

# The Irish Theosophist.

---

## LETTERS TO A LODGE.

[This series will be published in book form by *The Path*. All rights reserved.]

### VI.

COMRADES,—One of the first questions which meets us upon this path of ours is the question of right action. Into the many details of this question we will not at present enter, but we will occupy ourselves with one aspect only, to wit:

How shall we learn to discover and to encourage that Intuition which alone leads to right action?

Now there are three phases of consciousness which students are prone to confuse with a fourth, which is Intuition. These three are Intellect, Impulse and Instinct. What we require is some clear idea of the distinction between these and the Intuition. With Intellect it is easy to deal, for we readily distinguish its action in the reasoning faculty. Intellect has so little in common with Intuition that no danger of confusion arises here. To study, to reason, to debate, to analyze, to think in detail—all this is not Intuition and we are in no danger of mistake.

A real difficulty arises when we come to Impulse. Very many students mistake their impulses for intuitions. Yet the distinction is really very marked.

Intuition is the synthesizing faculty carried to its highest power. Facts are marshalled and synthesized in a flash; their array passes too rapidly for the brain consciousness to take note of separately; it notes the sum total alone, as the optic nerve sees the ray of light only when it becomes objective and—so to say—stationary, and not during its long journey towards the eye nor in its many millions of vibrations. The Intuition is *Buddhi-Manas*. It synthesizes and perceives. Also it informs. Very often its light falls upon some truth of which in this life we had no previous knowledge, for Intuition gazes directly upon

the Real. It is, in fact, itself a ray of the One Light, and one of its highest aspects is, as you know, the Kundalini force. But to-day we are only dealing with that form of Intuition which the ordinary man and woman can trace in themselves.

The distinguishing trait of Impulse is an interior propulsion towards action. It differs from Intuition in that this is a seeing, is apperception, while Impulse is invariably a desire to do. Impulse is wholly kamic.

Instinct, on the contrary, is largely pranic. It is the interior selective faculty. By it the lower mind takes what the physical and animal self most needs in life. By it the cells on their plane select, reject, assimilate. By it the creatures live, move and procreate. From its action comes the automatic self-preservation which we notice even in states of unconsciousness. By its action also does the astral or vital body of all creatures attract or repel that which is needful or harmful to its preservation and development. By the aid of instinct the kamic principle chooses what the intellect most desires—or what it wills—be it high or low. By it also the purified Soul seeks the real source of Truth and Light. For Instinct is of all planes and is the unbiassed servant of the Mind and Will. Where these are not as yet evolved, the Instinct is guided by the Life principle and by Kâma, which is pure in the pure and mindless creatures, and in the lower elementary lives, animal, vegetable or mineral. Instinct is one and undivided, but desire is manifold. Desire—and later on, Will, if all goes well with man—is the driver of Instinct.

The chief difficulty, therefore, is to distinguish between Intuition and Impulse. The best present guide for the student is the fact before named, that Intuition sees, while Impulse drives forward. Intuition is the seer. Impulse is the actor. Instinct, and not Impulse, should be the vehicle of Intuition. It would be so if our minds were free from sensuous desire. For our Instinct would be guided by Intuition toward the higher life. Or to put it differently, what Intuition sees, Intellect should establish and Instinct should carry out. For Intuition sees by its own true light, it is self-luminous, and the Instinct of men who have developed their Intuition is of the same order of life and gravitates by its own nature towards that light which it needs in order to live the life desired. When the purified mind instinctively discovers the true path, the path of its true needs, this path is from time to time illumined by flashes of Intuition. Intuitive ideas rise, full-orbed and flashing, upon the expectant mind.

Impulse is the vehicle of human desire. Its invariable tendency

to action shows this. We never feel an impulse to sit still. We may feel an instinct to do so.

Intuition carried to its highest power is, of course, *Buddhi*. In manifestation upon this plane it is *Manas*. "*Buddhi* never acts on this plane, where the acting agent is the *Manas*." It is moved by the will-force of occultism. That *shakti* is a spiritual force which sets a certain centre (in the case of *Buddhi*) in motion. But, as was before said, we are not now concerned with this highest form of Intuition. Few are they who even know the approaches thereof.

The developing Intuition may be known by a flash of a certain color in a certain centre, accompanied by an impression of knowledge, of a sure conclusion, upon the brain. A great mystic once said that the Intuition might be known from the simplicity of its utterance, which was always, "Thus saith the Lord." Its action is instantaneous; it illumines the darkness of the intellect. It is *unaccompanied by any feeling or emotion whatsoever*; note this well. The flash is in the head centre; the stir arises in the heart as a rule, and is thence flashed into the head centre. But no hard and fast rule can be given. Such intuitive knowledge is a partial recovery of what the soul has seen during sleep or trance, or what it knew "when journeying with Deity." For the pure Soul is pure Light in its own nature and is itself the Truth which we seek. The flash spoken of here is the moment of registration of this intuitive knowledge, or recovery of Truth, upon the brain. This registration, in cases of trance, is said to occur at the last moment of the passage back from the spiritual state to the objective state, and through this registration the knowledge gained is "brought through." In the cases of students not adepts, the knowledge has more difficulty in getting through; it may occur some time later and is but partially recovered, and usually mixed with error, for reasons pertaining to scientific occultism into which we will not at present enter.

Many persons who might hear all this about Intuition might say: "Oh, yes, I know that Intuition." But it is far less frequently known than is supposed, because few discern its action from that of mere brain flashes ("flashes in the pan" literally), which often arise from a variety of causes, even physiological ones. The light of the *Manas* is not the light of *Buddhi*. Neither its color, its mode of motion nor its action is that of *Buddhi*. But even were I able to fully describe these, I would not do so, lest they be falsely imagined to exist where they do not.

Of Impulse again it may be said that the student will find it to be of an explosive nature. That is, an outward propulsion of force takes place, usually attended by more or less heat or warmth spreading

suddenly through the body, and, sometimes, a sudden heat in the brain. A swift quickening heat and an attraction towards action; thus can Impulse best be described by me.

Of Instinct again it may be said that the upper brain appears unconscious of its action. This action is felt in the lower brain, the centre of automatic action and the real "Home of Isis," if mankind only knew it. The self-preservation of the drowning; the leaping aside from a danger before the brain has cognized the fact of danger; the going unexpectedly to a place or to a person where we meet what we most desire, all these are instances of instinctual action. Generally speaking, we are led by Instinct just as we breathe the air, without conscious thought. Instinct is pranic and wholly impersonal, which Impulse never is.

The Intuition is only true for the average man when judgment, heart and conscience verify it. These three are the witnesses of Intuition. But Intuition is Lord over all. It affirms; the witnesses only attest.

JASPER NIEMAND.

(*To be continued.*)

---

### "THE JUDGE CASE."

#### FINAL REFUSAL TO GIVE COPIES OF DOCUMENTS TO ACCUSED.

IN order to give the prosecutors every opportunity I wrote in February to Colonel Olcott, asking again for copies of the written documents in his possession forming the basis of Mrs. Besant's charges, and reminded him of his promise at London last July to send me the copies. While doubtful as to the result, I thought that perhaps he would see the propriety and wisdom of giving me the copies. But it is now quite evident that no intention ever existed to deal fairly. He replies under date of Feb. 26th, 1895, as follows:

"MY DEAR JUDGE,

". . . I don't know where you get your law from, but hang me if I ever heard of an accused who has been furnished with a copy of the charges pending against him, expecting that the documentary proofs in the hands of the prosecuting attorney shall be given him before the issue is on for trial. . . . I have given copies to nobody; Old's copies were taken by him before the action began and *while he was the custodian* [italics mine.—J.] of the documents *prior* to their coming into my possession. He had no right to take them or to use them. How many duplicates he may have made and given out I cannot imagine. . . .—H. S. O."

The *law* requires inspection and copies of letters if demanded by the accused; Theosophy and brotherhood would not require less than law.

It is singular that Mr. Old was the "custodian before" Olcott got the letters, when many of them were letters to Olcott himself. This part of the letter is, of course, untrue—to call a spade by its name. He calmly admits that Old as an enemy was allowed to take copies—Olcott having handed the originals over to Old out of his despatch box—and shows he does not care really how many duplicates were made. But the accused cannot have the copies.

It may be that as Olcott is coming to London this summer "to settle the Judge case," as he says himself, he is keeping the copies from me because of some new campaign he is aiding the virulent prosecutors to begin.

The Theosophical Society has become, in Europe and India, a detective bureau, an organization for assaults on character, for punishments, and has ceased to be a portion of the real theosophical movement.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

#### ADEPTS AND MEDIUMS.

IN *The Theosophist* for April appears a "postscript" by Colonel Olcott, repudiating the letter sent by one of the Masters through H. P. B. to certain Brahmans, which was published by Mr. Judge in the April *Path* and declared by him to be genuine. Colonel Olcott asserts that the communication contains "palpable proof of fraudulency" in that he thinks it to be "an ill-tempered attack" on Brahman orthodoxy, and that, moreover, it "grossly violates that basic principle of neutrality and eclecticism on which the Theosophical Society has built itself from the beginning." There are many, however, who differ absolutely from the Colonel in their opinion of this letter, and consider it to be one of the finest of the series. It is reprinted in a recent pamphlet issued to many members of the T. S., who will be able to judge for themselves. It is a candid but just criticism, not of the spirit of the Brahmanic philosophy, but of the hard forms, castes and creeds which have grown up around it, and which it was H. P. B.'s mission to break up and sweep away from all religions.

Colonel Olcott twice misquotes from the letter a very important word. He says that it asks the Brahman to "repudiate his religious beliefs, cast aside his splendid Scriptures and *turn Buddhist*!" Italics are mine. And again he quotes a passage thus: "which of them is ready to become a Buddhist, a *Nastika*, as they call us." The word used in the letter is "*Budhist*," not "Buddhist." Why does he so mis-

quote it when H. P. B. has so carefully explained the radical difference between the two words? Owing to the impression conveyed by the title of Mr. Sinnett's book, *Esoteric Buddhism*, that Theosophy was only a form of Buddhism, she explained in her Introduction to *The Secret Doctrine* that Buddhism is the religious system of ethics preached by the Lord Gautama, and named after his title of Buddha, "the Enlightened," while Budha means "wisdom" or knowledge (Vidya), the faculty of cognizing, from the Sanskrit root "budh," to know. She further said that Buddhism is not correctly spelt or pronounced in English, and should be Buddhaism. The word Nástika means, according to *The Theosophical Glossary*, one who does not worship or recognize the gods and idols.

Colonel Olcott advances the theory, which both he and Mrs. Besant have already applied to the case of Mr. Judge, that H. P. B. was a medium not always responsible for what was given through her. He is driven to invent this miserable and insulting excuse in order to avoid accusing her of conscious fraud. This theory is untenable, and to prove it I cannot do better than quote from an article by Jasper Niemand, entitled, "Judge the Act, Not the Person," which appeared in *The Path* of July, 1889. The writer there says:

"What difference is there between the instrumentality of H. P. B. and that of any transmitting medium? There is that radical difference which exists between the two extremes called by us poles. H. P. B. is an Adept; the other not. The Adept is such by virtue of the active principle. The medium is such by virtue of the passive principle. . . . H. P. B. is an active, conscious agent, acting through will power, having attained the power of perfect registration and trained concentration, able *at all times* to give a full account of all she knows, and one fitted to the development of the questioner, one responding to his physical, astral or spiritual sense. She is learned, acute, profound; disease of the body has not impaired her work, its quality, quantity, or her fidelity to it. The great proof is thorough comprehension, to the fullest depth, of all she has taken or received, AND THE BODY OF H. P. B. IS HER OWN INSTRUMENT; SHE EVEN HOLDS IT BACK FROM DISSOLUTION." [Capitals mine.—B. C.]

The medium theory being disposed of, a second question arises out of the position taken up by Mrs. Besant, Colonel Olcott and others.

Granting that H. P. B. was a Messenger from the Masters, would those Masters Whose name had once been taken in vain ever use the same instrument again?

The answer is undoubtedly No. All that has been written by H. P. B., by W. Q. Judge, by Jasper Niemand and others on the rules of occult

training, on the qualifications necessary for real chelaship, on the sacred relations between Master and chela, prove that such a thing is utterly impossible. H. P. B. has written that all the so-called "occult" letters must stand together or fall together. Yet it is sought to get rid of what is not approved by inventing theories which throw mud at the Masters and Their Messenger, and which violate the cardinal rules of Occultism. This is a question for those to whom the existence of Mahâtmas is a fact or a matter of personal belief, and that is why the charges against Mr. Judge can never be tried without fixing the dogma upon the T. S. Those who take teaching and advice from one whom they believe to be a Messenger of THE LODGE cannot say that some is true and some false. They may test by their intuition and assimilate what they can, but they may not attempt to put the seal of their paltry condemnation upon that which does not seem to them to be good. H. P. B. once wrote in *Lucifer* that "a member of the E. S. who receives instructions emanating from the Masters of the Occult Philosophy, and doubts at the same time the genuineness of the source, or the honesty of the humble transmitter of the old esoteric doctrines—LIES TO HIS OWN SOUL, AND IS UNTRUE TO HIS PLEDGE." [Capitals mine.—B. C.]

Hear also this extract from "the words of great Teachers," given by H. P. B. to her pupils as "the golden stairs up which the learner may climb to the Temple of Divine Wisdom":

" . . . A LOYAL SENSE OF DUTY TO THE TEACHER, A WILLING OBEDIENCE TO THE BEHESTS OF TRUTH, ONCE WE HAVE PLACED OUR CONFIDENCE IN, AND BELIEVE THAT TEACHER TO BE IN POSSESSION OF IT. . . ."

We have, then, these definite facts before us at last—I speak to those only who believe in Mahâtmas and that they communicate through chosen disciples.

1. That both H. P. B. and Mr. Judge are accused of making bogus messages.
2. That it is admitted that genuine messages were delivered by H. P. B. and Mr. Judge *after* those which are alleged to be false.
3. That the charges cannot be gone into before the T. S. without fixing the dogma of the Mahâtmas upon it.

Finally Colonel Olcott asserts that the question of this letter to the Brahmans does not bear upon the issues which [he thinks] he will have to judicially dispose of in London. I say that it is the fundamental and only issue, the complaint in both cases being identical at the root, and the step that the President has now definitely taken shows more clearly than ever that H. P. B. is the real centre of attack, and through her the





## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.

April 17th, 1895.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—April *Lucifer* calls for a word or two of comment. Mr. Bertram Keightley sets forth “with extreme reluctance” to “controvert” certain statements made by Dr. Archibald Keightley, who is at present in America. It is probably not for the first time in the history of the Theosophical Society that letters have been written “with extreme reluctance.” But Mr. B. Keightley, in his letter to *Lucifer*, is particularly careful to controvert nothing. He vaguely disputes Dr. Keightley’s account of the legal procedure which Mrs. Besant did *not* follow, but does not say which item set forth by Dr. Keightley—who had been professionally advised in regard to what he wrote—is, in his own opinion, incorrect; nor does he give what he considers to be the proper procedure.

Mr. B. Keightley next promises members that they will soon have “the whole of the evidence in their hands”—but in regard to this point I need only refer your readers to the pamphlet recently issued, *The Plot against the Theosophical Society*, where the nature of the proposed publication is explained. The “whole of the evidence” is, of course, nonsensical. Mr. B. Keightley is not reckless enough to assert that Mrs. Besant’s prosecutor’s “brief,” which Mr. Mead proposes to publish, contains copies of the seventy-eight and more exhibits specified as the “evidence” against Mr. Judge. Mr. B. Keightley *knows* that the “brief” does not contain copies of “the whole of the evidence.” Why does he go out of his way to make a statement which is not correct, and which is calculated to delude a number of members?

The next paragraph of his letter is ingenious. At the meeting at Richmond, in July, 1894, Mr. B. Keightley says that “Mrs. Besant did not promise Mr. Judge that he should have copies of all the evidence’ *in the sense of any undertaking to provide him with such.*” Has Mr. B. Keightley discovered a way of promising to give something to someone, without implying an “undertaking to provide him with such”? That is what he asks us to believe. Must we believe it? That would be a Jesuitical promise; would it be Brahmanical?

Then in regard to what took place at the Judicial Committee: Mr. B. Keightley’s memory is “in entire accord” with the memories of Messrs. Mead, Kingsland, Firth and Sinnett. That is unfortunate, for a reference to the March *Vahan* shows that he is in accord with emptiness. Mr. Mead there says that his “memory” is “defective” as to what took place, and the other members I have named were “defective” with him, if we are to accept Mr. Mead’s statement. But Mr. B. Keightley so phrases his assertion as to lead the unwary to imagine that he remembers something; whilst, in fact, he says that, like Mr. Mead, he remembers nothing. Is that Brahmanical? Mr. Judge, Dr. Keightley, Mr. James M. Pryse and myself have a positive recollection of a request being made by Mr. Judge for copies of the so-called evidence. Does Mr. B. Keightley imagine that his bad memory affects our statement?

Mr. B. Keightley wisely makes his next paragraph unintelligible. But in spite of italics and a "*verb. sap.*" at its close, he in no way disputes Dr. Keightley's statements that (a) the circular of Nov. 3rd was given to *The Westminster Gazette*, either directly or indirectly, by one of Mrs. Besant's own E. S. T. Council; (b) that if it was sent to an expelled member in India—a fact not yet proven—this was due to the carelessness or laziness of Mrs. Besant's London office, which did not inform the New York office of such expulsion, and (c) that in no case could Mr. Judge have had anything to do with sending it out.

I may add that such care was taken to avoid sending the circular to expelled members in India, that to this day some twenty Indian members have not received a copy for fear that they too might come under that head. This was done because those who sent out that circular, myself among them, were aware of much recent carelessness at the London office in Avenue Road, and were also aware that Mrs. Besant considered a large proportion of the members in India what she called "untrustworthy." Without knowledge of our own to go upon, we were obliged to trust to some extent to her opinion, and therefore did not send to a considerable number, as I have said.

But this should show that both Mrs. Besant and Mr. B. Keightley, in mentioning this circular at the Adyar Convention as "quasi-privately circulated," were either deceived, or were using what I will call personal imagination to further their end and aim and aspiration of expelling Mr. Judge from the Theosophical Society. Here I do not mean that Mr. B. Keightley has a positive aim and end of the sort; I refer to him rather as faithful Echo. But I do assert that Mrs. Besant has made the expulsion of Mr. Judge a clause in her creed. Does not Mrs. Besant's communication to the February *Lucifer* prove this? Did not Mrs. Besant write to London in a letter that was received on Feb. 4th, 1895, that "if the European Section will back up the Indian Section, Mr. Judge will be expelled from the Society in July, as he ought to be"? And this in spite of the emotion-moving conclusion to Mrs. Besant's *Daily Chronicle* letter, in which she said that Christ ate with sinners, and that she would take no part "in trying to ostracize him (Mr. Judge) from future work in the Society." Was this change in Mrs. Besant's attitude due to longer residence in India?

Mr. B. Keightley's last three paragraphs he perhaps intends as a joke, but I would suggest that joking has necessary limits, and that to speak of the "evidence *produced* against him (Mr. Judge) last July" savors too much of a "joke" once perpetrated on a man by his younger brother, who swore a criminal information against him "just for the fun of the thing."

Before leaving Mr. B. Keightley I should like to point out to him, as also to Mrs. Besant and Mr. Mead, a phrase in Colonel Olcott's letter published in the same issue of *Lucifer* (April), in which the Colonel lays down the following as one of the "conditions" under which he will confide to Mrs. Besant "the documents" to be used against Mr. Judge: "On the conditions of . . . your placing your statement and the evidence in the hands of the General Secretary of the European Section for distribution to Branches and members, AND OF HIS SUPPLYING A CERTIFIED COPY OF THE EVIDENCE TO MR. JUDGE FOR HIS INFORMATION AND USE." And so Colonel Olcott recognizes the fact that up to the present day Mr. Judge has no such copies, and that Mr. Judge's statement to that effect is correct. And will Mrs. Besant and

Mr. Mead (the latter acting on Mrs. Besant's assertion) now apologize for their reiterated misstatements to the contrary effect? I doubt it.

It is still possible to laugh heartily and good-naturedly at many of the absurdities committed by those who are so vigorously hounding Mr. Judge, as Dr. Keightley laughs in his "Luciferian Legends," but now and then it is not easy to restrain a feeling of great and almost irrepressible indignation at their method of carrying on this nineteenth century man-hunt.

It is, however, of interest to note that the prosecutors are not agreed as to the crimes (?) about which complaint is made. Compare the following statements :

MRS. BESANT.

It is stated by Mr. Judge that "I practised black magic on Mr. Judge and two others."—*Should Mr. Judge Resign?* p. 11.

Mr. Judge's circular "contains unproven accusations of the most shocking character—namely, of black magic—against a T. S. member, . . . and against myself. . ."—*Lucifer*, p. 466, February.

MR. B. KEIGHTLEY.

"Now even Mr. Judge himself does not accuse Mrs. Besant of any wilful wrong-doing. . . . On the contrary, he throughout alleges that she is deluded, 'has had herself no conscious evil intention.' . . ."

It should be noted that the above statement was made by Mr. B. Keightley in his circular on *A Common-Sense View*, etc., AFTER the diametrically opposite statement had been circulated by Mrs. Besant. But the difference was adapted to support a different argument, it may be urged!

A word or two in regard to Mr. Mead. As junior editor of *Lucifer* he devoted much space in the March "Watch-Tower" to calling me many names. Now that did not interest me, and there is no reason why it should have done so. I wondered for a few moments whom it could interest, but presumed that Mr. Mead knew his readers better than I—for I am very rarely one of them—and so went on with my work. Mr. Mead praised my writings, but I have quite forgiven him that. It was the worst there was to forgive! But I have no intention of entering into that matter so far as Mr. Mead thought it concerned myself. I only wish to point out that he endeavoured to draw into his scurrilous and silly defence of himself the name of a lady who has taken no public part in any of these proceedings; that the lady's husband (Dr. A. Keightley) then wrote a letter of protest, utterly disproving Mr. Mead's attempted insinuation and showing that Mr. Mead's statements in regard to this lady were (a) untrue, (b) vulgar, (c) libellous. This letter appeared in the April *Lucifer*. Did Mr. Mead apologize for his previous misstatements? Did he withdraw his insinuation of deception? He did neither, and I hardly expected that he would. He thought the natural protest of a gentleman and a husband under such circumstances "too ridiculous to need a reply." It would, of course, appear to be so to Mr. Mead. Constant practice must make it a matter of trivial importance to accuse other people of fraud, deception and so forth. Protest against such false insinuations and accusations would certainly then appear absurd. For if one were to judge by a standard of ordinary behavior it would appear that Mr. Mead no longer takes into account the truth of the accusation he makes. That, to him, is of

no importance; what is of importance is *that the accusation shall be made*. Yet I am quite well aware that it would be foolish to judge Mr. Mead from the standpoint of ordinary behavior. Thank Heaven, it is not my duty to judge him at all, and I think that his action is largely explained by nervous over-strain and loss of balance. He is excited and does not think, so we will wish him a quick recovery and better luck in the future.

But a statement made by Dr. Keightley in his letter to the junior editor is disputed by "B. K.," apparently as co-junior editor. Dr. A. Keightley wrote: "Mrs. Besant was informed [as to the personal identity of Che-Yew-Tsäng] immediately on her return from the Chicago Congress, and it was by her express desire (reiterated in her letters from India) that you [the junior editor] were not told." To this "B. K." volunteers a footnote: "This last statement has been expressly and emphatically denied by Mrs. Besant in recent letters" (p. 160).

To this I can only say that I absolutely refuse to believe such a thing of Mrs. Besant until I see it clearly stated over her own name. If I ever see that I shall have something more to say.

It is a minor point, and certainly does not concern either myself or the morality of my past actions. But it concerns a clear statement made by Dr. Keightley which I know to be true, and to which a second-hand denial is given by "B. K." It would be superfluous to endorse Dr. Keightley's statement. If it is called in question at any time ample endorsement will be forthcoming.

But how I wish that *Lucifer* would check its down-hill career of licentious slander; how I wish it would return to its original purpose of propagating Theosophy! We must all hope that *Lucifer* may usefully survive, but the facts are ominous and call to mind the ancient saying that "those whom the god would destroy he first makes mad."

Fraternally yours,

ERNEST T. HARGROVE.

25, Lancaster Gate, Hyde Park, London, W.

[It should be noted that the above was written on April 17th, being received in Dublin on the 18th—long before the appearance of the May *Vāhan* and of Mrs. Besant's "brief" against Mr. Judge. These further confirm several of Mr. Hargrove's statements.—ED.]

To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.

May 2nd, 1895.

DEAR BROTHER,—We send you herewith the monthly report of this Lodge and trust you will be able to find room for it in your magazine. Unfortunately we are precluded from the pages of *The Vāhan* by the censorship now being exercised by its editor; for this identical report was sent to *The Vāhan* for insertion, only to be mutilated by having every word that referred, in terms of trust and loyalty, to W. Q. Judge cut out.

We would take this opportunity of suggesting that you should at once start an "Activities Column," and invite reports from all those Lodges and Centres which, in supporting Bro. Judge, are unable to get their reports inserted in *The Vāhan*. It can no longer be said that *The Vāhan* is an official organ of the European Section. We trust you will see your way to adopting this idea.

We are, dear brother, fraternally yours,

103, Bow Road, London, E.

GORDON ROWE, Hon. Secs.  
WALTER H. BOX,

## BOW LODGE, T. S.

103, Bow Road, London, E.

ATTENDANCE somewhat low in number. The class for the study of Theosophy is now thoroughly remodelled, the subjects being all rearranged in better order; the Class is now much more interesting and active and is held *every* Saturday evening.

In view of the warring elements now seeking to disrupt the T. S. and to overthrow its members, this Lodge has started an informal class for the *heart's* consideration of Z. L. Z.'s invaluable *Letters that have Helped Me*. This choice of book is especially appropriate at a time when certain people are charging the author with vulgar fraud or irresponsible mediumship, and if proof were wanting as to the real and true status of William Q. Judge, one need not go further than a careful study of these helps to students; for they do unmistakably bear the stamp of one who is no stranger to the life of the Soul, do witness assuredly to one who sees the Heart of mankind with the unsealed gaze of the true disciple of the Great Brotherhood.

GORDON ROWE, } *Hon. Secs.*  
WALTER H. BOX, }

*To the Editor of THE IRISH THEOSOPHIST.*

DEAR SIR,—As the Countess Wachtmeister has thought fit to publish in *Lucifer* part of a letter to her, written by me, together with some comments thereon, kindly allow the whole of the letter to appear in your columns, with a few remarks added.—Yours fraternally,

WM. LINDSAY.

*London, Feb. 17th, 1895 (posted March 1st).*

DEAR COUNTESS,—You will, no doubt, remember telling me the following some time ago, "*for use if at any time required.*" Please note, therefore, that I shall use it, should I think fit, in defending Mr. W. Q. Judge. What you told me was, that before H. P. B. died she showed you a box wherein was Master's seal, and that immediately after H. P. B.'s death you took the box with the Master's seal in it into your keeping, and that the box was not in *anyone* else's hands till given over by you to Annie Besant on her return from America. When the box was opened by Annie Besant the *Master's seal was not to be found in it*, and all this took place *before* Mr. W. Q. Judge came to England.

You may be hurt that I should take this action, but you must not forget that the above information was given me for the express purpose of defending Mr. Judge should it be needful. I know you now regard Mr. Judge in a very different way, but that is no reason why I should not now use the information.—Sincerely yours,

WM. LINDSAY.

Every F. T. S. knows by this time that there is no darker sin against the Manifold Deity who runs the European Section (for whom, I take it, G. R. S. Mead acts as Manifested Logos) than want of courtesy. I, remembering this, and wishing to live yet a little longer, wrote the above letter to the Countess Wachtmeister prior to using the information contained in it. By which act I am, at the earliest possible date, honored by the now rather common distinction of being called a liar in *Lucifer*.

The Countess practically confirms her statement to me in the remarks following the extract of my letter, though she puts it in new language, for which confirmation I beg to thank her. Following these remarks are some by Mrs. Cooper-Oakley, Miss Cooper and Mr. Bertram Keightley, which is strange, seeing that the Countess addressed her letter to the Editor of *Lucifer* from India. How, then, is it that comments are made by these people, who are in England, in the same issue; unless it be, as I have for some time suspected, that *Lucifer* is, in fact, edited by a syndicate, trading, if I may use the term, under the title of G. R. S. Mead?

One thing, however, is worthy of note, viz., that a common cause has a wonderful power of drawing people together, however antagonistic they may have been toward each other in the past; for we find T. S. members who, while it was only a matter of forming the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood that they had in hand, were willing to wage war continually among themselves, now that a really congenial and worthy cause is to be upheld, *i.e.*, the persecution of a brother Theosophist (W. Q. Judge), are (apparently) ready, aye, are *anxious* to join hands, forgetting past differences, and to stand shoulder to shoulder in the fight for this noble ideal.

Truly I have heard of many "experiences" in divers lands of Mr. Bertram Keightley, but of this particular one, relating to the seal in question, I have never before been told.

Of course I am not responsible for the truth of the statement made by the Countess, but only for the correct rendering of such, as told to me, which I maintain I have done, and, after all, the principal point remains unchanged, viz., *that the seal was gone before W. Q. Judge came to England.*

WILLIAM LINDSAY.

April 23rd, 1895.

#### REVIEWS.

THE DREAM OF RAVAN: a Mystery. [Theosophical Publishing Society. Price 2s. 6d.]

THIS reprint introduces to the public, practically for the first time, a most remarkable though unknown mystic. It purports to be an account of a little known Indian poem. There seems to be some occult allegory running through every detail of the fantastic narrative. But, even without understanding this, everyone can enjoy the most original humor and vivid descriptions of ancient Indian life. There are passages which, for mystical beauty, are not surpassed by anything in our later literature. I would instance the evolution of the Titanic Ravan's soul, the analysis of the three Gunas, of the four states or tabernacles of the Spirit, and also the interpretation of the mirages as being most perfect in their way. The freedom and clearness with which the varying states of consciousness are handled could only come from one who had vision over a wide field—one in whom there is no longer effort but perfect achievement. Though seemingly thrown off in play, *The Dream of Ravan* still compels attention, fascinates with its power, ideality and tenderness, and its note of occult familiarity. For all its inaccuracies of style, it has a great literary quality and should reach a wider public than the T. S. The publishers have sacrificed to the Gods by reissuing it, and deserve well of Karma on this account.

## THE YOGA OF CHRIST, or the Science of the Soul. [Theosophical Publishing Society.]

WE have heard much and mysteriously lately of the modern Indian Teacher. His disciples have heralded him by quotations which were hardly self-illuminative, and which made us long for context to see if they definitely referred to anything. Now that he (perhaps it should be He) has come forth and unfolded himself, he turns out to be only a Sunday school teacher after all. *The Yoga of Christ* is the kind of thing we used to sleep under in church. We hear just such dreary sanctities droned out from many a pulpit. There is neither vigor of thought, observation, nor knowledge in it from first to last—neither Yoga nor Christianity. It teems over with maudlin ecstasies about the Lord, “Nothing seems felicitous except His loving presence.” He sees “His Face and tears roll down his eyes (*sic*) for joy.” As the poles of good and evil are apart so is it asunder from the teaching of Christ. “Love your enemies,” taught the Master. Our Indian Sunday school teacher amends as follows: “Friends should be few and well selected, the human heart is not large enough to find room for many.” The deadly dullness and lack of humor displayed amount to a more positive sin than the open licentiousness of other books. Witness the precious epistle in which the wisdom of Deity is applauded and our attention is called to an array of facts like the following:

“Man is strong—woman is beautiful.

“Man shines abroad—woman at home.

“Man has science—woman has taste,” etc.

We might add to his list of things not usually perceived,

“Man parts his hair on the side—woman in the middle.”

Let us practise concentration with regard to these things. The letter on punctuality would need a Mark Twain to do it justice, to set it so that its fatuousness would become a witty virtue. As it is, it is only painful reading these utterances of the second childhood of a race once wise and spiritual. The seal of the T. S. is on the cover of this book, which has been applauded in *Lucifer*; which things combined lead one to suppose that it is intended to bring Theosophy into disrepute and is part of the plot against the T. S.

## NOTES BY THE WAY.

THE “man-hunt” along unconstitutional lines still proceeds. So far it has been a sickly clamor, devoid of one redeeming feature. Mrs. Besant has come back to England; “back to her work; back to her indictment against ‘Brother Judge’.”

\* \* \*

In her “statement” to the delegates at the European Section Convention last July, Mrs. Besant said that in matters of controversy her vision was not always clear, and this confession is fully borne out in everything that has come from her pen, and in her utterances, in connection with “the present troubles.”

\* \* \*

Take, for example, the following from the interview that appeared in the *Westminster Gazette* a few days after her arrival in London:

"But what does Master Morya say to Mr. Judge's doings?" "He told me first that *the messages were forged.*" [Italics mine.—D.]

Again, compare another statement made to this interviewer with one made on a previous occasion:

"I have had the full evidence against Judge for eighteen months, and I am now preparing it all, from the very first, for publication."—*To W. G. Interviewer.*

"Yes, but the Master's words were such that they did not exclude the possibility of *the messages being automatic.*"

"It is no part of my duty, as a humble servant of the Lords of Compassion, to drag my brother's faults into public view."—"Neutrality T. S.," *Lucifer*, xiv. 458.

\* \* \*

In the same interview, excusing herself for not having "cleared up the whole matter" earlier, "as directed by the Master," Mrs. Besant says: "I was glad to give the benefit of the *doubt* to the man who had done so much good and noble work for the Society." Does this "doubt" no longer exist? The conflicting statements as to "messages," quoted above, would indicate that it does still exist. It will be noticed also that Mrs. Besant does not scruple to use the names of "Those Who to some of us are holy" in support of her charge of "forgery" and "fraud," even in face of the striking admission that the "Master's words" admit "of the possibility of the messages being automatic."

\* \* \*

Another example of confusion:

"Eighteen months ago He [the Master] told me to clear this matter up."—*To W. G. Interviewer.*

"I offered to take on myself the onus of formulating the charges against him (Brother Judge) . . . in this decision for which *I alone* am responsible. I meant to act for the best, but *it is very possible I made a mistake.*"—"Neutrality T. S.," *Lucifer*, xiv. 458.

Can Mrs. Besant reconcile these two statements? Can she prove that the Master's instruction to clear the matter up is a genuine message? Is it as tangible, in form, as those Mr. Judge is accused of "forging," and which are stated to be in "the well-known script"? If not, can Mrs. Besant say how it was communicated? It is an important point, and should be "cleared up" if this prosecution is to go on. Will the accusers of Mr. Judge insist on a committee of investigation?

\* \* \*

Now what is this expensive [*£50* Mr. Mead wants] "indictment" all about: this revised edition of *Isis very much Unveiled?* Suppose we look for a moment at the "charge." Says Mrs. Besant:

"I wish it to be distinctly understood that I do not charge, and have not charged, Mr. Judge with forging in the ordinary sense of the term, but with giving *a misleading material form* to messages received psychically from the Master in various ways, without acquainting the recipients with this fact."—*Lucifer*, xiv. 459-460. [Italics mine.—D.]

And again:

"*Mr. Judge's error* lay in giving them to me in a script written by himself, and not saying that he had done so."—*Lucifer*, xiv. 459. [Italics mine.—D.]



“A misleading *material* form.” “Mr. Judge’s *error*.” Note the words. Was the “error” *really* Mr. Judge’s? Let us see.

“Mr. Judge has believed himself to be justified in writing down . . . the message, psychically received, and in giving it to the person for whom it was intended, leaving *that person to wrongly assume* that it was a direct precipitation (Mrs. Besant, *Lucifer*, xiv. 461). Further, if “the sources of messages can only be decided by direct spiritual knowledge, or intellectually by the nature of their contents, and each person must use his own powers, and act on his own responsibility, in accepting or rejecting them,” as Mrs. Besant states (*Lucifer*, xiv. 461), then I ask whose is the “error”? The “receiver” who, relying on the “material form,” has “wrongly assumed,” or the “giver,” who does *not* “assume” the “receiver” to be ignorant of the manner in which the source of messages can be decided?

\* \* \*

In this connection the following quotations on the methods of precipitation may not be out of place:

“Most of the precipitations are done by chelas. . . . I see His orders, and the thoughts and words he wishes used, and I precipitate them in that form.”

“Well, what of their handwritings?”

“Anything you write is your handwriting, but it is not your personal handwriting, generally used and first learned, if you assume or adopt some form. Now you know that Master’s handwritings, peculiar and personal to themselves, are foreign both as to sound and form—Indian sorts, in fact. So they adopted a form in English, and in that form I precipitate Their messages at Their direction. . . . The message has to be seen in the Astral Light in *facsimile*, and through that astral matrix I precipitate the whole of it.”—H. P. B., “Conversations on Occultism,” *Path*, p. 18, April, 1894.

“Scripts may be produced by automatic or *deliberate writing* with the hand . . . and those *who afford the necessary conditions can be thus used*.”—Mrs. Besant, *Lucifer*, xiv. 461. [Italics mine.—D.]

“Another method which, since it saves time, *is much more frequently adopted*, is to impress the whole substance of the letter on the mind of some pupil, and leave him to do the mechanical work of precipitation. That pupil would then take his sheet of paper and, *imagining he saw the letter written thereon, in his Master’s hand*, would proceed to *objectify the writing*.”—*Transactions of London Lodge*, No. 24, p. 88, April, 1895. [Italics mine.—D.]

It will be seen, then, that a recognized method in precipitation, and the one most usually adopted, is for the pupil to objectify the writing through “that astral matrix,” which is a “*facsimile*” of the form adopted by the Master. Why does Mrs. Besant always talk of “the messages being *automatic*,” when, as she says, “scripts” may be produced by “*deliberate writing*” by those who afford the necessary conditions? Do the messages Mr. Judge is accused of “forging” not “admit of the possibility” of having been *deliberately* written?

\* \* \*

There seems to have been a deliberate and systematic refusal to furnish Mr. Judge with certified copies of the documents on which the charges against him are based. Colonel Olcott hands them over to

Mrs. Besant in order that she may publish "her indictment against Bro. Judge," stipulating that the General Secretary of the European Section shall furnish copies, and this after refusing them on Mr. Judge's direct application, as will be seen on another page. What, then, is the result? Mrs. Besant is allowed every facility to publish the "full evidence," without the necessary opportunity being afforded Mr. Judge of replying in time for his reply to go out with it. In *Lucifer*, xv. 456, Mrs. Besant writes:

"I thought that the Committee was to try a brother, and so we did not desire any sort of triumph, or any kind of advantage, but only absolute truth. *Every possible opportunity for explanation should be placed in Mr. Judge's hands.*" "To try a brother" sounds strange, but why has not *the one* opportunity he asked been granted?

\* \* \*

A very good course under such circumstances is suggested by Mrs. Besant in *Lucifer*, xv. 458: "If statements are made when a person has had no opportunity of answering them, it is right . . . *to form no opinion until the answer is made.*" How many will act on this suggestion? It will be interesting to see.

\* \* \*

Just on the eve of going to press Mrs. Besant's "case" against Mr. Judge comes to hand. Supposition and suspicion absent, there is no evidence which will prove the "charges" made against Mr. Judge. It will be found the weakest "case" on record.

There are six charges, but, says Mrs. Besant, "they really form *but a single charge* of seeking to gain influence and authority by unfair means"—now mark what follows—"in assuming a position of authority in the T. S. to which his long and eminent services *justly entitle* him." And so this is the charge now: using "unfair means" to obtain what he was "justly entitled" to. Queer, isn't it? Why should there be any necessity to use "unfair means"? Did someone dispute the *just title*? If so, was it not obviously unjust and unfair to do so?

\* \* \*

Turning to the "presentment of case," what do we find put forward as *proof* of non-genuineness of "messages."

- (a) Error in matter of fact.
- (b) Threat based on mistake.
- (c) Triviality.

No *proof of forgery here*; nothing about a "misleading material form." Those who are familiar with what H. P. B. has written on the subject of precipitation will remember that the accuracy with which ideas may be transmitted from the Master depends on the *chela's state*, so that, even admitting *a, b* and *c*, there is no evidence on the "main question," but rather to the contrary.

\* \* \*

Mrs. Besant has taken extracts from Mr. Judge's letters to her, in support of a charge of fraud against him, and afterwards destroyed the letters. What think you of this? Is it *fair* means?

D. N. D.

## FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA.

THE following report from a correspondent will give a general impression of the proceedings of the first Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society in America. The details and elaborations are equally important, but they will come later.

When the records and minutes concerning the early days of the T. S. were looked up, at the idea of some Boston members, a surprising state of things became apparent, making action by the Convention necessary. Had these facts been known, it is the opinion of those voting some proxies as "Nay" that the Branches so voting would have changed front and will change. As it was, there were not ten dissents—some individual, and not important when Branches—out of 205 votes. The voting was like the tramp of a great army. Yes, yes, yes, yes—almost unbroken. The first vote, which was "Yes," boomed and echoed through the Hall. A. K. was accorded an extraordinary reception, but the climax was reached when the resolutions were read. On the clause that the Chief be President for life, deep, loud, determined cheering set in, unlike any I ever heard; not excited at first, but having a cold determination about it that made the sound massive. It went on for two minutes and beat down like thunder upon the frail, bowed form of the Chief, who sat like a marble figure. (He has been very ill, as you know.) Then the audience took fire from itself, sprang from its feet to chairs, to tables even, and waved and roared, great lashings of sound. . . . This scene was repeated, but checked sooner by the same fear (the illness of Mr. Judge) when, towards the close of the Convention, the President for life took control of the Convention as "President." One wild roar leaped from the whole mass, in which were but two individuals of contrary opinion. The same thing occurred at the public evening meeting in a hired hall, filled with the public, when Mr. Judge as speaker was introduced as President of the T. S. in America. When the Convention had closed its dignified and fraternal session, marked by the entire absence of all ill-feeling, temper or accusation, the President for life *offered to the Section which had never asked it, and did not want it*, his explanation of the charges—necessarily incomplete as he had not the evidence. He is able to speak but a very few minutes, and hence asked Dr. Keightley to read the long paper. The stillness was intense and only broken at one point. When it became known that it was Mrs. Besant who had accused Colonel Olcott, coming to America for the purpose, and had endeavored to secure his removal, while allowing Mr. Judge to bear the blame in *The Westminster Gazette* and at the Adyar Convention when accused by Miss Müller, a gasp of astonishment made itself heard in the Hall. At the close, Dr. Anderson proposed a resolution of thanks, while saying that the Society did not need and had not asked Mr. Judge to explain, and cheers carried it in another ovation. An amusing interlude at the Convention, in a lull of business, was caused by a prominent Boston editor and F. T. S. showing a letter of Mr. Bertram Keightley's, saying that Mrs. Besant and himself had

"loyally" kept faith with Mr. Judge after the committee on charges until the circular of Nov. 3rd. As the letter was shown to person after person each would burst out laughing and would say, "How about 'Occultism and Truth'?" and "Doesn't Mr. Keightley read *The Review of Reviews* and Mrs. Besant's admissions?" There was merriment even at the reporters' table.

One of the best addresses was made by Mr. Smythe, of Dublin, now resident in Canada. It was markedly quiet and restrained where all were so, but had great force about it. This gentleman asked me to give to the Dublin Lodge "the Irish wish and the Irish heart." I've a mind to keep them for myself!

The work done has been greater than ever; the treasury is in better condition than ever before. Extracts from letters of H. P. B. were read—some bearing singularly upon the situation. In one she entreats Mr. Judge to be elected for life in reorganizing American T. S., and says it is the Master's wish. In another, on the eve of leaving Ostend for London, she says she goes to "galvanize a corpse" in England, and that later, when she has given it life, it will turn and destroy her. In another she gives a "vision" of the present state of the T. S., but predicts that America will prevail. Outside the T. S. public opinion is with Mr. Judge, as it is argued that the withholding of his legal rights, and the official action of Mr. Mead in refusing to examine the specification of charges and ascertain for himself Mrs. Besant's inaccuracy, show something rotten in the state of Denmark. The initiation of the cycle of accusation by the case of Colonel Olcott, as opened by Mrs. Besant, and her failure to free Mr. Judge of that blame, is also looked upon by the public as conclusive evidence of an ambitious plot. It is surprising how much interest the newspapers now take where once they would publish nothing. But the matter is now an old story, and the damaging circumstances under which the accuser has laid the "charges" leaves little room for interest in the evidence. Dr. Hartmann's letter was very greatly admired. A score of people asked for copies. The new Constitution is passed, and some of the bye-laws referred to the Executive Committee. And now we can all get to work.

In another letter a friend writes: The resolution putting the American Section on its original and proper basis was arrived at by 195 to ten—present and proxies. And the other people, who have been canvassing hard ever since January, could only get ninety to sign a protest out of some three to four thousand members. My own impression is that the action will be a surprise to most, for it is *not* secession and the legal points of the historical sketch cannot be got over.

#### DUBLIN LODGE, T. S.

THE discussions at recent meetings have been devoted to subjects with somewhat doctrinal titles, such as *The Communion of Saints*, *The Resurrection of the Body* and *The Life Everlasting*, the last of which received masterly treatment at the hands of Brother Pryse.

Extracts from *The Light of Asia* and the seventh chapter of *The Bhagavad Gîtâ* were read on White Lotus Day.

The present session will be brought to a close by papers on *The Study of Theosophy* and *Christianity*. FRED. J. DICK, *Hon. Sec.*