

THEOSOPHICAL OBJECTS, PROGRAM AND ORGANISATION

Articles by H. P. Blavatsky

A YEAR OF THEOSOPHY

1888

A PUZZLE FROM ADYAR

THE ORGANISATION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

H. P. BLAVATSKY SERIES • NO. 29
THEOSOPHY COMPANY (MYSORE) PRIVATE LTD.
BANGALORE 560004

FOREWORD

IN “A Year of Theosophy,” which appeared in the *Theosophist* for January, 1881, Madame Blavatsky reviewed the accomplishments of the Theosophical Society in India during 1880, noting also evidences of growth in other parts of the world. She gave an account of the activities of the Founders, adding a brief financial report which showed expenses far in excess of income. Here, as so often elsewhere, H.P.B. found occasion for correcting misconceptions about the Society, the Founders, and the purposes of Theosophic endeavor, stressing the pursuit of truth as the chief objective.

The custom of New Year’s greetings becomes, for H.P.B., an opportunity of showing the deeper purposes of the annual renewal which may be sought by students of Theosophy. Her article, “1888,” published in *Lucifer* for January, 1888, distinguishes between the conventional hope for “happiness” and “prosperity” and the Transcendentalist longing to grow in both knowledge and responsibility.

Richard Harte, a friend of Col. Olcott and an American newspaperman who became a member of the Society in 1878, had joined Olcott in India late in 1888 to assist in the conduct of the *Theosophist*. Articles which appeared early in 1889, evidently by him, exaggerated the importance of the organizational side of the work, minimizing the First Object, of Brotherhood. H.P.B., Harte implied, was a disturbing influence interfering with the orderly progress of the Society under the practical guidance of Col. Olcott at “Adyar,” the headquarters of the Society. Mr. Harte compared “Adyar” with the authority and power of “the Church of Rome.” H.P.B. replied to these criticisms and charges in *Lucifer* for August, 1889, in an article titled “A Puzzle from Adyar” “Shielding Olcott as well as she could from the

implication of his direct involvement with Harte's misrepresentation of the spirit of Theosophical work, H.P.B. showed that, far from being dependent upon the Society's "constitutional" development, the Objects were the primary and initial inspiration of both the Movement and the Society. The Society, she said, would deserve and have her loyalty only to the degree that it remained a channel for service to the Theosophical Cause and for the original program which the Society had in the beginning. This article is both a clarification of the prior importance of the moral and philosophical principles on which all Theosophical work is based, in contrast to organizations and instruments, and a warning to members who failed to make this distinction.

The article, "The Organisation of the Theosophical Society," although dated in manuscript by H.P.B. as completed at Ostende, Oct. 3, 1886, did not appear until publication in the *Theosophist* of June, 1924. The opening words of the article were there omitted, it being explained that the first page of H.P.B.'s handwritten MS had been lost. However, in a second printing of the article in the *Theosophist* for August, 1931, this initial portion was restored, taken from "a typed copy at Adyar of an incomplete rendering of H.P.B.'s article." This article, it was explained, and as becomes apparent, was H.P.B.'s reply to a pamphlet issued by two members (Mohini M. Chatterji and Arthur Gebhard), entitled "A Few Words on Theosophical Organisation."

The letter quoted in the long first footnote (page 17) is the same letter as the one partly reproduced by H.P.B. in *Lucifer* for January, 1888, under the title, "Some Words on Daily Life." However, only the last sentence of the footnote appears in "Some Words on Daily Life," the preceding material not having been previously published. As noted at the end of the footnote, an additional portion of this letter is quoted in the closing portion of the article (see page 35). There are minor variations in these two versions of the letter.

An editor's footnote included in the printing of this article in the August 1931 *Theosophist* explains that the mark (...)> commonly used to indicate an ellipsis, means, as here used, "no elision of words,

but only the beginning of a new sentence or thought which is particularly emphasized."

This article by H.P.B. throws great light on the character and purpose of the original Theosophical Society, as conceived by its Founders, especially in respect to its Objects, which are clearly stated.

Theosophist, January, 1881

A YEAR OF THEOSOPHY

THE dial of Time marks off another of the world's Hours... . And, as the Old Year passes into Eternity, like a rain-drop falling into the ocean, its vacant place on the calendar is occupied by a successor which—if one may credit the ancient prophetic warnings of Mother Shipton and other seers—is to bring woe and disaster to some portions of the world. Let it go, with its joys and triumphs, its badness and bitterness, if it but leave behind for our instruction the memory of our experience and the lesson of our mistakes. Wise is he who lets “the dead Past bury its dead,” and turns with courage to meet the fresher duties of the New Year; only the weak and foolish bemoan the irrevocable. It will be well to take a brief retrospect of those incidents of the year 1880 (A.D.) which possess an interest for members of the Theosophical Society. The more so since, in consequence of the absence from Bombay of the President and Corresponding Secretary, the anniversary day of the Society was not publicly celebrated.

It will not be necessary to enter minutely into those details of administration which, however important in themselves as links, weak or strong, in the general chain of progress, and however they may have taxed the patience, nerve, or other resources of the chief officers, do not at all interest the public. It is not so much explanation as *results* that are demanded, and these, in our case, abound. Even our worst enemy would be forced to admit, were he to look closely into our transactions, that the Society is immeasurably stronger morally, numerically, and as regards a capacity for future usefulness, than it was a year ago. Its name has become most widely known; its fellowship has been enriched by the accession of some very distinguished men; it has planted new branch societies in India, Ceylon

and elsewhere; applications are now pending for the organization of still other branches, in New South Wales, Sydney, California, India, Australia; its magazine has successfully entered the second volume; its local issues with the government of India have been finally and creditably settled; a mischievous attempt by a handful of malcontents at Bombay to disrupt it has miserably failed.¹ It has made official alliances with the Sanskrit Samaj of Benares, that is to say, with the most distinguished body of orthodox Sanskrit pandits in the world, with the other Sabha of which Pandit Rama Misra Shastri is Manager, and with the Hindu Sabha, of Cochin State; while, at the same time, strengthening its fraternal relations with the Arya Samajas of the Punjab and North-Western Provinces. Besides all this, we can point with joy and pride to the results of the late mission to Ceylon, where, within the space of fifty-seven days, seven branch societies of Buddhist laymen, one Ecclesiastical Council of Buddhist priests, and one scientific society were organized, and some hundreds of new fellows were added to our list.

All this work could not be accomplished without great labour, mental anxiety and physical discomfort. If to this be added the burden of a correspondence with many different countries, and the time required for making two journeys to Northern India and one to Ceylon, our friends at a distance will see that whatever other blame may properly attach to the Founders, who have never claimed infallibility of any sort, that of laziness is assuredly not to be cast in their teeth. Nor, when they learn that the work done since leaving America, the travelling expenses and the fitting and maintenance of the Headquarters establishment has cost some twenty thousand rupees, while the cash receipts of the Treasurer (exclusive of those from Ceylon, Rs. 2,440, which sum is set aside as a special fund to be used in the interest of Buddhism) have been only *one thousand two hundred and forty rupees*, all told, including one donation of two hundred rupees from the universally respected Maharanee Surnomoyee, and another of

¹ Secret letters by former members denouncing its Founders, sent to Paris and other Theosophists and pretending that the Bombay Society was virtually extinct (its best members having resigned), were sent back to us with new protestations of friendship and loyalty and expressions of scorn for the conspirators—(Ed. Theos.)

twenty rupees from a well-wisher in Bengal, will those who direct the Society's affairs be regarded by them as making money out of their offices. And these figures, which may most readily be verified, are our only answer to the calumnies which have been maliciously circulated by some who did not, and others who *did*, know the truth.

The trip to Ceylon occupied seventy-seven days in all, the second one to Northern India one hundred and twenty-five days. Thus the Founders have been absent from Bombay on duty twenty-nine weeks out of the fifty-two; their travels extending through twenty-five degrees of latitude, from Lahore at the extreme north of India, to Matara, the southernmost point of ancient Lanka. Each of the Indian Presidencies has contributed a quota of new members; and at the former capital of the late lion-hearted Runjeet Singh, a branch was recently organized by Sikhs and Punjabis, under the title of the "Punjab Theosophical Society." During the twelvemonth, President Olcott delivered seventy-nine lectures and addresses, a majority of which were interpreted in the Hindi, Urdu, Guzerati and Sinhalese languages.

Many misconceptions prevail as to the nature and objects of the Theosophical Society. Some—Sir Richard Temple in the number—fancy it is a religious sect; many believe it is composed of atheists; a third party are convinced that its sole object is the study of occult science and the initiation of green hands into the Sacred Mysteries. If we have had one we certainly have had a hundred intimations from strangers that they were ready to join at once if they could be sure that they would shortly be endowed with *siddhis*, or the power to work occult phenomena. The beginning of a new year is a suitable time to make one more attempt—we wish it could be the last—to set these errors right. So then, let us say again: (1) The Theosophical Society teaches no new religion, aims to destroy no old one, promulgates no creed of its own, follows no religious leader, and, distinctly and emphatically, is *not a sect*, nor ever was one. It admits worthy people of any religion to membership, on the condition of mutual tolerance and mutual help to discover truth. The Founders have never consented to be taken as religious leaders, they repudiate any such idea, and they have not taken and will not take disciples. (2) The Society is not composed of atheists, nor is it any more conducted in

the interest of atheism than in that of deism or polytheism. It has members of almost every religion, and is on equally fraternal terms with each and all. (3) Not a majority, nor even a respectable minority, numerically speaking, of its fellows are students of occult science or ever expect to become adepts. All who cared for the information have been told what sacrifices are necessary in order to gain the higher knowledge, and few are in a position to make one tenth of them. He who joins our Society gains no *siddhis* by that act, nor is there any certainty that he will even see the phenomena, let alone meet with an adept. Some have enjoyed both these opportunities, and so the possibility of the phenomena and the existence of "Siddhas" do not rest upon our unverified assertions. Those who have seen things have perhaps been allowed to do so on account of some personal merit detected by those who showed them the *siddhis*, or for other reasons known to themselves and over which we have no control.

For thousands of years these things have, whether rightly or wrongly, been guarded as sacred mysteries, and Asiatics at least need not be reminded that often even after months or years of the most faithful and assiduous personal service, the disciples of a Yogi have not been shown "miracles" or endowed with powers. What folly, therefore, to imagine that by entering any society one might make a short cut to adeptship! The weary traveller along a strange road is grateful even to find a guide-post that shows him his way to his place of destination. Our Society, if it does naught else, performs this kindly office for the searcher after truth. And it is much.

Before closing, one word must be said in correction of an unfortunate impression that has got abroad. Because our pamphlet mentions a relationship between our Society and certain proficientes in Occult Science, or "Mahatmas," many persons fancy that these great men are personally engaged in the practical direction of its affairs: and that, in such a case, being primarily responsible for the several mistakes that have occurred in the admission of unworthy members and in other matters, they can neither be so wise, so prudent, or so far-seeing as is claimed for them. It is also imagined that the President and Corresponding Secretary (especially the latter) are, if not actually Yogis and Mahatmas themselves, at least persons of ascetic

habits, who assume superior moral excellence. Neither of these suppositions is correct, and both are positively absurd. The administration of the Society is, unless in exceptionally important crises, left to the recognized officials, and they are wholly responsible for all the errors that are made. Many may doubtless have been made, and our management may be very faulty, but the wonder is that no more have occurred, if the multiplicity of duties necessarily imposed upon the two chief officers and the world-wide range of activity be taken into account. Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky do not pretend to asceticism, nor would it be possible for them to practise it while in the thick of the struggle to win a permanent foothold for the Society in the face of every possible obstacle that a selfish, sensuality-loving world puts in the way. What either of them has heretofore been, or either or both may in the future become, is quite a different affair. At present they only claim to be trying honestly and earnestly, so far as their natural infirmities of character permit, to enforce by example and precept the ideas which are embodied in the platform and rules of the Theosophical Society. Once or twice ill-wishers have publicly taunted us with not having given practical proofs of our alleged affection for India. Our final vindication must be left to posterity, which always renders that justice that the present too often denies. But even now—if we may judge by the tone of our correspondence, as well as by the enthusiasm which has everywhere greeted us in the course of our journeyings—a palpably good effect has been produced by our appeals to the educated Indian public. The moral regeneration of India and the revival of her ancient spiritual glories *must exclusively be the work of her own sons*. All we can do is to apply the match to the train, to fan the smouldering embers into a genial warmth. And this we are trying to do. One step in the right direction, it will doubtless be conceded, is the alliance effected with the Benares pandits and attested in the subjoined document:

[Here are printed the Articles of the Union formed by the T. S. and the Sanskrit Sabha of Benares, agreeing to cooperation and brotherly union between the two societies, in the interests of the promotion of Sanskrit Literature and Vedic Philosophy and Science; the agreement being signed by the officers and members of the Benares *Samañ* and by Col. Olcott as

President of the Theosophical Society. H.P.B.'s concluding comment follows:]

These custodians of Sanskrit learning have promised to put in writing the precious treasures of Aryan philosophy, and to cooperate with us to give the facts a worldwide circulation.

The London *Spiritualist* remarked, the other day, that we were doing much for Spiritualism in India. It might rather be said we are doing much to make known the importance of mesmeric science, for wherever we have been we have spared no pains to show the close and intimate relationship that exists between our modern discoveries in mesmerism, psychometry, and odic force, and the ancient Indian science of Yoga Vidya. We look forward with confidence to a day when the thorough demonstration of this connection will give to both Asia and Europe the basis for a perfect, because experimentally demonstrable, science of Psychology.

Lucifer, January, 1888

1888

PEOPLE usually wish that their friends shall have a happy new year, and sometimes “prosperous” is added to “happy.” It is not likely that much happiness or prosperity can come to those who are living for the truth under such a dark number as 1888; but still the year is heralded by the glorious star Venus-Lucifer, shining so resplendently that it has been mistaken for that still rarer visitor, the star of Bethlehem. This too, is at hand; and surely something of the Christos spirit must be born upon earth under such conditions. Even if happiness and prosperity are absent, it is possible to find something greater than either in this coming year. Venus-Lucifer is the sponsor of our magazine, and as we chose to come to light under its auspices so do we desire to touch on its nobility. This is possible for us all personally, and instead of wishing our readers a happy or prosperous New Year, we* feel more in the vein to pray them to make it one worthy of its brilliant herald. This can be effected by those who are courageous and resolute. Thoreau pointed out that there are artists in life, persons who can change the colour of a day and make it beautiful to those with whom they come in contact. We claim that there are adepts, masters in life who make it divine, as in all other arts. Is it not the greatest art of all, this which affects the very atmosphere in which we live? That it is the most important is seen at once, when we remember that every person who draws the breath of life affects the mental and moral atmosphere of the world, and helps to colour the day for those about him. Those who do not help to elevate the thoughts and lives of others must of necessity either paralyse them by indifference, or actively drag them down. When this point is reached, then the art of life is converted into the science of death; we see the black magician at work. And no one can be quite inactive. Although

many bad books and pictures are produced, still not everyone who is incapable of writing or painting well insists on doing so badly. Imagine the result if they were to! Yet so it is in life. Everyone lives, and thinks, and speaks. If all our readers who have any sympathy with LUCIFER endeavoured to learn the art of making life not only beautiful but divine, and vowed no longer to be hampered by disbelief in the possibility of this miracle, but to commence the Herculean task at once, then 1888, however unlucky a year, would have been fitly ushered in by the gleaming star. Neither happiness nor prosperity are always the best of bedfellows for such undeveloped mortals as most of us are; they seldom bring with them peace, which is the only permanent joy. The idea of peace is usually connected with the close of life and a religious state of mind. That kind of peace will however generally be found to contain the element of expectation. The pleasures of this world have been surrendered, and the soul waits contentedly in expectation of the pleasures of the next. The peace of the philosophic mind is very different from this and can be attained to early in life when pleasure has scarcely been tasted, as well as when it has been fully drunk of. The American Transcendentalists discovered that life could be made a sublime thing without any assistance from circumstances or outside sources of pleasure and prosperity. Of course this had been discovered many times before, and Emerson only took up again the cry raised by Epictetus. But every man has to discover this fact freshly for himself, and when once he realised it he knows that he would be a wretch if he did not endeavour to make the possibility a reality in his own life. The stoic became sublime because he recognised his own absolute responsibility and did not try to evade it; the Transcendentalist was even more, because he had faith in the unknown and untried possibilities which lay within himself. The occultist fully recognises the responsibility and claims his title by having both tried and required knowledge of his own possibilities.

The Theosophist who is at all in earnest, sees his responsibility and endeavors to find knowledge, living, in the meantime, up to the highest standard of which he is aware. To all such, *Lucifer* gives greeting! Man’s life is in his own hands, his fate is ordered by himself. Why then should not 1888 be a year of greater spiritual development

than any we have lived through? It depends on ourselves to make it so. This is an actual fact, not a religious sentiment. In a garden of sunflowers every flower turns towards the light. Why not so with us?

And let no one imagine that it is a mere fancy, the attaching of importance to the birth of the year. The earth passes through its definite phases and man with it; and as a day can be coloured so can a year. The astral life of the earth is young and strong between Christmas and Easter. Those who form their wishes now will have added strength to fulfill them consistently.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

Lucifer, August 1889

A PUZZLE FROM ADYAR

WHEN the cat is abroad the mice dance in the house it seems. Since Colonel Olcott sailed for Japan, the *Theosophist* has never ceased to surprise its European readers, and especially the Fellows of our Society, with most unexpected capers. It is as if the Sphinx had emigrated from the Nile and was determined to continue offering her puzzles broadcast to the CEdi-puses of the Society.

Now what may be the meaning of this extraordinary, and *most tactless "sortie"* of the esteemed *acting* editor of our *Theosophist*? Is he, owing to the relaxing climate of Southern India, ill, or like our (and his) editor-enemies across the Atlantic, also dreaming uncanny dreams and seeing lying visions—or what? And let me remind him at once that he must not feel offended by these remarks, as he has imperatively called them forth himself. LUCIFER, the PATH and the THEOSOPHIST are the only organs of communication with the Fellows of our Society, each in its respective country. Since the acting editor of the *Theosophist* has chosen to give a wide publicity in his organ to abnormal fancies, he has no right to expect a reply through any other channel than LUCIFER. Moreover, if he fails to understand all the seriousness of his implied charges *against me* and several honourable men, he may realise them better, when he reads the present. Already his enigmatical letter to *Light* has done mischief enough. While its purport was evidently to fight some windmills of his own creation, an inimical spiritualist who signs "Colenso" has jumped at the good opportunity afforded him to misrepresent that letter. In his malicious philippic called "Koot-hoomi Dethroned" he seeks to show that Mr. Harte's letter announces that the "Masters" are thrown overboard by the T. S. and "Mme. Blavatsky dethroned." Is it this that "Richard

Harte, acting editor of the *Theosophist*,” sought to convey to the Spiritualists in his letter in *Light* of July 6th?

Without further enquiry as to the real meaning of the *Light* letter, what does he try to insinuate by the following in the July number of the *Theosophist* ?

A DISCLAIMER

The Editor of the *Theosophist* has much pleasure in publishing the following extracts from a letter from Mr. Bertram Keightley, Secretary of the “Esoteric Section” of the Theosophical Society, to one of the Commissioners, which have been handed to him for publication. It should be explained that the denial therein contained refers to certain surmises and reports afloat in the Society, and which were seemingly corroborated by apparently *arbitrary* and *underhand* proceedings by certain Fellows known to be members of the Esoteric Section.

To this I, the “Head of the Esoteric Section,” answer:

1. Mr. Bertram Keightley’s letter, though containing the truth, and *nothing but the truth*, was never intended for publication, as a sentence in it proves. Therefore the acting Editor *had no right* to publish it.

2. Fellows of the E. S. having to be first of all Fellows of the Theosophical Society, what does the sentence “Fellows known to be members of the E. S.”—who stand accused by Mr. Harte (or even by some idiotic reports afloat in the Society) of “*arbitrary and underhand proceedings*”—mean? Is not such a sentence a gross insult thrown into the face of honourable men—far better Theosophists than any of their accusers—and of myself?

3. What were the silly reports? That the “British or the American Section,” and even the “Blavatsky Lodge” of the Theosophical Society wanted to “boss Adyar.” For this is what is said in the *Theosophist* in the alleged “disclaimer”:

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

Esoteric Section has any desire or pretension to ‘boss’ any other part or Section of the T.S.”

Amen! But before I reproduce the acting editor’s further marvellous comments thereon, I claim the right to say a few words on the subject. Since, as said, the letter was never meant to be paraded in print—chiefly, perhaps, because *qui s’excuse s’accuse*—it is no criticism to show that it contains that which I would describe as *2Lmt?Lmx\%)\zs\$ flap-doodle*, or, rather, a pair of them, something quite pardonable in a private and hastily-written letter, but quite unpardonable and grotesque when appearing as a published *document*.

1st. That the E. S. had never any pretensions to “boss the T.S.” stands to reason: with the exception of Col. Olcott, the President, the Esoteric Section has nothing whatever to do with the Theosophical Society, its Council or officers. It is a Section entirely apart from the exoteric body, and independent of it, *H.P.B. alone being responsible for its members*, as shown in the official announcement over the signature of the President Founder himself. It follows, therefore, that the E. S., as a body, owes no allegiance whatever to the Theosophical Society, *as a Society*, least of all to Adyar.

2nd. It is pure nonsense to say that “H.P.B.... is loyal to the Theosophical Society and to Adyar” (!?). *H.P.B. is loyal to death to the Theosophical CAUSE, and those great Teachers whose philosophy can alone bind the whole of Humanity into one Brotherhood.* Together with Col. Olcott, she is the chief Founder and Builder of the Society which *was and is* meant to *represent* that CAUSE; and if she is so loyal to H.S. Olcott, it is not at all because of his being its “President,” but, firstly, because there is no man living who has worked harder for that Society, or been more devoted to it than the Colonel, and, secondly, because she regards him as a loyal friend and co-worker. Therefore the degree of her sympathies with the “Theosophical Society and Adyar” depends upon the degree of the loyalty of that Society to the CAUSE. Let it break away from the original lines and show disloyalty in its policy to the CAUSE and the original programme of the Society, and H.P.B., calling the T.S. *disloyal*, will shake it off like dust from her feet.

And what does “loyalty to Adyar” mean, in the name of all wonders? What is Adyar, apart from that CAUSE and the *two* (not *one* Founder, if you please) who represent it? Why not loyal to the compound or the bath-room of Adyar? Adyar is the present Headquarters of the Society, because these “Headquarters are wherever the President is,” as stated in the rules. To be logical, the Fellows of the T.S. had to be loyal to Japan while Col. Olcott was there, and to London during his presence here. There is no longer a “Parent Society”; it is abolished and replaced by an aggregate body of Theosophical Societies, *all autonomous*, as are the States of America, and all under one Head President, who, together with H. P. Blavatsky, will champion the CAUSE against the whole world. Such is the real state of things.

What then, again, can be the meaning of the following comments by the acting Editor, who follows Mr. Keightley’s letter with these profoundly wise remarks :

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

The “private circulars” of the E.S. have nothing to do with the acting editor of the *Theosophist* nor has he any right to meddle with them.

Whenever “Madame Blavatsky does not approve” of “an action of the General Council,”¹ she will say so openly and to their faces. Because (a) Madame Blavatsky does not owe the slightest allegiance to a Council which is liable at any moment to issue silly and *untheosophical ukases*; and (b) for the simple reason that she recognizes but one person in the T.S. besides herself, namely Colonel Olcott, as having the right of effecting fundamental re-organizations in a Society which owes its life to them, and for which they are both *karmically* responsible. If the acting editor makes slight account of a

sacred pUdge, neither Col. Olcott nor H.P. Blavatsky are likely to do so. H. P. Blavatsky will always bow before the decision of the majority of a Section or even a simple Branch; but she will ever protest against the decision of the General Council, were it composed of Archangels and Dhyan Chohans themselves, if their decision seems to her unjust, or untheosophical, or fails to meet with the approval of the majority of the Fellows. No more than H. P. Blavatsky has the President Founder the right of exercising autocracy or *papal* powers, and Col. Olcott would be the last man in the world to attempt to do so. It is the two Founders and especially the President, who have virtually sworn allegiance to the Fellows, who they have to protect, and teach those who want to be taught, and not to tyrannize and rule over them.

And now I have said over my own signature what I had to say and that which ought to have been said in so many plain words long ago. The public is all agog with the silliest stories about our doings, and the supposed and real dissensions in the Society. Let every one know the truth at last, in which there is nothing to make any one ashamed, and which alone can put an end to a most painful and strained feeling. This truth is as simple as can be.

The acting editor of the *Theosophist* has taken it into his head that the Esoteric Section together with the British and American Sections, were either conspiring or preparing to conspire against what he most curiously calls “Adyar” and its authority. Now being a most devoted fellow of the T.S. and attached to the President, his zeal in hunting up this mare’s nest has led him to become more Catholic than the Pope. That is all, and I hope that such misunderstandings and hallucinations will come to an end with the return of the President to India. Had he been at home, he, at any rate, would have objected to all those dark hints and cloaked sayings that have of late incessantly appeared in the *Theosophist* to the great delight of our enemies. We readily understand that owing to lack of original contributions the acting editor should reproduce a bungled up and sensational report from the *N. Y. Times* and call it “Dr. Keightley speaks.” But when jumping at a sentence of Dr. Keightley’s, who in speaking of some “prominent members,” said that they had been “abandoned or been read out of the fold,” he gravely adds in a foot-note that this is “another mistake

¹ Or “Commissioners” of whom Mr. R. Harte is one. [Ed]

of the reporter," as "no Fellow of the Theosophical Society has been expelled of recent years"; it is time some one should tell the esteemed acting editor plainly that for the pleasure of hitting imaginary enemies he allows the reader to think that he does not know what he is talking about. If through neglect at Adyar the names of the expelled Fellows have not been entered in the books, it does not follow that Sections and Branches like the "London Lodge" and others which *are autonomous* have not expelled, or had no right to expel, any one. Again, what on earth does he mean by pretending that the reporter has "confounded the Blavatsky Lodge with the Theosophical Society?" Is not the Blavatsky Lodge, like the London, Dublin, or any other "Lodge," a branch of, and a Theosophical Society? What next shall we read in our unfortunate *Theosophist*?

But it is time for me to close. If Mr. Harte persists still in acting in such a strange and untheosophical way, then the sooner the President settles these matters the better for all concerned.

Owing to such undignified quibbles, Adyar and especially the *Theosophist* are fast becoming the laughing stock of Theosophists themselves as well as of their enemies; the bushels of letters received by me to that effect, being a good proof of it.

I end by assuring him that there is no need for him to pose as Colonel Olcott's protecting angel. Neither he nor I need a third party to screen us from each other. We have worked and toiled and suffered together for fifteen long years, and if after all these years of mutual friendship the President Founder were capable of lending ear to insane accusations and turning against me, well—the world is wide enough for both. Let the new Exoteric Theosophical Society headed by Mr. Harte, play at red tape if the President lets them and let the General Council expel me for "disloyalty," if again, Colonel Olcott should be so blind as to fail to see where the "true friend" and his duty lie. Only unless they hasten to do so, at the first sign of *their* disloyalty to the CAUSE—it is I who will have resigned my office of Corresponding Secretary for life and left the Society. This will not prevent me from remaining at the head of those—who will follow me.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

THE ORGANISATION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

[In order to leave no room for equivocation, the members of the T.S. have to be reminded of the origin of the Society in 1875. Sent to the U.S. of America in 1873 for the purpose of organizing a group of workers on a psychic plane, two years later the writer received orders from her Master and Teacher to form the nucleus of a regular Society whose objects were broadly stated as follows:

(1) Universal Brotherhood;

(2) No distinction to be made by the members between]* races, creeds, or social positions, but every member had to be judged and dealt by on his personal merits;

(3) To study the philosophies of the East—those of India chiefly, presenting them gradually to the public in various works that would interpret exoteric religions in the light of esoteric teachings;

(4) To oppose materialism and theological dogmatism in every possible way, by demonstrating the existence of occult forces unknown to Science, in Nature, and the presence of psychic and spiritual powers in Man; trying, at the same time, to enlarge the views of the Spiritualists by showing them that there are other, many other agencies at work in the production of phenomena besides the "Spirits" of the dead. Superstition had to be exposed and avoided; and occult forces, *beneficent and maleficent*—ever surrounding us and manifesting their presence in various ways—demonstrated to the best of our ability.

Such was the programme in its broad features. The two chief Founders were not told what they had to do, how they had to bring

* These opening words enclosed in brackets were presumably on the first manuscript page by H.P.B., which was lost, but they were later restored from a typed copy at Adyar and included in the August 1931 reprinting of the article in the *Theosophist*.—Eds.

about and quicken the growth of the Society and results desired; nor had they any definite ideas given them concerning the outward organisation—all this being left entirely with themselves. Thus, as the undersigned had no capacity for such work as the mechanical formation and administration of Society, the management of the latter was left in the hands of Col. H. S. Olcott, then and there elected by the primitive founders and members—*President for life*. But if the two Founders were not told *what they had to do*, they were distinctly instructed about *what they should never do*, what they had to avoid, and what the Society should never become. Church organisations, Christians and Spiritual sects were shown as the future contrasts to our Society.¹

To make it clearer:

(1) The Founders had to exercise all their influence *to oppose selfishness of any kind* by insisting upon sincere, fraternal feelings

¹ A liberal Christian member of the T.S. having objected to the study of Oriental religions and doubted whether there was room left for any new Society—a letter answering his objections and preference to Christianity was received and the contents copied for him; after which he denied no longer the advisability of such a Society as the professed Theosophical Association. A few extracts from this early letter will show plainly the nature of the Society as then contemplated, and that we have tried only to follow and carry out in the best way we could the intentions of the true originators of the Society in those days. The pious gentleman having claimed that he was a theosophist and had a right of judgment over other people was told ...

“You have no right to such a title. You are only ph/'/o-theosophist; as one who has reached to the full comprehension of the name and nature of a theosophist will sit in judgment on no man or action. . . . You claim that your religion is the highest and final step toward divine Wisdom on this earth, and that it has introduced into the arteries of the old decaying world new blood and life and verities that had remained unknown to the heathen? If it were so indeed, then your religion would have introduced the highest truths into all the social, civil and international relations of Christendom. Instead of that, as anyone can perceive, your social, as your private life is not based upon a common moral solidarity but only on constant mutual counteraction and purely mechanical equilibrium of individual powers and interests. . . . If you would be a theosophist you must not do as those around you do who call on a God of Truth and Love and serve the dark Powers of Might, Greed and Luck. We look in the midst of your Christian civilisation and see the same sad signs of old: the realities of your daily lives are diametrically opposed to your religious ideal, but you feel it not; the thought that the very laws that govern your being whether in the domain of politics or social economy clash painfully with the origins of your religion—does not seem to trouble you in the least. But if the nations of the West are so fully convinced that the ideal can never become practical and the practical will never reach the ideal—then, you have to make your choice, either it is your religion that is impracticable, and in that case it is no better than a vainglorious delusion, or it might find a practical application, but it is you, yourselves, who do not care to apply its ethics to your daily walk in life. . . . Hence, before you invite other nations 'to the King's festival table' from which your guests arise more starved than before, you should, ere you try to bring them to your own way of thinking, look into the repasts they offer to you. . . . Under the dominion and sway of exoteric creeds the grotesque and tortured shadows of the theosophical realities, there must ever be the same oppression of the weak and the poor and the same typhonic struggle of the wealthy and the mighty among themselves. . . . It is esoteric philosophy alone, the spiritual and psychic blending of man with Nature that, by revealing fundamental truths, can bring that much desired mediate state between the two extremes of human Egotism and divine Altruism and finally lead to the alleviation of human suffering. . . .” (See next to last page for continuation. [See p. 35])

among the Members—at least outwardly; working for it to bring about a spirit of unity and harmony, the great diversity of creeds notwithstanding; expecting and demanding from the Fellows, a great mutual toleration and charity for each other's shortcomings; mutual help in the research of truths in every domain—moral or physical—and even in daily life.

(2) They had to oppose in the strongest manner anything approaching *dogmatic faith and fanaticism*—belief in the *infallibility* of the Masters, or even in the very existence of our invisible Teachers, having to be checked from the first. On the other hand, as a great respect for the private views and creeds of every member was demanded, any Fellow criticising the faith or belief of another Fellow, hurting his feelings, or showing a reprehensible self-assertion, unasked (mutual friendly advices were a duty unless declined)—such a member incurred expulsion. The greatest spirit of free research untrammelled by anyone or anything, had to be encouraged.

Thus, for the first year the Members of the T. Body, who representing every class in Society as every creed and belief—Christian clergymen, Spiritualists, Freethinkers, Mystics, Masons and Materialists—lived and met under these rules in peace and friendship. There were two or three expulsions for *slander* and *backbiting*. The rules, however imperfect in their tentative character, were strictly enforced and respected by the members. The original \$5 initiation fee was soon abolished as *inconsistent with the spirit of the Association*: members had enthusiastically promised to support the Parent Society and defray the *expenses of machines for experiments, books*, the fees of the *Recording Secretary*,² etc., etc. This was *Reform No. 1*. Three months after, Mr. H. Newton, the Treasurer, a rich gentleman of New York, showed that no one had paid anything or helped him to defray the current expenses for the Hall of meetings, stationery, printing, etc., and that he had to carry the burden of those expenses *alone*. He went on for a short time longer, then—*he resigned as treasurer*. It was the President-Founder, Col. H. S. Olcott, who had to pay henceforth for all. He did so for over 18 months. The “fee” was re-established, before the Founders left for India with the two English

² Mr. Cobb.

delegates—now their mortal enemies; but the money collected was for the Arya Samaj of Aryavarta with which Society the Theosophical became affiliated. It is the President Founder who paid the enormous travelling expenses from America to India, and those of installation in Bombay, and who supported the two delegates out of his own pocket for nearly 18 months. When he had no more money left, nor the Corr. Secretary either—a resolution was passed that the “initiation fee” sums should go towards supporting the Headquarters.

Owing to the rapid increase of the Society in India, the present *Rules* and *Statutes* grew out. They are not the outcome of the deliberate thought and whim of the President Founder, but the result of the yearly meetings of the General Council at the Anniversaries. If the members of that G.C. have framed them so as to give a wider authority to the Pres. Founder, it was the result of their absolute confidence in him, in his devotion and love for the Society, and not at all—as implied in “A Few Words”—a proof of *his love for power and authority*. Of this, however, later on.

It was never denied that the Organization of the T.S. was *very* imperfect. *Errare humanum est*. But, if it can be shown that the President has done what he could under the circumstances and in the best way he knew how—no one, least of all a theosophist, can charge him with the sins of the whole community, as now done. From the founders down to the humblest member, the Society is composed of imperfect mortal men—not gods. This was always claimed by its leaders. “He who feels *without sin* let him cast the first stone.” It is the duty of every Member of the Council to offer advice and to bring for the consideration of the whole body any incorrect proceedings. One of the *plaintiffs* is a Councillor. Having never used his privileges as one, in the matter of the complaints now proffered—and thus, having no excuse to give that his just representations were not listened to, he by bringing out publicly what he had to state first privately—sins against Rule xii. The whole paper now reads like a defamatory aspersion, being full of untheosophical and unbrotherly insinuations—which the writers thereof could never have had in view.

This Rule xnth was one of the first and the wisest. It is by neglecting

to have it enforced when most needed, that the President-Founder has brought upon himself the present penalty.³ It is by too great indulgence and unwise carelessness that have led to all such charges of abuse of power, love of authority, show, of variety, etc., etc. Let us see how far it may have been deserved.

As shown for 12 years the Founder has toiled *almost alone* in the interests of the Society and the general good—hence, not his own, and, the only complaint he was heard to utter was, that *he was left no time for self-development and study*. The results of this too just complaint are, that those for whom he toiled, are the first to fling at him the reproach of being ignorant of certain Hindu terms, of using one term for another, for inst. of having applied the word “Jivanmukta” to a Hindu chela, on one occasion! The crime is a terrible one, indeed. . . . We know of “chelas” who being Hindus, are sure never to confuse..such well known terms in *their* religion; but who, on the other hand, pursue Jivanmuktaship and the highest Theosophical Ethics through the royal road of selfish ambition, lies, slander, ingratitude and backbiting. Every road leads to Rome: this is evident; and there is such a thing in Nature as “.Mahatma”-Duggas. ... It would be desirable for the cause of Theosophy and truth, however, were all the critics of our President in general, less learned, yet found reaching more to the level of his all-forgiving goodnature, his thorough sincerity and unselfishness; as the rest of the members less inclined to lend a willing ear to those, who, like the said “Vicars of Bray” have developed a hatred for the Founders—for reasons unknown.

The above advice is offered to the two Theosophists who have just framed their “Few Words on the Theosophical Organisation.” That they are not alone in their complaints (which, translated from their diplomatic into plain language look a good deal in the present case like a mere “*querelle*⁴ d’Allemand”) and that the said

³ For years the wise rule by which any member accused of backbiting or slander was expelled from the Society after sufficient evidence—has become obsolete. There have been two or three solitary cases of expulsion for the same in cases of members of no importance. Europeans of position and name were allowed to cover the Society literally with mud and slander their Brothers with perfect impunity. This is the President’s Karma—and it is just.

⁴ This may be a reference to the legal term, querela, for “bill of complaint”; Geb-hard being in Germany, the “Allemand” is clear—Eds THEOSOPHY.

complaints are in a great measure just,—is frankly admitted Hence, the writer must be permitted to speak in this, her answer, of Theosophy and theosophists in general, instead of limiting the *Reply* strictly to the complaints uttered. There is not the slightest desire to be personal; yet, there has accumulated of late such a mass of incandescent material in the Society, by that eternal friction of precisely such “selfish personalities,” that it is certainly wise to try to smother the sparks in time, by pointing out their true nature.

Demands, and a feeling of necessity for reforms have not originated with the two complainants. They date from several years, and there has never been a question of *avoiding* reforms, but rather a failure of finding such means as would satisfy the theosophists. To the present day, we have yet to find that “wise man” from the East or from the West, who could not only *diagnose* the disease in the T. Society, but offer advice and a remedy likewise to cure it. It is easy to write: “It would be out of place to suggest any *specific measures*”⁹⁶ (for such reforms, which do seem more difficult to suggest than to be vaguely hinted at)—“for no one who has any faith in Brotherhood and in the power of Truth will fail to perceive what is necessary,”—concludes the critic. One may, perhaps, have such faith and yet fail to perceive what is *most* necessary. Two heads are better than one; and if any practical reforms have suggested themselves to our severe judges their refusal to give us the benefit of their discovery would be most *unbrotherly*. So far, however, we have received only most impracticable suggestions for reforms whenever these came to be specified. The Founders, and the whole Central Society at the Headquarters, for instance, are invited to demonstrate their theosophical natures by living like “fowls in the air and lilies of the field,” which neither sow nor reap, toil not, nor spin and “take no thought for the morrow.” This being found hardly practicable, even in India, where a man may go about in the garment of an Angel, but has, nevertheless, to pay rent and taxes, another proposition, then a third one and a fourth—each less practicable than the preceding—were offered . . . the unavoidable rejection of which led finally to the criticism now under review.

After carefully reading “A Few Words, etc.,” no very acute intellect is needed to perceive that, although no “specific measures” are offered in them, the drift of the whole argument tends but to one conclusion, a kind of syllogism more Hindu than metaphysical. Epitomised, the remarks therein plainly say: “Destroy the bad *results* pointed out by destroying the *causes* that generate them.” Such is the apocalyptic meaning of the paper, although both causes and results are made painfully and flagrantly objective and that they may be rendered in this wise: Being shown that the Society is the result and fruition of a bad President; and the latter being the outcome of such an “untheosophically” organized Society—and, its *worse than useless* General Council—“make away with all these *Causes* and the results will disappear”; *i.e.*, the Society will have ceased to exist. Is this the heart-desire of the two *true* and *sincere* Theosophists?

The complaints—“submitted to *those interested* in the progress of true Theosophy”—which seems to mean “theosophy divorced from the Society”—may now be noticed in order and answered. They specify the following objections:

I. To the language of the *Rules* with regard to the powers invested in the President-Founder by the General Council. This objection seems very right. The sentence . . . The duties of the Council “shall consist in *advising* the P.F. *in regard to all matters referred to them by him*” may be easily construed as implying that on all matters *not* referred to the Council by the Pres.-Founder . . . its members will hold their tongues. The Rules are changed, at any rate they are corrected and altered yearly. This sentence can be taken out. The harm, so far, is not so terrible

II. It is shown that many members *ex-officio* whose names are found on the list of the General Council *are not known* to the Convention; that they are, very likely, not even interested in the Society “under their special care”; a body they had joined at one time, then probably *forgotten* its existence in the meanwhile to withdraw themselves from the Association. The argument implied is very valid. Why not point it out *officially* to the Members residing at, or visiting the Headquarters, the impropriety of such a parad

ing of names? Yet, in what respect can this administrative blunder, or carelessness, interfere with, or *impede* “the progress of true Theosophy.”⁵

III. “The members are appointed by the President-Founder.” it is complained; “the Gen. Council only *advises* on what is submitted to it” . . . and “in the meantime” that P.F. is empowered *td issue* “special orders” and “provisional rules,” on behalf of that (“dummy”) Council. (Rule IV, p. 20.) Moreover, it is urged that out of a number of 150 members of the G. Council, a quorum of 5 and even 3 members present, may, should it be found necessary *by the President*, decide upon any question of vital importance, etc., fctc, etc.

Such an “untheosophical” *display* of authority, is objected to by Messrs. M. M. Chatterji and A. Gebhard on the ground that it leads the Society to *Caesarism*, to “tyranny” and “papal infallibility,” etc., etc. However right the two complainants may be *in principle* it is impossible to fail seeing the absurd exaggerations of the epithets used; for, having just been accused on one page of “tyrannical authority,” of “centralization of power” and a “papal institution” (p. 9)—on page 11, the President-Founder is shown “issuing *special orders*” from that “centre of Caesarism”—*which no one is bound to obey, unless he so wishes!* “It is well known” re-marks the principal writer—“that not only individuals but even Branches have refused to pay this (annual) subscription ... of . . . two shillings” (p. 11); without any bad effect for themselves, resulting out of it, as appears. Thus, it would seem it is not to a *non-existent* authority that objections should be made, but simply to a vain and useless *display* of power that no one cares for.

The policy of issuing “special orders” with such sorry results is indeed objectionable; only, *not on the ground of a tendency to Caesarism*, but simply because it becomes *highly ridiculous*. The undersigned for one, has many a time objected to it, moved however, more by a spirit of *worldly* pride and an *untheosophical* feeling of self-respect than anything like Yogi humility. It is admitted with regret

5 Furthermore the writer of the complaints In “A Few Words, etc.,” is himself a member on the General Council for over two years (see Rules 1885). Why has he not spoken earlier?

that the world of scoffers and «0«-theosophists might, if they heard of it, find in it a capital matter for fun. But the real wonder is, how can certain *European* Theosophists, who have bravely defied the world to make them wince under any amount of ridicule, once they acted in accordance with the dictates of their conscience and duty—make a crime of what is at the worst a *harmless*, even if ridiculous, bit of vanity; a desire of giving importance—not to the Founder, but to his Society *for which he is ready to die any day*. One kind of ridicule is worth another. The Western the-osophist, who for certain magnetic reasons wears his hair long and shows otherwise eccentricity in his dress, will be spared no more than his President, with his “special orders.” Only the latter, remaining as kindly disposed and brotherly to the “individual The-osophist and even a Branch”—that snub *him* and his “order,” by refusing to pay what others do—shows himself *ten-fold more Theo-sophical and true to the principle of Brotherhood*, than the former, who traduces and denounces him in such uncharitable terms, instead of kindly warning him of the bad effect produced. Unfortunately, it is not those who speak the loudest of virtue and theosophy, who are the best exemplars of both. Few of them, if any, have tried to cast out the beam from their own eye, before they raised their voices against the mote in the eye of a brother. Furthermore, it seems to have become quite the theosophical rage in these days, to denounce vehemently, yet, never to offer to help pulling out *any* such *motes*.

The Society is bitterly criticized for asking every well-to-do theosophist (the poor are exempt from it, from the first) to pay annually two shillings to help defraying the expenses at Head-Quarters. It is denounced as “untheosophical,” “unbrotherly,” and the “admission fee” of £1, is declared no better than “a sale of Brotherhood.” In this our “Brotherhood” may be shown again on a far higher level than any other association past or present. The Theosophical Society has never shown the ambitious pretension to outshine in *Theosophy* and *brotherliness* the primitive Brotherhood of Jesus and his Apostles,⁶

6 Yet, the Theosophical Brotherhood does seem doomed to outrival the group of Apostles in the number of its denying Peters, its unbelieving Thomases, and even Iscariots occasionally, ready to sell their Brotherhood for less than thirty shekels of silver!

and that “Organisation,” besides *asking* and being occasionally refused, helped itself *without asking*, and as a matter of fact in a *real* community of Brothers. Nevertheless, such actions, that would seem highly untheosophical and prejudicial in our day of culture when nations alone are privileged to pocket each other’s property and expect to be honoured for it— do not seem to have been an obstacle in the way of deification and sanctification of the said early “Brotherly” group Our Society had never certainly any idea of rising superior to the *brotherliness* and *ethics* preached by Christ, but only to those of the *sham* Christianity of the Churches—as originally ordered to by our MASTERS. And if we do no worse than the Gospel Brotherhood did, and far better than any Church, which would expel any member refusing too long to pay his Church rates, it is really hard to see why our “Organisation” should be ostracized by its own members. At any rate, the pens of the latter ought to show themselves less *acerb*, in these days of trouble when every one seems bent on finding fault with the Society, and few to help it, and that the President-Founder is alone to work and toil with a few devoted theosophists at Adyar to assist him.

IV. “There is no such institution in existence as the Parent Society”—we are told (pp. 2 and 3). “It has disappeared from the Rules and . . . has no *legal* existence” . . . The Society being unchartered, *it has* tfof—legally; but no more has any Theosophist a legal existence, for the matter of that. Is there one single member throughout the whole globe who would be recognised *by law* or before a Magistrate—as a *theosophist*? Why then do the gentlemen “complainants” call themselves “theosophists” if the latter qualification has no better legal standing than the said “Parent Society” of the Head Quarters itself? But the Parent-body *does* exist, and will, so long as the last man or woman of the primitive group of Theosophist *Founders* is alive. This—as a body; as for its moral characteristics, the Parent-Society means that small nucleus of theosophists who hold sacredly through storm and blows to the *original programme* of the T.S., as established under the direction and orders of those, whom they recognise—and will, to their last breath—as thereal originators of the

Movement, their *living*, Holy MASTERS AND TEACHERS.⁷

V, The complaints then, that the T.S. “has Laws without sanction, “a”legislativebody without legality,” a Parent Society without existence,” and, worse than all—“a President *above all rules*’”—are thus *shovmoviXypartially* correct. But even were they all absolutely true, it would be easy to abolish such rules with one stroke of the pen, or to modify them. But now comes the curious part of that severe *philippic* against the T.S by our eloquent Demosthenes. After six pages (out of twelve) had been filled with the said charges, the writer admits on the 7th,—that they have been so modified!—“The above” we learn (rather late) “was written under *misapprehension* that the ‘Rules’ bearing date 1885—were the latest. It has since been found that there is a later version of the Rules dated 1886 which *have modified the older rules on a great many points*” So much the better.—Why recall, in such case, mistakes in the past if these exist no longer? But the accusers do not see it in this light. They are determined to act as a theosophical Nemesis; and in no way daunted by the discovery, they add that nevertheless “it is *necessary* to examine the earlier rules to ascertain *the underlying principle*, which rules through the present ones as well.” This reminds of the fable of “the Wolf and the Lamb.” But—you see—“the chief point is, that the Convention *has no power to make any rules*, as such a power *is opposed to the spirit of Theosophy*” . . . etc., etc.

Now this is the most extraordinary argument that could be made. At this rate no Brotherhood, no Association, no Society is possible. More than this; no theosophist, however holy his present life may be, would have the right to call himself one; for were it always found *necessary* to examine *his earlier life*, “to ascertain the *underlying principle*” which rules through the nature of the present man—ten to one, he would be found unfit to be called a theosophist! The experiment would hardly be found pleasant to the majority of those

⁷ The members of the T.S. know, and those who do not should be told, that the term “Mahatma,” now so subtly analysed and controverted, for some mysterious reasons had never been applied to our Masters before our arrival in India. For years they were known as the “Adept Brothers,” the “Masters,” etc. It is the Hindus themselves who began applying the term to the two Teachers. This is no place for an etymological disquisition on the fitness or unfitness of the qualification, in the case in hand. As a state Mahatmaship is one thing, as a double noun. Maha-atma (Great Soul) quite another one. Hindus ought to know the value of metaphysical Sanskrit names used; and it is they the first, who have used it to designate the MASTERS.

whom association with the T.S. has reformed; and of such there are a good many.

After such virulent and severe denunciations one might expect some good, friendly and theosophically *practical* advice. Not at all, and none is offered, since we have been already told (p. 9) that it would be “out of place to suggest any specific measures, as no one who has any faith in Brotherhood—and in the power of Truth *will fail* to perceive what is necessary.” The President-Founder has *no faith* in either “Brotherhood,” or “the power of Truth”—apparently. This is made evident by his having *failed* to perceive (a) that the Head Quarters—opened to *all* Theosophists of any race or social position, board and lodging free of charge the whole year round—was an *unbrotherly* Organisation; (b) that “the central office at Adyar for keeping records and concentrating information” with its European and Hindu inmates working *gratuitously* and some helping it with their own money whenever they have it—ought to be carried on, according to the method and principle of George Miller of Bristol, namely, the numerous households and staff of officers at Adyar headed by the President-Founder ought to kneel every morning in prayer for their bread and milk, appealing for their meals to “miracle”; and that finally, and (c) all the good the Society is doing, is no good whatever but “a spiritual wrong,” because it presumes to call a *limited* line of good work—(theosophy) Divine Wisdom.”

The undersigned is an ever patient theosophist, who has hitherto laboured under the impression that no amount of subtle scholasticism and tortured casuistry but would find like the Rosetta stone its Champollion—some day. The most acute among theosophists are now invited to make out in “A Few Words”—what the writers or writer—is driving at—unless in plain and unvarnished language, it be—”down with the Theosophical Society, President-Founder and its Head-Quarters!” This is the only possible explanation of the twelve pages of denunciations to which a reply is now attempted. What can indeed be made out of the following jumble of contradictory statements;

(a) The President Founder having been shown throughout as a “tyrant,” a “*would be* Caesar,” “aiming at *papal* power” and a

“Venetian Council of Three,” and other words to that effect implied in almost every sentence of the paper under review, it is confessed in the same breath that the “London Lodge” of the Theosophical Society has *completely ignored* the *Rules* (of the Pope Caesar) published at Adyar! (p. 4) And yet, the “L. L. of the T.S.” still lives and breathes and one has heard of no *anathema* pronounced against it, so far.. ..

(b) Rule XIV stating that the Society has “to deal *only* with scientific and philosophical subjects,” hence, “it is quite *evident* [?] that the power and position claimed in the *Rules* for the P’t Founder and the Gen. Council and Convention are opposed to the spirit of the declared Objects.”

It might have been as well perhaps to quote the entire paragraph in which these words appear,⁸ once that hairs are split about the possibly faulty reaction of the *Rules*? Is it not self-evident, that the wordsbroughtforward”onlywithscientificandphilosophical subjects” are inserted as a necessary caution to *true* theosophists, who by dealing with politics *within* any Branch Society might bring disgrace and ruin on the whole body—in India to begin with? Has the Society or has it not over 140 Societies scattered through four parts of the world to take care of? As in the case of “Mahatmas”and”Mahatmaship”—active work of the Theosophical Society is confused—willingly or otherwise, it is not for the writer to decide—with Theosophy. No need of entering here upon the difference between the jar that contains a liquid and the nature of, or that liquid itself.

“Theosophy teaches *self-culture* .. and not control,” we are told. Theosophy teaches *mutual-culture* before *self-culture* to *begin* with. Union is strength. It is by gathering many theosophists of the same way of thinking into one or more groups, and making them closely united by the same magnetic bond of fraternal unity and sympathy that the objects of *mutual* development and progress in Theosophical

⁸ XIV “The Society having to deal only with scientific and philosophical subjects, and having Branches in divergent parts of the world under various forms of Government does not permit its members, as such, to interfere with politics, and repudiates any attempt on the part of any one to commit it in favor of or against any political party or measure. Violation of this rule will meet with expulsion.”

This rather alters the complexion put on the charge, which seems to conveniently for get that “scientific and philosophical subjects” are not the only declared objects of the Society. Let us not leave room for a doubt that there is more animus underlying the charges than would be strictly theosophical.

thought may be best achieved. “Self-culture” is for isolated *Hatha Yogis*, independent of any Society and having to avoid association with human beings; and this is a *triple distilled* SELFISHNESS. For real moral advancement—there “where two or three are gathered” in the name of the SPIRIT OF TRUTH—there that Spirit or Theosophy *will be in the midst of them*.

It to say that theosophy has no need of a Society—a vehicle and centre thereof—is like affirming that the Wisdom of the Ages collected in thousands of volumes, at the British Museum has no need of either the edifice that contains it, nor the works in which it is found. Why not advise the British Gov’t on its lack of discrimination and its *worldliness* in not destroying Museum and all its vehicles of Wisdom? Why spend such sums of money and pay so many officers to watch over its treasures, the more so, since many of its guardians may be quite out of keeping with, and opposed to the Spirit of that Wisdom? The Directors of such Museums may or may not be very perfect men, and some of their assistants may have never opened a philosophical work: yet, it is they who take care of the library and preserve it for future generations who are indirectly entitled to their thanks. How much more gratitude is due to those who like our self-sacrificing theosophists at Adyar, devote their lives to, and give their services gratuitously to the good of Humanity!

Diplomas, and Charters are objected to, and chiefly the “admission fee.” The latter is a “taxation,” and therefore “*inconsistent* with the principle of Brotherhood”.... A “forced gift is *unbrotherly*” etc., etc. It would be curious to see where the T.S. would be led to, were the P’t. F. to religiously follow the proffered advices. “Initiation” on admission, has been made away with already in Europe, and has led to that which will very soon become known; no use mentioning it at present. Now the “Charters” and Diplomas would follow. Hence no document to show for any group, and no diploma to prove that one is affiliated to the Society. Hence also perfect liberty to any one to either call himself a theosophist, or deny he is one. The “admission fee”? Indeed, it has to be regarded as a terrible and *unbrotherly* “extortion,” and a “forced gift,” in the face of those thousands of Masonic Lodges, of Clubs, Associations, Societies, Leagues, and even the “Salvation

Army.” The former, extort yearly *fortunes* from their Members; the latter—throttle in the name of Jesus the masses and appealing to *voluntary* contributions make the converts pay, and pay in their turn every one of their “officers,” none of whom will serve the “Army” for nothing.

Yet it would be well, perchance, were our members to follow the example of the Masons in their solidarity of thought and action and at least *outward* Union, notwithstanding that receiving a thousand times more from their members they give them in return still less than we do, whether spiritually or morally. This solitary single guinea expected from every new member is spent in less than one week, as was calculated, on postage and correspondence with theosophists. Or are we to understand that all correspondence with members—now left to “*self-culture*”—is also to cease and has to follow diplomas, Charters and the rest? Then, truly, the Head Quarters and Office had better be closed. A simple *Query*—however: Have the 1£—the yearly contribution to the L.L. of the T.S., and the further sum of 2/6d. to the Oriental Group been abolished as “acts of unbrotherly extortion,” and how long, if so, have they begun to be regarded as “a *sale of Brotherhood*”?

To continue: the charges wind up with the following remarks, so profound, that it requires a deeper head than ours to fathom all that underlies the words contained in them. “Is the T.S. a Brotherhood, or not? queries the plaintiff—”If the former, is it possible to have any *centre of arbitrary power*?⁹ To hold that there is necessity for such a centre is only a roundabout way of saying that no Brotherhood is possible,¹⁰ but in point of fact *that necessity itself is by no means proved* [!]. There have been no doubt Brotherhoods under high Masters. ...” [there “have been” and *still are*. H.P.B.] “but in such cases the Masters were never elected for *geographical* or other considerations [?]. The natural leader of men was always recognised by his embodying the spirit of Humanity. To institute comparisons would

⁹ It is the first time since the T.S. exists that such an accusation of “arbitrary power” is brought forward. Not many will be found of this way of thinking.

¹⁰ No need taking a roundabout way, to say that no Brotherhood would ever be possible if many theosophists shared the very original views of the writer,

be little short of blasphemy. The greatest among men is always the readiest to serve and yet is unconscious of the service. Let us pause before finally tying the millstone of worldliness around the neck of Theosophy. Let us not forget that Theosophy does not grow in our midst *by force and control* but by *sunshine of brotherliness* and the *dew of self-oblivion*. If we do not believe in Brotherhood and Truth let us put ashes on our head and *weep in sack-cloth* and not rejoice in the purple of authority and in the festive garments of pride and worldliness. It is by far better that the name of Theosophy should never be heard, than that it should be used as the Motto of a *papal authority*. . . .

Who, upon reading this, and being ignorant that the above piece of rhetorical flowers of speech is directed against the luckless Pres't Founder—would not have in his “mind's eye”—an Alexander Borgia, a Caligula, or to say the least—General Booth in his latest metamorphosis! When, how, or by doing what, has our good-natured, unselfish, ever kind President merited such a Ciceronian tirade? The state of things denounced exists now for almost twelve years, and our accuser knew of it and even took an active part in its organisation, Conventions, Councils, Rules, etc., etc., at Bombay, and at Adyar. This virulent *sortie* is no doubt due to “SELF-CULTURE”? The critic has outgrown the movement and turned his face from the original programme; hence his severity. But where is the *true theosophical charity*, the tolerance and the “*sunshine of brotherliness*” just spoken of, and so insisted upon?

Verily—it is easy to preach the “dew of self-oblivion” when one has nothing to think about except to evolve such finely rounded phrases; were every theosophist at Adyar to have his daily wants and even comforts, his board, lodging and all, attended to by a wealthier theosophist; and were the same “sunshine of brotherliness” to be poured upon him, as it is upon the critic who found for himself an endless brotherly care, a fraternal and self-sacrificing devotion in two other noble-minded members, then—would there be little need for the President Founder to call upon and humble himself before our theosophists. For, if he has to *beg* for 2 annual shillings—it is, in order that those—Europeans and Hindus—who work night and day at

Adyar, giving their services free and receiving little thanks or honour for it, should have at least *one meal a day*. The fresh “dew of *self-oblivion*” must not be permitted to chill one's heart, and turn into the lethal *mold of forgetfulness* to such an extent as that. The severe critic seems to have lost sight of the fact that for months, during the last crisis, the whole staff of our devoted Adyar officers, from President down to the youngest brother in the office, have lived on 5d. a day each, having reduced their meals to the *minimum*. And it is *this mite*, the proceeds of the “2 shill. contribution,” conscientiously paid by some, that is now called *extortion*, a desire to live “in the purple of authority and the festive garments of pride and worldliness”!

Our “Brother” is right. Let us “weep in sack cloth and ashes on our head” if the T.S. has many more such *unbrotherly* criticisms to bear. Truly “it would be far better that the name of Theosophy should never be heard than that it should be used as a motto”—not of *papal authority* which exists nowhere at Adyar outside the critic's imagination—but as a motto of a “self-developed fanaticism.” All the great services otherwise rendered to the Society, all the noble work done by the complainant will pale and vanish before such an appearance of cold-heartedness. Surely he cannot desire the *annihilation* of the Society? And if he did it would be useless: the T.S. *cannot be destroyed as a body*. It is not in the power of either Founders or their critics; and neither friend nor enemy can ruin that which is *doomed to exist*, all the blunders of its leaders notwithstanding. That which was generated through and founded by the “High Masters” and under their authority if not their instruction—MUST AND WILL LIVE. Each of us and all will receive his or her *Karma* in it, but the *vehicle* of Theosophy will stand indestructible and undestroyed by the hand of whether man or fiend.

No; “truth does not depend on show of hands”; but in the case of the much abused President-Founder it must depend on the *show of facts*. Thorny and full of pitfalls was the steep path he had to climb up alone and unaided for the first years. Terrible was the opposition outside the Society he had to build—sickening and disheartening the treachery he often encountered within the Head Quarters. Enemies gnashing their teeth in his face around, those whom he regarded as his

staunchest friends and co-workers betraying him and the Cause on the slightest provocation. Still, where hundreds in his place would have collapsed and given up the whole undertaking in despair, he, unmoved and unmovable, went on climbing up and toiling as before, unrelenting and undismayed, supported by that one thought and conviction that he was doing his duty. What other inducement has the Founder ever had, but his theosophical pledge and the sense of his duty toward THOSE he had promised to serve to the end of his life? There was but one beacon for him—the hand that had first pointed to him his way up: the hand of the MASTER he loves and reveres so well, and serves so devotedly though occasionally, perhaps, unwisely. As President elected for life, he has nevertheless offered more than once to resign in favour of any one found worthier than him, but was never permitted to do so by the majority—not of “show of hands” but *show of hearts*, literally—as few or more beloved than he is even by most of those, who may criticize occasionally his actions. And this is only natural: for, cleverer in administrative capacities, more learned in philosophy, subtler in casuistry, in metaphysics or daily life policy, there may be many around him; but the whole globe may be searched through and through and no one found stauncher to his friends, truer to his word, or more devoted to real, practical theosophy—than the President-Founder; and these are the chief requisites in a leader of such a movement—one that aims to become a Brotherhood of men. The Society needs no Loyolas; it has to shun anything approaching casuistry; nor ought we to tolerate too subtle casuists. There, where every individual has to work out his own Karma, the judgment of a casuist who takes upon himself the duty of pronouncing upon the state of a brother’s soul, or of guiding his conscience, is of no use, and may become positively injurious. The Founder claims no more rights than every one else in the Society: the *right of private judgment*, which, whenever it is found to disagree with Branches or individuals is quietly set aside and *ignored—as shown by the complainants themselves*.

This, then, is the sole crime of the would-be culprit, and no worse than this can be laid at his door. And yet what is the reward of that kind man? He, who has never refused a service, outside what he considers his official duties—to any living being; he who has redeemed

dozens of men, young and old, from dissipated, often immoral lives and saved others from terrible scrapes by giving them a safe refuge in the Society; he, who has placed others again, on the pinnacle of Saintship *through their status in that Society*, when otherwise they would have indeed found themselves now in the meshes of “worldliness” and perhaps worse;—he, that true friend of every theosophist, and verily “the readiest to serve and as unconscious of the service”—he is now taken to task for what? —for insignificant blunders, for useless “special orders,” a *childish*, rather than untheosophical love of display, out of pure devotion to his Society.

Is, then; *human nature* to be viewed so uncharitably by us, as to call *untheosophical*, worldly and sinful the natural impulse of a mother to dress up her child and parade it to the best advantages? The comparison may be laughed at, but if it is, it will be only by him who would, like the fanatical Christian of old, or the naked, dishevelled Yogi of India —have no more charity for the smallest human weakness. Yet, the simile is quite correct, since the Society is the child, the beloved creation of the Founder; he may be well forgiven for this too exaggerated love for that for which he has suffered and toiled more than all other theosophists put together. He is called “worldly,” “ambitious of power” and *untheosophical* for it. Very well; let then any impartial judge compare the life of the Founder with those of most of his critics, and see which was *the most theosophical*, ever since the Society sprang into existence. If no better results have been achieved, it is not the President who ought to be taken to task for it, but the Members themselves, as he has been ever trying to promote its growth, and the majority of the “Fellows” have either done nothing, or created obstacles in the way of its progress through sins of omission as of commission. Better unwise *activity*, than an overdose of too wise *inactivity*, apathy or indifference which are always the death of an undertaking.

Nevertheless, it is the members who now seek to sit in Solomon’s seat; and they tell us that the Society is useless, its President positively mischievous, and that the Head-Quarters ought to be done away with, as “the organization called Theosophical *presents many features seriously obstructive to the progress of Theosophy.*”

Trees, however, have to be judged by their fruits. It was just shown that no “special orders” issuing from the “Centre of Power” called Adyar, could affect in any way whatever either Branch or individual; and therefore any theosophist bent on “self culture,” “self-involution” or any kind of *selfness*, is at liberty to do so; and if, instead of using his rights he will apply his brain-power to criticize other people’s actions then it is he who becomes the *obstructionist* and not at all the “Organization called Theosophical.” For, if the-osophy is anywhere practised on this globe, it is at Adyar, at the Head-Quarters. Let “those interested in the progress of true the-osophy” appealed to by the writers look around them and judge. See the Branch Societies and compare them with the group that works in that “Centre of Power.” Admire the “progress of the-osophy” at Paris, London and even America. Behold, in the great “Brotherhood,” a true *Pandemonium* of which the Spirit of Strife and Hatred himself might be proud! Everywhere—quarreling, fighting for supremacy; backbiting, slandering, scandal-mongering for the last two years; a veritable battlefield, on which several members have so disgraced themselves and their Society by trying to disgrace others, that they have actually become more like hyenas than human beings by digging into the graves of the Past, in the hopes of bringing forward old forgotten slanders and scandals!

At Adyar alone, at the Head-Quarters of the Theosophical Society, the Theosophists are that which they ought to be everywhere else: *true theosophists* and not merely *philosophers* and *Sophists*. In that *centre* alone are now grouped together the few solitary, practically working Members, who labour and toil, quietly and uninterruptedly, while those Brothers for whose sake they are working, sit in the *dolce far niente* of the West and criticize them. Is this “true theosophical and brotherly work,” to advise to put down and disestablish the only “centre” where real brotherly, humanitarian work is being accomplished?

“Theosophy first, and organization after.” Golden words, these. But where would Theosophy be heard of now, had not its Society been organised before its spirit and a desire for it had permeated the whole world? And would Vedanta and other Hindu philosophies have been ever taught and studied in England outside the walls of Oxford

and Cambridge, had it not been for that organization that fished them like forgotten pearls out of the Ocean of Oblivion and ignorance and brought them forward before the profane world? Nay, kind Brothers and critics, would the Hindu exponents of that sublime philosophy themselves have ever been known outside the walls of Calcutta, had not the Founders, obedient to the ORDERS received, forced the remarkable learning and philosophy of those exponents upon the recognition of the two most civilized and cultured centres of Europe—London and Paris?

Verily it is easier *to destroy* than to build. The words “untheosophical” and “unbrotherly” are ever ringing in our ears; yet, truly theosophical acts and words are not to be found in too unreasonable a super-abundance among those who use the reproof the oftener. However insignificant, and however *limited the line* of good deeds, the latter will have always more weight than empty and vainglorious talk, and will be *theosophy*, whereas theories without any practical realisation are at best philosophy. Theosophy is an all-embracing Science; many are the ways leading to it, as numerous in fact as its definitions, which began by the sublime, during the day of Ammonius Saccas, and ended by the ridiculous—in Webster’s Dictionary. There is no reason why our critics should claim the right for themselves alone to *know* what is theosophy and to define it. There were theosophists and Theosophical Schools for the last 2,000 years, from Plato down to the mediaeval Alchemists, who knew the value of the term, it may be supposed. Therefore, when we are told that “The question is not whether the TS. *is doing good*, but whether it is doing *that kind of good which is entitled to the name of Theosophy*”—we turn round and ask: “And who is to be the judge in this mooted question?” We have heard of one of the greatest Theosophists who ever lived, who assured his audience that whosoever *gave a cup of cold water to a little one* in his [Theosophy’s] name, would have a greater reward than all the learned Scribes and Pharisees. “Woe to the world because of offences!”

Belief in the Masters was never made an article of faith in the T.S. But for its Founders, the commands received from Them when it was established have ever been sacred. And this is what one of

them wrote in a letter preserved to this day:

“Theosophy must not represent merely a collection of moral verities, a bundle of metaphysical Ethics epitomized in theoretical dissertations. Theosophy must be made practical, and has, therefore, to be disencumbered of useless discussion. ... It has to find objective expression in an all-embracing code of life thoroughly impregnated with its spirit—the spirit of mutual tolerance, charity and love. Its followers have to set the example of a firmly outlined and as firmly applied morality before they get the right to point out, even in a spirit of kindness, the absence of a like ethic Unity and singleness of purpose in other associations and individuals. As said before—no Theosophist should blame a brother whether within or outside of the association, throw a slur upon his actions or denounce him¹¹ lest he should himself lose the right of being considered a theosophist. Ever turn away your gaze from the imperfections of your neighbor and centre rather your attention upon your own shortcomings in order to correct them and become wiser. . . . Show not the disparity between claim and action in another man but—whether he be brother or neighbour—rather help him in his arduous walk in life. ...

“The problem of true theosophy and its great mission is the working out of clear, unequivocal conceptions of ethic ideas and duties which would satisfy most and best the altruistic and right feelings in us; and the modeling of these conceptions for their adaptation into such forms of daily life where they may be applied with most equitableness. . . . Such is the common work in view for all who are willing to act on these principles. It is a laborious task and will require strenuous and persevering exertion, but it must lead you insensibly to progress and leave no room for any selfish aspirations outside the limits traced. . . . Do not indulge in unbrotherly comparisons between the task accomplished by yourself and the work left undone by your neighbor or brother, in the field of Theosophy, *as none is held to weed out a larger plot of ground than his strength and capacity will permit him*, ... Do not be too severe on the merits or demerits of one who seeks admission among your ranks, as the truth about the actual state

¹¹ It is in consequence of this letter that Art. XII was adopted in Rules and a fear of lacking the charity prescribed, that led so often to neglect its enforcement.

of the inner man can only be known to, and dealt with justly by KARMA alone. Even the simple presence amidst you of a well-intentioned and sympathizing individual may help you magnetically.... You are the Free-workers in the Domain of Truth, and as such, must leave no obstructions on the paths leading to it.”. . . [The letter closes with the following lines which have now become quite plain, as they give the key to the whole situation]... “*The degrees of success or failure are the landmark we shall have to follow, as they will constitute the barriers placed with your own hands between yourselves and those whom you have asked to be your teachers. The nearer your approach to the goal contemplated—the shorter the distance between the student and the Master*” . . .

A complete answer is thus found in the above lines to the paper framed by the two Theosophists. Those who are now inclined to repudiate the Hand that traced it and feel ready to turn their backs upon the whole Past and the original programme of the T.S. are at liberty to do so. The Theosophical body is neither a Church or a Sect and every individual opinion is entitled to a hearing. A Theosophist may progress and develop, and his views may outgrow those of the Founders, grow larger and broader in every direction, without for all that abandoning the fundamental soil upon which they were born and nurtured. It is only he who changes diametrically his opinions from one day to another and shifts his devotional views from white to black—who can be hardly trusted in his remarks and actions. But surely, this can never be the case of the two Theosophists who have now been answered. . . . Meanwhile, peace and fraternal good will to all.

H. P. BLAVATSKY
OSTENDE, OCT. 3RD, 1886

H. P. BLAVATSKY
CORRES. SEC'Y, T.S.