystery surrounding the writer. I do not like mysteries, nor with you would I conceal any *of my own*. You first told me of the ‘Chinaman’s’ article. The moment after you told me, I saw a *psychic* something which told me who the writer was, as I believed.

“That afternoon, out in London, I met at a certain place a ‘Companion’ whom I had seen first in Convention Hall, unintroduced and unknown. As I told you, this person walked up behind me that afternoon and, as I turned my head, said: ‘I am the Chinaman. Silence’—and walked away.


“When you showed me the first article in proof, I recognised several of the things as some I had said, and the writer has now asked me to say that part of the matter was mine. But I did not then *know* the writer had ever heard me say them (the definition of intuition was one), nor do I *now* know how or when. Like you I ask no questions. When you showed me the second article I recognised H. S. O.’s words and felt anxious on that, but did not know how to reach the ‘Chinaman’ in time, as you did. [I wrote to the address given me by ‘Che-Yew-Tsang’—G.R.S.M.] I advised *your* being told, or the articles being stopped,—and the latter was chosen. I got permission to tell A. B. You will remember that I always kept reserve on them. The writer does not know the Force that came twice and then stopped. I think I do. It is not ‘I’ in any way. They are true and timely I think.”

This was written nearly six months after the articles, meantime there had been hints enough and to spare of the same nature. It is a small thing to be misled oneself, but it is a grave matter to have been made the means of misleading others. The italics in the above letter are Mrs. Keightley’s.—G.R.S.M.]



APPENDIX

F



W.Q. JUDGE'S LAST MESSAGES

Table Of Contents ~ Appendix F

1. W.Q. Judge's Last Messages. (An Introduction). By Compiler. 331
2. Transcript of Mr. Judge's May 7th, 1895 remarks. 332
Handwritten notes of letter prepared by Mr. Judge and read on his behalf
before The Aryan T.S. on May 7th, 1895.
(from the Archives of The Theosophical Society, Pasadena — previously unpublished) . 333-337
[The note "Read before Aryan Br on May 7 '95" is in Joseph H. Fussell's handwriting.]
3. Transcript of Mr. Judge's notes for the Anniversary of the T.S. 338-341
Handwritten notes by Mr. Judge, President, of his Annual Address to The Aryan T.S.,
read on his behalf before The Aryan T.S. in November 1895.
(from the Archives of The Theosophical Society, Pasadena — previously unpublished) . 342-359
[Date was added by Joseph H. Fussell, Mr. Judge's private secretary.]
4. "The Last Days of W.Q. Judge." By E.T. Hargrove.
Theosophy (The Path), Vol. 11, May 1896, pp.34-37. 360-362
5. "The Cremation." By Claude Falls Wright.
Tributes by C.F. Wright, E.T. Hargrove and James Pryse.
Theosophy (The Path), Vol. 11, May 1896, pp.38-40. 363-366

1. W.Q. JUDGE'S LAST MESSAGES.
(An Introduction)

1895 was a very busy year for Theosophists around the World, especially in Europe. Judge's accusers counted on full support from the European members as a result of the accusations brought to the Judicial Committee but instead found that many came to his defense. The controversy over who said what and when was carried in the theosophical magazines. G.R.S. Mead who had just recovered from influenza, followed by a complete breakdown, was still extremely weak. He was the editor of **The Vahan** and co-editor of **Lucifer** as well. Both were published on the H.P.B. Press. On January 1st, 1895, orders came from Mrs. Besant and Bertram Keightley to close the Press, partly in an effort to rid themselves of James M. Pryse, co-editor of **The Vahan**. Because of this, many of the letters from European members regarding this controversy could only have their voices heard through **The Irish Theosophist**.



Printed on the H. P. B. Press.

Meanwhile, in America some of the members were very upset with the tactics being used against Mr. Judge. For example, the Annie Besant T.S. in Fort Wayne, Indiana, requested consent from the Aryan T.S. Executive Committee to change their name to the Fort Wayne T.S.

In August Judge issued the following NOTICE:

I am compelled to absent myself from Headquarters because of the state of my health, as the great amount of overwork during the past few years, and the terrific strain I have been subjected to for over a year, added to a bad cold contracted in Chicago last December while visiting the Branches, have made great inroads on my physical health which must be repaired. All T.S. and other business will go on as usual at Headquarters *and in my name* as before. Members and correspondents will therefore *not address letters to other names*. I am officially there, and all important matter is forwarded to me for attention and signature. All remittances also should be made to my name; otherwise trouble and confusion will result.

Although this was the release issued for the public, Judge's reason was to get away from the constant astral harassment he was subjected to while staying in New York. He alluded to this in his May 7th, 1895, letter to the Aryan Branch which follows.

Despite all the controversy, interest by persons seeking membership was high. Regular meetings of the Aryan T.S. started on Tuesday, September 3rd. Because of increased attendance and further anticipated increase in the coming months, a system of cards or tickets was used for visitors and associate memberships were offered. Meetings of the Aryan T.S. were held on Tuesdays and Sundays. Ushers were appointed to attend to visitors. As attendance increased to over one hundred at some of the regular meetings, Chickering Hall, with a seating capacity of eighteen hundred people was acquired for public Sunday morning lectures. The regular Sunday morning lecturer, Claude Falls Wright, presented his first talk on October 13th at 11 A.M.

On Saturday, October 5th, the trustees of the Aryan T.S. held an "off-night", feeling that a reunion would draw members closer together and provide opportunity to meet visitors. Music, singing and whistling, along with a magic-lantern show, were part of the entertainment. The evening concluded with readings from unpublished works of Robert Louis Stevenson and those remaining late conversed past midnight.

During part of his absence from headquarters Judge stayed with Dr. Buck in Cincinnati. On Tuesday, September 17th, 1895, he delivered perhaps his last remarks to a gathering of one hundred and fifty, on "The Three Objects of the Theosophical Society". Judge was not well enough to attend the meetings and gatherings in New York. In November he sent his Annual Report to The Aryan Theosophical Society in time for the Anniversary of what he considered the original Theosophical Society.

— Compiler

2. Read before Aryan Br on May 7 '95

Dear Friends:

I had hoped to attend a meeting of the Branch for the purpose of seeing and talking with you, but the orders of physicians are such that I cannot go out at night unless it is unavoidable. So I write these few words in order to bid you good bye for a while, as I am going away before your next meeting to stay long enough to secure a safe condition of health.

The present state I am in physically is due to several causes. I have overworked myself for many years, day and night, for the theosophical cause as there were but few to do anything. But of late the number of earnest workers has so increased I can feel that a complete rest is possible. Perhaps the overwork I have spoken of would not have resulted so badly if there had not been added the terrific strain caused by the bitter and untheosophical attacks upon me by Mrs. A. Besant, which have been kept up for over a year. The onslaughts have, of course, insidiously affected my health, and at one time came very near destroying me. Now however, we have a different state of things, although the attacks will doubtless continue until the woman is dead or insane. But there is a clearer air and a feeling of lightness due to independence.

The slight change made at Boston in Convention will do us a great deal of good. It is a pity of course to lose even one or two of our members who take the wrong and narrow view of the change, but we surely can afford to wait for all to come back: The historical sketch read at Convention is very true. It ought to be read by all. It can be enlarged and more proofs added to it. It is thereby shown that we do not secede at all, but simply make plain and definite our independence. The unity and the international character of the theosophical movement do not consist of nor depend upon a single organization nor upon any certain form of government. The only international and original officers of the first T.S. are Col. Olcott and myself, all the rest is a mass of patchwork and other officers have no real title to office. As late as the issuance of our own Aryan Charter you will find the Parent Society talked of, and if that means anything it really means the Aryan T.S. which is the form the Parent Society finally took. But I did not intend to argue this case; I simply throw out the above rough and general considerations.

It once used to be said that if I did not go to the meetings they were poor and not well attended. This was not a good state of things. A branch should live by the united work of all its members. But of late my compulsory absences have demonstrated that there are (as I always thought) men and women enough in the Aryan to make the meetings valuable and attract attendance. This should continue. It would be a pity if the Aryan, with such a fine old name, and with its possible claim to being the real Parent, should degenerate in interest or audience at its meetings.

With the example before us of the past year, when we have all so often blamed many abroad for improper actions, let us try ourselves not to fall into the errors we have condemned. All those errors, all the hypocrisy, that have been developed have proceeded from or been fostered by too much intellectual playing with theosophy. Let us try to make it a living thing and not a mere intellectual gymnastics. If it is taken up only by the intellect it will surely break down at the first strain. If the Aryan T.S. as a whole realizes this then, without stirring from our Hall, we can influence in the most potent manner a wide area of our movement in America.

Good bye for the present dear friends. I will try to write you often and to contribute a written paper as frequently as possible to your discussions.

Fraternally
William Q. Judge

Read before Aryan Bt on May 7 '95.

Dear Friends:

I had hoped to attend a meeting of the Branch for the purpose of seeing and talking with you, but the orders of physicians are such that I cannot go out at night unless ^{it is} unavoidable. So I write these few words in order to bid you good bye for a while, as I am going away before your next meeting to stay long enough to secure a safe condition of health.

The present state I am in physically is due to several causes. I have overworked myself for many years, day and night, for the theosophical cause as there were but few to do anything. But of late the number of earnest workers has so increased I can feel that a complete rest is possible. Perhaps the overwork I have spoken of would not have resulted so badly if there had not been added the terrific strain caused by the bitter and untheosophical attacks upon me by Mrs. A. Besant, which have been kept up for over a year. The onslaughts

have, of course, considerably affected my health, and at one time came very near destroying me. Now however, we have a different state of things, although the attacks will doubtless continue until the woman is dead or insane. But there is a clearer air and a feeling of lightness due to independence.

The slight change made at Boston in Convention will do us a great deal of good. It is a pity of course to lose even one or two of our members who take the wrong and narrow view of the change, but we surely can afford to wait for all to come back. The historical sketch read at Convention is very true. It ought to be read by all. It can be enlarged and more proofs added to it. It is thereby shown that we do not recede at all, but simply make plain and definite our independence. The unity and the international character of the Theosophical movement do not consist of nor depend upon a

3

single organization nor upon any certain form of government. The only international & original officers of the first I.S. are Col. Olcott and myself; all the rest is a mass of patchwork and other officers have no real title to office. As late as the issuance of our own Aryan Charter you will find the Parent Society talked of, & if that means anything it really means the Aryan I.S. which is the form the Parent Society finally took. But I did not intend to argue this case; I simply throw out the above rough and general considerations.

It once used to be said that if I did not go to the meetings they were poor and not well attended. This was not a good state of things. A branch should live by the united work of all its members. But glacial my compulsory absences have demonstrated that there are (as I always thought) men and women enough

4
in the Anjan to make the meetings
valuable & attract attendance. This
should continue. It would be a pity
if the Anjan, with such a fine old
name, and with its possible claim
to being the real Parent, should de-
generate in interest or audience at
its meetings.

With the example before us of
the past year, when we have all
so often blamed many abroad
for improper actions, let us beg
ourselves not to fall into the
errors we have condemned. All
those errors, all the hypocrisy, that
have been developed have proceeded
from or been fostered by too much
intellectual playing with Neurology.
Let us try to make it a living thing
and not a mere intellectual
gymnastics. If it is taken up
only by the intellect it will surely
break down at the first strain. If

5

The Aryans, I, as a whole realize this. Then, without stirring from our Hall, we can influence in the most potent manner ~~the~~ a wide area of our movement in America.

Good bye for the present dear friends. I will try to write you often and to contribute a written paper as frequently as possible to your discussions.

Fraternally
William W. Phelps

3. Annual Address to The Aryan T.S. from
William Q. Judge
President

[November 1895]

Dear Friends,

I had hoped to be able to meet with you on this anniversary but the state of my health and voice prevents me. You may be sure that only such compelling forces could keep me away from those meetings I attended so long with profit and pleasure. I therefore beg that you will accept these written words in place of my personal appearance.

Much of my life is bound up in this Society, in its history, and in its work. I was its founder, stood by while it had a very weak and doubtful childhood, saw it grow a little, then have a temporary sickness, and at last was gratified when it rallied to the work, grew strong and began to walk as a man & not as a child. At one time it had hiatuses in meetings, at another it met in Brooklyn where a devoted few studiously went over the Bhagavad Gita; then it would adjourn while we tried to get a meeting-place. It grew at once when we managed to hire 64 Madison Avenue, where the T.S. was started.

Although it has accepted a Charter in the TS, and has also an Incorporation under the laws of our State, it is in my opinion the original Theosophical Society; and it could sustain that claim but will not try, because to do so would involve a bitter fight destructive of all brotherhood. So it is content to remain as now, (and I hope it always will) wishing but to work for the benefit of the race.

Since your last annual meeting the most important event in our history was the convention at Boston last May, when the American Section decided to call itself the Theosophical Society in America, and to declare what it long had exercised, its absolute independence of action. It reaffirmed its loyalty to Theosophy.

The decision and slight change made then were inevitable. In the course of not a very long time it would have come about of itself if even no quarrels, no charges, no unbrotherliness had arisen. The logic of events, the changes in Society, geographical causes, increase of population, and other causes would have made it a fact. But it was known to some of our thinkers at the time HPB died that this event was sure to soon follow, because her departure released the bonds which her presence placed upon ambition, envy, and other human failings. Soon there burst forth the storm of persecution and denunciation which would wreck any institution that permitted it to go on unchecked. All the more easily would it wreck all theosophical endeavor because it struck at the very root of our real object — Universal Brotherhood. This blast was directed at me, and my two hopes were in my innocence of the charges made, and in the American Branches, which for many years I had slaved for. They, including you, were practically asked to throw me over because the world thought the unproved charges scandalous. But you all stood by the principles you had adopted and hence the declarations at Boston were inevitable. It has been said I wanted to be a president. This is nonsense. As General Secretary I had as much power as a President. And I will now tell you a bit of inside history bearing on that.

Before our federation some years ago there was a Board of Control here of which Mr Elliott B Page was first president. Later a Mr Elliott Coues, of Washington was made president. His proceedings became so absurd, flagrant and dangerous that I moved for federation. He opposed me violently, making all sorts of threats. But as there was some good in him I tried various ways of making some agreement. When the meeting for federation came on, you must know there was only a hodge podge of a Constitution in general, and we needed a new one and a new scheme. I formulated both. As Coues had said I simply was aiming for position of president I proposed the plan of a General Secretary & no President. This was to prove to the then detractors that I was not aiming for President. In that way came about the general rule of General Secretaries. I might have then arranged for a President here, and been president ever since, which Col Olcott & others would not have then objected to. This I have not published before.

The immediate object of the change we have made was to stop the constant, deep & bitter annoyance we all were subject to so long as others in foreign countries had power to officially harass us. This we accomplished. And that it was absolutely necessary must be now evident to all if only by remembering how the English part of the persecutors rejected the pacific & brotherly address sent from us to them, even in the face of the official declaration of recognition from Col Olcott. The real object however is to make strong and solid the theosophical movement not only in America but elsewhere. For already the change we made has been also made in Europe and Australia.

The whole movement is world-wide, each geographical division of it should be independent and free, all parts of it should and can work harmoniously together for the great end in view. This will only be possible by having just the very independence we have declared. For the truth was — & is still in certain places — that many were making a fetish of an organization, becoming more devoted to By Laws than to Theosophy. They had even the absurd temerity to say that HPB[']s work was being spoiled by interfering with “her Society.” They forgot, or chose not to remember, how often she had denounced such an attitude; how she had herself publicly declared European theosophy independent and herself as its president; how often she threatened to cast if off from her if members persisted in giving too much attention to mere forms.

When the Convention was over and the long breath after such an effort was taken, a feeling of relief spread all over the Society. Then a consciousness of great solidarity arose, carrying with it a determination everywhere to do more work than ever. New Branches began to spring up. New members came in as rapidly as ever. It could not be observed that anything had happened to us except improvement.

We had a few resignations but they were neither important nor dangerous. The very few from our own Branch show you how loyal, sensible, and earnest our members are. A Branch can always afford to have a resignation. In my opinion they should always be accepted. If the resigning person offers the resignation from pique, or to test the Society, it should be accepted; if it is because of uncongeniality, or incompatibility, or a radical difference, as in this case, it should be accepted. No one member is so necessary that he cannot be spared.

And now, having looked over those recent events, what should we do? We should increase our determination to make new, better, greater efforts for the spread of theosophy. We do not have to change all our ways. The best evolution and development is always due to slow alterations of old shapes and forms, to a perfecting of

the constitution of already existing things; & not to sudden and sweeping changes. We should avoid any crystallization of thought or method. Some members are crystallizing in the seats they occupy weekly; they should arouse themselves and try to add to the general good.

Another way in which crystallizing has shown itself is in the method adopted by some of preparing papers. These papers are composed mostly of quotations, most often from Madame Blavatsky. While the writer may have adopted in full such selections, it cannot be possible that the thought is fresh or the matter thoroughly understood. Each one has his own way of thinking and expressing himself, and there is an immediate loss of originality when a quotation is used. But I have heard here papers read in which the substantial part was quotation. There is no objection to quotations in themselves, and if we come to hear an author's work read to us, well and good, but here we should have the result of assimilation, not mere copying. And besides this it is prejudicial to a person to quote too much. A habit of not thinking and not defining for ones self is likely to arise. We should make for ourselves a clear and accurate definition, in our own way, of each doctrine, so as to be able to state it in our own words. If we rely on quotations then forgetfulness of those means a loss of the other.

We should all keep watch over ourselves to see that we do not give strange, and often ridiculous ideas of theosophy to inquirers. Seekers after theosophy do not need to hear about occultism and various mysterious things which but few can understand. Their spiritual needs require the common sense statement of those plain theosophical doctrines, such as Karma and reincarnation, as explain the problems of life, and give a basis & reason for the practise of right ethics. If members are to be the propagators of these doctrines then they ought to so understand them as to be able to clearly state them. It is positively wrong to begin with an enquirer and talk about mysterious matters relating to the occult, magical side of nature. It can lead to no good. What good does it do either the cause of theosophy or the enquirer to tell him about black magicians, or to let him hear you ascribe some personal difficulty — or even a change in the weather — to the black magicians? Or there is mysterious talk about such and such a place being “full of elementals”, when the fact is that there is no one place more full of them than another. In one city I knew of a fuss being made with a lady member who wore red in her hat. The others objected because they heard that red was the color of passion. This was not in joke, but in earnest. Outsiders heard it & harm was done. All this is a great folly not absent from our movement, and we will do well to watch closely so as to avoid it.

The Aryan Branch has always been a firm support and home basis for me. It has sustained me by its votes, by its quiet powerful standing its ground and acting at the right time, by its real loyalty moving silently like the current of a large river. It has been said that I have done a good deal. But very little would have been done did I not have such a refuge as this. A Branch can pass resolutions, thus acting as a body; but its real strength lies in its members. If those are weak it will not be strong. It is not money that makes its strength but the conviction, the sincerity, the moral power & tone of its members. Upon its brotherhood I have leaned and not been disappointed.

But let none of us lean in our beliefs upon another. We must, in that, depend upon ourselves, and by thus standing on our own feet will we help to make the theosophical movement stronger with each year. For the movement does not depend on any one person but upon the whole mass of people. If the people are not ready, the greatest and most glorious achievement in social arrangements could not be carried out. Even when force

is used in the world it is necessary to have a people in some way behind the change. Great as was Bonaparte he could not get to the desired end until he had the army and others with him. So in theosophy a leader cannot do more than the whole body allows. If each one of us then will consider himself to have thus a great responsibility in and to the theosophical movement, we will see even greater and more encouraging results than ever.

So, dear friends I bid you again good speed in the hope that 'ere long I shall be able to personally once more work with and among you.

W.Q.J.

27.

A

Annual address to
the Bryan T.S. from
November 1895

William A Judge
President

Dear Friends.

I had hoped to be able to meet with you on this anniversary but the state of my health and voice prevents me. You may be sure that only such compelling forces could keep me away from those meetings I attended so long with profit and pleasure. I therefore beg that you will accept these written words in place of my personal appearance.

(go on 7)

To the ~~Ames~~ TS
 Dear Friends

(1)

Much of my life is bound up in this Society, in its history, and its work. I was its founder, ^{started by} ~~started~~ ^{and} ~~and~~ ^{it} had a very weak and doubtful ^{beginning} ~~beginning~~ saw it grow a little, then have a temporary sickness, and at last was grasped when it rallied to the work, grew strong and began to walk as a man not as a child. At one time it had features in meetings, at another it met in Brooklyn where a devoted few ~~then~~ studiously went over the Bhagavad Gita; then it would adjourn while we tried to get a meeting-place. It grew at once when we managed to hire 64 Madison Avenue, where the T.S. was ~~originally~~ started.

Although it has accepted a charter in the T.S. and has also an incorporation under the laws of our State, it is in my opinion the original Theosophical Society; and it
 (over)

could sustain that claim but will not try, because to do so would involve a bitter fight destructive of all brotherhood. So it is content to remain as now (and I hope it always will) wishing but to work for the benefit of the race.

Since your last annual meeting the most important event in our history was the convention at Boston last May, when the American Section decided to call itself the Theosophical Society in America, and to declare what it long had exercised, its absolute independence of action. It reaffirmed its loyalty to Theosophy-

The decision and slight
 change made then were
 inevitable. ~~was~~ In the course
 of not a very long time it
 would have come about of itself
 if even no quarrels, no charges,
 no unbrotherliness had arisen.
 The logic of events, the changes in
 society, geographical causes,
 increase of population, and
 other causes would have made
 it a fact. But it was known
 to some of our thinkers at the
 time H.P.B. died that this
 event was sure to soon follow,
 because her departure released
 her bonds, ^{which} ~~that~~ her presence
 placed upon ambition ~~and~~^{upon}
 other despicable passions in
 certain quarters. ~~every~~ envy
 and other human failings. Soon
 there burst forth the storm
 (over)

of persecution and denunciat-
ion which would wreck any
institution that permitted
it to go on unchecked. All
the more easily would it
wreck all theoretical en-
deavor because it struck
at the very root of our real
object—Universal Brotherhood.
This storm blast was directed
at me, and my two hopes
were in my innocence of
the charges made, and in
the American Branches, which
I had served for many years
I had served for. They, in-
cluding you, were practically
asked to throw me over bet
cause the world thought the
unproved charges scandalous—

3 But you all stood by the principles you had adopted and hence the declarations at Boston were inevitable. It has been said I wanted to be a president. This is nonsense. As General Secretary I had as much power as a President. And I will now tell you a bit of inside history bearing on that.

Before our ^{some years ago} federation, there was a Board of Control here of which Mr Elliott B Page was first president. Later a Mr Elliott Coates, of Washington was made president. His proceedings became so absurd, flagrant and dangerous that I moved for federation. He opposed me violently, making all sorts of threats.

over

But as there was some good in him I tried various ways of making some agreement. When the meeting for federation came on, you must know there was only a hodge-podge of a constitution in general, and we needed a new one and a new scheme. I formulated both. As Coles had said I simply was aiming for position of president. I proposed the plan of a General Secretary & no President. This was to prove to the then detractors that I was not aiming for President. In that way came about the general rule of General Secretaries. I might have

If they are ^{arranged} for a President
 & been ^{presiding over} ^{agreed}
 here, which Col Olcott & others
 would not have them objected
 to. This I have not published
 before.

^{immediate}
 The object of the change
 we have made was to stop
 the constant, deep & bitter
 annoyance we all were
 subject to so long as others
 in foreign countries had power
 to officially harass us.
 This we accomplished. And
 that it ^{was} absolutely necessary
 must be now evident to all
 of us only by remembering how
 the English part of the per-
 secutors rejected the pacific
 & brotherly address sent
 from us to them, even in
 the face of the official declar-
 ation of recognition from Col Olcott
 (over)

The real object however is to make strong and solid the philosophical movement not only in America but elsewhere. For already the ^{change} ~~change~~ has been ^{made} ~~made~~ in Europe and Australia -

The whole movement is world-wide, each geographical division of it ^{should be} ~~is~~ independent and free, all parts yet shared and can work harmoniously together for the great end in view. This will only be possible by having just the very independence we have declared. For the truth was - we still in certain places - that many were making a fetish of an organization, becoming more devoted to By Laws

than to Theosophy. They had even
 the absurd temerity to say that
 H.P.B.'s work was being spoiled
 by interfering with "her Society."
 They forgot, or chose not to re-
 member, how often she had
 denounced such an attitude;
~~and~~ how she had ^{publicly} de-
 clared European theosophy
 independent and herself as
 its president; how often she
 threatened to cast it off from
 her if ^{much} ~~too~~ attention were
~~persisted in respecting~~ were
~~for~~ members persisted in giving
 too much attention to mere forms.

When the convention was over
 and the long breath after such
 an effort was taken, a feeling
 of relief spread all over the Society.
 Then a consciousness of great
 solidarity arose, carrying with
 it a determination everywhere

to do more work than ever, new Branches began to spring up. New members came in as rapidly as ever. It could not be observed that anything had happened to us except improvement.

We had a few resignations but they were neither important nor dangerous. The very few from our own Branch show you how loyal, sensible, and earnest our members are. A Branch can always afford to have a resignation. In my opinion they should always be accepted. If the resigning person offers the resignation from pique or to test the Society it should be accepted; if it is because of un- congeniality, or incompatibility, or a radical difference, as in this case, it should be accepted. No one member is so necessary

6 that he cannot be spared.

And now, having looked over more recent events, what should we? We should increase our determination to make new, better, greater efforts for the spread of Theosophy. We do not have to change all our ways. The best evolution and development is always due to slow alterations of old shapes and forms, to a perpetuity of the constitution of already existing things; not to sudden and sweeping changes. We should avoid any crystallization of thought or method. Some members are crystallizing in the seats they occupy weekly; they should arouse themselves and try to add to the general good.

Another way, ^{in which} ~~that~~ crystallizing has shown itself is in the method adopted by some of preparing papers. These papers are composed mostly of quotations, most often from Madame Blavatsky. While the writer may have adopted in full such selections, it cannot

As possible that the thought is fresh or the matter thoroughly understood. Each one has his own way of thinking and expressing himself, and there is an immediate loss of originality when a ~~same~~ quotation is used. But I have heard here papers read in which the substantive part was quotation. There is no objection to quotations in themselves, and if we come to hear ~~an~~ an author's works read to us, well and good, but here we should have the result of assimilation, not mere copying. And besides this it is prejudicial to a person to quote too much - a habit of not thinking and not defining for oneself is likely to arise - We should make for ourselves a clear, plain and accurate definition, in our own way, of each doctrine, so as to be able to state it in our own words. If we rely on quotations

7 their forgetfulness of those means
2 a loss of the other.

We should all keep watch
over ourselves to see that we do
not give strange, and often rid-
iculous ideas of theosophy to in-
quirers. Seekers after theosophy
do not ~~want~~ need to hear about
occultism and various mys-
terious things which but few can
understand. Their spiritual
needs require the common
sense statement of these plain
theosophical doctrines, such
as Karma and reincarnation,
as explain the problems of life,
and give a basis + reason for
the practice of right ethics. If
members are to be the propa-
gators of these ^{doctrines} they ought
to understand them as to be
able to clearly state them. It
is positively wrong to begin with
an enquirer and talk about

mysterious matters relating to
the occult, magical side of nature.
It can lead to no good. What good
does it do ~~either~~ either the cause of theo-
sophy or the enquirer to tell him
about black magicians, or to
let him hear you ascribe some
personal difficulty - or even a
change in the weather - to the
black magicians? ~~All this is a
sort of folly, not absent from
our movement, but which we
will take good care to avoid.~~
Or there is mysterious talk about
such and such a place being
"full of elementals", when the fact
is that there is no one place more
full of them than another. In
one city I knew of a fuss being
made with a lady member who
wore red in her hat. Because the other
objected because they heard that
red was the color of passion. This
was not in joke, but in earnest.

Outsiders heard it & harm was done. All this is a great folly not absent from our movement, and we will do well to watch closely so as to avoid it.

The Anyan Branch has always been a firm support and home basis for me. It has sustained me by its votes, by its quiet powerful standing its ground and acting at the right time, by its real loyalty moving silently like the current of a large river. It has been said that I have done a good deal. But very little would have ^{been} done did I not have such a refuge as this. A Branch can pass resolutions, thus acting as a body; but its real strength lies in its members. If those are weak it will not be strong. It is not money ^{that} makes its strength but the conviction, the sincerity, the moral ^{power} strength & tone of its (own)

members. Upon its brotherhood I have leaned and not been disappointed.

But let none of us lean in our beliefs upon another. We must, in that, depend upon ourselves, and by thus standing on our own feet will we help to make the ^{theoretical} movement stronger with each year. For the movement does not depend on any one person but upon the whole mass of people. If the people are not ready, the greatest and most glorious ~~reform~~ achievements in social arrangements could not be carried out. Even when force is used in the world it is necessary to have a people in some way behind the change. Great as was Bonaparte he could not ~~carry~~ ^{get to} the desired end until he had the army and others with him. So in

9 Theosophy a leader cannot
 do more than the whole body ^{allows}.
 If each one of us then will con-
 sider himself to have thus
 a great responsibility in and
 to the Theosophical movement,
 we will see even greater and
 more encouraging results than
 ever.

So, dear friends I bid you
 again good speed in the hope
 that ere long I shall be able
 to personally see more work
 with and among you.

W.27.

4. **Theosophy (The Path)** Vol. 11, May 1896, pp.34-37.

THE LAST DAYS OF W. Q. JUDGE.

The task of giving a short account of our leader's last days and of the change that finally took him to a wider field of work, and the necessary going back in thought to those weeks of suffering and continuous strain, must fill anyone who loved him, not with sorrow but with gladness that the end came as quickly as it did, to leave him *free*.

I was with him for two weeks at Aiken, South Carolina, during last Christmas and until after the new year, where he was staying with Mrs. Judge. He had left New York in October, 1895, for Asheville, S. C., but finding the climate there too cold he had gone further south to Aiken. After he had been there a few weeks the dullness of the place seemed to weary him; his cough was incessant and the trouble with his digestive and assimilative organs kept him in almost constant pain. He came to the conclusion that climates were of no avail and determined to return to New York, where he would be in the midst of friends and close to the Headquarters of his work. He intended to devote his evenings to writing a book on "Occultism," and we spent many hours talking over its contents and the general outline of the work. Students will never see that book, and those who know something of the vast fund of information on occult matters possessed by W. Q. Judge will appreciate their loss and the loss to the cause of Theosophical education.

Before returning to New York, he decided to visit Dr. Buck in Cincinnati and Dr. Buchman in Fort Wayne. This he did, leaving Aiken on January 9th, spending two weeks in Cincinnati, over a week in Fort Wayne, and reaching New York on February 3d, at 6 P. M. He then went to the Lincoln Hotel on Broadway, pending the discovery of a suitable apartment. It was evident that he was in far worse condition on his return to the city of his adoption than when I had last seen him in Aiken. He was much weaker, his cough was more frequent, his digestive organs caused him greater pain. He missed the fresh air and the sunshine. But his keen interest in the work of the Society was undiminished, and I would spend an hour or two with him daily while he would either dictate or give notes for replies to the immense number of letters he received, besides attending to other work that he felt obliged to supervise. On February 22d at about 2.30 P. M. he drove in a closed carriage to the apartment on the third floor of 325 West 56th Street, the last time but one that he was out of doors. Ill as he was his contempt for the precautions that all orthodox invalids take — in the shape of shawls, rugs and so forth — was characteristic of the man, though alarming to his friends.

From that day he grew weaker and weaker, with rare spurts of renewed strength, though down to the very last he retained his power of energizing and inspiring others. Some two weeks before his death he was warned by Dr. Rounds, who was attending him daily, that his only chance of living would be destroyed unless he would consent to absolutely give up all work. This he reluctantly agreed to do, but the first effect of such a change in his whole life's practice was to bring about a reaction that threatened an immediate collapse. After this he read but little, and then only the lightest sort of literature. He would doze whenever he could, as his nights were broken by his cough, and for weeks before he finally passed away he had not been able to get more than three hours continuous sleep at any one time. Hardly able to whisper, so weak that he had to be supported from chair to chair, torn to pieces by his racking cough, that made it impossible for

him to lie down, he still held fast to life and did so until the time had come for him to relax his effort and die. And throughout it all he preserved his magnificent power of endurance and self-control.

On the morning of March 19th he asked me to make full enquiries in regard to health resorts in the South and to report to him at once. At the same time I was to telegraph Mr. E. A. Neresheimer to call on him. He said that if he could "only get to some place where he could sit in the midst of sunshine and of flowers" he might yet perhaps recover. Mr. Neresheimer called that afternoon, and it was after he had said good-bye and when I was sitting by the side of Mr. Judge's sofa, that the "Rajah" suddenly roused the body out of the half-sleep in which it had been lying, and with his unmistakable force said: "There should be calmness. Hold fast. Go slow." I took this at first to apply particularly to the contemplated journey to a warmer climate, and it was not until several days later when his papers had been examined that the full significance of this message appeared. It had meanwhile been applied to all the matters that came up for decision, and it was well that this was done, for hasty action taken during the day or two following his death might, as I now see, have brought lasting disaster on the Society. Mr. Neresheimer may or may not have something to say in regard to this, his last interview with W. Q. Judge.

On the morning of Friday, the 20th, Dr. Rounds gave positive orders that no more visitors were to see him, and the same morning, by dint of the united entreaties of Mrs. and Miss Emily Judge he for the first time consented to have a professional night nurse. All that day he grew worse, but late in the afternoon got some broken sleep. It was after this that he told me he was "away most of the time — had I seen him come back just then?" He did not care to have the nurse in the room and as Mrs. Judge — who had nursed him so faithfully throughout his long illness — badly needed rest, and Miss Emily Judge, who had devoted all her days since his return to New York to his care, was obliged to go home, it became my welcome duty to sit up with him from ten o'clock that Friday night till about a quarter to three on Saturday morning. During the whole of that time he dozed, waking up every half hour regularly for his medicine. Unselfish to the last he told me every time he woke to go to bed at once; what was I up so late for? — with that rare smile of his. Numerous excuses were invented, at which he again smiled his old smile.

At a quarter to three Mrs. Judge took my place, but at six in the morning she called me up, saying that Mr. Judge wished to see me at once. When I went to him he whispered me to go immediately and get a certain New York doctor, a specialist, who need not be named. This doctor had been called in once before to consult with Dr. Rounds. I roused this famous specialist with considerable difficulty (ringing his bell for half an hour without ceasing), but when roused he absolutely refused to see Mr. Judge, stating that to see him without his regular physician would be contrary to professional etiquette. The fact that a man's life was at stake had no effect in face of this argument.

Back at eight, to find Mr. Judge in the same condition, almost speechless, but sitting upright on the sofa, full of nervous energy. His muscles were so feeble that he could not walk, but his nervous strength was remarkable. I told him the result of my call, and suggested the name of another specialist, but he firmly refused to see any doctor, and did not even see Dr. Rounds when he came in a few minutes later. At about 8.30 I left the room. At about ten minutes to nine Mrs. Judge rushed into the room where the nurse and I were consulting as to what, if anything, could be done, calling to us to come at once. We hurried in to find him

still sitting upright, but with the clear mark of approaching death on his face. In three minutes he quietly breathed his last.

Dr. Rounds afterwards said that the condition of his lungs could not have caused his death; that death had been due to "failure of the heart's action." But all the doctors who had examined him had agreed that his heart was as sound as a bell, and from this it is safe to conclude that he died as H. P. B. died, from no immediate physical cause, but because the right time had come. He passed out, and lost nothing in the process but a body that had ceased to be of service and had become a hindrance. He passed from comparative inactivity into the full use of his powers; from constant physical pain into a state where such a thing could only exist as a memory. For him death had no terrors, brought with it no separation. So we who loved him have no cause to mourn, but should instead rejoice that he is free at last.

E. T. HARGROVE.

5. **Theosophy (The Path)** Vol. 11, May 1896, pp.38-40.

[38]

THE CREMATION.

The proceedings at the cremation of the body of W. Q. Judge were of the simplest possible order. As he died on Saturday morning it was not easy to notify many members outside the vicinity of New York in sufficient time for them to attend the funeral on the Monday following. Nevertheless a very large number of members were present, including many from Boston, Bridgeport, Providence and other cities.

All day Sunday the body had lain in state at his residence, 325 West 56th Street, in the room in which he died. On Monday [March 23rd, 1896] it was conveyed to 144 Madison Avenue, at noon, at which time the ceremony was to take place in the Aryan Hall. The coffin was carried into the Hall by the pall bearers — Messrs. [Elliott B.] Page, [Joseph H.] Fussell, Jas. Pryse, Jno. [M.] Pryse, [Richard T.] Prater and [Claude Falls] Wright — and deposited on the platform, which was profusely decorated with flowers. All the chairs had been taken out of the Hall, the people standing to admit of more room.

Addresses were then made by Messrs. Wright, Hargrove and Jas. Pryse. Mr. Wright said:

“We assemble here to-day in this Aryan Hall, before the body of our brother and co-worker, William Quan Judge, the founder of the Theosophical movement of this century, with H. P. Blavatsky and others. We meet for the purpose of bidding a temporary farewell to the spirit that has left its body. Yet we do not assemble as mourners — as those who believe the dead cannot return. We are not as they who believe the body is all there is of man. As Theosophists, and as this is a Theosophical gathering, we must above all things feel that we are simply meeting together to bid a farewell for a while. W. Q. Judge has been here on earth, has worked for this movement many times before, and he will come to work again. It is not for us to feel as if we had lost him forever. I am myself standing before a scene almost identical with that which took place at the death of H. P. Blavatsky in London, a few years ago, at a time when everybody felt very much as they do now. Many then believed that the Society would fall to pieces, but those were only weak-hearted persons who knew nothing of the real nature of this movement, and the Society surely did not fail, but increased in vitality. We must continue to feel as we have felt for a long time since, that the society depends on *principles*, not on *personalities*, and that even in the going away from us of a great master and brother we are still in the movement and it must go on unaffected by the death of all personalities. Death is as common as birth. People have been dying ever since the world began, and death cannot affect our onward march, and if it did, then it would only show that we depended on personalities and therefore were untrustworthy. We must only hold to the high principles, and even while we feel that deep sorrow which must inevitably come to everyone for the loss of so great a personality as was that of W. Q. Judge, yet we must hold fast to the fact and belief that the society will grow. It is known of every great adept that when his powers are withdrawn, his spiritual energies are distributed among all students. The energy centered in the one becomes spread among all; consequently everyone will have additional power to work from now on, and should himself endeavor to represent a living centre. In a recent number of *The Path*, Mr. Judge tried to inspire all with that idea — ‘Each member a centre,’ were his words. [39] And remember H.P.B.’s words: ‘So long as there are three persons willing to live in accordance with the real principles of the movement, so long will it live and prosper.’ Let there be, not only three, but hundreds of centres! Therefore there is no necessity nor right for anyone to feel loss of courage or strength; on the contrary, he is acting in an untheosophical way who allows such thoughts and feelings to enter into him.”

Mr. James M. Pryse then spoke as follows:

“Five years have fled since out of gloomy and smoke-begrimed London all that was mortal of H.P. Blavatsky was taken across the green fields to Woking and surrendered to crematorial flames. And as I wandered back, that day of brilliant sunshine, across those English fields that, clad in the tender green of spring and starred with daisies, seemed to prophesy the joyous resurrection of all life, much of the sorrow in my heart was lifted, as I thought of our strong American brother who was hastening across the sea to bring us comfort and wise counsel. And now in my own land as I stand beside his cold clay, my heart is heavier than it has ever been before. Unwise are they who shrink from the chastening touch of sorrow. As Life has its lessons, so Death is a teacher, and the teachings of death can be understood only when sorrow for those who are lost has softened the human heart; for that is the one great need of humanity to-day — that the hardness and the selfishness of the heart shall be broken. So I think it is wise in this sense to sorrow for the dead. That is false in any philosophy or any religion which gives an evil comfort through teaching indifference to death, or seeks to harden the heart that goes out in yearning love toward those who are taken from us. But unselfish sorrow wastes itself not in useless repining, but stirs within us a strong desire to reach up into the deathless world where those whom we loved have gone, softens us to deeper sympathy with humanity, and strengthens us in our power to help and comfort those around us. This, our brother, has gone from among us. Therefore let our tribute of mourning resolve itself into an indomitable will to carry on the work he began and in which he was our leader. Let us build this Society up as an imperishable monument through ages to come, to H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge.

“Through long years I looked upon him as my truest friend and teacher. No other is there in this world whom I have loved so much, none to whom I owe so deep a debt of gratitude. In lives long past I knew and followed him; in lives to come I shall find and follow him still. His was ‘the strong deep heart like the hearts of old’; and though well I know that he is one who in times past conquered death and could say, ‘Death is swallowed up in victory. Where, O Death is thy sting? Where, O grave is thy victory?’ — still, in this hour of loss and loneliness, I would dwell only on the human side of life, that human nature that suffers and seeks consolation. This, our brother is gone. He whom we loved has left us.

“To him we gave the proud title of the ‘friend of all creatures.’ Let us each strive to be, like him, a friend of all that lives and breathes; let us carry on unweariedly the work for which he and H. P. Blavatsky laid down their lives, and let us show by our deeds that the teaching of his life, and the still greater teaching of his death, has not been wasted upon us.”

Mr. Hargrove said:

“Brothers and Sisters, Friends:

“I am to speak to you to-day in order to give you a short account of the death of our friend and teacher. You all know quite well that his illness was a long one. You will know that as long as he thought it his duty to struggle for life, he fought the battle — a battle that none of us could have fought. He fought for life from day to-day, from minute to minute, till he knew that the battle was over; not lost, but gained in the truest sense. He tried various climates to see if his illness could be cured by any change of air, and then [40] he returned to New York, knowing that death was certain, and preferring to die in this city of his adoption than elsewhere.

“In the hour of his death he was surrounded by friends, and by every possible solace. He was nursed to the last by a faithful and devoted wife. His death was painless. He told me himself very shortly before he

died that for several days past he had been very little in his body, and certainly when the last breath of life left it he was not there; he was looking on at all that was taking place.

“One person who had been constantly with him during the last weeks of his illness, but who was absent when the moment of departure came — a person who loved him with a perfect love — cried out ‘Thank God that he is dead,’ on being told of what had happened. And this feeling must be shared by all who know how much he suffered before he left us. So much for the dead. Now for the living.

“His last message to us was this: ‘There should be calmness. Hold fast. Go slow.’ And if you take down those words and remember them, you will find that they contain an epitome of his whole life-struggle. He believed in Theosophy and lived it. He believed because he knew that the great Self of which he so often spoke was the eternal Self, was *himself*. Therefore he was always calm.

“He held fast with an unwavering tenacity to his purpose and to his ideal.

“He went slow, and never allowed himself to act hastily. He made time his own, and he was justice itself on that account. And he had the power to act with the rapidity of lightning when the time for action came.

“We can now afford to console ourselves because of the life he lived, and should also remember that this man, William Quan Judge, had more devoted friends, I believe, than any other living man; more friends who would literally have died for him at a moment's notice, would have gone to any part of the world on the strength of a hint from him. And never once did he use that power and influence for his own personal ends; never once did he ask anyone for a cent of money for himself; never once did he use that power, great as it was not only in America but in Europe, Australasia and elsewhere as well, for anything but the good of the Theosophical movement.

“A last word: a few days before his death he said to me ‘There is no need to worry, for even if I die the movement *is* a success.’ It *is* a success; but it is for us to make use of this success; and I think that if we want to pay a tribute to the life and final sacrifice of W.Q. Judge, we can best do so by carrying on the work for which he lived and died.”

The body was then carried out of the Hall and conveyed to the crematory at Fresh Pond. About eighty members gathered in the little chapel attached to the crematory while Mr. Wright read over the coffin a few words addressed by W. Q. Judge to a friend two years before, when seriously near death:

“There is no room for sorrow in the heart of him who knows and realizes the Unity of all spiritual beings. While people, monuments and governments disappear, the self remains and returns again. The wise are not disturbed; they remain silent; they depend on the self and seek their refuge in It.”


The body was then cremated.

C.F.W.

* * *

[Part of Hargrove's address was published in **Letters That Have Helped Me**, Volume II (1918), pp.121-122. The compilers, Jasper Niemand and Thomas Green, added the following paragraph to Hargrove's text. This addition is also included the Theosophy Company (ULT) 1946 edition, pp.274-275.— Compiler]

“Poor Judge. It was not the charges that stung him, they were too untrue to hurt. It was the fact that those who had once most loudly proclaimed themselves his debtors and his friends were among the first to turn against him. He had the heart of a little child and his tenderness was only equalled by his strength . . . He never cared what people thought of him or his work so long as they would work for brotherhood. . . . His wife has said that she never knew him to tell a lie, and those most closely connected with him theosophically agree that he was the most truthful man they ever knew.”



APPENDIX

G



JUDGE'S DIARIES

and

KATHERINE TINGLEY

Table of Contents ~ Appendix G

1. Questioning Interpretations of Ambiguous Historical Documents
Introductory Comments to Appendix G. By Compiler. 371-373
2. “E.S.T. — To The Members of The E.S.T.” Dated April 3rd, 1896.
A verbatim report of a general E.S.T. meeting held in New York at Headquarters
on Sunday, March 29th, 1896. Issued after Judge’s death by the “Council”. 374-385
3. The Tingley “Successorship”
The Theosophical Movement, 1875-1925, pp.667-681. 386-392
4. “The Judge ‘Occult Diary’, Vindication of Tingley, Hargrove, Fussell”
The O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, September 1932. 393-394
5. Letter from James M. Pryse to Editor, **The Canadian Theosophist**.
Vol. 13, June 1932, pp.124-126. 395
6. “A Letter from W.Q. Judge to Katherine Tingley”
The O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, October 1932. 396-397
7. “A Letter from W. Q. Judge to Dr. Archibald Keightley”
The O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, November 1932. 398-400
8. Mrs. Tingley Channels the Recently Deceased William Q. Judge.
“Spiritualism and the Rise of Katherine Tingley”
California Utopia: Point Loma: 1897-1942, pp.16-17. 401-402
9. “More about the Judge ‘Diary’”
The O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, December 1932, pp.6-9. 403-406
10. “CORRESPONDENCE.” “*To the Editors of the Theosophical Quarterly:*”
Theosophical Quarterly, Vol. 31, July 1933, pp.88-89. 407-408
11. “The Judge Diary Question — Mr. Hargrove Speaks”
The Editor comments on Hargrove’s letter.
The O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 22, March 1933. 408-409
12. “William Q. Judge and Katherine Tingley — I”
The O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 23, November–December 1934. 410-412
13. “William Q. Judge and Katherine Tingley — II”
The O.E. Library Critic, Vol. 23, January–February 1935. 412-413
14. “Covina Explains.” By Charles J. Ryan.
The Canadian Theosophist, Vol. 27, September 1946, pp.212-219. 414-419

1. Introductory Comments to Appendix G — Compiler

Questioning Interpretations of Ambiguous Historical Documents

Theosophical historical material has to be placed in its proper context in order to better understand its implication. Information which at first glance appears related to the topic under review, can confuse the issue or simply remain a mystery upon which assumptions are predicated. Unsatisfied with the interpretation presented, some seek to resolve that enigma.

Using the analogy of a jigsaw puzzle, most people participating in its construction start by placing two pieces together which seem to fit. At first our sense of sight is the basic instrument used to conduct this exercise. As interest is piqued, logic is applied and the pieces are sorted by color and by shape for expediency. As completion of this blueprint-less puzzle draws nearer, one sometimes discovers that there are too many pieces—some are from another puzzle. Supposing the puzzle is large enough to fill an entire wall and the individual pieces small, how can a novice or one too personally involved/too close to the picture tell if all the pieces actually belong? As one becomes more interested in understanding the picture's meaning one starts to study it from a different perspective and discovers flaws in the picture. One finds that although the pieces look similar and fit the puzzle, somehow the picture just doesn't look quite right — until the odd pieces are replaced by the correct ones, which then make the picture look as it was intended. However, the average person does not see the problem nor does he care because he is satisfied with the picture he has gotten from others' interpretations. He accepts the results and goes happily onward, not realizing that his perception has been distorted. As in Law, however, identifying the "intent" is of utmost importance before conclusions are drawn.

Applying the above analogy to the theosophical material available to us, how are we to differentiate between the real and the unreal, the pertinent and the un-pertinent, the facts from mere fancy, diaries from simple private notes? Has it been convenient for most students of Theosophy to accept that all material the Founders have put down on paper is material the author actually sanctioned? Perhaps they were merely records of observations or private notes.

It is assumed that most diaries kept by certain individuals are notes about their life experiences, in other words, truths as they have experienced them. However, a scientist keeps diaries/records which are not necessarily his beliefs but careful notes, perhaps supplemented with comments, which capture details at the time experiments are conducted. If he does not have his notebook at hand, pieces of paper are used and the information can later be transferred to the notebook. These notes are a record of observations taken while still fresh in a person's mind so important details are not forgotten. They can then be reflected upon at a future date to bring back recollections, flashes of insight, which can lead to a proper analytical examination of the experiment.

In a world of perfect justice, the object of any law case is for the two opposing sides to contest each other's case on behalf of their clients in order to expose the truth. The prosecution bases its case on the incriminating evidence and the defense tries to show that there is insufficient evidence, the evidence is tainted, or there is reasonable doubt and their client should therefore be found innocent of the alleged crime. Lawyers for either side are compelled to do their best. Most often, however, not all the facts can be presented therefore the case can never be thoroughly explained, leading to decisions based on circumstantial evidence. H.P.B. herself claimed that "[c]ontrast alone can enable us to appreciate things at their right value; and unless a judge compares notes and hears both sides he can hardly come to a correct decision."¹

1. **The Theosophist**, Vol. 2, July 1881, p.218; reprinted in **BCW**, Vol. 3, p.225.

Unfortunately, in the world of theosophy, because of the mysticism involved, the truth is quite often obscure, misunderstood or simply overlooked because of lack of occult knowledge, prejudices, or lack of obvious intent from the person in question. This can lead to a rush to judgement. What appears to be the truth, based on the material found, may simply be misleading and confusing to one who is not trained in the mystical arts, and results in condemning rather than exonerating that person. The occult actions of another are frequently misinterpreted.

Since Judge's death there have been detractors who have claimed that Judge was seeing mediums in order to make contact with H.P.B. or with the Masters. The conclusion that Judge received and accepted communication from the deceased H.P.B. as genuine, may or may not be accurate. Alice Leighton Cleather, a member of Katherine Tingley's "Crusade" eventually became disillusioned with her leadership. After some alleged privileged remarks made by Tingley, Cleather concluded that Judge had "committed the fatal error of seeking communication through mediums, psychics, and clairvoyants. . . ." ² But this scenario of Judge's interest in mediumship for personal psychic reasons is completely contrary to the known character Judge exhibited while he was alive, and does not seem to fit the picture. Judge, who could have explained the whole scenario, died without leaving clear directions to his followers. His last words of advice were, "There should be calmness. Hold fast. Go slow"—which no one followed. Feeling pressured by both the membership and the media, they tried to put the pieces together as best they could, to interpret his intentions from the material he had left behind, but that only led to confusion and mistaken notions.

E.T. Hargrove came to the conclusion that assumptions had been made. Hargrove, a "boy" as Judge often called him, junior in age to his peers, came to realize that the picture which the Council had presented in the E.S.T. pamphlet of April 3rd, 1896, was incorrect. Upon reflection, perhaps after re-reviewing Judge's notes when things slowed down from their hectic pace, Hargrove must have concluded that they were extra pieces to the puzzle and were actually records of observations of experiments Judge had been conducting at the time, as he had done with various mediums in the past. Hargrove may have recognized that others' trials were similar to his own when he had been appraised by Judge. ³ His decision created much dissent within the American movement at the time. Other theosophists later came to the conclusion that they had also made mistakes by accepting that Judge had chosen someone to succeed him after his death.

Knowing that the Mahatmas were interested in finding suitable mediators, Judge had invited Laura Holloway from America to come to England in 1884 so she could be tested by H.P.B. and the Masters. Master K.H. stated, "She is an excellent but quite undeveloped clairvoyante. Had she had not been imprudently meddled with" ⁴ by Sinnett he might have been able to use her talents. Judge had apparently assessed Holloway's abilities fairly accurately. Although this experiment did not succeed it did not deter Judge from continuing his search for other possible candidates. The fact that Judge was looking for suitable candidates at that time seems to be overlooked, possibly because the Masters did not mention him very often during the early years. H.P.B. acknowledged the fact that Judge was looking for possible successors for her. His searches likely carried over to his own situation.

2. **H.P.B. As I Knew Her**, p.29. Over a quarter of a century later, Mrs. Cleather also claimed that Katherine Tingley persuaded Judge to appoint her as his successor and stated K.T. had told her personally that she had dictated the E.S.T. Circular, **By Master's Direction** (p.30). No evidence is presented to support these claims. Also see Chronology, March 12, 1930 entry.

3. In a letter to Hargrove, June 14th, 1895, Judge wrote: "There was no need for me to write you because we communicate other ways." See Appendix D for Judge's letter.

4. **Mahatma Letters**, p.355.

Comments by James Morgan Pryse on the subject are included in this Appendix. Had Pryse considered that the Diary he was given to examine by Hargrove was not a Diary as he believed it to be, but possibly records Judge was keeping as part of his ongoing investigations with potential mediators, he might not have made those statements.

One whose name did not appear in the E.S.T. of April 3rd, 1896, was Robert Crosbie. He, unlike Hargrove, later chose to show that he was closer to Judge than records indicate and decided to start a group of his own, the United Lodge of Theosophists. Crosbie's followers have particularly criticized Hargrove and the other Council members for the assumptions they made after Judge's death, even though Crosbie had supported the idea at the time. Their perspective of history is recorded in **The Theosophical Movement 1875-1925**. Would they have been so critical if Crosbie had been one of the signatories of this E.S.T. document, or would they have had a more open-minded view on the confusion at that time?

After reflecting upon the whole quandary, Hargrove and his many followers, some of whom were among Judge's closest friends⁵ and the best scholars of the time, came to the conclusion that the Theosophical Society had failed and that no one had been selected as successor to either H.P.B or to W.Q.J. They decided it was better to let the Society die of natural causes upon their deaths rather than maintain the false impression that it was prevailing with pseudo-successors.⁶

Is it possible that the wrong pieces have been inserted in this puzzle and that we should reassess the picture and replace some of these pieces in order to have the correct understanding of the events which occurred at that time?

With the new evidence presented in the Supplement, the documentation held in the Archives of the various theosophical organizations would have to be re-examined in an attempt to determine fact from misinterpretation. A new generation of theosophists, distanced from the picture, may be able to examine the information from a different perspective and possibly deduce Judge's intent at that time.

One thing is sure, William Q. Judge was a very complex and private individual who seems to have done some very unusual things in the later part of his life which have complicated our completion of this picture/puzzle. But this was not totally unusual for Judge — there is also much secrecy about his time in India before he left to return to America.

Perhaps Hargrove said it best when he stated that in order to know Judge, we have to seek his spirit in what he wrote; in the pages of **The Path**, in **Letters That Have Helped Me**, in **The Ocean of Theosophy** and in his **Letters to Hargrove**. "They may discover even why it was that H.P.B.'s Master called him *friend*."⁷

5. Clement Acton Griscom, perhaps Judge's closest friend in New York, also participated in one of Tingley's séances. He, like Hargrove, came to the same conclusions about Tingley.

6. At his first meeting with Katherine Tingley, Judge "told her of H.P. Blavatsky; he showed her a picture of her which Madame Blavatsky herself had drawn and given to him; as of 'one whom he should look for'; and said that but two years before H.P. Blavatsky passed on, on the top left-hand corner of one of her letters to him she had written, 'Have you found your chela yet?'" **The Theosophical Path**, Vol. 36, No.9, Sep. 1929, p.401. In a letter dated August 22nd, 1889, H.P.B. included a PS which read "Has your new chela turned up yet?" **Theosophical Forum**, Vol. 3, No.10, June 1932, p.192.

7. **Theosophical Quarterly**, Vol. 31, July 1933, p.89, and also in this Appendix as item #10.

2.

STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL.*FOR E.S.T. MEMBERS ONLY.***E. S. T.**

144 Madison Ave., New York City.



All communications relative to this School to be addressed to "Secretary E.S.T.," must be marked "PRIVATE" and contain no other business.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE E.S.T.*April 3rd, 1896.*

DEAR FRIEND AND FELLOW-MEMBER OF THE E.S.T.:

We send you herewith the following papers: (a) A verbatim report of a general E.S.T. meeting held in New York at Headquarters on Sunday, March 29th, at 12:30 p.m.; (b) New form of pledge; (c) Amendments to the Book of Rules.

This is done according to the directions of the late Outer Head, William Q. Judge. The papers left by him provided for the future Management of the School by the present Outer Head, a Council, and an Advisory Council in Europe. The Outer Head is known to and is in communication with the Council, but, according to direction and for reasons in part explained in the report of the above mentioned E. S. T. meeting, the name and identity of W. Q. Judge's occult heir and successor is to remain unknown to the members in general for one year. Speculations as to who this Outer Head may be are useless and will prove injurious if indulged in. Both the name and person are practically unknown in the Theosophical Society, having been confided by Mr. Judge to but a very few chosen and trusted friends. Needless to say, the Outer Head is not among those named as being on the Council.

The Council consists of the undersigned and other members to be added as soon as they have been communicated with.

The Advisory Council in Europe remains the same as heretofore.

[2] You are requested to give the most serious attention to the new form of Pledge and to re-read the Book of Rules with the accompanying amendments before undertaking this solemn and binding obligation. It differs but slightly from the pledge already taken by you, but these points of difference should be carefully considered, as they all have a purpose and if properly understood will pave the way to greater heights of attainment and closer communion with that universal Self which is at once the radiation of the eternal spiritual Sun and the light that shines within us all.

We are further directed to say to you that:

"By raising themselves to the point of Trust and Intuition, expected by the Master, which enables them to take the present pledge, members are actually advancing towards real Initiation; they are once more 'reborn,' their past is left behind and they begin to receive THE NEW LIGHT THAT HAS GONE OUT FROM THE LODGE."

We have only to add to the statements made by us at the E.S.T. meeting, minutes of which are enclosed, that individually and unitedly we have continued to receive unmistakable proof that the Outer Head appointed

by W. Q. Judge is in direct communication with Masters, with H. P. B. and with the "luminous youth" or "Rajah," as that Adept has been variously named. This latter fact depends solely upon our most solemn testimony, but those who knew and trusted W. Q. Judge should take his decision as final and sufficient in itself.

We are directed to inform you that twenty-one days from the date of your receiving these papers will be given in which you may decide whether you will accept or reject the provision made by the late Outer Head of the School for its management. If you decide to accept, the accompanying form of Pledge should be *written out* by you, signed and sent to the Secretary of the E.S.T. at 144 Madison Avenue, New York, U.S.A., together with the printed form of acceptance you will find herewith, also to be *signed by you*. If, on the other hand, you decide to reject the present management, you are requested to return all your papers "to the proper agent of the Head of the School," the Secretary as above stated.

It should, however, be borne in mind that this period of twenty-one days is not obligatory, and that an immediate reply *by return mail will* do much to add momentum to your own development and to the movement as a whole. This [3] fact is not stated in order to hurry a decision, but for your information and possible benefit.

It is desirable that before the Convention of the T.S.A. to be held on April 26th, when a new cycle begins, all should have formed a decision.

Faithfully and fraternally yours,

E. T. HARGROVE.
 JAMES M. PRYSE.
 JOSEPH H. FUSSELL.
 H. T. PATTERSON.
 CLAUDE FALLS WRIGHT.
 GENEVIEVE LUDLOW GRISCOM.
 C. A. GRISCOM, JR.
 E. AUG. NERESHEIMER.

MINUTES OF A GENERAL MEETING HELD AT HEADQUARTERS, 144 MADISON AVENUE, NEW YORK, ON SUNDAY, MARCH 29, 1896, AT 12:30 P.M.

After the usual opening, Mr. E. T. HARGROVE addressed the meeting as follows:

BROTHERS AND SISTERS: — In the first place, I have to ask you this question: Is everyone in this room prepared to keep all the proceedings of this meeting absolutely confidential and private until such time as a report of them is sent to all members of the School? If not, perhaps those not so prepared had better leave the room now before we proceed further. Those who agree to this will please rise. [All present rose.] I take it for granted, therefore, that everyone present agrees that these proceedings shall remain absolutely private. [Mr. Hargrove then proceeded]:

Since the departure from his poor worn body by our Chief, some of us have been examining his papers and have come across messages and letters of enormous importance and interest. Not wishing to keep these things to ourselves but knowing that he would have desired that you also should share this knowledge, this meeting has been called in order that we may tell you something of what has been found.

Those of us on the platform are going to send out as soon as possible a letter which I will now read and which will form a fitting introduction to what I have to say further.

[4] [The E.S.T. circular of March 29th was then read.]

Now in order that you may more fully appreciate the correctness of the statements made in that letter, I will read you one or two passages from the Chief's diary and from other papers that he has left behind which were not written for the benefit of others, but for his own use, and have all the more significance on that account. You will notice, I think, the wonderful humility of this man, who was in constant communication with Masters, and who yet said so very, very little about it, even to those who were nearest to him. I have simply taken these extracts at random, not for their bearing on the present state of affairs, but to show you that he was not left alone in his work.

[EXTRACTS.]

November 2d, 1894: " refers to Kansas City, Chicago and San Francisco as three very important points. Also told me *where* the city of learning is to be. Says others are not to know."

"Do not yet give out right doctrine of . . . It is not time. The circular and order will be as much as they can digest. It must be hurried for reasons you will see later. "

"In fifteen years there will be great changes here and the T.S. doctrines will subtly affect the people. After another "

Then one of his chief accusers "shown by " : "Two lights over head, black and white fighting. Suspended in mid-air. The feeling of one day one way, and another, another one. This black and white fighting causes depression and low circulation. You recognize her work, are pained for her state and the damage to T.S. If love in T.S. ask it for her. She should meditate *not* by the rules given her by dark man. Before three years you and she will touch hands again as when H.P.B. was alive. Then the real work of her life will begin. *That is*, if she lets the higher rule. But if she follows ambition, the rules given by dark man, and her fancied sense of injustice rules, she will not have this opportunity."

On November 26th, 1894, there is the following entry in his diary as from " : "The letter to *The Westminster Gazette* should be put in a New York paper. They were arming before this to break you up in England. There will be a division in England, part with you and part other. M— is on the fence. There will be light spots left here and [5] there. You must bring them together and gradually work them up. Never submit to a Committee of Honor. If you get down on that plane you will have to do it always. You have much from H.P.B. which you have not given out, and you may give it also to your successor. You will have a reorganization [indistinct] in London, with something added."

It should be especially noted here that he was not only advised on apparently unimportant matters, such as sending his reply to a New York paper, but that he was informed long in advance as to what the outcome in England would be. You will have remarked the reference to his *successor*.

"Entered December 5th, 1894, from notes made Dec. 1st or Nov. 30th. " July Convention will be a lively one. Much will be cut and dried by enemies to corner you and then drive you out."

The following bears directly upon the present condition of things, both in T. S. and E.S.T. November 15th, 1894:

". . . After this is settled you must write a letter to T.S. on the danger of having or expecting constant communication with " under present or similar conditions. The atmosphere of the world is now disturbed and so is the T. S. Members of the T. S. are made to suspect. *Trust must be aroused*. Few are prepared to hear

from ^ . Each cannot have a special benediction from ^ . Latent dislikes are aroused by these efforts. They must aim to develop themselves in daily life in small duties. ^ has been obliged to let many go and suffer for their good, even if they have to wait another life. When all is over they will see ^ back of all this. Windows of the cause are opened to dark powers by distrust of leaders and workers.”

It is not clear whether that message is from H.P.B. or from his own inner self.

Many other extracts could be given, proving our Chief's constant intercourse with Masters, who once called him their “Colleague.” More of these extracts will be given out from time to time in the future.

Now in regard to the assistance which he received — assistance from a living person. I am going to speak of this person, but not by name. I will call that person “Promise.” That is not the real name; it is simply invented by myself, and whether it is man, woman, or child, or merely a voice in the air, matters not in the least: therefore I will speak of that person as “he.”

[6]

[EXTRACTS.]

It should first be stated that in Mr. Judge's occult diary he has entered messages and communications received through this person in the same way as he has entered his own, as from Master; and this he has done in no other case, showing that “Promise” was the only person whom he placed on his own level of reliability in this respect.

In a long message received by him from H.P.B. ^ , extracts from which were read at a general E. S. T. meeting in New York about a year ago, these being at the same time sent to the Advisory Council in London, there are some important references to this chela:

“H.P.B., Jan. 3rd, 1895. Yours is not a bootless [?] errand. You have nobly sustained our cause in the crisis. Be encouraged. Well did Master know the staunch fearless attributes of your soul when he directed me to make you leader of our craft in America. As the centre of our force is attacked the more does our light work for the right. Victory is ours. All will end for the good of all. Mistakes have been made, but you have not gone far from the lines laid down by Master. My desire is for you to be careful about sending out Instructions to the E.S., for treacherous and unworthy persons are within the gates, and all new ideas will be appropriated by the other side after the split.

“Our dear chela, you have at last found your fellow chela, who was one of ours years ago, consecrated to the work then, and now by the Master's will brought face to face with you. —— and —— [signs representing the inner selves of H.P.B. and “Promise”] is Raavais, linked with you in our work. As your light shines into ‘Promise's’ soul, fears will disappear as the dew before the sun. Time will regulate all this.

[“Your fellow chela” refers to a question put by H.P.B. to Mr. Judge when they first met. She then asked him “Why did you not bring along that chela?” — in regard to whom Mr. Judge then knew nothing. She described this chela to him, gave him the chela's portrait which he for long carried in his pocket, but which he was later obliged to destroy. When Mr. Judge last saw H. P. B. during her lifetime she said to him: “You have not found the chela, and one mistake lay in destroying that portrait I gave you. Master made it. You will find —— [“Promise”] when you most need.” Another portrait of this chela was found, how- [7] ever, among our Chief's especially private papers. This portrait is in the possession of the Council.]

“The forces are out and annihilation is the only thing that can interfere. ‘Promise’ should have been in place with us at the beginning, but for your folly and his lack of trust in the Master. Let me tell you some of the things I have learned since I absented myself from the outer world. Many of the problems of life that should

have been solved if we had been more together have come up before me and I have learned much. I am, next to the American work, interested in Spain. Ireland can take care of itself. In the pine woods I have found a Lodge which I knew something of before I went away. There seven chelas and the light they show that some day will be better known, I will describe to you at our next meeting. There is much connected with it that can be used for irradiating forces in this country, for there is a subtle connection. Be sure that at our next meeting this is not forgotten. Slowly the light from this Lodge is being thrown over Spain, and I see that from the old corpse of bigotry, superstition and credulity will be reared a temple of light which will unite its forces with that of America and Ireland and from these three points I know that humanity shall be saved. This battle of light and darkness in our midst seems but small when I view the work before us, and the ends and prospects of our work shall stem the tide of this cruel and unworthy persecution. Under all of it and over it all the Master's hand; be sure that all is well for thee.

“This is our centre here in America illuminated by the Lodge and protected by love. Send ‘Promise’ out, but not yet; you can make what you will of ‘Promise,’ for the truthfulness of spirit and devotion to us that are there will make it a good instrument. But keep it well in the background. In outer work ‘Promise’ is our mystery.

“The light mentioned in Spain is of seven sides, with a yellow and a purple light. On each of the seven sides is a star. This represents the Lodge of Spain. Connect yourself with it as you will be directed. I will not permit you to resign nor will I permit you to submit to further investigation. Form your plans for American work, keep all your lines perfect with sustaining points and leave the rest to us. This is to your questions of last night.

“I can do better in time here. I will not touch upon minor points; they will take care of themselves. Master is [8] not after minor points. Let our eyes turn to the American future of Theosophy.”

Six days later, on January 9th, there is this record by Mr. Judge of a message from H.P.B.:

“I have tried to bring knowledge of mine to you in a line of order. There are some difficulties. Yes, a pledge had better be made. [This with “Promise.”— W.Q.J.] There will be more to it than you now understand. No one I have met in the last five centuries has been qualified. As I said, ‘Promise’ is our mystery. ‘Promise’ a mystery to ‘Promise.’ Judge, try a little more of it. Let ‘Promise’ say what — wants to.

“Now, about Spain. Leave the Instructions that will be most useful in the E. S. until we meet again.

“I found after the last breath had left that old carcass I had used, I went to where are those crystallized forces that are only understood by ——. There I took a deep rest — you know why — to prepare me for the work that has come. I then gravitated to Spain, and I found in that Lodge a Companion of mine I knew five thousand centuries ago. That seems long to you, but it is nevertheless correct. Through him I found that Spain as a people has that quality of devotion that is essential for the promulgation of our truths. I also found that many thousands of people, wearied with the persecutions of the past, were seeking light, and their eyes are turned to America.

“Then I knew that although there was not in the outer any evidence of our connection there, the seed of my thoughts and yours had entered Spain and some fallen into good ground. So here I said I will centre for awhile and all that time the body of which I was a part in America missed me. Use all means *possible* to introduce our literature there. When we meet again I will give you the Instructions I spoke of that will carry your E. S. through a course that will be useful.”

Question by W. Q. J.: "Do you exclude the rest of Europe in referring to Spain?"

H.P.B.— It is all connected with Europe. I want some things done that I never told you of because we had no time and it is better now."

W.Q.J.— "But they are working that way in Spain."

H.P.B.— "A little. But they have not used all *possible* means. We will have to have a sufficient time together and you will take pencil and follow the motions of my hand. I [9] want to show you the outline of a form which must be used in the Inner Circle, but it will take time and it must be done carefully after I give you the points. It will add a new spiritual influence to the movement, unite forces throughout the world, and make your way easier in the coming months. You can then put your thoughts on other work on a larger scale. It is a shape and a color. Think out how you can find seven bells of certain tones. Think of the form of a star . . . illuminated inside. . . ."

That "Inner Circle," not all of whom had before been told of their membership, he appointed to act as the Council now constituted; other members to be added later.

The chela I have called "Promise" is to be, and already is, the Outer Head of the School; but for one year members must wait to know who this Outer Head is. By that time the confusion will be over, everything will be in full working order, and for other evident reasons I think you will agree as to the advisability of this course, even considering it apart from the directions given by Mr. Judge. I am to tell you what Mr. Judge himself said of this Outer Head, and will quote his own words. But first of all let me say that I shall hereafter speak of Mr. Judge as the "Rajah" or "Luminous Youth," whose portrait you see on the platform behind me. Many people in this hall and all through America know that the Judge we saw was only the outer form, and that the inner man who used that body had the appearance you see in this picture. The instrument he thus used varied, of course, in its responsiveness to his touch. I shall be glad if all those here present who have personal knowledge in regard to the correctness of my assertion and who know the "Rajah," will rise in their seats after I have concluded my remarks. [Sixteen members later rose in response to this request, including the Council.]

This is the "Rajah's" statement in regard to our new Outer Head: "*This Head is as true as steel, as clear as a diamond, as lasting as time.*"

Keeping in mind the extracts I have already read you in regard to "Promise," I will now continue with further extracts on the same lines from the "Rajah's" private diary. On November 30th, 1894, are these entries:—
" 'Promise's' best work through you. Power increased. In February 'Promise' will pull you through a shadow of ill-health. ^ "

" 'Promise' is close to the Sun. Both are. Blessed [a [10] name of "Promise"] on top. Enemies in the mire of their Karma. ^ "

There are other entries of messages received through this chela; of warnings given by him, afterwards noted as having been justified. Also an admirable account by "Promise" of our good brothers in Dublin — "Promise" never having met them or seen them — with the statement that " ^ forces concentrated there."

Then comes this most weighty and momentous statement by H.P.B. ^ to the "Rajah," dated April 3, 1895:

“How I yearn for the day when I can come myself and work. It is being put off by all this strife and bitterness. I WILL COME, AS I SAID, THROUGH ‘PROMISE.’ Every day, they keep this up is another day of delay for that event.

“Had both [“Rajah” and “Promise”] been free, you well, and ye met at the time I said, more and more wonderful phenomena would have happened than did with me; and we would have one hundred members for every one we now have.”

If any think that we have been deserted let them bear in mind those words of H. P. B.’s: “I will come, as I said, through ‘Promise.’ “

In conclusion I will read this message received by the “Rajah” from H.P.B., ^ as parts of it bear directly upon the present condition of affairs:

“Much has transpired in your interior make-up since you came here; it pleases me and promises much. You must expect to have days of weakness and depression. But through following our advice ‘Promise’ made it possible for us to do more. The danger, as ‘Promise’ called it, which threatened and which palsied his action is over. Since it is over, come, I will tell you what it was: paralysis of the brain and general breaking down of the whole system. To sum it up, your faculties begin to swell and a part of the connection is made. The moon and the place and water and ‘Promise’ helped us. . . . When anything pushes you ahead it does the same for ‘Promise.’

“You will have about the 22d of March a paper of immeasurable interest which I want to have a hand in revising. It is to come through the mail from your E.A.N. group; they have made some mistakes in the paper.

“An additional pledge will have to be introduced into the E.S. when the row is ended. I promised certain instructions on vibrations which I have not forgotten. They had [11] to be put aside for this more important matter. But I will do it later. I will also later go on about Spain, and other matters bearing on mistakes that have been made by our students.

“Master has made to me a picture of our work. It is of a tree torn up by the wind, thrown on a plain where there is nothing to sustain it; only through a light from the Lodge coming down and acting upon it can it be restored to life. On the material plane there is nothing to be found that can save it.¹ You should make a very good article out of that.

“Not one of those who have deliberately taken part in this work of destruction can come under the rays of Master’s light. They must go another way and through their experiences learn lessons of wisdom that will help them at another time when tempted by ambition and jealousy. Waste no time on these people. Put all your thought and force into the ranks of the brave ones who stood, and let there be greater work of coöperation and unity. Make something out of this. A year and over of probation was given by Master to those who do so madly try to destroy his work and his chela, yet they turn not from their evil ways.

“ ‘Promise’ ” through his hands will do some of my best work.”

1. The condition of Mr. Judge’s body for some time before he left it corresponded to the T.S. “on the material plane,” in fact and not only symbolically. There is nothing on the material plane that can now save the T.S. A “light from the Lodge coming down” alone can do it. That light has come, and the Society is safe.

This clearly shows that our only chance for the future lies in our trust in this light from the Lodge which is within us all, but which must also have a special centre of action to focus and distribute its rays. And if at any time we doubt that this light still sustains the Society and its workers; if at any time we think that our Chief has deserted us, then as he himself has said not so very long ago, let us take those doubts and *carry them up to the sky and leave them there.*

Trust is our only salvation, but reason alone should show that he *could not* have left that body if he had not had an occult heir and successor to take his place, for that is the law in the Lodge. This occult heir is the link between ourselves and him, and so on from the Rajah to H.P.B., to Masters and to the great Lodge. There must be that link; his papers showed us where to find it; we have found it, have tested it and verified it beyond all question, individually and unitedly.

[12] You may perhaps think our action strange, but yet, I ask you to remember that it is not possible for you to see all sides, and it will therefore be better not to presume to judge us. We ask you instead to stand by us, leaving time and perhaps some seven years to show what the future will bring to this body.

I have to say finally, that in this basket of tulips on the platform there are fifty-four flowers — a symbol, for H.P.B. has said there are fifty-four members in America who will succeed in perfecting faithfulness, and although you will not see the significance of this statement to-day, in a year's time you will see it.

[I have made two or three additions to the verbatim report of my remarks at this meeting, consisting of further messages and quotations from Mr. Judge's diary.]

MR. JAMES M. PRYSE then addressed the meeting as follows:

“We cannot be too careful of our words. So the little I have to say I have written down, simply for the sake of clearness. I endorse what Mr. Hargrove has said to you. And I wish to reiterate his request that in this critical time you should give us your confidence and unwavering support. Our position is not one to be envied. For myself, I am here for only one reason: because our Chief desired it. And to carry out his wishes and make the movement a success, I will do the little that lies in my power, continuing to do as I have done for the past ten years — abandon all my personal affairs, and be an unthanked slave to this movement, give up all prospect of study, or individual improvement and progress, all personal ties, become if necessary an exile again from my own land, my own people, sacrifice personal comfort, health and life in this work. That is what lies before my companions and myself who have been designated to take up this task which is to bring us only sacrifice and suffering; and we only ask your confidence and coöperation in keeping the School united and in making it an instrument that the Master may use for the salvation of mankind.

MR. J. H. FUSSELL.— *Brothers and Sisters:* — I wish first to say that I know of my own knowledge that what our Brother Ernest T. Hargrove has stated is true; that our Chief, the Rajah, is with us, and that he has not left us by the death of his worn-out body. But since that death of the body he has been, and is now, with us and the whole School, and he is [13] still working along the same lines that he has worked hitherto; and will continue to so work and to lead us. All here in this room have been more or less closely associated with our Chief, and therefore we all feel the strongest ties towards him. And I doubt not that everyone here personally would do anything, would sacrifice everything in order to help our Chief accomplish his work, which, however, will be accomplished whether we help him or not. But I stand here, as our Brother Pryse has stated, with these others, all of us pledged to him, pledged to help this work, and to give our strength and our life, if need be, for its accomplishment. Now this crisis — for it is a crisis, and this choice which has come to all of us — is only another opportunity in our lives. And we ought to remember that if we wish for an opportunity at any time we have only to look to what lies before us at the moment, and *there* is our

opportunity. We all believe that the future of the Theosophical Society depends upon the unity which there is in its inner body, the Eastern School of Theosophy, and therefore I ask you now whether you do not agree with what I say, that we should hold together in the closest bonds of love and friendship for our Chief, the Rajah, and for the work and for each other. Let us only be united and strong, for we may be strong if we will. But if we feel weak, let us look to the light which comes from the Lodge, and that will give us new strength and courage. Then not only will the Theosophical Society be a success, not only will it accomplish this work, but the future of humanity is assured. The future of humanity depends upon those of us who see the light. Let us hold together and follow it.

MR. H. T. PATTERSON. — Brothers and sisters, I realize the solemnity of this occasion. I realize the tremendous importance of the step we have taken. Were I doubtful I should not dare take the responsibility I have. I have no doubts. My certainty is due partly to knowledge held in common with these others; partly to my own independent knowledge; and partly to the writings of William Q. Judge which I myself have seen.

MR. CLAUDE FALLS WRIGHT. — You must understand, brothers and sisters, that what we are saying is in corroboration of the statements and documents laid before you by Mr. Hargrove. Everyone here on the platform² has of course had opportunity of going into these matters much more thoroughly than would be practicable here, and of [14] course each has been able to verify for himself, and we are here to tell of this. And when Mr. Pryse stated that we had pledged ourselves to the work he meant that we as a council are determined, if necessary, to sacrifice our very lives to the carrying out of the work of the Lodge. But we are in no sense better than all of you: as a matter of Karma, or in some other way, we have been named as the custodians of these facts and have to make them known to you; yet each and everyone of you is in exactly the same position as are we, you have all similar opportunities, and you all are expected to renew within yourselves the pledges you have taken to work for our great cause — the spiritual regeneration of mankind.

For myself I will say that I have always believed and trusted in the aid of Higher Powers and the Masters, and I knew we should not be deserted. But a few weeks before the late body of the Rajah passed away I confess I became troubled a little about the future; such periods of gloom and darkness come to all. And I then received, no matter in what way, a message which at once removed all doubt and depression, and which I showed to many members present. It will be well to read it now, as it so fully corroborates what you have heard to day. It is as follows: “Fear not — we are working with all who are striving as surely as ever before. The present condition of Judge our servant is but a part of the destiny of our Order. *It is the night preceding [sic] the dawn of a great regeneration.* To those who work on unconcerned for the future, profiting by the errors of the past, great opportunities will yet be given.” (March 2d, 1896.) The fact that this is the dawn of a great regeneration strikes home. It is the beginning of the great spiritual cycle. It is the time of great opportunity. I believe all the past has been to a great extent a preparation. Of course everything is more or less a preparation; but the time is now at hand when everyone will have opportunities he never had before, for the “new messenger” has come from the Lodge.

I met this Chela — “Promise” — several times in 1894 and 1895. Mr. Judge introduced me at a meeting of the Aryan T. S. in 1894, saying to me beforehand: “Here is some one I want you to look at closely; it is a particular person.” He afterwards told me that “Promise” frequently was in touch with the Lodge. Later he sent me to a house where “Promise” was staying, and there this chela went [15] into a trance and told me much of the future — more particularly of the founding of a great school of occultism in the West — the revival of the ancient mysteries — which was afterwards embodied by W. Q. Judge in the E.S.T. Circular of November 3d, 1894. where he says that one of the objects of H.P.B. was “*the establishment in the West of a great seat of learning where shall be taught and explained and demonstrated the great theories of man*”

2. The Council.

and nature which she brought forward to us, where western occultism, as the essence combined out of all others, should be taught." And this is part of the great work shortly to be begun, and which will be accomplished by unity and strength among us now.

And I have to call your attention to an extract from a letter of H.P.B. to W.Q.J., October 23d, 1889. "The day W.Q.J. resigns H.P.B. will be virtually dead for the Americans. W.Q.J. is the *antaskarana* between the American thought and . . . esoteric knowledge." W. Q. J. did not resign, and H. P. B. is not dead to the Americans; for, as stated in the Circular of November 3d, 1894, "H. P. B. has not reincarnated. That Ego is quite conscious and working towards the final accomplishment of the end in view, which depends very largely upon the members of the Theosophical Society and on their loyalty." And H.P.B. said she would come through "Promise." I have had ample proof that she *has* already come in this manner.

That we would not be deserted all of you must have felt sure. It is this trust and call that has continued our school under the direct protection of the Masters and the Lodge. We on the platform have in the last few days had marvelous proofs of this. I must only add that I fully and freely corroborate all that has been said here to-day.

MRS. G. L. GRISCOM. — I wish most earnestly and emphatically to corroborate everything that has been said by Mr. Hargrove.

MR. C. A. GRISCOM, JR. — I have nothing to add to what has already been said except that I have followed step by step all that has led up to this meeting. And I bear my testimony to the absolute truthfulness of what has been said.

MR. E. A. NERESHEIMER. — I have a few remarks to make with regard to the Outer Head or chela of whom you have heard. Mr. Judge several years ago put me into communication with that person, and I think it is my duty to inform you of the fact. As you have heard, you will be made acquainted with the person after the expiration of one year. [16] I will also tell you that the important work that was done at the last Convention was done by the guidance of the Masters, that it was through this person that the instruction was given to us, and I will read you one of those communications which I received from this person long before the Convention and long before any of us had any idea what should be done in order to accomplish that which was ultimately brought about. The communication referred to was received on March 5th, 1895, 10 o'clock a. m. It was in the ordinary handwriting of this person (nothing mysterious about that) and was in the following words:

"March 5th, 1895. This course should be adopted at the Convention; it cannot be avoided. If any time is wasted much will be lost; a *split* should be declared in such a way that it will leave the door open for the others when they wish to restore harmony. America must insist that it can no longer submit to such *friction, intolerance* and untheosophical work.

"It declares itself independent until the disrupting forces bring the fight to a close. Unless this is done another year will pass in turmoil and strife and the chief aims of Master's work retarded.

"You must fix it so that it will be well planned and no mistakes.

"Consult with ——— at once.

"San Francisco and Boston will join heartily; others will follow.

“Under no circumstances must Mr. Judge know of this.”

Now this will give you a little insight as to how far we are connected with the Lodge. To my certain knowledge there is a great power exercised in this movement. We may appear to be little, each one of us, but more certain work can be done by every one if he is, in a certain sense, passive enough to put aside his personality in order to enable the Master to do that little which can be accomplished through him.

These few people on the platform are trying to put themselves in such a position in order that they may be servants of the Masters. Of course you realize as well as we do that we cannot now give you all the information that we have in our possession, although we may be ever so desirous of doing so; and perhaps it is little and perhaps it is much. I think it is a great deal, and it shall be our endeavor to make you acquainted with all we know, although it is not possible in the few moments that we have to ourselves to give you all. Consequently, if you personally choose that we act in accordance with the desire that has been laid down by the Rajah, and accept us as Council for the E. S. T., then we shall give out from time to time all this information as soon as we can possibly handle it. It is the desire of the Rajah that those people who are on the platform, and others who have also been named by the Rajah are to be the Council of this movement in America. We are to receive our instructions, whatever there be, from the Outer Head, with whom, as I previously stated, I am acquainted and so are the others.

I wish to say that the matter of the E. S. T. and the re-acceptance of this School, its Outer Head, and its management, will be submitted to each member, and they each will have plenty of time for consideration, twenty-one days being given to decide and to give answer as to whether each will accept this Council and Head under these conditions or not.

I corroborate everything that has been said by Mr. Hargrove. I was present when the papers of Mr. Judge were examined, and I have seen all the documents to which he referred.

MR. C. F. WRIGHT. — It falls to my lot to close this meeting. Please go out of the hall at once instead of remaining. Everybody before going out of this hall should make an attempt to unite himself with the Lodge, and this certainly can be done, even if the person so doing does not necessarily see anything. Each can find his own Self in a few moments by working with his nature so as to get rid of certain difficulties. Therefore you will stand up for three minutes and meditate upon this in silence, and in meditating the endeavor will be that everybody will use his very best efforts to get rid of the great drawbacks; first of suspicion — it is essentially evil, than which nothing is more liable to ruin the progress of the soul; secondly, of jealousy; and thirdly, each will endeavor to forget his own past, because by getting rid of the distrust and by getting rid of all those things which come up to him, he puts himself into a condition where he can commune. So if each one of you holds himself in that position, and particularly at the present time, the time of regeneration and new birth, you will all go out with renewed strength, and it will be the beginning of a new era.

[The meeting was then brought to a conclusion in the usual manner.]

[18]

NEW FORM OF PLEDGE.

1. *I pledge myself to make Theosophy a living power in my life and to give all the time, money and thought at my disposal to the work of the Theosophical Movement.*
2. *I pledge myself never to listen without protest to any evil thing said of a brother Theosophist.*
3. *I pledge myself to obey all the rules of the School trustingly.*

4. *I pledge myself to maintain a constant struggle against my lower nature and to constantly work for humanity, thus keeping within my heart the light of that Self which is our link with the Lodge and the radiation of the eternal Spiritual Sun.*

AMENDMENTS TO BOOK OF RULES.

ENTRANCE.

Page 17, Rule 1, line 3. Insert the word "three" in place of the word "six."

Rule 4. Insert "Headquarters of the School" in place of "Central Office of the Division."

ORGANIZATION.

Rule 1 shall read as follows: "The management of the School is vested in an Outer Head and a Council."

Other Rules under this heading now reading Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, change to Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, respectively.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Page 18, line 2. Insert "The Secretary E.S.T." in place of "William Q. Judge."

SECRECY.

(Old edition, p.19.)

Rule 2 shall read as follows: "Members are required to preserve inviolable secrecy as regards the signs and passwords of the School and all confidential documents. This rule, as to secrecy, once taken is binding for life and for all time. It applies to all documents marked 'E.S.T., strictly private and confidential,' to the Rules and Pledge, and to any other matter connected with the School declared to be private and confidential. Members disobeying this Rule become liable to suspension from the School."

[19]

DOCUMENTS AND ADDRESSES.

Page 19, Rule 1. Insert "Headquarters of the School" in place of "Central Office of the Division."

GENERAL.

Page 20, Rule 4, line 6. Insert "suspend" in place of "expel."

Rule 5. Insert "Outer Head and Council" in place of "Chief Officer of his Division."

Rule 6, line 2. Insert "speak" in place of "boast."

Page 21, Rule 11. Add: "NOTE. Special attention is to be paid to this Rule."

Page 23, Rule 16. Insert at the beginning of the Rule: "It should never be forgotten that the main object of the E. S. T. is to help the T.S. and members of the School will therefore," etc. etc. The *N.B.* shall read: "*Probationers as well as members are expected to work strenuously and practically for Theosophy and the Theosophical Society.*" Strike out last 3 lines of *N.B.*

All communications to be addressed to "Secretary E.S.T.," must be marked "Private" and contain no other business.

3. THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT 1875 - 1925, pp.667-681.

The Tingley “Successorship”

[667] It should be self-evident that if Mr. Judge had had anything to do with selecting his alleged successor, he would not have left the students dependent upon “messages,” either before or after his death, which they would have no means of verifying, nor upon the verbal say-so of any, but would have left clear, indisputable evidence, in his own physical handwriting of his own opinion and advice. H.P.B. left no “successor,” but she assuredly did leave abundant record in her own handwriting of how she regarded the various students, notably Mrs. Besant and Mr. Judge. That many came to regard Mrs. Besant as her successor was certainly no fault of H.P.B.’s, but due to Mrs. Besant’s self-assertions and the natural credulity and misconceptions of human beings. It can be observed by any one who reads closely the assertions in the circular of March 29, and its “proof” in the pamphlet of April 3, 1896, that in no place is the specific statement made that any of the alleged “proofs” were in *Mr. Judge’s own handwriting*. His “private papers” are freely spoken of, his “occult diary,” his “instructions for the future management of the School”— but that is all. If Mr. Judge had *himself* left any such “unmistakable proofs,” would not the “Council” and Mrs. Tingley have been first and foremost in proclaiming the fact and inviting the fullest and most rigid inspection of the alleged documents? The inference is irresistible. The surety is made doubly sure by the fact that from that day to this not one of those “private papers,” or “instructions,” or the “occult diary” has ever been produced. The weakness of Mr. Wright’s statement of his conversations with Mr. Judge becomes the more evident the more it is examined from various aspects. If he had known since 1894 that Mrs. Tingley or “Promise” was in “communication with Masters,” was a true “chela,” was “frequently in touch with the Lodge”— was, in short, to be Mr. Judge’s “successor”— why was he “troubled” just before Mr. Judge’s death? If he received the “message” of which he spoke that “at once removed all doubt and depression,” then it is evident that his “certainty” about “Promise” was not [668] due to anything Mr. Judge had previously said to him about her. It seems not to have occurred to him or to any of the others that if Mr. Judge were, in fact, an “elder brother” in “high standing” with the “Lodge,” an “adept,” perhaps Mr. Judge himself was able to see “much of the future” and was giving Mr. Wright an *occult hint to put him on his guard* against the future “successor” claim. If it were Mr. Judge who sent him later to see Mrs. Tingley, and if, as Mr. Wright says, she “went into a *trance*,” it only shows Mrs. Tingley to have been a medium, or “sensitive,” *not a chela*. “Mediumship,” wrote H.P.B. in “Isis Unveiled” (Volume 2, p. 588) “is the *opposite* of adeptship.” And as to Mr. Wright’s closing line as quoted, it is to be remarked that neither he nor any of the others went into any details on the “marvelous proofs” they had “continued to receive” after Mr. Judge’s death.

Mrs. G. L. Griscom followed Mr. Wright in the meeting and said: “I wish most earnestly and emphatically to corroborate everything that has been said by Mr. Hargrove.”

Her husband, Mr. C. A. Griscom, Jr., next stated:

I have nothing to add to what has already been said except that I have followed step by step all that has led up to this meeting. And I bear my testimony to the absolute truthfulness of what has been said.

Mr. Neresheimer was the last to give his “solemn testimony.” He said:

I have a few remarks to make with regard to the Outer Head or chela of whom you have heard. Mr. Judge several years ago put me into communication with that person, and I think it is my duty to inform you of the fact. As you have heard, you will be made acquainted with the person after the expiration of one year.

Mr. Neresheimer then read a “communication from the Masters,” which he said he had received “through [669] this person” in March, 1895, assumedly in regard to the Boston Convention. Its last sentence is telltale. It reads: “*Under no circumstances must Mr. Judge know of this.*” There is no doubt — since they both admitted it — that Mr. Neresheimer and Mr. Wright had been in the habit of “consulting” Mrs. Tingley,

believed in her “powers,” and accepted as “messages from the Masters” communications received through her, a year or more before Mr. Judge’s death. Yet their “pledge” in the E.S.T. and the “Rules” of the “School,” both absolutely forbade such intercourse. Like many another, they “wandered from the discipline” and inevitably reaped the consequences. To what state Mr. Neresheimer and the others had come in the few days following Mr. Judge’s death is shown by Mr. Neresheimer’s concluding remarks:

It is the desire of the Rajah that those people who are on this platform, and others who have also been named by the Rajah are to be the Council of this movement in America. We are to receive our instructions, whatever there be, from the Outer Head, with whom, as I previously stated, I am acquainted and so are the others.

From all the foregoing it must be clear that the general membership not only had no knowledge of their own in regard to the “Successor,” nor any means of verifying the alleged “proofs,” even had such opportunity been afforded them, for the “unmistakable proofs” were all *phenomenal* and hung on “messages” from H.P.B. and “Masters.” Equally must it be apparent that the membership relied wholly and absolutely on the “solemn testimony” of these eight witnesses and their direct assertions that all this was but carrying out Mr. Judge’s directions. Those witnesses were all well-known Theosophists, all with good reputations, manifestly sincere in their point-blank declarations; hence their testimony as to super-mundane facts was accepted as unquestioningly as it might have been regarding the most ordinary everyday occurrences.

[670] This brings the inquiry straight home to the eight witnesses themselves. The mass of the membership relied on them and their oaths. What did *they* rely on? The answer must be: On Mrs. Tingley and on “messages” received through her, not on any documents in the handwriting of William Q. Judge. Mr. Neresheimer and Mr. Wright, on their own confession, and the others by their indirect statements, showed they had attended *séances* with Mrs. Tingley before Mr. Judge’s death, and certainly afterwards when all their “marvelous proofs” were received.

A reading of the pamphlet of April 3 makes clear that some sort of consultations had been going on prior to the meeting of Sunday, March 29. What were they, and what reasons for secrecy and silence regarding them? No faintest intimation was suffered to leak out as to what took place in the interval between Mr. Judge’s death, March 21, and the meeting of March 29, save and except the assertion that “we have been examining Mr. Judge’s private papers.” What were the facts thus kept purposely obscured?

This much is known: Almost at once after the funeral services, Messrs. Neresheimer and Griscom invaded the privacy of Mrs. Judge’s grief and asked and obtained from her the keys to Mr. Judge’s desk and to the safety-deposit box in which Mr. Judge kept his personal papers. Later on, when Mrs. Judge visited the headquarters she found no private papers of Mr. Judge in his desk, and on going to the safety-deposit box, found it absolutely empty. *What became of those papers?* They have never been produced to this day.

Next, it is known that Mr. Neresheimer went to Mrs. Tingley for “advice and instruction.” That he received both abundantly is shown by the sequel — a sequel not disclosed for two years and then unwittingly as to its implications and bearings on the “successorship” claim. Mr. Neresheimer summoned to a private meeting at Mrs. Tingley’s house on Thursday evening, March 26, the witnesses whose testimony the members afterwards relied on. There they were “told” by *Mrs. Tingley* that Mr. Judge had “told” her in conversation in 1895 to appoint them as her “Council” in case of his death! On the strength of Mrs. Tingley’s own rendition of this alleged “conversation” with Mr. Judge in 1895, and on the “messages” produced, assumedly from “H.P.B.” and “the Masters,” rests the whole myth that *Mr. Judge* appointed “Promise” his “occult heir and successor.” The much-proclaimed and never-produced “private papers of Mr. Judge” bear a rather remarkable likeness to “private notes” of *Mrs. Tingley*.

It is from these “private notes” of *Mrs. Tingley* and other matter in *The Searchlight* for April, 1898, and Mr. Hargrove’s admissions which drew them forth, that the final light is shed on the mysteries leading up to the E.S.T. meeting of March 29, 1896, and the pamphlet of April 3 following. *The Searchlight* itself was a rabidly pro-Tingley publication issued at irregular intervals during the throes of the fierce struggle that ensued in 1898 between Mrs. Tingley’s supporters and those of Mr. Hargrove. To appreciate the bearings of *The Searchlight* revelations it is necessary to sketch briefly the intervening events.

The pamphlet of April 3, 1896, was followed at the end of April by the annual Convention of the T.S. in A. The active and controlling factor in the Society at large was, of course, the E.S.T. When the Convention met at New York City, it was already an open secret that “Promise” was Mrs. Tingley. On her “suggestion” Mr. Hargrove was enthusiastically elected President of the T.S. in A. He appointed Mr. Fussell as his private secretary and took charge of the editorial conduct of *The Path*, whose name had meantime been changed to *Theosophy*. Mr. Wright “called to more important work” as the private secretary of the “successor” to Mr. Judge, addressed the Convention and informed it that “the Masters” were “preparing to found a School for the Revival of the Lost Mysteries of Antiquity.” Mrs. Tingley addressed the Convention on the same subject. Amidst unbounded enthusiasm a subscription list was opened for this “School” and a large sum quickly raised. [672] Following the Convention, on May 14, a “strictly private and confidential” circular was sent to all E.S.T. members and entitled “An Urgent Appeal.” They were informed that a “CRUSADE has been directed by the Master,” and all were urged to contribute. The circular included the following gem of inanity from the new “Outer Head”:

Today the needs of humanity are embodied in one great *call*: “Oh God, my God, is there no help for us?” All people should heed the call of the Master and help to belt the world within the compass of the “cable tow” of the crusaders, for in their force is a quality of the “golden promise”— the Light of the Lodge. It will radiate throughout the world, and with the aid of the widow’s mite will make perfect the Master’s plan.

This appeal of the “golden ‘*Promise*’ — “the Light of the Lodge” — was joyfully responded to by the membership. Many thousands of dollars were raised and the “Crusaders,” headed by Mrs. Tingley, prepared to carry the “message” around the world. Great meetings were held in Boston and New York City. Speeches were made, greetings were read from many noted Theosophists. By the middle of June, when the “Crusaders” departed for Europe on the first stage of their journey round the globe, Mrs. Tingley, whose “successorship” had meantime been publicly announced, was universally regarded by leaders and rank-and-file alike as the “Agent of the Masters.” This feeling had been greatly strengthened by a seven-page circular issued in the E.S.T., written by Mr. Hargrove and sent out “with the consent and approval of the Council” on May 17, 1896. It was entitled “An Occultist’s Life,” and purported to give “certain facts” in the life of the new “Outer Head,” — “facts,” says Mr. Hargrove, “which were well known to Judge during his lifetime.” Mr. Judge’s name thus having been lugged in to support his theme, Mr. Hargrove proceeds to tell of the “voices” and the “strange [673] spirit” which accompanied “Promise” during her childhood; of her “fiery devotion to humanity”; of her being “at last allowed by the Master to separate herself from her [first] husband and to return to her father’s home”; of her having been “directed to marry her present husband, on an unusual basis,” after “throwing aside many more advantageous offers”; of her then becoming “more fully conscious of her true occult position”; of her using “her power as a psychometer”; of Mr. Judge’s “approval of this work.” Mr. Hargrove then declares that Mr. Judge told him that this “work” had been “carried on by Master’s direction and under Master’s supervision.” Mr. Hargrove told how “‘*Promise*’ has suffered as very few have suffered,” and concluded his panegyric:

“*Promise*” reached Theosophy by degrees, and in the process of reaching it underwent a training and preparation even more rigid and comprehensive than that experienced by either H.P.B. or W.Q.J. Always guided by the Master, every event in her life had a meaning and a purpose: When the “moment of

consummation" came, several years ago, known and recognized by Mr. Judge, the meaning and the purpose became clear at last

Let us all bear this warning in mind: "Do not let us in any way throw the slightest obstacle in the path of our chosen leader. If we do, we shall regret it."

In prefacing this remarkable contribution Mr. Hargrove assured the members that it was sent out "unknown to the O[uter] H[ead]," and that the members "should use great discrimination in giving out the facts it contains." Those "facts" are unaccompanied by names, dates, verifiable references of any kind, and from first to last are such as could only have emanated from "Promise" herself.

Coincident with Mr. Hargrove's circular letter of May 17 to the E.S.T., there appeared in the *New York [674] Tribune* of May 18, an article of more than two full columns disclosing Mrs. Tingley's identity as the "Successor," and containing a long authorized "interview" with her. Under date of May 21, another "strictly private and confidential" circular was sent out to all members of the E.S.T., containing a "warning" against the "Black Powers"; a disclosure of "Promise's" identity as Mrs. Tingley, and enclosing a copy of the *Tribune* article.

Mr. Hargrove and Mr. Wright accompanied Mrs. Tingley on her "Crusade" from New York around the world. Mrs. Alice L. Cleather joined the party in Europe. From the departure in June, 1896, till the return to San Francisco in February, 1897, Mr. Hargrove kept *Theosophy* supplied with a monthly report of the wonders of the "Crusade." Mr. Fussell, Mr. Neresheimer, and others continued the propaganda in the United States. An E.S.T. circular was sent out, dated July 12, 1896, and signed "The Council," containing the text of a "message from H.P.B. " received by the "Crusaders" in mid-ocean on June 15. During the eight months of the "Crusade" the pages of *Theosophy* witnessed from month to month the highly colored pictures painted for the edification and encouragement of the membership. On the return to America the "cornerstone" of the "School for the Revival of the Lost Mysteries of Antiquity" was laid with great *éclat* by Mrs. Tingley and her aides at Point Loma, near San Diego, California. "Warnings" were issued in E.S.T. circulars dated January 21, and May 4, 1897, of attacks upon the "Outer Head" and the "work." During the summer of 1897 the campaign of laudation of Mrs. Tingley as "successor" of Mr. Judge and as "Leader of the Theosophical Movement throughout the world," had reached the point where all lesser lights were eclipsed or shone as mere satellites.

Mr. Hargrove, despite his chief and most prominent part in these pyrotechnics, and in spite of being the President of the T.S.A. and editor of *Theosophy* would seem to have reached the conclusion that his rôle of Warwick, the King-maker, had been played entirely too successfully. [675] He found that Mr. Neresheimer as co-legatee of the publishing business under the will of Mr. Judge was disposed to overrule him in the editorial conduct of *Theosophy*. In the disputes which ensued, Mr. Hargrove, finding himself powerless, resigned the Presidency of the T.S. in A. and the conduct of *Theosophy*. Mutual felicitations were published, but the actual cause of controversy kept secret, as was the dissension between Mr. Neresheimer and "Jasper Niemand" — Mrs. Keightley — the other legatee. In the E.S.T. however, a circular was sent out, dated September 3, 1897. It was signed by Mrs. Tingley, and contains the admission that it was she who had "suggested" Mr. Hargrove for President in the first place, because, she said: "I knew at that crisis he was the only available man to fill the place." This circular was quickly followed by two additional communications to the E.S.T., both dated September 13, 1897, and both signed by Mrs. Tingley. As subsequently became clear, both these pamphlets were preparatory for the open battle which followed a little later. One of the pamphlets related to "The International Brotherhood League," organized by Mrs. Tingley immediately after the return from the "Crusade." The other was entitled "The Theosophical Movement." These were followed by the correspondence between Mr. Neresheimer and Mrs. Keightley, over the publishing business. Mrs. Keightley espoused the cause of Mr. Hargrove and Mr. Neresheimer was determined to support the cause

of Mrs. Tingley. In November, Dr. Keightley resigned the Presidency of the affiliated Theosophical Society in England and the Presidency of the English E.S.T. "Council," without assigning any reasons.

By January, 1898, the internal rivalry had become so high-pitched that its echoes began to reach the ears of the general membership both of the T.S. in A., and of the E.S.T. On January 3, 1898, a highly laudatory pamphlet was distributed to the membership, recounting in detail the "great works" accomplished by Mrs. Tingley. It was signed by Mr. Fussell and others and was sent out "unofficially." This was followed by the perfecting [676] of plans at a private conference held at Mrs. Tingley's home early in January for the organization of the "Universal Brotherhood" and the mergence in it of the T.S. in A. at the forthcoming annual Convention. This meeting was not made known at the time, but public official notice was sent out that the Convention would be held on February 18, 1898, at Chicago, instead of at the end of April, as had been the invariable custom from the beginning.

The proponents of Mr. Hargrove had meantime been active and vigilant. A circular was sent out by them, signed by Mrs. Keightley among others, and dated January 17, 1898, asking for signatures and support to elect Mr. Hargrove President at the coming Convention. As Mr. Neresheimer's name was proposed for Treasurer and as the circular proposed to create the old title of Corresponding Secretary and elect Mrs. Tingley to that office, the move was well calculated to appeal to peace-loving members. The pro-Tingley faction countered with a circular signed by Mr. Neresheimer as President of the T.S. in A., disavowing any connection with the scheme and calling for support of Mrs. Tingley. The Hargrove supporters re-issued their circular with a "Note" signed by Mr. A. H. Spencer and dated January 23, disclaiming any intention in the original circular of the 17th to make it appear that Mrs. Tingley was enlisted with the scheme. Another circular — undated — followed from the Hargrove faction declaring that "serious and obvious defects exist in the management of the Society" and, without naming her, arguing against the overwhelming authority exercised by Mrs. Tingley. This was followed by an E.S.T. circular issued by Mrs. Tingley, in which she tells the members:

I have evidence from one or two places of absolute disloyalty to the Master and the School. Plans in embryo, indicating proposed action, which would be detrimental to the interests of the Theosophical Society, have come into my hands.

[677] After invoking the names of H.P.B. and Mr. Judge, Mrs. Tingley gives the E.S.T. members the intimation of the program prepared for the Convention on February 18, in these words:

Look for instructions which will open the door to those who wish to avail themselves of the opportunities of the new cycle, to be mailed on February 18, 1898, to Presidents of E.S.T. Groups for distribution to each Member.

The instructions referred to were duly distributed and advised the members of a New Lodge being formed under her direction," to be the Guardians of the E.S.T.," and containing the usual warning against the "few who are working adversely at the present time to the interests of the School." She adds the significant words:

When the report of the Convention of the Theosophical Society in America at Chicago shall have reached you, you will then better understand the deeper significance of one door closing and the other opening.

The Convention of the T.S. in A. duly met at Chicago on February 18, 1898. There was a large and enthusiastic attendance of delegates and visitors. There were placed in the hands of the delegates prepared and printed Resolutions, a Preamble and Constitution of the "Universal Brotherhood," and a "Proclamation to the Members of the Theosophical Society in America, by Katherine A. Tingley." Willingly, and with little short of unanimity, the Convention adopted the Resolutions, which provided for the turning over of the T.S.

in A. to the "Universal Brotherhood" organization, and its future conduct as a department of that institution and under its Constitution. The Constitution of the "Universal Brotherhood" provided for various officers and a "Cabinet." Mrs. Tingley was constituted its "Leader and Official Head," and the same of the T.S. in A. department. Under the Constitution of both, as presented [678] and adopted, all final authority vested in Mrs. Tingley. No action of any kind could be valid if disapproved of by her, and any action taken by her as "Leader and Official Head" was incontestable. It was provided that this "Constitution" might be amended by a two-thirds vote at any "Congress" of the organization, but such congress could be called only by the "Leader and Official Head," and "no amendment shall be of force until approved by the Leader and Official Head." Mrs. Tingley had the right to appoint or remove at pleasure any and all Officers, and supreme control over all Branches and Lodges coming under the new organization.

The Hargrove band of followers, few in number, met in another hall after the Tingley program was adopted by the Convention. Mr. Spencer presided and resolutions protesting against the action of the Convention were adopted. The meeting then proceeded to hold a "convention" of its own. Resolutions were passed affirming that the action of the Chicago Convention was illegal; electing Mr. Spencer acting President, appointing an Executive Committee, and reaffirming the Constitution of the T.S. in A. as originally adopted at Boston in April, 1895.

Thereafter an active and violent battle was waged to gain the adherence of the members of the T.S. in A. and of the E.S.T. — on the one hand by Mrs. Tingley's "Universal Brotherhood," and on the other by the Hargrove faction. More than 95 per cent of the membership accepted the action of the Chicago Convention. In all, some 200 members out of approximately 6,000 followed Mr. Hargrove and his associates. During the excitement which followed the Chicago Convention Mr. Hargrove issued a twenty-seven-page pamphlet entitled "E.S.T.," which was mailed to as many members as possible. It was dated March 1, 1898.

This "E.S.T." pamphlet of Mr. Hargrove's is, perhaps, the most remarkable of all the remarkable utterances put afloat by him during the entire period from the death of Mr. Judge onwards. It is in the form of "Minutes" of an "E.S.T. meeting" called by Mr. Hargrove [679] at Chicago in the late afternoon of February 19, following the Chicago Convention and the dissentient meeting held by the "bolters" from the action taken by that Convention. At this meeting Mr. Hargrove read to those who answered his call, a series of letters addressed by him to Mrs. Tingley at various dates from January 19, 1898 up to and including noon of the date of the meeting — February 19. The pamphlet contains the full text of these letters, plus bracketed comments added by Mr. Hargrove, and containing also other letters addressed by him to Mrs. Tingley subsequent to the Convention and up to February 25, 1898. There can be no dispute regarding these letters, as they were published by Mr. Hargrove himself. In them he incidentally makes the most astonishing admissions as to the course of events immediately following Mr. Judge's death. If the reader will refer to the statements of Mr. Hargrove at the meeting of March 29, and those contained in the circulars of that date and of April 3, 1896, as given earlier in the present chapter, and compare them with the statements made in his letters to Mrs. Tingley as given in his "E.S.T." pamphlet of March 1, 1898, the nature of the fraud perpetrated on the membership in declaring Mrs. Tingley to have been the successor appointed by Mr. Judge, becomes at once apparent. For in his letter to Mrs. Tingley dated January 30, 1898, he says:

Now, my dear friend, you have made an awful mess of it — that is the simple truth. *You were run in as O (uter) H (ead)* as the only person in sight who was ready to hand at the time. We were all of us heartily glad to welcome you, for you solved the problem which confronted us — who was to be O. H.; you were a sort of neutral centre around which we could congregate. And most of us fairly yelled with delight, for you solved our difficulty and we had ample proofs that some members of the Lodge were working through you and that you had high and rare mediumistic and psychic gifts and that you were [680] a disciple of the Lodge. So things went swimmingly for a time.

Our enthusiasm and anxiety to see all go well carried some of us too far — carried me too far to the extent of . . . leading me to use my personal influence with people to get them to accept you as O. H. I thought it was for the good of the work, but since then I have learned better.

In the course of his bracketed comments Mr. Hargrove refers to the *original* Minutes of the “Council” meeting at Mrs. Tingley’s home following the death of Mr. Judge. This does not refer to the “general E.S.T. Meeting” of March 29, 1896, but to the secret gathering at Mrs. Tingley’s home on Thursday evening, March 26, 1896. Mr. Hargrove quotes from page 2 of those Minutes: “After some speculation we finally, through E.T. H(argrove) were told that the Outer Head was Purple (Mrs. Tingley).” Mr. Hargrove adds a further reference to page 54 of the Minutes to show that it was *through him* that the other members of the Council “first heard of” Mrs. Tingley as the “Outer Head.” His comments also show that a *revised* version of the original minutes of this meeting was later prepared *at Mrs. Tingley’s direction*. Neither the “original” nor the “revised” version of what took place at that meeting has ever been made public, though Mr. Hargrove claimed in his comments that a certified copy of the original Minutes and the original of the *revised* version were in his possession.

That Mr. Hargrove, as well as Mrs. Tingley, had “high and rare mediumistic and psychic gifts” is indicated throughout his letters, for he tells Mrs. Tingley: “It is by Master’s order that I write you”; “by order of the Master you have ceased to be the Outer Head of the E.S.T. in the interior and true sense”; “The Outer Head to follow you has already been appointed by the Master.”

The circulation of Mr. Hargrove’s pamphlet, the legal proceedings begun by him and his associates to test the [681] validity of the action of the Chicago Convention, and the revival of the old *Theosophical Forum*, with its first number dated February, 1898, containing an account of the Chicago proceedings and the efforts of the “bolters” to continue on the old lines — all these were met by vigorous efforts on the part of the pro-Tingley majority. By the middle of April the first number of *The Searchlight*, to which we have referred, was out with forty large pages of fine print in an endeavor to counteract the feared effects of the Hargrove revelations. The combined matter of both sides, when sifted and related to the proceedings made public immediately after the death of Mr. Judge in the circulars of March 29 and April 3, 1896, establishes beyond all question that Mrs. Tingley’s “successorship” was due, and due only, to the “messages” obtained by virtue of the “high and rare mediumistic and psychic gifts” of Mrs. Tingley, Mr. Hargrove, Mr. Wright, and others — “messages” from “Masters,” from the *dead* H.P.B. and the *dead* W.Q. Judge — not to any “appointment” made by the *living* William Q. Judge in *his own physical handwriting*.

Completely inoculated with the virus of “apostolic succession,” both the fragments of the parent Theosophical Society rapidly degenerated. . . .

4. **The O. E. Library Critic**, Vol. 22, September 1932, No. 2.

The Judge "Occult Diary"
Vindication of Tingley, Hargrove, Fussell

Much has been written of late about the quotations made by Mr. E.T. Hargrove in an E.S.T. circular of April 3d, 1896, from a purported diary and other papers of W.Q. Judge, and relating to Katherine Tingley. The existence of these Judge documents was called in question in the United Lodge of Theosophists book, *The Theosophical Movement* (pages 667, 670) and very recently Mr. E.A. Neresheimer, who has in his possession a diary of Judge which does not contain the passages in question, has not hesitated to say that "Those alleged 'messages and quotations' attributed to Mr. Judge could only have been concocted by Mrs. Tingley, assisted by Mr. Hargrove and Mr. J.H. Fussell"; a very serious charge indeed. ("Some Reminiscences of William Q. Judge", 1932, privately circulated, quoted in *Canadian Theosophist*, May, 1932, page 70.) [See entries Feb. 25, 1932 and May 1932 in Chronology for "Mr. Judge's Alleged Diary" — Compiler]. Based on Mr. Neresheimer's statements, the fraudulent nature of the Hargrove quotations has been accepted by several persons who have assumed, curiously enough, that Mr. Judge could have had but one diary. (See *Canadian Theosophist*, May, 1932, page 70, and *The Theosophical Movement*, Bombay U.L.T., July, 1932).

It is claimed by the authorities at Point Loma that they actually have at least four Judge diaries. Very recently they have unearthed in their archives a series of loose sheets in *Judge's handwriting*, in which are found *every one of the quotations* made by Mr. Hargrove in support of Katherine Tingley.

I am not asking anybody to accept their assertion alone. But I have been furnished with photographs of five of these loose sheets, the contents of which I give below, containing six of the disputed quotations. All except the one about the ring are quoted by Mr. Hargrove. Anybody having the E.S.T. circular of April 3d, 1896, can compare them with Mr. Hargrove's quotations. I submitted these photographs to two friends who had been closely associated with Mr. Judge, who at once pronounced them to be in his handwriting. Together we compared them with several personal, handwritten and signed letters from Mr. Judge in their possession, and we agreed that there could be no doubt whatever that the writing of the loose sheets was his.

There is nothing suspicious in these papers coming to light at this late date. Nearly every office has a lot of unsorted or unclassified material, and the appearance of the papers is not such as to attract attention, four of them being obviously written by pencil on a scratch pad, 5 x 4½ inches.

There can therefore be no doubt that the papers are genuine Judge writing, and that the persons charged with fraud are fully exonerated, unless one makes the assumption that one of them, besides being a cheat, was a very skilful forger also, and imprudent enough to preserve the forged papers after they had served their purpose. Incidentally it may be mentioned that four of the sheets are written in pencil, apparently hastily, as the punctuation is defective, giving the impression that they may have been taken down from dictation (by a medium?). There are two or three insignificant verbal changes in the quotations as presented by Mr. Hargrove, from which it would appear that Mr. Judge may have copied them, with corrections, in a permanent diary from which Mr. Hargrove quoted, and which Mr. J.M. Pryse claims to have had in his possession for a time (*Canadian Theosophist*, June, page 125) [See Chronology, June 1932 entry — Compiler], but which cannot now be located.

Whether the person referred to was Mrs. Tingley or not is beyond the scope of this article to discuss. The communications are supposed to be from the discarnate H.P.B.

In the originals there occurs a sign for the name of a person, designated by Mr. Hargrove as "Promise" and supposed to be Mrs. Tingley. As this cannot be reproduced without a special engraving I have indicated it by the letter "X". One sign, however, is different, though also designated by Mr. Hargrove as "Promise". This I have indicated by "Y".

Sheet 1—written with pen and ink

April 3 night

B. How I yearn for the day when I can come myself and work. It is being put off by all this strife and bitterness. I will come, as I said through Y. Every day they keep this up is another day of delay for that event.

X X X

B. Had both been free, you well, & ye met at the time I said more and more wonderful phenomena would have happened than did with me; & we would have 100 members for every one we now have.

X X X

The ring you wear is mine. She thinks she has mine and that you have hers. But you are right. It was done by substitution, in the night by one of us. There is also a letter I left you which has never been delivered.

Sheet 2—written with pencil

4) Jan 2

if we had been more together have come up before me & I have learned much. I am, next to the American work, interested in Spain. Ireland will take care of itself. There in Spain in the pine woods I have found a lodge which I knew something about before I went away. There 7 chelas and the light they

Sheet 3—written with pencil

5

show that some day will be better known, I will describe to you at our next meeting. There is much connected with it that can be used for irradiating causes in this country. Be sure that at next meeting this is not forgotten. Slowly the light from this Lodge is being thrown over Spain & I see that from the

Sheet 4—written with pencil

8

You can make X what you wish & the truthfulness of X spirit & devotion to us will make X useful. Keep X well in the background In outer work X is our mystery The light I mentioned in Spain is of 7 sides with a purple-yellow light On each of

Sheet 5—written with pencil

10

with sustaining points & leave the rest to us. This is to your questions of last night. I can do well now with 13 I can do better in time. I will touch upon minor points they will take care of themselves Master is not after the little points Let our eyes turn to the American future of theosophy.

5. **The Canadian Theosophist**, Vol. 13, June 1932, pp.124-126.

Editor, Canadian Theosophist: — To the symposium in the May C. T. on the subject of Mr. Judge and the mythical “successorship” traced through him from H.P.B., permit me to add the following comments, merely remarking prefatorily that I have been well acquainted with every person named in them, and that I concur unreservedly in your declaration (p.69): “The true esoteric teaching is that such persons as Madame Blavatsky are *sui generis* and cannot be duplicated”. . . .

[125] *Judge's Unprintable Diary*. — The C.T. is in error when it states that “no one ever saw the alleged ‘Diary’ except Mr. Hargrove, Mr. J. H. Fussell and Mrs. Tingley herself”. For Mr. Hargrove loaned me the Diary without my asking for it (and I wish to add, incidentally, that I regard Mr. Hargrove as a sincere and honourable Theosophist, though I cannot say that of the two other persons mentioned); and that Diary was not an “alleged” one, for it was all in Judge’s handwriting. But though the writing was clear and legible I didn’t read much of it. I’ve read a great deal in English, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, French and Spanish, but that Diary belonged to a class of literature that I don’t care to read in any language. It was too sentimental, mushy and, spiritualistic for me to wade through it. Among other matters, it covered the period when Mr. Judge and Mrs. Tingley, his favourite spirit-medium, went into seclusion together at Mineral Wells, and in it there was much fulsome praise of her, while the estimable Mrs. Judge, who had been left in Brooklyn, whenever referred to was nick-named “Kali” — after the most hideous Goddess in the Hindu pantheon. In sorrow for Judge I gave the Diary back to Hargrove mostly unread. I’d like to have burned it. Whoever has it now should consign it to the flames without delay. Even the Tingleyites have not dared to besmirch Judge’s memory by publishing it.

A Question of Veracity. — Impressions of the Master’s seal (which Col. Olcott said was a defective and rejected one) appear on “messages” sent me by Judge; and while the impressions may have been “precipitated” they distinctly show what printers call “indentation” on the paper. When C. F. Wright said that H.P.B., in the presence of the Countess Wachtmeister, called attention to such seal-impressions on a rematerialized telegram, and the Countess [126] said that she did not, the testimony of the Countess is to be accepted. In any “conflict of evidence” between her and Wright my vote as a jurymen is for the Countess. Considering that her memory and her imagination may sometimes have caused her to get things a bit mixed, it is nevertheless certain that she would never consciously tell an untruth. And honestly I cannot say that of Claude Falls Wright. He was only a boy who never grew up to responsible manhood, and he was somewhat addicted to what children call “fibbing”. He was a skilful penman and assisted Judge in writing “messages” imitative of the Master’s handwriting. They both confessed that to Mr. Mead. When a statement by C. F. Wright was published in a prominent New York daily, to the effect that soon after Judge’s death his “astral hand” picked up a pencil on his desk at the Headquarters and wrote, “Claude Falls Wright is my successor”, Wright (being hauled over the coals by the Purple Mother) denied that he had said it. But Mr. Hecht, the reporter, assured me that Wright had not only dictated the statement to him but had read and approved of the article in manuscript before it was given to the newspaper for publication. Yes; my, vote is for the Countess! Both she and Wright, like Judge and nearly all of the early Theosophists, have departed from this world. Let us trust that they are now resting blissfully in Devachan, and that when they return to earth they will continue to be faithful workers for Brotherhood and Theosophy, and let us throw the mantle of charity over their frailties. We should remember with gratitude the noble work they did under H.P.B. and pass lightly over the other things that are not pleasant to remember.

James Morgan Pryse.

6. **The O.E. Library Critic**, Vol. 22, October 1932, No. 3.

[NOTE: See Chronology, Jan. 5, 1895 entry.]

[Letter from W.Q. Judge to Katherine Tingley on communications from the discarnate Madame Blavatsky.
— Compiler]

A Letter from W.Q. Judge to Katherine Tingley.

Note by the Editor [of the **Critic**, Dr. Henry N. Stokes].—The following is a letter from W.Q. Judge to Mrs. Tingley, now in the archives of the Point Loma T.S. While the month and year are not given, the date is obviously January 5th, 1895, the time when Judge was receiving what he regarded as communications from the discarnate H.P.B. (See letter of Judge to Dr. Archibald Keightley dated January 4th, 1895, to be printed in the next **CRITIC**.) The trip referred to in the heading is briefly described in the February, 1895 *Path* (page 407). Judge went to Chicago, returning via Cincinnati (Jan. 12th - 15th), reaching New York January 17th.

“Purple” was a sobriquet of Mrs. Tingley used by Judge and by her intimate associates up to the day of her death, and is supposed to be based on some occult relationship between the color purple and Mrs. Tingley’s character. The signature Υ , the sign of Aries, was occasionally used by Judge, I am informed. He was born April 13th, 1851, which falls in that constellation. The letter “R” is represented in the original by a sign (possibly stenographic) referring to a prominent personage whose identity may be surmised. The “Spanish idea” is given in the quotations made by Hargrove in the E.S.T. circular of April 3d, 1896 (pages 7, 8) and in part in the loose scratch pad sheets in Judge’s writing described in the September **CRITIC**, as purporting to be communications from H.P.B.

This letter not only shows Judge’s belief in the supposed H.P.B. communications, but indicates an intimate friendship with and confidence in Mrs. Tingley. Not only does he ask her advice on the Spanish matter and promise to act on it; he says “I shall have you in mind every day”. It is clear that Judge was in the habit of consulting Mrs. Tingley on confidential matters. The letter follows:

“[Jan] 5th [1895] on train [from New York City to Chicago]

Dear Purple [Mrs. Tingley]

Just as I was leaving some foreign letters came & I sent his letter so you could see how he is. I wish you would get those glasses I spoke of as you do not like to read with what you have. You ought to see how he is now, for he is either lying on purpose in the letter or speaking his heart. I think the latter. I do not know what *proof* he wants or would accept. You see he has not taken well what I said as to an anonymous letter. He may tell it to all the rest & thus prevent their sending any. In the other letter is one from the printer who saw Prince long ago — I told you of him — He tirades agst the Hdqr’s. crowd like anything.

Now about this Spanish idea. It’s a good one — but. It will raise a lot of ideas & talk. It will raise some jealousy. She [Blavatsky] was right in saying, as she said today, that she did not mean to exclude the rest of Europe *and* that those now in the work in Spain had not used all efforts. They have not. Now the prominent man there has not accepted the order. Would it be well to tell him what she has said? It looks to me like a good idea. He does believe in HPB and R will certainly have no such message for him. If you think well of this plan I will write to him from Chicago.

They report that the R crowd in London are now beginning to pretend to hear from Master. They will have revelations soon. They intend to try & show that HPB changed her opinion of me in 1891.

I shall have you in mind every day. Why dont [sic] you put down briefly things you get & not have them all lost.

Well the train jolts & I stop. It seems singular the Truth does not come. Why do you suppose? Good night

γ

I forgot that small bottle for gargle — as usual. But I have the white oil. Nasty.”

[The certification to the above letter reads as follows:]

The above is an exact copy made by me of an original letter in William Q. Judge's handwriting, written on two sides of one sheet of white paper, 6⁷/₈ in. by 10 inches, the top half of the first side (i.e. the first paragraph) in pencil, the remainder in ink.

Copy made and compared by me with the original, this 23rd day of October 1932, at Oakley House, Bromley Common, Kent, England.

IVERSON L. HARRIS

We, the undersigned, on this 23rd day of October, 1932, at Oakley House, Bromley Common, Kent, England, have compared the above copy with the above described original letter in W.Q. Judge's handwriting, and find the copy to be accurate in every respect.

J.H. FUSSELL
HELEN HARRIS
ELSIE V. SAVAGE
MARGHERITA SIREN

7. **The O. E. Library Critic**, Vol. 22, November 1932, No. 4.

A Letter from W.Q. Judge to Dr. A. Keightley

The following letter from W.Q. Judge to Dr. Archibald Keightley and the accompanying document, both certified to be in Judge's handwriting, are published partly for the purpose of showing that Judge actually accepted as genuine the purported communications from the deceased H.P.B., and partly to prove that Mr. E.A. Neresheimer was wrong in asserting that since the quotations claimed by E.T. Hargrove (E.S.T. circular of April 3d, 1896) are not found in a certain Judge diary in his—Neresheimer's—possession, therefore the series of quotations was "concocted" by Katherine Tingley, E.T. Hargrove and J.H. Fussell. This is a very serious charge, libelous if untrue, and it is my intention to defend the honor of the two surviving theosophists, Hargrove and Fussell, by showing that the quotations were actually made from documents in Judge's handwriting. This was done in part in the September CRITIC, where reference is made to certain loose sheets in Judge's handwriting, of which I have received photographs, and which were quoted by Hargrove.

The letter and document were sent by Judge to Dr. Keightley, then in London, as a member of the E.S.T. Advisory Council, and were returned to Judge with other E.S.T. papers later, finally finding their way into the Point Loma archives. The entire document was quoted *verbatim* by Hargrove (E.S.T. circular, April 3d, 1896, pages 4-8). It will be seen by reference to that circular that the document notes certain omissions, making no reference to the person designated by Hargrove as "Promise" and supposed to be Mrs. Tingley. Why are these references not found in the document sent to Dr. Keightley? Clearly Judge intended to keep these to himself, as directed by the supposed H.P.B. This lack is supplied in part by the photographs in my possession which, in Judge's handwriting, make reference to a certain person designated by a sign which I have indicated by "X" (see September CRITIC). "Keep X well in the background"; "X is our mystery" says one of the passages. I shall present these again later, putting them in parallel with the Hargrove quotations, and shall present evidence that it was Katherine Tingley who was referred to in such eulogistic terms by the supposed discarnate H.P.B.

Speaking of the supposed communications from H.P.B. to Judge, Hargrove stated as follows (E.S.T. circular of April 3d, 1896, page 6):

It should be stated that in Mr. Judge's occult diary he has entered messages and communications received through this person in the same way as he has entered his own, as from Master, and this he has done in no other case, showing that 'Promise' was the only person whom he placed on his own level of reliability in this respect.

In a long message received by him from H.P.B., extracts from which were read at a general E.S.T. meeting in New York about a year ago, these being at the same time sent to the Advisory Council in London, there are some important references to this chela:

This is followed by the quotations of which the following document forms a part. It will be shown later that Judge received the "message," wrote it down hastily on scratch pad sheets, and afterwards copied it with some verbal emendations in a permanent form, whether in a diary or not matters nothing. As for the esteem in which Mr. Judge held Mrs. Tingley, the reader is referred to his letter to her, in the October CRITIC.

The certification of the Keightley letter and document is as follows:

The attached is an exact copy, *verbatim et literatim*, made by me from the originals of two documents written in ink in the handwriting of William Q. Judge, the one signed by him being on a sheet of yellow paper 5½ x 8½ in. with the following printed letterhead:

“All Communications herein must be marked ‘Private’
and contain no other Business.

E.S.T.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE
144 Madison Avenue,

NEW YORK 189 ”

these three figures “189 ” being the only thing on the attached copy that is not in Mr. Judge’s handwriting: the figure “5” which follows to complete the date 1895 is in his handwriting. In the upper left-hand corner is the imprint of the E.S. seal, consisting of two interlaced triangles enclosed in a circle with the Sanskrit word “Sat” in the Devanâgari characters in the middle, with the winged disk below.

The document referred to in the above-described letter is written on two sides of a plain sheet of white paper 8½ by 11 inches, watermarked “Pure Monarch Linen L”.

Copy made and compared by me with the originals in William Q. Judge’s handwriting this eighth day of December, 1932, at Oakley House, Bromley Common, Kent, England.

IVERSON L. HARRIS

We, the undersigned, on this eighth day December, 1932, at Oakley House, Bromley Common, Kent, England, have compared the attached copy with the above described original documents in the handwriting of William Q. Judge, and declare the copy to be accurate in very respect.

JOSEPH H. FUSSELL
ELSIE V. SAVAGE
MARGHERITA SIREN
HELEN HARRIS

The letter is as follows:

Dr. A. Keightley
(for Councillors etc.)

Jan. 4 [189]5

Comrades

Enclosed is an exact transcript of what HPB said to me Jany 3, prematurely ended by a visitor — as usual & as results from European continual nagging at me. It is word for word. More will be said later. You can let all worthy & devoted loyalists read this — It may be read in a proper group. Copies not to be made. This is to be kept with Council papers.

Fraternally
WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

Go to no extremes in thought or act hereupon.

[Also see Chronology, Jan. 4, 1895 entry for W.Q. Judge’s letter to Archibald Keightley, and for additional comments and references. — Compiler]

The accompanying document is as follows:

H P B. Jany 3 1895

Yours is not a (bootless) or fruitless) errand. You have nobly sustained our cause in the crisis. Be encouraged. Well did Master know the staunch fearless attributes of your soul when he directed me to make you leader of our craft in America. As the centre of our force is attacked the more does our light work for the right. Victory is ours. All will end for the good of all. Mistakes have been made but you have not gone

far from the lines laid down by Master. My desire is for you to be careful about sending out Instructions to the E.S. for treacherous and unworthy persons are within the gates, & all new ideas will be appropriated by the other side after x x x x . The forces are out and annihilation is the only thing that can interfere.

Let me tell you some of the things I have learned since I absented myself from the outer world. Many of the problems of life that should have been solved if we had been more together have come up before me & I have learned much. I am, next to the American work, interested in Spain. Ireland can take care of itself. In the pine woods I have found a lodge which I knew something about before I went away. There, seven chelas & the light they show that some day will be better known, I will describe to you at our next meeting. There is much connected with it that can be used for irradiating forces in this country for there is a subtle connection. Be sure that at our next meeting it is not forgotten x x x x Slowly the light from this Lodge is being thrown over Spain & I see that from the old corpse of bigotry superstition & credulity will be reared a temple of light which will unite its forces with that of America & Ireland & from these three points I know that humanity will be saved. x x x

This battle of light & darkness in our midst seems but small (little) when I view the work before us x x x and the ends and prospects of our work shall stem the tide of this cruel & unworthy persecution. Under all of it & over it all the Masters hand; be sure that all is well for thee. x x x x.

The light mentioned in Spain is of seven sides & a purple & yellow light. On each of the seven sides is a star. This represents the Lodge of Spain. Connect yourself with it as you will be directed. x x x

I will not permit you to resign nor will I permit you to submit to further investigation. Form your plans for the American work. Keep all your lines perfect with sustaining points & leave the rest to us. This is to your questions of last night. x x x x x

I will not touch on minor points. They will take care of themselves. Master is not after minor points. Let us turn our eyes to the American future of Theosophy. x x x x (Interruption & conclusion by a visitor)

8. **California Utopia: Point Loma: 1897-1942**, pp.16-17

[The original of the following letter is in the handwriting of Emil August Neresheimer and is preserved in the Archives of The Theosophical Society, Pasadena, California. The letter dated March 31, 1896, written only ten days after Judge's death, was to Alice L. Cleather who was then residing in England. The letter gives an amazing account of how Katherine Tingley brought Neresheimer and the others to acknowledge her leadership in the Society. E.A. Neresheimer was a close friend of Judge and co-executor with Jasper Niemand (Julia Keightley) of Judge's will.]

[The following excerpts from the letter were first published in the book **The Point Loma Community in California: 1897-1942** by Emmett A. Greenwalt, University of California Press, 1955; second & revised ed. with new title, **California Utopia: Point Loma: 1897-1942**, Point Loma Publications, 1978, pages 16-17, Chapter II, "Spiritualism and the Rise of Katherine Tingley". — Compiler]

Mrs. Tingley Channels the Recently Deceased William Q. Judge.

[March 31, 1896]

The day after he [Judge] died he sent for me through † with whom he made me acquainted in 1894. . . . Next day early I called, could not connect with him, all I could get through † was 'to go slow, immensely slow.' He had something to say before the incineration. He came again at 12 m. next day but said nothing of any account. † was not conscious.

Two days afterward I was sent for in the evening. We (Griscom, E.T.H. [Ernest T. Hargrove] and myself) had been engaged all along night after night sorting papers and things; I went, made notes of what he wished me to say to the others, which was mostly retailing my entire connection, introduction by him to †, all that transpired about the arrangement for the Convention in 1895, program of which was furnished me by † and which was carried out. This I did to the (skeptical) audience consisting of E.T.H., Patterson, James Pryse, Griscom, Fussell (who were all designated to hear it) and I also transmitted the appointment for all of us to meet at Purple's [Mrs Tingley] same evening at 7:45 p.m.

The Rajah [Judge] commenced to talk almost immediately through †, suggesting to select the Outer-Head and the Council. First change of feeling occurred at recognition of the Rajah. Skepticism was carried to the winds, doubts vanished, and spontaneity prevailed. . . . I tell you the thing was most wonderful and impressive.

[Emmett A. Greenwalt, author of **California Utopia: Point Loma: 1897-1942**, p.17, adds:]

Neresheimer went on to relate that each of the above leaders was designated for some high office in the Society. Katherine Tingley was quite willing, for example, that the presidency should go to Hargrove, knowing full well, as had Madame Blavatsky, that the real power lay with the Outer Head of the esoteric section. She took the precaution, however, of remaining anonymous in this position until the loyalty of the membership could be assured. According to Neresheimer, "each member separately would be given the ultimatum and new pledge, which was to be handed in twenty-one days after its receipt." The anonymity of the Outer Head was explained as a stratagem to shield that person from "the inevitable slander and persecution" which had fallen upon previous holders of the office, Madame Blavatsky and Judge.

In the meantime, a search was made of Judge's papers to find some endorsement of Katherine Tingley as his successor. No direct endorsement was ever found, and its lack was to provide ammunition to Tingley critics in the years to follow. There were, however, enough cryptic references in Judge's diary to Katherine Tingley

and her “messages” to show that she enjoyed a full measure of the man’s confidence. Probably because of this somewhat vague and indirect endorsement, the diary excerpts were not released by Tingley followers for publication until after her death many years later. It is a matter of record, however, that in their March 29, 1896 meeting the leaders of the esoteric section unanimously endorsed Tingley as Judge’s successor.

[See Chronology, March 29, 1896 and March 31, 1896 entries. — Compiler]

[The symbol † designates Katherine Tingley. — Compiler]

9. **The O.E. Library Critic**, Vol. 22, December 1932, No. 5, pp.6-9.

[6]

More about the Judge "Diary"

In the September CRITIC attention was called to the fact that a series of loose sheets, in Judge's writing, has been found at Point Loma, containing all of the quotations made by Mr. Hargrove in 1896 in support of Katherine Tingley, the authenticity of which quotations had been called in question by Mr. E.A. Neresheimer and others. It was also stated that I had received photographs of several of these sheets, containing parts of eight paragraphs quoted by Mr. Hargrove, and that with the cooperation of friends I had compared these with several personal letters from Judge in their possession, our conclusion being that they were unquestionably written by Judge himself, and that therefore the Hargrove quotations were authentic.

Several questions arise in connection with these documents:

1. Does the particular sign used in these purported communications from the discarnate H.P.B., and designated by Hargrove as "Promise", really refer to Mrs. Tingley as he supposed, or to some other person?
2. How did Judge get these communications? Were they received psychically while alone, or were they dictated to him by Mrs. Tingley herself, acting as a "medium", or perhaps by some other person?
3. Did Judge accept these so-called communications from H.P.B. as genuine, including their commendations of the personage called "Promise" by Hargrove?

Answering the first question, the sign referred to in the original loose sheets, which I have designated by an "X", to avoid making a special cut, consists of a sloping line crossed by three short lines. The documents are in Judge's handwriting and the sign is referred to by Hargrove as "Promise", supposed to be Mrs. Tingley. In the archives at Point Loma there are numerous letters from Judge and others to Mrs. Tingley, or about her, in which she is specifically designated by this sign. Owing to [7] the absence of the Point Loma staff in England these are not accessible at the present time and I therefore present in proof thereof the two following certificates:

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that, during the later years of William Q. Judge's life, i.e., from 1892 until his death in 1896, I was his Private Secretary; that during the greater part of the period between 1896 and 1929, when Katherine Tingley died, I was her Private Secretary; that for many years last past I have been Secretary General of The Theosophical Society, Point Loma; that to my personal knowledge, William Q. Judge frequently referred to Katherine Tingley in letters written to her and about her by the signs X (see above) and 13; that there are such letters in my custody at the present time in the archives of The Theosophical Society, Point Loma.

Subscribed by me this 29th day of December, 1932, at Oakley House, Bromley Common, Kent, England.

JOSEPH H. FUSSELL.

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that, during the later years of Katherine Tingley's life and until her death in 1929 I served her as amanuensis; that since that date I have been and am now Private Secretary to Dr. G. de Purucker; that there are, to my certain knowledge, in the private files of Katherine Tingley's correspondence in the archives of The Theosophical Society, Point Loma, numerous letters from various Theosophists, some from William Q. Judge, many from E.A. Neresheimer, and some from others, in which the symbol X (see above) is used in addressing Katherine Tingley and in talking about her.

Subscribed by me this 29th day of December, 1932, at Oakley House, Bromley Common, Kent, England.

ELSIE V. SAVAGE.

It is therefore clear that the person referred to by Hargrove in the E.S.T. circular of April 3rd, 1896, as "Promise", and about whom Judge received supposed communications from the dead H.P.B., was no other than Katherine Tingley, said communications having been written down by Judge himself. The figure "13" used in one of the loose sheets (see below) also refers to Mrs. Tingley.

To question 2, there is no evidence at hand at present to establish positively whether Judge received these messages while alone by some psychic or other process, or whether they were given to him by some medium, possibly Mrs. Tingley herself. Most of them were received early in January, 1895, while Judge was in New York, and probably Mrs. Tingley likewise. That is, there is no evidence at hand to controvert the view that it was Mrs. Tingley herself who inspired these messages.

As to question 3, there can be no doubt that Judge regarded them as genuine communications from the discarnate H.P.B., unless, indeed, we make the highly improbable and derogatory assumption that Judge himself "concocted" them, to use the word applied by Mr. Neresheimer to Messrs. Hargrove and Fussell. The evidence of this is to be found in the letter from Judge to Mrs. Tingley printed in the October CRITIC, and in his letter to Dr. Archibald Keightley with the accompanying document, both printed in the November CRITIC. As space is lacking to reproduce them here, the reader is referred to those two issues of the CRITIC.

To repeat, all of these documents are in Judge's handwriting, but just here is to be noted an important fact. *Some of the sentences in the Judge document sent to Keightley and quoted by Hargrove are also found in the loose sheet photographs in my possession, which are also in Judge's handwriting.* But — and this is a very significant point — the message sent by Judge to Keightley and as quoted by Hargrove, as well as other Hargrove quotations, differ in a few trifling verbal respects from the photographs, yet both are in Judge's writing. To make this clear I set the two versions side by side. The numbers refer to the successive sheets. I have enclosed [8] in brackets ([]) the portions of the photographs which were quoted by Judge to Dr. Keightley (letter in November CRITIC) and requoted by Hargrove. These, then, are found *twice* in Judge's writing. Doubtless if I had photographs of the entire series of loose sheets there would be more. The brackets do *not* occur in the originals:

As given in the loose sheets.

4) Jan 2

[if we had been more together have come up before me & I have learned much. I am, next to the American work, interested in Spain. Ireland will take care of itself. There in Spain in the pine woods I have found a lodge which I knew something about before I went away. There 7 chelas and the light they

5

show that some day will be better known I will describe to you at our next meeting There is much connected with it that can be used for irradiating causes in this country. Be sure that at next meeting this is not forgotten. Slowly the light from this Lodge is being thrown over Spain & I see that from the]

8

you can make X what you wish & the truthfulness of X spirit & devotion to us will make X useful. Keep X

As presented by Hargrove.

[if we had been more together have come up before me and I have learned much. I am, next to the American work, interested in Spain. Ireland can take care of itself. In the pine woods I have found a Lodge which I knew something of before I went away. There seven chelas and the light they

show that some day will be better known, I will describe to you at our next meeting. There is much connected with it that can be used for irradiating forces in this country, for there is a subtle connection. Be sure that at our next meeting this is not forgotten. Slowly the light from this Lodge is being thrown over Spain, and I see that from the]

you can make what you will of "Promise," for the truthfulness of spirit and devotion to us that are there

well in the background In outer work X is our mystery
[The light I mentioned in Spain is of 7 sides with a
purple yellow light on each of]

10

[with sustaining points & leave the rest to us. This is to
your questions of last night.] I can do well now with 13
I can do better in time. [I will touch upon minor points
they will take care of themselves Master is not after the
little points Let our eyes turn to the American future of
theosophy.]

will make it a good instrument. But keep it well in the
background. In outer work "Promise" is our mystery.

[The light mentioned in Spain is of seven sides, with
a yellow and a purple light. On each of]

[with sustaining points and leave the rest to us. This is
to your questions of last night.]

I can do better in time here. [I will not touch upon
minor points; they will take care of themselves. Master
is not after minor points. Let our eyes turn to the
American future of Theosophy.]

The explanation of the whole matter is simple enough. The loose sheets at Point Loma are the original notes taken down by Judge on a scratch pad at the moment of receiving the communication, and so hastily written that he neglected the punctuation and even the word "not" in sheet No. 10. These were then copied by Judge with slight emendations, forming the version accessible to Hargrove, whether in diary form or not matters nothing. Could anything be simpler?

We must conclude then, I think, that we have the indisputable evidence in Judge's own handwriting:

1. That he received a series of communications which he accepted as coming from H.P.B. [9]
2. That in these communications a person designated as "X" or "13" was spoken of in high terms by H.P.B., and who is proved to be Mrs. Tingley.
3. That Judge copied these loose scratch pad sheets or memoranda either into a diary or in some other form, making slight corrections. This — not the original memoranda — was quoted by Hargrove, and a portion copied and sent to Dr. Keightley. The diary, or whatever it was, has not been located to date, but Mr. Neresheimer's claim that because he possesses a Judge diary which does not contain them, therefore no such record existed and that the Hargrove quotations were fraudulent, falls through.
4. That Judge wrote familiar letters to Mrs. Tingley, indicating the high esteem in which he held her.

The theory has been advanced that the whole series of documents are forgeries made by some designing person. We must assume that the forger wrote in Judge's handwriting a sham letter to Dr. Keightley, accompanied by a sham document, which Dr. Keightley would certainly have discovered later; that he wrote sham letters to Mrs. Tingley, and deposited the "messages" among Judge's papers, also at the imminent risk of discovery. Such a person would be a fool or a madman.

The photographs of the loose sheets as quoted above, however, afford conclusive evidence of genuineness. Suppose a forger to have started by making a preliminary scratch pad draft of a document which he proposed to forge. Is it likely when he wrote in such haste as to neglect the full stops, that he would have taken the trouble to imitate Judge's writing at the same time? Don't believe it. The rough draft would be in his own writing and he would have reserved his imitation of Judge's writing to the finished product. Yet the whole series, the rough notes and the transcript sent to Dr. Keightley are in Judge's writing, and the photographs are witness to this being the case with the original notes.

The United Lodge of Theosophists' anonymous book, *The Theosophical Movement*, regarded by that association as the final word on theosophical history — which will not tolerate even the suggestion that Judge claimed to have had communications from the dead H.P.B. or that he was on intimate terms with Mrs. Tingley and which spends pages in trying to prove that eight members of the New York E.S.T., of hitherto unblemished reputations, and several of them close associates of Judge, were either knaves or fools — makes much of the fact that in the E.S.T. circular of April 3rd, 1896, "in no place is the specific statement made that

any of the alleged ‘proofs’ were in *Mr. Judge’s own handwriting.*” (page 667.) This is quite true, but why should this have been done? Does any biographer go to the pains of assuring his readers that every personal letter he quotes is in his subject’s own handwriting? Quite naturally the gentlemen whose honor or common-sense is questioned by *The Theosophical Movement* took it for granted that that would be understood.

To sum up. The evidence is that Judge received and accepted as genuine what he regarded as communications from H.P.B., dead nearly four years; that these, quoted by Hargrove and endorsed by several others who claimed to have seen the documents, were highly laudatory of Katherine Tingley and accepted as such by Judge, and that Judge conferred with Mrs. Tingley and sought her advice on certain matters contained in them and sent portions to the London E.S.T. It now remains for those whose exalted opinion of Judge precludes such possibilities to wriggle out as best they can, or to retract publicly their slanderous charges against brother theosophists, or, else, which is far more likely, to decline to look facts in the face.

In conclusion I repeat what I have said before, that I have no interest whatever in taking sides with Mrs. Tingley and Point Loma, or — as some may interpret it — in reflecting on Mr. Judge. I am only interested in getting at the facts and in defending, if possible brother theosophists against unjust accusations.

10. **Theosophical Quarterly**, Vol. 31, July 1933, pp.88-89.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the Theosophical Quarterly:

May I be permitted, through your columns, to reply to letters in which I am requested to say what I know about various papers referring to Mrs. Tingley, marked Private, issued after Judge's death?

The request in itself is strange. Papers marked Private, sent out and received on the clearest understanding that their contents would be preserved with inviolable secrecy, are what I am urged to discuss. If others choose to do such a thing, on their heads be it. I will not. There are those who excuse themselves for such conduct on the ground that they believed certain things at the time these papers were issued, which they do not believe to-day. On that basis anyone would be free to release himself from any sort of promise whenever he felt like doing so. Such persons are outside the pale of human intercourse.

This much, however I can say:

(1) The papers in question gave exactly what they purported to give, namely, extracts from Judge's diaries and occult records, referring to Mrs. Tingley, in his handwriting, accurately copied, nothing being omitted which would have discredited or nullified the passages quoted. The originals were seen at the time by several persons who certified they had seen them.

(2) Mrs. Tingley *was* Judge's successor so far as his non-public position was concerned. She was intended to serve as a stop-gap.

(3) Mrs. Tingley failed, and then intrenched herself in her failure. Her new position had fostered her ambition and other very serious weaknesses. Consequently she was deposed by the order of those whom, from the beginning, Judge recognized as his Superiors and as the true Founders of the Theosophical Society.

(4) As Mrs. Tingley refused to accept her deposition and was able to persuade many that it was invalid — not even the formation by her at Chicago of the so-called Universal Brotherhood with herself as Official Leader with autocratic powers, serving to open their eyes — the task of carrying on the Work of Judge and of H.P.B. and their Masters, fell to those who have been identified with The Theosophical Society [NY] and with the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY from that time to this.

(5) The Point Loma Society represents those who followed Mrs. Tingley out of the Movement, in spite of her obvious failure and her open violation of Theosophical principles.

(6) The United Lodge represents those who, like Robert Crosbie, followed Mrs. Tingley to Point Loma, out of the Movement, and who, when they did finally wake up to the fact of her failure, lacked the moral courage to seek readmission to the real Society, preferring instead to claim they had been deceived, and that Mrs. Tingley never had been Judge's occult legatee.

(7) The Adyar Society represents those who attacked, slandered, and did their utmost to destroy Judge, as part of the Brahmin campaign to destroy the reputation of H.P.B.

Allow me to add that those who have questioned me on this subject (none of them members of The Theosophical Society [NY]) are of two kinds: those who are looking for controversy, and those who are looking for light. As to the first group, they can be of interest only to themselves. As to the second, they are

looking for light as it never can be found; they are attempting, by analogy, to determine whether John the Divine was “genuine” by an analysis and comparison of texts, authorities and other material details which are not only unilluminating and lifeless, but childish and deadening; they are trying to decide, again by analogy, whether H.P.B. was really a Lodge Messenger, by counting the number of misquotations in *Isis Unveiled*. If they would know Judge, they must seek him in what he wrote, in what he did; in the pages of the old *Path*, in *Letters that Have Helped Me*, in *The Ocean of Theosophy*, in his letters now appearing in the QUARTERLY; they must seek his spirit and purpose in all these things, and should then look for his “fruits”, as in the thirty published volumes of this magazine. If they will do this honestly, they will find him, — in all his simplicity, integrity, unswerving devotion, and great attainment; they may discover even why it was that H.P.B.’s Master called him *friend*: why Mrs. Besant betrayed him; why he died prematurely and was obliged to name Mrs. Tingley his “successor”; finally, why and how it was that Mrs. Tingley so lamentably turned her back on the Lodge to follow her own will and desires.

E.T. HARGROVE.

11. **The O.E. Library Critic**, Vol. 22, March 1933, No. 8.

[The following are comments on Hargrove’s letter by the editor of the **Critic**, Dr. Henry N. Stokes. This issue of the **Critic** is dated March 1933, four months prior to Hargrove’s letter in the **Theosophical Quarterly** in July 1933. The **Critic** was likely published late. — Compiler]

The Judge Diary Question — Mr. Hargrove Speaks

In its discussion of the genuineness of the Hargrove quotations from papers of W. Q. Judge referring to Mrs. Tingley, the United Lodge of Theosophists publication, *The Theosophical Movement: a History and a Survey*, states that “in no place is the specific statement made that any of the alleged ‘proofs’ were in *Mr. Judge’s own handwriting*.” (page 667).

Dr. Joseph H. Fussell has already come forward with the testimony that these documents, recently discovered in the archives of the Point Loma Theosophical Society, are in Judge’s writing (see December CRITIC), a statement which the Bombay U. L. T. organ, *The Theosophical Movement*, refused to publish, after having cast aspersions on him. This is confirmed by the CRITIC (September, 1932) from a partial set of photographs of the documents. The CRITIC has since received a much fuller set of photographs, nearly complete, in Judge’s writing, containing the Hargrove quotations. Further reference may be made to these later.

Mr. E.T. Hargrove has now spoken in a letter addressed to the Editors of *The Theosophical Quarterly* and published in its July, 1933, issue (page 88) from which I quote in part:

Originals Written by Judge

“(1) The papers in question gave exactly what they purported to give, namely, extracts from Judge’s diaries and occult records, referring to Mrs. Tingley, in his handwriting, accurately copied, nothing being omitted which would have discredited or nullified the passages quoted. The originals were seen at the time by several persons who certified that they had seen them.

“(2) Mrs. Tingley *was* Judge’s successor so far as his non-public position was concerned. She was intended to serve as a stop-gap.”

Mrs. Tingley Deposed by Masters

“(3) Mrs. Tingley failed, and then entrenched herself in her failure. Her new position had fostered her ambition and other very serious weaknesses. Consequently she was deposed by the order of those whom, from the beginning, Judge recognized as his Superiors and as the true Founders of the Theosophical Society.”

We Are the Elect

“(4) As Mrs. Tingley refused to accept her deposition and was able to persuade many that it was invalid — not even the formation by her at Chicago of the so-called Universal Brotherhood with herself as Official Leader with autocratic powers, serving to open their eyes — the task of carrying on the Work of Judge and of H.P.B. and their Masters, fell to those who have been identified with The Theosophical Society [NY] and with the *Theosophical Quarterly* from that time to this.”

All Others “Out of the Movement”

“(5) The Point Loma Society represents those who followed Mrs. Tingley out of the Movement, in spite of her obvious failure and her open violation of Theosophical principles.

“(6) The United Lodge represents those who, like Robert Crosbie, followed Mrs. Tingley to Point Loma, out of the Movement, and who, when they did finally wake up to the fact of her failure, lacked the moral courage to seek readmission to the real Society, preferring instead to claim they had been deceived, and that Mrs. Tingley never had been Judge's occult legatee.

“(7) The Adyar Society represents those who attacked, slandered, and did their utmost to destroy Judge, as part of the Brahmin campaign to destroy the reputation of H. P. B.”

The important point in the above is Mr. Hargrove's statement that his quotations in the E.S.T. circular of April 3rd, 1896, were from documents *in Judge's handwriting*. The truth of this is abundantly proved by the photographs in my possession.

Naturally Mr. Hargrove takes the attitude of his particular society with regard to the later history of Mrs. Tingley. With this I am not concerned here, though it is somewhat amusing to note that “the task of carrying on the Work of Judge and of H.P.B. and their Masters fell to” his particular organization, constituting it THE ONE AND ONLY, while all of the other folks are “out of the Movement”, no matter how loudly they swear by the same Judge, H.P.B. and Masters. One would also be interested to learn on what he bases his statement in “(3)” that Mrs. Tingley was deposed by order of the Masters. It should not be forgotten that Mrs. Besant based her attack on Judge upon purported orders of the Master received by her personally (*The Case Against W. Q. Judge*, page 13). Without intending to reflect on Mr. Hargrove's sincerity one would like to know what actual proof exists of the genuineness of such orders regarding Mrs. Tingley. These “Masters” are certainly most accommodating, adapting themselves to everybody's desires.

12. **The O.E. Library Critic**, Vol. 23, November–December 1934, No.4.

[Dr. Henry N. Stokes on the purported messages to William Q. Judge from the dead Madame Blavatsky which praise Katherine Tingley: — Compiler]

William Q. Judge and Katherine Tingley — I

Not a little discussion has been aroused by the circulation in 1932 by Mr. E.A. Neresheimer of a document directly charging Katherine Tingley, J.H. Fussell and E.T. Hargrove with having “concocted” certain statements quoted by Mr. Hargrove in an E.S.T. circular dated April 3d, 1896, as being found in documents left by W.Q. Judge and which Mr. Hargrove regarded as referring to Mrs. Tingley, and which were advanced by him as supporting her as Judge’s successor. The charge of “concoction”, as directed against three prominent theosophists, two of whom are still living, is a serious one, and it has been the aim of the CRITIC to get to the facts, even at the risk of boring some of its readers who may have thought it a matter of no importance. These are asked to consider whether the vindication of two persons, prominent theosophists and officials of theosophical societies, against charges of fraud is not a matter worthy of some effort.

Missing Judge Documents Discovered

The question of the relation of W.Q. Judge to Katherine Tingley having been raised again, and the honor of one of the Point Loma officials having been impugned, search of the Point Loma archives brought to light all of the documents, hitherto forgotten, containing the passages quoted by Mr. Hargrove, and all of them *in Judge’s own handwriting*. That they should have been overlooked is not surprising seeing that they were in part written on odd scraps of paper, and as the questions involved had not gone so far as to lead to those concerned being charged with deliberate fraud.

What Judge Wrote

I was furnished with photographs of most of these forgotten and now rediscovered documents. These I compared, with the assistance of old friends of Judge, with unquestionably genuine and personal letters of Judge in their possession and in the presence of a person expert in examining handwriting, and the unanimous conclusion was that the documents were actually written by Judge. In the CRITIC of September, October, November and December, 1932, I discussed these manuscripts, especially those containing what Judge regarded as direct communications from the deceased H.P. Blavatsky, in which a woman designated by a sign was spoken of in highly laudatory terms. The special sign used — though there were others — consisted of three short nearly horizontal lines crossed by a nearly vertical stroke, and this, designated by Hargrove as “Promise”, was supposed by him to refer to Katherine Tingley. In one case the three short horizontal lines were used, the vertical stroke being omitted, presumably because of haste in taking down the dictation, many other signs of such haste being in evidence. The complete sign I have designated before and herein as “X”, the incomplete sign being herein designated by “Xb”. Another sign used was “13”. I reproduce here the passages of the Judge scripts containing these signs, copied from the photographs before me:

You can make X what you wish & the truthfulness of X spirit and devotion to us will make X useful. Keep X well in the background in outer work X is our mystery

Our dear chela, you have at last found your chela who was one of ours years ago (X) consecrated to the work then & by the $\hat{\quad}$ will brought face to face with you. X is Raavais linked with you in our work. As your light shines in upon her soul fears will disappear as the dew before the sun.

Jany 9, H.P.B.

No one I have met in the last 5 centuries has been qualified As I said Xb is our mystery. Xb is a mystery to Xb. Judge try a little more of it. Let Xb say what ————— [unintelligible symbol] wants to.

I can do well now with 13 can do better in time.

Clearly then, Judge was getting from some source communications supposed by him to be the discarnate H.P.B., referring to a mysterious person, a woman, "X", or "Xb", of great importance, but who was to be "kept well in the background in outer work".

Judge Meant Tingley

Who was this mysterious woman? Why was no reference found to her by name in anything left by Judge as far as has been discovered? Mr. Hargrove interpreted these signs as "Promise", supposed by him and others associated with him to be Katherine Tingley, and with good reason as will appear below. But the photographic evidence was still lacking that it was she rather than some other person who was meant. I therefore secured from the two Point Loma officials, Dr. J.H. Fussell, who was private secretary to Mrs. Tingley, and from Miss Elsie V. Savage, another secretary to Mrs. Tingley, certificates to the effect that this sign "X" was constantly used by Judge and others in addressing or in referring to Mrs. Tingley, as shown by numerous letters in the Point Loma archives. These certificates will be found in the CRITIC of December, 1932.

Some Judge Letters to Tingley

But these were not sufficient to convince the "doubting Thomases" and I did not myself possess the direct evidence of the truth of this claim. Now, however, I have before me the originals of five letters of W.Q. Judge to Katherine Tingley, all in his handwriting, in which both the signs "X" and "13" were used in addressing her. These were loaned to me from the personal file of Mrs. Tingley and are browned with age and in part broken along the folds and mended. The contents of these letters I am not permitted to quote, though it may be said that they deal mainly with current theosophical affairs, both trivial and important, and indicate that the writer was in the habit of taking Mrs. Tingley into his confidence. They are as follows:

1. Written in pencil, undated addressed to "X" and signed "γ" (Aries), "♃" (Jupiter) and a Sanskrit initial "J". The Jupiter sign was used by Judge in writing to Hargrove (see his series of Judge letters in 1932-3 *Theosophical Quarterly*) [see Appendix D — Compiler]. One of the Judge-Hargrove letters was signed with a Sanskrit "J" (*Theosophical Quarterly*, Jan., 1932, page 245) [see Appendix D, Part IV — Compiler]. Judge also used the Aries sign at times (see his letter to "Dear Purple" in Oct., 1932, CRITIC).
2. Written in ink, dated "Nov. 12/94" and addressed to "D X", unsigned and with pencil notes said to be in Mrs. Tingley's writing.
3. Written in pencil, dated "Nov. 15/94" and addressed to "Dear X"; signed "♃" [Jupiter] and "Prince" and bearing a pencil note said to be in Mrs. Tingley's writing: "Letter of W.Q.J. to Purple".
4. Written in ink, dated "Jan. 11" [1895] addressed to "Dr. X" and signed "γ". It refers to his trip to Chicago and Cincinnati and evidently linking on to his letter to "Dear Purple" dated "Jany 5th" and published in the October, 1932, CRITIC.
5. Dated "Monday," addressed to "Dear X 13" and unsigned.

An important point to be noted is that two of these letters, Nos. 2 and 3, are dated about six weeks or more before the dates of the now famous scripts recording his supposed communications from H.P.B., thus

showing that his use of the sign “X” for Mrs. Tingley antedated its use in these scripts. Judge’s use of this sign in the scripts was therefore made with the knowledge that Mrs. Tingley was the wonderful person meant by H.P.B.

(To be concluded)

13. **The O.E. Library Critic**, Vol. 23, January–February 1935, No. 5.

William Q. Judge and Katherine Tingley — II

(Concluded from Nov.-Dec. CRITIC)

Other Letters to Tingley

Further, I have three letters from Mrs. Tingley’s files, two originals and one a photograph, written to her after Judge’s death by a person who was for years closely associated with her. The name of the writer must be kept confidential, as well as the contents, other than to state that they are such as would be communicated by the writer only to his chief. In each of these Mrs. Tingley is addressed by the same sign “X”. These letters are all handwritten, the script being identical, and are as follows:

1. Original, dated Sept. 28th, 1896, written on the writer’s business letterhead, beginning “My very dear Preceptor X” and signed with a symbol.
2. Original, undated, written from the writer’s home on paper with the T.S. symbol, beginning “My dear X” and signed with the writer’s initials.
3. Photograph of original, dated March 15, 1897, written on the same business letterhead as No. 1, addressed to “My dear X” and signed with the writer’s initials.

We have then the positive proof that the special sign which I have designated here and elsewhere as “X” and which was used by Judge in the script of his purported communications from H.P.B. about the end of 1894 and beginning of 1895 was also used by him in addressing Mrs. Tingley, that he knew at the time that it was Mrs. Tingley who was referred to, and that the same sign was used by others in writing to Mrs. Tingley after Judge’s death. The same holds for the secondary sign “13”. That “Xb” is the same as “X” is shown by the scripts speaking of her as “our mystery”. That the Judge scripts in photograph occasionally use other signs apparently referring to the same person, and in one case questionably, all of which were translated by Hargrove as “Promise” and referred by him to Mrs. Tingley in no wise affects the force of the conclusion that Judge was receiving from some source what he regarded as communications from H.P.B. endorsing Mrs. Tingley — see above — but admonishing him to keep her “in the background in outer work”. This should afford a sufficient reason why she was not mentioned *by name* in any discovered documents in his writing, even when quoting H.P.B.’s “communications” to others, as to Dr. Archibald Keightley (see November, 1932, CRITIC). One has but to read between the lines of Judge’s letter to Mrs. Tingley (October, 1932, CRITIC) to sense the esteem in which he held her.

Summary

To sum up:

1. Judge received various communications supposed by him to be from the spirit of H.P.B., endorsing a woman whom he designated by the sign “X”, and on one occasion by “13” and on another by “Xb”.

2. Judge was in the habit of writing to Mrs. Tingley, addressing her by the same sign "X", and also "13" and this even before the date of the H.P.B. scripts. He must therefore have known that H.P.B. was referring to Mrs. Tingley.

3. Others used the same sign "X" in writing to Mrs. Tingley after Judge's death.

4. Hargrove is cleared of the charge of "concocting" his quotations as is J.H. Fussell. Hargrove was fully justified in assuming that it was Mrs. Tingley whom Judge had in mind.

What Crosbie said about Tingley

5. While nothing has come to light in Judge's own handwriting appointing Mrs. Tingley as his "successor" — the reason for which may be surmised from the above — Robert Crosbie — of whom it is claimed by the United Lodge of Theosophists (official pamphlet, *The United Lodge of Theosophists; its Mission and its Future*, page 6), that "During all the troublous period 1893-6 Mr. Crosbie shared to an extent unknown and undreamt of by others in the burdens and the confidence of Mr. Judge" — has distinctly stated (his printed address of April 1, 1901, published in the pamphlet "In honor of W.Q. Judge", page 46; see May 1933, **CRITIC**): [See Chronology, April 1, 1901 entry. — Compiler]

Mme Blavatsky was the first leader, by the force of her wisdom and power of leadership, and all the true students of Theosophy accepted her as such. And when she appointed William Q. Judge as her successor, his leadership was accepted for the same reason — and so, too, with Katherine Tingley, who was appointed by William Q. Judge as his successor.

Unless, therefore, we are to assume that Mr. Crosbie, founder of the U.L.T., the intimate sharer "in the burdens and the confidence of Mr. Judge", was falsifying, he must have had good reasons for thinking that such were at least Judge's intentions. In fact, if the reader could have the opportunity of reading the personal letters of Judge to Tingley referred to above, he would see that, to paraphrase what the U.L.T. says of Crosbie: "During all the troublous period 1893-6 *Katherine Tingley* shared to an extent unknown and undreamt of by others (if we except Robert Crosbie!) in the burdens and the confidence of Mr. Judge." (with due allowance regarding the earlier date.)

Concerned with Facts, not Theories

In this and the preceding articles I have been concerned with the actual facts, not with theories as to what Judge might or should have done based on preconceived views of his character, or whether the facts are consistent with his earlier attitude or writings. Theories must fit facts, not facts ignored to support theories. Had Judge lost his grip and allowed himself to be imposed on by Tingley? Was Crosbie, the third member of the U.L.T. Holy Trinity, the confidant of Judge, and who was so sure Judge had appointed Tingley, fooled or lying? Or is it possible that Tingley was far from being the scheming ogre that some would represent her to be, and that Judge knew just what he was about in trusting her, and that Crosbie was entirely familiar with this and approved of it? I am not going to express an opinion, at least here, except to say very distinctly that charges of forgery, or even vague insinuations such as have been made (*Theosophy*, Oct., 1933, page 572) reflect only on the character of the persons making them, unless backed by proof including an explanation of why a forger so ingenious as to have faked a series of interrelated documents and planted them here and there in order to boost Mrs. Tingley's successorship, was so stupid as entirely to have forgotten to mention that successorship at all, and, likewise, how Crosbie could have committed such an egregious blunder. As for the Bombay U.L.T. organ, *The Theosophical Movement*, which reflected on the integrity of Dr. Fussell (though not by name) and refused to give even a summary of his defense when asked by him to do so, perhaps the less said the better, for it would not be complimentary.

14. **The Canadian Theosophist**, Vol. 27, September 1946, pp.212-219.

[212]

COVINA EXPLAINS

As *The Canadian Theosophist* has reproduced the article in *Theosophy* for April on Carey McWilliams' slanders of Kath[e]rine Tingley and Point Loma students, I beg leave to make a few remarks which may throw a different light on some of the statements in *Theosophy* which indicate that the writer is very badly misinformed. I refer particularly to the statements about 'succession', such as "There is absolutely no evidence of any sort that Mr. Judge thought Mrs. Tingley or anyone else as his 'successor', nor that the mysterious talk of 'Promise' was anything more than a frantic fabrication of foolish students who felt that they must have some figure-head for a 'leader'." Then E.T. Hargrove is quoted as saying that Mrs. Tingley was run in as "the only person in sight who was ready to hand at that time . . . a sort of neutral centre round which we could congregate . . .", and the old fable is revived that occultism is opposed to the principle of "apostolic succession." We are also told that "Certain 'private papers' of Mr. Judge, said to bear out this claim, were never produced."

We had all hoped that the rotting [213] remains of these old and exploded charges had long ago received a decent burial, but it seems that eternal vigilance is the only price of safety and if a false rumour is given a fair start Truth has great difficulty in overtaking it.

I may say here that I have had the privilege of being a working member of the Theosophical Society ever since the beginning of the so-called "Judge Case" in 1894 in which I took an active part in Mr. Judge's defence.

Among this mix-up which must be straightened out for future reference we may all agree that on one occasion during a newspaper controversy in 1892 Mr. Judge *did* write that H.P.B. never contemplated or notified a successor, but as it can be shown that H.P.B. actually contemplated a successor on several occasions it seems probable that he was carried away for the moment by his righteous indignation aroused by the preposterous claims of a certain H.B. Foulkes to have been nominated by H.P.B. to succeed her in the Esoteric School of Theosophy! He was striking hard blows and in the heat of battle he may not have meticulously weighed his words; or momentarily had forgotten certain facts. Poor Mr. Foulkes seems to have thought that his feeble psychic or mediumistic attainments warranted his demand, but W.Q. Judge boldly declared that H.P.B.'s status was *sui generis*, unique, a word that rightly applies to her magnificent intellectual and spiritual endowments, her control of the higher potencies in Nature and her absolute consecration to the Masters and their Cause, all and more combined in one individual.

Whatever the explanation may be, we have positive record that H.P. Blavatsky had long contemplated and searched for a successor sufficiently qualified to "keep the link unbroken," the link she spoke of with her last breath, apparently referring to the need for wise guidance during the period before the great effort toward the end of the twentieth century.

Col. Olcott says in his *Old Diary Leaves*, i, 462, that H.P. Blavatsky often spoke to him about possible successors, and there is one passage in a letter from him to Miss Francesca Arundale dated "9.2.85 Adyar" which proves that an occult successor, apparently Damodar, was envisaged. He writes: "Again our Master snatched her from the jaws of death . . . Damodar goes to Tibet for development, and if she should die before his return I am to be the temporary link between the Masters and the T.S. These are his orders but I shall be a sorry substitute. However let us hope that I may not be called upon for that but that they will keep her alive until her successor can be sent." (*The Theosophist*, September 1932, p.732. Italics mine.)

Rather earlier than this, according to H.P.B. and W.Q.J., Mrs. Laura Holloway almost 'made the grade.' She was part author of *Man, Fragments of Forgotten History* which the Master desired to see published in spite of some errors (see *The Mahatma Letters*, p.361). She was a remarkable woman and an intimate friend of Mr. Judge. In a letter from Mr. Judge to Col. Olcott written from Paris in April 1884 when the former was helping H.P.B. with *The Secret Doctrine*, he says there is a possibility of getting "a magnificent co-adjutor, if not a successor to H.P.B. and one who has trained scientific methods of literary work, as well as psychical abilities of the kind that make H.P.B. so remarkable".

Furthermore, he thinks that the Masters would let H.P.B. have her desire and "vanish" if the person mentioned would do, and says that while someone was extolling that lady "H.P.B. leaned back and said 'O my God, if I shall only find in her a SUCCESSOR, how gladly I will PEG OUT'." (*The Theosophist*, [214] November 1931), However, Mrs. Holloway was not found to be properly qualified, for reasons given in *The Mahatma Letters*, pp.359-61.

Some years later, H. P. Blavatsky was still looking for a successor. Quoting from Countess Wachtmeister's *H. P. B. and the Present Crisis in the Theosophical Society* pamphlet, page 3, we read: "H.P.B. always told me that her successor would be a woman, long before Annie Besant became a member of the T.S. She made various attempts with different people, hoping to find one. . . ." The Countess then speaks of H.P.B.'s high estimate of Mrs. Besant and quotes her letter to W.Q. Judge in March 1[8]91, shortly before her death, wherein she writes "Judge, she is a most wonderful woman, my right hand, my successor, when I will be forced to leave you, my sole hope in England as you are my sole hope in America." We all know that for a while Mrs. Besant was Co-Outer Head of the Esoteric School with Mr. Judge. It is worth mentioning in view of controversial statements, that part of the letter from which the above sentence is quoted was published in slightly but significantly garbled form to suit a certain point of view, not Judge's, during the troubles in the T.S. in 1894 and later. Mrs. Archibald Keightley showed me the original letter for comparison.

There can be no doubt that H.P.B. was definitely and with good occult reasons looking for a successor. Even in *The Secret Doctrine* vol. i, we find her modestly saying "In Century the Twentieth some disciple more informed and far better fitted, may be sent by the Masters of Wisdom to give final and irrefutable proofs that there exists a Science called *Gupta-Vidya* . . ." This may refer to the Leader who is expected toward the last quarter of the century. Her published letters show her high estimate of the real W.Q.J., the *Nirmanakaya*, the one who was, as she said "part of herself for æons," etc., terms such as she never used about anyone else, and that he was quite capable of filling the immediate vacancy in the E.S. with dignity and occult qualifications. Of course neither he nor anyone else was "unique" in the special sense that H.P.B. was, but in one letter she writes that he must ultimately "take her place at Adyar" and that it would be no more difficult for him to work under the *exoteric Presidency* of Olcott than it was for her to do so. (*The Theosophical Forum*, May 1930). She was of course referring to the Direction of the E.S.T.

Then there is the testimony of a private and personal letter written just before her death to W.Q.J. from which I have quoted the sentence about successorship in England and America, and which he, in harmony with his scrupulous sense of honour and fair-dealing placed before the E.S. Council on May 27, 1891, the earliest possible date after H.P. Blavatsky's death. It was this letter which largely if not entirely caused the Council to place Annie Besant and W.Q. Judge together as Co-Outer Heads or 'successors.' The Master approved of this decision and endorsed it by his brief message "Judge's Plan is right"; which was whole-heartedly accepted by Annie Besant, the entire Council and W.Q.J. himself. Some weeks after, she frankly and generously acknowledged Mr. Judge's higher occult standing in a letter dated July 2 addressed to esotericists who did not want to accept her Co-Headship with him. She wrote, "If I could, I would say to you, my dear — sign only to Mr. Judge. I should be quite content, for indeed there is no reason why you should have any

confidence in me. Only as They have put us together, I have no power to stand aside.” (*The Path*, June 1895, p.100) .

That Mr. Judge fully accepted the principle and the fact of successorship [215] is finally demonstrated by his proclamation in the famous November 3 *Circular* wherein he declares Master’s Order that Annie Besant’s Co-Headship is at an end and says “. . . I resume in the E.S.T. in full all the functions and powers given to me by H.P.B. . . . and *that came by orderly succession* after her passing from this life, and declare myself the sole Head of the E.S.T.” (italics mine).

It would be farcical to imagine that when Mr. Judge wrote the italicized words he did not believe in the principle of occult succession!

Now in regard to the principle of *apostolic succession* in general, which we are told once more was condemned by H.P.B. as a “gross and palpable fraud” it is regrettable that this old and unjustified mistake has been rehashed. The statement was first made, I believe, in *The Theosophical Movement* in 1925 and discussed in *The Canadian Theosophist* and elsewhere about thirteen years ago when Mr. August E. Neresheimer charged certain persons with the production of fraudulent documents to sustain the claim that Katherine Tingley was W.Q. Judge’s successor; which charge I will discuss later. It was shown that H.P.B.’s denunciation referred to the *Roman Catholic claim to the apostolic succession alleged to have been transmitted from Simon Barjona to the present day by the laying on of hands*; and which is believed by the faithful to give priests supernatural authority to bind and loose sinners, etc., etc. She calls this “a gross and palpable fraud” and “an imposition alike upon priest and penitent.” It does not bear any application outside the Roman Church.

In *The Theosophical Movement*, p.362 and as subsequently used by writers who ought to have been more careful, the quotation from *Isis Unveiled* ii, 544, reads “The present volumes have been written to small purpose if they have not shown . . . that . . . apostolic succession is a gross and palpable fraud.” This is verbatim, including the dots. By the omission of the small but very important word “the” before the words “apostolic succession” H.P.B.’s meaning was *transformed* to support the argument against any kind of succession and especially in the Theosophical Society. However, it must be said in justice, that *this time* the *Isis* quotation is repeated, (in *Theosophy* for April) it has been given correctly, as “the apostolic succession”, but of course the whole argument against apostolic succession in Theosophy or occultism is thereby vitiated! We must look elsewhere to find H.P.B.’s attitude toward the succession of esoteric Teachers or Leaders. This has been shown in part in the earlier pages of this letter, but I would add that not only does she discuss and approve of it but she mentions it as a normal proceeding. In terrestrial and human evolution there are the Manus; a succession of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; the 28 Vyasas, etc. She specifically mentions succession among the Druses, and cites the transference of spiritual wisdom and leadership from Moses to Joshua on Mount Nebo, after which the former had to die, and there is also the giving of the mantle of Elijah to his successor Elisha. Various references to the system occur in *The Complete Works of H. P. Blavatsky*, centenary edition. (Rider and Co.) The Tibetan Lama system is one of rigid succession, and as, according to H.P.B., the Masters are in touch with the highest Lamas and have schools of chelaship in some of the *gompas*, they can hardly disapprove of it in occult training.

H.P.B. gives an interesting case of the general principle in *Isis* ii, 42, footnote, where she describes the tragic death of a Russian magician whose designated successor was forcibly prevented from reaching him in time. Though this was not a case of *white* [216] magic it serves to illustrate the ancient custom of occult successorship carried on by the passing on of the mysterious “Word which is no word,” for she writes that it can be traced “to the old Mysteries which had been for ages spread all over the globe.” Therefore though capable of being misused it is very high in its origin. Frazer’s *Golden Bough* contains a vast amount of

information on the wide-world practice of the succession of Hierophants, though of course he only deals with the exoteric and folklore aspect.

In regard to the remarks in April *Theosophy*, against which I strongly protest, the statement that Mrs. Tingley was “run in as O(uter) H(ead)” as an emergency measure would be laughable if it were not so mischievous. Mr. Neresheimer’s respected name is brought in to support this point of view though he never held it. Of course his affidavit as quoted is honest, though its terms did not hinder him from enthusiastically supporting Katherine Tingley and her work for at least thirty-two years! But the writer in *Theosophy* has failed to observe or at least to inform the reader that Mr. Neresheimer was speaking only of the affairs of the *Theosophical Society* and makes no mention of the Esoteric School, whose Outer Headship is the point in question. It is no doubt correct that no papers were seen by Mr. Neresheimer “naming Mrs. Tingley or anyone else, directly or indirectly, as his successor in the affairs of the Theosophical Society in America” as he declared on oath, but there were papers to show that Mr. Judge had been contemplating for many months an *Esoteric* successor in the person of “Promise” (Mrs. Tingley) through whom he believed that H.P.B. would come and help. Without having given an explicit nomination in writing, which we are told is not the best way in occultism, Mr. Judge left notes on this subject which are so plain and showed such confidence in Katherine Tingley that even had there been no other reasons for their action the Council could not reasonably have done anything but accept her as the rightful successor in the E.S.T. The convenient stop-gap “run in” excuse offered by E.T. Hargrove was declared much later on when it suited his purposes.

One of the most important pieces of evidence, perhaps not familiar to the writer in *Theosophy*, was published in *The Searchlight* of May 1898, p.30. It was written by Mrs. Archibald Keightley (“Jasper Niemand”) one of Mr. Judge’s closest and most trusted friends, and also close friend and associate of E.T. Hargrove. Many Theosophists thought she might well be Mr. Judge’s successor. Her statement is the best evidence of Katherine Tingley’s standing, long before Mr. Judge’s death, that could be desired. She writes: “It is well known to members of the Inner Council in America and Europe that the present Outer Head (Mrs. Tingley) has for two years past assisted Mr. Judge in the *inner* work of the school as his associate and equal. Some of these Councillors were doing important work under her direction, and by the order of Mr. Judge, for some time before he passed away. The present Outer Head had the entire confidence of Mr. Judge and has that of the Council. The Council, composed of members in America and Europe, is in entire harmony on this point, and especially those members of it who were in close touch with H.P.B. during her lifetime . . . For myself, I may say that as early as June 1894 Mr. Judge told me of the standing of the present Outer Head of the School . . . Of his appointment of the present Outer Head there is absolutely no doubt; and there is also no doubt of her entire ability to fill that appointment; or of her right to it; or that it came from and was directed by the Master.”

[217] There is not much about anyone being run in as a “neutral centre” in this solemn declaration of E.T. Hargrove’s devoted friend! It is hardly necessary to add more on this point, but I cannot help quoting a few words published by Hargrove himself and then leave the reader to decide on the credibility of that gentleman whose simple statement is so innocently swallowed by the poorly informed writer who tries to resuscitate the mouldering errors of the past. E.T. Hargrove writes in an editorial in *Theosophy* for 1896 pp.67-68 (the name given to *The Path* by Mr. Judge just before his death).

“An attack appeared in a New York Newspaper whose reporter had been instructed, as he inform[e]d one of our number, ‘to tear Theosophy to pieces.’ This attack was directed against Mrs. Katherine A. Tingley, a member of the Theosophical Society in America, a personal friend of Mr. Judge’s and Outer Head of the ‘E.S.T.’, to which position *she was appointed by Mr. Judge in papers left by him.*” (italics mine). E.T. Hargrove then goes on to pay a high tribute of respect and regard to Mrs. Tingley’s past and present activities. The editorial is sign[e]d E.T.H.

Now about the most unwarranted charge of all, i.e., that alleged “foolish students” — really some of the oldest and most responsible members in America — fabricated “the mysterious talk about ‘Promise’, certain “messages and quotations” claimed to be in Mr. Judge’s handwriting; forged them in fact, in order to persuade the E.S. members that Mrs. Tingley was the right person to be recognized as Outer Head. These papers were found among Mr. Judge’s things after his death and have been associated with several diaries or notebooks that he kept. These record books, with the exception of one that was handed to Mr. Neresheimer by Mrs. Tingley in 1928, are in the Covina archives. The messages and quotations are not intrinsic parts of any of the diaries, but are written on separate loose sheets of paper, large and small, and all are also in the archives. Mr. Neresheimer seemingly expected to find the writings on the pages of the diary he received from Mrs. Tingley, but not finding them he was much disturbed and unhappily jumped to the conclusion that there was something very wrong and that, in his own words, they “could only have been concocted by Mrs. Tingley assisted by Mr. Hargrove and Mr. J.H. Fussell.” Mr. Neresheimer’s honourable reputation for fair dealing gained considerable vogue for this serious charge against two living men and one dead woman, and the whole question was thrashed out in *The Canadian Theosophist* for 1932-3. Although you, Mr. Smythe, then as now Editor of this journal, took Mr. Neresheimer’s part at the outset of the discussion, writing a condemnatory article in *The Canadian Theosophist* for May 1932 entitled “Mr. Judge’s alleged Diary” and signed A.E.S.S., after hearing all the evidence you frankly and honourably withdrew the statements and in January 1933 wrote and published what you rightly hoped would be taken as an *amende honorable*.

In addition to the charge of fabrication the writer in *Theosophy* repeats the statement that the “private papers” were never produced. This is easily shown to be another misstatement, arising from ignorance we must suppose, for when Dr. G. de Purucker, former Leader of the Theosophical Society, Covina, established a temporary headquarters at Oakley House, Bromley, near London, from September 1932 to November 1933, he invited Miss M.A. Thomas, *an active member of the United Lodge of Theosophists*, to inspect the originals in Mr. Judge’s handwriting of the disputed “messages and quotations.” She declared herself perfectly satisfied that they were genuine. Dr. H.N. Stokes of the *O.E. Library* [218] *Critic* took the matter up in his magazine and his complete and impartial analysis of the documents is to be found in a long series of issues in Vols. xxi to xxii (1932-34). He was sent photographic copies of the disputed papers and his verdict was emphatically against the possibility that they could be “fabrications”, “concoctions”, or anything but what they appear to be, i.e., Mr. Judge’s private notes and instructions in support of Katherine Tingley’s (“Promise” as he called her at that time) high occult standing, and of the confidence he felt in her. So much for the misleading statement that the papers were never produced. The writer in *Theosophy* would perhaps find the two series of letters and articles in *The Canadian* and in the *O.E. Critic* instructive as well as interesting.

One more matter, important, and I shall have covered most of the ground. It concerns what happened after the publication of Mr. Neresheimer’s charge of “concoction”, as already discussed. In brief, Mr. and Mrs. Neresheimer were invited to Point Loma in 1932 where, on August 25 and in the presence of responsible witnesses Captain John R. Beaver, Mr. Olaf Tyberg, and Mrs. Tyberg, (the latter a resident today at the Covina headquarters) Mr. J.H. Fussell showed them a number of the “messages and quotations” disputed by Mr. Neresheimer. After careful examination Mr. Neresheimer, who knew Mr. Judge’s handwriting very well, declared that he was perfectly satisfied that they were in his handwriting and perfectly genuine. He also acknowledged the authenticity of the Judge Diaries or Record Books.


Mr. Neresheimer then undertook to publish a written statement endorsing the authenticity of the documents and withdrawing his charges which were evidently made under a strange misapprehension, but unfortunately this was never done. Mr. Neresheimer died in 1937. I was told that he thought it better to let sleeping dogs lie. Unfortunately, however, they often wake up and try to bite, as in the present case, and so prevention is better than cure.

Feeling anxious about future possibilities, when Mrs. Neresheimer visited Covina not very long ago I asked her if she could do anything to set the question finally at rest, so that these unjustified charges would trouble us no longer.

In regard to the interview at Point Loma where Mrs. Neresheimer was present and about which her evidence — and Mrs. Tyberg's, they being the only living witnesses today — is of the first importance, Mrs. Neresheimer responded at once, and very kindly wrote me a letter stating that the facts of the interview at Point Loma had occurred as outlined above. This letter is preserved in the Covina archives, wherein the long and animated correspondence between Mr. Fussell, Mr. Tyberg and Mr. Neresheimer that was exchanged after the production of the latter's *Reminiscences of William Q. Judge* containing the original charges is also in safe-keeping.


In the *Reminiscences* Mr. Neresheimer says that on March 22, 1896, the day after Mr. Judge laid aside his worn out frame, Mrs. Tingley told him that he had appeared twice in the night to her in distress because he could not impress his wishes on his former associates. The Covina archives contain a letter from Mr. Neresheimer to Mrs. Alice L. Cleather dated March 31, 1891, advising her that the "Rajah" (his higher *Nirmanakaya* aspect which H.P.B. once called "Maharajah") had come through and given complete instructions as to the management of the Esoteric School and its control by Katherine Tingley as Outer Head; and other directions about the T.S. Mrs. Cleather was to be added to the Council. These instructions, according to this letter, were very detailed and amply justify [219] all that was done by the Council. Mr. Neresheimer displays the greatest enthusiasm and delight that everything had turned out so well under occult direction. Thirty-four years afterwards, when he wrote the ill-advised remarks in his *Reminiscences* which have caused such anxiety, he must have entirely forgotten what he wrote in the letter to Mrs. Cleather which has been quietly resting in the archives all the time.

Charles J. Ryan.
Covina, California.



APPENDIX

H



MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Table of Contents ~ Appendix H

1. Introduction to “Miscellaneous Items”.
Introductory Comments to Appendix H. By Compiler. 425-426
2. “The Sweet-Tongued Voices of Illusion.”
The Irish Theosophist, Vol. 3, August 1895, pp.200-203. 427-429
3. Letter/article by Alice L. Cleather and Basil Crump.
Obtained from The H.P.B. Library. It is doubled spaced, with poor print quality,
unsigned but with the authors’ initials and the Library Seal. 430-433
Compiler’s Comments. 433
4. Letter from Master K.H. to Henry Olcott.
Letters From The Masters of The Wisdom, 1881-1888, pp.50-56, 116-118.
Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras, India, 1919 [First Series].
(Transcribed and Compiled by C. Jinarajadasa). 434-436
5. “Memorandum of Interview with Dr. Annie Besant.”
Notes and comments procured by William Mulliss during his interview
with Besant on October 6, 1926. 437-442
6. One page statement by B.P. Wadia.
Typed document obtained from Dallas TenBroeck. 443
7. “A Case of Amnesia in an ‘Arhat’.” By H. N. Stokes.
O. E. Library Critic, Vol. 16, November 1926. 444-445
8. “Mrs. Besant and the Judge Case.” By H. N. Stokes.
O. E. Library Critic Vol. 16, January 1927. 445-446
9. “Address at a General Meeting in London by the O. H. (1909).” By Annie Besant.
The Link, August 1911, pp.53-67. 447-452

1. Introductory Comments to Appendix H — Compiler.

Introduction to “Miscellaneous Items”

One year after **The Case Against W. Q. Judge** was published (in April 1895) by Annie Besant, Alice Cleather published her personal observations on the new teachings adopted by Besant following her association with the Brahmans in India. Cleather joined the Society in 1885 and in 1890 became one of twelve members, six women and six men, accepted by H.P. Blavatsky for private Theosophical teachings in the Inner Group of the Esoteric Section. Cleather, unlike Besant who was a well-known orator, was virtually unknown as a public figure in England; but she was a familiar face to the London Theosophists. She handled most of the Press Bureau for the Society in England and supplied monthly reports on theosophical activities in England to **The Theosophist**. Her first report was featured in the April 1890 issue and her last, the June 1895 report, appeared in the August 1895 issue. She severed her relationship with Adyar in July 1895.

Cleather visited America and attended the American Section Convention at Boston in April 1895. At the Convention, by regular order of motion she was given a seat and voice, without power to vote, as a representative from London. There she realized how strong, and how dedicated to the original Theosophical Cause, Judge’s position was. At this Convention a new Constitution was drafted and the Theosophical Society in America was born. On her return to London she wrote “The Sweet-Tongued Voices of Illusion” and sent it to **The Irish Theosophist**, the only magazine in Europe which totally supported Judge. It is reprinted here as Item number 2. This important article draws attention to the philosophical changes which had occurred with Besant since her (then) recent visit to India. Cleather published this article to show that she could no longer support Besant and her new philosophy. Her dissatisfaction was expressed very clearly and served as a warning to all other Theosophists to be vigilant about Besant’s new teachings. Alice Cleather, Dr. Archibald Keightley*, Dr. Herbert A. W. Coryn** and Claude Falls Wright were the only members of the Inner Group to join with the Theosophical Society in America. After Judge’s death Cleather participated in the around the world Theosophical Crusade led by Katherine Tingley in 1896.

Item number 3 is by Alice Cleather and her friend and co-worker, Basil Crump. It appears to have been written in the early 1920s while they were in India. It was obtained from The H.P.B. Library. The letter is stamped with the Library’s Seal and initialed by both Cleather and Crump. It has never been published before, as far as can be ascertained. The letter opens with an extract from **The Lamp**, a Canadian magazine published by Albert Smythe, and provides some interesting insights and their views as to what destroyed the Theosophical Society. Some of these comments were found to be wrong assumptions on their part and are clearly footnoted by the Compiler. From the Compiler’s point of view, many of Cleather’s books, which were published in the 1920s, did a lot of damage to Judge’s credibility. Her assumptions and innuendoes about Judge were not supported by facts or by evidence, although much of her personal observations and other information can be substantiated. This letter provides an opportunity to refute some of these assumptions.

Item number 4 shows that Olcott had difficulty accepting some of the changes which occurred in the Theosophical Movement while Blavatsky was still alive. Olcott was apparently jealous of Judge to a certain extent. This perhaps impaired his ability to see the depth of Judge’s true loyalty to the Cause of Truth, which

* Dr Keightley was also present at the Boston Convention. “After the Boston Convention in 1895, at which those principles were accepted by the Society in America, with an invitation to members throughout the world to unite on the same platform, Dr. Keightley’s home became the official centre of the work in England.” (**Theosophical Quarterly**, Vol. 28, January 1931, p.292.)

** Dr. Coryn supported Judge and worked in connection with the Theosophical Headquarters at 144 Madison Avenue, New York. He joined the Tingley movement and moved to Point Loma in early 1900.

led to many difficulties a few years later. It may also have prevented him from seeing and feeling the depth of his own loyalty. This letter from Master K.H. to Olcott is mentioned by Cleather and Crump.

Item number 5 has never been published in full before, again, as far as can be ascertained. It is a transcript of a “Memorandum” prepared by William Mulliss Williams (his actual name), a Canadian newspaper man who was the Managing Editor for the **Hamilton Spectator** in Ontario, and who happened to be in Los Angeles at the time that Annie Besant was there in October 1926. Portions of his interview with Besant have been cited by Boris de Zirkoff in the **Blavatsky Collected Writings**, Volume XIV and in his booklet, **Rebirth of the Occult Tradition**, in **Theosophy** (ULT), November 1978 (with related information in the December 1926 issue), and in **The Eclectic Theosophist**, January 1979.

Item number 6 is an interview by B.P. Wadia, a respected member of the Theosophical Society, whereby he extracted an admission from Besant that she had come to realize “that Judge did not forge those letters; and that the messages received by him were genuine.” Both this item and the previous one support each other in context regarding Judge’s innocence, and both interviews took place in the 1920s.

Items number 7 and 8 are from **The O.E. Library Critic**. Here Besant’s statements are examined by Editor, H.N. Stokes. Stokes unveils what some people had observed about Besant as far back as the mid-1890s, after Blavatsky’s death: that her statements often changed, sometimes contradicted her earlier statements, and were not always consistent. [See Chronology, May 21, 1895 entry for Julia C. Keightley’s statement regarding Besant’s “constant forgetfulness”.]

Item number 9 is Besant’s “Address at the General Meeting in London by the O[uter] H[ead] (1909).” These meetings were strictly private for pledged members of the Esoteric School. Her lecture was published in **The Link**, a magazine only for the E.S. and circulated once every quarter to all English-reading pledged members. By this time Besant had reestablished the Esoteric Section* and appointed herself as the Outer Head, signifying that she was in direct contact with the Masters, as their representative, who were the Official Head of the Organization. Interestingly, she never produced any evidence that she was ever in contact with these Masters, but spoke as though she was. This item is included for the comparisons she draws, while in a private meeting, with the Leadbeater situation she found herself in at the time versus the crisis during the “Judge Case”.

— Compiler

* The Rules of the Esoteric Section in 1911 were: “Pledged Members of more than one year’s standing may pass from the Esoteric School into the Esoteric Section, by applying to the Corresponding Secretary of their Division, who will forward the application to the O.H. Members of the O.S. [Order of Service] are, *ipso facto*, in the Esoteric Section. No one can enter the Esoteric Section except through the Esoteric School. Annie Besant, O.H.” (**The Link**, August 1911, p.44.)

2. **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, August 1895, pp.200-203.

[200] "THE SWEET-TONGUED VOICES OF ILLUSION."

DURING the past three months there have been appearing in *Lucifer* a series of "extracts of letters received from Indian friends" of Mrs. Besant's, and which are put forward by her under the high-sounding title of "The Doctrine of the Heart." That Mrs. Besant can seriously, and in all sober earnest, present these extracts as appropriate subject-matter to be placed under the almost sacred title of "The Doctrine of the Heart," only proves to what extraordinary lengths she has gone in the acceptance and promulgation of what is certainly a more dangerous form of religious teaching than the gush and emotionalism which is usually associated with certain forms of orthodox Christianity.

It would seem scarcely necessary, or indeed worth while, to take much notice of these "extracts of letters"—for one would imagine that to most sensible and unprejudiced men and women they would carry on their very face their own condemnation—were it not that Mrs. Besant now figures as a prominent teacher of Theosophy; and when this sort of thing is given out to the world seriously, and under such an utterly misleading title, it is time that some protest should be raised, some word of warning uttered, in the interests of what many of us conceive to be the true theosophical teaching. For the pen of the writer of these letters exudes a honied and cloying sweetness; and the *mâyâvic* regions to which he beckons have allured and detained even the highly cultivated and otherwise sane and keen intellect of so gifted a woman as Mrs. Besant.

Let us examine a little closer this pabulum for the soul which Mrs. Besant has found so "helpful" that she wishes, and very rightly and naturally, to share it with others.

We find, in the first extracts given, that much stress is laid upon "devotion." So far so good. But devotion to what? To the Lord within? Man's seventh principle, the Self? Not so, but to something [201] altogether outside; something, or someone, that the devotee "feels nearer to . . . when he lands in India"; the "Lords of Love and Light" (picture, *en passant*, the disgust of our old Lion of the Punjab over these lusciously-sweet "letters that have helped" Mrs. Besant), the mention of whose "Lotus Feet" occurs with constant and painful iteration throughout these extracts.

What is all this but a return to the worship of the personal? A return—subtle and insidious, it is true—to the cultivation of priestcraft and its attendant abominations. Is there not here creeping in, and that apparently quite unobserved by Mrs. Besant, for she appends no warning or explanatory footnotes, a return to the old domination of the PERSONAL GOD? With that obsessing and monstrous idea H. P. B. waged an almost life-long war. Yet it is one of her own pupils (her "successor," according to the pupil) who is now doing her unconscious best to help lay this burden once more upon the shoulders of those who had succeeded in freeing themselves from it, under the influence of H. P. B.'s saner, wholesomer, and more virile teachings.

Again, I note in these extracts a peculiar glorification of the virtue of self-sacrifice, that virtue which so dangerously soon becomes a vice, and a praise of suffering which seems to be exaggerated out of all just proportion. Take a few sentences at random:

"It seems to me that there is a peculiar sweetness in being resignedly patient, in gladly sacrificing one's own will to the will of Those Who know better and always guide aright."

"Try to realize the beauty of suffering . . ."

“How sweet it is to suffer when one knows and has faith; . . .”

“Let us rejoice that we have opportunities of serving the great Cause by personal sacrifices, . . . a disciple . . . should, therefore, suffer ungrudgingly and gladly. . . .”

Comments on the above are surely not needed, nor do the omitted portions materially alter the sense, indeed they do but serve to emphasize the truth of what I have already put forward.

The writer further assures Mrs. Besant that the idea — the *feeling* — of *isolation* is a mere product of Mâyâ, that from it flow ignorance and all personal desires, and that it is at the root of all our misery. I had understood that it was the “sense of *separateness*,” rather than the “*feeling of isolation*,” which is the fertile cause of all these above enumerated woes. That I am not in error in making this distinction is proved by the constant mention of “the blessed Feet of the Lords” (“under” which the disappointed disciple is driven “to seek shelter”), the “Holy Ones”; in fact, something outside ourselves to which we [202] should fly for refuge, much as the devout Christian is bidden to seek shelter under the cross of Jesus. “Life,” for instance, is said to be “only worth having as it is sacrificed at Their Feet.”

All this is bad enough; but there is more, and worse, to follow. Take the extract given on p.301 of the June number, where the writer says that “self-reliance is quite unavailing and even deceptive” under trials which are stated to proceed from “the Dark Powers.” That as “these troubles and illusions come not from the self, the self is powerless against them,” and that, therefore, “the only way to escape from these illusions is to devote oneself completely to Them.” Now note the corollary. “The reason of this, too, is plain enough. *The force, in order to be effective in its opposition, must be on the same plane as that on which the Power to be counteracted plays*” [italics mine. — A. L. C.], and proceeding, as these “troubles and illusions” do, “from the Dark Ones, they can only be neutralized by the White Brothers”!

So then, we find to our amazement that, according to this Hindu letter-writer, those Masters in whom so many of us believe *act on the same Plane as “the Dark Ones.”* That any appeal to, or call upon, the Higher Self (for that, I presume, is meant by “the self,” though it is not even treated to a capital letter) is useless, because it is “powerless” to help. Masters, however, will neutralize *for the disciple* — so I understand the writer — the operations of “the Dark Powers” which so distress and harass him. If this is not good Christian orthodoxy I am at a loss to find another name for it. But enough of this sorry travesty of the true Doctrine of the Heart. We have not so learned Theosophy.

Mrs. Besant is absorbing her new teachings with almost fatal rapidity; witness her reply to Mr. Gladstone in *The Nineteenth Century* for June. Therein can plainly be traced her subtle and misleading interpretation of the idea of sacrifice. She says: “The Law of the world’s progress in the whole and the parts is sacrifice, . . . the very Logos is the Self-limited God; . . . such self-limitation and manifestation can only be a supreme act of sacrifice . . .” — and so on, as we have all probably read for ourselves.

It seems sufficiently evident that this blind and almost unintelligent devotion to the idea of pain and self-sacrifice can only proceed from an unbalanced attitude of the soul in the presence of the difficulties and trials which beset the path of the would-be occultist. For if, as we believe, the Mahâtmâ is he who works in perfect harmony with Nature’s laws, he must accept the fact that he cannot give without receiving, for this is the Law; nor could perfect equilibrium be otherwise [203] preserved. Yet this is precisely what is so completely lost sight of in this new teaching of Mrs. Besant’s.

Finally, I must maintain that all this continued harping on self-sacrifice and pain is not only morbid and unhealthy, it is false, because only a partial and one-sided presentment of fact, of Law; that such presentment

is contrary alike to common sense and the true science of Life; that it is at variance with the real trend of all theosophical teaching, which is founded on observation of the nature and action of Law, and not on mere emotionalism, of however refined and exalted a nature, and however ably put forward.

ALICE L. CLEATHER.

3. Letter/article by Alice L. Cleather and Basil Crump.

[The following was likely written in the early 1920s. Basil Crump and Alice L. Cleather were both in India at that time, where they published a number of books on H.P. Blavatsky. — Compiler]

From **The Lamp**, Feb. 1895, p.108. In the pamphlet “The Neutrality of the T.S.” [subtitled: An Enquiry Into Certain Charges Against The Vice-President, Held in London July, 1894”, and published July 21, 1894] Mrs. Besant says of her action in formulating the charges against Mr. Judge: “It is very possible I made a mistake—for I have made many mistakes of judgment in my life. . . . And now I must reduce these charges to their proper proportions, as they have been enormously exaggerated. . . . I believed that the messages he gave me in the well known script were messages directly precipitated or directly written by the Master. . . . I know now that they were not written or precipitated by the Master, and that they were done by Mr. Judge, but I also believe that the gist of these messages was psychically received. . . . The source of messages can only be divined by direct spiritual knowledge or intellectually, by the nature of their contents, and each person must use his own powers and act on his own responsibility in accepting or rejecting them.”

If Mrs. Besant would say upon what grounds, from direct spiritual knowledge or intellectually, she in the first place accepted these messages, and in the second place whether it was from direct spiritual knowledge or intellectually, she rejected them, some obscure points would be elucidated. Many are unable to decide whether she is correcting direct spiritual impressions with later ones, or previous intellectual impressions with subsequent spiritual (psychic) knowledge, or whether the whole matter is simply a weighing of primarily inadequate and of later more complete intellectual testimony.

(End of extract from **The Lamp**).

[For more on Mrs. Besant’s statement on “An Inquiry Into Certain Charges Against The Vice-President”, see Chronology, July 12-13, 1894 entry. — Compiler]

Of course the whole thing was ridiculous in itself and was merely the means used by the Brahmins to destroy the solidarity of the T.S. The Editor of **The Word**¹ recently told a friend of ours who visited him during an effort to see Mrs. Langford² (Laura Holloway) that W.Q.J. had got such a grip of the American movement that Chakravarti saw that the only way to loosen it as the first step in the disruptive process was to induce A.B. [Annie Besant] to formulate the charges of forging messages against him. This he did by gaining such hypnotic control over her, through her well-known susceptibility to male influence,³ that she was like a medium in his hands and did exactly as she was told and believed the Master gave her orders through him. Thus, we know from A.L.C. [Alice Leighton Cleather], who was a member of the I.G. [Inner Group] at the time, that when A.B. was taxed she confessed to that group that the “order” she received to accuse W.Q.J. was received, not direct by herself, but *through Chakravarti*. Probably the same is true of her relations with Leadbeater and is the secret of her persistent support of him in the face of his sexual rottenness.

1 Harold W. Percival was Editor of **The Word** until it ceased publication in September 1917. — Compiler

2 In a letter dated March 1920 Basil Crump states that “Mrs. Henderson did her best last autumn to see Laura H[olloway] but found that, although she waited close to the farm where she lived [In the early 1920s Mrs. Langford lived in Canaan, New York, a small town north of New York City] she could not induce her to see her.” [A copy of this letter, received by Albert Smythe from Basil Crump who was writing from Darjeeling, March 1920, is in the archives of Edmonton Theosophical Society. There is also a copy in the archives of The H.P.B. Library. In Cleather’s Foreword to her book, **H.P. Blavatsky, As I Knew Her**, she states that in May 1922 she had written the substance of this book as a contribution to Mrs. Laura Langford’s book, **Helena Petrovna Blavatsky: Personal Recollections by old Friends. H.P. Blavatsky, As I Knew Her** was published in 1923. — Compiler]

3 For more details on how Annie Besant allowed herself to be controlled by the men in her life see “Annie Besant, Her Passions and Her Relationships”, Part 1 and Part 2 in **FOHAT**, Vol. IV, No. 4, Winter 2000 and Vol. V, No. 1, Spring 2001. — Compiler

All these evils have, of course, arisen from the initial blunder of believing that after H.P.B.'s death any communication with Masters was either possible or probable. Nothing could be more definite on this point than the very important letter from K.H. to Olcott rebuking him for his "revolt" against H.P.B.'s "infallibility", and reminding him that she has been their direct agent for "the past 30 years", and "with occult matters has everything to do." The Master there states most clearly: "Since 1885 I have not written, nor caused to be written save through her agency, direct or remote, a letter or line to anybody in Europe or America, nor communicated orally with, or through any third party. Theosophists should learn it. You will understand later the significance of this declaration, so keep it in mind. Her fidelity to our work being constant, and her sufferings having come upon her through it, neither I nor either of my Brother Associates will desert or supplant her"⁴

This clearly refers to Sinnett's persistent claim, even long before H.P.B.'s death to direct communication, which he continues to this day altho' we learn from his own disciples that it is based entirely on communications obtained through mediums and crystal gazing. It also applies quite as clearly to the later cases of A.B. and W.Q.J., both of whom relied on third parties for communications after H.P.B.'s death,⁵ obviously because they could not get them direct and believed that as Outer Heads of the Esoteric School they must try to continue the function of "agent" which they ought to have known was only possible for her, and necessarily ceased with the death of her body. In the attempt to perform this function W.Q.J. most unwisely entered into relations with several female psychics, the last and most fatal being Mrs. Tingley, who completed the wreck begun through A.B. and gained complete control of a large portion of both the E.S. and T.S. in America and Europe, setting up her own special "Master" and diverting the whole thing into a side track entirely different from the lines laid down by H.P.B. Our belief is that when she departed, after the failure of her last attempt to form a real nucleus (the I.G., which developed disharmony almost at once), the inner W.Q.J. also was withdrawn, and it was the deserted personality who had recourse to psychics to make good the deficiency in himself. H.P.B.'s death, we are convinced, was the signal that the movement had failed for that century, through the inability of even six men and six women, some selected by the Master Himself (the I.G.) to "live the life" even to the extent of the very first condition, that of preserving harmony among themselves. All the disasters which followed were the direct result of this failure at the centre. H.P.B., the life-blood and inspiration of the whole structure, having to be withdrawn, the whole thing was bound to disintegrate and degenerate into exoteric sects guided by ordinary fallible personalities, as is the case with all exoteric religions. Nothing could be more definite in this connection than H.P.B.'s own words in a letter apparently to W.Q.J. (THEOSOPHY Sept. 1913 [pp.463-469]) : —

"I am the Mother and Creator of the Society: it has my magnetic fluid, and the child has inherited all its parent's physical, psychical, and spiritual attributes — faults and virtues if any. Therefore I alone and to a degree . . . can serve as a lightning conductor of Karma for it. I was asked whether I was willing, when on the point of dying — and I said yes — for it was the only means to save it. Therefore I consented to live. . . ." It is perfectly clear from this that the Society's existence was bound up with hers, and therefore when she did die in 1891 it was because she saw it was no longer possible to keep it alive. [*She Being Dead Yet Speaketh.*" in **The Path**, Vol. 7, July 1892, p.123.]

4 See Compiler's Comments at the end of this item.

5 The Compiler agrees with Alice Cleather's notions that Sinnett and Besant were caught in their own delusions and thought they could receive communications from K.H. and M. There is plenty of evidence to support her claims. However, the Compiler disagrees with Mrs. Cleather's assumption regarding Judge. Judge had been initiated by Master M. in 1884 while in India, and the NIRMANKAYA had blended with his astral. (See the Supplement for details.) Judge was ever on the lookout for individuals who could be occultly trained, and tested a number of individuals, including E.T. Hargrove and Katherine Tingley. While some believed that he may even have been *training* Tingley for that end, many came to the conclusion that she failed, including Hargrove. For this he was greatly ridiculed and ostracized along with those who supported him.

That W.Q.J. should soon follow her was only to be expected, for he was the only one left who had shown any signs of being a real occultist, and, as said above, his subsequent actions indicated that the real occult worker left or was withdrawn at the same time as H.P.B. Shortly before her death, when the T.S. was passing through a series of grave crises in 1889-90, she issued a magnificent address to the members of the E.S. in which she stated that “the larger the number of applicants who *take* the pledge, the greater the possibility of helping the masses.” This shows how vital was the importance of the inner body to the success of the work for humanity at large. The very large proportion of monks in Tibet, which has aroused the adverse criticism of European observers who know nothing of the occult side of Buddhism, has the same significance. Every one of those monks has taken the ten obligations of exoteric Buddhism which are sufficiently near to those of the Esoteric School of the Buddhist reformer Tson-ka-pa to be of considerable effect on the lines mentioned by H.P.B. Even if only a proportion really live up to their obligations it means that Tibet, as the sacred land which has always been the shrine of the true Pre-Vedic Wisdom-Religion (Buddhism), radiates an occult power for the good of humanity which is unapproached in any other part of the world. It is strange how Theosophists have never realised the importance of Tibet and of Northern Buddhism, despite all that H.P.B. has written about it, and that she was herself a professed Buddhist, learnt all she knew there, and that the Masters themselves declared they were the “humble followers of the man of men Gautama Buddha”. A.B. embraced Brahmanism, enemy of Buddhism, directly she set foot in India, and is now absorbed in Indian politics. W.Q.J. allowed himself to be led away by Mrs. T.⁶ into proclaiming “By the Master’s Direction” (through Mrs. T. of course) to the members of the E.S. the establishment of a school of Western Occultism which she has now carried out at Point Loma, but the preliminaries revealed to us before we left her bore no trace whatever of the Tibetan teachings given through H.P.B., and in many essential features were in direct contravention of them. Those who go back carefully over H.P.B.’s writings, especially in the early THEOSOPHIST, when she was in India, will find innumerable notes and many articles pointing to Tibet and its philosophy as the true source of Occultism. The idea of a Western school comparable to it is therefore a delusion and as devoid of true foundation as the Krishnamurti of A.B.

[HPB Library Seal]

A.L.C.

B.C.

⁶ Again, the Compiler disagrees with Mrs. Cleather’s assumption on this matter. There is no proof that Mr. Judge *was not* in direct communication with Master M. but there is sufficient evidence through Judge’s correspondence and his writings to show that he was in direct communication with Master M. (and with H.P.B. until she was withdrawn).

Compiler's Comments (re: footnote 4)

[“Since 1885 I have not written, nor caused to be written save through her agency, direct or remote, a letter or line to anybody in Europe or America, nor communicated orally with, or through any third party. Theosophists should learn it. You will understand later the significance of this declaration, so keep it in mind. Her fidelity to our work being constant, and her sufferings having come upon her through it, neither I nor either of my Brother Associates will desert or supplant her”.]

K.H. here refers to the period from 1885 to the time Olcott received this letter, August 23rd, 1888. K.H. had corresponded with others via H.P.B., that is, “through her agency”, up to 1885. This statement does not discount the fact that he may have resumed correspondence with others after August 1888, nor does it preclude the fact that the other two Masters alluded to may still have corresponded with others. Case in point: Elliott B. Page acknowledged receiving a letter from Hilarion in 1887, (called by K.H. “our semi-Greek brother”). [**The Canadian Theosophist**, Vol. 18, July 1936, p.134; also see **Theosophy (Path)**, Vol. 11, May 1896, pp.43-46.]

On March 31st, 1885, H.P.B. was hurried away from Adyar, never to return to India, after being encouraged to resign as Corresponding Secretary of the Society as a result of the accusations by the Coulombs, followed by the Hodgson Report. K.H. was likely quite disappointed when the Council chose to not support Blavatsky's defense against her accusers through legal action. Sinnett, who had been receiving letters from K.H. through the agency of H.P.B., apparently received his last letter approximately six months later, in September 1885.

K.H. may well have decided that this direct attempt at correspondence, with those he had considered most capable of taking a leading role in the theosophical Cause, had not been successful. Why, therefore, should he direct his limited time and energies to such an endeavor? It was also during the period referred to, 1885 to 1888, that K.H. was heavily involved in the writing of **The Secret Doctrine**. When Olcott arrived in London, shortly after receiving the August 23rd, 1888 letter, part of **The S.D.** was at the printers.

4. **Letters from the Masters of The Wisdom**, First Series, pp.50-56, 116-118.

[Olcott sailed from Bombay on August 7th, 1888 for London. On board the P. & O. Mail Steamer *Shannon* his thoughts were on H.P.B., his old friend. While preparing for dinner in his cabin a letter dropped from the air onto the table before him. Olcott was upset with Blavatsky for starting a new Section called the Esoteric Section of the Theosophical Society. He disliked the idea of secrecy and pledges, calling it an empire within an empire, and considered this an organization that would divide the power of administration and of brotherhood. H.P.B. was in direct communication with the Masters, thereby strengthening the occult link between the T.S. and the Masters, and also giving her pupils the extra teaching they were asking for.

[Sinnott was insisting that his views in **Esoteric Buddhism** of the seven-fold scheme of the universe was the correct interpretation, as communicated to him by the Masters, and that Blavatsky was wrong in her explanations in **The Secret Doctrine** which had just been published. This contradiction made it more apparent that Blavatsky needed to demonstrate that she was the only person in actual and constant communication with the Masters and that her explanation in **The S.D.** was to correct the mistake made by Sinnott. For more information follow the Mars and Mercury controversy in the Chronology section. — Compiler]

**LETTERS FROM THE MASTERS OF THE WISDOM
1881–1888**

[50]

LETTER XIX *

TO HENRY OLCOTT

AGAIN, as you approach London I have a word or two to say to you. Your impressibility is so changeable that I must not wholly depend upon it at this critical time. Of course you know that things were so brought to a focus as to necessitate the present journey, and that the inspiration to make it came to you, and to [51] permit it, to the Councillors *from without*. Put all needed restraint upon your feelings, so that you may do the right thing in this Western imbroglio. Watch your first impressions. The mistakes you make spring from failure to do this. Let neither your personal predilections, affections, suspicions nor antipathies affect your action.

Misunderstandings have grown up between fellows both in London and Paris which imperil the interests of the movement. You will be told that the chief originator of most, if not of all these disturbances, is H.P.B. This is not so; though her presence in England has, of course, a share in them. But the largest share rests with others, whose serene unconsciousness of their own defects is very marked and much to be blamed. One of the most valuable effects of Upasika's mission is that it drives men to self-study and destroys in them blind servility for persons. Observe your own case, for example. But your revolt, good friend, against her "infallibility"— as you once thought it — has gone too far, and you have been unjust to her, for which I am sorry to say, you will have to suffer hereafter, [52] along with others. Just now — on deck, your thoughts about her were dark and sinful, and so I find the moment a fitting one to put you on your guard.

* There is little doubt, not only from the context, but also from one fact mentioned by Colonel Olcott, that this letter was received in August 1888. But, curiously, it seems from reading *Old Diary Leaves*, Third Series, p.91, as if it were received in 1883. Colonel Olcott there quotes from this Letter, and connects it with the difficulties of 1884 in the London Lodge, concerning which instructions were given to him in Letter XVIII. Colonel Olcott mentions that Letter XIX was "received phenomenally in my cabin on board the 'Shannon,' the day before we reached Brindisi" (p.91). But he sailed from Bombay for London on P. & O. Mail Steamer *Shannon* on August 7th, 1888, as reported in *The Theosophist, Supplement*, September 1888, p.ciii. Furthermore, in the body of the Letter itself the Master says: "since 1885 I have not written"; and C. W. L., who is [117] mentioned at the end of the letter, did not come out to India till the end of 1884. It would seem, therefore, that Colonel Olcott, in narrating events about the London Lodge, took this letter about the "situation" in 1888 to refer to the situation in 1884. [Comments by Compiler C. Jinarajadasa, p.116]

Try to remove such misconceptions *as you will find*, by kind persuasion and an appeal to the feelings of loyalty to the Cause of truth, if not to us. Make *all* these men feel that we have no favourites, nor affections for persons, but only for their good acts and humanity as a whole. But we employ agents — the best available. Of these, for the past thirty years, the chief has been the personality known as H.P.B. to the world (but otherwise to us). Imperfect and very troublesome, no doubt, she proves to some; nevertheless, there is no likelihood of our finding a better one for years to come, and your theosophists should be made to understand it. Since 1885 I have not written, nor caused to be written save through her agency, direct or remote, a letter or line to anybody in Europe or America, nor communicated orally with, or thro' any third party. Theosophists should learn it. You will understand later the significance of this declaration, [53] so keep it in mind. Her fidelity to our work being constant, and her sufferings having come upon her thro' it, neither I nor either of my Brother Associates will desert or supplant her. As I once before remarked, *ingratitude* is not among our vices. With yourself our relations are direct, and have been, with the rare exceptions you know of, like the present, on the psychical plane, and so will continue thro' force of circumstances. That they are so rare — is your own fault as I told you in my last. To help you in your present perplexity: H.P.B. has next to no concern with administrative details, and should be kept clear of them, so far as her strong nature can be controlled. But this *you must tell to all*: — *with occult matters she has everything to do*. We have *not* abandoned her. She is *not* given over to chelas. She is *our direct agent*. I warn you against permitting your suspicions and resentment against “her many follies” to bias your intuitive loyalty to her. In the adjustment of this European business, you will have two things to consider — the external and administrative, and the internal and psychical. Keep the former under your control and that of [54] your most prudent associates, jointly; *leave the latter to her*. You are left to devise the practical details with your usual ingenuity. Only be careful, I say, to discriminate when some emergent interference of hers in practical affairs is referred to you on appeal, between that which is merely exoteric in origin and effects, and that which beginning on the practical tends to beget consequences on the spiritual plane. As to the former you are the best judge, as to the latter, she.

I have also noted, your thoughts about the “Secret Doctrine”. Be assured that what she has not *annotated* from scientific and other works, we have given or *suggested* to her. Every mistake or erroneous notion, corrected and explained by her from the works of other theosophists *was corrected by me, or under my instruction*. It is a more valuable work than its predecessor, an epitome of occult truths that will make it a source of information and instruction for the earnest student for long years to come.

P. S[reenivasrow] is in great mental distress once more, because of my long silence, not having a clear intuition developed (as how should he after [55] the life he has lead?). He fears he is abandoned, whereas he has not been lost sight of for one moment. From day to day he is making his own record at the “Ashram” from night to night receiving instructions fitted to his spiritual capabilities. He has made occasional mistakes, *e.g.*, one recently, in helping thrust out of the Headquarters house, one who deserved a more charitable treatment, whose fault was the result of ignorance and psychical feebleness rather than of sin, and who was a strong man's victim. Report to him, when you return, the lesson taught you by Ā [**], at Bombay, and tell my devoted tho' mistaken “son” that it was most theosophical to give her protection, most untheosophical and selfish to drive her away.

I wish you to assure others T.T., R.A.M., N.N.S., N.D.C., I.N.C., U.U.B., T.V.C., P.V.S., N.B.C., C.S., C.W.L., D.N.G., D.H., S.N.C., etc., among the rest, not forgetting the other true workers in Asia, that the stream of Karma is ever following on and we as well as they must win our way toward liberation. There have

** “I do not know which Adept is referred to by this symbol, nor have I been able to find out what was the incident at Adyar to which the Master refers.” — C. Jinarajadasa. [p.118]

been sore trials in the past, others await you in the future. May the faith and courage [56] which have supported you hitherto endure to the end.

You had better not mention for the present this letter to anyone — not even to H.P.B. unless she speaks to you of it herself. Time enough when you see occasion arise. It is merely given you, as a warning and a guide; to others, as a warning only, for you may use it discreetly if needs be.

K. H.

Prepare, however, to have the authenticity of the present denied in certain quarters.

5. William Mulliss' interview with Annie Besant on October 6, 1926.

[William Mulliss' interview with Annie Besant was never published in any newspaper, as far as can be ascertained to date. Theosophical historians, compilers and editors have acknowledged the existence of this interview but the document has never previously been published in its entirety. It has been mentioned by the Editors of **The Eclectic Theosophist** in the January 15th, 1979 issue, p. 6; and **Theosophy** (ULT) in Volume 67, November 1978, p.27, (with related information in Volume 15, December 1926, pp.51-53), as well as by Boris de Zirkoff, Compiler of the **Blavatsky: Collected Writings**, in Volume XIV, pp.xxxi-xxxii, and in **Rebirth of the Occult Tradition**, p.65. Here de Zirkoff states the interview appeared in the **Hamilton Spectator** on October 6th, 1926 but, to date, it has not been found. — Compiler]

[1] MEMORANDUM OF INTERVIEW WITH DR. ANNIE BESANT

October 6, 1926

by

William Mulliss

When I arrived in Los Angeles on Sunday morning last I had no idea that Mrs. Besant was also in the city, and having occasion to call on Mr. George Young, the Publisher and Editor of the Los Angeles *Examiner* on Monday afternoon, it occurred to me that the time might be opportune to arrange for a meeting with Mrs. Besant. Mr. Young was quite ready to fall into the suggestion that I interview Mrs. Besant as a representative of the Los Angeles *Examiner*, and he gave instructions to his Managing Editor to arrange the interview if possible. After some preliminary difficulties a meeting was arranged for 9:30 Wednesday morning at the home of a person identified to me as the Rev. John Ingleman, 2154 Beachwood Blvd., Hollywood.

When I arrived Mrs. Besant was already occupied with visitors. She received me very graciously and in her private room. I explained to Mrs. Besant that I was a newspaper man representing both Canadian and American newspapers; that I was not unfamiliar with the subject of Theosophy and in that respect she would not be meeting the usual type of interviewer who had no special knowledge of the subject under discussion and criticism. She seemed to be interested in the fact that I was a Canadian for she observed she had lectured in Vancouver and that she later on expected to visit Toronto, and, in an aside, she expressed her regret that she would not be able to visit Ottawa where a family, whose name I caught as Waddington, were living, this family having been with her for sometime at Madras.

After a few generalities, in which I referred to the fact of attending her lecture on Monday night, and in which she explained she had been in San Diego the day previously and also attended a meeting of her Esoteric Section there, I plunged directly into the heart of the subject on which I was anxious to secure her views. I explained to her that I had reduced several questions to a typewritten form so that she could better visualize them and so that there could be no misunderstanding of the points that I proposed to bring to her notice.

The first paragraph in my memorandum set forth that in my examination and research into the history of the Theosophical Movement the situation, as I found it to-day, was that there were several sincere and important groups of students, each proclaiming themselves as the believers and exponents of true Theosophy and to be promulgating the same doctrine and teachings as were given out by H.P. Blavatsky.

In an incisive and commanding way she almost demanded to see my memorandum. With regard to the first observation her comment was that she had no fault to find, no criticism to offer, of any Society or group of

students who were studying, teaching or preaching Theosophy. She, however, reverted to the adjective with which I prefaced the word Theosophy and in so doing apparently reserved the right to classify as she thought best just which was the true Theosophy.

My next question was: “Do you believe H.P. Blavatsky was an accredited Agent of those exalted Intelligences which are known to Theosophists as Mahatmas?” There was no hesitancy in answering this question. She said: [2] “I unreservedly do; I know that H.P.B. was the direct, and only direct, Agent of the Masters during her lifetime. I have never stated anything differently and can never believe otherwise. I came in contact with that wonderful woman through the medium of the late W.T. Stead, who put into my hands a book called *The Secret Doctrine*, written down by H.P. Blavatsky. From the very moment that I glanced into that book I knew that I had found what I had been seeking, and never for a moment have I thought of departing from, or denying, the fundamental teachings in that great work. Mme. Blavatsky lived in my home for some time before her death, and while the time was limited that I spent actually in her presence and her guidance and instruction, for my other appointments kept me busy traveling in various parts of the country, I still absorbed enough to do what she so urgently instructed me to do and ordered me to do, that is, to go out into the world and to popularize Theosophy, which I have made my life work.”

Relative to H.P. Blavatsky I enquired still further: “Do you believe that one of the Mahatmas in 1888 defined the status of H.P.B. to Col. Olcott as being Their best available Agent and the chief Agent since 1858?”

“As I have already said,” Mrs. Besant commented, “I am wholly convinced of H.P.B.’s *bona fides* and status, for I have been informed on higher authority that the body of H.P. Blavatsky was the greatest psychic instrument that the Masters had discovered in the western world for two hundred years.”

“How do you interpret the following statement made in that same letter to Olcott: ‘there is no likelihood of our finding a better one for years to come and you Theosophists should be made to understand it.’ There are many statements made, Mrs. Besant, in that letter which was published in a volume issued from the Theosophical Publishing House at Adyar in 1919, which seemed to be in conflict with statements that have been made and recorded in various books and writings since the passing of H.P.B. in 1891. For instance, it is clearly stated in that letter by the Master K.H. that *The Secret Doctrine* had been corrected by Him or corrected under His instructions, yet in the face of the Master's statement — ‘it is a more valuable work than its predecessor; an epitome of occult truths that will make it a source of information and instruction for the earnest student for long years to come’ — the charge has been made by students of H.P.B. that thousands of unnecessary and unwarranted alterations, mutilations and deletions have been made in that work whose first edition carries the seal and sanction of approval of one of its inspirers, the Master K.H. Is there any truth in such charges and allegations?”

Mrs. B.: “What is this letter to which you refer? Where is it published?”

Mr. M.: “The letter which I have quoted was published, as I have stated by your Publishing House at Adyar in 1919. It was compiled and annotated by Mr. Jinarajadasa and carried with it a foreword from yourself.”

Mrs. B.: “Well, if it was annotated and authorized by Mr. Jinarajadasa, it was certainly accurate. With regard to the *Secret Doctrine*, I do not necessarily regard it as an infallible book. You will observe that the statement is made that the *Secret Doctrine* had been corrected by the Master K.H., or under his instructions. I take this to mean that this refers to the fundamental teachings and explanations and Commentaries on the Stanzas, rather than to the mass of general information with which the book deals. For instance, take the Second Volume: Much of that

deals with a mass of details affecting scientific and other matters which we surely cannot accept as being [3] absolutely correct and infallible. With regard to the charge of alterations, I am aware that much that is preposterous and unjust to me has been circulated by my enemies and critics. I have long since passed the stage where I think it necessary to reply to such malicious and ill-natured out-pourings against me and my activities.”

Mr. M.: “I believe that I have read somewhere — I think in one of Mrs. Alice Cleather's books — that she claims that she and her students have checked up actually thirty thousand alterations.”

Mrs. B.: “I am sure I do not know and I am not interested in the number, but this I will say: H.P. Blavatsky did not claim to be an accomplished English linguist or grammarian. She scarcely knew English at all when *Isis Unveiled* was written in New York in 1877, and in London she many times had to appeal to G.R.S. Mead and to others, myself included, for protection against errors in grammar and composition. She was not as proficient in English as I was and did not pretend to write with the same clarity and correctness. The alterations that were made I am satisfied were not changes in teachings or fundamentals; they were corrections that were honestly made with the object of bringing about a clearer understanding of the writings.”

Mr. M.: “Your critics have insisted that somebody or other has deliberately suppressed the Third and Fourth Volumes of *The Secret Doctrine* to which H.P.B. makes reference in the First Volumes of *The Secret Doctrine*. What have you to say of this? Do you regard the Third Volume of your edition of *The Secret Doctrine* entitled “Occultism” as containing any of the matter intended for the Third and Fourth Volumes?”

Mrs. B.: “I was appointed H.P.B.'s literary executor, and the matter from which I compiled the Third Volume of “Occultism” in *The Secret Doctrine*, published under my direction was compiled from a mass of miscellaneous writings found in her desk after her death. These I took under my own charge.”

Mr. M.: “Did Mead help you in the compilation of these articles?”

Mrs. B.: “No. The papers came absolutely under my own hand and Mead had nothing to do with them.”

Mr. M.: “Well what about the material for the Third and Fourth Volumes?”

Mrs. B.: “I never saw them and do not know what has become of them.”

Pursuing further the question of the accuracy of *The Secret Doctrine* Mrs. Besant made some allusions to H.P.B. from which one might surmise that she still regarded H.P.B. as an embodied entity — as a living Master in the flesh in fact, for she said: “I have suggested to him the importance of coming out into the world again and doing what he could for the people, but — and she shrugged her shoulders in a highly significant way — “He is very comfortable where he is in the North, and why should He? I want you to understand that we have had further illumination, especially on the subject of the World Teacher. This is a matter which I have taken up with him as far back as 1912.”

Mr. M.: “Do I understand that you have, since the passing of H.P.B., received instructions and illumination that would correct or contradict the teachings as laid down in *The Secret Doctrine*?”

- Mrs. B.: “No, not to correct or to alter, or deny. We have simply received further illumination.” [4]
- Mr. M.: “I had the pleasure of meeting both Mr. Wadia and Mr. Ernest Wood who were under your instruction at Adyar for many years.”
- Mrs. B.: “I regard Wadia as being an exceptionally able platform speaker.”
- Mr. M.: “I understand from Mr. Wood that he had been Secretary for Mr. Leadbeater for a period of seven or eight years at Adyar. Mr. Wood spoke to me in the very highest terms of Mr. Leadbeater.”
- Mrs. B.: “Mr. Leadbeater is a man of great personal purity of life and a most wonderful clairvoyant.”
- Mr. M.: “His enemies seem to have made considerable capital out of his alleged perverted sexual proclivities. Mr. Wood was most indignant in his denial of such charges and in his denunciations of those who made them. He also told me that he too regarded Mr. Leadbeater as a great clairvoyant; in fact he said that he knew that Mr. Leadbeater could project his consciousness as far as the planet Mars; further, that he could describe the appearance and apparel of a man the other side of a brick wall.”
- Mrs. B.: “Yes. Mr. Leadbeater is a great clairvoyant. I have collaborated with him in many works. Our “Occult Chemistry” written under his clairvoyant direction several years ago has been justified in later days by the discoveries of science which has had to acknowledge the truth of the propositions there propounded. With regard to Mr. Leadbeater and his purity of life, I have had many instances of his immaculateness on the question of sex. I have heard men of the world make flippant and improper remarks pertaining to sex matters which Mr. Leadbeater was wholly unable to understand, for his mind is not directed towards such subjects. He is a clean and brilliant character whose mind is an open book and the door of whose room is never locked.”
- Mr. M.: “For a man to whom you so generously give so clean a reputation he seems to have fallen under a tremendous amount of misrepresentation and persecution.”
- Mrs. B.: “So do we all. We all come under the lash of criticism of the ignorant and credulous. We all make mistakes in judgment. In my younger days I have been guilty of the same thing.”
- Mr. M.: “Mr. Judge whom I [am] persuaded was the greatest of the Teachers after H.P.B. came similarly under this persecution by biased and prejudiced minds, yet I find you in later years — within the last four or five years — referring to him as “that incomparable man, Judge,” and using a cabinet photo of him in your Magazine.”
- Mrs. B.: “I pay no longer any attention to slanders. As I said, I too have made many mistakes, and that in regard to Judge, I was young in the Movement then, impetuous, and in my zeal did things that I would not think of doing to-day. Judge did a great work in the West and although I still believe that some of his claims are untenable, he did a splendid work for Masters and for Theosophy in America. The Society will survive ruthless destructive criticism. It was nearly wrecked in 1885 by ambitions and personalities. I am convinced after long experience that our sole consideration should be principles — not personalities.”

At this point of the interview, Mrs. Besant becoming restive and evidently having other appointments, I suggested that I leave with her the memorandum containing all the questions which I had submitted to her, and further suggested that at her leisure and when she was not improperly crowded with extraneous [5] affairs, that she might take time to answer the queries therein contained. This she very readily agreed to do. She said she could not possibly do it while she was lecturing here but she would have time when traveling, and would forward her observations to my permanent address which I left with her.

The Complete memorandum left with Mrs. Besant was as follows:

In my examination and research into the history of the Theosophical Movement the situation as I find it today is that there are several sincere and important groups of students, each proclaiming themselves as the believers and exponents of true Theosophy, and to be promulgating the same doctrine and teachings as were given out by H.P. Blavatsky.

Do you believe that H.P. Blavatsky was an accredited agent of those exalted intelligences which are known to Theosophists as Mahatmas?

Do you believe that one of the Mahatmas in 1888 defined the status of H.P.B. to Col. Olcott as being their best available agent and the chief agent since 1858?

How do you interpret the following statement in that letter: “. . . There is no likelihood of our finding a better one for years to come and your theosophists should be made to understand it.” There are many statements made in that letter, which was published in a volume issued from the Theosophical Publishing House at Adyar in 1919 which seem to be in conflict with statements that have been made and recorded in various books and writings since the passing of H.P.B. in 1891. For instance, it is clearly stated in that letter by the Master K.H. that the Secret Doctrine had been corrected by him or corrected under his instructions. Yet, in the face of the Master's statement, “It is a more valuable work than its predecessor, an epitome of occult truths that will make it a source of information and instruction for the earnest student for long years to come” the charge has been made by students of H.P.B. that thousands of unnecessary and unwarranted alterations, mutilations and deletions have been made in that work whose first edition carries the seal and sanction of approval of one of its inspirers, the Master K.H. Is there any truth in such charges and allegations?

Do you regard the volume first published in 1923 by T. Fisher Unwin, Ltd., London, entitled “The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett from the Mahatmas M. and K.H.” as being authentic? Criticism has been general that no reference whatever has been made in your magazine *The Theosophist* to this publication. Is that criticism correct? Would you care to explain, if this is in accord with the first, why you have ignored any reference to this important contribution to Theosophic literature, providing, of course, that you regard it as genuine?

On page 203, *Mahatma Letters*, referring to H.P.B. K.H. observes “After nearly a century of fruitless search, our chiefs had to avail themselves of the only opportunity to send out a *European body* upon European soil to serve as a connecting link between that country and our own.” If it was so desperately difficult to find only one person available as an agent for the Mahatmas after a century of search how do you account for the flock of self-labelled Mahatmic agents and instruments that have come to light since the passing of H.P.B.?

Those who adhere strictly to the teachings and writings of H.P.B. and the Mahatmas complain that later writers have set up an anthropomorphic conception of deity and have also instituted the necessity of a clergy and a church, which is familiarly known as the Liberal Catholic Church, and that while you have made it clear that the Liberal Catholic Church is no part of the Theosophical Society of which you are the head, you

have not discouraged members of the society from becoming [6] adherents of that church and of accepting the ritual, the credal and sacramental rites which that church observes. In the face of that how do you explain the following statement made by the Master K.H. “. . . we know there is in our system no such thing as God, either personal or impersonal . . . The word ‘God’ was invented to designate the unknown cause of those effects which man has either admired or dreaded without understanding them, and since we claim and that we are able to prove what we claim — i.e., the knowledge of that cause and causes we are in a position to maintain there is no God or Gods behind them . . . The idea of God is not an innate but an acquired notion” “The real evil proceeds from human intelligence and its origin rests entirely with reasoning man who dissociates himself from Nature. Humanity then alone is the true source of evil. Evil is the exaggeration of good, the progeny of human selfishness and greediness” “I will point out the greatest, the chief cause of nearly two-thirds of the evils that pursue humanity ever since that cause became a power. It is religion under whatever form and in whatever nation. It is the sacerdotal caste, the priesthood and the churches. It is in those illusions that man looks upon as sacred, that he has to search out the source of that multitude of evils which is the greatest curse of humanity and that almost overwhelms mankind. Ignorance created Gods and cunning took advantage of opportunity. Look at India and look at Christendom and Islam, at Judaism and Fetichism. It is priestly imposture that rendered these Gods so terrible to man; it is religion that makes of him the selfish bigot, the fanatic that hates all mankind out of his own sect without rendering him any better or more moral for it. It is belief in God and Gods that makes two-thirds of humanity the slaves of a handful of those who deceive them under the false pretence of saving them.”

Oct. 25, 1926

ADDMEMO OF INTERVIEW WITH DR. ANNIE BESANT

Among various obiter dicta in the interview, Mrs. Besant took occasion to express her opinion with regard to the publication of the Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to A.P. Sinnett. She said:- “I regard this as a most scandalous outrage which should never have been published. If it had been advisable to do so, Sinnett would have done it, but he never did.”

Referring to her degree of doctor of laws, she explained with some pleasurable pride, that hers was degree number two, the Prince of Wales being No. 1, having received the honor from the same University in India on the previous day.

She asked if I had ever met Jinarajadasa, and also, if I had yet received a copy of “The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society”. She regards this Golden Book as being accurate and authentic and fair in every way. She said “The whole story of the movement is told in it. Nothing of consequence is left out but has been most frankly revealed and most carefully collected and edited by Mr. Jinarajadasa. The truth will be found therein.”

Two statements, more or less significant, were also made by her. One was that she had been a Yogi for thirty years. The other was that the original objects of the Society had been changed some time ago.

6. Statement by B.P. Wadia.

The following statement by B.P. Wadia was received by the editors of **The Theosophical Movement 1875-1950**. It appears on pages 297-298. A transcript of the document, dated December 15th, 1947, was supplied to the Compiler by Dallas TenBroeck.

In **The Theosophical Movement 1875-1950**, the following endnote was added (p.342):

“Mr. B.P. Wadia, of Bombay, India, for years an active member and speaker of the Adyar Sociey, has supplied the editors of this volume with a signed statement giving this account of his interview with Mrs. Besant.”

The document reads as follows:

Not only Col. Olcott, but also Mrs. Besant came to perceive the error of her ways in later years. A respected member of the Adyar Society who had fully studied the Judge case interviewed Mrs. Besant specially on the subject. In course of the serious conversation, Mrs. Besant admitted that what was presented to her was on the whole accurate and that she had come to a conclusion some time previously that Judge did not forge those letters; and that the messages received by him were genuine. On being requested to say that much only, if not more, to the Theosophical public the world over Mrs. Besant demurred and remarked that it was such an old and forgotten matter — “Why revive it?” On permission being sought by the friend to make her view public, she flatly refused. This came as a shock to the gentleman who was refused this permission, for he fully expected that in the interests of historical veracity Mrs. Besant would agree to say in public what she so readily admitted to him in private conversation, completely exonerating Mr. Judge from manufacturing bogus mahatma messages.

Signed Dec. 15, 1947

7. **O. E. Library Critic**, Vol. 16, November 1926.

A Case of Amnesia in an “Arhat”

In her book, *Theosophical Lectures, Chicago, 1907* (copyrighted by Annie Besant, 1907), there is a series of questions addressed to Mrs. Besant, and her replies. On pages 121-22 we read:

Question — For our information, please state a case of wrong-doing on the part of a Theosophical Society member that would clearly justify the expulsion of the member.

Answer — I cannot, because I am not in favor of expulsion. I will tell you what I think is the most justifiable case for expulsion, where a T. S. member uses his membership for the swindling of another T. S. member in money matters. That is a case I think most deserves expulsion. But I would not expel, I would publish it, to save people from being cheated. . . . No, *I have never been in favor of expulsion. In the trouble that arose around a great Theosophist, Mr. Judge, many years ago, when a motion was brought forward in India for his expulsion, I opposed it. I objected to what he had done. But I opposed his expulsion on the same ground that I take now, that I would not expel a brother even if he makes a mistake, especially one who had rendered to the movement such great service as Mr. Judge had done.*

That should be clear enough. She says she never recommended Judge’s expulsion. But let us quote from her pamphlet *The Case Against W. Q. Judge*, published in 1895, page 88:

Notice

If some definite action with regard to Mr. Judge shall not have been taken by the European Section before the meeting of its Annual Convention in July, *we the undersigned, shall*—failing any full and satisfactory explanation having been made by Mr. Judge before that date, or his voluntary secession from the Society — *propose and second at that Convention, the following resolution:*

Whereas, Mr. W. Q. Judge has been called on to resign the office of Vice-President of the Theosophical Society by the Indian, Australasian, and European Sections, but has not complied with their request; and

Whereas, he evaded the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee of July, 1894, refused a Jury of Honour, and has since given no full and satisfactory explanation to the Society in answer to the charges brought against him;

Resolved: that this Convention of the European Section of the Theosophical Society unites with the Indian and Australasian Sections in *demanding his expulsion from the Society*, and requests the President-Founder to immediately take action to carry out the demand of these three Sections of the T. S.

ANNIE BESANT, F. T. S.

G. R. S. MEAD, F. T. S.

All the italics are mine. I quote the above, not with the idea of entering the Judge controversy, nor of questioning Mrs. Besant’s sincerity, but to show that even the memory of an Arhat is not always to be depended upon, and that Mrs. Besant’s numerous assertions about past events, for instance that H. P. Blavatsky appointed her as her “Successor,” that she authorized her to revise *The Secret Doctrine* and that she gave her permission to break her pledge of secrecy by publishing certain esoteric papers in the so-called third volume of *The Secret Doctrine*, need to be backed up by substantial evidence before they can be accepted. The Judge affair upset the T. S. for a considerable period, and Mrs. Besant played an extremely conspicuous and prominent part in it. That she had in 1907 so completely forgotten her attitude in 1895 as to deny it *in toto* almost makes one almost suspect that her loss of memory was pathological.

And it is also interesting to note that in 1923 she had completely forgotten what she said in 1907, for in June, 1923, she expelled T. H. Martyn, who had served her faithfully for many years, and eleven of his associates in the Sydney Lodge, without making formal charges or even granting them the courtesy of a hearing.

[Further to this issue of expulsion, see the Apr. 19, 1895 entry in the Chronology for Besant's view regarding the expulsion of members, after she had received a letter from Alexander Fullerton. Besant's comments there appear to be more in line with a conspiracy having been in place, from the very beginning, to expel Judge and prevent him from holding any office in the Society. She also wanted America to secede from the parent Society. By the time Besant's comment appeared in print in the May 1895 issue of **Lucifer** the American Section had already decided its fate, and elected Judge as President of the Theosophical Society in America.

[Besant's credibility for remembering what she had stated earlier on any particular issue had come under question before by those who worked with her. See Chronology, May 21, 1895 entry for Julia C. Keightley's statement about Annie Besant's "constant forgetfulness". — Compiler]

8. **O. E. Library Critic**, Vol.16, January 1927.

Mrs. Besant and the Judge Case

A prominent theosophist whose name I have not been given permission to mention informs me that on her recent visit to his city Mrs. Besant told him that "the one mistake she had made was to accede to Col. Olcott and prefer the charges against Judge."

It is laudable to admit one's mistakes and I am glad Mrs. Besant has done it in the case of Mr. Judge, but to throw the blame on another reminds me of Adam's excuse to Jehovah: "The woman, whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." According to Mrs. Besant's present account it was Olcott who beguiled her — he was the Eve who caused her to attack Judge.

Now it happens that in her pamphlet *The Case Against W. Q. Judge*, published in 1895, page 13, she says:

The result was that I made a direct appeal to the Master, when alone, stating that I did feel some doubt as to Mr. Judge's use of His name, and praying Him to endorse or disavow the messages I had received through him. He appeared to me as I had so often before seen Him, clearly, unmistakably, and I then learned from Him directly that the messages were not done by Him, and that they were done by Mr. Judge. . . . No details were given to me by Him, but word was sent to me a little later that no action might be taken before the public on information that I could not prove — and how could I prove what had occurred to me when alone? — but that I should find evidence on reaching Adyar. If on reading that evidence I found that, with other facts known to me, it was intellectually convincing, then I should take action to put an end to the deception practised. The order to take action was repeated to me at Adyar, after the evidence was in my hands, and I was bidden to wash away the stains on the T. S. "Take up the heavy Karma of the Society. Your strength was given to you for this." How could I, who believed in Him, disobey?

Now, today, we are given to understand that it was Olcott, not her Master, whom she obeyed, and that she made a mistake in doing so!

This involves two alternative admissions. The first is that she, Outer Head of the E.S. and direct representative of the Masters (as she claims), used their name as a cloak for an action which was really instigated by a common mortal, Col. Olcott. The other is, that if she really believed what she said about the order of her Master, she now thinks she made a mistake in obeying it, which is tantamount to saying that Masters give orders which it may be a mistake to obey. There is another possibility, that she has recognized that her vision and communications from her Master were delusions. We have then:

(a). Her action against Judge involved a gross fraud, in claiming the authority of a Master.

Or (b). Her Master is such a fallible being that it may be a mistake to obey him.

Or (c). Her supposed communications were delusions.

Without regard to the merits of the Judge controversy, let us apply these to the present time. She is now claiming that the Christ will soon appear, using the body of Jeddu Krishnamurti. Her authority is — I myself heard her say so — “The Christ Himself told me so.” Further, she adduces alleged communications from a Master in support of the Liberal Catholic Church.

How are we to know that today, as well as in 1893-95, she is not making false claims about the Christ, the Master, the King of the World, etc., the real instigator of her actions being, perhaps, C. W. Leadbeater; or, that whatever entities these may be who communicate with her, they may not be of such a nature that it may be a mistake to believe them, if, indeed, these purported communications may not be mere hallucinations?

Creditable as it is for Mrs. Besant to admit privately that she made a mistake in bringing charges against Judge, it places her in a position which utterly discredits the claims she is making today and justifies the suspicion that she is either a conscious deceiver or unwittingly a dupe. Like the fly in the tanglefoot, the more she tries to get out, the worse she gets in. Perhaps a few years from now, when the Krishnaji boom has collapsed, we may hear of another “mistake” she made in listening to C. W. Leadbeater.

9. **The Link**, August 1911, pp.53-67.

“Issued once a quarter to all English-reading pledged members of the E.S.”— C.J.[C. Jinarajadasa], May 1908, p.1.

PRIVATE

Issued by the O.H. of the School

[53]

Address at a General Meeting in
London by the O. H. (1909).

To look at some general points. Although some of the points are familiar, yet there is an advantage in recalling, and in looking at the facts, so that we see the position as a whole.

Everyone coming into the School should try to realise what it means to come in, and what duties and responsibilities it imposes. It means that you stand out of the general evolution of humanity as candidates for the first Great Initiation, and are recognised as Candidates by the Occult Hierarchy. This should be realised, otherwise you will not make the necessary efforts for progress, and will not be able to keep your footing in the more difficult positions in which you are placed. You [54] cannot come forward to make more rapid progress without having to face greater difficulties than the mass of mankind. Rapidity and difficulty of progress go hand in hand. If your life did not become more difficult it would mean that you were not ready; that you had come into the School too soon; that your appeal to the Lords of Karma had been put aside; your voice had not been strong enough to reach Them. Great difficulties, therefore, you should expect, and the greater the difficulties the greater the progress of the pupil if he surmounts them.

But not only will there be individual difficulties, difficulties connected with your position in the Movement will come, and these are the more important, for they concern the larger Self.

What is your position in the great Movement of which you are a portion? The School stands as a bridge between the T. S. as a whole and the Masters; a channel between the two. And just as the Society as a whole is a receptacle for Their life, by which it spreads into the world at large, so does the School stand as an inner vessel, into which that Life is poured, and then spreads out through the Society. As H. P. B. said, E.S. is the heart of the T. S. The Society is the body, and through the E.S. as through the vessels of the human body, all the life-currents go, and then the body acts upon the outer world. The School is the heart of the body, into which pour perfectly freely all the impurities which these life-currents, as they circulate through the body, bring with them. From the heart, they pour out again purified—the lungs, [55] of course, are really appendages of the heart—unless the heart can do this the body will become diseased. So that into this School must pour all the difficulties of the outer Movement. If the School becomes too weak to perform this function, it fails in its office. It is a difficult and dangerous work, and hence the enormous importance of the School to the body at large. From the Masters directly it receives its life, and by Their consent it has become again the Second Section of T. S. The Society used to be divided into three Sections: the Masters as the first; certain pupils as the second; and the Society as the third. After a time that arrangement was broken up, and the First Section ceased to exist as such. It came back again as the First Section some time ago, no longer outside the T.S. but within it. In order that that might become effective all the great difficulties had to be faced and overcome. You should all know the reasons why these shocks take place from time to time; I will tell you again why they come. I learnt it myself during the Judge secession in America. Practically the whole of the American Section then went out, leaving only 5 or 6 branches and something like 100 members. I was very much upset by this: I asked myself ‘why should such a thing take place?’ It was then, as I was travelling in a train, that my Master said: “Do you not yet understand”? And I answered in a shame-faced way: “No, I do not”. He then told me why these things happened. The Society, He said, was the beginning of the 6th

Root Race, of which He was to be the Manu, and the Master K. H. the Bodhisattva. [56] They had taken this way of sounding out the note of Brotherhood in order to call together the people who might do to form the nucleus of the Race that is to establish Brotherhood upon earth; this is Their way of choosing out the likely people. A good many, however, will come in who are not quite suitable, and so from time to time some passing event, some piece of karma which some prominent person in the Society has to work out, is taken advantage of, and used as an opportunity for these great shakings of the T.S. The result is always the shaking out of elements that are not wanted or have become mischievous. This does not mean that such people drop out of the Movement altogether, but only for the time; some defect in their own nature makes them hindrances, and they must step out for the time, to return at another point. The present time is a very special time, owing to the transition state in which we are standing, which gives great opportunities and great difficulties.

I can speak more freely here than outside, and you will have noticed that my public lectures turn upon the question not only of the great Root Race, which takes hundreds of thousands of years in forming, but also upon the question of the building of the sixth sub-race, which we are specially concerned with. If you can make yourself of a certain type, you may have before you the opportunity of immediate rebirth, in order to share in the spiritual outpouring which will accompany the coming of the great Teacher, in perhaps Thirty or Forty years.

[57] This view of the T.S. as the nucleces [sic] of the sixth Root Race was to me a kind of revelation which made everything else a matter of indifference; and that is why I tell you of it. When He said that these shocks were absolutely necessary for the Movement in order that it might do its work, everything that happened to the T.S. short of its breaking down completely, became a matter of indifference.

Those who suffer blindly, *they* suffer; those who suffer *understandingly* hardly feel the troubles at all.

Think, then, of the Master M. as the coming Manu, and the Master K.H. as the coming Bodhisattva. These are the leaders in the T.S., responsible for its success. They guide and shape its course, not with regard to the triumph of the moment, but with a view to the work which it is ultimately designed to do. Some people will come forward and be prominent in the work for the time, and then apparently drop out. Judge was such a man, a splendid man, one of the noblest servants of the Masters. He had behind him a piece of very bad karma, which he had to get rid of; and so when his life was drawing to a close that piece of karma was hastened in order that he might work it off. He paid its debt; he gained, by what seemed a terrible catastrophe. Advantage was taken of that karma of his to give the Society the shaking which was required, so that it might go forward. Only those difficulties come which the Masters permit.

Then, in addition, comes in the active agency of the great Brothers of the Shadow; the active [58] agency which hopes that the Society may be destroyed, and is always working against it. Their hope, of course, is that in a critical moment they may be able to over-balance the movement. They want merely to retard evolution. They have no enmity against the people concerned, but they want to check the spiritual evolution, because they want materiality to remain, so that Unity may be delayed and diversity continue. Therefore, at critical times, they throw in their force to desintegrate [sic] and destroy. Their work is largely done through people's virtues, not their vices. The mass of people who went out with Mr. Judge were good people; their loyalty was played upon to break the Movement. The storm passed, and the Movement went forward rapidly; it cannot be broken now.

Then came the need for the next great shaking, when elements had accumulated that were not ready to go further. It had to be a very great shaking, for the times demanded it, in order that the advance afterwards might be rapid. This time it came through our Brother Leadbeater. It was a choice between him and me. I did

not happen to have a piece of karma, which could conveniently be used, while he had an old piece of bad karma. There is a curious difference between his line and mine; he has not been in incarnation for some 2000 years, since he was a pupil of a disciple of Pythagoras, whereas I have taken birth over and over again. I have had plenty of catastrophes, which seemed very terrible at the time, and the effect has been to work off much accumulated karma, leaving that which has made the storms in my [59] present incarnation. Hence as he had to work off this piece of karma from long ago, before he could go further, it was utilised to shake the Society. You could not have had a more troublesome ordeal for the society; the Judge difficulty was nothing compared to this, especially with the Anglo-Saxon Race, conventional beyond all else in matters of sex. Hence all the turmoil, and its inevitable results in shaking out a large number of good and earnest people who were nevertheless no good to us at the moment, because they could not adapt themselves to the new Life.

You *must* realise of what value adaptability is; man is said to be the most adaptable of all animals, because he is the most evolved. You must be able to change; to take new ideas, new views. The higher life is different from the life you know, and things that down here you think matter, do not really matter at all. Do you know, that the only thing the Masters thought about in all this turmoil was not the passing events, but simply how they were affecting promising members of the Society. "So-and-so is standing it rather better than we thought he would." They simply look at the matter as it affected the future usefulness of individuals. "So-and-so has not been able to assimilate the new life".

Then at a great meeting two years ago One of the higher Personages was asked whether another chance might not be given to some who had failed in the first ordeal. My own election was the second chance given to those who had not passed the first. The comment made upon some of those who [60] failed also in this test was: "For this day their sun is set; but there are many days." In these many days many of them will come back and work again. All of you who are here have come through, so far; now try to look at the School as part of an immense Movement.

Only when it was seen that the Society and the School would stand, when my own election was over, only then was it possible for the Masters to take up again Their place with regard to the T.S. There was just a moment when it was in the balance, but the critical point passed; and only after this did the Masters take up again Their place as the First Section of the T. S. A number of Them came to the Shrine Room at Adyar to announce this. But this means that *we* have to become the Second Section; the School was assured of its place. We could not have the First re-established till the Second had become secure. Thus the Movement became a Movement to which the Lodge is linked, and into which the Life of the Lodge flows without check, as part of Itself.

Now to be a member of that Second Section is an immense privilege, but also a very great responsibility. The life of each one of you becomes of importance, that there may not be a check an obstruction in the channel. And while immense possibilities open out, due to the transition period, there comes the certainty that if we cannot bear the pressure we must fall out.

Let us come back to the point of adaptability. *You* must accustom yourselves to the Masters, not *They* to you. It is easy to see that when you [61] look back upon History, say of the time of the Christ; remember how few held on to Him till the moment of His death. Remember how "many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him", because of "a hard saying". "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" This was a saying which they utterly misunderstood; yet in the Christian Church the idea, has become familiar through use; the statement was startling to unaccustomed ears. It is inevitable, in a way, because the great Ones *must* be misunderstood; it is the people who are near us whom we understand best; the higher they climb, the more unintelligible they become. Even in my own case, many have said of me: "How Mrs. Besant has changed." That was the difficulty the Masters faced in the early days of the Movement. People had their own ideas of

what a Master *ought* to be, and instead of trying to understand what He *was* when He manifested Himself, they measured Him by their own ideas. Some of them went so far as to say that these Masters did not at all come up to their ideal of what a Master should be—at which the Masters were gently amused. This came out in a letter from the Master M., who is more outspoken than the Master K.H. whom He speaks of as “my more gentle-spoken Brother”. In the letter He said: “the mark of the Adept is not kept at Simla; it is kept at Shamballa, and I try to adapt myself to *that*”. The mark of the Adept is the standard set by the great Lords of the Hierarchy; what the people down here think of the Adept does not matter; it is nothing, and only causes Them a [62] kind of affectionate amusement. What does the child know of the outer world? If you think of it as the affectionate amusement of the father, you get the right idea. That is true, in a measure, of other questions; it is quite easy for us, because we can understand what we have been through, and it is only a question of looking back to realise the position in which any member of the Society may be.

In recent difficulties you have wasted upon me so much good sympathy; but there is nothing to be sorry about, *I* have not suffered. There is no suffering in it, but only the question: “What is the best way of helping so-and-so; is it by kindness or rebuke?” What is the best way to help? It is nothing more than that. Your position is a very much harder one than mine, because you have not been through the experiences, and therefore cannot understand; you have great difficulty. Where does following of the conscience end and where does trust in the Master begin? You can only work that out for yourselves step by step. You must have noticed that I have not asked anyone of you in the School to express any opinion about my Brother Leadbeater; inevitably you cannot *understand*, and it would be wrong to force your conscience by trying to make you take positions which you cannot hold.

That is the Master’s way; I have so often seen the Master avoid the least pressure. Sometimes He said something among His disciples which has not been understood, and seeing that they have not grasped it, He just said: “Never mind; you will [63] understand presently.” People sometimes say: “What would you do if a Master told you to do something that you thought was wrong?” H. P. B. once asked me that. The answer, of course, is that it would be impossible for a Master to do such a thing. They might as well say: “How would you fit a triangle into a square, without changing the shape of either?” It is impossible. Absolute trust and utter confidence exist in the disciple for his Master, and a conviction that goes through and through every fibre of one’s being that in Wisdom, Purity and Greatness of every kind He utterly transcends oneself. There is no possibility of challenging anything He says; one’s nature cries out in glad assent to His bidding, and yet there is the most utter freedom in thinking one’s own thought.

There are Those who are above the Masters, but in the whole of these grades of Initiates there is always one Will, and the moment a higher Being gives a hint the whole nature of the lower Being immediately springs forward to carry it out. If a higher One said: “So-and-so ought to be done”, no Master would dream of challenging it. Those who know the Law and express it, are taken as an expression of the Law. The whole of the Masters bend all Their energies into the channel that has been pointed out, and utilise therein all Their powers and knowledge. So with us who are disciples; every power of mind and brain is turned to do what He says: the whole nature answers, no question ever arises. The difficulties you have here never come to us, because we have recognised the reality of spiritual greatness.

[64] If any one of you can feel that towards any disciple, who may be your immediate link with the Master, then follow [sic] him or her at all hazards. You will sense the higher truth, even if you cannot [sic] work it out down here.

From the outer standpoint it would be called blind credulity; it is really the command of the Spirit to the mind, and the mind yields the inner assent, as answer to the highest in us; If you cannot [sic] feel that, then follow your conscience at all hazards, wherever it leads you, and against whomsoever it leads you. If your

eyes are open and you can see the sunlight, you do not need the farthing-taper; if your eyes are blind, and you cannot see the sunlight, do not blow out your farthing-taper. I can affect your mental body directly, but you should try to make a link between your mental body and the brain; try to think things out for yourself.

Now what lies before you is really the development of the particular qualities which are wanted during the next half-century. Numbers of workers are needed, not for the sake of the workers, but for the sake of the work. The Masters have to find these out of available material. There lies your opportunity. You have come into the T.S. and into the E.S. By that, and by standing through recent difficulties, you have the right to the opportunity; you have made good karma. And from amongst the members of the School, all over the world, many of the workers for the coming time will be chosen. You are none of you in the position as yet of being able to take immediate rebirth; [65] but you may be helped to do so by the Master, if you show the qualities of the needed workers. He has to check you, and to prevent you going into the great stream into which everyone goes in order to pass into Devachan.

The giving up of Devachan *is* a great sacrifice. One thing done by meditation is that you have laid up a large amount of material for working up in Devachan into your next mental body. You would then come back extraordinarily different from what you now are. All this has to be given up if you come back immediately, and it is a very great sacrifice. If, then, you are to come back you must be stopped artificially, and the Master will only do this under certain conditions: namely, you must show out the characteristics of the Sixth Sub-race in your present bodies, otherwise it is not worth His while to stop you. You make the changes in the astral and mental bodies which you now have, and then the rest will be done for you.


The first thing is: Do you *want* to come back? There is much to be said on both sides, and you should make up your mind definitely on these points. You should think it over carefully, and if you decide to give up Devachan in order to help the Masters in the work that is to be done, then will come the question: "What am I to do in order that I may fit myself?" This question you must answer for yourself; otherwise you will go on in the regular way, improving yourself as much as you can. For that rapid coming back, one of the most necessary things is *intuition*, and [66] that intense trust in the Master which would make it impossible to doubt.

The difficulty that some of you feel is: "How shall we become self-reliant if we do what we are told?" It is answered in this way: you are never told details. You are told only the main thing you are to do. I, for instance, am never told *how* to do a thing. Every power of brain and heart and courage is taxed to find out the best way. You are not hampered, or made a puppet or tool. He who sees further than you do, puts up a target at which you are to aim, but it is your skill which has to hit it. So there is always room for individual work and initiative; all is turned along the lines which the Supreme has designed for the evolution of the world. Both lines—Devachan and immediate return—are good.

If you will try to take this bigger view in everything and apply it to the questions of the moment, you will find it a great help. Remember there were people at the last coming of the Christ just like us, and they did not know the time they were in. You at least, have been told a little; still, the decision must be yours. If you can bring this to bear upon your daily problems you will find them easier to solve than without that great light. You will begin to realise that there is something higher than the intellect in man. The intellect is a magnificent tool, but a bad master. Spirit is higher than intellect.

Do not let yourselves fall into "gossip" about these great things: "Mary kept these things and pondered them in her heart."

[67] We are part of the body of which the Masters are the Head and Heart. They cannot be shaken. Those who are true to Them can pass fearlessly through any storm.



APPENDIX

I



JUDGE'S PSEUDONYMS

and

WORDS OF WISDOM

Table of Contents ~ Appendix I

1. William Quan Judge's Pen-Names (Pseudonyms)	457-459
2. "Gleanings From Unpublished Letters of W.Q.J." The English Theosophist Vol. 2, 1898 – Vol. 3, 1900.	460-466
3. Words of Wisdom by W.Q. Judge.	467-471
4. "What is Occultism?" Theosophy , Vol. 8, October 1920.	472
5. "Musings on The True Theosophist's Path." The Path , Vol. 1, August 1886 – February 1887.	473-477
6. "Living The Higher Life." The Canadian Theosophist , Vol. 60, March–April, 1979.	478-481

1. William Quan Judge's Pen-Names (Pseudonyms)
in chronological order as they appear.

The information gathered below is from records supplied by Dr. Joseph Hall Fussell, dated April 6th, 1939, (published in **Corresponding Fellows Lodge**, February 1976) while he was Secretary-General of the Point Loma Theosophical Society. Dr. Fussell was well qualified to give this information as he was one of Judge's secretaries during the last years of his life. The United Lodge of Theosophists (Theosophy Company, Los Angeles) has also supplied information gathered by its members and distributed March 1970. The following list is a combination of these sources plus research by the Compiler and Doris and Ted Davy, and information supplied by Dara Eklund from data provided by Boris de Zirkoff.

Pseudonym used	Year first appeared (most in The Path)	Title
Ex-Asiatic	Oct. 1881	"The Moral Law of Compensation." Theosophist , Vol. 3, Oct. 1881
Hadji-Erinn	Apr. 1886	"AUM!"
Nilakant	May 1886	"Theosophical Symbolism."
American Mystic	Aug. 1886	"Musings on the True Theosophist's Path." [Dr. J.D. Buck has also been attributed to having written articles using this pseudonym.]
Moulvie	Mar. 1887	"Through the Gates of Gold." Followed in May 1888 by "The Gates of Gold."
Pythagoras	Mar. 1887	"Consideration on Magic."
William Brehon	Apr. 1887	"The Bhagavad-Gita." (A series)
Zadok	Oct. 1887	NOTICE TO INQUIRERS that questions would be received and answered, and which became a regular segment beginning the following month as "Answers to Questioners."
Albertus	Nov. 1887	"Mediumship."
Râmatîrtha	July 1888	"Culture of Concentration." (2 part series.)
Eusebio Urban	Aug. 1888	"The Three Planes of Human Life."
Narayan Nilakant	Nov. 1888	"Answers to Questioners."
Rodriguez Undiano	Dec. 1888	"Theosophical Diet."
Bryan Kinnavan	Dec. 1888	"A Curious Tale."
Z.	Dec. 1888	"Letters That Have Helped Me." — First in a series of letters to Jasper Niemand which appeared in The Path , then as a book of the same title.
Philanthropos	Apr. 1889	"The Struggle for Existence." This article was first published in Lucifer , Vol. 4, April 1889, p.104. It was reprinted in Theosophy (ULT) Vol. 2, December 1913, p.55 and again in Vol. 48, p.396. [It has been suggested that since Fullerton was in London at the time he may have written the article. He left for London on Feb. 16 th , 1889. Since Judge was also in Europe at that time it could equally be said that he wrote the article. Considering this — leaning toward WQJ, although the style does seem different.]
Dies Non	Feb. 1889	"Spiritual Gifts and Their Attainment." [Unable to confirm but leaning toward WQJ.]

Urban	Feb. 1889	“Stray Memoranda.” [Unable to confirm but leaning toward WQJ.]
Marttanda	Feb. 1890	“Our Sun and The True Sun.”
Harris P.	May 1890	“Closed or open Lodges.”
Quilliam	July 1890	“Practical Theosophy.”
Cadi	Aug. 1890	“Stumbling Blocks in Words.” (Possibly Cadi Boyse, a Boston Member who joined March 13 th , 1887. The endorsers for her application were Ammi Brown and Susan E. Gay. [Cadi also means a minor Moslem magistrate or judge.]
A.P. Ril	Sep. 1890	“Personalities.” [This article might not be Judge’s because of the unusual fact that it was dated “ <i>Bangkok, June 1890</i> ”.]
J. Quilter	Oct. 1890	“Prince Talleyrand — Cagliostro.” [Unconfirmed but most likely WQJ.]
Occultus	Jan. 1890	On the suggestion of Miss Kate Field, Judge took this <i>nom de plume</i> for a series titled “Echoes from the Orient” which first appeared, January 1890, in Kate Field’s Washington . (<i>Lucifer</i> , Vol. 7, September 1890, p.86.)
A Student	Mar. 1891	“Reward For Unmerited Sufferings.” [Unconfirmed but leaning toward WQJ.]
Hadji	Mar. 1891	“Transmigration of Soul.” [Unconfirmed but leaning toward WQJ.]
F.T.S.	May 1891	“If Methuselah Existed, Why So Short Our Lives?” [Not all articles signed F.T.S. were by Judge.]
Demophilus	Nov. 1891	“The Synthesis of Occult Science.” (3 part series.) [Most likely WQJ.]
An Embodied Spirit	Sep. 1892	“Spiritualism Old and New.” (2 part series.)
A.T. Mana	Dec. 1892	“Iconoclasm Towards Illusions.” [Unconfirmed but most likely WQJ.] A.T. Mana = ATMA or ATMAN.
An Obscure Brahman	Jan. 1893	“A Commentary on the Gayatri.” (Editorial) [Most likely WQJ.]
One of the Recipients	Feb. 1893	“What the Masters Have Said.” (Editorial) [Most likely WQJ.]
One of the Staff	Apr. 1893	“Authorship of Secret Doctrine.” (Editorial) [Most likely WQJ.]
Amaran	Nov. 1894	“A Little Vision.” (Editorial) [Most likely WQJ.]

NOTE:

While the unsigned editorials in **The Path** are by W.Q. Judge, and also unsigned articles, it does not follow that every unsigned article is by Judge. For example in Vol. 6, p.71, “Loss of the Soul”, part of a series continued from the April 1891 issue, is unsigned. The article was first read before the Cincinnati T.S. January 25th, 1891, and was signed Harij which is Jirah when reversed. This was the first name of Dr. Jirah Dewey Buck, the President of that Branch. The first installment of this article appeared in March 1891.

Other names sometimes wrongly attributed to W.Q. Judge are:

American Mystic	Most likely Dr. J.D. Buck.
Exeter	Walter Burton, member at large. He joined on January 22 nd , 1888. His application was endorsed by William Q. Judge and Alexander Fullerton.
G. Hijo	Clement Acton Griscom. (See The Theosophical Quarterly Cumulative Index for more of Griscom's pen-names.)
Harij	Jirah D. Buck. (Jirah spelled backwards.)
Jasper Niemand	Mrs. Julia Ver Planck, later Mrs. Keightley (Archibald Keightley's wife)
J. and Julius	Mrs. Julia Ver Planck, later Mrs. Keightley (Archibald Keightley's wife)
Murdhna Joti	(means <i>Head Light</i>). Bawaji or Babajee a Hindu member a.k.a. Darbhagiri Nath, M. Krishnamachari and S. Krishnaswami Iyengar; see BCW 7, p.50.) For correction see Theosophy , Vol. 50, pp.57, 95. [He caused much trouble to H.P.B. and the Society. Blavatsky called him a liar, a traitor and a selfish ambitious wretch.]
Pilgrim	(Unknown author.)
Rameses	Clement Acton Griscom.
Theophilus	Theosophy (ULT) suggest that this was WQJ but cannot find anything written under this name in The Path . [Could this be Rev. Arthur Theophilus mentioned in BCW Index ?]

Articles which are not signed but attributed to W.Q. Judge:

“Astral Intoxication.” — Vol. 2, October 1887, pp.206-208.

“A Theosophical Tract. No. 1, An Epitome of Theosophy.” Vol. 2, No.1, January 1888, pp.320-324. (This article was originally prepared and written by Alexander Fullerton and published in **The Path**. Judge re-wrote the entire original “Tract” and titled it **An Epitome of Theosophy** which was distributed as a small pamphlet. It was published by The Theosophical Publication Society, England, (T.P.S.) during the summer of 1888 and was later translated into many languages.)

“Conversations on Occultism” was first serialized in Vol. 3, April 1888 to October 1888. Subsequent installments ran in Vol. 9 from October 1894 to February 1895. Additionally, “Conversations on Occultism With H.P.B.” appeared in Vol. 9, April 1894.

“May You Reach the Terrace of Enlightenment” — Mentioned by Dr. Fussell but no article by that name has been found. This phrase was used by Judge at the conclusion of the first four “Conversations on Occultism”, and this was likely the extent of its use.

It is interesting to note that nearly all of Judge's mystical tales are signed Bryan Kinnavan, for example the article, “Where the Rishis Were”, which is a narrative on the destruction of Atlantis as told in **The Secret Doctrine** Vol. II; his philosophical articles, for example those on “The Bhagavad-Gita”, are signed William Brehon (“Brehon” means Judge in Gaelic), and much of his correspondence, answers to questions, etc., are mostly by Zadok or Z.

Judge also occasionally signed off letters with astrological glyphs: ♈ [Aries] or ♃ [Jupiter].



2. **The English Theosophist** Vol. 2, No.8, October 1898; pp.140-143; Vol. 3, No.10, January 1900, pp.206-209; No.11, February 1900, pp.238-243, No.12, March 1900, pp.267-268.

[140]

GLEANINGS

FROM UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF W.Q.J.

There are no authorities in Theosophy except such as everyone chooses to accept for himself.

No effort, even the smallest, is ever in vain; and knowing this, each one can “try, ever keep trying.”

It is unwise to consider phenomena or try to understand them, until one has thoroughly grasped the philosophy of nature and man found in Theosophy.

Phenomena are wholly illusionary, and if considered lead away from the reality of life and truth.

[141] The accounts of other incarnations are not useful nor reliable, they will do no good in the end, but may lead to vanity and gloom; and are therefore to be avoided. I never knew a case yet where such were followed or relied on that had not bad consequences. And the only Adepts I ever knew refuse to tell of one's past life: it is a rule of occultism that relations of past lives shall not be indulged in, similar to the rule against relating your progress in the higher life *in this life*. A study of spiritual philosophy as found in Bhagavad Gita will shed light on all possible events, which are all mere motions and unreal apparitions, hiding the truth from our perception.

As to yourself, of course those powers that come naturally are good, and may be used naturally, and the caution I would give (that to you may not be necessary) is that the less people to whom you actually reveal yourself the better for your progress, and for them too. The way to do good with those powers is, never by the exhibition of them, but by the influence they may silently exert on others, and by the cues, clues, and points they may give to their possessor if rightly used; in that way they may become of use, but not by talking of them, nor by any show. This is a great point in all true schools of Occultism.

Do not be discouraged; there is no cause; nothing that is done with ease is really very good or lasting; there must be annoyances and strains here and there.

Do not harbour the idea that — and others do not attend for “caste reasons” and the like. Better to assume that they have other reasons; better to hope for the best and the best will come; . . . besides, I do not think it is the fact. Gossip gets up these ideas.

The circumstances we are in are the best for us if we will only so regard them. Try to do this, and thus get the best out of them, and escape them in another life.

Try to get people to practise true theosophy and brotherhood.

As to the matter of —, the best way is to wait with moderation, to do the best possible, to refuse to listen to calumny and see what will happen. . . . We are not always to be reforming others, while at the same time we can refuse to let the others damage the work. . . .

Stand firm, avoid controversy, and continue work.

Try to progress in harmony; the other kind of progress will then follow in due course. Be a centre of harmony yourself and others will help you in spreading that feeling throughout.

[142] Let us all draw closer together in mind and heart, soul and act, and try thus to make that true brotherhood through which alone our universal and particular progress can come.

I think you and ——— ought to change your attitude of mind in this one point; it seem to me, — though I may be wrong, and, if so, excuse me, — that in wishing to have harmony you try, either in thought or act, to make harmony. Now, I do not think harmony can be made, but is the result of either action or thought. Consequently, you and ———, being persons who do their duty, should rest on that and let results go. If you do right, and do not think about whether harmony is the result or not, harmony must result if your actions are harmonious. This attitude will prevent nervous troubles, for very often we are nervous about a thing because we are thinking of the results. Now, if you do your best, and harmony does not result, it cannot be your fault; consequently you should not think about it; the less you think about it the sooner harmony will come.

The Society seems to be entirely different from all other organizations in this: that in others plenty of money is furnished by members, — clubs and churches can raise large sums of money because they offer definite creeds. I suppose that human nature comes in its real colour before us in the Society, where we offer nothing of that kind, but demand real altruistic work.

And now as to the Branch. A rush of members is not good for it unless those in are able to cope with the rush. Hence it is of high importance that the branch should educate and strengthen itself or it may grow too quick, like a child, and get weak, and thus retard itself. If, on the other hand, a large number of its members become each one a centre and a power from having good knowledge of the subject, then you would see the branch go on with undoubted power and force. If you had lecture after lecture, and merely new members and no building up of the old members, your branch would die the moment the supply of lecturing was cut off. Try and impress this on whatever of the members are willing to listen.

I regret to hear that you are not reconciled to your son's departure from this physical plane. It is hard to part with those we love, but death is only a parting on the lower planes; it is not a "loss" on the higher. But the true union on the inner planes, which always exists though we may be unconscious of it, cannot be *consciously* felt so long as there is any feeling of "disappointment." Try to think within yourself what would be the real desire of your son, and what is your own real inner desire, though you may not [143] know it, in regard to your attitude. It would be, and *is*, on the inner planes that you should not sorrow or grieve, but "rejoice," — yes, rejoice in the position in which you now are, because there is your great opportunity, because the Law and Nature always provide the greatest opportunity and bestow on us the greatest *blessings* we are capable of receiving. From the standpoint of the soul it is all we *ourselves* (the "souls") would have it.

[206] It is well you are courageous and to endure you are able. Indeed, endure is the best word, for that is what the oak does when the storms rage, for it is better to endure when we can do nothing, than to faint and fall. My best love now we are near Christmas and New Year and may there be some sunshine to light the Path. I send you no present, but my love unsullied by a mere gift.

Difficulties and friction are the accompaniments of existence, and if everything was smooth and all right all the time we would have nothing to do. Our movement is a reform one, dealing with the very character of the race, and therefore neither we nor the other members of the race are perfect. Did you ever reflect on the question: "What would you do if all our ideals for man were accomplished, if altruism were Universal?" We

would have to emigrate to some worse planet to have scope for our feelings. Hence we should accept all the difficulties as part of the day's work, and try to get as many people, including ourselves, arranged for help as we can.

Do not think you do nothing for the Cause which is so dear to you, for indeed the truest work is done on the inner planes, and without this there could be no work done on the outer planes. So remember that you *can* work and are doing real work to help the cause by [207] being strong in heart, in trust, and in devotion. In this way you help to keep the centre of the whole movement strong, and others, who can work on the outer plane, will be helped to do their work because the centre is strong and they themselves get help from it. This is what you can do and you should think of it often.

We are now to be like the Freemasons, who are one and all, in every part of the world, Freemasons. Yet each Grand Lodge is independent, autonomous. That is the way to look at it. In the U.S. there are about forty independent States; in each a Masonic Grand Lodge for the State, every one autonomous, and yet every member a Freemason and travelling into every Lodge if he follows the rule.

It was quite right that Autonomy was agreed on as the method. There would be very great clumsiness and friction in being part of the American T.S. Each great territory, like an individual, stands on its own feet, while all are united in aim. . . . After everything is arranged it is to be hoped that you may be able to reach many more minds than before. If we keep in mind that what we ought to work for is to bring the truths of Theosophy before the greatest number of persons and not that we seek office or honour, then our efforts must have good results. I congratulate all and hope for the very best.

I have your letter and reply as best I can. In the first place I am neither wise enough nor good enough to be the guide for anyone, but am willing to help all I can to the best of my ability, always premising that we are [208] on quite an equal footing. So much then to begin.

I am glad you have such an earnest desire to help in the T.S. cause and to try and spread truth as you understand it. This attitude being persisted in will lead to the right end. It is the only one you need assume and if you listen to the voice of your own soul it will guide you aright and better than I could.

You are now in the flush of a new thing. This flush will wear off to some extent to be succeeded by a deeper knowledge and hence a greater strength. So then all you have to do is to continue doing all you can for others and at the same time keep up the process of purifying the mind of old notions and of getting the new ideas well fixed, well grounded and well arranged. Then you will be all the better able to, each day more and more, help all with whom you may be thrown.

But I would not advise you to use your strength in curing people of ills save now and then, for the reason that each one has just so much power and if used it is gone. The Masters have more power than you or I, yet they are not found curing diseases now, but are at work all the time at the souls of men and at their minds. For the deep darkness of the soul and the mind of the race are more important than their outer miseries, as the latter will all soon be ended by death. Thus we are not justified in using all our strength to help the very few that one person might reach in a lifetime. Use your power that way and you die having helped in body a few. But use your power for the souls and minds of men and you will have cured many, for many lives to come, even in this present short life.

Later it will be time for you to look into the other and [209] higher flights of Theosophy. At present your test and your trial are in the great enthusiasm you have with but little vent. By standing this it will do you good;

but using all opportunity for others in your present circumstances you will take all that nature offers and she will, later on, offer you more and better chances if you are fit — not otherwise.

In regard to the movement you may be sure that it will be taken care of if the members do their part. H.P.B. laid down the lines of work and if we follow these we may safely leave the results in the hands of the Master and the Law of Karma.

[238] I SHALL use the story of your little girl's conversasion [sic] in the *Path* without giving any names or places so as not to involve you.¹ It will be useful and interesting for the readers. It is very instructive and more like it would be if people did not repress the children. In the past I published a good many such in the *Path*.

The only book for children in our list is a very beautiful one by a friend of mine called *The Wonder Light and Other Tales*.

As to the child. It is true of course we are not perfect, but while we are not so it is not true that we cannot give the children as nearly perfect teaching as possible; they may be more perfect and make better use of it when we give it to them. Hence I would tell her all of reincarnation, and not make the mistake of letting her explain away a truth as she did by a mere mechanical and mental reply like her saying it was a picture in the mind. Why not say "why that is a fact, you lived before and many times, and it is likely you saw with your real memory the picture of another mother who may have been myself when I lived with you." Then tell her the simple truth of the soul and its unity, and of the great Soul of all and of the actual immortality now and not after, and that eternity is now; and also of Karma. She will understand perhaps better than your- [239] self, for her mind is not filled with nonsense. How much could be avoided for the children if they were not left to the fight we have had, and is it not your duty to save her from such a long struggle to get over bad education. What you find good for your own mature mind should not be kept from your child, and she can understand very well and will not forget.

¹ The following letter appeared in the CORRESPONDENCE section of **The Path**, Vol. 8, March 1894, pp.388-389. —
Compiler

Dear Mr. Judge:—

This is a true story and may be useful. I have a daughter now just five years old, whom I have taught and brought up myself and to whom no one has spoken of reincarnation or of former lives. She has always insisted that she lived before. One day she and I were walking over a stretch of prairie, and she was skipping and running about as we went. Coming back to my side she took my hand, and here is what she said:

"Mamma, ideas come into my head like this — I see two mammas; I see you and I see another one just like you. I say to myself, 'No, that cannot be; this is my mamma and I hold her hand. I see the other one in my mind, and she is just the same. How can that be?'"

"What put that idea into your head?", and she replied:

"Nothing put it there. Ideas like that come into my head. I was not thinking about anything when I saw you and another just like you walking at your side."

At other times she said, "I have lived a long, long time ago when I was a grown up lady, knew everything and travelled all over the world, long before I was born a baby this time."

I may say that I have not taught the child any of the conventional notions of religion, nor have I repressed her with fears of hell or other degrading things, but at the same time she has not been hearing any conversation on reincarnation or any matter like it, and has had no ideas from others on which she might weave a structure from imagination. I regard it as possibly a recollection of some other life definitely.

P.

I should advise you not to talk *much* to the child of her other lives. Let the fact of those be a tacitly understood thing. Teach her all you like of law and ethics and duty, and what not, but you will do well to avoid now particularizing old events. In time, living in an atmosphere where the real truth of things is taught and believed, her soul will expand and she herself will know when to speak of those former events and when not.

When you feel lonely, remember that on the higher planes we are never alone, but that those who are striving to follow the right path are linked together by bonds of sympathy and true brotherhood, and remember too, that the greatest work is not done on outer physical planes but on the thought plane. Here is something then for you to do: — to think strong helpful thoughts for all the members of the T.S. and for your friends, and then for the whole of humanity. It may be that when a bright helpful thought comes into your own life that it has been sent forth from some other, who is trying to lighten the load of the world's suffering, and all the loving helpful thoughts that you can send out will help to lighten someone's sadness, and bring a ray of hope into someone's life. Each thought is a seed and will bear fruit in due season.

[240] Around the word Spiritualism in your letter, is the bad influence that is against you. My advice to you is to keep that whole influence off as much as you can, try to work for others, and rely on your Higher Self.

I am glad to hear of your work in F ——— and trust that you will be able to get together a strong Centre; remember, however, that you yourself can be and are a centre to the extent that you make Theosophy a living power in your life.

Sexual intercourse is a right and proper thing when used for its right object as intended by nature, *i.e.*, the propagation of children. But if indulged in simply for personal and sensual gratification it becomes like any other passion and as regards this you can decide for yourself.

The arguments *pro* and *con* on this point will not help you much. Better get them out of your mind and depend on the leading of the spirit and the voice of conscience.

Endeavour to do that which is right from the standpoint of your inner consciousness, and you will be led in the right way.

Instead of being annoyed, I am glad to get your letter, for it shows *you* see. It is a twenty years' experience with me to know what you see and not be able to destroy the mask born with another and now mine. But it has been useful. Did I know how to destroy it perhaps it would be better, perhaps not — it might mean death.

If you look at its hand you would find death shown fifteen years ago and now — yet it lives. Too much [241] effort might kill it now — I do not know. But so many thinking as you do may have effect in time unconsciously so to say. The whole thing comes from the peculiar fact of a person living in a house he did not build and having two astrals at work.

No, your friends do not and will not forget you, but remember that the greatest and truest friend is the Higher Self. He who has the Higher Self as his friend possesses all things and lacks nothing, and the Higher Self is your friend if you will but receive that friendship. Take courage and be patient, the light is shining in your heart and if you will but go on you will find it there and it will be brighter far than you can now imagine.

It is true that too often when we begin to meditate on some elevating thought, that dark thoughts come in and this is not easy to overcome, but if we remember that the very essence of our being, the inmost sanctuary of the Soul, is divine, we can enter into it and shut out the evil. The tendency of the mind is to wander from subject to subject, and so we should try to follow the advice of the *Bhagavad Gîtâ*: "To whatsoever object

the inconstant mind goeth out, he should subdue it, bring it back and place it upon the Spirit." "There is no purifier in this world to be compared to spiritual knowledge, and he who is perfected in devotion findeth Spiritual knowledge springing up spontaneously in himself in the progress of time."

Although so far away, yet through ——— I hear something of all that you and your co-workers are doing. It interests me very much, it must be of great effect and value, both now and in later days. As I understand it, [242] your work is with those who are called in England "common people." In this country we are all common people, and such work strictly is hardly possible here. It is therefore very interesting, because from the better (so-called) classes no great improvement will come. If you can sensibly alter those "common people" you will have done a great work for the world. The cultured classes do not give us any hope for theosophy, they are too selfish and too superficial.

I feel sure you do not hold that erroneous opinion that theosophy can only be understood by the highly educated. Any man can understand it and make it a part of his life. In fact I think that its essential truths are easier for the humble than for the polished. For a lot of education and a smattering of different notions in the heads of the better educated make it difficult for them to come to any conclusions in any such matters.

I trust you will go on unfalteringly. Do not be depressed by anything. It is of no use. Besides it may be avoided if you will avoid setting down, to be achieved, any certain results as to persons, numbers, times or otherwise. We must be satisfied with what the time and Karma give us after we have done our duty and the best.

Let us simplify our teachings, avoiding long and strange words. "Merit" and "Demerit" express part of Karma and are words well known to Catholics. And so on in all directions we should try to avoid all pedantry and the making of a new language.

Let us not judge others too much, for they also may be acting up to the best light they have. Besides [243] Karma ever works, and ever the T.S. must feel it even more than other bodies. The effect of the fuss — for it is but that — must be for the best, for, if it kills the T.S., that proves a deserved death; if not, then the T.S. is stronger than ever. The latter is what I see as the final end, however far off. . . .

Our duty these days of trial and transition is to engage in propaganda, so as to place Theosophy before as many of the race as possible. To do that, the most common-sense, simple presentation of theosophy, free from vagueness and big words, is the best.

The very best I can say to you is that, as you know, all our trouble in life arises from ourselves, no matter how much they may seem to come from the outside; we are all parts of the one great whole, and if you try to centre your mind upon that fact and to remember that those things that seem to trouble you are really due to your own way of looking at the world and life, you will probably grow more contented in mind. It is your own mind you should watch and not the circumstances in which you are placed. Others have been in worse circumstances than what you think surround you, and have not been disturbed as you seem to be. It must be, therefore, that it is the way you yourself look at this thing; stop looking at it then in that way and look at everything in a contented spirit, feeling sure that they are all more or less illusionary, and you will do better.

[267] A TEACHER, and that is your present status no matter how or why, has to have not only a pleasant manner on the outside but must have a purely pleasant and sweet feeling inside; for if the inside does not, in fact, coincide with the outside then there is trouble. When the outside is pleasant but the inside is false, then it is a hollow shell and all the good magnetism is cut off. When the outside is rough but the inside wishes to be right and there is sincerity, then the magnetism is not cut off, but a current in opposition is often

raised which engenders error and misconception and makes a big obstacle, while many friends arise who overlook it.

But it is not to be so left. The inner attitude must be made entirely suave and the outer will soon be made to correspond. Surety of conviction is not best conveyed by force, but by the great onward quiet movement of the glacier, the best example of this. To the quiet motion of the glacier add the steady fire of the genial Sun, and nothing can resist. This is the way and if it is comprehended there will be more and better work done and more help given.

When one stops to think, to weigh, and to consider what is one's duty, or which of many duties should be performed first, it is indeed perplexing and difficult to [268] know *what* to do. But if you will do just what lies before you without thinking about all the other things and without troubling your mind about all the things you can't do, then it will be all different and everything will grow brighter for you. Do what you have to do now, and don't trouble about other things, they will be looked after in due time; but what will help you in all these matters is to be content, to do what you can, and to let the rest go; act with a high motive; have kindly feelings towards all; do some little act of kindness every day and try to realize that the end of all this will be happiness and peace for all humanity. Then a foretaste of that peace will enter your own heart. There is a bright side to life and what makes the brightness is the love which each of us may have for humanity.

Generally speaking, the habit of drinking intoxicants is due to a desire to get rid of what might be called the present personal consciousness. When people drink to try and drown sorrow, pain, worry, they clearly do it with that motive in view. But others drink without any such ostensible motive, though still with the same actual motive, for they long to get rid of what is to them an intolerable sense of identity, of monotony, of sameness. It is an effort to produce by extraneous aids what can only be done properly and lastingly by interior development. People read trashy novels, gamble and so forth with the same motive, that is to say with the intention of getting rid of their personal identity for the time being. Ultimately the race will come to realize that this can only be achieved by identification of the ego with the higher instead of the lower nature. Meanwhile and for the ordinary person healthy and interesting occupation is the best cure for such a habit. If possible he should be made to understand that the desire for drink is now a habit in certain lives in his body whose very existence depends upon their being fed with alcohol. The desire is not in himself unless he is foolish enough to identify himself with the desire. Once he ceases to so identify himself the desire will lose more than half its power over him.



3.

WORDS OF WISDOM

“There should be calmness. Hold Fast. Go slow.” (WQJ's last words.)

— **Theosophy (The Path)**, Vol. 11, May 1896, p.40.

August E. Neresheimer wrote: He was called by some “*The Rajah*.” I wrote him once at the end of a period of prolonged anxiety, worry and trouble in my affairs, asking what was the lesson to be learned from it, as I could not make the application myself. His reply was: “The lesson is not different from anything in life. It is just Karma, and being applied to large circumstances seems larger, but is in reality no more than the small ones of others. Calmness is the best lesson to learn with an indifference to results. If all comes right it is well, and if you have been calm and detached then it is better, for you shall have made no new Karma of attachment by it. Calmness also preserves health in affairs more than anything else and also leaves the mind free to act well.” — **Theosophy (The Path)**, Vol. 11, May 1896, p.57.

If misery, want and sorrow are thy portion for a time, be happy that it is not death. If it is death be happy there is no more of life. — **The Path**, Vol. 1, October 1886, p.210; **Echoes of the Orient**, Vol. 1, p.20.

On Living The Theosophical (Higher) Life

. . . nature, working toward reunion with the great All, manifests many varieties often at war with each other, yet all members of the great whole. — **Practical Occultism**, p.49.

Sincerity does not confer of itself knowledge, much less wisdom.

— **By Master's Direction**. E.S.T. Circular. November 1894, p.4.

If you find friction between yourself and another or others, never stop to think where they are wrong. Everybody is always wrong somewhere; and, apart from that, it would be easy enough to find their errors in your own imagination. Their errors, real or imaginary, are no concert of yours, are not your duty, and need not and should not be considered by you. For you to do so would be to make an occult ‘break.’ What concerns you and what is your duty is to discover wherein you have been at fault. If, on finding friction of any sort, you will look back over your past thoughts and words and deeds, you will surely find you have erred, either directly or indirectly, by leaving something undone or unsaid. By living that way you will learn a good deal about yourself, while by looking for and noting the possible faults of others — no matter how greatly they have sinned, in your opinion — you will learn nothing and will merely prove yourself an ass.

— **The English Theosophist**, Vol. 3, April 1899, pp.6-7.

On Duty

If we look at the field of operation in us of the so-called advantages of opportunity, money, travel and teachers we see at once that it all has to do with the brain and nothing else. . . . all these begin and end in the brain and not in the soul or character. . . . But imagine the same brain and body not in places of ease, struggling for a good part of life, doing their duty and not in a position to please the senses; this experience will burn in, stamp upon, carve into the character, more energy, more power and more fortitude. It is thus through the ages that great characters are made. — “Advantages and Disadvantages in Life.” **Vernal Blooms**, p.12; **Echoes of The Orient**, Vol. 1, p.462; **The Path**, Vol. 10, July 1895, p.125.

We should deny no man and interfere with none; for our duty is to discover what we ourselves can do without criticizing the actions of another. . . . If we attend strictly to our own duty all will act in harmony,

for the duty of another is dangerous for us. — “Methods of Theosophical Work.” **Vernal Blooms**, p.59; **Echoes of The Orient**, Vol. 1, p.190; **The Path**, Vol. 6, August 1891, p.160.

However, our duty is to never consider our ability, but to do what comes to be done in whatever way we can, no matter how inadequate the work appears to others. When we stop to consider our weakness, we think, by comparison, of how another would do it. Our *only right is in the act itself*. The consequences are in the great Brahm. — **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.7.

It is our duty to help all, and we must begin on those nearest to us, for to run abroad to souls we might possibly help we again forsake our present duty. It is better to die in our own duty, however mean, than to try another one. — **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.10.

They who go into war for gain or revenge do wrong, but not he who goes at his superior’s orders, because it is his present duty. — **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.24.

Duty persistently followed is the highest yoga, and is better than mantrams or any posture, or any other thing. If you can do no more than duty it will bring you to the goal. And, my dear friends, I can swear it, the Masters are watching us all, and, without fail, when we come to the right point and really deserve, They manifest to us. At all times I know They help and try to aid us as far as we will let Them.

— **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.68.

What should be done is to realize that “the Master-Soul is one,” with all that that implies; to know the meaning of the old teaching, “Thou art That.” When this is done we may with impunity identify our consciousness with that of anything in nature; not before. But to do this is a lifetime’s work, and beforehand we have to exhaust all Karma, which means duty; we must live for others and then we will find out all we *should* know, not what we would *like* to know. — **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.111.

It is one’s duty to try to find one’s own duty and not to get into the duty of another. And in this it is of the highest importance that we should detach our *minds* (as well as our tongues) from the duties and acts of others whenever those are outside of our own. If you can find this fine line of action and inaction you will have made great progress. — **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.120.

The very first step towards being positive and self-centered is in the cheerful performance of duty. Try to take pleasure in doing what is your duty, and especially in the *little* duties of life. When doing any duty put your whole heart into it. There is much in this life that is bright if we would open our eyes to it. If we recognize this, then we can bear the troubles that come to us calmly and patiently, for we know that they will pass away. — **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.125.

And this practical suggestion is to fulfil faithfully and conscientiously every known duty. It is in and through the incidents of daily life, in work well done, in duties thoroughly performed, that we today can most readily make progress in the higher life, — slow progress, it may be, but at any rate sure. These are stepping stones to better things. We advance most rapidly when we stop to help other wayfarers. We receive most when we sacrifice most. We attain to the largest measure of Divine love when we most unselfishly love the brethren. We become one with the Supreme most surely when we lose ourselves in work for Humanity. — “Spiritual Gifts and Their Attainment.” **Vernal Blooms**, p.33; **Echoes of The Orient**, Vol. 1, p.98; **The Path**, Vol. 3, February 1889, p.341.

At the same time, no one of us may be the judge of just how much or how little our brother is doing in that direction. If he does all that he can and knows how to do, he does his whole present duty. — “Conversations on Occultism.” (The Kali Yuga — The Present Age.) **Vernal Blooms**, pp.133-134; **The Path**, Vol. 3, April 1888, p.21.

Student — What should be our duty, then, as students of the truth? Should we go out as reformers of science, or what?

Sage — You ought not to take up the role of reformers of the school and their masters, because success would not attend the effort. Science is competent to take care of itself, and you would only be throwing pearls before them to be trampled under foot. Rest content that all within their comprehension will be discovered and admitted from time to time. The endeavour to force them into admitting what you believe to be so plain would be due almost solely to your vanity and love of praise. It is not possible to force them, any more than it is for me to force you, to admit certain incomprehensible laws, and you would not think me wise or fair to first open before you think, to understand which you have not the necessary development, and then to force you into admitting their truth. Or if, out of reverence, you should say “These things are true,” while you comprehended nothing and were not progressing, you would have bowed to superior force. — “Conversations on Occultism.” **Vernal Blooms**, p.161; **The Path**, Vol. 3, September 1888, p.188.

We must not only be unselfish, but must do all the duties that Karma has given us, and this intuition will point out the road of duty and the true path of life. — “Conversations on Occultism.” **Vernal Blooms** (No. XI: Clairvoyance, Intuition, Adept), p.191; **The Path**, Vol. 9, November 1894, p.245.

On Karma

Good Karma is that kind which the Ego desires and requires; bad, that which the Ego neither desires nor requires. — “Advantages and Disadvantages in Life.” **Vernal Blooms**, pp.9-10; **Echoes of The Orient**, Vol. 1, p.461; **The Path**, Vol. 10, July 1895, p.123.

But seeing that we have many lives to live, and that they will give us all needed opportunity for building up character, we must admit that poverty is not, in itself, necessarily bad Karma. Poverty has no natural tendency to engender selfishness, but wealth requires it. — “Advantages and Disadvantages in Life.” **Vernal Blooms**, pp.11; **Echoes of The Orient**, Vol. 1, p.462; **The Path**, Vol. 10, July 1895, p.124.

The great conflict already begun between the wealthy classes and the poorer is a sign of darkness. Were spiritual light prevalent, the rich and the poor would still be with us, for Karma cannot be blotted out, but the poor would know how to accept their lot and the rich how to improve the poor; now, on the contrary, the rich wonder why the poor do not go to the poorhouse, meanwhile seeking in the laws for cures for strikes and socialism, and the poor continually growl at fate and their supposed oppressors. All this is of the quality of spiritual darkness. — “Conversations on Occultism.” (The Kali Yuga — The Present Age.) **Vernal Blooms**, p.130; **The Path**, Vol. 3, April 1888, p.18.

And, being unconscious and only acting according to the natural laws of its being, the elemental world is a powerful factor in the workings of Karma. And so long as mankind does not cultivate brotherly feeling and charity towards the whole of creation, just so long will the elementals be without the impulse to act for our benefit. But so soon and wherever man or men begin to cultivate brotherly feeling and love for the whole of creation, there and then the elementals begin to take on the new condition. — “Conversations on Occultism.” (Elementals — Karma.) **Vernal Blooms**, pp.144-145; **The Path**, Vol. 3, June 1888, p.95.

If you are not well-balanced and physically purified, you will often get thoughts that are not correct. Such is your Karma and the Karma of the race. But if you are sincere and try to base yourself on right philosophy, your mind will naturally reject wrong notions. You can see in this how it is that systems of thought are made

and kept going, even though foolish, incorrect, or pernicious. — “Conversations on Occultism.” **Vernal Blooms** (No. XII: Phantasy; Memory and Mind; The Sun; Altruism), p.197; **The Path**, Vol. 9, December 1894, p.282.

The first is Justice; we call it Karma; you can call it Justice, but the old Sanskrit word is Karma. It is that you will reap the result of what you do. If you do good you will get good; if you do evil you will get evil.

— **Vernal Blooms** (Our Objects. The Convention Speeches of London, 1892.), p.271.

On One’s Own Effort

Karma brings everything about. It attaches to our real inner selves by attachment and repulsion. That is, if we love vice or anything, it seizes on us by attachment; if we hate anything, it seizes on our inner selves by reason of the strong horror we feel for it. In order to prevent a thing we must understand it; we cannot understand while we fear or hate it. We are not to love vice, but are to recognize that it is a part of the whole, and, trying to understand it, we thus get above it. — **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.22.

He is forced to see that, as he entered the world alone, he must learn to live there in the same way, leaving it as he came, solely in his own company. — **Echoes From The Orient**, p.37.

On Psychic Development

It is not the Black Lodge that tries to keep back psychic development; it is the White Lodge. The Black would fain have all the psychic powers full flower now, because in our wicked, mean, hypocritical, and money-getting people they would soon wreck the race. — **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, January 1895, p.56.

No vain striving to preach or prove phenomena will be of any value, for, as again Masters have written, one phenomenon demands another and another. . . . We have to do as Buddha told his disciples: preach, promulgate, expound, illustrate, and make clear in detail all the great things we have learned. That is our work, and not the bringing out of surprising things about clairvoyance and other astral matters. . . . The Master’s plan has not altered. He gave it out long ago. It is to make the world at large better, to prepare a right soil for the growing out of the powers of the soul. . . .

— Entire quotation from **Eirenicon**, July/August 1946, p.12.

— All but the first sentence can also be found in “The Closing Cycle.” **The Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 3, January 1895, p.56.

The placid surface of the sea of spirit is the only mirror in which can be caught undisturbed the reflections of spiritual things. When a student starts upon the path and begins to see spots of light flash out now and then, or balls of golden fire roll past him, it does not mean that he is beginning to see the real Self—pure spirit. A moment of deepest peace or wonderful revealings given to the student, is *not* the awful moment when one is about to see his spiritual guide, much less his own soul. Nor are psychical splashes of blue flame, nor visions of things that afterwards come to pass, nor sights of small sections of the astral light with its wonderful photographs of past or future, nor the sudden ringing of distant fairy-like bells, any proof that you are cultivating spirituality. These things, and still more curious things, will occur when you have passed a little distance on the way, but they are only the mere outposts of a new land which is itself wholly material, and only one remove from the plane of gross physical consciousness. — “Astral Intoxication.” **Vernal Blooms**, p.77; **Echoes of The Orient**, Vol. 1, p.45; **The Path**, Vol. 2, October 1887, pp.206-207.

You have no right, therefore, to enter into the mind of another who has not given the permission and take from him what is not yours. You become a burglar on the mental and psychic plane when you break this rule. You are forbidden taking anything for personal gain, profit, advantage, or use. — “Conversations on Occultism.” **Vernal Blooms** (No. XIII: Rules for Higher Conduct), p.201; **The Path**, Vol. 9, January 1895, p.311.

On Organizations

Organisations, like men, may fall into ruts or grooves of mental and psychic action, which, once established, are difficult to obliterate. To prevent those ruts or grooves in the Theosophical Movement, its guardians provided that necessary shocks should now and then interpose so as to conduce to solidarity, to give strength such as the oak obtains from buffeting the storm, and in order that all grooves of mind, act, or thought, might be filled up. — *Eirenicon*, July/August 1946, p.11; **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.74.

On Self-Discipline

Do not judge in anger, for, though the anger passes, *the judgment remains!* — *Theosophy (The Path)*, Vol. 11, May 1896, p.47; **Letters That Have Helped Me** - J.N., Vol. 1, p.93.

On Western Occultism

It is not the desire of the Brotherhood that those members of the Theosophical movement who have, under their rights, taken up a belief in the messengers and the message should become pilgrims to India. To arouse that thought was not the work nor the wish of H. P. B. Nor is it the desire of the Lodge to have members think that Eastern methods are to be followed, Eastern habits adopted, or the present East made the model or the goal. The West has its own work and its duty, its own life and development. Those it should perform, aspire to and follow, and not try to run to other fields where the duties of other men are to be performed. If the task of raising the spirituality of India, now degraded and almost suffocated, were easy, and if thus easily raised it could shine into and enlighten the whole world of the West, then, indeed, were the time wasted in beginning in the West, when a shorter and quicker way existed in the older land. But in fact it is more difficult to make an entry into the hearts and minds of people who, through much lapse of time in fixed metaphysical dogmatism, have built in the psychic and psycho-mental planes a hard impervious shell around themselves, than it is to make that entry with Westerners who, although they may be meat eaters, yet have no fixed opinions deep laid in a foundation of mysticism and buttressed with a pride inherited from the past.

The new era of Western Occultism definitely began in 1875 with the efforts of that noble woman who abandoned the body of that day not long ago. This does not mean that the Western Occultism is to be something wholly different from and opposed to what so many know, or think they know, as Eastern Occultism. It is to be the Western side of the one great whole of which the true Eastern is the other half. It has, as its mission, largely entrusted to the hands of the Theosophical Society, to furnish to the West that which it can never get from the East; to push forward and raise high on the circular path of evolution now rolling West, the light that lighteth every man who cometh into the world — the light of the true self, who is the one true Master for every human being; all other Masters are but servants of that true One; in it all real Lodges have their union. — **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.75.



4. What Is Occultism?

Occultism is the not telling all one knows; but reticence.

Occultism is the not saying all one suspects; but silence.

Occultism is the not speaking of all one “sees”; but reverting inward to the source of sight.

Occultism is the not repeating of all one “hears”; but a closed mouth lest hearing should escape therethrough.

Occultism is the not speaking of faults of others; but charity.

Occultism is the not setting of fixed plans; but a fluidic position balanced in the good law.

Occultism is the not laying down for another his duty; but self-watchfulness in performing one’s own.

Occultism is the not doing what one wishes and when one wants; but discipline.

Occultism is the not listening to gossip or slander; but good-will to all, from which gossip and slander can draw no sustenance.

Occultism is the not giving way to anger or impatience; but calmness.

Occultism is the not being vain of one’s learning, or proud; but humility.

Occultism is the not hurrying one’s daily affairs nor forcing one’s progress; but knowing the amplitude of time in all things.

Occultism is the not doing all the great work there is to do; but the will to labor; the willingness to accept help or be a helper; the joy that another does a task the best.

Occultism is the not striving to be a leader of men; but to follow a line.

[These aphorisms on Occultism were attributed to W.Q. Judge by some early students. They were printed in the magazine **Theosophy**, Vol. 8, October 1920, pp.353-354, from an Unknown Source; and reprinted in **Echoes of The Orient**, Vol. 3, pp.260-261. — Compiler.]



5. **The Path**, Vol. 1, August 1886, pp.155-156; October 1886, pp.208-211; February 1887, pp.339-341.

[155] **MUSINGS ON THE TRUE THEOSOPHIST'S PATH.**

“The way of inward peace is in all things to conform to the pleasure and disposition of the Divine Will. Such as would have all things succeed and come to pass according to their own fancy, are not come to know this way; and therefore lead a harsh and bitter life; always restless and out of humor, without treading the way of peace.”

Know then Oh Man, that he who seeks the hidden way, can only find it through the door of life. In the hearts of all, at some time, there arises the desire for knowledge. He who thinks his desire will be fulfilled, as the little bird in the nest, who has only to open his mouth to be fed; will very truly be disappointed.

In all nature we can find no instance where effort of some kind is not required. We find there is a natural result from such effort. He who would live the life or find wisdom can only do so by continued effort. If one becomes a student, and learns to look partially within the veil, or has found within his own being something that is greater than his outer self, it gives no authority for one to sit down in idleness or fence himself in from contact with the world. Because one sees the gleam of the light ahead he cannot say to his fellow “I am holier than thee” or draw the mantle of seclusion around himself.

The soul develops like the flower, in God's sunlight, and unconsciously to the soil in which it grows. Shut out the light and the soil grows damp and sterile, the flower withers or grows pale and sickly. Each and every one is here for a good and wise reason. If we find partially *the why* we are here, then is there the more reason that we should by intelligent contact with life, seek in it the farther elucidation of the problem. It is not the study of ourselves so much, as the thought for others that opens this door. The events of life and their causes lead to knowledge. They must be studied when they are manifested in daily life.

There is no idleness for the Mystic. He finds his daily life among the roughest and hardest of the labors and trials of the world perhaps, but goes his way with smiling face and joyful heart, nor grows too sensitive for association with his fellows, nor so extremely spiritual as to forget that some other body is perhaps hungering for food.

It was said by one who pretended to teach the mysteries “It is needful that I have a pleasant location and beautiful surroundings.” He who is a true Theosophist will wait for nothing of the sort, either before teaching; or what is first needful, learning. It would perhaps, be agreeable, but if the Divine [156] Inspiration comes only under those conditions, then indeed is the Divine afar from the most of us. He only can be a factor for good or teach how to approach the way, who forgetting his own surroundings, strives to beautify and illumine those of others. The effort must be for the good of others, not the gratifying of our own senses, or love for the agreeable or pleasant.

Giving thought to self will most truly prevent and overthrow your aims and objects, particularly when directed toward the occult.

Again there arises the thought “I am a student, a holder of a portion of the mystic lore.” Insidiously there steals in the thought “Behold I am a little more than other men, who have not penetrated so far.” Know then oh, man, that you are not as great even as they. He who thinks he is wise is the most ignorant of men, and he who begins to *believe* he is wise is in greater danger than any other man who lives.

You think, oh, man, that because you have obtained a portion of occult knowledge, that it entitles you to withdraw from contact with the rest of mankind. It is not so. If you have obtained true knowledge it forces you to meet all men not only half way, but more than that to seek them. It urges you not to retire but, seeking contact, to plunge into the misery and sorrow of the world, and with your cheering word, if you have no more (the Mystic has little else) strive to lighten the burden for some struggling soul.

You dream of fame. We know no such thing as fame. He who seeks the upward path finds that all is truth; that evil is the good gone astray. Why should we ask for fame? It is only the commendation of those we strive to help.

Desire neither notice, fame or wealth. Unknown you are in retirement. Being fameless you are undisturbed in your seclusion, and can walk the broad face of the earth fulfilling your duty, as commanded, unrecognized.

If the duty grows hard, or you faint by the way, be not discouraged, fearful or weary of the world. Remember that "Thou may'st look for silence in tumult, solitude in company, light in darkness, forgetfulness in pressures, vigor in despondency, courage in fear, resistance in temptation, peace in war, and quiet in tribulation."

[208]

II.

"Work as those work who are ambitious. — Respect life as those do who desire it. — Be happy as those are who live for happiness." — *Light on the Path*.

We are tried in wondrous ways, and in the seemingly unimportant affairs of life, there often lie the most dangerous of the temptations.

Labor, at best, is frequently disagreeable owing either to mental or [209] physical repugnance. When he who seeks the upward path, begins to find it, labor grows more burdensome, while at the time, he is, owing to his physical condition, not so well fitted to struggle with it. This is all true, but there must be no giving in to it. It must be forgotten. He *must work*, and if he cannot have the sort he desires or deems best suited to him, then must he take and perform that which presents itself. It is that which he most needs. It is not intended either, that he do it to have it done. It is intended that he work as if it was the object of his life, as if his whole heart was in it. Perhaps he may be wise enough to know that there is something else, or that the future holds better gifts for him, still this also must to all intents be forgotten, while he takes up his labor, as if there were no to-morrow.

Remember that life is the outcome of the Ever-Living. If you have come to comprehend a little of the mystery of life, and can value its attractions according to their worth; these are no reasons why you should walk forth with solemn countenance to blight the enjoyments of other men. Life to them is as real, as the mystery is to you. Their time will come as yours has, so hasten it for them, if you can, by making life brighter, more joyous, better.

If it be your time to fast, put on the best raiment you have, and go forth, not as one who fasts, but as one who lives for life.

Do your sighing and crying within you. If you can not receive the small events of life and their meanings without crying them out to all the world, think you that you are fitted to be trusted with the mysteries?

The doing away with one or certain articles of diet, *in itself*, will not open the sealed portals. If this contained the key, what wise beings must the beasts of the field be, and what a profound Mystic must Nebuchadnezar have been, after he was "turned out to grass!"

There are some adherents of a faith, which has arisen in the land, who deem it wise to cast away all things that are distasteful to them; to cut asunder the ties of marriage because they deem it will interfere with their spiritual development, or because the other pilgrim is not progressed enough. Brothers, there lives not the man who is wise enough to sit as a judge upon the spiritual development of any living being. He is not only unwise but blasphemous who says to another: "Depart! you impede my exalted spiritual development."

The greatest of all truths lies frequently in plain sight, or veiled in contraries. The impression has gone abroad that the Adept or the Mystic of high degree, has only attained his station by forsaking the association of his fellow creatures or refusing the marriage tie. It is the belief of very wise Teachers that all men who had risen to the highest degrees of Initiation, have at some time passed through the married state. Many men, failing in [210] the trials, have ascribed their failure to being wedded, precisely as that other coward, Adam, after being *the first transgressor* cried out "It was Eve."

One of the most exalted of the Divine Mysteries lies hidden here — therefore, Oh Man, it is wise to cherish that which holds so much of God and seek to know its meaning; not by dissolution and cutting asunder, but by binding and strengthening the ties. Our most Ancient Masters knew of this and Paul also speaks of it. (Ephesians v. 32.)

Be patient, kindly and wise, for perhaps in the next moment of life, the light will shine out upon thy companion, and you discover that you are but a blind man, claiming to see. Remember this, that you own not one thing in this world. Your wife is but a gift, your children are but loaned to you. All else you possess is given to you only while you use it wisely. Your body is not yours, for Nature claims it as her property. Do you not think, Oh Man, that it is the height of arrogance for you to sit in judgment upon any other created thing, while you, a beggar, are going about in a borrowed robe?

If misery, want and sorrow are thy portion for a time, be happy that it is not death. If it is death be happy there is no more of life.

You would have wealth, and tell of the good you would do with it. Truly will you lose your way under these conditions. It is quite probable, that you are as rich as you ever will be, therefore, desire to do good with what you have — and *do it*. If you have nothing, know that it is best and wisest for you. Just so surely as you murmur and complain just so surely will you find that "from him that hath not, shall be taken even that which he hath." This sounds contradictory, but in reality is in most harmonious agreement. Work in life and the Occult are similar; all is the result of your own effort and will. You are not rash enough to believe that you will be lifted up into Heaven like the Prophet of old — but you really hope some one will come along and give you a good shove toward it.

Know then, Disciples, that you only can lift yourselves by your own efforts. When this is done, you may have the knowledge that you will find many to accompany you on your heretofore lonely journey; but neither they or your Teacher will be permitted to push or pull you one step onward.

This is all a very essential part of your preparation and trial for Initiation.

You look and wait for some great and astounding occurrence, to show you that you are going to be permitted to enter behind the veil; that you are to be Initiated. It will never come. He only who studies all things and learns from them, as he finds them, will be permitted to enter, and for him there are no flashing lightnings or rolling thunder. He who enters [211] the door, does so as gently and imperceptibly, as the tide rises in the nighttime.

Live well your life. Seek to realize the meaning of every event. Strive to find the Ever Living and wait for more light. The True Initiate does not fully realize what he is passing through, until his degree is received. If you are striving for light and Initiation, remember this, that your cares will increase, your trials thicken, your family make new demands upon you. He who can understand and pass through these patiently, wisely, placidly — may hope.

[339]

III.

If you desire to labor for the good of the world, it will be unwise for you to strive to include it all at once in your efforts. If you can help elevate or teach but one soul — that is a good beginning, and more than is given to many.

Fear nothing that is in Nature and visible. Dread no influence exerted by sect, faith, or society. Each and every one of them originated upon the same basis — Truth, or a portion of it at least. You may not assume that [340] you have a greater share than they, it being needful only, that you find all the truth each one possesses. You are at war with none. It is peace you are seeking, therefore it is best that the good in everything is found. For this brings peace.

It has been written that he who lives the Life shall know the doctrine. Few there be who realize the significance of The Life.

It is not by intellectually philosophizing upon it, until reason ceases to solve the problem, nor by listening in ecstatic delight to the ravings of an *Elemental clothed* — whose hallucinations are but the offspring of the Astral — that the life is realized. Nor will it be realized by the accounts of the experiences of other students. For there be some who will not realize Divine Truth itself, when written, unless it be properly punctuated or expressed in flowery flowing words.

Remember this: that as you live your life each day with an uplifted purpose and unselfish desire, each and every event will bear for you a deep significance — an occult meaning — and as you learn their import, so do you fit yourself for higher work.

There are no rose-gardens upon the way in which to loiter about, nor fawning slaves to fan one with golden rods of Ostrich plumes. The Ineffable Light will not stream out upon you every time you may think you have turned up the wick, nor will you find yourself sailing about in an astral body, to the delight of yourself and the astonishment of the rest of the world, simply because you are making the effort to find wisdom.

He who is bound in any way — he who is narrow in his thoughts — finds it doubly difficult to pass onward. You may equally as well gain wisdom and light in a church as by sitting upon a post while your nails grow through your hands. It is not by going to extremes or growing fanatical in any direction that the life will be realized.

Be temperate in all things, most of all in the condemnation of other men. It is unwise to be intemperate or drunken with wine. It is equally unwise to be drunken with temperance. Men would gain the powers; or the way of working wonders. Do you know, O man, what the powers of the Mystic are? Do you know that for each gift of this kind he gives a part of himself? That it is only with mental anguish, earthly sorrow, and almost his heart's blood, these gifts are gained? Is it true, think you, my brother, that he who truly possesses them desires to sell them at a dollar a peep, or any other price? He who would trade upon these things finds himself farther from his goal than when he was born.

There *are* gifts and powers. Not just such as you have created in your imagination, perhaps. Harken to one of these powers: He who has passed onward to a certain point, finds that the hearts of men lie spread before him as an open book, and from there onward the motives of men are clear. In [341] other words he can read the hearts of men. But not selfishly; should he but once use this knowledge selfishly, the book is closed — and he reads no more. Think you, my brothers, he would permit himself to *sell* a page out of this book?

Time — that which does not exist outside the inner circle of this little world — seems of vast importance to the physical man. There comes to him at times, the thought that he is not making any progress, and that he is receiving nothing from some Mystic source. From the fact that he has the thought that no progress is being made the evidence is gained that he is working onward. Only the dead in living bodies need fear. That which men would receive from Mystic sources is frequently often repeated, and in such a quiet, unobtrusive voice, that he who is waiting to hear it shouted in his ear, is apt to pass on unheeding.

Urge no man to see as yourself, as it is quite possible you may see differently when you awake in the morning. It is wiser to let the matter rest without argument. No man is absolutely convinced by that. It is but blowing your breath against the whirlwind.

It was at one time written over the door: “Abandon Hope, all ye who enter here.” It has taken hundreds of years for a few to come to the realization that the wise men had not the slightest desire for the company of a lot of hopeless incurables in the mysteries. There is to be abandoned hope for the gratification of our passions, our curiosities, our ambition or desire for gain. There is also another Hope — the true; and he is a wise man who comes to the knowledge of it. Sister to Patience, they together are the Godmothers of Right Living, and two of the Ten who assist the Teacher.

AMERICAN MYSTIC
[William Q. Judge]



6. **The Canadian Theosophist**, Vol. 60, March–April, 1979, pp.2-5.

[2]

LIVING THE HIGHER LIFE

THE THEOSOPHICAL LIFE NOTED IN THE WRITINGS OF WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

When Jesus said, “If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor . . . and come and follow me” (*Matthew*, xix, 21), he threw down a challenge that seemed enormously difficult for the rich young man who had asked how he could attain eternal life. With those words he also established a rule for all aspiring Christians. Although down the ages many have deemed to call themselves followers of the Christ, relatively few have ever applied that particular rule, which is perhaps not surprising, considering the degree of self-denial called for. The prospect of living at the level that Jesus exemplified and preached is unattractive to all who are tied down with material possessions.

It is very similar with the “Theosophic Life”, which was discussed in an article in *The Canadian Theosophist*, Jan.-Feb., 1979, with particular reference to H.P. Blavatsky’s definitions. Most of us, when confronted with the requirements of living the Theosophic Life are like the rich young ruler who was disappointed with Jesus’ simple but stern answer; and as noted in the aforementioned article, few there are who dare call themselves Theosophists in the strict meaning of the term.

Living the Theosophic Life means a change in our life-styles that few of us can, or are willing to make. Our customary way of life is completely different, and the illusion of material satisfaction is so strong that we are exceedingly reluctant to change its direction.

Altruism, the essential requirement, appears doubly difficult. The positive virtues of altruistic living are far from our reach. The ideals seem remote from modern living. No wonder there is a temptation to “get away from it all” and practice this way of life in a more conducive environment. This probably accounts for the relative attractiveness of monastic existence, where the demands of the outside world are minimal, even though the internal discipline might at times be restrictive.

For most, however, it is not possible to retire from the workaday world, if only for karmic reasons. If we are to try to live the Theosophic Life at all, it has to be where we are, at home, at work, in the marketplace — certainly far removed from a cave in the Himalayan mountains. But then, this should not be considered a bad thing:

“Ages of experience have proved that the greatest progress is not made by those who retire from the sight of men.” — William Q. Judge, *Practical Occultism*, p. 35.

Rather than despair at the seeming difficulty of meeting the standards required by the Theosophic Life, we should take heart that some have practised it at the same “level”, so to speak, that we find ourselves on — the everyday world. Their example deserves our serious consideration.

One such was William Q. Judge, student of Theosophy, and tireless early leader of the Theosophical Society. Unfortunately, Judge is ignored by many in the Theosophical Movement, largely because of his clashes nearly ninety years ago with Col. Olcott and Mrs. Besant, which is a great pity. The karma of these three and others involved in those controversies is their own. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and we would be far better using our faculties for discrimination to judge their works rather than condemning or approving their actions, as the case may be.

As one who was irrevocably pledged to [3] the service of the Masters, it comes as no surprise to find that Judge’s philosophy of life was based on their exacting moral and ethical standards. Unlike many others similarly pledged, the direction of his life did not appear to deviate from those standards. There are no dark

sides to Judge, even though he remains something of a mystery, an enigma, even, because of this rare quality. He not only preached the Higher Life, he went out of his way to live it. Although he would probably have considered himself a relative failure, yet from our standpoint his triumphs are far more significant than his shortcomings. The latter are only too understandable.

Predictably, the ideal of Altruism, and the Doctrine of Unity were more than theoretical concepts in Judge's philosophy, which required that brotherhood be a practical goal, regardless of the difficulty in reaching it.

"The first steps in true occultism are Self discipline, self knowledge and devotion to the interests of others — i.e.: unselfishness." — *ibid*, p.148.

"Our difficulties are always due to the personality, which is unwilling to give itself up to the great idea that it has no real existence except in the one spirit." — *ibid*, p.221.

"Nature, working towards reunion with the great All, manifests many varieties often at war with each other, yet all members of the great whole." — *ibid*, p.49.

"To fail would be nothing, but to stop working for Humanity and Brotherhood would be awful. We cannot; we will not. Yet we have not a clear road. No, it is not clear. I am content if I can see the next step in advance, only." — *Letters That Have Helped Me*, p.4.

"We live in one another, and our widely different deeds have often a common source. The occultist cannot go far upon his way without realizing to what a great extent he is 'his brother's keeper'. Our affinities are ourselves, in whatever ground they may live and ripen." — *ibid*, pp.16-17.

His article, "Spiritual Gifts and their Attainment", contains much good, practical advice, and ends with these words:

"We advance most rapidly when we stop to help other wayfarers. We receive most when we sacrifice most. We attain to the largest measure of Divine love when we most unselfishly love the brethren. We become one with the Supreme when we lose ourselves in work for Humanity." — *Echoes of the Orient*, [Vol. 1], p.98.

Likewise, the performance of one's duty is considered a most serious requirement for the Higher Life:

"... it is a mistake for a man to ever suppose that any other sort of fortune than the one that is now his is a better one; that which is now ours is the best because it is the only one that by any possibility could be ours, and if we long for any other we commit a grave error and give ourselves trouble in the future, for we set up certain tendencies that MUST at some time be overcome. By working out our duty with a single heart we unconsciously acquire a large degree of concentration." — *Practical Occultism*, pp.121-2.

"What, then, is the panacea, finally — the royal talisman? It is DUTY, Selflessness. Duty persistently followed is the highest yoga, and is better than any mantrams or posture, or any other thing. If you can do no more than duty it will bring you to the goal." — *Letters That Have Helped Me*, p.68.

Throughout his writings, whether in letters to friends, or in his published articles, Judge returns again and again to the warning that is twice repeated in the *Bhagavad-Gita*:

"It is better to do one's own duty, even though it be devoid of excellence, than to perform another's duty well. It is better to perish in the performance of one's own duty; the duty of another is full of danger." — *Bhagavad-Gita*, Recension by William Q. Judge, p.21. (A similar passage occurs on pp.99-100).

The Law of Karma is full of implications for daily living. The importance of this subject is attested to by the number of times he referred to it in articles. The indexes of *The Ocean of Theosophy* and *Echoes of the Orient* both contain numerous references to Karma. Here are a few examples from Judge's letters urging his correspondents to respond to the challenges of Karma:

“There is no reward and no permanence nor real happiness except in the life of the spirit, and that is not gained by running away from Karma.” — *Practical Occultism*, p.277.

“My own experience in occultism and in trying to live the Higher Life has conclusively shown me that we are placed by Karma wherever we may be and that we cannot gain by trying to ‘alter mere surroundings’, we thus only run away from the very test given us for the object in view.” — *ibid*, p.61.

“Place your only faith, reliance, and trust on Karma.” — *Letters That Have Helped Me*, p.2.

The necessity to journey for oneself along the Path, a logical and pragmatic extension of the “self-induced and self-devised efforts” necessary in spiritual evolution, is also touched on here and there.

“You do not progress by studying other people’s philosophies, for then you do but get their crude ideas. Do not crowd yourself, nor ache to puzzle your brain with another’s notions. You have the key to self and that is all: take it and drag out the lurker inside.” — *ibid*, pp.39-40.

“Unlike those who grumble at not being ‘helped’, I think there is more danger of our being ‘helped’ too much than too little. Machines break from over-speeding, not from being run too slowly — save in exceptional cases.” — *The Path*, April 1891, p.27.

Finally, for those aspiring to live the Higher Life, Judge always offered practical advice, of a sort that we can usefully adapt to our own circumstances:

“A true, wise, Theosophist never looks back, but always directly in front . . . If we stop to look back, we may find that mistakes of the past assume undue prominence; all we have to be careful about is that every step is taken to the best of our ability, with sincerity and purity of motive. The results have nothing to do with us.” — *Practical Occultism*, pp.219-220.

“. . . our real inner character . . . is improved or enlarged only by a spiritualized life and motive. That is to say, for example, take two persons, one of whom solely practised for these apparent outside effects and acquirements (thought-transference, psychometry, etc.), and the other wholly ignoring them spent life in trying to understand the doctrine, the ethics of Theosophy, promulgating them clearly to all. The first person really accomplished nothing, while the second has cleared away much rubbish from his character, has established himself firmly, has acquired much good helpful karma and will emerge in the next life vastly higher than the first, and in a position to intelligently take up and understand all those laws and forces which will give greater power to aid and benefit the race.” — *ibid*, pp.291-2.

“The old rule still remains in force in things occult: that knowledge is only given to those who deserve it, and have proved by their life that they do deserve it. Only those who do the will of the Masters are reckoned as deserving their notice; aspirations, desires, promises go for nothing. What is that will? Well, it is simply to free your mind from vain and earthly desires, and to work at the work before you always lending a helping hand to others. Get rid of anger, of vanity, pride, resentfulness, ambition, and [5] *really lose them*, and you have then made the first step towards the understanding of the occult . . .” — *ibid*, p.54.

“Do not expect to ‘drift’ into calmer seas. You must ‘row’ there. Progress comes from effort, not from inaction.” — *ibid*, p.69.

“We are not to love vice, but are to recognize that it is a part of the whole, and, trying to understand, we thus get above it.” — *Letters That Have Helped Me*, p.22.

“Begin by trying to conquer the habit, almost universal, of pushing yourself forward. This arises from personality. Do not monopolize the conversation. Keep in the background. If someone begins to tell you about himself and his doing, do not take first chance to tell him about yourself but listen to him and talk solely to bring him out. And when he has finished, suppress in yourself the desire to tell about yourself, your opinions and experiences. Do not ask a question unless you intend to listen to the answer and enquire into its value. Try


to recollect that you are a very small affair in the world, and that the people around you do not value you at all and grieve when you are absent. Your only true greatness lies in your inner true self and it is not desirous of obtaining the applause of others. If you will follow these directions for one week you will find they will take considerable effort, and you will begin to discover a part of the meaning of the saying, 'Man, Know Thyself'." — *ibid*, p.114.

"It is not wise to be always analyzing your faults and failures — to regret is a waste of energy. If we endeavour to use all our energy in service of the Cause, we shall find ourselves rising above our faults and failures, and though these must perhaps occur, they will lose their power to drag us down. Of course, we do have to face our faults and fight them, but our strength for such a struggle will increase with our devotion and unselfishness." — *ibid*, p.127.

Did Judge practise what he preached? Did he lead a life in conformity with the philosophy contained in the above words? Only he would *really* know.

Judge worked at his profession, which was that of a lawyer, and as well he devoted every available moment to the service of the Theosophical Society. His philosophy was therefore constantly being tested, and it appears that his adherence to it never wavered. From all external evidence, and on the testimony of those who knew him well, including H.P. Blavatsky, one would have to conclude that this was a soul very finely attuned to the Higher Life; and possessed of a strong will to live it despite the most difficult of circumstances. In the last twenty-one years of his life he certainly tried to exemplify living the Theosophical way, so much so that perhaps one of his friends was not exaggerating when he said: "Judge made the life portrayed by Jesus recognizable to me."

T[ed] G. D[avy]



APPENDIX

J



ASTROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

Table of Contents ~ Appendix J

1. Life in a Borrowed Body. By Compiler.	487-493
2. Astrological Analysis, by Chris McRae.	
Basic Delineation of Natal Chart of William Q. Judge	494-496
Illness at Age Seven	497-498
Did Mr. Judge Have a Powerful Spiritual Experience On or About September 17 th , 1884?	499-500
Did Death Occur by Poisoning?	501-502
3. Assessment of William Q. Judge's Astrological Chart, by Dr. A. Basu.	503
Astrological Data: Dasa and Bukti Periods of Planets.	504
Analysis of Important Periods of W.Q. Judge's Life.	505-509
4. "The Soul Photographed" By Nizida	510-511
The Theosophic Isis , Vol. 2, February 1897, pp.426-430.	

1. Life in a Borrowed Body. — Compiler.

Life in a Borrowed Body

There are two classes of exalted beings which have been identified in early Theosophical literature. The first are the Mahâtmas, sometimes referred to as Adepts.¹ The second are the Nirmânakâyas. The former are alive in a physical body while the latter have overcome the need for a physical form. Both are considered White Adepts of the Great Lodge or Brothers of Light. These Adepts of occultism² have expanded their consciousness, over lifetimes, to embrace the Universe in proportion to their individual progress. Adepts signify proficiency, while Mahâtmas and Nirmânakâyas are Adepts who have attained what mortal men call impossible — that is, transcending time and space.

In 1851, at age twenty, while visiting in London, H.P. Blavatsky recognized a tall Hindu man in the street with some Indian princes. She immediately recognized him as the same person she had seen in the Astral. Her first impulse was to rush towards him but was given a sign not to. The following day she went for a walk in Hyde Park to contemplate this wondrous incident when she was approached by this man. He introduced himself to her and told her “he required her cooperation in a work which he was about to undertake”.³ He, “Morya”, a Mahâtma, told her that she would have to undergo training in Tibet to prepare for this important task.

In 1858, at the age of seven, William Q. Judge, in Dublin, Ireland, at the time, was struck with a serious illness. “The physician declared the small sufferer to be dying, then dead; but in the outburst of grief which followed the announcement, it was discovered that the child had revived, and that all was well with him. During convalescence the boy showed aptitude and knowledge never before displayed, exhibiting wonderment and questioning among his elders as to when and how he had learned all these new things. He seemed the same, and yet not the same; had to be studied anew by his family, and while no one knew that he had ever learned to read, from his recovery in his eighth year we find him devouring the contents of all books he could obtain, relating to Mesmerism, Phrenology, Character-Reading, Religion, Magic, Rosicrucianism, and deeply absorbed in the Book of Revelation, trying to discover its real meaning.”⁴

What happened to the lad at the age of seven remained a mystery for many years. Part of this mystery only came to light through the writings of his good friend and co-worker Mrs. Julia Campbell Ver-Planck.⁵ He had approached her with the idea that she should write an occult novel about his experiences. Judge had agreed to furnish the material. It was obvious that the book was to be a study of ideas involving the spiritual

1. A Mahâtma is an Adept of the highest order.

2. Occultism is defined as the science of the occult — or the science of the secrets of Nature — that being physical and psychic, mental and spiritual. An occultist is one who studies the various branches of occult science.

3. **Reminiscences of H.P.B.**, pp.56-57 and also in **BCW**, Vol. 1, pp.xxxviii-xxxix.

4. **Letters That Have Helped Me** - J.N., Volume II, p.111, by Jasper Niemand. Also in **Cdn. Theosophist**, Vol. 13, March 1932, pp.20-21. Originally published in the **Irish Theosophist**, Vol. 4, February 1896, p.91.

5. Mrs. J. Campbell Ver-Planck was a member of the staff at the New York headquarters. She wrote many articles for **The Path** and much of the correspondence with T.S. enquirers. The letters in **Letters That Have Helped Me** were written by Judge and received at her Pennsylvania home where she lived with her parents. She stated: “They were written for me . . . and for the use of others later on . . . at the express wish of H.P. Blavatsky.” [**The Path**, Vol. 9, April 1894, p.16.] She became better known to theosophists as Julia Keightley after marrying Dr. Archibald Keightley in 1891, or by her *non-de-plume* “Jasper Niemand”.

soul's journey through the cycle of rebirths. It would also include the assembling of Skandhas ("bundles" or finite groups of attributes) and personal anecdotes or incidents in order to better explain this difficult topic.

From time to time Judge would send his friend suggestions written on scraps of paper while waiting for his tram or for his next engagement in Court. Mrs. Ver-Planck appears to have had difficulties assembling all that was needed and would ask Judge for clarification on certain ideas. One such incident involved a different aspect of reincarnation, one which included the use of a borrowed body.

Blavatsky claimed about Judge "that he had been a part of herself and of the Great Lodge 'for aeons past' . . . and that he was one of those tried Egos who have reincarnated several times immediately after death; assisted to do so, and without devachanic rest, in order to continue his Lodge work".⁶

Judge describes his personal tale as follows:

I must tell you first what happened to me in this present life since it is in this one that I am relating to you about many other lives of mine.

I was a simple student of our high Philosophy for many lives on earth in various countries, and then at last developed in myself a desire for action. So I died once more as so often before and was again reborn in the family of a Rajah, and in time came to sit on his throne after his death.⁷

Two years after that sad event one day an old wandering Brahmin came to me and asked if I was ready to follow my vows of long lives before, and go to do some work for my old master in a foreign land.⁸ Thinking this meant a journey only I said I was.

"Yes," said he, "but it is not only a journey. It will cause you to be here and there all days and years. To-day here, to-night there."

"Well," I replied, "I will do even that, for my vows had no conditions and master orders."

I knew of the order, for the old Brahmin gave me the sign marked on my forehead. He had taken my hand, and covering it with his waist-cloth, traced the sign in my palm under the cloth so that it stood out in lines of light before my eyes.

He went away with no other word, as you know they so often do, leaving me in my palace. I fell asleep in the heat, with only faithful Gopal beside me. I dreamed and thought I was at the bedside of a mere child, a boy, in a foreign land unfamiliar to me, only that the people looked like what I knew of the Europeans. The boy was lying as if dying, and relatives were all about the bed.

A strange and irresistible feeling drew me nearer to the child, and for a moment I felt in this dream as if I were about to lose consciousness. With a start I awoke in my own palace — on the mat where I had fallen asleep, with no one but Gopal near and no noise but the howling of jackals near the edge of the compound.

"Gopal," I said, "how long have I slept?"

6. *Irish Theosophist*, Vol. 4, March 1896, p.115.

7. Rajah or Rājā is a Prince or King in India. Judge's close associates would often refer to him as the Rajah. — Compiler.

8. In a letter to Olcott, dated March 4th, 1880, Judge wrote: "I have lived at one time in India 19 years . . . so you see I am not so much younger than you. . . ." [*The Theosophist*, Vol. 52, March 1931, p.459.] Olcott was born, August 2nd, 1832 and Judge was born April 13th, 1851. Adding 19 years to Judge's age would make him the same age as Olcott. — Compiler.

“Five hours, master, since an old Brahmin went away, and the night is nearly gone, master.”

I was about to ask him something else when again sleepiness fell upon my sense[s], and once more I dreamed of the small dying foreign child.

The scene had changed a little, other people had come in, there was a doctor there, and the boy looked to me, dreaming so vividly, as if dead. The people were weeping, and his mother knelt by the bedside. The doctor laid his head on the child's breast a moment. As for myself I was drawn again nearer to the body and thought surely the people were strange not to notice me at all. They acted as if no stranger were there, and I looked at my clothes and saw they were eastern and bizarre to them. A magnetic line seemed to pull me to the form of the child.

And now beside me I saw the old Brahmin standing. He smiled.

“This is the child,” he said, “and here must you fulfil a part of your vows. Quick now! There is no time to lose, the child is almost dead. These people think him already a corpse. You see the doctor has told them the fatal words, ‘he is dead’!”.

Yes, they were weeping. But the old Brahmin put his hands on my head, and submitting to his touch, I felt myself in my dream falling asleep. A dream in a dream. But I woke in my dream, but not on my mat with Gopal near me. I was that boy I thought. I looked out through his eyes, and near me I heard, as if his soul had slipped off to the ether with a sigh of relief. The doctor turned once more and I opened my eyes — his eyes — on him.

The physician started and turned pale. To another I heard him whisper “automatic nerve action.” He drew near, and the intelligence in that eye startled him to paleness. He did not see the old Brahmin making passes over this body I was in and from which I felt great waves of heat and life rolling over me — or the boy.

And yet this all now seemed real as if my identity was merged in the boy.

I was that boy and still confused, vague dreams seemed to flit through my brain of some other plane where I thought I was again, and had a faithful servant named Gopal; but that must be dream, this the reality. For did I not see my mother and father, the old doctor and the nurse so long in our house with the children? Yes; of course this is the reality.

And then I feebly smiled, whereon the doctor said:

“Most marvellous. He has revived. He may live.”

He was feeling the slow moving pulse and noting that breathing began and that vitality seemed once more to return to the child, but he did not see the old Brahmin in his illusionary body sending air currents of life over the body of this boy, who dreamed he had been a Rajah with a faithful servant named Gopal. Then in the dream sleep seemed to fall upon me. A sensation of falling, falling came to my brain, and with a start I awoke in my palace on my own mat. Turning to see if my servant was there I saw him standing as if full of sorrow or fear for me.

“Gopal, how long have I slept again?”

“It is just morning, master, and I feared you had gone to Yama's dominions and left your own Gopal behind.”⁹

9. In the **Vedas** Yama represents the god of the dead, the Lord of Death and Judge of men. — Compiler.

No, I was not sleeping. This was reality, these my own dominions. So this day passed as all days had except that the dream of the small boy in a foreign land came to my mind all day until the night when I felt more drowsy than usual. Once more I slept and dreamed.

The same place and the same house, only now it was morning there. What a strange dream I thought I had had; as the doctor came in with my mother and bent over me, I heard him say softly:

“Yes, he will recover. The night sleep has done good. Take him, when he can go, to the country, where he may see and walk on the grass.”

As he spoke behind him I saw the form of a foreign looking man with a turban on. He looked like the pictures of Brahmins I saw in the books before I fell sick. Then I grew very vague and told my mother: “I had had two dreams for two nights, the same in each. I dreamed I was a king and had one faithful servant for whom I was sorry as I liked him very much, and it was only a dream, and both were gone.”

My mother soothed me, and said: “Yes, yes, my dear.”

And so that day went as days go with sick boys, and early in the evening I fell fast asleep as a boy in a foreign land, in my dream, but did no more dream of being a king, and as before I seemed to fall until I woke again on my mat in my own palace with Gopal sitting near. Before I could rise the old Brahmin, who had gone away, came in and I sent Gopal off.

“Rama,” said he, “as boy you will not dream of being Rajah but now you must know that every night as sleeping king you are waking boy in foreign land. Do well your duty and fail not. It will be some years, but Time's never-stopping car rolls on. Remember my words,” and then he passed through the open door.¹⁰

So I knew those dreams about a sick foreign boy were not mere dreams but that they were recollections, and I condemned each night to animate that small child just risen from the grave, as his relations thought, but I knew that his mind for many years would not know itself, but would ever feel strange in its surroundings, for, indeed, that boy would be myself inside and him without, his friends not seeing that he had fled away and another taken his place. Each night I, as sleeping Rajah who had listened to the words of sages, would be an ignorant foreign boy, until through lapse of years and effort unremittingly continued I learned how to live two lives at once. Yet horrible at first seemed the thought that although my life in that foreign land as a growing youth would be undisturbed by vague dreams of independent power as Rajah, I would always, when I woke on my mat, have a clear remembrance of what at first seemed only dreams of being a king, with vivid knowledge that while my faithful servant watched my sleeping form I would be masquerading in a borrowed body, unruly as the wind. Thus as a boy I might be happy, but as a king miserable maybe. And then after I should become accustomed to this double life, perhaps my foreign mind and habits would so dominate the body of the boy that existence there would grow full of pain from the struggle with an environment wholly at war with the thinker within.

But a vow once made is to be fulfilled, and Father Time eats up all things and ever the centuries.¹¹

Judge lived his entire life adjusting to the difficulties of having two consciousnesses. He once explained:

10. In **The Theosophical Glossary**, Rama or Râma-Chandra is described as the hero of the Râmâyana, the famous epic poem collated with the Mâhâbhârata. [Theosophy Company edition, 1973, p.275.]

11. **Letters That Have Helped Me** - J.N., Volume II, pp.105-110. Also in Theosophy Company, 1946 edition, pp.257-260, but slightly altered.

The whole thing comes from the particular fact of a person living in a house he did not build, and having two astrals at work.¹²

Clement A. Griscom, a close friend of Judge, described the difficulties he had adjusting to having two souls; It was the good fortune of a few of us to know something of the real Ego who used the body known as Wm. Q. Judge. He once spent some hours describing to my wife and me the experience the Ego had in assuming control of the instrument it was to use for so many years. The process was not a quick nor an easy one and indeed was never absolutely perfected, for to Mr. Judge's dying day, the physical tendencies and heredity of the body he used would crop up and interfere with the full expression of the inner man's thoughts and feelings. An occasional abruptness and coldness of manner was attributable to this lack of co-ordination. Of course Mr. Judge was perfectly aware of this and it would trouble him for fear his real friends would be deceived as to his real feelings. He was always in absolute control of his thoughts and actions, but his body would sometimes slightly modify their expression.¹³

Claude Falls Wright wrote:

In the early part of his last life I do not think he was completely conscious twenty-four hours a day, but several years ago he arrived at the stage where he never afterwards lost his consciousness for a moment. Sleep with him merely meant to float out of his body in full possession of all his faculties, and that was also the manner in which he "died" — left his body for good.¹⁴

Some forty years after the event, Cyrus Field Willard broke his silence and wrote about his experience at the Convention of 1891 in Boston.¹⁵ He wrote:

I can tell, *now*, what I know, and saw with my own eyes, about this "borrowed body" and which was also seen and verified by at least ten other persons, who openly so stated at a meeting held in the headquarters of the Boston branch, shortly after Judge's death in 1896. And I think Brother Smythe can vouch for my reputation for veracity.¹⁶

It was at the Boston convention of 1891, where I served on a committee with Annie Besant, on her first visit to America, and was predisposed in her favour by her work for the Bryant & May match-girls.

Word was sent to all members of the E.S.T. [Eastern School of Theosophy] which I had joined under H.P.B. in 1889, to be present at an E.S. meeting in the large double parlours of the Parker House. When I got in, it was early and from newspaper habit I walked down to the front row of seats and sat less than 10 feet away from Judge and Annie. As she has seen fit to publish the E.S. instructions, it will not therefore be without justification that I relate what occurred, in order to give Judge his due.

12. **Letters That Have Helped Me**, p.174.

13. **Theosophy (The Path)**, Vol. 11, May 1896, p.52. "The Greatest of The Exiles" was written by G. Hijo, a pseudonym for Clement A. Griscom.

14. **The Lamp**, Vol. 2, April 1896, p.132, taken from the **New York Journal** of March 23rd, 1896. Claude Falls Wright was one of Blavatsky's secretaries, in London, during her last three years. After her death in 1891 he came to America and worked closely with Judge at the New York headquarters.

15. Cyrus F. Willard was a trained and experienced newspaper man from Boston who joined the T.S. on November 23rd, 1889. Willard knew Judge well and would go visit him in his hotel room when Judge visited Boston, to talk and question him on some practical work for Universal Brotherhood. "Our conversation ranged over many subjects and often he would tell me things in which I had no interest, but which he evidently thought I should know for later developments." [**Cdn Theosophist**, Vol. 13, May 1932, p.69.]

16. Albert E.S. Smythe, Editor of **The Canadian Theosophist** (and its predecessor **The Lamp**), was present at that Boston convention, on April 26th and 27th, 1891. Judge, as General Secretary of the T.S., read a resolution that had been adopted by the Toronto T.S. at a regular meeting on April 23rd, 1891. The Toronto T.S. was chartered on February 25th, 1891. It was the last charter issued by Blavatsky before she died. [**Report Of Proceedings**, 1891.]

The rooms soon filled up with about 200 persons, and I noticed leaning up against the pedestal behind which Judge stood as presiding officer, so all could see and exposed for the first time, pictures of the two Masters, blessed be their name, for the knowledge they have given us. As he started to call the meeting to order, he leaned toward her, who stood on his right hand, and I heard him say to her in a low voice, "Sound the Word with the triple intonation." She replied in the same low voice, "I don't dare to," or, "I don't care to", but I think it was the first. I heard him say in a firm tone, "Then I will." He had been twirling his gavel in his hand but laid it down, stepped to his right, pushing her aside, and stepped to the side of the pedestal, facing his audience, with her behind him, and said:

"I am about to sound the Word, with the triple intonation, but before I do so, I have a statement to make which I do not care to have you speak to me about later, nor do I wish you to discuss among yourselves. I am not what I seem; I am a Hindu".

Then he sounded the Word with the triple intonation.

Before my eyes, I saw the man's face turn brown and a clean-shaven Hindu face of a young man was there, and you know he wore a beard. I am no psychic nor have ever pretended to be one or to "see things", as I joined the T.S. to form a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood. This change was not one seen by me only, and we did not discuss the import of his significant statement, until after his death when a meeting was held in the Boston headquarters to determine our future action. Then I mentioned it in a speech and his statement, and fully ten persons from different parts of the hall spoke up and said, "I saw it too." "I saw and heard what he said", etc. That would seem proof enough about the borrowed body. . . .

But why did he say he was a Hindu, when the Judge body was born in Ireland? I believe from what I saw that Judge was a Hindu, the Rajah, and never was moved by the charges against him. That is, the indwelling Ego in the Judge body was a Hindu, and that I saw him once. . . .

I have only come out of my long silence in order to do justice to Wm. Q. Judge, who was one of the sweetest, dearest companions and friends any man could have.¹⁷

The Tibetan technical term for the process described above is *Tulpa*.¹⁸ There are many degrees of this condition and much of it is kept secret. If we are to accept Judge's own description of events, conditions became favorable at the age of seven such that another living being, a chela of the Masters, could be amalgamated with the consciousness of the young Irish lad. The reason for such a process is to mesh one's consciousness with that of another for a specific purpose. These conditions vary from a fully conscious to an unconscious incarnation. The reasons vary as well, but mainly it is to take advantage of certain situations in order to teach men.

Judge had many difficulties adjusting to the dual consciousness but when he went to India in 1884, the Mahatmas further seemingly complicated his condition. Blavatsky described what happened to Judge while he was in India. She wrote: "With you, it is the Nirmânakaya not the 'astral' that blended with your astral."¹⁹ Now Judge had the guiding influence of a Nirmânikaya to contend with as well. The difficulties adjusting to all of these entities eased somewhat by 1886 and Judge was able to align and focus his energies into great potency for the CAUSE.

17. *Cdn Theosophist*, Vol. 13, May 1932, pp.65-67.

18. "Tulpa is the voluntary incarnation of an Adept into a living body, whether of an adult, child or new-born babe. [Tulpa is the magical process; Tulku is the result, although they are often used interchangeably.]" [*BCW*, Vol. 14, p.401.]

19. *Theos. Forum* (P.L.), Vol. 3, August 1932, p.253, and *WQJ T. Pioneer*, p.19.

Judge had described to his close friend and co-worker, in December 1894, what he was expecting to happen next. C.A. Griscom, wrote that “the Judge body was due by its Karma to die the next year and that it would have to be tided over this period by extraordinary means. He then expected this process to be entirely successful, and that he would be able to use that body for many years.”²⁰ His friend may or may not have comprehended the whole significance of this. Judge may not have been implying that his actual physical body would have to die, but rather that a process would have to be undergone by which the kamic impulses tied to karmic conditions (that is, to his [Irish] natal body), would be relinquished in deference to the kamic impulses of the Rajah.

This process would have accelerated and facilitated the work that needed to be done for the Movement. Dr. Basu, in his astrological analysis, indicates this very clearly. Unfortunately, because of the negative influences over many of the members in the Theosophical Movement and their inability to overcome these influences, the Mahatmas decided to withdraw their support and leave the Society to its karma.

The three Founders of the Theosophical Society were each chosen by the Mahatmas for a specific task: H.P. Blavatsky to introduce Theosophy to the West, H.S. Olcott for his organizational skills, and W.Q. Judge to teach the morals and ethics of Theosophy, the “Heart” doctrine, to the western mind. Judge, a true Theosophist,²¹ could have been saved from the poisonous effects on his body²² — he could have survived — but he was “withdrawn” in 1896, as was Blavatsky five years earlier, in 1891.


— Compiler

20. **Theosophy (The Path)**, Vol. 11, May 1896, p.52.

21. A true Theosophist is one who follows his inner guiding principle and who works for the benefit of humanity, without the curse of separateness.

22. See “What Killed W.Q. Judge?”, **Fohat**, Vol. 7, Summer 2003 (Part I), pp. 29-34, and Fall 2003 (Part II), pp.60-64, 69-70, where it is suggested that Judge died from iatrogenic causes as a result of being prescribed potassium cyanide following a diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis.

2. Astrological Analysis, by Chris McRae.



Basic Delineation of Natal Chart of William Q. Judge

By: I.I. Chris McRae*

William Q. Judge was born in Dublin, Ireland, April 13th, 1851 between the hours of 4:00 and 6:00 AM LMT (Local Mean Time), as stated by himself. Alan Leo, a prominent astrologer, author, and associate of Madame H.P. Blavatsky rectified the time to 5:07 AM LMT from events in Judge's life. There is little doubt that Alan Leo also knew William Judge personally. A rectified birth time should be considered speculative but the known personality characteristics and facts of Judge's life seem to fit into this birth pattern.

At the alleged time of birth, the sign of Aries was rising on the eastern horizon. The Sun in Aries was just ready to peak over the horizon, with Saturn, Pluto, Uranus all in Aries and Mercury in Taurus, each in turn rising shortly thereafter. Three other planets, namely Mars, Venus and Neptune in Pisces were just above the horizon in his 12th house. All of this would endow him with a powerful personality thrust indicating a strong pioneering and leadership potential, as well as someone who is likely to be willful, arrogant, energetic, and even aggressive.

He was born at a time when Uranus and Pluto were conjunct in the sky at a critical position of 29 degrees celestial longitude which is the end of one sign and the beginning of another. That symbolism is applicable to a journey just beginning. Even though Pluto was not yet discovered, until 1930, and ready to be assimilated into the consciousness of the general populace, there would have been some advanced souls born with the capacity to assimilate its revolutionary process. At the time of its occurrence, society goes through revolutionary changes freeing the world from outworn inhibitions. People born with it are capable of continuing the process of those changes when they grow up. Such was the birth of William Q. Judge. He was destined to be one of the movers and shakers of societal changes that were emerging. These changes took many forms but the one we are concerned with here is the development in spiritual understanding.

This powerful planetary combination only occurs once every 112 and 143 years in an alternating cycle. The one in modern times occurred in the mid-1960's in the sign of Virgo which rules the way we organize data. It was the real beginning of the computer age.

Two other significant planetary placements in the chart of Mr. Judge were namely that of Jupiter and Moon, creating 7 oppositions, which in any chart, is a large number. This would indicate that he would be faced with a great deal of opposition throughout his life, enemies ready to accuse him justly or unjustly, and the humiliating necessity of having to make many compromises to the will of others or fall short of his expectations. He undoubtedly had a deep, powerful conviction of his own destiny in affecting the growth of metaphysical interests on a very large scale. His strength of character gave him sustaining power but so much opposition would have tested his endurance and forced adjustments. He not only gave up a lot but he gained a great deal.

Astrological interpretation is rich in its symbolism, ranging from the most challenging and difficult to the highest level of spirituality and earthly fulfilment for any single planetary position. The 5 planets in Judge's first house gave him power, personal significance, and strong ego drives but the opposition to Jupiter indicated that his ideas were not always well received, partly due to the fact that he may not have planned his strategy well and his own expectations were at times inflated. Jupiter is the planet of philosophy, religion, wisdom, truth, and other so-called higher minded pursuits, which connects strongly in his chart.

Mars, the ruler of his Ascendant in his 12th house in Pisces, along with Venus and Neptune indicating several possibilities. On the difficult side, the 12th house is one of confinement, hospitalization, unhappiness, enmity and even undoing. On the positive and elevated side, the 12th house is a very deep well of wisdom, compassion, healing and spirituality. It is evident from this text that he experienced each of these levels. These planets are opposed by the Moon which is the planet of emotionalism, nurturing and home. Indeed he was not blessed with a happy, supportive home life or a peaceful emotional life. From a physiological point of view, the Moon is also the planet of functioning. Its aspect with the Sun, which governs one's constitution, is misaligned. It is noted that he was sickly as a child and nearly died at the age of 7. He undoubtedly had health problems throughout his entire life.


Mr. Judge, and indeed Madame Blavatsky, as well as other Theosophists of the era were all instruments of a powerful change that was occurring in consciousness at that time. The planets Neptune and Pluto formed an exact conjunction in the sky in the mental sign of Gemini, in 1891. This only occurs once every 492 years and was destined to begin a cycle between these two planets that actually escalated the long-range spiritual growth and understanding of mankind. A conjunction of any 2 planets operates like a New Moon. It indicates new starts. This marvelous coupling of Neptune and Pluto occurred in the sign of Gemini which is the archetype energy of learning and communication. Neptune symbolizes spirituality, sensitivity and compassion. Pluto symbolizes transformation and evolution. The very structure of religion and belief systems was undergoing a profound and gradual shift that would take all of 492 years to fully manifest.

It is difficult to divorce egos from such a dramatic and revolutionary shift, so dissension was bound to exist as the process adjusted itself in the making. Such was the indication in the pattern of oppositions in Mr. Judge's chart. It does take powerful personalities to undertake such enormous tasks of this nature even though such patterns are not easy to live.

One of the most notable patterns in Mr. Judge's chart is called a Golden Quintile Yod. It is a pattern recognized by Johannes Kepler and its connection to the magical and mystical powers of the 5th Harmonic and the Golden Pentagram. His chart has two of them, one emanating from the mystical/spiritual planet of Neptune connecting to the philosophical planet Jupiter; and the North Node of the Moon connecting his outer world experience to the work he needed to do in this particular personality embodiment. Venus, the planet of peace and love, also apexes a Golden Quintile Yod with Jupiter and the North Node. He also had a triple Quintile Golden Triangle, which is another signature of a mystic.

There is little doubt that the destiny of William Q. Judge was to have a powerful impact upon others, in spite of the personality and physical struggles he had to endure. It is also evident that his lifetime, and a span of time long after his death, is still heavily influenced by the oppositions in the planetary influences under which he was born. Perhaps this text will finally balance the scales and understand his mission.

* I.I. Chris McRae, PMAFA, CA.NCGR Level 4, ISAR.CAP, is the author of such titles as **The Geodetic World Map** (1988) and **Understanding Interceptions** (2002), both published by the American Federation of Astrologers, from which she received her accreditation in 1974. She is a contributing author in **Astrology of the Macrocosm**, published by Llewellyn Publications in 1990. Chris is also an internationally recognized lecturer and teacher.



Illness at Age Seven

The issue of someone else entering the body of the young ailing Judge boy, will remain controversial among scholars. The task of putting this question to rest astrologically is more conjecture than proof, part of the reason being the ambiguity regarding the time of this illness. The other part of the reason is that astrology is a language of symbology offering a range of possibilities at any given time. In lieu of that, a 3-wheel chart was constructed showing his natal or birth chart on the inside wheel, the progressed chart in the middle wheel, and the transits in the 3rd wheel. The chart was set for the arbitrary time of his birthday at age 7 and can allow for a range of time assuming the event occurred sometime that spring or early summer.

A word of explanation for non-astrologers will likely prove worthwhile. The natal chart is the birth pattern indicating life-time potential, but life is not static. It is an ongoing developmental process. The progressed, or middle chart, opens up possibilities for change leading to potential evolutionary development. The outer wheel of transits is more event orientated facilitating that change and geared to experience at any given time that correlates with the planets moving at their specific rate in the solar system. The planetary transits are for everyone to experience, but events vary according to the individuality of each different birth pattern as well as environmental circumstances.

Looking at the natal chart of William Quan Judge, it is evident that the man was potentially destined to be a powerful leader, a pioneer, with a very strong spiritual path. It is also evident that it would be a troublesome life plagued with opposition and physical difficulties. (See brief Natal Chart Interpretation.) It is important to note here a relevant fact about the position of his Mercury not previously brought forward. This is the planet of conscious thought process and communicative resources. It is posited in the prominent 1st house square the Nodes of the Moon. From a reincarnational point of view, the South Node is the experience we bring into this lifetime from another personality embodiment of another time. We draw from this experience to help us move forward into the new work we are to do in this life time indicated by the position of the North Node. There is a strong indication that he belonged to a group of innovative thinkers pursuing cosmic consciousness that needed earthly application. In his 1851 embodiment he was to use his powerful creative drive and personal dynamics to bring this into awareness for the benefit of all humanity. Sometimes his own ego would interfere but the humanitarian principles would continue to predominate from his soul urging.

To tie this into his illness at age 7, this nodal axis was activated in the consciousness of the young boy, stimulating his interest in metaphysical musings. His natal sun position had moved by progression from 22:42 Aries to 29:32 Aries. This is a crisis degree and often coincides with a turning point. It is the end of a situation in readiness for new developments. It is often connected with trauma. Natally he has Uranus and Pluto at 29 degrees Aries promising that each time it was activated, as it was at age 7, he would experience a crisis and turning point in his life. Pluto and Uranus would indicate the enormity of the crisis since Uranus rules unexpected, innovative change in personal consciousness as well as that of humanity; and Pluto rules the principle of transformation and mass consciousness. His Ascendant had moved from 19:21 Aries to conjunct or coincide with the above-mentioned Mercury stimulating mental activity.

Many of the transits in the sky during the month of his 7th birthday were piled into that same powerful 1st house of selfhood reinforcing his natal promise of having a powerful impact upon everyone he met and everything he did.


There is no doubt that something very powerful occurred around this time in the life of the young boy destined to be notable and not soon to be forgotten. Whether it was an exchange of bodies is not easily proved but it is a certainty that something powerful was going on during that spring.

Second Chart

Progressed Chart
 Sep 17, 1884
 Dublin, IRE
 05:07:00 AM LMT
 ZONE: +00:00
 006W15'00"
 53N20'00"

Outer Chart

Transit Chart
 Sep 17, 1884
 Madras, INDIA
 00:00:01 PM Z05
 ZONE: -05:21
 080E17'00"
 13N05'00"



Progressed Chart

☽	11° 59'	-18° 36'
☉	25° 08'	+19° 04'
☽	01° 41'	+20° 29'
♀	19° 57'	+06° 05'
♂	15° 54'	+05° 15'
♃	13° 59'	-04° 08'
♄	27° 59'	+08° 38'
♅	01° 44'	+11° 37'
♆	09° 05'	-08° 55'
♇	29° 55'	-04° 04'
♈	28° 16'	+20° 31'
♁	08° 06'	-18° 15'
♂	15° 56'	+22° 43'

☽	15° 17'	+08° 59'
☉	22° 42'	+08° 50'
☽	04° 50'	+14° 02'
♀	10° 49'	-08° 13'
♂	20° 10'	-05° 00'
♃	17° 31'	-05° 25'
♄	23° 50'	+07° 10'
♅	29° 51'	+10° 57'
♆	08° 20'	-09° 11'
♇	29° 10'	-04° 17'
♈	02° 01'	+19° 44'
♁	11° 57'	+07° 05'
♂	23° 00'	-17° 39'

William Q. Judge
 Geocentric
 Tropical
 Placidus Houses

Transit Chart

Pl	Geo Lon	Rx	Decl.
☽	28° 40'		+08° 25'
☉	24° 45'		+02° 05'
♀	29° 34'	Rx	-03° 03'
♂	08° 45'		+15° 52'
♃	03° 00'		-12° 42'
♄	24° 15'		+14° 08'
♅	23° 55'		+21° 52'
♆	28° 18'		+01° 20'
♇	23° 13'	Rx	+16° 52'
♈	02° 07'	Rx	+07° 52'
♁	14° 05'	Rx	-05° 33'
♂	26° 20'		+01° 27'
♂	21° 40'		-23° 11'

Did Mr. Judge Have a Powerful Spiritual Experience On or About September 17th, 1884?

The natal chart of Mr. Judge was progressed forward to September 17th, 1884, and planetary contact analyzed for such a possibility. It is evident, from an astrological point of view, that he did have a powerful experience that could have been spiritual in nature. There is no doubt that it was expansive and revolutionary from a philosophical point of view.

His Ascendant had moved into the middle degrees of Gemini and was forming a very favorable trine aspect to his natal Jupiter which is the planet symbolizing mental expansion, spiritual growth, as well as physical travel to far away places. Its rulership of the 9th house in his chart further supports this choice of key words. His Progressed Secondary Moon, which correlates with change, was in the philosophical, spiritual sign of Sagittarius, in the 8th house of transformation. As a point of interest, when that same Secondary Moon was in the 9th house of publishing, he started *The Path* magazine.

Transiting Pluto, the planet of evolutionary transformation, had arrived at the position of his progressed Mercury, planet of cognitive perception, in the communicative sign of Gemini, indicating that he was capable of deep insight during that period and some form of cognitive recognition. These were forming a square aspect to his Moon's Nodal Axis. This is a powerful indication of a profound experience of conscious integration of past into present.

The transit of Jupiter was forming a favorable trine aspect to his natal 1st house Saturn. Natively Saturn points to the serious nature of his personality. Jupiter moves into position to broaden his outlook and expand upon his philosophy and spiritual beliefs. It also indicates some form of professional advancement, achievement, or recognition.

Transiting Uranus was closely approaching a reorganizational aspect to the profound Uranus/Pluto conjunction in his natal house. (See Natal Chart interpretation.) This would undoubtedly correlate with some form of extra-ordinary experience affecting his future outlook and attitude, and perhaps freeing him from some form of restriction or doubt about himself or doubt about the activities he was involved in.


There is no doubt in this astrologer's mind that Mr. Judge went through a significant change in consciousness at this time in his life. It could have been through insight that was strengthening in his own mind, or it could have been an exterior event that so moved him.

Second Chart

Progressed Chart
 Mar 21, 1896
 Dublin, IRE
 05:07:00 AM LMT
 ZONE: +00:00
 006W15'00"
 53N20'00"

Outer Chart

Transit Chart
 Mar 21, 1896
 New York, NY
 09:00:00 AM EST
 ZONE: +05:00
 074W00'23"
 40N42'51"



Geocentric
Tropical

Geocentric
Tropical

Progressed Chart

☽	03° 08' 28'	+07° 54'
☉	06° 02' 12'	+21° 22'
♃	25° 08' 44'	R _x +16° 13'
♄	03° 08' 37'	+11° 00'
♅	24° 07' 36'	+08° 34'
♆	13° 02' 21'	R _x -03° 56'
♇	29° 07' 18'	+09° 05'
♈	02° 08' 20'	+11° 49'
♉	09° 08' 13'	-08° 53'
♊	00° 08' 09'	-04° 01'
♋	27° 08' 47'	R _x +20° 37'
MC	19° 08' 26'	-15° 00'
ASC	27° 07' 41'	+23° 26'

☽	15° 07' 17'	+08° 59'
☉	22° 07' 42'	+08° 50'
♃	04° 08' 50'	+14° 02'
♄	10° 08' 49'	-08° 13'
♅	20° 08' 10'	-05° 00'
♆	17° 08' 31'	R _x -05° 25'
♇	23° 07' 50'	+07° 10'
♈	29° 07' 51'	+10° 57'
♉	08° 08' 20'	-09° 11'
♊	29° 07' 10'	-04° 17'
♋	02° 08' 01'	R _x +19° 44'
♌	11° 07' 57'	+07° 05'
♍	23° 07' 00'	R _x -17° 39'

William Q. Judge
 Geocentric
 Tropical
 Placidus Houses

Transit Chart

PI	Geo Lon	R _x	Decl.
☽	20° 02' 35'		+28° 06'
☉	01° 07' 28'		+00° 35'
♃	08° 08' 31'		-10° 25'
♄	02° 08' 57'		-11° 23'
♅	13° 08' 41'		-17° 48'
♆	29° 08' 07'	R _x	+21° 03'
♇	18° 07' 38'	R _x	-14° 59'
♈	24° 07' 17'	R _x	-18° 34'
♉	15° 07' 26'		+21° 15'
♊	10° 07' 54'		+11° 47'
♋	03° 08' 22'	R _x	-10° 17'
MC	13° 08' 06'		-16° 54'
ASC	07° 07' 14'		+21° 32'

Did Death Occur By Poisoning?

The Natal chart of William Q. Judge was progressed forward to the time of his death which took place in New York City, allegedly at 9:00 AM on March 21, 1896. Whether death occurred by natural causes or poisoning is an interesting question because poisoning can be intentional for malicious purposes, or unintentional due to the application of medical knowledge of the time.

As early as October, 1893, right through until his death, a series of Solar and Lunar Eclipses moved alternately across the axis of his 6th and 12th houses suggesting that potentially a serious illness may have been eroding his health and demanding attention on his part. Western Astrology prefers not to make dire predictions but prefers to indicate areas of vulnerability where influence is being applied. At least to some extent, this precludes that fate is totally predetermined at moment of birth. Astrology is a path of self-awareness, self-mastery and evolutionary potential, and not fatalistic in its attitude.

In this instance the planet Neptune would need to be examined. Its concepts include such keywords as nebulous states of consciousness, the fog or veil obscuring reality, unconsciousness, drugs, poison; as well as such universal concepts of love, spirituality, and compassion.

At the time of his passing, we see the transit of Neptune forming an exact square or challenging aspect to his natal Moon, which is the planet of physical functioning, in his 6th house of illness and distress, ruling his 4th house of endings. This trail of evidence leads to the possibility of poison or a drug causing the illness, but it could also be the poison or drug being administered in trying to cure an illness. In situations where Neptune is responsible for dissipation of physical strength, it usually occurs gradually.

The transit of Pluto, the planet of transformation, rules his 8th house of death, and it forms an exact square to his Venus/Neptune conjunction in his 12th house. Nebulous Neptune again sneaks its way into the scenario making a specific assessment difficult.

The transit of Jupiter, the benefactor, is exactly trine his 8th house cusp of death. This would indicate death as being a blessing or relief. Jupiter is often present in such situations.

NOTE: Refer also to "What Killed William Q. Judge?", by Ernest Pelletier, **Fohat**, Vol. 7, No.2, Summer 2003, Part I, pp.29-34; Vol. 7, No.3, Fall 2003, Part II, pp.60-64, 69-70. — Compiler.

3. Assessment of William Q. Judge's Astrological Chart, by Dr. A. Basu.

Assessment of William Q. Judge's Astrological Chart

By: Dr. A. Basu*

The following report is based on a verbal discussion held on Monday, October 28, 2002, with Dr. Basu.

Dr. Basu is a third generation astrologer born in India. He uses the Vedic system of Indian astrology which is based on the belief that a person's natural life span is one hundred and twenty years. The system is based on karmic law: that every cause must produce an effect; that Energy is never destroyed, it is only transformed. The calculations for the horoscope were based on information supplied by Alan Leo, as allegedly stated by Judge. William Quan Judge was born at about 5.7 (5.07) a.m. on April 13, 1851 in Dublin, Ireland.

Dr. Basu is not a member of any theosophical organization. He was furnished with important dates and data regarding Judge's life and was asked to explore those avenues to see if the horoscope would indicate any particular tendencies and potentials. R. Pelletier was present taking dictation of the conversation. The transcript has been verified and approved by Dr. Basu.

Dr. Basu's opening comments:

A chart can show 'potential', that is, if circumstances had been as they are now. . . .

DASA is defined as a planetary period system; how events actually unfold in a 'natural lifetime', which in Indian astrology is defined as 120 years.

The DASA system includes planets with major and minor influence over you, designated as periods and sub-periods. Everything important that happens is due to planetary influence.

It is important to note that the Moon is given much importance in the DASA system and that RAHU, the North Node, and KETU, the South Node of the Moon, are given the status of planets. RAHU, the North Node, creates the opposite effect to any planet. [The Indian system views the function of the nodes differently than western astrology. — Compiler]

The most important phase of William Quan Judge's life was the period which ran **from May 23, 1879 to May 22, 1897**. [Judge died on March 21, 1896. — Compiler]

* Dr. A. Basu holds a Doctorate in Biology and worked in this field in Europe, the United States and Canada. Although born into a family of astrologers and mystics, he remained skeptical regarding the validity of palmistry and astrology until crucial experiences convinced him otherwise. He is now a recognized palmist, astrologer, mystic and psychic, and has lectured internationally on palmistry and astrology.

WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE

VIMSOTTARI DASA

(120 YEAR CYCLE)

BALANCE OF DASA AT BIRTH RULER SUKRA 5 YEARS 1 MONTHS 9 DAYS

DASA AND BUKTI PERIODS OF PLANETS

SUKRA--20 YEARS

13/4 /1851	AGE		
22/5 /1856	YRS M D		

DD/MM/YY			
SUK	-	-	-
RAV	-	-	-
CHA	-	-	-
MAN	-	-	-
RAH	-	-	-
GUR	-	-	-
SAN	13/4 /51	-	-
BUD	22/5 /52	1	1 9
KET	23/3 /55	3	11 10

RAVI--6 YEARS

22/5 /1856	AGE		
23/5 /1862	YRS M D		

DD/MM/YY			
RAV	22/5 /56	5	1 9
CHA	9 /9 /56	5	4 26
MAN	10/3 /57	5	10 27
RAH	16/7 /57	6	3 3
GUR	10/6 /58	7	1 27
SAN	29/3 /59	7	11 16
BUD	10/3 /60	8	10 27
KET	15/1 /61	9	9 2
SUK	22/5 /61	10	1 9

CHANDRA--10 YEARS

23/5 /1862	AGE		
22/5 /1872	YRS M D		

DD/MM/YY			
CHA	23/5 /62	11	1 10
MAN	23/3 /63	11	11 10
RAH	22/10/63	12	6 9
GUR	22/4 /65	14	0 9
SAN	22/8 /66	15	4 9
BUD	22/3 /68	16	11 9
KET	22/8 /69	18	4 9
SUK	23/3 /70	18	11 10
RAV	21/11/71	20	7 8

MANGAL--7 YEARS

22/5 /1872	AGE		
23/5 /1879	YRS M D		

DD/MM/YY			
MAN	22/5 /72	21	1 9
RAH	18/10/72	21	6 5
GUR	6 /11/73	22	6 23
SAN	13/10/74	23	5 30
BUD	21/11/75	24	7 8
KET	18/11/76	25	7 5
SUK	16/4 /77	26	0 3
RAV	16/6 /78	27	2 3
CHA	22/10/78	27	6 9

RAHU--18 YEARS

23/5 /1879	AGE		
22/5 /1897	YRS M D		

DD/MM/YY			
RAH	23/5 /79	28	1 10
GUR	2 /2 /82	30	9 19
SAN	28/6 /84	33	2 15
BUD	4 /5 /87	36	0 21
KET	21/11/89	38	7 8
SUK	9 /12/90	39	7 26
RAV	9 /12/93	42	7 26
CHA	3 /11/94	43	6 20
MAN	4 /5 /96	45	0 21

GURU--16 YEARS

22/5 /1897	AGE		
22/5 /1913	YRS M D		

DD/MM/YY			
GUR	22/5 /97	46	1 9
SAN	10/7 /99	48	2 27
BUD	21/1 /2	50	9 8
KET	27/4 /4	53	0 14
SUK	3 /4 /5	53	11 20
RAV	3 /12/7	56	7 20
CHA	21/9 /8	57	5 8
MAN	21/1 /10	58	9 8
RAH	27/12/10	59	8 14

SANI--19 YEARS

22/5 /1913	AGE		
22/5 /1932	YRS M D		

DD/MM/YY			
SAN	22/5 /13	62	1 9
BUD	25/5 /16	65	1 12
KET	2 /2 /19	67	9 19
SUK	13/3 /20	68	10 30
RAV	13/5 /23	72	1 0
CHA	24/4 /24	73	0 11
MAN	24/11/25	74	7 11
RAH	2 /1 /27	75	8 19
GUR	8 /11/29	78	6 25

BUDHA--17 YEARS

22/5 /1932	AGE		
22/5 /1949	YRS M D		

DD/MM/YY			
BUD	22/5 /32	81	1 9
KET	18/10/34	83	6 5
SUK	15/10/35	84	6 2
RAV	15/8 /38	87	4 2
CHA	22/6 /39	88	2 9
MAN	20/11/40	89	7 7
RAH	17/11/41	90	7 4
GUR	6 /6 /44	93	1 23
SAN	12/9 /46	95	4 29

KETHU--7 YEARS

22/5 /1949	AGE		
21/5 /1956	YRS M D		

DD/MM/YY			
KET	22/5 /49	98	1 9
SUK	18/10/49	98	6 5
RAV	18/12/50	99	8 5
CHA	25/4 /51	100	0 12
MAN	24/11/51	100	7 11
RAH	21/4 /52	101	0 8
GUR	10/5 /53	102	0 27
SAN	15/4 /54	103	0 2
BUD	25/5 /55	104	1 12

Analysis of Important Periods of W.Q. Judge's Life

1. 1858 — At the age of 7 young William nearly died.

The major planet ruling at this time was RAVI (Sun)
The minor planet was GURU (Jupiter)

This was a VERY favorable time — COULD NOT have died.
Very favorable time for maturing, rebirth, coming of age, forthright, discovering oneself and showing leadership — early on.
Consider it as rebirth: opportunity for out-of-body, near-death, or life-altering experience.
Very significant.

During the period of June 10, 1858 — March 28, 1859 was the opportunity to experience near-death, out-of-body experience, vision.
Would have been very formative and significant in his turn to philosophy, etc.
No more fear of death.

He would have become a “new person” with a new perspective.
Even if he had never met H.P.B. he would still have been a philosophical and spiritual individual — leader.

THE most significant window for this experience was from ages 7 years 1 month 27 days to 7 years 11 months 16 days.

2. July 14th, 1864 — The Judge family arrived in New York.

Judge was in a ten year cycle of CHANDRA (Moon) which implies creativity, restlessness, attraction to water/travel/journey.
Under this period, RAHU (North Node) starts October 23, 1863 and runs until April 21, 1865.
Due to the opposite effect of RAHU (North Node), travel at any other time before or after this period would have been better. Coming to New York would have been much more significant pre/post: his accomplishments would have been much more significant; luck was not with him at that time.

3. April 1872 — W.Q. Judge became US Citizen.

Judge was still under the influence of CHANDRA (Moon) at this time.

4. May 1872 — W.Q. Judge was admitted to the Bar in New York.

On May 22, 1872 he came under the major influence of MANGAL (Mars) with a minor influence of the Moon. Very good.
In this period the influence of the Sun and Moon together would = success in career, public-dealing, good salesmanship, good judgement.

5. Marriage in 1874.

If he married *before* October 13, 1874 the woman would have dominated, she would have been strong-willed and therefore would have controlled.

If he married *after* October 13, 1874 it would have been disastrous.

It would have been better if he had married after 26 years of age.

6. Fall of 1874 — Came in contact with H.P. Blavatsky.

Period of MANGAL-GURU (Jupiter in Mars)

All women he would have met during this period would have dominated him at that time.

It was a period of overwhelming influence from the opposite sex, both positive or negative.

7. September 1875 — The Theosophical Society was established.

(Note: H.P.B. was a 'realized' individual.)

BUDH (Mercury) in MANGAL (Mars) at that time. The T.S. would have been a good venture.

Mercury implies commerce, making it work, organizing it, running it, financing, and legal work.

This would have involved the business aspect of the T.S. much more than the esoteric/philosophical for Judge at that time. When The T.S. was launched, his main focus and responsibility would have been with organizing. He would have been energetic, involved and in charge of day-to-day activities of the organization. He would not have been in a leadership position, but behind the scenes would have worked tirelessly to promote and extend the influence of the Theosophical Society and bring new blood into its fold. Mystical experiences.

KETU (South Node) in MANGAL (Mars), September 18, 1876 until April 15, 1877. Emotional turmoil, falling out with object of admiration, bad luck, loss.

SUKRA (Venus) in MANGAL (Mars), April 16, 1877 until June 15, 1878. Infatuation and devotion.

RAVI (Sun) in MANGAL (Mars), starting June 16, 1878, until CHANDRA (Moon), ending May 22, 1879. Strong desire for travel, but unable to do so. Longing to unite with loved one, jealousy.

8. 1881 and March 1882 — Venezuela.

Not a very good period. RAHU (North Node) would have already started.

Not very positive, not productive, no long-lasting results, economic misfortune.

9. March/April 1884 — London and Paris.

Period of RAHU (North Node) and SANI (Saturn).

Early 1884 (before June) was a good period; Judge was drawing power from H.P.B.

After June 1884 was not good; his trip = trouble, could not express himself effectively.

[For further information on RAHU see No. 12: **May 4, 1887 to May 3, 1896.**]

10. September 17, 1884 to October 26, 1884.

Period of CHANDRA (Moon) is a time for learning, gaining, position, power, strength, advancing according to one's merit, achieving their most.

But at this time Judge was under the major influence of RAHU (North Node) which creates the opposite effect.

Judge would have relinquished everything he had learned before, plus by divine grace.

This period would have cleansed him of everything (good or bad) and left him "an empty vessel, ready to be filled."

Under normal circumstances one gains traditional knowledge, etc., but under RAHU (North Node), the opposite is true: one gives up everything and is open to new possibilities.

It is highly possible that Judge underwent initiation at this time.

Judge was in prime state to come under major influence of a transcendental nature. Traditional nature and desires, etc. would have been wiped out.

Question: Would this have been a time when W.Q. Judge could have been called and initiated?

Dr. Basu gave examples of individuals giving up everything and setting out to seek answers (abandoning well-paying careers and heading for isolation of the mountains). He then stated:

Yes, Judge was in prime condition to be influenced, whether positive or negative, by anyone. Physically, it was not a good time to undergo a stressful experience but it is acknowledged that it is precisely during a period when the physical is strongly negatively affected (e.g., weakened immune system, headaches, etc.) that an experience of spiritual transformation can occur (enlightenment).

[Mrs. Judge remarked that Judge returned to New York from India "very worn and ill". — Compiler]

It is documented that Judge was not doing well at all at that time; he felt totally alone, abandoned.

Dr. Basu mentioned that it is not uncommon for people going through such an experience to fall silent; they cannot explain to others what they are going through (and, likely, no one would understand).

Dr. Basu's Conclusion: Although spiritual transformation could have occurred, due to the influence of CHANDRA (Moon) and RAHU (North Node), Judge would still have been left feeling split (double-minded, indecisive) and fighting forces he could not correctly identify.

11. April 1886 — *The Path* was started.

Not a good period; doomed to fail.

If the magazine had been started May 4, 1887 it would still be continuing today.

12. May 4, 1887 to May 3, 1896 — extended period of RAHU.

RAHU (North Node) in BUDH (Mercury) May 4, 1887 until RAHU (North Node) in CHANDRA (Moon) ending May 3, 1896.

Upside: Single-minded devotion, evangelical spirit, spreading the word, philosophy and higher vision, perseverance.

Downside: Bouts of depression, bad luck, obstacles, hurdles, ill health.

13. Late 1893

Under the influence of RAVI (Sun). Good name, fame, charisma, influence, etc.
 However RAHU (North Node) has the opposite effect. Ill will, bad name, harassment, etc.
 From December 9, 1893 and progressively increasing with time.

14. 1894.

Under the influence of CHANDRA (Moon).
 Travel indicated in November 1894.

Everything is bad.

15. March 21, 1896 — W.Q. Judge Died.

Still under the period of CHANDRA (Moon).
 Absolutely no sign whatsoever of death on chart.
 Foul play had to be involved.

Question: What about the possibility of poison being involved? He was being treated for Chagres fever/Tuberculosis. Could the treatment have killed him?

Judge should have lived.
 Almost never happens that anyone with the aspects Judge had at that time actually dies.
 All indications are that he could not have died naturally before the age of 53.
 Judge definitely did not die of a broken heart.
 His natural death age was 83 (October 18, 1934).

The following dates are found in the chart supplied by Dr. Basu.
 These dated are the best opportunities to exit the body, dates where he *could* have died:
 38 yrs. 7 mo. 8 days
 53 yrs. 0 mo. 14 days
 67 yrs. 9 mo. 19 days
 75 yrs. 8 mo. 19 days
 83 yrs. 6 mo. 5 days
 [See the VIMSOTTARI DASA chart.]

Judge did not die; he was taken out. Foul play, such as poison, had to be involved.
 It was not just astral influences that killed him.
 RAHU (North Node) indicates that physical influences killed him.

At the time that Judge died, he could not trust the people around him.
 He may have suspected that someone was conspiring against him.

Dr. Basu provided a list of general characteristics of individuals born under the influence of Jupiter, Judge's minor ruling planet. It reads, in part:

Due to the lordship of Jupiter, they are the chief governor for philosophy, and progeny. They are restless, dreamy, contemplating, imaginative and never hesitating to lead a romantic life. They are honest, outspoken, helpful and humane. They are unassuming . . . Being a watery and dual sign, they are a puzzle to others and themselves. They are frank, polite, sweet-tempered, and modest. They are led with fresh ideas and fancies. . . . They may visit foreign lands. They will have good neighbors and will develop friendships by generosity and a great service to them. They may be studious and ever changing their residence. They are harmless and can understand defects, deficiencies and plan to alleviate suffering of people.

Specific characteristics listed are:

A good ability to communicate in words and writings very well. . . Likely to have quick reactions, be very witty, and have varied interests.

Dr. Basu indicated that a person such as this does not die of a broken heart; such a person remains hopeful no matter what.

Dr. Basu's closing remarks:

Had Judge lived another year (into 1897) he would have entered a period in which sixteen years of Jupiter would have been excellent for him; this would have been a very good period. He would have done great things for the Theosophical Movement.

During June 28, 1884 to May 3, 1897 Judge would have experienced both the highlights, and at the same time, the worst events of his life.

4. **The Theosophic Isis**, Vol. 2, February 1897, pp.426-430.

THE SOUL PHOTOGRAPHED

By: Nizida*

[427] . . . But to the eye of the seer, photography performs a service which, to the general public, remains inaccessible. By the rays of light which illuminates a higher, ethereal plane of existence, we obtain a *photograph of the soul*. Transpiercing the “carapace,” or the shell of the body, the indestructible, un-lying Soul gives forth to the eye of the seer its *true* lineaments of character — the effluence of its spiritual nature. Its very aura of beneficence or maleficence is sensed. And this with the most indubitable certainty. The true character is *known*. But, we must add, the seer ought to possess the purified vision of one lifted above the shadow emanating from the lower nature, or the astral plane near the earth. He must be perfectly free from prejudice against the individual represented by the photograph, or an utter stranger to him. Prejudice in the mind of the seer would prove an unpurified lower nature, and the vision of such persons is unreliable.

The true character of the earthly personality which each one builds up for himself from birth, which may be worn as a veil to hide the depths of an unpurified nature, or which may have been sublimated by the soul’s efforts to purify itself into a robe of transparency as clear as light — all is conveyed in a flash to the eye of the *trained seer*. Mistake is impossible. But this knowledge will not come to us from a *painted portrait*. We may read by the form and expression of the features the characteristics of the personality; but we shall not obtain by the work of another man’s hand and genius that sense of a man’s *inner* true nature — the virtues, and spiritual excellence obtained by his aspiring efforts on the path of evolution (or the absence of these) which is conveyed by the photograph. The painted portrait is no medium for the transmission of anything so spiritual. For, let us bear in mind, occult, or spiritual science *penetrates matter*, tears aside any veils assumed for the purpose of deception, and exposes the real things. The penetrative inner vision of the man trained in occult science cannot be deceived.

[428] . . . For we enter, in the study of Occult [429] Science, the Land of Mystery; but that Mystery is a thing *more real* than the earth we live upon. If we continue to view it as a dreamland, whose objects we cannot realise as true, but as more or less imaginary, we shall indubitably help to cultivate and strengthen the power and tendency we all possess towards *self-hallucination*. Therefore, let us plainly set before ourselves that our souls are *real beings*: not vague, phantasmic wraiths, never to be understood nor realised, but our own most real selves, with the Higher Mind we must evolve, with all its supernal faculties, which will bring us into the company of the Highest Beings we can at present know of; which will transform us into beings quite beyond our present conceptions, and render us worthy to be of Their company. There can be no higher destiny.

One other object also in writing this paper was to add one more testimony from the occult, or soul-side of nature, to the spiritual beauty attained, while in the body, by our beloved chief, W.Q.J. We one day presented to a seeress the engravings of a photograph of our chief. She had never met him; never seen a picture of him before, and was therefore utterly unacquainted with his appearance.

“What a perfectly *true* expression there is in this face,” she said. “A complete absence of all concealment — frank truth itself — like limpid, clear water.” Then, slowly, like one in deep contemplation, “How it grows upon me. It seems to me as if I could see, if I chose to try, the whole of that man’s life depicted in his face. It seems to me to lie there without a shadow upon it. His eyes, too, seem to pierce to the depths of your soul; with such a gentle kindness — not faultfinding; such a wise judgment. Yet so piercing are they, that I feel an inward shrinking from them, as if I were not worthy to stand such scrutiny. And now his very body seems transparent.” — “How so? Do you see his heart, lungs, etc.?” — “No! not at all. But it is as if it was a sheet of glass through which you can see. I should say that would indicate a perfectly spiritual transparency of

nature — a symbol of it, you know, to my soul-sight. All of earth would seem to have been completely put off — no dross left. Surely, *his* shadow does not rest upon his mortal coil? I have never met with such a thing before; there is his body there, but I see right through it, as if [430] it *wasn't* there. I should think, from this appearance — a limpid transparency of the body, coupled with the unusual effect of truth in the eyes, that such a man, from mental training, and soul-evolution, had become incapable of formulating an evil thought.” — “You do not think he would try to deceive anyone, for instance?” “Impossible! Impossible! It would never occur to him!”

We maintain that had not that soul-nature been present in the form photographed, *it could never have been seen there*; so unerring is the *true* soul-vision. There is an imperfect vision which sees upon the lowest astral plane only, and may be deceived by the illusions of that plane. But the true vision, trained according to the laws laid down by the Masters, with the accompaniment of a pure, and spiritualised nature, is not deceived by these illusions, but detects them, or soars above them.

A very extraordinary thing is that the picture of the soul which may thus be seen by means of a photograph, as if in a mirror, is never destroyed, even if it were to be engraved over and over again. It lives in the engraving as in the original photograph — for it is a life-picture taken by the rays of the sun. As we can sense a man's nature in his hand-writing, in the *printed* words also which convey to us his thoughts, so in the photograph we may know him in his *inner* nature. As the phonograph may give us back again and again the voices of departed friends, so the photograph contains enshrined in its voiceless presentment the expression of the very soul's nature, whose beauty, in *that* incarnation, may have made all the joy of our life.

The inner life which occult science can reveal to us, is the only true and *real* life. The external life contains it as a shell.

NIZIDA.

[Mrs. Mary Catherine Londini]

* A.L. Cleather intimated that Mrs. Mary Catherine Londini was “Nizida”. Londini joined the T.S. through the Liverpool Branch on October 13th, 1888. Her application was endorsed by H.S. Olcott and Thomas Bickerstaff, who was a member of the Golden Dawn. Nizida wrote on occult topics. She authored: “Nature-Spirits, or Elementals” and “The Difference Between Elementals and Elementaries”, *Theosophical Siftings*, Vol. 1, No.10, August 10th, 1888, pp.1-24; “Edison. [From A Theosophic Standpoint.]”, *Lucifer*, Vol. 6, June 1890, pp.292-296; “Leylet-en-Nuktah (‘The Night of The Drop’)", *Lucifer*, Vol. 2, June 1888, pp.273-276; and a novel titled “**The Astral Light**: An Attempted Exposition of Certain Occult Principles in Nature with Some Remarks Upon Modern Spiritism”, Theosophical Publishing Society, London, 1889, 181 pages. (Reprinted by Eastern School Press in 1983.)

