

# THE CANADIAN THEOSOPHIST

Divine Wisdom

Brotherhood

Occult Science

---

The Theosophical Society is not responsible for any statement in this Magazine, unless made in an official document

---

VOL. XXIV., No. 9

HAMILTON, NOVEMBER 15th, 1943

Price 20 Cents.

---

## TRAINING THE LITTLE ONES

BY A MOTHER OF THREE GROWN-UPS

*After some years of persuasion I have been fortunate enough to gain the consent of a dear Canadian mother to place on record some of her thoughts on bringing up young children. She does not go into the fascinating detail which we might hope that some day she will reveal, but she supplies the fundamental principles which we feel sure will be welcomed by many young theosophical parents. "You don't know how humble I feel about all this," she writes in a covering letter; "it sounds very elementary, but I think it should be so. You see, I feel that every child is a law unto himself, and as far as set rules are concerned—well, we didn't have too many of them. Right now I don't know just how well all our little schemes worked. To be sure our three are grown, but their real life work is in its early stages. At the same time we can already see many fine sides in their make-up. And they are very dear to us."*

Happiness with vast experiences comes into the life of every individual, but the most far-reaching and enduring happiness is that of having a child born into a household. It is the unique kind of happiness that comes with privilege and responsibility.

At once, if the parents have any of

the subtle awareness of life and its purpose, the up-bringing of a child looms upon the horizon as a stupendous task, mingled with mixed feelings of love, responsibility and the need for greater understanding. Instantly, the parents become entirely different beings; their outlook changes and will continue to change: their compassion expands and life takes on a different colour and meaning.

Let us for a moment try to enter the thoughts and feelings of the parents.

The thought of how we shall train our child, confronts us. What do we wish him to be like? We perhaps see our child already with a rich background. We realize that he is a fragment of the Divine and also are aware that he has been here before and has come with an accumulation of desires and abilities. He has been lent to us and hence we proudly take up our task.

Primarily, we see to it that the child is well cared for physically; cleanliness and proper food being essential. We can not plead ignorance in this matter, as the current child magazines are teeming with sound ideas along this line. So we will take it for granted that the physical is carefully watched and tended.

During the very early years, the parents are everything to a child. He watches every move with interest. These tender-age ones are very easy to impress and are never critical of their parents, even if we should be a little down at the heel, because they have not yet put any value on the material things of life. (In this respect also, it behooves us to become more "like little children".)

We must bear in mind that the child's first teacher is his mother. When the baby begins to reach for his toys he will soon begin to express his feelings for them. Right then we must be ever-vigilant and see what we can find out about him. Does he show signs of tenderness or ruthlessness? If he falls off his tricycle, do we pound the "bike" and say "naughty bike"? No, of course we do not go through that nonsense of making the child feel that everything that causes him pain must be punished. We show him the proper way to ride, so he won't be hurt and we put the onus on him: then he won't be ready to pound everything to pieces and to think everything exists for his benefit only. The idea would seem to be to teach him in our own way that he is a little part of the whole scheme of life. All this sounds so easy to say. It is a big task to do.

Nature is one of the largest avenues of approach in this teaching or informing task. As soon as the little one becomes aware of flowers, insects, birds, dogs and cats, it seems an advantageous idea to build your story telling around these. If you have any yen for simple story telling, just pick your ideas "out of the blue", as it were, let your imagination ramble. Let us try a bird story. Show the child where the sparrow's home or nest is; tell him how the bird builds it with sticks and dried grass and lines it with soft wool so that it will be comfortable for the babies. As there is

always a father and mother sparrow, baby sparrows always come and need tender care. Then there are the gardens and fields abounding with seeds, where the birds eat, it's their dining room. It is also a community centre where all kinds of birds gather and meet each other. You can tell of their moulting or changing clothes; of their hibernations and the long journeys they make. You can go on and on and will see eyes open with interest. Change your stories and sometimes ask the child something in order to see if he is becoming creative or imaginative? Where does he think that dog is going—to meet his master—to dig up an old bone he has buried, or just to meet a pal? Get your child wondering. To wonder is the first step towards knowledge. When you have accomplished this, you have planted a seed—a worthwhile seed.

Of course we are taking for granted that the parents read some of the delightful fairy tales: these are filled with cosmic laws. Also, we shall encourage the child to do some of his own reading as soon as he is able.

When the child gets a bit older and his little friends are going to Sunday School, what are we as Theosophists going to do? Do we want him to receive the letter only or do we want to make his spiritual life applicable and practical in every phase of life. If the child does not go to Sunday School he must never be allowed to feel that he is missing something, and it is our responsibility to see that there is no void. We must not let him get an inferior feeling or think that his parents have an odd set of ideas and are not just like other people. On the other hand, if he goes to Sunday School, it is our duty to see that, in an unobtrusive manner, his Sunday School lesson is explained to him from a fuller Theosophical viewpoint, by relating it to all life and the Universal Laws which pervade all. It

is not wise to lead our child to believe that the Church is inferior to Theosophy—just as you do not want him to think that little Mary at school, who is poorly dressed, is not as good as he is. Brotherhood and understanding must be clearly practised in all we do and think. Let us suppose Mary stands for Christianity itself—dress her in a poor little dress of the limited thwarted anthropomorphic interpretation of Christianity as taught in the Church and then compare her in the more beautiful spiritual dress of a Theosophical interpretation of Christianity and we find she stands out like a beautiful fairy child. The soul or kernel, truth itself, is always the same: the mode of expression or external appearance is different, that is all, and we must be able to discern and recognize truth wherever we find it, and always with an understanding mind and spirit. Tolerance is one of the foundation stones of wisdom itself, and so from the very beginning the child must be taught the great principle of tolerance, which is born of understanding.

Little children talk about their prayers. Have ours any? Do we teach our child one that will frighten him so that he is afraid to go to sleep lest he "die before he wakes." Heaven forbid! Here is a beautiful bed-time verse that can be easily explained to a small child.

"I am a link in the golden chain of love  
That stretches around the world  
And must keep my link bright and  
strong.

So I will try to be kind and gentle  
To every living thing I meet,  
And to protect and help those  
Who are weaker than myself.

I will try to think pure and beautiful  
thoughts.

I will try to speak pure and beautiful  
words.

I will try to do pure and beautiful  
actions.

May every link in the golden chain of  
love

Become bright and strong."

There is a challenge to the child here—a task—a game—a responsibility. Without his doing his part, the link would sever the whole chain. It is easily memorized and supplies a child's early need and besides makes him a builder. When he needs a new prayer, a more advanced one, he will be in a position to create one of his own.

As parents, we can talk freely and the child will understand about the one-ness of all life, the universality of all things. No matter what we do, whether good or evil, it is all recorded. The Golden Rule of "do unto others as you would be done by" is indeed a golden treasure to be given to every little child to be cherished all his lifetime. We are living lives of importance. We are not living unto ourselves. We will realize the sacredness and importance of promises made to our children: to be honest in all our little dealings with them, honest to a hair's breadth, and at the same time we must never lose our sense of humour or spirit of happiness. We all must know that the happiness we get in life is the happiness we give away.

We will need to remember that, not only are we teaching our children, but they in turn are teaching us, and blessed teachers they are. It is our good fortune to be learners with them.

There is no need to let ourselves become excited, worried or perplexed about our little ones. If we have an "open mind, an eager intellect" and an unselfish spirit, we shall be able to contribute much to their advancement. A great life is the art of living well with ourselves and with and for those about us. "May every link in the golden chain of love be bright and strong".

A Mother.

## KING ARTHUR'S TABLE SIGNS AND SECRETS—V

(Concluded from last month.)

The Giant Huan's 'letter' being cuneiform, it follows that the makers of the Somerset zodiac were of Sumerian origin, as the name Somerset implies. That being so it is not surprising to find the place name Liver Moor just below the Giant's knee, for the Chaldeans divined by means of a liver to interpret the oracles of the gods. The Babylonians believed that the seat of all passions was not the heart but the liver, and in the Book of Ezekiel xxi. 2, we read, the king of Babylon "looked in the liver;" that was in the sixth century, B.C.

Liver divining was practiced in Nineveh a century earlier, which is proved by the clay model of a liver inscribed with omens, now in the British Museum. Other excavations have brought to light a considerable number of clay models of an animal's liver inscribed in cuneiform with remarks in the Babylonian and Hittite languages. Whilst an Etruscan liver, cast in bronze, and now at Piacenza, resembles our Giant.

Sargon of Agade and Naram-Sin, who lived between 2637 and 2582 B.C., made use of omens derived from the livers of sheep, as illustrated by Wallis Budge in 'Amulets and Superstitions'.

A place name that tells another story is Redlands, for this Giant Twin and the surrounding countryside is composed of red marl; consequently we find on the map not only Redlands in front and behind him, but Red Lake outlines the boat in which he sits. This is significant, because the ancients connected red earth with life, as on the Island of Teneriffe, which is thought by some to be the last peak of Atlantis, thousands of mummies were found in the red strata of the caves; these I have visited, and picked up bones stained red from contact with the red rock.

*The High History of the Holy Grail* places the chief tournament in which King Arthur and his knights contested, at Red laund; before the war one could see circles on the Fair Field left by the modern fair, that was held, very likely, on the same ground on which the tilting contests took place, for it is the only suitable field between the swamps of the sea-moors and the steep red hills.

Given these clues, a peculiar place name, Emblett Lane, which outlines the stomach of the Giant, is worth study, because the Giant sits between the two masts of his ship, on the base line of the triangle which gives the exact measurement of the thirteenth moon month of the layout of the calendar. The name suggests that this was the month that was 'intercalated' to fill in the irregularities of a year, that secret thirteenth moon month of the Templars, who were the keepers of the Grail.

Ember means a season of fasting and humiliation or it may mean, directly from Anglo Saxon: "the circle or course of the year" from emb, round. In the Church of England calendar it is used in ember-days, ember-tide, ember-week, and ember-fast. From the Greek root comes 'embolism' meaning "intercalation or the insertion of days or months in an account of time to produce regularity".

This being the case we have the explanation why Argo Navis, the star constellation below the giant Orion, is always depicted on star maps as only half a ship with no prow! For here on the Round Table of King Arthur's zodiac is a measurement recorded between its two masts intended to be remembered for all time, the measurement of that sidereal thirteen moon month—27 degrees 41 minutes 32 seconds of the 360 degrees of this Temple's circumference.

Here is an instance why ancient signs and symbols should not be tampered

with, for every picture originally set in the heavens was intended to speak for itself. The Somerset effigy ship gives us the meaning so long sought of the prowless Argo Navis.

Books on the constellation figures say that this is the celebrated ship of the Argonauts, of which Homer sung nearly ten centuries before Christ. Sir Isaac Newton puts the expedition of the Argonauts shortly after the death of Solomon (about 975 B.C.), while Dr. Blair's chronology puts it at 1236 B.C., but according to records of solar eclipses the exact date of the return of Ulysses was April 16th 1178 B.C., for Homer tells in the Odyssey that "The sun has perished out of heaven" and the eclipse was total around Ithaca, where Ulysses lived, on that date. Some people think that the story had its origin in name as well as in fact from the Ark of Noah.

Considering the tradition in English history that King Brutus came of Trojan stock, the Argonaut story might well apply here, but the Giant child who is seated in the Ark was certainly conceived over a thousand years earlier and may have had his boat reconstructed by the Argonauts, as it is the only effigy in the whole lay-out that is entirely delineated by straight lines.

As for the legends that King Solomon built the ship of the Graal, Solomon, in the Arthurian Romances, must be read Sol the Sun, for its masts slope like rays from the sunrise, and point to that mythical bird at the zenith of the Winged Temple, which I am tempted to call the Ember goose, whose breast and belly are silver like the moon and whose wings and tail feathers are black as the night. Of Hansa the goose, Madame Blavatsky says: "the symbol of Hansa the goose is an important symbol, representing for instance, Divine Wisdom, Wisdom in darkness beyond the reach of men . . . Hansa is the symbol of that

male or temporary deity, as he, the emanation of the primordial Ray, is made to serve as a Vahan or vehicle for that divine Ray, which otherwise could not manifest itself in the Universe, being, antiphrastically, itself an emanation of "Darkness" . . . As to the strange symbol chosen, it is equally suggestive; the true mystic significance being the idea of a universal matrix, figured by the primordial waters of the "deep", or the opening for the reception, and subsequently for the issue, of that one ray (the Logos); which contains in itself the other seven procreative rays or powers" (*The Secret Doctrine*, p. 80).

"A physical basis is necessary to focus a Ray of the Universal Mind and link them together, thus the Ray is the animating principle electrifying every atom into life. Spirit-matter, Life; the "Spirit of the Universe" or the second Logos." Therefore in Arthurian Romances, Merlin told Uther—"and this is what yon star doth betoken. The ray doth portend that a son shall be born unto thee that shall be of surpassing mighty dominion." That son was King Arthur of Britain. "There appeared a star of marvellous brightness and bigness, stretching forth one ray whereon was a ball of fire spreading forth in the likeness of a dragon, and from the mouth of the dragon issued forth two rays, whereof the one was of such length as that it did seem to reach beyond the region of Gaul, and the other, verging toward the Irish sea, did end in seven lesser rays."

Compare the Navajo Creation Myth with the foregoing. "A great Star appeared over the Mountain. The Star was the Fire god, he sent a Light-ray down to the mountain. The Talking god then appeared dressed in a rainbow and spake four times to the people who told him to 'go and see why there was a light on the mountain' and he saw the Light-ray connecting the mountain and the sky and he heard all sorts of birds

singing. When he went up to the mountain he found a very fine newly born baby the child of the Earth Spirit and Sky Spirit." Here we have our effigy Giant child again!

So the Welsh Barddas gives us the last WORD on this "secret of the whole wide world". "The letters of the Holy Name are called the three columns of truth, because there can be no knowledge of truth but from the light thrown upon it; and the three columns of the sciences because there can be no sciences, but from the light and truth." and again, "Having obtained Earth under him coinstantaneously with the Light, he drew the form of the voice and light on the Earth."

#### "THE WRITING ON THE GRAIL"

"In The Garden of Paradise"

As the Templars were the traditional keepers of the Holy Grail, of which King Arthur's Round Table of the Stars was the pattern, let us try to read between the lines of a Templar who wrote soon after 1100 A.D. and thus find the secret of Wolfram von Eschenbach's 'Parzival'; which he calls "a parable so fleeting too swift for the dull shall be".

Never-the-less, to those who know the meaning of the writing "in the palm of mine hand", he reveals his secret immediately, as a Freemason might in "the mystery of a close grasp he sure doth know," for the "writing on the Grail" was a more closely guarded secret than even the starry bowl, that received its inspiration also from on high.

His story commences when "at Bagdad did reign a monarch so strong and powerful, that homage he well might claim from two-thirds or more of earth's kingdoms." One's mind at once reverts to those Sumerian rulers from whom the Somerset Zodiac derives, for Sargon was supposed to have lived 2800 B.C. but a quotation from L. A. Waddell's 'Makers of Civilization' will clear

up this point. "Now, however, the date of the Foundation of the First Babylonian Dynasty has lately been definitely fixed by astronomical data and calculations with precision. The astronomical observations which now fortunately fix for us this date are an admirably exact series made at Babylon on the morning and evening disappearance of the planet Venus, recorded by the orders of Ammi—"Zadugga", the tenth king of this dynasty, for the twenty-one years of his reign . . . The result of these revised calculations have been published, and show that "the date of the Foundation of the First Babylonian seasonal calendar and history, is the year 2195 B.C."

Thus we see that Wolfram von Eschenbach was using a definitely authentic source for his Grail Romance, despite the slur cast upon his Toledo manuscript; and it is also likely to be true that the knight who wounded the King of the Grail, came from the River Tigris, as he states, because the red wound on the thigh of the effigy Orion (King Anfortas) was made by a "heathen" whose purpose in wounding the king was that "he should win the Grail and should hold it", for it was "the fame of the Grail drew him thither". This wound seems to hold the secret of the keeper of the Grail's kingdom, for the text says—"yet King shall he be no longer tho' healing and bliss he know", also the fateful question that Parzival had to ask, hinges upon this particular wound.

As a matter of fact it is upon the wound that the central Ray of the three fold WORD falls, the wound corresponding with the famous star Rigel, in the constellation Orion. (<sup>1</sup>) Rigel is one of the most luminous stars in all the heavens and sparkles like a white diamond, recalling the lines—"upon the wound they lay it, (the spear) and the frost from his flesh so cold it draweth,

(Continued on Page 281.)

## THE GEOFFREY HODSON CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Smythe received the letter which follows from Mr. Hodson, and as it was stated to be "a purely personal expression of opinion from a fellow member" he replied to it at once in personal terms. Later, after he had written and mailed his letter to Mr. Hodson, he learned at the October Executive meeting that all the members of the Executive had been addressed by Mr. Hodson. He submitted his own reply as already reported, and the Executive then voted to send a joint reply to Mr. Hodson as well. Dr. Wilks, also wrote a reply on his own behalf and representing Western Canada. The four letters are thus accounted for.

### MR. HODSON'S LETTER

10 Belvedere Street, Epsom, S. E. 3,  
Auckland, New Zealand.

10th August, 1943.

My dear Brother,

This letter comes to you as a purely personal expression of opinion from a fellow member of The Theosophical Society, New Zealand, to whom for some time now your General Executive has been kind enough to send the Canadian member of our family of Theosophical Magazines. I have been grateful for this, for the Journal so often contains informative articles and quotations. I must confess, however—and this is why I am writing to you—that I rarely open the wrapper without misgivings. Always the question forms in my mind; what new attack and villifications in the official statements will mar the pleasure and take away most of the profit which might be derived from the rest of the Magazine? I have heard many others of our brethren confess to the same sense of regret. In fact everyone who refers to your Journal in my presence expresses these sentiments.

So, at long last, I write and ask you and your fellow officers whether in our Canadian Magazine we can express our ideals and convictions without villifying each other, especially our more prominent brethren, past and present.

As I expect you are well aware, yours alone amongst our Theosophical Magazines consistently prints attacks and abuse of brother Theosophists. When referring to fellow members, all our other Theosophical Magazines unflinchingly display courtesy and goodwill.

These members whom we attack, together with those many thousands of F. T. S. who have been and are inspired and illumined by them, think differently from their Canadian brothers. I cannot think that we are justified in continuing to abuse them because of this, to heap scorn, calumny, vituperation upon them because they see Theosophy and the Masters' work differently from their Canadian brothers; for this, it seems to me, is most untheosophical in Theosophists, and most unbecoming in Theosophical Officials.

As I have come to understand thus far in my Theosophical studies, there is not, nor ever can be, a fixed Theosophical orthodoxy or standard of verity by which one student could say, as we seem continually to say in our Canadian Journal: "My view of Theosophy is right; yours is wrong". The ring of conviction in the presentation of our views is always acceptable, but our apparent contention that they alone represent true Theosophy and that other views differing from them are false, is surely quite untenable. When we add to our presumption of exclusive rightness, personal abuse of those who see Theosophy differently from ourselves; it seems to me that we fall far below those ideals of tolerance and gentleness which are the marks of a mind illumined by Theosophy.

The Theosophical spirit, as I begin to understand it, would seem to be better

expressed in the words of that Frenchman who said in effect: "I disagree profoundly with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it". Our Canadian attitude would seem to be expressible in terms of an opposite affirmation: "I both disagree with what you say, and deny you the right to say it. Furthermore, for your beliefs and utterances I denounce you as charlatans and traitors".

Because this is so, I write, first, to protest in the strongest possible terms against our settled Canadian policy, which I think is fairly described in the foregoing, and second, to appeal to you for its complete reversal.

If, as would not be unnatural, you feel inclined to ask me to mind my own business, I remind you that we are all brothers in this great work which is one work, and that we are all intimately included and involved in each other's actions. That is partly why I write to ask that we in Canada desist from conduct which violates the basic Theosophical principles of tolerance, good-will and freedom of thought.

I make this plea, not only for the sake of all Theosophists, but also for those who might draw near to its teachings. Our work is to spread Theosophy in such a way as to appeal to the finest minds. Imagine, if you will, someone whose spirit has been stifled and whose intellect has been fettered by the suffocating walls of dogmatism in orthodox religion, at last finding Theosophy and seeing hope in its breadth and freedom of opinion and belief. Then imagine them reading our official Canadian writings, and their utter dismay in finding therein the dogmatic spirit of Sectarian Christianity expressed in crude attacks upon brother Theosophists. Of course they would at once turn away from the Ancient Wisdom. Fine minds would be repelled by personal abuse of those of different opinions. They would

regard it, as characteristic of Theosophy and Theosophists. Yet, anything more untheosophical it would be difficult to find. The application of the lowest human epithet to one of the Fellows of the Theosophical Society whom thousands respect as their elected President, and many deeply revere as elder brother and teacher, can, in my opinion, only be described as infamous.

Our basic idea upon which our long continued attacks are founded, apparently is that there exists a common, fixed measure of truth, a yardstick of Theosophia conceived by us in Canada. All teaching which is strictly within our conception is Theosophically right. All teaching which is outside of our conception is Theosophically wrong. Those for whom extra-Canadian views contain a measure of truth are "traitors to Theosophy". Those who dare to express them are "quislings" — the lowest human epithet.

Such, my brothers, is the view of the Eternal Wisdom which we proclaim by our long continued abuse of those who differ from us. It is, I submit to you, static, narrow, intolerant, discourteous. The Theosophical ideal surely is to be dynamic, broad, tolerant, and to maintain always a royal courtesy.

I did hope that the onset of War and the forming of the United Nations would open our eyes as Theosophists to the necessity for unity in our endeavour to spread light and to oppose darkness. That hope, however, has not been fulfilled. The forces of discord, destruction and calumny are rife in the world today. Victory over the Axis Powers is in sight. Peace and reconstruction will follow. Does it not seem to you of immense importance that we Theosophists, who have an unparalleled opportunity immediately before us, should be both peaceful and constructive in our relations with each other? We may differ harmoniously concerning beliefs, but



surely we err seriously when we initiate and maintain for years implacable antagonism as the official policy of one Section to all others who hold different views. The fact that this antagonism and disunity is wholly one-sided and evokes no response in kind does not prevent it from seriously impairing the possible unified world contribution which Theosophy and The Theosophical Society could make to post-war reconstruction. For this reason, also I am making this appeal to you all.

This situation in our Society seems to me to be especially unfortunate in those of us who are elected Leaders in a Movement whose first objective is Brotherhood; for under the guise of aiding the Movement we are continually doing it infinite harm. The effects of our unbrotherly thoughts are bad enough, but happily they are relatively transient. As the Executive Committee of a National Section and all its members, our written words in a Theosophical Magazine have a certain physical and visible permanence, and so unhappily the spectacle which they present will for a time endure. In this action I fear that we are making Theosophical history upon which future Theosophists cannot but look back with shame.

Therefore, on behalf of the dignity and fair name of our Movement, I strongly appeal that, at least in our published work, we desist from such undignified behaviour.

What of the recipients of our antagonism? As I have watched, for many years now, the continued attack upon them, I notice that those whom we calumniate so vilely do not reply. Not by one word do they answer our abuse, either with abuse or with any self-defence. Such letters from them to our Canadian Section as are published are always couched in terms of perfect courtesy. This conduct of theirs, in the face of long continued vituperation is, I feel, a great example to each and every

one of us.

As a reader of your Magazine for many years, I have become well aware of the Canadian views. I recognise that in Canada we feel a deep concern for the welfare of The Theosophical Society. I fully believe that our motive is to cut down what we regard as noxious weeds hindering the growth of the Theosophical tree, and I welcome such a motive. I recognise, too, both the value of an intelligent and constructive opposition and the perfect right of each one of us to our own opinions and beliefs. *It is solely against our methods that in this letter I protest and appeal.*

We Theosophists all have a right to differ from each other, and even to express freely yet courteously our disagreement with doctrines and policies; but I cannot see that we have a right to attack and villify persons, and to attribute the worst possible motives for their actions. To my mind a just cause needs no resort to calumny.

All these destructive thought forces which we continually generate and send out from Canada cannot fail to return destructively to our Canadian Leaders, brethren and the work of the Section as a whole. They cannot harm our brothers against whom they are so virulently discharged. They harm, not only the great causes of Theosophy and of decency in human conduct, but they also harm those of us who conceive and transmit them, and any others who have the misfortune to be influenced to join us in our untheosophical and discourteous behaviour. I write solely for the sake of that greatest of Causes—to bring Theosophy in its noblest guise to the mind and life of modern man. Is there any hope that you will henceforth refrain from continuing to harm this Cause, that you will adopt our President's splendid ideal: "Together though differently"?

This letter has grown to considerable length. Please excuse this on the

grounds of the deep seriousness of the great issues with which it deals. Excuse also any infelicities of expression which it may contain, and accept cordial greetings to you all and every good wish for the progress of the work throughout our Canadian Section.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,  
Geoffrey Hodson.

**MR. SMYTHE'S LETTER**

Tuesday, 14th September, 1943.

My dear Brother,

You make me a nice compliment by taking so much time from your busy life to write me this long letter of 10th August, and I will do my best to reply, for it is evident you are moved by impressions received from the company among which you move. Our magazine has been sent to you as a member of the General Council so it is purely an automatic favour and you do not need to feel indebted to anyone. That you open our wrapper with misgivings is nothing to what we expect from the Adyar Theosophist when it makes its irregular visits through the dangers of the submarines. You look for new "attacks and villifications" from us and we look for new misrepresentations of the Secret Doctrine, new assumptions of authority, new policies to drive away the outer world from the Ancient Wisdom which so much energy and effort has been expended to place before the world, and now so much effort has been exerted to set it in defiance of all the religions and religious communities of the world. Perhaps you belong to the Liberal Catholic Church, as you have a perfect right to do. I myself chartered a Lodge, the Annie Besant Lodge, consisting entirely of L. C. C. members, but I am still held to be an opponent of that body. In any case, can you not see that there is some reason for a Theosophical Society—setting up a new Church in opposition to all the Christian Churches, all the Hindu, Buddhist, Moslem and other re-

ligious organizations—being regarded as unfriendly to these earlier religions, and unlikely to attract their sympathy? We profess Universal Brotherhood, but in practice unless you belong to the L. C. C. you are in dutch at Adyar. Now we denounce that attitude, but do not do so unless immediate and special cause brings it up for further and renewed discussion. I suppose you regard it as villification when Dr. Arundale was stigmatized as a quisling. Well, a quisling is a man who considers his duty to a foreign power as precedent over his native patriotism. Dr. Arundale undertook in speech and writing when elected president not to give precedence to his Church views, not even to wear Church emblems and regalia, in short, to make Theosophy paramount. When he tells the Fellows of the T. S. and also members of the Protestant Churches that they do not give proper reverence to the Virgin Mary nor pay such respect to her as the Church of Rome does, he is showing that he regards his duty to a foreign power as paramount over his theosophical patriotism. Anybody but an Adyar addict would see this. You say that our magazine alone amongst Theosophical magazines prints such "attacks and abuse." Well, the other folk got out of the Adyar society to the number of 100,000 since forty years ago and have many magazines of their own with bigger circulations and wider influence than *The Theosophist*, and they stick to the teachings of the Masters and the Secret Doctrine and exert wide influence. Would you prefer, that we join that considerable army? We do not abuse the thousands of Adyar members who are hoodwinked and deluded by those who have apparently been hoodwinked and deluded in their turn. Our society motto—There is no Religion higher than Truth, is one that requires discrimination and intuition, but in order to exercise these faculties it is necessary to have material to work upon.

All that we have asked in this respect is to permit the same freedom to study The Mahatma Letters and the Blavatsky books that is afforded the works of later writers. When we can get intelligent students to read the early works on which the Society was founded, they almost invariably change their minds and not only admit the superiority of the Mahatma writings but wonder why anybody should prefer the later books.

A whole Lodge recently in Philadelphia which had been told they could not understand The Secret Doctrine, took up the study at our suggestion, they wanted to know at once why they had been so deceived, and that led to what you call villification, a simple historical statement of facts covering the last half century. Why do I do this? you will ask. For the simple reason that I have always taken The Golden Rule as a standard of conduct. If I had been misled and deceived I would rejoice if anyone with open sight and intelligence would lead me to straight roads and safe paths. We have no objection to those who prefer to walk on the devious byways that belong to the sacerdotal traditions of priests and priestcraft as Mr. Jinarajadasa points out on pages 37-9 of his Master's "Letters to C.W.L." I read everything without prejudice and have enjoyed some of your own writings very much. But if you were elected president, and I think you would make an excellent one, and insisted that the members must all believe in fairies and angels, I would be compelled to "villify" you also. It is all very well to say there can never be a fixed standard of Theosophy. That depends altogether on what you mean by Theosophy. The Masters say they have put nothing on record that has not been tested for thousands of years by generations of Adepts. When one of my contemporaries gets up and contradicts some of these thousands of years' old statements, without any corroboration from anyone else, I can

only be amazed at his gall, and proceed to "villify" him. Of course he has a perfect right to express his opinion and others have the similar right to believe him and worship him too if that pleases them, but have I no right to express my opinion and protect my friends from his influence if I can show them that it is a detrimental element? I have a responsibility in the matter. I have lectured over most of America. For twelve years I wrote two columns a week in a popular newspaper which went all over the world and was read in the trenches during the last war. My readers and hearers got what no one in those days disputed as to whether it was orthodox or heterodox. It appealed to the common sense of people who were sick of plausible humbug. It is only in these later years that to tell the truth about things is regarded as villification. If I do not speak the truth our columns are open to any correction that may be made. I am not in the business of muckraking nor of deception of any kind. Tolerance and gentleness are too often the sheep's clothing worn by the wolves against whom we have been warned. I will roar you as gently as any sucking dove if occasion servè, but truth is not always gentle nor pleasant. Fine minds are repelled by our coarseness! We do not find it so. People really believe that there is no religion higher than Truth, and welcome it in any language. You seem to forget that the Adyar Society is in a minority in the Theosophical Movement. The Secret Doctrine Theosophy which we advocate in Canada is being accepted by more and more thousands outside the Adyar ranks. When I bargained with Mrs. Besant to return to her Society in 1907 we were in entire agreement as to policy. It was she who changed; not I. But we remained friends. You say the calumniated do not reply. No doubt they are convinced. There is no religion higher than Truth.

The point of view is everything and

had you lived among Theosophists since 1884 as I have done, perhaps you would see some historical reason in what now looks to you like infelicitous diagnosis of things as they are. The Master knows what is in our hearts. Little else matters. The judgments of men are as nothing beside the edicts of Karma. We all belong to the One Life. You may be able to judge these issues long after I have passed away. You may understand then who took the high road and who took the low road. But at least you will know that we are all Brothers and serve according to our wisdom. Cordially and fraternally yours,

Albert E. S. Smythe.

P.S. I see you have lured me into mis-spelling vilification. Shall I then say "Evil communications, etc., etc?" Or would you regard that as abuse?

#### THE GENERAL EXECUTIVE LETTER

Saturday, 16th October, 1943.

Mr. Geoffrey Hodson,  
10 Belvedere Street, Epsom, S. E. 3,  
Auckland, New Zealand.

Dear Brother Hodson,

Our General Executive held a regular meeting on Sunday afternoon, October 3rd, at which the chief topic of discussion was the letter you had sent to each of the members. It was resolved to reply to you jointly in a letter to be drawn up by the General Secretary embodying points suggested by the members, the letter to be submitted to and approved by them. It was first moved to endorse my personal letter to you, but this was withdrawn in favour of the motion for a joint letter with general approval of mine.

It was felt that your letter was a propaganda document intended by its exaggerations and indiscriminate charges of crude attacks, abuse, vilification, scorn, calumny, and vituperation, to impress readers who would never hear the other side of the case, but would remain in ignorance of the real

reason for our protests. In the one case you cite of "personal abuse," the application of the epithet "quisling" to Dr. Arundale, we may remark he is the only person in The Theosophical Society to whom it could be applied, as he is the only person endued with presidential authority with power to use it or, as we believe he has done, to misuse it. A Quisling is one who, entrusted with the guidance of a nation, uses his power to further the cause of his nation's enemies. The Roman Catholic Church has banned the Theosophical Society, placed its literature on the *Index Expurgatorius*, forbidden its members to attend our meetings, and shown itself entirely hostile to our work. Yet in face of this Dr. Arundale be-rates the Protestant Churches for not following the example of the Roman Catholic Church in worshipping the Virgin Mary, and exhorts the members of The Theosophical Society to adopt this dogma of the Vatican and do honour to the "Queen of Heaven."

It is a measure of the grave change in the character of the members of the Society that no protest but that of the Canadian National Society has been heard. We commend to the members, and to Dr. Arundale himself the notable statement of the President of China, Chiang Kai-Shek, in his inaugural address to his people: "If I should ever transgress the limit of my power, it is the duty of every citizen to censure and correct me." Apparently Dr. Arundale resents such censure, and his friends confirm him in this.

Our Constitution was approved by the General Council in 1919 after nearly a year's consideration. "No member of the Theosophical Society shall promulgate or maintain any doctrine as being that advanced and advocated by the Society." That is Article V. Clause vii. which Dr. Arundale has violated. As we have frequently stated, he has a perfect right, if he wishes, to hold such

views and express them personally, but he has no right to give the impression, as he has done, that the Theosophical Society agrees with him. If the General Council were not so supine, he would hear further protests.

At the same time we must secure the personal liberty of our members. Article III. Clause iii. of our Constitution maintains this. "Every member has the right to believe or disbelieve in any religious system or philosophy, and to declare such beliefs or disbeliefs without affecting his standing as a member of the Society, each being required to show that toleration of the opinions of others which he expects for his own." The undogmatic mind has no difficulty about this, and we do not need Voltaire to guide us either. It is only since the parasitic policy of the "Liberal Catholic Church" has succeeded in penetrating the Society, so that no other religious system has anything like equal rights accorded to it, that any difficulty has arisen.

You state that there can be no "fixed standard of verity." That is a plausible way of side-stepping the motto of the Society. We need not go into the details, but you know, and we know, and everybody knows that the Adyar Society under Dr. Arundale holds views of truth different from those held under Colonel Olcott. All we ask is the same freedom in all the Lodges to study the Theosophy taught in The Mahatma Letters and The Secret Doctrine that was enjoyed up till 1906. You must admit that when an emissary of the Esoteric Section can come into a Lodge and tell the members that The Mahatma Letters are not Theosophy, a change has occurred. You repeat that we are unable to say what is Theosophy. But we can certainly assert what Theosophy is not. People may differ about the twilight, but there is no difference of opinion about light and darkness unless among the blind.

One of your statements is: "In this action I fear that we are making Theosophical history upon which future Theosophists cannot but look back with shame." There is little doubt about this, but the shame will be not for what you mean. It will be for those things about which all discussion or reference is suppressed in the Hitler manner, episodes which Adyar deems it expedient not even to have mentioned. You do not yourself give any examples of the alleged crude attacks, abuse, vilification, scorn, calumny, and vituperation which you profess to find in our protests. We continue to be F. T. S., and though you "will defend till the death our right to speak" in what Adyar journals are our views allowed to appear. One exception may be mentioned—the annual report of the General Secretary, but where else are the causes of our differences allowed to appear? It is very well to say, as you do, that we are "static, narrow, intolerant, discourteous," but you do not give examples of these offences, so that we might improve our manners.

You say that our basic idea is "a common fixed measure of truth, a yardstick of Theosophia." If you mean by this our commendation of The Secret Doctrine as a subject of study, we can only wonder if you have ever read the book, or if you have a cosmic yard measure that bears no relation to mundane affairs.

We are not conscious of calumniating anyone unless the statement of historic facts comes under that head. It may seem wise to you not to reply to the testimony of historic facts. History shows that the descent of all great moral and spiritual movements has begun by the introduction of sacerdotal influence and the exaltation of dogmatic belief to the displacement of reliance on man's own latent divine and developing powers. On the basis of the latter we can carry on "together, though differently," but

on the basis of the former we can only degenerate into a static, narrow and intolerant sect. You can look up the history of similar movements in the past, and decide whether you can arrive at any other conclusion. If you want an example of what is "static, narrow and intolerant" you only need to go to the Vatican. The Liberal Catholic Church has established a bridge-head in The Theosophical Society. This pleases Dr. Arundale very much. What he will do with it is indicated by the advice he gave to the members of the Society and the Protestant Churches concerning the Virgin Mary. He is a long way from the Preface to the second volume of "Isis Unveiled."

Fraternally yours,

(Signed) Felix A. Belcher,  
W. A. Griffiths,  
Maud E. Crafter,  
E. L. Thomson,  
D. W. Barr,  
G. I. Kinman,  
Albert E. S. Smythe,  
W. E. Wilks.

The General Executive, T. S. in Canada.

#### DR. WILKS' LETTER

805 Medical Dental Bldg.,  
Vancouver, B.C.,  
Friday, Oct. 29th, 1943.

Dear Mr. Hodson:—

I was glad to receive your letter, as in spite of the plain speaking in our Canadian Theosophist which you deplore as vilification and vituperation, it is quite clear that you have failed to grasp the reasons for our attitude and what it is our endeavour to do.

You ask us, in the name of that Brotherhood to which we all subscribe, and for the sake of a better and wider understanding of Theosophy which we all desire, to be 'kind', 'gentle' and 'tolerant' in our expressions of disagreement with some others, especially the Leaders past and present of the Theosophical Society. What, it would seem,

could be fairer, what more reasonable than this simple request?

Leaving all minor points in your letter aside, I will try to explain our attitude, and when I have finished, if I succeed in making myself clear, I shall be surprised if you do not declare that our fault lies in not being sufficiently out-spoken, in being too mealy-mouthed, and that we should not only call a spade a spade, but a bloody shovel, if that will help to right so great a wrong.

Now to my explanation of the attitude which you deplore and think could be righted by a little kindness, etc. You have heard of the Pearl of great price, which once a man knows of it, he will sell all he has to try and possess it. Well, a half century or so ago there were those who rediscovered this Pearl for all men to see. It was a Pearl of great purity and austere beauty, and possessed the unique power of healing all souls which gazed long and ardently upon it.

Soon the time came for those in charge of the Pearl to go hence, and they gave the guardianship of it into the hands of some others who were charged to keep it available to cure the spiritual blindness of all who desired sight. These others, dissatisfied with the number of worshippers of the Pearl, made an artificial pearl, larger and scintillating with colours of all kinds to attract the eyes of its worshippers with its glamour of many-coloured lights. Large numbers were attracted and great was its renown, and the real Pearl beyond price was forgotten by all but a few who had not been deceived by the substitution.

Supposing all this had happened, would those who knew of the substitution not be right in using every means in their power to show up the fraud and denounce those guilty of its perpetration, and would you advise them in the name of Brotherhood to be kind, gentle, and tolerant, toward this great wrong

which had been done? Toward whom should they exercise these qualities, to the wrong-doers or to those deprived by them of that which is above all price?

Well, my friend, that is, in the minds of many students of Theosophy in Canada, exactly what has happened in the T.S., and if you have read the Canadian Theosophist as you seem to imply, you should know it. Perhaps, though, you think this picture is overdrawn, exaggerated, false, or entirely without truth? Let us see. Books have been written showing the betrayal of Theosophy, but I will rapidly sketch some of the high lights of the history of the T.S. since the death of H. P. Blavatsky to remind you of the things you must know very well.

It was about 1908, when C. W. Leadbeater, the evil genius of the T. S., was invited back into the Society from which he had been forced to resign some years earlier, and most, if not all, the weird monstrosities subsequently foisted upon the Society are ascribed to his inventive powers. The first of these was an Adventist movement. The second coming of Christ was proclaimed. For fifteen years most of the energy of the Society was spent in expectation and preparation for the coming of the Christ who would inhabit the body of Krishnamurti and through him teach the world. In 1912, Mrs. Besant's famous Convention lecture in London was entitled, *The Coming Christ*. The Leaders announced that the "World Teacher" would have as before his twelve disciples, and about seven were actually chosen, of course from amongst those most prominent in the Society; our present President was one of them. This ghastly farce was broken up by Krishnamurti himself after the World Teacher was declared to have taken over his personality. He repudiated the movement and disbanded the whole organization built around him, since when he and the Theosophical Society

have gone their very separate ways. H. P. B. after reviewing some of the preposterous Adventist movements of the past optimistically expressed the pious hope that "Surely now we have seen the last of the Messiah craze". But alas! Not much more than a couple of decades later her Society had a Messiah craze of its own in full swing.

Next in importance among the monstrosities hatched out by the Leaders was a new Church complete with Bishops and Priests. Hatched out under very shady circumstances it, unfortunately, proved no abortion (like most monstrosities) but continues to live and flourish in close relation with most of our lodges. H. P. Blavatsky and her co-workers fought unremittingly against religious superstition and priestcraft, and the Mahatmas in their letters to Sinnett and Hume make it perfectly clear that in their opinion, sacerdotalism is by far the greatest evil which afflicts mankind. Yet, such was the adulation of the 'dear Leaders' and so sure were they of the blind loyalty of the members, that the utter incongruity of a *Church* sponsored by the T. S. did not prevent them from offering this crowning insult to the Founders of the Society. No longer need the members strive by "self-induced and self-devised effort" to reach the Light; no longer need they cultivate the power of Self-reliance in order to awaken the Divinity within. Priestly mummery will untwist the ether of their sins, whilst Bishops will pour down spiritual light from above upon their submissive heads.

This travesty of Theosophy, the greatest imaginable to the mind of man, throve and still thrives throughout the T.S. which was created to bring Theosophy, the very antithesis of this, to the attention of men.

Of course you know all this as well, or far better than I do, but I must go on to explain why we find it a little difficult to take you seriously when you ask us to

deal gently, kindly, and tolerantly, with the people who did these things and in doing them made Theosophy and the T. S., a thing of scornful merriment throughout the whole world. If anyone had wished to destroy the value of the T.S., and keep Theosophy from the world, they could have found no better way than this that was actually used.

Next in order in this descending scale, I might mention the World Mother, the Great Obstetrician on the inner planes, who ensouled and I suppose still does, the personality of Rukmini, Bishop Arundale's charming wife; and then there was the "King of the World" whose orders Mrs. Besant solemnly and portentously passed on to assembled members, and also there was the Jagat Guru. A World Teacher, a World Mother, a King of the World, a Jagat Guru; this unbelievable collection of high-sounding titles of persons of cosmic importance, (which one would think could only have escaped from some unpublished musical comedy by Gilbert and Sullivan), these preposterous inventions were eagerly and with proper awe accepted by the members without serious question or criticism.

All this is history which I but recall to your attention. It is an open book for anyone to study who cares to do so, and is well known to all who are not new-comers to the T.S.

But now I must deal with matters which are not mere statements of historical fact about which there can be hardly two opinions, but matters of teaching and its influence upon the members. Although not so obvious as the foregoing, this influence has been even more devastating in its effects upon the minds and souls of the members subjected to it, as I shall show. I know it is maintained by many in the T. S. that Neo-Theosophy—by which I mean the teaching evolved by the leaders of the Society since, let us say, H. P. B.'s death—is but an amplification of

the original teaching. This statement is often made but *it is not true*. If we reserve the name Theosophy for the original teaching, then Theosophy and Neo-Theosophy are in direct conflict in innumerable important matters. For a comparison in parallel columns may I refer you to a book by Margaret Thomas on this subject. Anyone who maintains these two teachings are the same in essentials has gone no farther than to compare the terminology used by both. I will cite two important and easily verifiable instances of this conflict. The Mahatmas and H. P. B., their Agent, went to considerable trouble to destroy the idea of an Anthropomorphic God. But Neo-Theosophy, as you know, lost no time in reverting to a belief in a personal God, remarkable as of old for his extraordinary willingness to be suborned by prayer and supplication.

The other instance I choose because it is clear cut and easily verifiable. If one compares what the Mahatmas have to say in "The Letters" regarding the states of human consciousness after death and what H. P. B. says about this subject in the Key to Theosophy, with the voluminous writings on the same subject in Neo-Theosophical literature, it is very evident that a contradiction exists between them. In the former it is explained that after death, with a very few specified exceptions, man lacks entirely objective selfconsciousness and lives in a purely subjective state. He is cut off from all new outside experience and is locked up with the content of his own mind and memories, and this continues all through the Lokas and Devachan, until by rebirth a new physical body is obtained. This teaching is in sharp contrast with the teaching of Neo-Theosophy which depicts man as going about on the Astral plane living his life and contacting others much as he did before death on earth. This agrees with the picture given by the Spiritualists with their



happy "Summerland", but is in complete conflict with the teaching of Theosophy. Either Theosophy or Neo-Theosophy may be the Truth, but certainly both cannot be.

I agree with you when you say there can be no fixed Theosophical orthodoxy or standard of verity, and so on. But we can say, "This is what Theosophy teaches", for the Founders of Theosophy left us a very definite doctrine, quite clear at least as to essentials. Any teaching which unmistakably conflicts with this, cannot be a mere amplification of the original teaching, Theosophy. For the last quarter of a century any view or teaching put forward with a little authoritative backing from Adyar has been called Theosophy, no matter how much it conflicts with the original teaching. This is the cause of great confusion and leads students to think that teachings the very opposite of Theosophy have the authority which association with the Founders of the Theosophical Movement gives them. Every student has to decide the truth or otherwise of any matter of vital concern to him. He accepts no authority, however high, as conclusive. The final authority must be his own intelligence and discrimination. This is not to say that he has no use for authorities, far otherwise; and he will accept as probably true statements from authorities according as he has found them reliable in other matters he has been able to check on.

The adulation of the Leaders of the Society, which they permitted and encouraged, and the great claims which they made for themselves or one another, or allowed to be made in their behalf, gave them an authoritative standing with the members, which combined with the complete atrophy of the critical faculty amongst the members, made possible the eager acceptance throughout the Society of fantastic movements, teachings and ideas such as

I have described. Eventually there was literally nothing too absurd for the members to swallow, if it but came as the authoritative pronouncement of the Leaders.

Finally, let us enquire what was the effect of all this upon the minds and souls of the members of the T.S.? Theosophy, and indeed all spiritual philosophies down the ages teach unanimously that the one thing above all others which stands in the way of man's spiritual awakening is Egoism, Self-love, which takes so many and varied forms, beautiful forms as well as ugly. And the greatest good that can happen to any man is that he wears down, undermines, and eventually attacks and utterly destroys the 'Giant Weed' in his soul—the sense of Separateness, the obsession of Self.

A spiritual appeal or teaching has this characteristic that always in one way or another it makes its appeal to that germinal part of man which is above considerations of personal importance, grandeur and personal power, that part which though it lacks the power to carry them out, sees and responds to the eternal validity of impersonal values. Compare this with the inescapable appeal to personal aggrandizement which permeated all sections of the T.S. This pernicious influence started with the Leaders who claimed to be on the 'threshold of Divinity' and in possession of marvellous clairvoyant and spiritual powers. The adulation which attended them approached worship; their pronouncements were regarded as practically infallible. "That power which the disciple shall covet as that which shall make him appear as nothing in the eyes of men" was forgotten, and personal aggrandizement reached unheard of heights. Books such as 'Lives of Alcyone' and 'Man, How, Whence and Whither' described the past lives of prominent members as known outstanding historical characters, as

relations of the Mahatmas, or of the Leaders; all calculated to play upon the vanity and give self-importance to those mentioned. This whole thing would have been immediately stamped as a ridiculous farce, an obvious imposture by any sane group of people. But the members, trained in the greatness and infallibility of the Leaders, trained in blind loyalty to them, allowed their sane critical faculties to fall into absolute abeyance; and a saving sense of humour cannot long live in such an atmosphere. Initiates sprang up over night (they were initiated in their sleep) among the favoured, and even common members were told that they were active in sleep as 'Invisible Helpers' on the Astral plane. Just to become a member cut one off from the common crowd and placed one in a special relation with the Masters. Everything was done, it would seem, which could be done to destroy the inherent sanity and to inflame the self-importance of every member of the Society.

I have said nothing of the E.S., an 'Esoteric' organization within every lodge, its members the elect, bound in blind loyalty to the Leaders and always secretly in the know about things which ordinary members were said to be not sufficiently developed to be told. Could anything more fiendish than all this which befell the hapless T.S., be devised to destroy the Society as a spiritual organization and as a vehicle for the spread of the spiritual light for mankind, called in this age Theosophy.

You say in your letter, "Our work is to spread Theosophy in such a way as to appeal to the finest minds". Imagine if you will, any mature individual who has read or heard of Theosophy and who thinks 'Maybe these people have something' coming to a typical lodge of the T.S. and being told by the members in their simple enthusiasm of their marvellous Leaders of the coming of Christ again in the person of one of their mem-

bers as the World Teacher, and of how they go out at night on the Astral plane to help the dead, and so on. Do you think that such an individual would not promptly take his 'finest mind' to a less farcical environment? The truth is, that the T.S. has in itself erected an almost insurmountable barrier between the 'finest minds' and Theosophy.

The history of the hapless T.S. makes a weird and fantastic story which beggars the imagination and strains credulity to the utmost. In the short space of fifty years, the life giving truths this Society was organized to proclaim have been twisted and distorted into their very opposites' its austere values have either been lost in a welter of psychism or have become sicklied over with mawkish sentiment, whilst its spirituality has become tainted with the market place. So fittingly enough today we find a Bishop,—yes a Catholic Bishop seated in the Presidential chair of the Society H.P.B. gave her life to found. Yet this is nothing other than has been the fate, sooner or later, of every great spiritual teaching.

There is a law, it is said, that every effort to bring Light into human life is met by a counter effort from the Forces of Darkness to destroy it. Certain it is that anyone who ventures to become a Light-bringer does so at his peril, for every chink in his armour, every weakness in his character, will be probed mercilessly to find a means to bring him down from his high resolve. And so it is, until we can produce a few individuals in every generation who are strong enough to establish and maintain a spiritual teaching in its purity, such efforts as the T.S. must remain in the main failures. Few things therefore, to the student of Theosophy can be more important than a clear understanding of the means used and the psychological forces involved in destroying most that was of greatest value in the T.S. For until the student, as the result of having

been fooled, deceived over and over again, learns to use his intelligence and distinguish the true from the false, the real from the unreal,—the Pearl of great price from its imitations—he can be nothing more than part of the great mass of dead weight liability which has to be *carried* in any spiritual movement with an open membership.

There is one other matter that seems to need clarification. Those who, like yourself, resent and object to plain, or if you prefer it, harsh criticism of individuals who have put themselves forward as Leaders and Teachers in the T.S., regard such criticism as personal attack. It should be clearly understood that private individuals and ordinary members have a perfect right to any opinion they like to hold or express; but the moment anyone puts himself forward as a spiritual leader or teacher his opinions become the concern of everyone involved, for he is there to lead or mislead others and his opinions and actions are no longer his private concern. Surely this must be perfectly clear.

And now, my friend, that I have told you as best I can why we feel *intolerant* of this fraud and substitution and show it up in no 'Kind and Gentle' manner whenever we can, why, may I in turn ask, is it that you who must know all this are not using your opportunities to point out the true from the false, the real from the imitation, for surely there is nothing that matters half so much.

Yours fraternally,

W. E. Wilks,  
Orpheus Lodge, T.S.

---

## BOOKS ON THEOSOPHICAL SUBJECTS

which have passed the tests of time and use  
Supplied on request. Forty years' experience  
at your service. Let me know your wishes.

N. W. J. HAYDON,  
564 PAPE AVE., TORONTO

## CANADIAN LODGES

### CALGARY LODGE:

President, E. H. Lloyd Knechtel; Secretary, Mrs. Lillian Glover, 418, 10th Ave. N.W., Calgary, Alta. Meetings at 231 Examiner Bldg.

### EDMONTON LODGE:

President, Mrs. F. Colbourne; Secretary, Mrs. Mabel Morrison, Suite 1, Mission Court, 109 St., Edmonton 8, Alta.

### HAMILTON LODGE:

President, Mrs. E. M. Mathers; Secretary, Miss Mabel Carr, 108 Balsam Avenue South, Hamilton, Ont.

### KITCHENER LODGE:

President, Alexander Watt; Secretary, Daniel Shantz, 14 Ontario St. S., Kitchener, Ont.

### LONDON LODGE:

Secretary, Mrs. Helen M. Shaw, R. R. 2, London, Ont.

### MONTREAL LODGE:

President, D. B. Thomas; Secretary, Mrs. Rose Ovenden, 3817 Girouard Avenue, N. D. de G., Montreal, Que. Lodge Rooms, Room 15, 1501 St. Catherine Street West.

### OTTAWA LODGE:

Secretary, David Chambers, 531 Bay Street, Ottawa, Ont.

### ST. THOMAS LODGE:

President, Benj. T. Garside, Secretary, Mrs. Hazel E. Garside, General Delivery, St. Thomas, Ont.

### TORONTO LODGE:

President, E. B. Dustan; Secretary, Dudley W. Barr, Lodge Rooms, 52 Isabella Street, Toronto, Ont.

### TORONTO WEST END LODGE:

President, Mrs. A. Carmichael; Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Goss, 20 Strathearn Boulevard, Toronto, 12, Ont.

### VANCOUVER LODGE:

President, Mrs. Buchanan; Secretary, M. D. Buchanan. The Lodge rooms are at 416 Pender Street West.

### VULCAN LODGE:

President, Guy Denbigh, Vulcan, Alta.

### ORPHEUS LODGE, VANCOUVER:

President, Ernest Wilks; Secretary, E. Harper, 1952 Ogden Avenue, Vancouver. Lodge room, Room 15, 163 Hastings St. W., Vancouver.

### VICTORIA LODGE:

President, Mrs. Minnie S. Carr; Secretary, George Sydney Carr, 33 Government St., Victoria, B. C.

### WINNIPEG LODGE:

Secretary, P. H. Stokes, Suite 7, 149 Langside Street, Winnipeg, Man.

## THE CANADIAN THEOSOPHIST

THE ORGAN OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY  
IN CANADA

Published on the 15th day of every month.



Editor—Albert E. S. Smythe.

Entered at Hamilton General Post Office as Second-class matter.

Subscription: TWO DOLLARS A YEAR

OFFICERS OF THE T. S. IN CANADA  
GENERAL EXECUTIVE

Wash. E. Wilks, 925 Georgia St. W., Vancouver.  
 Maud E. Crafter, 57 Sherwood Avenue, Toronto, Ont.  
 Dudley W. Barr, 18 Rowanwood Avenue, Toronto, Ont.  
 Felix A. Belcher, 250 N. Lisgar St., Toronto, Ont.  
 Edw. L. Thomson, 163 Crescent Road, Toronto, Ont.  
 William A. Griffiths, 37 Stayner Street, Westmount, P.Q.  
 George I. Kinman, 46 Rawlinson Avenue, Toronto, Ont.

## GENERAL SECRETARY

Albert E. S. Smythe, 5 Rockwood Place,  
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

To whom all communications should be addressed.

Printed by The Griffin & Richmond Co., Ltd.,  
29 Rebecca Street, Hamilton, Ontario.

## OFFICE NOTES

The correspondence arising out of Mr. Geoffrey Hodson's letter, which fills so much of our space this month, marks a crisis of vital importance in The Theosophical Society. Mr. Judge told me it was of the highest importance that Canada be held for Theosophy. Dr. Wilks' letter, to which I call special attention, gives the reasons why.

✱ ✱ ✱

New books announced by Rider & Co., 47 Princess Gate, London, S.W. 7, include *The Wisdom of the Overself* by Paul Brunton, Ph.D.; *The Occult Sciences in Atlantis* by Lewis Spence; *The Sword and the Spirit* by H. K. Chaloner; and *Healing and the Conquest of Pain* by Dr. Josiah Oldfield.

✱ ✱ ✱

Christmas boxes should be mailed by the time this comes under the eyes of

our readers if they have any over-sea friends to remember. Many would be glad to have one of our fifty-cent books for a remembrance rather than an elaborate card. A subscription to our magazine may be sent to any service man, navy, army or air force, for One Dollar for the year.

✱ ✱ ✱

*The Theosophical Movement* for August has a discussion on the existence or otherwise of ancient continents, reprinted from *The Theosophist* of August, 1880, the arguments being largely philological or ethnical, omitting altogether the incontestable geological argument that continents like America, Africa, Asia and Europe, composed largely of stratified rocks, must have been laid down in great ocean beds from the detritus washed down from pre-existing continents. No one with the least elementary knowledge of geology can deny this. The issue contains other invaluable articles reprinted from *The Path*, etc.

✱ ✱ ✱

The General Secretary had a visit on October 18 from one of his old newspaper friends, Mr. Thomas Bengough who had been living in Vancouver for some years but returned to Toronto on the death of his wife. He celebrated his 90th birthday on May 7 last when the occasion was marked by a dinner given him by the National Shorthand Association of America with which he has been associated for 35 years. During that time he has co-operated with them in the production of a general Phrase Book and of a technical Phrase Book in advanced Pitmanic outlines. Mr. Bengough's long experience as a Hansard reporter in the House of Commons and as a law courts reporter eminently qualifies him for such constructive work.

✱ ✱ ✱

I have been favoured with a copy of a pamphlet from the Forward Publishing Company, in the course of which it is argued that various other proposals

should be ruled out because they interfere with the "natural law of supply and demand because if that law is allowed to work freely it gives a fair deal to the manufacturer, the worker and the consumer." Whoever wrote this should go to Calcutta where the consumers are dying of starvation 130 per diem, and all they get for their demands is not even coffins. No, my boy; there is plenty to supply every demand except the demand of the manufacturer and his colleagues that he should not be expected to produce plenty for everybody as he can do and does in war time, not in response to "natural demand" but in response to the unrestricted stimulation of public opinion. Such public opinion should rule in peace time as well as during war, with natural results.

✻ ✻ ✻

Mr. Sidney A. Cook, president of the American Theosophical Society, has written as appears elsewhere in clarification of a statement by Dr. Arundale, and incidentally finds fault with us for publishing letters in which the motives of leading members of the Society are impugned. Our correspondents who have so written affirm that they have been deceived regarding the original objects and teachings of the Society, having discovered this on examination of the original records and literature, and naturally they imagine there must be some motives for such deceptions. Either such motives exist or the deceivers are so ignorant that they do not know the difference between one thing and another. If there are motives they ought to be known and set forth. If it is merely ignorance that has changed the policy of the Society we know of no remedy but publicity. Side issues of what Dr. Arundale means by "His Majesty's Opposition" are of no importance compared with the main issue of the alteration in the policy of the Society.

✻ ✻ ✻

The magazine *Time*, October 18, announces the death of Ignatius Timothy Trebitsch-Lincoln, "charlatan extraordinary to the 20th century," at the age of 64 after an intestinal operation at Shanghai. Born a Hungarian Jew, he soon became a Lutheran, left London as a Presbyterian missionary to Canada, reappeared as an Anglican curate in Kent. Then he dropped his clerical garb, called himself Lincoln, in 1910 was elected M. P. with the help of B. Seebohm Rowntree, a credulous cocoa king for whom Lincoln had turned Quaker. During World War I he became a British mail censor, was jailed after boasting how he had out-smarted Britain as a spy. Released as an Anglo-phobe, he tried to help German militarists back into power, eventually sold out to France. In the mid-'20s Chinese Buddhist Abbot Chao Kung was identified as Trebitsch-Lincoln reincarnate, founder of the "League of Truth." In 1926 he was allowed to return to the side of his British soldier son Ignatius (a condemned murderer), lost his race with the hangman, repented of his wicked life. In 1938 he transcendent-alized: "I am still pro-Chinese and therefore pro-Japanese." As World War II approached he demanded that peace-planless European governments resign before Tibetan Buddhist "supreme masters" were compelled to chastize them with secret "forces and powers." If members of the Theosophical Society were not the most credulous people in the world they would never permit themselves to be deceived by rascals of this type. But they will swallow anything that has a big enough pretence behind it to be different. One of our Canadian Lodges was broken up by this notorious spy when he posed as a Buddhist Abbot.

✻ ✻ ✻

When Dr. Arundale remembers that he has been elected president of a *Theosophical Society* for seven years and not

of a theological propaganda club, he does not do so badly, but for seven years he should practise the self-denying ordinance of keeping theology out of his head for the whole term. In discussing the prospects of the Convention to be held next December, he writes under the heading "Consult our Classics," and thinking of the "individual leadership of members of The Society by virtue of their knowledge of Theosophy" he goes on, "And I think first of all of their insight into the great works of H. P. Blavatsky and of the conclusions they draw from such insight. What conclusions do they draw as regards the essential material well-being of the world to be? I do not think they can reach truly Theosophical conclusions without a baptism in the teachings of the greatest of all Theosophists in the outer world. So I hope that H. P. Blavatsky will be the first study by all throughout The Society for the reaching of answers to the questions I have ventured to pose. Indeed it is not so much what H. P. Blavatsky may have written, but what conclusions the student is impelled to draw from the spirit which she has set on fire in him. The spirit of Theosophy must help the student to lay his own individual foundations for the superstructure of the new world. What are the foundations for the material and other well-beings of the new and post-war world?" This seems like a promising beginning but the Doctor does not stop there. "Naturally," he continues, "H. P. Blavatsky will not be the only source from which members will be able to draw their conclusions and formulate their principles. Every contributor to Theosophy's classic literature and each of us must determine who are such contributors—must be the subject of intensive study." By these other sources some may think he alludes to *The Mahatma Letters*, and the early volumes of *The Theosophist*, *Lucifer*, and *The Path*, but one must not jump to conclusions.

In some small way, I may be held to represent Czechoslovakia, having been born in a Moravian village in the north of Ireland in 1861. I take pleasure therefore in acknowledging the tribute paid to Czechoslovakia on the 25th anniversary of its independence, in *The Theosophist* for September. The various articles on the country, its Defence of Freedom, its fight for Spiritual Freedom, its Cultural and Social life and its History should gain many sympathizers for its national and racial ideals. Germany's brutal attempts to stamp out these fine flowers of a civilization which Germany may find it difficult to attain in the present aion, have aroused the soul of the world in protest. Charles IV, John Huss and Palacky are mentioned as national heroes of the past but Comenius and Count Zinzendorf must not be forgotten while Masaryk, Capek and Benes are honoured . . . The Moravians were the first Protestants in Europe and gave every man the right to interpret the scriptures according to his own understanding. In an article on Essential Reconstruction by F. J. W. Halsey, the Master is quoted on the Sin of Superstition. Dr. Arundale should note the urgent warning of the Master (page 365) that no slightest trace of superstition "remains in you." Mr. Halsey, I hope, will escape the contumely heaped upon me for pointing out one evidence of the President's superstition. I can understand his toleration of superstition, but its practice is something else to be considered. Our old reactionary Wynyard Battye, lets himself go on the Back to Blavatsky idea that Dr. Stokes fathered. Speaking of the writings of Besant and Leadbeater he says: "I believe that their publications are not to be found in the B. to B. movement." The poor man does not realize that it is because we have these books that we prefer Blavatsky's. It is just a matter of mental development. Some enjoy Beethoven. Others prefer jazz. In a

note on Planetary Chains Mr. James Arthur objects to the correction required by Mr. T. H. Redfern of a statement made regarding Mr. Judge's explanation of the septenary nature of the earth. Judge believed the seven globes formed one entity, by analogy similar to the principles in man. "For H. P. B. they formed, as I believe, seven different, separate entities," asserts Mr. Arthur with all the dogmatism of Adyarites who do not read *The Secret Doctrine*. "I challenge the writer to cite any text from the Masters or H. P. B. in direct support of the 'single mass' or 'interpenetration' idea." This is a typical example of the ignorance of Adyarite students of the teachings. Adyar edition of the S. D., page 220, vol. i.: "As Globes they are in co-adunition but not in consubstantiality with our earth." But we fear Mr. Arthur will refuse to be convinced.

### THE WAR

The War has reached a climax which cannot fail to have a speedy result. It is of course prudent to prepare for unreasonable continuance of the conflict on the part of the German leaders, but the people of Germany are at last scared and sick and starved, and the result of such conditions are not far to seek. The lesser and neutral nations have read the signs. Portugal has offered her assistance. Turkey has given indications of being willing to take some risks. The important Moscow meeting which resulted in an agreement of the four great nations, China, Russia, the United States and Great Britain, to establish peace on earth among men has been hailed with a satisfaction in the hearts of all sane people such as the world has rarely experienced. We must not look forward to a time when all troubles shall be ended, all problems solved, but at least we shall be able to feel that for the first time in recognized human history the vast majority of men are

pledged to live and work for aims that are not altogether selfish but include the well-being and the betterment of their fellow men of all races and nationalities. A new time is dawning. The Phoenix, the Bear, the Dragon and the Lion are agreed to fellowship and co-operation, a Square Deific which might well be chanted by some new Whitman of the era that is opening before us. Man after all, as Swinburne told us, is the Master of Things, and when he rises to the heights of his own innate divinity, and understands that the Word has become flesh in him and lives in mankind, there is no limit to the success that may attend the exertion of his benevolent will.

A. E. S. S.

### INTRODUCTION

#### TO "SERAPHITA"

BY GEORGE FREDERIC PARSONS.

(Concluded from Page 237)

The sixth chapter of "Seraphita" is chiefly occupied with the beautiful and noble discourse in which the dying mystic unfolds to her companions the secret of "the Path." Up to this time Wilfrid, who represents the Abstractive type, has failed to understand Seraphita. Earthly ambitions still burn fiercely in his breast. He cherishes what seem to him high thoughts of conquest. He would go to Central Asia and plot against the British supremacy in India. He would head such a formidable irruption of Asiatic tribes as Genghis Khan organized. He thinks that the prospect of sovereignty, of Oriental luxury and splendour, will tempt Seraphita, and he lays before her his far-reaching schemes and invites her to share his glory. But Seraphita smiles. There is for her no temptation in such offers. As she says, beings more powerful than Wilfrid have already sought to dazzle her with far greater gifts. Minna approaches with a more dangerous

because a purer and higher petition. She offers nothing but herself as a vicarious sufferer. Love raises her above the sphere of the Abstractive. Already the divine is shining through her envelope of flesh. Already the tender loyal heart has found the entrance to the Path by which alone the celestial sphere can be attained. Then the prophetic vision of Seraphita recognizes in these two the elements of Force and Love which, when purified by the discipline of patient suffering, will unite to constitute the relatively perfect Angelic entity. This is the meaning of the exclamation she utters in gazing upon Wilfrid and Minna before she begins her final address to them.

That address may be regarded as in some sense a recapitulation of all the doctrines indicated and shadowed forth in the preceding parts of the story. Once more, and now with large insistence, the doctrine of reincarnation is dwelt upon, and referred to as the necessary and sole explanation of human evolution. Balzac here treats it more in detail than he has done elsewhere, although it is the basis of Seraphita's history, and makes intelligible the whole structure of her existence and theosophy. Seraphita traces existence from the Instinctive sphere upward. The lower life is occupied, she says, with exploitation of the purely material. It is there that the inevitable lust of possession has to be worked out. It is there that men toil and struggle to amass earthly treasures, and, having succeeded, slowly realize the uselessness of such riches. Matter must be exhausted before Spirit assumes control, and it may happen that many existences are required to expend the craving for impermanent possessions. As a rule men indulge their lowest desires to satiety, and it is only when disgust overcomes them, when the emptiness of all mundane enjoyments is demonstrated by prolonged experiment, that they begin to seek a

more excellent way. The long period of education is protracted still further by relapses and excesses. "A lifetime is often no more than sufficient to acquire virtues which balance the vices of the preceding existence." At length suffering brings love, and love self-sacrifice, and that aspiration, and aspiration, prayer; which is the direct bond of union between the finite and the infinite. It is indeed no new lesson. The directions for gaining the strait and narrow path have been vouchsafed to the sons of men in countless forms and ways, and with characteristic perseverance and malign ingenuity they have nullified their opportunities again and again by quarrelling over the phraseology and disputing the authority of the guide-books, while ignoring the significance of the essential harmony which subsists between all the rules laid down for the attainment of ultimate felicity and emancipation from evil. Yet the recognition of the superior attractions of the Divine can never be for all alike. For the souls still chained to Matter in the Instinctive sphere, for the majority even of the Abstractives, the allurements of the impermanent world must continue to be insuperable. It is only the minority who possess the courage to endure what follows every sincere movement of separation from the Material. The latter, though in one sense but a condition of Spirit, is in its lower forms hostile to Spirit, and it resents its renunciation by the few who elect to enter the Path. Instinctive Man not only deliberately prefers his inferiority, but regards with positive enmity all who evince a desire to ascend in the scale of existence. This enmity is in part automatic and literally instinctive, and resembles the resistance which an air-breathing creature offers to immersion in the water. Instinctive Man cannot breathe nor live in the rarified atmosphere of the Divine, and feeling this he fights with all his strength against



every attempt to raise him to that uninhabitable sphere. The Path once chosen, therefore, the pilgrim must make his account with persecution and scorn and ill-feeling. The world will not let him go at all willingly, and if he tear himself away will surely follow him with its sharp displeasure.

These two, however,—Wilfrid and Minna,—were, as Seraphita knows, prepared by previous incarnations to take the step which should separate them from the world; and her final task is the application of the stimulus which shall determine them in entering upon their new and arduous career. As he listens to the seraphic eloquence of the mysterious being he has in vain tried to entangle in the meshes of an earthly love, Wilfrid feels his carnal impulses dying, and a purer, loftier aspiration takes their place. For the first time he begins to comprehend who and what Seraphita is. For the first time he is made to perceive the delusive character of his dreams of earthly glory and magnificence. For the first time, also, he looks upon the human girl beside him with a feeling of respect and sympathy, and is drawn toward her by the attraction of a common yearning after the higher life. Then the work of Seraphita on the plane of humanity is finished, and in a final burst of rapture and adoration her spirit breaks the last fragile bonds uniting it to the body, and she rises into the celestial spheres to receive judgment, reward, whatever is awaiting her. The final chapter, entitled "The Assumption" by Balzac, is an exquisitely imagined vision. Wilfrid and Minna, kneeling by the body of Seraphita, are rapt into the heavens. For a time their spirits are permitted to leave their shells and traverse the lower fields of space, when they are enabled to witness the splendour and majesty of their late companion's divine initiation. There is no need to follow or interpret this closing scene. It is only necessary to

say that it fitly concludes a marvellous work; that notwithstanding the unavoidable employment of some conventional forms, the elevation, nobility, solemnity, and beauty of the whole picture render it a literary masterpiece, scarcely equalled and not surpassed by the most glowing conceptions of the greatest mystical poets.

So ends Balzac's philosophical trilogy. The human imagination, stretched to the utmost in sustaining these last and loftiest creations, can proceed no farther. The author has traced the evolution of the spirit from the natural to the divine world. Beyond the threshold of the latter it is not given to incarnated souls to penetrate save in vision, but the path which leads upward has been indicated with equal skill and subtlety, and some intimation has been given of the glories which attend translation to the celestial sphere. As a literary experiment "Seraphita" stands alone. It is bold,—some may thing even to rashness,—but its beauty and spirituality must be admitted, and it crowns a difficult and laborious enterprise finely, harmoniously, and majestically.

## KING ARTHUR'S TABLE

*(Continued from Page 262.)*

and lo! as crystals of glass to the spear doth hold, and as ice to the iron it clingeth, and none looseth it from the blade."

Consequently there can be little doubt that the Giant Orion is the effigy in question, for the centre of the boat from which King Anfortas used to fish, and the ship of the Grail<sup>(2)</sup> also used by Parzival, lies exactly below Rigel. So with the evidence of this "Mysterious Ship, destined to sail the seas for centuries", whose masts converge on the sun, and the red wound on which hung "the Enchantments of Britain", and the Tamuz month on the calendar June, and the world wide legends about the

wounding of other resurrection gods, Adonis, Osiris, Tamuz, Mithra and the rest; and also that the Sword which could "enforce an entrance into the Earthly Paradise" and was a Hallow of the Grail, was kept here where Orion naturally kept his world famous sword, we conclude this is the most likely place in which to find "the writing on the Grail".

The ceremonies attending the resurrection gods imply the alternate return of summer and winter, the festivals always began with mournful lamentations, and finished with a revival of joy as they returned to life. We find the same lamentation characterizing the Grail history, and on Parzival's visit to Anfortas "thro' the lofty palace was weeping and wailing sore, the folk of thirty kingdoms could scarce have be-moaned them more."

Now if we turn to the last 'book' of Wolfram von Eschenbach's 'Parzival', we see that the Templars have been keeping their king Anfortas alive with the sight of the Holy Grail, "from the might of Its mystic virtue fresh life must he ever draw", for its essential quality is "fresh life", and "the word" had been seen "writ on the Grail" that should cure him by the aid of Parzival.

So the future Grail-keeper Parzival, arrives at the castle with his "black and white" brother; and "the twain did Anfortas welcome with gladness, and yet with grief, and spake, 'O'er long have I waited tho' I win from thine hand relief.'" In answer to the wounded king's query—"Now say where the Grail it lieth?", Parzival "three times on his knee he bowed him in the Name of the Trinity" and asked "what aileth thee here, mine uncle?"

That last fateful question is never answered! but the king's question "now say where the Grail it lieth" is answered by Parzival's gesture of genuflexion "in the NAME of the Trinity", "here", in front of the wound, and at once An-

fortas is healed and his face shone with radiant beauty; no doubt illumined by the three-fold rays of the holy Name. Also when Parzival tells the news of the healing a hermit replies—"God is Man, and the WORD of His Father; God is Father at once and Son, and I wot thro' His Spirit's working, may succour and aid be won!"

The Welsh Bards have retained this WORD which was not allowed to be uttered, (hence Parzival's gesture), from the earliest times of Sumerian colonization; and "when swearing in the Name of God, a Bard stood within the form or figure of the Divine Name, which was, as it were, imperceptibly drawn on the Gorsedd". That is to say, at the time the sunrise, on equinoctial and solstitial days, casts its rays over the 'station stones', "the rays should traverse them in the direction of the stone of the covenant, in the centre of the circle", as for example on a sun-dial, or like the broad-arrow.

Wolfram von Eschenbach tells us, it was written upon the Grail that no one should ask what country or name or race its priests came from, the reason being that just as the Zodiacal creatures were pre-Christian so the writing was of the same age, for we have already been told that the Holy Grail existed at the time the monarch of Bagdad ruled over "two-thirds or more of the earth's kingdoms".

(3) "'Twas a heathen, Flagetanis, who had won for his wisdom fame, . . . .

And he was the first of earth's children the lore of the Grail to tell.  
By his father's side a heathen, a calf he for God did hold,"

This calf dates him as between 2000 and 4000 B.C. when the sun was in Taurus.

"And the heathen, Flagetanis, could read in the heavens high

How the stars roll on their courses, how  
they circle the silent sky,  
And the time when their wandering  
endeth—and the life and the lot  
of men

He read in the stars, and strange secrets  
he saw, and he spake again

Low, with bated breath and fearful, of  
the thing that is called the Grail,

(4) In a cluster of stars was it written,  
the Name, nor their lore shall  
fail . . . .

And the sons of baptized men hold It,  
and guard It with humble heart,  
And the best of mankind shall those  
knights be who have in such ser-  
vice part."

#### Notes:

- (1) See 'Freemasonry and the Ancient Gods' by J. S. M. Ward, for the illustration of "The raising of the Master", and the note on the three 'rods': also his chapter on the ancient charges, which hold many of the same traditions as the Arthurian legends; Ward quotes "it began with the first men of the East, who brought it to the West" and says—"I contend that the brotherhood were descended from a remote period".
- (2) I venture to suggest that the hawk or "Griffon" standing on the rudder of the ship was laid out in the year 2776 B.C. because in the civil calendar of Egypt at that very date, the July new year was exactly recorded by the heliacal rising of Sirius, which famous star, if traced from the planisphere, falls under the edge of the "Griffon's" wing, marked by an abundant spring of water. The spring is clearly shown on Grove Lane in the illustration of the "Griffon". Plate 15, "A Guide to Glastonbury's Temple of the Stars."
- (3) Wolfram von Eschenbach's "Parzival", translated by Jessie L. Weston, page 262.
- (4) See "The Stars in their courses," by Sir James Jeans, illustrated by (four) inspiring photographs of the constellation Orion, and its nebulosity.

#### BOOKS BY CHARLES JOHNSTON

Bhagavad Gita .....	cloth	\$1.25	leather	\$1.75
Crest Jewel of Wisdom .....	cloth	\$1.25		
Great Upanishads, vol. I .....	cloth	\$1.50		
Parables of the Kingdom .....	paper	.50		
Patanjali's Yoga Sutras .....	cloth	\$1.25		
Song of Life .....	paper	.75		

THE QUARTERLY BOOK DEPARTMENT  
P. O. Box 64, Station O. New York City

#### TWO PATHS TO KNOWLEDGE

The purpose of this essay is to meet a challenge and to record a definite step forward made by Sir James Jeans in his book *Physics and Philosophy*. In his book (p. 74) he challenges Sir Arthur Eddington's acceptance of the *a priori* or epistemological method as a valid way to truth. All our Theosophical teaching has been obtained by its use rather than the strictly inductive way of physics. And the proof of its validity is the remarkable confirmation given by modern research to claims and predictions made in its literature before 1891.

Sir James also gives an incorrect definition of epistemology (p. 75) when he asserts that its only tool is pure logic, for the word *epistemon* means intuitive knowledge, the antithesis of the empirical method of physics.

In a book, *Apocalypse Unsealed*, by James Pryse, a vivid and startling light is thrown on this matter. Briefly his story is that Greek numbers were expressed by letters instead of figures, with the result that Greek words express a number by the sum of their letters, in this case *epistemon*—or intuition—has the value of 999. Many students have been puzzled by the strange statement in *Revelation* as to the number of the "Beast", which is 666, the number of a man. This is the number value of the Greek *o phren* which means the mind of man, the mind that distinguishes him from all sub-human beings.

Further, there is an ascending scale of values of the various grades of man's consciousness from 333 to 1,000, thus: 333 is the number value of *akrasia*, also of *akolasia*, both meaning incontinence or licentiousness; 444 is derived from *speirema* which gives animal magnetism; 555 is from *epithumia*, desire, which man shares with the animals; then comes 666, the lower mind as said above; 777, from *stauros*, cross. This

is important as it is the bridge by which man crosses over from the logical process to the intuitive. And it is this transmutation that lifts man from the limits of opinion to the clear dicta of Truth; 888, the value of *Iesous*, the Greek form of Jesus, is the higher mind, the noumenal mind of which Plato speaks so highly; 999, the value of *epistemon* or intuitive wisdom, the Greek root of epistemology which Sir James derides as a method in its own right for acquiring, not merely knowledge, which it can and does, but wisdom, a much greater attribute within man's powers.

Finally, we learn that 1,000 is the value of *ho nikon*, the Conqueror, that seems to be of the nature of Christos, from which Christ is derived, and which was known and used by the Greeks hundreds of years before the great teacher of Galilee trod the hills and plains of Judea. Students of Theosophy will readily see the identity of *ho nikon*, the Conqueror, with Atma; of *epistemon*, with Buddhi; and *Iesous*, Higher Mind with Manas; the three are one constituting Spiritual Man, the Noumenal Man of Plato. All this, of course, is not evidence of anything to physicists who reject the noumenal as they do anything super-physical. Curiously, the pineal gland is the physical organ of intuition which can be definitely cultivated, or ignored or weakened by abuse or disuse. Strangely, Sir James Jeans with his keen love of Truth, has naturally developed his intuition to a considerable extent, which makes him the clear-seeing and capable writer which he is.

Evidence for the reality of a second and farther reaching path to knowledge is available in Dr. Richard Bucke's famous work *Cosmic Consciousness*. The Doctor was head of the mental hospital in London, Ontario, and so was familiar with many strange phases of psychology. He was an intimate friend of Walt Whitman, a friendship which

probably had much to do with the labour of love of gathering together of records of people in ancient and modern times who possessed that intuitive faculty which gave them such eminence in history.

He gives us fourteen "valid" cases which include such names as Gautama, Jesus, Paul, Plato, Plotinus, Swedenborg, Boehme, Francis Bacon, Balzac and Walt Whitman. There is an additional list of thirty-six not so "valid" or typical, such as Tennyson, Emerson, and many moderns who preferred to remain anonymous. One of the outstanding facts in them all is that the faculty reaches its maximum intensity between the ages of 25 to 45, which means at the best of physical fitness. It seems to be spontaneous in its onset. In all cases it manifests as an identification of themselves with all humanity and even with the sub-human kingdoms of nature. Naturally he stresses Whitman, being so intimate with him.

It is natural also that attention will be called to the spots on these various suns, but this should not blind us to the deep and swift current of their inner life. A life that made them sufficiently famous with their contemporaries to make and keep records of their lives and teachings.

Let us admit that these examples do not meet the demands of physicists, they are given for those who are interested enough to know more about it and may cultivate it as ardently as our devoted physicists develop their particular ways and means. Aldous Huxley may be quoted in this connection. In his *Ways and Means* we find this:

"Human beings are creatures who, in so far as they are animals and persons, tend to regard themselves as independent existents, connected at most by purely biological ties, but who, in so far as they rise above animality and personality, are able to perceive that they are interrelated parts of physical and spir-

itual wholes incomparably greater than themselves."

Definitely, the most outstanding evidence for a second path to knowledge is to be found in Theosophical literature, for that came from men who have in varying fulness developed the special tool of intuition which is superior to logic, for that depends upon the accuracy of its premise, while intuition does not—it supplies a faultless premise whatever fallible logic may deduce from it.

*The Secret Doctrine* asserts that the Great Pyramid was designed as a fane of initiation because the structure is replete with geometry and mathematics of a very high order. This was asserted as early as 1888, since when much valuable work has been done in revealing some of its secrets by Marsham Adams and D. Davidson. The former made the discovery that the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*—so called—supplies the proof of the Secret Doctrine assertion. The accepted names of passages and chambers are meaningless because they are based on the assumption that the Pyramid was built for tomb purposes, whereas their correct names and uses are in the case of the King's and Queen's chambers, the Chamber of the Open Tomb, and the Chamber of New Birth respectively. But for our present purpose the Ascending Passage, and the Grand Gallery will suffice, for the *Book of the Dead* is explicit that they are the Double Hall of Truth; the narrow passage of about three by four feet through which to this day one must grope so as to reach the higher part which is called Truth in Light, being 28 feet high, and having much masonic symbolism expressed architecturally. Truth in darkness represents the candidate for initiation being taught that the exclusively inductive and empirical method of knowing has its rightful place which is to lead up and into Truth in Light in which noumenal Truth is taught, not in human

language but in ideas flashed into the physical brain. It is safe to say that the idea of the quantum did not come to Max Planck in words; he put into words the idea that came to him. So with the idea of atomic numbers instead of atomic weights that came to Moseley.

Very many passages from *The Secret Doctrine* could be given along this line, but three only will be offered. They are all taken from just one chapter: "The Masks of Science".

"Occultism says that in all cases Matter is the most active, when it appears inert. A wooden or a stone block is motionless and impenetrable to all intents and purposes. Nevertheless, and *de facto*, its particles are in ceaseless eternal vibration which is so rapid that to the physical eye the body seems absolutely devoid of motion: and the spatial distance between these particles in their vibratory motion is—considered from another plane of being and perception—as great as that which separates snow flakes or drops of rain. But to Physical Science this will be an absurdity."

This was written before 1888;—How did the writer know? Certainly not by the empiric method. Certainly it anticipates Sir James Jeans' "Gossamer Universe." Again, *The Secret Doctrine* taught that "on the doctrine of the illusive nature of Matter, and the infinite divisibility of the Atom, the whole Science of Occultism is built," And again:—"The Atom belongs wholly to the domain of Metaphysics". Only a higher Path to knowledge than that of the Physicists can account for such statements that have been corroborated by Modern Science in later years. One more quotation:—

"Therefore, though Occult Science may be less well informed than modern Chemistry as to the behaviour of compound elements in various cases of physical correlation, yet it is immeasurably higher in its knowledge of the ultimate Occult states of Matter, and of

the true nature of Matter, than all the Physicists and Chemists of our modern day put together."

This topic has by no means been exhausted. If sufficient interest is aroused a further instalment along the same lines may be attempted.

Felix A. Belcher.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### CLARIFICATION

Editor, *The Canadian Theosophist*:—

I have noted with regret the letter signed Annie Leslie Roger, appearing in *The Canadian Theosophist* of September 15th. The Editor of course is entirely within his rights to admit member opinion to the pages of the Magazine and members may properly expect that space will be accorded them. Is it not, however, the generally accepted rule that the pages of Theosophical magazines, and indeed of the best of many others, should be available for expression of opinion only when such opinion is courteously conveyed and without impugning the motives or imputing unworthy motives to others, especially when the situation discussed can be explained on the basis of motives that are sincere and honourable?

I read Dr. Arundale's statement in which he referred to "His Majesty's Opposition." It did not seem necessary to ascribe to this phrase any reference to the Inner Government or an analogy identifying Adyar with the first Section of the Society, or to assume that "His Majesty" referred to the "Adept Founder" of the Society. Knowing Dr. Arundale very well, I am quite certain that he would never refer to one of the Masters by the phrase, "His Majesty." The simple explanation and one that I am sure is true is that Dr. Arundale was using the phrase, "His Majesty's Opposition," to indicate those out of office who were critics of those in office. The content and nature of the article clearly

indicate that and such is the normal and accepted use of the term in British circles in which it has parliamentary application.

I see nothing "ambiguous" in Dr. Arundale's remarks. Your correspondent's statement that they are intentionally misleading, is unworthy of any writer in a Theosophical magazine and of the magazine itself. The "clarification" is so simple that it need not "come from Adyar." This, I trust will serve as such clarification.

Sidney A. Cook.

Olcott, Wheaton, Ill.,  
October 6.

### "INHERENT FALLACY"

Editor *The Canadian Theosophist*:—

Recently there has come to my attention an article by G. S. Arundale, "Theosophy and Freedom", reprinted by the English "Theosophical News & Notes" from the May 1943 issue of "The Theosophist". It has doubtless misled many people by its apparent plausibility, and I wondered whether your magazine could find room for an attempt to point out its inherent fallacy.

The way in which Mr. Arundale writes about the Theosophical Society would indicate that "brotherhood" and a sort of pleasant good-fellowship were its only purposes. There are plenty of other societies, clubs, and churches, where such purposes can be put into effect, and any so-called theosophists who are interested *only* in that ought to spend their energies in these other circles. If the Theosophical Society is turned into a sort of club, where people get together just for the sake of fellowship, and each member's opinion is supposed to be worth just as much as any other member's opinion, in a sort of debating society style, there is no purpose in the existence of the Society at all. Unfortunately, just that has been more or less the "approved" policy for many years, with the natural result of a

continual decline in membership and vitality.

Theosophy *was* supposed to be a revelation to the modern world of part of the Ancient Wisdom, which is real knowledge of *truth*, accumulated, verified, and passed on by generations of adept investigators. Theosophists were supposed to be students of that truth. There is no room for "individual opinion" in such matters, as truth is not a matter of opinion. To be sure, anyone is allowed to be a *member* of the Society, no matter what his beliefs are, but after he is in the Society, surely the leaders thereof should endeavour to teach him at least some modicum of the truth. The nominal leaders themselves have *no right* whatever to hold, or express, opinions contrary to the statements of the Adept Leaders.

If an individual such as Mr. Arundale holds opinions directly contrary to the expressed statements of the Adepts concerning things on which They *know* the truth, such an individual might have a right to be a simple member of the Society, and in his ignorance to express his "own views" as such. But the President, the alleged representative of those Adepts, *has no such right*. It is not his business to express his "own views" in a private, personal magazine, and then blandly announce that no one must take such views as representing those of the Society. Rather, it is his business as President to find out the *true* views which are held by the Adepts, and then propagate those views, to aid in the enlightenment of the membership, and of the world at large.

It is my conviction that, no matter how much freedom of opinion you want to allow to individual ordinary members, *no one* should hold office in the Society, even a small office in a lodge, unless he or she has given evidence of loyalty to the Adept Founders and of honest endeavour to carry out *Their* purposes. No other policy can justify

the claim to be still identical with the Society which Madame Blavatsky founded by Their orders. Has Mr. Arundale-given any evidence even of being aware of any such requirement? The members should give this matter some thought.

(Mrs.) Anna K. Winner.

253 South 9th St.,  
Philadelphia 7, Pa.,  
October 15.

## THE MAGAZINES

We have received the following magazines during the month of October: Eirenicon, Hyde, Cheshire, Sept.-Oct.; The Middle Way, Sept.-Oct.; The Christian Theosophist, Sept.-December; Evolucion, Buenos Aires, July and Aug.; Theosophy, Los Angeles, October; The Toronto Theosophical News, October; The Indian Theosophist, June and July; The American Theosophist, October; Y Fforwm, Cardiff, Wales, Sept.-October; The Theosophist, August and September; U. L. T. Bulletin, No. 179, September, London; Ancient Wisdom, October; The Pilgrim Way, Spring and Autumn issues; Bulletin of Montreal Lodge, September; Revista Teosofica Cubana, July-August; Revista Teosofica Argentina, July-August and Sept.-October; Lucifer, Boston, November; Theosophy in Action, September; Canada at War, October; Inner Culture, Oct.-Dec.; The Indian Theosophist, August; The Theosophical Forum, November; The Theosophical Movement, August; The Link, Johannesburg, August; The Pro and Con Vox, October.

---

### BOOKS BY THE LATE GEORGE R. S. MEAD

Fragments of a Faith Forgotten; The Gospels and the Gospel; Thrice-Greatest Hermes, 3 vols.; Apollonius of Tyana; Did Jesus Live 100 B.C.†; The World-Mystery; The Upanishads, 2 vols.; Plotinus; Echoes from the Gnosis, 11 vols.; Some Mystical Adventures; Quests Old and New; Orpheus; Simon Magus; The Pistis Sophia.

May be had from JOHN WATKINS

21 Cecil Court, Charing Cross Road,  
London, W.C., 2, England.

## RELIGIOUS BIGOTRY

In a copy of the *Psychic News* for May 15 last, sent me by Mrs. Janet Inman, Hannen Shaffer complains to the Home Secretary, Herbert Morrison, of the conviction and sentence to 12 months' imprisonment of Stella Hughes on the evidence of two police women, acting as *agents provocateurs*, who were themselves shortly after found guilty of robbing houses they were supposed to guard and had been carrying on such thefts for a long time. Mr. Shaffer in his letter pointed out that Stella Hughes had only one defence against the charge under the Vagrancy Act, which was to say she was a medium, and that would render her liable to conviction under the Witchcraft Act, passed by King James I because, when he was crossing the North Sea to bring his bride, Anne of Denmark, the sea was rough and it was officially decided that the sea had been made rough by Witchcraft. Under this Act mediumship is illegal. "Here are we," wrote Mr. Shaffer to the Home Secretary, "at least you and I, if no one else—waging a war for liberty, and yet all the time Spiritualists, who really believe that they can comfort the bereaved by giving evidence of Survival, are made rogues and vagabonds." "I am in favour of freeing Spiritualists from restrictions on their liberty and of repealing obsolete Acts," declared Clement Atlee, now the Deputy Prime Minister, at the time of the last election. "Why should one religion be persecuted," pursued Mr. Shaffer, "at a time when we are urged on the air, and even in a wireless speech by the Queen, that only a return to religion can save us? It has long been whispered that there is Roman Catholic influence in the Home Office. Whether that is true or not I do not know," he observed. "Stella Hughes was not pretending to turn bread into flesh, or wine into blood. She is a medium of the type who recently

convinced the last Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Master of the Temple, the Dean of St. Paul's, and all the other distinguished members of a committee appointed by the present Primate, and adopted by his predecessor, that the evidence for communication with the dead had been established."

## POET'S HOME CIRCLE

A biography of W. B. Yeats, the famous Irish poet, has just been published. "No part of Yeats's various activities is left untouched," says Sydney Carroll, reviewing the book in the "Daily Sketch". Well, I have not seen the biography, but I would be prepared to wager that Yeats's Spiritualism does not appear.

Carroll says the book refers to the poet's "mystical meanderings." There was nothing mystical or meandering about Yeats's Spiritualism. He had a home circle at which his wife was the medium, and received through her a series of philosophical messages which he carefully copied into notebooks and indexed. He had many seances with Hester Dowden, Geraldine Cummins and Margery Crandon.

Meandering, of course, is always what the other fellow does.—*Psychic News*, 20th February, 1943.

---

**THE PATTERN LIFE**  
**THE SYMBOLIC LIFE OF CHRIST**

By F. Homer Curtiss, M.D.

The most astonishing yet revealing interpretation of the Gospel story. Gives it a new spiritual yet logical and scientific appeal.

Gives the only satisfactory explanation of the many inaccuracies and flat contradictions in the GOSPELS.

A great reconciler of conflicting opinions and theories.

Amplly documented and indexed for students.  
 Price, \$2.50

Send postal for descriptive circular.

**THE CURTISS PHILOSOPHIC BOOK CO.**  
 5130-C Connecticut Ave. Washington, B, D.C.



# SOLOVYOFF'S FRAUD

*Being a critical analysis of the book "A Modern Priestess of Isis" translated from the Russian of Vsevolod S. Solovyoff by Walter Leaf.*

By BEATRICE HASTINGS

(Continued from Page 256)

"I communicated the contents of her letter to Madame de Morsier, who was greatly delighted, and at once sent to Torre del Greco a whole bundle of newspapers, with remarks about the Theosophical Society, etc. In the middle of May Madame de Morsier handed me the enclosed letter which she had received."

[The letter is in French and says that Madame Blavatsky has had no reply to her letter to Solovyoff. She wonders if Solovyoff is still a friend. She says also, that Hodgson had pronounced all the phenomena fraudulent and everyone, H. P. B. herself, Olcott, Damodar—all charlatans.]

"'What do you think of this' Madame de Morsier asked me.

"'. . . I think . . . that it would be well for me to make by way of pendant to Hodgson, . . . a careful and dispassionate inquiry. Unluckily, I cannot go to Naples now.'" [pp. 120-1]\*

[Letter produced by Mme. Jelihovsky.]

Paris, 48 Rue Pergolese,  
May 18, 1885.

Dear Helena Petrovna, What does this mean? I have written to you twice, and posted the letters myself. I have had from you one letter in which you announced your arrival at Torre del Greco. To-day, Madame de Morsier tells me that you have not got my letters. I telegraphed to you at once, and I am sending this letter registered. Where our letters disappear I cannot conceive . . . But in any case you have no right to doubt my sincere feeling for you. I do not change; that is not in my character. I too, am very ill, dear H.P., I am suffering seriously from my liver, and no-one here has done me any good. There is no getting away from ill-luck

and annoyances . . . Believe me that I am doing everything in my power to come to see you, if I can only get strength enough and a spare week. But in my position this is so extremely difficult, and I am so tied in every way, that I much fear it will remain a dream . . . What am I to do? . . . I have no right to live my own life . . . I had an idea of passing this spring in Italy,—then I would have met you accidentally, so to speak . . . "

[Mme. J. writes: "Here follow details of how he was being deceived and swindled. He goes on:]

Generally speaking, I have been greatly disenchanted with the people here. Relations that began by being friendly have invariably ended in every sort of exploitation, and rude demands on my purse . . . Your enemies' trick about the investigation of the phenomena may be all nonsense too. But force must be met with force. I must see you; but I have only one head, two hands, two feet, a very sickly body, and Karma binds me in every direction. Do recover! This is my heart-felt wish.

Yours, Vs. Solovyoff.

[H. P. B. had come from India accompanied by Dr. Hartmann, a Theosophist, Mary Flynn, a devoted, although rather erratic, young lady from Bombay, and Babaji Dharbagiri Nath, a CHELA of Mahatma K.H. H. P. B. replied to Solovyoff, describing these persons; says that she is going to write the "Secret Doctrine" and intends going to a quiet German town to live. H. P. B. wrote again to Madame de Morsier (where is the original letter?) thanking her for a sum of money sent by an unknown Parisian friend, and refers to Solovyoff: "I like very much my friend Solovyoff, but he says stupid things about our Mahatmas, this poor unbelieving Thomas." Considering the tone of Solovyoff's own letters, there is not much evidence

of this unbelief! One can only conclude that Madame Blavatsky was indulging in a little ironical flattery of his occasional exhibition of the *ESPRIT FORT A LA MODE*. He next writes concerning his efforts on her behalf. Letter produced by Mme. J.]

Paris, 4 Rue Balzac,  
Friday, June 12, 1885.

Dear Helena Petrovna, The last two weeks have not passed in vain. Crookes and Sinnett have been here. I have made their acquaintance; but the thing is that all is arranged and prepared to overwhelm, here at least—that is in the Paris press—all this rabble of Coulombs and all the asses, to what learned society soever they may belong, who could for a moment pay attention to her abominable pamphlet. The pamphlet has produced universal indignation here, and I have not even had to defend you to anybody—so that after this dirty intrigue, they have only increased the sympathy felt for you . . . Ah, if I could only see you!

Your sincerely devoted and affectionate

Vs. Solovyoff. (p. 302. App.)

### XVII

[Evidently, Solovyoff escaped somehow from his financial and domestic embarrassments in Paris, for we next find him in Switzerland with Madame de Morsier.]

“. . . I sent Madame Blavatsky our address. At the end of July, there was a letter from her:—

Dear V. S., Pardon me, I could not write; my right hand is so swollen that my fingers are numb. I am in a bad way. I start to-morrow to settle for the winter in Wurzburg, a few hours from Munich . . . I shall go there with Babaji and Miss F., my friend, but a great fool. Lord, how sick I am of life! Now do write if you cannot come yourself . . . Madame X [H. P. B.'s aunt] promises to come. I do not know if it will be so . . . I shall go through Rome and Verona.

“Five days later came a telegram from Rome . . . I telegraphed, ‘Come here’, and explained by what route they should come . . . having agreed with Madame de Morsier that if Madame did not come we would meet her at Geneva. But she came.”

[Solovyoff describes the plight of poor Madame Blavatsky, swollen, worn out and venting her fatigue and ill-temper on the two companions.]

“Somehow or other all was finally arranged, and in an hour Helena Petrovna settled in an adjacent house, dined with a poor appetite, and scolded on . . . .

“There, my friends, now you see my position yourselves. Some days I can move neither hand nor foot and lie like a log, and no one to help me in anything. Babaji only spins like a top and never stirs from his place and this Mashka F. is a born fool, and I curse the day when I agreed to take her with me. You see, the fact is that she was dreadfully bored there at home and thought that she would find some agreeable distractions in travelling . . . .

“She suddenly calmed down, changed her manner . . . and soared into the other spheres.”

[Everyone notes this extraordinary sudden change of H. P. B. from a frenzied despair at even some trifle to “other spheres”; her anger was always ephemeral and unmalicious.] “And from these other spheres was heard her inspired voice.

“Her thoughts . . . were always expressed by Helena Petrovna with an unusual simplicity and clearness which were an indubitable proof of true talent, and were in fact the principal magnet that drew me to her. At times, and quite unexpectedly, she changed into a really inspired prophetess, she was entirely transfigured . . . (pp. 132-6)

[Solovyoff decided to pass the summer at Wurzburg. Both he and Madame de Morsier appear to have become enchanted with H. P. B., despite her fits of temper that flashed up and

passed. A week on the mountains had done her a world of good.]

"I wrote to Myers that not knowing Hodgson or his investigation, or how exact and dispassionate it was, I should undertake one of my own; I should pass a longer or shorter time at Wurzburg, where Madame Blavatsky was to settle, and should learn everything. The results of my investigation I should report in proper time.

"This letter I showed in Madame de Morsier's presence to Madame Blavatsky, and she . . . was highly delighted." (p. 138)

### XVIII

"I found her at Wurzburg . . . There had been arranged for her [by Dr. Hartmann] very convenient and roomy lodgings in the Ludwigstrasse, the best street of the town . . . She again fell very ill; Babaji came running up to me, all trembling with terror . . . Madame was very bad, a doctor, a famous specialist for internal complaints, was greatly alarmed . . .

"To my inquiry about his patient, the doctor replied: 'I never saw anything like it in the whole course of my many years of practice. She has several mortal diseases—an ordinary person would have been dead long ago from any one of them. But hers is a phenomenal nature; and if she has lived so long, she may, for all we can tell, live on yet.'

"For the moment then, her life is not in danger?"

"Her life has been in danger for years, but you see she is alive. A wonderful, wonderful phenomenon."

"I again found Helena Petrovna all swollen up and almost without movement. But a day passed, and she managed to crawl out of her bed to her writing-table, and wrote for several hours, gnashing her teeth with anguish . . . pages and sheets were pouring from her pen at an astonishing rate . . ."

[There are several things of importance that Solovyoff sees fit not to mention; that for the first day or two, Dr. Hartmann was at Wurzburg; that he himself was accompanied by his lady companion whom he introduced to everyone as his wife, and their child; that Mme. Fadeev, H. P. B.'s aunt arrived from Russia by, at latest, the 27th of August, a day or two after H. P. B.'s illness; that Miss Arundale and Mohini came from London on Sept. 1st. Thus, Solovyoff could scarcely have passed much time ALONE with Madame Blavatsky. He writes (p. 144): 'I settled myself in Rugmer's Hotel . . . and all the time I did not spend in sleeping, eating and walking through the town, I passed with Madame Blavatsky'. Apart from H. P. B.'s other visitors, his own companion, must have made some demand on his time. He keeps her entirely out of the picture in his book although, as his letters say he had considerable domestic 'karma', and was not at all free to do as he pleased. H. P. B. wrote to Sinnett on August 19th: 'Solovyoff is so indignant that he has sent in his resignation to the S. P. B. He wrote a long letter to Myers and now the latter answers him, . . . begs of him not to resign and asks him whether he still maintains that what he saw at Elberfeld was not a hallucination or a fraud; and finally begs him to come and meet him at Nancy—where he will prove to him my GUILT! Solovyoff says that since he is placed by their REPORT as so many others, between choosing to confess himself either a lunatic or a confederate—he considers it a SLAP ON THE FACE, a direct insult to him and answers Myers DEMANDING that his letter should be published and resignation made known. He intends stopping here at Wurzburg with me for a month or so, with his wife and child.' On August 28th, she writes again: 'I do not see why my aunt should delay your coming . . . She sleeps during the day and talks with me all night . . . Rugmer's Hotel is close by . . . The Solovyoffs are there . . . We see each other very little though, for we both of us have work to do.' (H. P. B. to A. P. S. pp. 113, 117). Miss Arundale and Mohini stayed a week and Sinnett and his wife came immediately after they left. Mrs. Sinnett stayed with H. P. B. and Sinnett at the hotel. Solovyoff says (p. 138) that H. P. B. had promised him lessons in occultism: 'I give you my word of honour that I will reveal all to you, all that is possible'. Maybe, she said it, in any case, she would have preferred him, an own countryman, to many

others. Still, after that first visit at Elberfeld, the Mahatma M. seems to have ignored Solovyoff. Mahatma K. H. wrote him a word or two; as in the case of Hume, Massey, Madame Coulomb and others, K. H. may have been inclined to try patience far longer with these slippery people than the stern "Master". However much impressed H. P. B. must have been by the undoubted psychical value of Solovyoff, a clairvoyant and clairaudient, although quite passive, she had to reckon with the Master as to the question of revealing PROCESS, and she knew this; so it is very doubtful that she said anything about revelations, but likely enough that she said she would show him some phenomena and give him the chance of making discoveries for himself—as every novice has to do, no process ever being told to novices. However, very soon after reaching Wurzburg, she began to discern that Solovyoff was an incorrigible gossip and scandal-monger, and a sentence in a letter to him indicates that Vera had told her that Solovyoff had "attacked the society" (p. 130). Perhaps it was only through Vera that H. P. B. learned of Solovyoff's "doubting Thomas" attitude, for not one letter to H. P. B. herself shows anything of the sort.]

### XIX and XX

[In these two chapters Solovyoff tells about the phenomena performed for his enlightenment—the which perverted narrative in no wise belongs to this Plain Tale and will be dealt with in the sequel.]

### XXI

"Two or three days afterwards I saw Madame X [Mme. Fadeev] who had come from Russia . . . After Mme. X there came to Wurzburg Sinnett and his wife, and Mohini with Miss Arundale.

[Miss A. and Mohini and Babaji left for London BEFORE SINNETT CAME.]

I used to call at Madame Blavatsky's lodgings to talk to Madame X . . . I used to go for walks with her, leaving Miss Arundale with Mohini and Sinnett with Madame Blavatsky. The latter was now occupied several hours a day, dictating ("Incidents in the Life of Madame Blavatsky", published 1886.)

.....  
"Miss Arundale soon went back to

London, taking with her Babaji as well as Mohini. I also was on the point of leaving Wurzburg . . . Before my departure I paid Madame a farewell visit."

[Madame Blavatsky had prophesied certain future events to happen to Solovyoff during the next two months. We never learn WHAT were these prophecies, but among them certainly was some kind of statement referring to Solovyoff's psychical development and, possibly, that he would once again be taken in hand by the Master M. Maybe, H. P. B. fancied that she could persuade the Master; there is plenty of evidence that she frequently exercised her CHELA right to propose a new novice for whom she would be responsible. However that may be, Solovyoff went away so full of faith in his approaching glorification that he sought out Professor Richet in Paris. A letter Solovyoff solicited from Richet after H. P. B.'s death throws some light on Solovyoff's communication to him, and can scarcely have been quite satisfactory to Solovyoff. I translate from page 346.]

When I saw you, you said to me—"Reserve your judgment, she has shown me some astonishing things, my opinion is not quite decided yet, but I thoroughly believe that she is an extraordinary woman, endowed with exceptional faculties. Wait, and I will give you further explanations."

Letter produced by Mme. J. p. 288. App.]

Paris, Oct. 8, 1885.

"Dear Helena Petrovna, Which is the better, to write at random, or to hold one's tongue and work for the good of one's correspondent? . . . I have made friends with Madame Adam, and talked a great deal to her about you; I have greatly interested her, and she has told me that her *Revue* is open not only to theosophy but to a defence of yourself personally if necessary. I praised up Madame de Morsier to her, and at the same time there was another gentleman there who spoke on your behalf in the same tone, and Madame Adam wished to make acquaintance with Madame de Morsier, who will remain in Paris as the official means of communication be-

tween me and the *Nouvelle Revue*. Yesterday, the meeting of the two ladies took place; our Emilie was quite in raptures . . . In any case, this is very good. To-day I passed the morning with Richet, and again talked a great deal about you, in connexion with Myers and the Psychical Society. I can say positively that *I convinced Richet of the reality of your personal power and of the phenomena which proceed from you*. He put me three questions categorically. To the first two I answered affirmatively (presumably, that she had shown him phenomena and that she possessed "extraordinary faculties"); with respect to the third I said that I should be in a position to answer affirmatively, without any trouble, in two or three months. But I do not doubt that I shall answer affirmatively, and then you will see! There will be such a triumph that all the psychists (S.P.R.) will be wiped out . . . Yes, so it will be; for you did not treat me as a doll? . . . I start the day after to-morrow for St Petersburg . . . What will happen?

Yours cordially devoted

Vs. Solovyoff.

### THE SEQUEL

What did happen? Apparently, nothing. Solovyoff was given neither visual, auditory nor documentary evidence of the existence of the Masters. "And then you will see! there will be such a triumph that all the psychists will be wiped out." Solovyoff nursed the remarkable delusion (suffered long since by A. O. Hume and others) that if only HE were put in a position to swear to the phenomena, the world would be quite satisfied; this same world that rejected one who could DO the phenomena! The case is exactly that, for, if Solovyoff had not been convinced that the phenomena were genuine, he would not have dreamed of being able to prove them to the world.

And here he was—completely ignored and rejected; what a position! He had "convinced" Richet and Madame Adam and who knows who else of the powers of Madame Blavatsky; he had patronized "our Emilie", Madame de Morsier, whom, later, when she takes his side, he will call

the noblest of women; had certainly shown off to all the Paris theosophists, none of whom had been honoured by a note from the Master, even so much as to tell them that he could not open their eyes that would not see. He had written to the S.P.R. and Myers severe letters, had published his experiences in the S.P.R. Journal and in the REBUS. Above all, again—Richet, he had CONVINCED RICHET: and here he was with all this gossip about him floating around and himself with nothing to show for all his boasting. What could he do? Only one thing—denounce Madame Blavatsky as a charlatan and so be received back by Richet, Myers and Company with some sort of dignity left: as a scientific enquirer, who, like the rest, had thought it his duty to look into these strange matters, impartially; impartially, without fear to find himself the dupe of the charlatan and then—to denounce her, a painful, but public, duty.

And this is what Solovyoff did.

On his return to St. Petersburg, Madame Jelihovsky received him with open arms, sympathized with all his troubles and more than once, as she confesses—

"tried to prevent his losing his head; trusting to his honour (?) I even allowed myself to make statements which, perhaps, I had no right to make. I never concealed my mistrust of the miraculous side of my sister's work; I told her so openly, and at this time, ignorant of much that I learned afterwards, I was in many ways unjust to her and to those about her. I should, of course, have been more reticent in my admissions, could I have foreseen that he would make use of my friendly confidence, not for his own profit only, but as a weapon to sow discord between us by revealing it." (app. p. 290.)

Vera's orthodox arguments gave him the best mantles to throw over his defeat; from this time, Solovyoff grasped the possibility of figuring as a saviour of Christian Russia from what he calls the "miasmatic exhalations" of Theosophy. Christians may perhaps not be too grateful to him. He writes on p. 284:

"If a new sect has any success, it gathers adherents chiefly among the hysterical who are susceptible of suggestion".

The feeblest Christian might object to this analysis of the beginnings of successful religions.

Meanwhile, Theosophical history was being made in other directions, in ways that singularly fortified Solovyoff and his schemes. A scandal concerning Mohini and some ladies had burst in London and Paris. Madame de Morsier was seriously upset. A letter from H.P.B., advising public discretion about the whole affair merely exalted her into the notion of perishing **POURVU QUE JE FASSE MON DEVOIR**, her notion of this duty being, apparently, to publish the scandal far and wide and thus bring suffering on the innocent numbers of Theosophists.

At this moment, also, the news of the coming Report denouncing H.P.B. as an impostor was sedulously being scattered by the S.P.R. Undoubtedly, Solovyoff was early informed of it by his friend, Myers. At the end of December, he returned to Paris and immediately clanned with Madame de Morsier and her party. He told Mme. de M. that H.P.B. had believed in Mohini's guilt from the very first. A lie. She never believed it to the last, but none the less, advised against an official enquiry that would have oozed through somehow to the newspapers. In fact, there is no evidence against Mohini further than that he had replied to love-letters from a certain lady. But Madame de Morsier had set off on a path from which she seems to have felt small inclination to return. She showed Solovyoff a letter in which his own precious name was mentioned. He then wrote to Madame Blavatsky a letter that she describes to Sinnett as a "thundering, sickening, threatening letter. He threatens that if I bring his name into this dirty scandal, all my devils (meaning Masters) will not save me from utter ruin. He speaks of Baron Meyendorf—of Blavatsky, and the reputation made for me by FRIENDS in Russia and elsewhere".

The fact seems to be that Vera and her daughters, who declared that H.P.B.'s name "stank in their nostrils as Christians", had gossiped with quite shameful family disloyalty to Solovyoff, and about matters of which it is very clear they never knew the real circumstances. What the tales were exactly we never hear. Solovyoff cannot produce any of them. His book is quite vague on the subject. Maybe, he got nothing but vague hints. All the rumours about H.P.B.'s "wild youth" boil down to almost nothing! Examination by the gynecological specialist, Oppenheim, proved that she was physically deformed and practically an hermaphrodite and

could not have indulged in any of the pranks usually included in the expression, a wild youth. Wild she was, but her wildness was for complete freedom to study occultism. We scarcely need her own statement to confirm the obvious attitude of the orthodox among her family towards this study... She says that she deliberately led people to accuse her of seeking love-affairs in her wanderings, as a cover for what she was really engaged in, and for which some of the family would have anathematized her. One of the most touching traits in H.P.B. is her affection for this family that so long treated her as the Ugly Duckling. Her letters to Vera contain a few small deceptions. Whose fault? The families of geniuses are mostly unsympathetic (less so, nowadays, perhaps, when genius is recognized as a commercial asset to possible heirs and heiresses—at least, after a first bit of favourable publicity). Madame Blavatsky knew better than to give babes strong meat, and indeed it took Vera many years to grow up to the view of her sister as a vastly superior personage whom she could only honour without hope of deeply understanding. H.P.B. forgave (though that is hardly the word, but one should rather say, calmly overlooked) all the damage Vera had done to her, took her to her bosom and died happily friends.

Solovyoff's letter drove H.P.B. into a frenzy. It was, as she says, the last straw on the burden of slander, disloyalty and treachery she was suffering from all sides, her only friend near at this time being the angelic Countess Wachtmeister. The S.P.R. Report was out; every post, so the Countess tells us, brought letters from wavering Theosophists when not stark insults from some who resigned. It is a story that would take volumes to tell properly, so many lines cross and re-cross, so many mysteries there are to be unwound; and some are probably beyond unwinding. She was ill as few have been ill and lived. And she was writing the "Secret Doctrine". Fallen on evil days and evil tongues, she continued as genius does continue in spite of all.

I think it likely that Solovyoff, for once, speaks the truth when he says he had not written to her for some time and had left a letter or two (she says that she only wrote him three times) without reply. She must have wondered painfully why he did not reply, for that she had taken him into her almost uniquely wide, if not very deep, perhaps, affection, there is small doubt. She loved everyone in a way and could

always overlook any mischief they did to her and I verily believe that if even the Coulobms had turned up again in misery and tears, she would soon have been giving them tea and chatting of old times and saying in that quaint way of her—"But why did you do it, what had I done to YOU? How damned absurd of you! What fools! Well, let it go."

It is likely, too, that she expected that her Master would again take some notice of Solovyoff. Had he not come to see her when she was under the cloud, come even to Wurzburg and stuck to her, sent angry letters to Myers and his resignation from the S.P.R.? From all we can gather, this Master had made up his mind about Solovyoff during that astral visit at Elberfeld: there would be no further relations between them. The liar and bully he proved himself to be would have been written in his aura as well as the egoistic and upstart motives of his craving for chelaship and the possession of the powers he saw in H.P.B. She would not be told plainly that he was rejected but left to find it out for herself if she could, for such is the rule; but the usual hint she doubtless did get and failed to take, as she had failed more than once before in similar cases, and precisely through that careless liking, she rarely could quite abandon anyone she had known at all intimately. Theosophical story is full of instances of her struggles not to see what was impossible to tolerate in anyone she liked. It is a kind of virtue none too common, but the defect of it is fatal in a chela, whose whole business it is to develop cool clarity of understanding, however charitably he might act. She confused frequently this psychological process, thinking uncharitably but blinding herself and acting as though she had seen nothing to beware of. It was only in piercing to a person's occult capacities that she could be cool; ordinary dealings in human nature found her ready to take everyone to her capacious bosom and many a snake she took! Her adventures in this way would be sufficiently amusing if some had not turned out a tragedy for her. What is certain is that no soul of her sort was ever an intriguer with the least success! She was to the last absolutely unable to refrain from saying what she thought of anyone at the time. She made enemies of the stupid and pompous, but her friends adored her even although she trod on their own toes. "You know you don't mean it!" could always bring her to that state of winsomeness that both Olcott and Countess Wachtmeister noted as such a lovely trait. Her

swearing at you at times became quite unimportant once you knew her.

And so, she liked the amusing, conversational Solovyoff, the Russian from her own Russia, and managed to forget or overlook what she had seen well enough at times, the bitter-minded, ambitious man, a bad gossip too. (See H.P.B. to A.P.S. P. 184.) Yet, a clairvoyant and clairaudient, he had come under notice of her Masters who are said to examine every psychic as a possible blessing to humanity and to be protected, but also as a possible curse and to be left to—those who may be called for short, their father, the devil. Madame Blavatsky knew much about all this that the non-psychic world laughs at, and when Solovyoff departed for Russia, still vowing friendship, doubtless she supposed that he had still a chance. "We bade one another farewell as though we were dearest friends, almost with tears . . . Not a word, except vows that he would stand up for me in Russia, and help me in every way did I hear. And then he suddenly—goes and holds his tongue. Without cause or reason he is in quite a different mood in St. Petersburg. You do not know, in the innocence of your soul, but I know; he is simply frightened of the abuse of the Psychological Society . . . You see, they have declared of a *Gentil-homme de la chambre* that he is either a liar or suffers from hallucinations . . ." Thus she writes to Vera after receiving the "thundering, sickening threatening letter", not knowing at the time what she will soon know; and almost as soon forgive, that Vera herself was for something in Solovyoff's change of attitude, that Vera had exercised her Christian influence and gone the length of telling the scoundrel some early gossip about her sister.

But what could this gossip have been? Obviously Solovyoff was never given any particulars or he would have put them in his book. The story was probably not known in its particulars to Vera who was still a schoolgirl when H.P.B. was married. Vera could only have heard vaguely of a romance that was surely never known in full even to the elders. Madame Ermeloff gives us a clue in her *Memoirs*. I had vowed never to draw attention to this romance, but someone else may do worse . . . As a very young girl, Helena Petrovna gazed with awe and adoration on a certain prince, an occultist. She fled to, not with, him, and he almost certainly sent her back home. Then, her father being far away and her mother long dead, the angry grandfather and aunt married her off quickly to Mr. Blavat-

sky. She speaks to Sinnett of her "prayers and supplications not to be married to old Blavatsky". There is a story that she herself induced Blavatsky to propose because her governess declared that no-one would marry her, so ugly and ill-tempered. Change that to so disgraced and there may be much truth in it. If she did induce the unfortunate man to propose, she was horrified at the resolution to make her go through with the contract. And she soon fled again, now a real married woman and, as she seems to have understood it, free to take the road to liberty with no grandfathers and aunts to interfere. Off she went, and maybe she met the prince again, maybe not. I should say, yes; but I believe her own words that she loved occultism more than man and her medical dossier proves that, for her, love's young dream can never have been anything but a dream. Nothing is known. One day, some great novelist may make a story of it, but nothing is known.

The whole province had gossiped, however, and the echoes of this gossip reached Solovyoff, vague even as echoes, for his pen at its most malignant is reduced to blustering hints. Solovyoff's "sickening threatening" letter has apparently not been preserved. H.P.B. immediately sent it to her aunt, Madame Fadeev, as we learn from a letter to Vera, quoted on p. 314:

"It is my fault that they were angry with you. I have done a foolish act. In vexation and anger at you, I sent off to them a letter of Solovyoff's to me, that begins in a most mysterious style: 'After what has happened, I can have no further communication with you'. And it ends with all sorts of allusions to matters twenty and thirty years old".

To Sinnett, she wrote with more hope of sympathy: "He threatens that if I bring his name into this dirty scandal, all my devils (meaning MASTERS) will not save me from utter ruin. He speaks of Baron Myendorf—of Blavatsky, and the reputation made for me by friends in Russia and elsewhere . . . Solovyoff threatens me moreover that Mr. Blavatsky is not dead but is a 'charming centenarian' who had found fit to conceal himself for years on his brother's property".

H.P.B.'s reply to Solovyoff begins with a paragraph of pure genius.

"I have made up my mind. Has the following picture ever presented itself

to your literary imagination? There is living in the forest a wild boar—an ugly creature, but harmless to everyone so long as they leave him at peace in his forest, with his wild beast friends who love him. This boar never hurt anyone in his life, but only grunted to himself as he ate the roots that were his own, in the sheltering woods. For no reason, a pack of fierce dogs is loosed against him; men chase him from the woods, threaten to burn his native forest and to leave him a wanderer, homeless, for anyone to kill. For a while, he flies before the hounds, although he is no coward by nature. He tried to escape *for the sake of the forest*, lest they burn it down. But lo! one after another, the wild beasts which were once his friends join the hounds; they begin to chase him, yelping and trying to bite and catch him, to make an end of him. Worn out, the boar sees that his forest is already set on fire and that he cannot save either it or himself. What is left? What can the boar do? Why, thus: he stops, he faces the mad pack of dogs and beasts and shows his spirit, himself as he really is. He bounds on his foes in their turn. He slays them until he has no more strength, until he falls dead—and then he is *really* powerless."

(To Be Continued)

(Copyright. All Rights Reserved.)

## THE BHAGAVAD GITA

A Conflation prepared from available English translations by the General Secretary

The Esoteric Character of the Gospels  
By H. P. Blavatsky.

The Evidence of Immortality  
By Dr. Jerome A. Anderson.

Ancient and Modern Physics  
By Thomas E. Willson.

Modern Theosophy  
By Claude Falls Wright.

The Four Books at 50c Each.  
Postage on Books Extra.

## THE BLAVATSKY INSTITUTE

52 ISABELLA ST.,

Toronto, Ontario