

The Lischner Documents

by Ernest E. Pelletier

CONTENTS:

- The Lischner Document - excerpt
 - Introduction to Dr. Lischner's pamphlet
 - Letter by Dr. Hyman Lischner
 - Dr. Hyman Lischner's 38pp. pamphlet
-

The Lischner Document

Following is an excerpt from *Katherine Tingley: The Hijacking of the Theosophical Society in America*, pp.151-153. [Ernest E. Pelletier, 2024]

Dr. Hyman Lischner (1880-1967)

Dr. Lischner was born in Kiefr, Russia on October 27th, 1880, came to America in 1895 and became a U.S. citizen August 3rd, 1904. He graduated from the New York Homeopathic Medical College and Flower Hospital on May 6th, 1905. Dr. Lischner was listed in *The Practitioners' Digest and California Register of Physicians and Surgeons* as having registered there in 1909, and living at Point Loma. [1:2, Jan. 1910] His specialty was diseases of children. His wife, Frances (nee Rieger), was also a medical doctor. She graduated from the New York Medical College and Hospital for Women in 1909, and was registered in Los Angeles in 1914.

Dr. Lischner claimed he was a “co-member” of the Point Loma organization and had been closely involved for many years. In all likelihood he knew Katherine Tingley in New York and she invited him to Point Loma, offering offices in the Isis Theater. The *San Diego Union and Daily Bee* reported that he “decided to locate in San Diego and . . . opened offices in the Isis theater building.” [Jan. 30, 1910] According to the County Directory, he still had his practice at these offices in September 1917.

Dr. Lischner issued a 38-page pamphlet, dated May 8th, 1931 and titled *Some Correspondence Between Dr. G. de Purucker, Dr. J.H. Fussell and Hyman Lischner, M.D.*, which he distributed together with a letter dated May 28th addressed “To a Fellow Theosophist”. In this letter he described having “had the opportunity of observing . . . for over thirty years” and that “inconsistencies in the every day life of the ‘Leader’ . . . forced themselves upon my conscience and resisted all my efforts at ‘explaining them away’.” He wrote that Tingley had banned *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*, *Letters of H.P. Blavatsky*, and *The Real H.P. Blavatsky* by William Kingsland. However, “some three years ago” Neresheimer gave him copies when Lischner asked for more information about H.P.B. His letter included the following:

My nature was just beginning to timidly rebel against what I was gradually becoming aware of as priestly authority parading under the guise of “successorship”, ceremonialism, emotionalism, “lying for the good of the Cause”[Jesuitical!], and other doctrines and pretensions, “passed on” to the “devoted” and “privileged”, by word of mouth and by various means of suggestion that were radically and shockingly different and contrary to public and published professions—all in the name of Theosophy and H.P.B.

He went on to explain why he had compiled the 38-page pamphlet which he included with his letter:

A sense of duty to the Theosophical Movement and to H.P.B prompts me to take the liberty of sending you a copy of some correspondence that has passed between Dr. de Purucker, Dr. Fussell and myself . . . [Letter and pamphlet, Edmonton T.S. Archives]

Dr. Lischner was Tingley's physician; he wrote that he had frequent opportunities to get to know members of her household and her "cabinet" after her cerebral apoplexy [stroke] in 1925. [See Appendix G for full text of May 28, 1931 letter; See theosophycanada.com for full text of the pamphlet, May 8, 1931, 38pp.]

Interestingly, Tingley reportedly resided chiefly in Europe from 1925 until her death in July 1929. It seemed to coincide with the loss of her appeal in the California Supreme Court in June 1924 when an earlier verdict was upheld. Dr. George Mohn left his home in Los Angeles and took up residence at Point Loma. In 1918 Mrs. Mohn filed a suit charging that "by the exercise of . . . improper and undue influence, [Tingley] did induce [him] to turn over and transfer to [Tingley] personal and real property. . . of the value of about \$250,000. . . ." and also that Tingley "had caused an estrangement between herself and husband." The case dragged on for years. Mrs. Mohn was awarded a judgment of \$100,000. [*Los Angeles Times*, Mar. 2, 1918; *San Bernardino County Sun*, June 29, 1924; *Dictionary of American Biography* (1936), p.562]

One year later, Dr. Lischner is mentioned in an article in *The Canadian Theosophist*. William C. Clark (1878-1945) was president of Orpheus Lodge, Vancouver, BC. Details of his visit to California in 1932 were included in the September issue.

On his return journey besides once more looking up the Pryse Brothers and the U.L.T. at Los Angeles he met Dr. Hyman Lischner an ex-member of the Point Loma Society and now a member of the U.L.T. It was the pamphlet published by Dr. Lischner containing his correspondence with D[r]. de Purucker and Dr. Fussell which threw added light on the claims to Successorship, etc., made by them, which made so deep an impression on some Students. [*CT*, 13:7, Sep. 1932, p.211]

Introduction to Dr. Lischner's Pamphlet

By Ernest E. Pelletier

Hobart Lorentz Gottfried de Purucker was born on January 15th, 1874, at Suffern, Rockland County, New York, a small village 35 miles north of Manhattan. His father was an ordained minister in the Anglican Church and served as chaplain of the American Church in Geneva, Switzerland. At age eighteen Gottfried returned to the U.S.A.

[H]e settled for several years in California, spending some time for experience on different ranches, among these Old Fort El Tejon, near Tejon Pass in the Tehachapi Mountains. He then moved to San Diego, where in 1892 he joined the 'Point Loma Lodge' of the Theosophical Society. . . .

In 1895 he returned to Geneva, Switzerland, to live and study music. [*Theosophia*, 30:3 (137), Winter 1973-74, p.3] De Purucker met Tingley in Geneva in September 1896 during the Crusade. [*The Eclectic Theosophist*, No. 88, July-Aug. 1985, pp.6-9]

Gottfried had been expected to follow in his father's footsteps in the service of the Church. In preparation for the ministry he specialized in Hebrew, Latin, Greek, and the writings of the early Church Fathers. However, study of Eastern philosophies and Sanskrit literature led him to theosophy with its broad comprehension of religion, philosophy, and science. After working closely with Katherine Tingley, he succeeded her as head of The Theosophical Society from 1929 until his death in Covina, California, on September 27th, 1942. [*Theosophia*, 30:3 (137), Winter 1973-74, p.3; *Theosophical Forum, New Series*, 1:1, Sep. 1929, p.10; <https://www.theosociety.org/pasadena/ts/bio-gdep.htm>] However, de Purucker was not Tingley's first choice to succeed her.

Katherine Tingley and Elizabeth (nee Churchill) Mayer, had struck a strong friendship soon after Tingley first met William Q. Judge in late December 1894. Mayer, a vocal instructor, was in charge of the children's program, an unsectarian Sunday school. Judge had instituted a program called the Children of the Theosophical Lotus Circle, and an entertainment segment was held on Sundays in the Aryan hall at the headquarters of the Theosophical Society, 144 Madison Avenue, New York. In April 1897 Tingley

established “The International Brotherhood League”, added “Headquarters of the War Relief Corps” to the sign at the T.S. building, and converted Aryan hall into a work area. [See photos in *Katherine Tingley: The Hijacking of the Theosophical Society in America*, pp.124-125]

Elizabeth Mayer and Albert Spalding were high school sweethearts. They got engaged in Rockford, IL, but broke it off and went separate ways. Elizabeth married George J.E. Mayer, a leader among the athletic young men of the day, in Winnebago, IL, on January 20th, 1875. They moved to Fort Wayne, IN, where she taught music at the Fort Wayne Conservatory. After a time their union became uncongenial and separation followed.

Meanwhile, Spalding’s career as a player in major league baseball flourished, from 1871 to 1878. He married Sarah Josephine Keith, a school teacher from a respectable family from the Boston area, on November 18th, 1875. She died July 9th, 1899, after having her appendix removed; she had suffered from chronic appendicitis.

George Mayer died in St. Louis Hospital on April 29th, 1902, due to an abscess which appeared upon his side, complicated with locomotor ataxia. [*The Fort Wayne Sentinel*, Apr. 29, 1902]

Albert G. Spalding married Elizabeth Mayer at Point Loma on June 24th, 1900; they spent their honeymoon in Paris. Albert, of New York, was one of the United States commissioners to the Paris Exposition. They spent their entire summer in Europe. [*Los Angeles Times*, June 25, 1900]

When they returned, they moved into an elaborate white stucco home Tingley had designed with an amethyst dome, hand-carved mosaics and frescoes and an external spiral staircase. Spalding paid \$10,000 (about \$360,000 today) for the house. [**“The Baseball Legend and the Purple Mother”** by James Ross on Substack, Nov. 6, 2023]

Marc Lamster, an architecture critic and author of *Spalding’s World Tour*, described it as “an oriental fantasy, an octagonal structure with an external spiral staircase, extensive internal carvings, and a crystal on the roof. . . .” Of all the buildings constructed on the Homestead only two remain: Katherine Tingley’s house and the Spalding residence. Today the Spalding home survives as the administration building of Point Loma Nazarene University. [<https://designobserver.com/the-curious-architecture-of-albert-spalding/>, Aug. 10, 2009]



[On the far left: The Raja-Yoga Academy/Hotel-Sanitarium/Homestead.

In the middle: the Temple of Peace built about 1900 with steel superstructure for glass dome and sphere.

Far right: the Spalding house built about the same time as the Temple; now called Meiras Hall.]

[*Albert Spalding, Madame Tingley and The Great Myth of Baseball* by Randy Dotinga, September 2, 2019.

<https://obrag.org/2019/09/albert-spalding-madame-tingley-and-the-great-myth-of-baseball/>]



[The Spalding House]

[*The Curious Architecture of Albert Spalding* by Mark Lamster, August 10, 2009.

<https://designobserver.com/the-curious-architecture-of-albert-spalding/>

[A different version about ownership was presented in the October 1901 issue of *Universal Brotherhood Path* which announced the “Dedication of the First Students’ Home at Point Loma.”

A most beautiful and impressive ceremony was arranged by the Leader for the dedication of “Student’s Home No. 1,” named “Yerba Santa Cliffs” now completed and in the occupation Mr. and Mrs. Spalding who have leased it for a term of years.] [Vol. XVI, No.7, p.412]

De Purucker may have been in line as Tingley’s successor but her first choice was known to have been Elizabeth Spalding. Keith Spalding, Albert Spalding’s son, claimed that Elizabeth was “the intimate friend of Mrs. Tingley” and “was held up by . . . Mrs. Tingley to the public and by . . . Elizabeth Churchill Spalding [herself] as her successor in the command of said work and institution.” [*The Bakersfield Californian*, Oct. 5, 14, 1915] However, Elizabeth died suddenly at the age of 70 on November 26th, 1926, on her return trip from an extended European lecture tour. She was in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, when she was stricken “by a sudden illness . . . while passing through Vancouver on her way to her home at Point Loma, Calif.” An article titled “Mrs. E.C. Spalding Dead” appeared in the *Calgary Herald*, on Saturday, November 27th. Some Ancestry records indicate that she died in San Diego, which is incorrect. The article stated that “her remains were cremated this morning and the ashes will be shipped to Point Loma for interment.” [*Calgary Herald*, Calgary, AB, Nov. 27, 1926]

The sudden death of Elizabeth Spalding must have been a tremendous shock to Katherine Tingley; her plans became unraveled. Some had wondered why Tingley was not mentioned in the last will and testament of Albert G. Spalding [1850-1915]. Historical records clarify that Tingley knew that money bequeathed to Elizabeth would eventually be funneled to Universal Brotherhood or Tingley’s other incorporated companies. Money was always a priority and Tingley knew that Elizabeth had lots of it. De Purucker was not heir to a fortune; he was the son of an ordained minister. There are other reasons why Tingley would have wanted Elizabeth Spalding as her successor but money was unquestionably one of the main factors. Tingley had

heavily mortgaged the Point Loma homestead and most of that money was owed to Elizabeth Spalding. During the trial of Tingley vs Irene Mohn, Elizabeth Spalding covered half of the cost of the bond of that trial: \$100,000. However Tingley lost that case and all the appeals, and Elizabeth lost all that money. [*Los Angeles Times*, Apr. 13, 1921, July 10, 1923; *St. Luis Obispo Daily Telegram*, *The Hanford Sentinel*, July 9, 1923; *The Recorder*, July 10, 11, 1923]

Within a month of Elizabeth Spalding's death Katherine Tingley wrote her Last Will and Testament on December 15th, 1926. There was no mention of successorship.

Katherine Tingley died on July 11th, 1929. On July 29th an article in the *San Diego Union* gave details of Dr. de Purucker becoming the new

Leader and Official Head of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society. Appointment of her successor had been made by Katherine Tingley before she died. . . . It was stated that while Theosophists the world over had agreed to accept the Leader that Katherine Tingley named, his identity was known only to the cabinet and executive committee until yesterday afternoon. Cablegrams went out . . . from Theosophical Headquarters giving the name of the new Leader. [*Theosophical Forum*, *New Series*, 1:1, Sep. 1929, pp.8-9]

The 38-page document that follows Lischner's cover letter, addressed "To a Fellow Theosophist", is correspondence between Hyman Lischner, Gottfried de Purucker and Joseph Fussell. Upon first reading de Purucker's long reply to Lischner one can easily perceive his smooth writing style; he was a "Doctor of Letters". He was very authoritarian and convincing, and claimed to be in contact with the theosophical Mahatmas. Tingley had claimed that she was also, as for example her supposed meeting with a Mahatma in Darjeeling. De Purucker therefore claimed he must be the successor, the next person in the lineage following Blavatsky, Judge, then Katherine Tingley.

A sketch by the *San Francisco Call* (see: *Katherine Tingley: The Hijacking of the Theosophical Society in America* , p.123) depicts men and women on their knees, prostrated at the feet of "the Supreme Ruler of the Universal Brotherhood." In his pamphlet, Lischner also includes details of the ritual neophytes underwent, including being "escorted to the Outer Head, before whom he kneels" and recites the Pledge.

Neither H.P. Blavatsky nor W.Q. Judge was known to use rituals of this sort. The Pledge taken by the candidate was always to their Higher Self, never to any person. [*Blavatsky Collected Writings*, Vol.12, p.506]

The Editor of *Eirenicon*, T.H. Redfern, in the Winter Solstice issue wrote:

In adopting the title of Leader, Mrs. Tingley imposed this title also on H.P. Blavatsky as Leader from 1875-1891, and W.Q. Judge as Leader from 1891-1896. This was unwarranted. Can anyone familiar with her work doubt that H.P.B. would have repudiated it? [**No.105, 1952, 16pp.**]

H.P.B. held the position of Corresponding Secretary for the Society and W.Q.J. was elected President for Life of the T.S. in America. They never held the position of Leader. [*The Judge Case*, Vol.1, p.298]

It becomes obvious in reading theosophical literature that there was never any lineage of successorship in the Theosophical Society. Dr. Lischner was close to the action and participated in the so-called esoteric section. He realized, after being separated from Tingley for some time while she was in Europe, that most things he had been told were questionable. After reading original theosophical material, and first-person accounts from those who had been close to Madame Blavatsky and W.Q. Judge, he deduced that something was wrong. So he decided to ask de Purucker for clarification.

The document which follows has not been common reading material for most theosophical students, nor readily available. This exchange of letters is presented so you may draw your own conclusions.

Letter by Dr. Hyman Lischner

Following is a copy of Appendix G, published in *Katherine Tingley: The Hijacking of the Theosophical Society in America*, pp.224-226. [Ernest E. Pelletier, 2024]

Letter by Dr. Hyman Lischner

The following is a transcript of Dr. Hyman Lischner's letter of May 28th, 1931. It accompanied his 38-page document, dated May 8th, 1931 and titled *Some Correspondence Between Dr. G. de Purucker, Dr. J.H. Fussell and Hyman Lischner, M.D.*, which can be found under 'publications' on Edmonton Theosophical Society's website: theosophycanada.com

[6717 Whitley Terrace
Hollywood, Calif.]

To a Fellow Theosophist:

May 28, 1931

"The possibility of achievement for the individual lies not in following and pledging loyalty to any personal Leader, but by uncompromising devotion to the Idea,—to principle."

The realization of the truth to the above thought as summed up by the Editor, A.T. Barker in his introduction to "The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett" had not yet broken through the psychology of personal worship and dependence on the "Leader". I was going through a period of unhappiness and disappointment—I was beginning to feel as if my props were being removed from under me as inconsistencies in the every day life of the "Leader" and some of her immediate associates (as compared with the ideals they professed) forced themselves upon my conscience and resisted all my efforts at "explaining them away". One day, some three years ago, in response to a request for some information regarding H.P.B.'s personal character, Mr. E. August Neresheimer (prominent American Theosophist, a student of H.P.B., a co-worker of W.Q.J., and whom the latter called his "staunch friend and good adviser") placed the "Mahatma Letters", "Letters of H.P. Blavatsky", and later "The Real H.P. Blavatsky" by William Kingsland, into my hands.

I had reached a point where Madam Tingley's ban on these books did not prevent me from reading them, for which I am most thankful. These books have helped me immeasurably in my effort to free myself from a sectarian religious psychology which had gradually enveloped my being, in my association with the Point Loma Institution. Nothing like it before has given me such love and insight into that frank, robust yet tender character of what I might call "the Everyday H.P.B.". These books filled a need in my heart just at the right time. My nature was just beginning to timidly rebel against what I was gradually becoming aware of as priestly authority parading under the guise of "successorship", ceremonialism, emotionalism, "lying for the good of the Cause", and other doctrines and pretensions, "passed on" to the "devoted" and "privileged", by word of mouth and by various means of suggestion that were radically and shockingly different and contrary to public and published professions—all in the name of Theosophy and H.P.B.

I realize that unless the one who claims to be a "conscious Agent" presents, for instance, revelations as new and original to the times as those offered in "Isis Unveiled" or the "Secret Doctrine", there is great difficulty in recognizing fully the true nature of the claimant merely through his public utterances, pronouncement of

policies or repetition of teachings seemingly in keeping with the teachings that have already been given out through H.P.B and the Masters.

A sense of duty to the Theosophical Movement and to H.P.B. prompts me to take the liberty of sending you a copy of some correspondence that has passed between Dr. de Purucker, Dr. Fussell and myself. Whether you look upon G. de P. as a “Spiritual Leader and Teacher” or not at this time, I feel sure that in any case you will read this rather lengthy correspondence with impartiality and give it your careful and logical attention. It may offer you a glimpse into the claims of successorship and equal status with H.P.B. as you will note in Dr. de Purucker’s letter to me.

It is only fair to state that Katherine Tingley was ill for a number of years previous to her death, particularly after her cerebral apoplexy [stroke] in 1925. I was her physician and therefore had the opportunity of frequent and intimate contact with her, with members of her household and with her “cabinet”, including Dr. de Purucker.

With few exceptions most of the members, young and old, including former students of H.P.B. and W.Q.J. who had opportunities of *close* personal contact with Katherine Tingley, left her organization sooner or later. Though I had the opportunity of observing this for over thirty years, it did not strike me to inquire as to the real significance of this fact. It was always attributed to “disloyalty” and a demonstration of some phase of the “lower nature” in those who went away, and I took it at that valuation. It did not occur to me to ascertain for *myself* the actual causes and reasons for the disaffection of really splendid men and women and young people. Finally, I began to see things in a different light, because circumstances became such that I was *forced* to see below the appearance of things. Each must gain his realization through his *own assumption* of responsibility.

The enclosed correspondence is made public in order that you and others may have one more evidence of the menace to the Cause of Theosophy and to all trustful Theosophists in accepting claims to “successorship” and spiritual authority by whomsoever made.

Yours cordially

Hyman Lischner.

Dr. Hyman Lischner’s pamphlet

"There Is No Religion Higher Than Truth"

Some CORRESPONDENCE Between

DR. G. de PURUCKER

DR. J. H. FUSSELL

and Digitized by Edm. Theos. Soc.

HYMAN LISCHNER, M. D.

"FACT is the only tribunal we submit to, and recognize it
without appeal."

"Theosophists are ever ready to abandon every idea that
is proved erroneous upon strictly logical deductions."

(P. 390 and 143 "A Modern Panarion,") H. P. Blavatsky.

We present our facts and tell them to see, hear, and judge for themselves.---H. P. B.

Sept. 1, 1929

Dr. Gottfried de Purucker,
Point Loma, Calif.

Dear Dr. Purucker:

This is the first opportunity I have had of writing to you since our conversation on August 19th. I appreciate the opportunity of meeting you personally after my letter of the 18th. I have thought a great deal of much that we covered that afternoon, of the criticisms as well as the kind things you said about me; your suggestions of possible opportunities for me on the Hill. I am still questioning in my mind what you really meant by the statement in your letter of August 6th: "despite the mistakes you have made in the past and which **you yourself have told me,**" also puzzled on what you meant by my having "the vice of being **too sincere.**" I have again thought of your adopted slogan "to forget the waters that have passed under the bridge," etc., etc., I have finally tried to resolve my problems to their simplest form, to a common denominator, so to speak, and I think I have succeeded as far as I am concerned. All my problems and questions resolve themselves into one vital question. If that is answered **now**, nothing else matters. We can then forget the past, and as you say, "look to the brilliant future ahead."

During the past year I have devoted a great deal of time to reading and studying all I could possibly obtain concerning H. P. B. I have had access to the early volumes of the "Theosophist," "Lucifer," the "Path;" Volumes of Letters of the Masters and H. P. B., etc. I also sought and obtained information and opinions from those who had the privilege of contacting H. P. B. to a greater or lesser degree. Throughout my study and reading, and from those who knew H. P. B. personally, I find no evidence of her expecting anyone to believe in her personally on "faith." That she actually volunteered and did

give abundant proof of her own occult powers and communication with the Masters, is a well-known fact to all Theosophists. I often thought that considering the then new and marvelous scientific, religious and philosophic thought she brought forth was proof enough, to the spiritually-minded at least,—that she was the “Messenger” of the Lodge. But apparently not wishing to impose on the credulity of mankind, she sapped her own vitality and produced proof after proof. Every Messenger in history has shown that consideration to humanity. It is true, as time would go by, the more outer proofs and evidences would be forgotten, but the impress they left by word and deed, on the minds and hearts of men, ever remained a proof of their divine mission. Another marked evidence to me of the certainty of H. P. B.’s position, as that of an accepted Chela and Messenger of the Masters in this cycle, was the liberality and tolerance she showed to all those who, in good faith, questioned her authority. In fact she refrained from displaying authority according to those who knew her best.

Pardon the slight digression into past history; and may I now review briefly a bit of the present, as far as our own small organization is concerned. We will begin with, I believe, the second E. S. meeting following the death of K. T.; for I believe that at that meeting your fate as “Leader”—on true or false lines—was sealed. On that night Mr. Fussell brought a message from the “Outer Head” to the effect that he had been visited by the Master, a Chela, etc. Also that the Outer Head had been a Chela of the Master from childhood, etc. Mr. Fussell, of course, did not know this of his own knowledge, but said that he “was so informed or told,” (by whom?). Considering also the references to the Master in a similar way in your circular letter, I believe it is a bolder claim, in the open, than any ever made by K. T. with all her genius. I understood it to be an accepted fact, by students of H. P. B., that the Masters had withdrawn from direct visitations to individuals in the Theosophical Society, some time even before H. P. B.’s death—references to this effect also being made in letters, by the Masters themselves.

The interesting feature of the third E. S. meeting, I believe, was the indirect method pursued in announcing the “Outer Head.” One naturally expected the direct simple method of presenting or reading the official appointment by K. T. of her successor, **according to the Constitution and her promise.** Instead, we merely heard two people repeat what they heard K. T. say on one or more occasions. Mr. Fussell repeated that which was in favor of your leadership made in 1903 or 1904, but did not refer to anything he knew K. T. to have said regarding yourself which was unfavorable. He also failed to mention her oft-repeated declaration, including one definite cablegram from her, about 1913, saying that you, were **not** to be her successor, and that her successor “did not live on the Hill.” It is hardly necessary to refer to the value of the support or the proof of your successorship to K. T. made by Mrs. Lambert, considering the reputation for lack of veracity and sincerity she held with the great majority of workers on the Hill. It seemed to me that your own direct declaration that you were appointed by K. T. as her successor would have been more fair than the offer of proof through the hearsay testimony of others—bearing in mind that you had already, at a previous meeting, caused the bold assertion to be made that you were in communication with the Master himself, and already pledged yourself to him personally. I also wonder at the fairness of requiring the members to rise immediately after the above declaration by J. H. Fussell and Mrs. Lambert, and repeat the pledge without first being given time for deliberation.

I know that a great many of my comrades, noble souls that they are, would be shocked on hearing of my presumption to even think such thoughts or questions, not alone to write them down; but let them recall with charity how their pious religious friends were shocked, just as sincerely, when the latters’ belief in certain dogmas, or in the divine guidance of their minister or Pope, was put to the test of reason and logic by the former following the example of H. P. B.

Dear Dr. de Purucker, as I have said in my last letter, I have had a great deal of respect and love for you as a man. There was no more occasion or reason for me to be critical of your personal weaknesses than of those of any other comrade on the Hill. I have known you for some time, contacted you professionally, and I have naturally formed an opinion of your possibilities. Your strong points, up to the death of K. T., as I saw them, were your splendid intellectual conceptions, your retentive memory, your ability as a speaker, etc., etc., which, to my mind, made you the logical successor to K. T. among the men left around her. By what other rights you assume the role of sole spiritual Leader and Teacher, I, for one, am in a most serious quandary. This is the **crux of the situation** as far as I am concerned.

The closer you are to the Master, the more kindly you will be disposed to lend ear and heart to the yearnings and questionings of my soul. This I know. It is your avowed aim to bring "our Society **more directly** in line with the policy originated by H. P. B." I would gladly forget the "waters that have passed under the bridge" and humbly sit at your feet, and do your bidding—whether it be practicing medicine, or cleaning cesspools—were you able to show now in some way that which H. P. B. showed when she claimed "guidance" and "possession" by the Master. I repeat, please forgive my blunt statement of fact and reason. All my problems have resolved themselves into one at this time—are **you** the Messenger of the Master?

Yours loyally,
HYMAN LISCHNER.

P. S.—I have in mind certain extracts from a message of H. P. B. to the American Theosophists which I should like to enclose. A reprint containing five of her messages—the last one written three weeks before her death—should be most interesting to every member.

Of course, your request that I call on Judge Finlayson regarding the formation of a lodge in Los Angeles, will have to await a reply to this letter.

Extracts from "Five Messages from H. P. Blavatsky to the American Theosophists."

From "The First Message," 1888, addressed to William Quan Judge.

"Orthodoxy in Theosophy is a thing neither possible nor desirable. It is diversity of opinion, within certain limits that keeps the Theosophical Society a living and a healthy body, its many ugly features notwithstanding. Were it not, also, for the existence of a large amount of uncertainty in the minds of students of Theosophy, such healthy divergencies would be impossible, and the Society would degenerate into a sect, in which a narrow and stereotyped creed would take the place of the living and breathing spirit of Truth and an ever growing Knowledge."

"But let no man set up a popery instead of Theosophy, as this would be suicidal and has ever ended most fatally. We are all fellow-students, more or less advanced; but no one belonging to the Theosophical Society ought to count himself as more than, at best, a pupil-teacher—he who has no right to dogmatize. . . . But there are others among us who realize intuitively that the recognition of pure Theosophy—the philosophy of the **rational explanation of things** and not the tenets—is of the most vital importance in the Society, inasmuch as it alone can furnish the beacon-light needed to guide humanity on its true path."

INTERNATIONAL THEOSOPHICAL HEADQUARTERS

Point Loma, California

G. de Purucker
Private Office

September, 5, 1929.

Hyman Lischner, M. D.,
240 So. Rodeo Drive,
Beverly Hills, California.

Digitized by Edm. Theos. Soc.

My dear Brother Lischner:

Your long letter of September 1st with its single-space typing and the oddity of its contents lies before me. I have given it careful reading twice, and at the present moment my mind is divided between a disposition to laugh at you and a disposition to consider your letter as the out-pouring of a wounded soul or heart, whichever you like, asking for more light.

I am going to answer your letter with the latter disposition uppermost in my mind. In other words, I am going to give you the benefit of the doubt, and take it for granted that you are honest and sincere and frank in writing as you did write to me.

I might say in passing that my disposition to laugh was not a disposition arising out of sarcasm, but more akin to the feeling that one has when one sees another deliberately and—pardon me for saying so—foolishly making trouble for himself when it is totally unnecessary to do so. We cannot help smiling at such things, and that is all I mean.

You are very sensitive, my dear Hyman, as is shown by your repeating in your letter to me various remarks that you allege I have made to you which you call criticisms. I am going to talk to you straight from the shoulder. You have no right to call these remarks of mine criticisms, because you knew the spirit in which I uttered them was not critical. They were statements of truth to you, and if you think that you are so superior to ordinary human failings, my dear Brother, that I cannot see these failings and speak to you about them in the same frank manner in which you have criticized me and your fellow-comrades here, then I can only say that until you learn to see your own faults and failings—for all human beings have failings—you will never be able to understand me or the Work which I represent.

I am going to take up the points in your letter seriatim, although these points are not specifically enumerated nor placed in columnar form, but consist rather in a sort of running commentary of criticism about me and what I have done, about what H. P. B. and W. Q. Judge and K. T. have done, and about what the Comrades at our International Headquarters at Point Loma have done.

I am delighted, first, to note from your letter that you have been devoting a good deal of time to reading and studying all you could possibly obtain about H. P. B. You say that you "have had access to the early volumes of 'The Theosophist', 'Lucifer', and 'The Path'; volumes of letters by the Masters and H. P. B., etc. I also sought and obtained information and opinions from those who had the privilege of contacting H. P. B. to a greater or lesser degree. Throughout my study in reading and from those who knew H. P. B. personally, I find no evidence of her expecting anyone to believe in her personally on 'faith'. That she actually volunteered and did give abundant proof of her own actual powers and communication with the Masters is a well-known fact to all Theosophists."

Now, my dear Lischner, it is good that you have had sufficient interest in our wonderful Theosophical teachings and books to do all this, but I want to point out one thing before I go on to other matters. What on earth do you mean by talking about H. P. B. expecting no one to believe in her

personally on faith? I know this as well as you do, and so does anybody else. Why do you arrogate to yourself a marvelous discovery which everybody knows? This is like the secret of Polichinelle, in other words a "secret" that everybody knows!

Do you imagine for a minute that I, as H. P. B.'s successor and the fourth Leader of the Theosophical Movement, want people to accept me on faith, blind faith, foolish faith? If so, you know nothing of me, nothing of my policy, nothing of the Masters' Work, and nothing of what my objects and methods are.

Equally with you I detest blind faith, and if you had it in me, you would soon find that out of sheer disgust, as your Leader and Teacher I would both mentally and verbally so castigate you in a brotherly and kindly way, that you would change from blind faith to at least some understanding of me, merely in order to be left in peace! This remark is a bit humorous, but nevertheless I mean it, and every word of it!

Next, my dear Boy, and let me say my dear Friend, you talk about H. P. B. actually volunteering and giving abundant "proof" of her own "occult powers and communication with the Masters", and say that these are "a well-known fact to all Theosophists." Are they, indeed? This is news to me. What you say is not the fact, Lischner. Most Theosophists believe these things, and while I do not say they believe them on blind faith, because that is not true, to call them well-known facts is using rather strong language.

The truth is that Theosophists have believed in H. P. B. on account of the spiritual and intellectual qualities, faculties, and powers which my great Predecessor possessed, and which established her claim and her right to the position which she held and the leadership which she deliberately assumed—and rightly—in both cases.

I do not know of a single Theosophist, dead or alive, who could claim to have had "abundant proof" of H. P. B.'s occult powers or communication with the Masters. Don't you see my point? All true Theosophists believe because they are inwardly convinced of these the same things that you allege regarding H. P. B.'s position in the esoteric world and her right to lead and to teach; but not because they had any proof of the kind that you allege, such as occult powers.

Let me tell you something which, if you do not know now, you will know: esoteric leadership and the right to teach in all Mystical Schools do not depend in any manner whatsoever on "powers" or phenomena, but solely on spiritual and intellectual capacity. So far as "powers" and phenomena go, you apparently forget that even modern mediums—I mean the true ones—the very so-called fakirs and magicians of the African and Indian wilderness, can give physical evidences of powers and phenomena such as H. P. B. showed at times to the world. The sounding of raps on the table or on the window-pane, or the reading of letters with blind-folded eyes, or the reading of one's thoughts, or the precipitation of written communications through the air—these amount to nothing at all, and are no proof of spiritual and intellectual capacity, and still less are they proof of one's right to lead and teach in the School of the Masters.

It is extraordinary if you cannot see this yourself, and why you should allege "occult powers" as proofs of H. P. B.'s communication with the Masters, or as parts of the *insignia majestatis*, is a mystery to me!

Any Messenger of the Lodge proves his standing and his right to teach solely on the two things of which I have already twice or thrice spoken: by spiritual and intellectual capacity, by spiritual and intellectual knowledge, by his or her acquaintance with esoteric mysteries, and by nothing else; and these are evidenced in the teaching and in the life of the Teacher, and are the only things that prove the Messenger.

I am afraid, my dear Hyman, that you do just as it has been said of the Jews of old in the supposed "time of Jesus": They asked for signs and wonders! Signs and wonders prove nothing at all except that signs and wonders appear. And most emphatically they do not prove spiritual and intellectual capacity, nor are they the proofs of esoteric leadership, and still less do they prove that such or another one is a Messenger of the Lodge.

You are perfectly right, on the other hand, in saying that "another marked evidence to me of the certainty of H. P. B.'s position as that of an accepted Chela and Messenger of the Masters in this cycle, was the liberality and tolerance she showed to all those who in good faith questioned her authority." This is quite true, and every esoteric Teacher would do the same; and if you think that I lack liberality and tolerance with those who do not know me and who may question my esoteric standing, then I say you do not know me at all.

On the other hand, you are utterly wrong in stating, as you do about H. P. B., the following: "In fact, she refrained from displaying authority, according to those who knew her best." This last statement is utterly false and shows that while you may have studied the life and teachings of H. P. B. somewhat, you have not grasped either her policy or her method. It is precisely because H. P. B. displayed authority and proved her authority by giving evidences of a spiritual and intellectual grandeur in her, and of her capacity to teach, that she proved she was the Messenger of the Masters; and precisely the same observation applies to W. Q. Judge and to K. T.

Now, Lischner, I have been at the head of our Masters' work not yet two months. You have given me no time to show what is within me, and yet you judge me, or at least, if you do not judge me—and I want to be fair—your letter is a running criticism in the way of comments and complaints about something which your imagination has evolved, and in no wise about anything that I have done, as far as I can see, or left undone; because you do not know what I am going to do, what my motives are, what my policy is, what my methods will be, what the teachings which I shall give out are. Do you see my point?

I now come to the next items in your rather vague and rambling letter to me. You take up the various E. S. meetings which you attended here at my invitation, please remember, Hyman Lischner, after K. T. had passed. You assert dogmatically that you think it was at the second of these E. S. meetings that "your fate as Leader—on true or false lines—was sealed."

How do you know all this? Why do you assert dogmatically something about which you can possibly know nothing? As a matter of fact, what you state to be a fact and which I believe you sincerely believe to be a fact, is not true. My "fate as Leader" was not sealed at any esoteric meeting. You attended a certain esoteric meeting and saw certain things and heard certain things read, and you think that my fate as "leader" was then and there settled. Oh! my poor, blinded, wilfully blinded Friend!

I may tell you now that my fate as "leader" was settled many, many years ago, in fact from my childhood, and I have been living a secret, private life until K. T.'s passing, about which no one on earth knew anything except my own Teacher and K. T. and myself. I was obliged, by the ancient rules of Occultism to hide from everyone who I was or what my destiny was to be; and these ancient rules are those of the Esoteric School, and resulted from the traditional lines of policy which have been existent in the Great Lodge from time immemorial. No Chela ever has a right to announce himself as such unless by direction from his Teacher; and this is only given in unusual circumstances in order to achieve certain things, such as: H. P. B. was obliged to announce herself as the Messenger of the Masters, obliged again to assume control of the Esoteric School, obliged again to say that she was the sole intermediary between the Masters and her own pupils, obliged again to hide from the world the real secrets of her life and to appear before that doubting and

skeptical world as merely a Russian gentlewoman whom that world thought to be of a rather erratic and tempestuous character.

These same remarks apply particularly to Mr. Judge again when he had to assume sole control of the E. E. School at the time of Annie Besant's treachery, at the time when he openly announced himself as the Messenger of the Teachers.

And in the same way, but in somewhat more moderate lines which were accordant with the necessities and methods of the time, did K. T. have to do the same.

What is the matter with you, Lischner? If I had done nothing at all, I doubt not that you would have found grounds of complaint in that fact, because I had not openly stated my position and had not told the members the truth, and had left them in the dark when they were heart-hungry to know just who I was and something about me; and because, on the other hand, I did what I was told to do in accordance with the traditional methods of the Esoteric School, you now seem to be suspicious of this; and yet, what have I done in any wise or in any particular that is different from what H. P. B. did and from what W. Q. J. did, and from what K. T. did? Cannot you see, dear Hyman, that your position is both illogical and unreasonable?

You refer to my Circular Letter to the Members, and call it "a bolder claim in the open than any ever made by K. T. with all her genius." Well, that may be so, but am I K. T.? Was K. T. I? How about the bold claims made by H. P. B. and by W. Q. J., and other bold claims along other lines, but tending to the same direction that K. T. made?

Then you go on to say that you consider it an "accepted fact" by students of H. P. B. that the "Masters had withdrawn from direct visitations to individuals in the Theosophical Society some time even before H. P. B.'s death—references to this effect also being made in letters from the Masters themselves." Well, this is true; this I do not deny. But why do you apply to me something which actually does not apply? Because you think it applies you state it dogmatically.

It is perfectly true that the Masters, as a general rule, no longer have personal intercourse with non-chelas, which you call "visitations to individuals," and it is also true that this fact has been openly published. But how does all this apply to me? Why do you omit stating the other half of this general fact, which other half is a distinct allegation that the relationship of Teacher to Chela of course remains just as it always has been and that the Masters take particular care, as much as they did when H. P. B. and Judge and K. T. were alive, to stimulate and help individuals remarkable for spiritual and intellectual development who **show the Buddhic Light**.

The difficulty in all this lies in the fact, my dear Hyman, that you are touching upon esoteric mysteries and methods of esoteric training about which you cannot possibly know anything, because you are not a Chela. You are simply, I believe, a sincere man hunting for the Light; but why should you criticize these methods, or criticize me, because you cannot possibly understand them? Is that sort of thing fair?

If you claim to be a Chela, if you claim to know esoteric Mysteries and esoteric methods of training, then you must prove them to me. And so far you have failed. You assume the position of judge. You say, in one part of your letter, that you are a loyal friend, and all you want to know is whether I am the Masters' Messenger at the present time, and yet you criticize me for doing exactly what the other three Masters' Messengers, my great Predecessors, did and said!

How on earth can I prove to you something which your mind is already

made up to disbelieve? If you won't accept in my case what you accepted in three cases, in the case of three of them, how on earth can I prove the matter to you? I cannot do violence to your mind and hammer knowledge and conviction into your head. No, not even if I would, and I certainly would not! The student himself must solve these problems for himself or for herself, and all the Teacher can do is to prove his spiritual and intellectual status and standing and right as a Teacher by the sublimity of the doctrines he enunciates, by their logical force and continuity, and by the *insignia majestatis*, the signs of esoteric majesty which accompany these; and if you have not the eyes to see them, dear Hyman Lischner, that is your misfortune, but not mine.

You came to these esoteric meetings of which you speak of the second and the third, and you came at my invitation because you were a member of the School; and yet a large part of your letter consists in criticizing what took place. Why do you criticize? Are you a chela? Are you so evolved spiritually that you are competent to do this? Don't you see that your criticisms arise out of the fact that you do not understand, in the first place, and that you are not willing to accept as a pupil what you saw and heard in the second place, because you think you know better? Don't you see that you place yourself in the position of a judge, which means that in your own mind you think you know more than your Leader and Teacher does?

If you don't want to accept me as Leader and Teacher, that is another thing entirely, and you are perfectly right, and I applaud you if you take that position, because it is honest and manly; but that is not the question apparently.

Your letter goes on to say that you thought the proper way of appointing me would have been to "read the official appointment by K. T. of her Successor, according to the Constitution and her promise." My dear Brother! Here you are setting yourself up as a judge again. How do you know the manner of the "official appointment" of an esoteric Teacher?

Furthermore, let me tell you that the Constitution of the T. S. has nothing to do with the method of working in the E. S. The Constitution of the T. S. is not the Constitution of the E. S.

It seems to me, my dear Hyman—and you will pardon the irony of it—I do not think you would have been in your present state of mind if the Masters had consulted you as to the proper method of K. T.'s appointing me. I do not mean this unkindly; but it actually represents, I think, what your grouch or feeling is all about.

So far as Mr. Fussell and Mrs. Lambert writing the two letters to me which Mr. Fussell read in the E. S. meeting is concerned, this was not done at my request, but I had no objection to it. Mr. Fussell and Mrs. Lambert did not appoint me merely because they had heard K. T. say I was to be her Successor. These letters were read merely by way of information; and I may add here that from two other people, one of whom is not a member, and both of whom are K. T.'s, dearest friends, I have a written statement that K. T. told these two people within the last two years that I was to be her Successor; and one of these, as a matter of fact, is a member of the Society.

One of them I never saw in my life. It was Mr. Fussell who received the letter from one of these two, in which the writer stated that only a short time ago K. T. had told the writer—this person who is not a member of the Society, please remember—that I was to be her Successor. And furthermore, let me point out here how little you know about the methods of the Esoteric School. Cannot you understand that a written document can be lost, can be destroyed by enemies, can be forged, can be tampered with? Cannot you understand that even in a court of law the testimony of two credible witnesses is very good evidence and sometimes even prevails over a written document? How about the four of which I have already spoken—all of them honorable and high-minded people? [See K. T.'s statement p. 26].

You don't like Mrs. Lambert, and consequently when her letter was read your mind arose in protest merely because you don't like her; and all you can say about Mr. Fussell's letter is that it referred to something K. T. told him in 1903 or 1904.

I must tell you something more, and I will tell you this in confidence as to a gentleman: that K. T. frequently spoke of me in terms which were deliberately used by her in order to attract attention away from me as her Successor. Why she did this I understand, but I utterly despair of ever making you understand it! I may say this, however: that while K. T. was alive, "her Successor did not live on the Hill"—a perfectly obvious proposition because there can be no Successor as long as one Teacher is alive. The Successor comes in when the preceding Teacher passes, and as far as I know, I have never heard from anybody of any telegram or any positive statement by K. T. that G. de P. "was not to be her Successor."

As a matter of fact, I may also say that if you understood esoteric Mysteries, you would not have made the remark that you did along this line, my dear Hyman, because the G. de P. of today is not the G. de P. who was twenty-four hours before K. T. passed on! Make of this what you like. I have given you a hint and a key, and if you are clever enough to put it in the lock of Truth and enter the portal, bully for you!

I pass over your unfriendly comments about Mrs. Lambert, because I do not think I am called upon to answer them one way or the other. I point out further, running through the paragraphs of your letter, that quite in line with your suggestion that I ought to have announced myself as K. T.'s Successor, my Circular Letter of July 29th does precisely that.

So what is the matter with you, Hyman? You say one thing and then you go back of it and turn your face the other way and try to say something else. Your letter is contradictory, illogical, vague, and you remind me of a man hunting around in the dark for the clue to come out of the labyrinth of obscurity, and yet you refuse to see the light which is blinding you because you say it is not the light. It is something you have in your own eyes, which is just about the truth of the matter.

I cannot go into all the details of your criticisms of the way the E. S. meetings were conducted, my dear man. How does this concern you? You sat there as an E. S. member, and apparently all the interest you took in it was to criticize what took place. Perhaps if you had conducted the meeting it might have been conducted in a different way, but as you did not conduct it, by what right do you criticize the manner in which Mr. Fussell conducted it? I left everything entirely in his hands, and I saw nothing wrong or out of the way.

You arose when the Pledge was called for, and I suppose that you recited the Pledge with the others. If you objected, why did you not leave the Temple? You were perfectly free to do that; but having stayed there, and having recited the Pledge, why do you now write in a carping and critical spirit because you did stand? Do you mean that you were just swept off your feet by the spirit of enthusiasm that prevailed? Well, surely then, it is nobody's fault but your own.

Let me tell you one thing more: that yours is the only communication of any kind, written or verbal, that I have received since I assumed the office of Leader, criticizing or finding fault or suggesting suspicion, or anything that is false or wrong. The membership throughout the world is enthusiastic, and I am receiving written and verbal communications on all sides and from everywhere, expressing the unbounded devotion, the unusual loyalty, and the extraordinary sincerity, of the new life that is flowing through the Theosophical Society since I assumed the Leadership.

People are telling me constantly that they never had thought such a

thing was possible, or that they could not have dreamed that such spiritual fidelity could exist in the Theosophical Society again. Yours is the only criticising note. Perhaps you will flatter yourself over this, and consider yourself to be the only "wise man" of the entire Theosophical body! Well, as to this I make no comments except to say this, my dear boy: that your remarks are a direct distinct, and deliberate reflexion on the intelligence and heart and sense of duty of every other member of the Theosophical Society. Perhaps you are superior to any other member, and superior to all of them considered as a bunch, but, my dear Hyman, I fail to see it! And I am sure you would find that they fail to see it too. What others that have left our ranks may have to say about the circumstances I do not know, and what is more, I do not care. They will discover their mistakes some day, and come back to us, and I believe and feel the sooner they come back to us the better. The doors are always open to them if they come back with the right feeling. I certainly won't keep them out, and I won't make the return difficult for them. I will do all I can for them. But principles I won't abandon, and I shall keep emphatically to the methods of H. P. B. to the end of my days.

So there you are, dear Hyman. Make out of it what you can or wish. I do not think any single comrade either here at Headquarters or elsewhere, would condemn you for what you call your "presumption" in writing to me as you do. I do not think it presumption; I just think you are temporarily half distraught, and have allowed that suspicious and critical side of your nature to carry you off your feet for the time being; but I am pretty certain that with your splendid qualities of heart and mind you will find your way back to the Path.

I will do anything I can to help you, but I am not going to debate the question with you on the course that your letter very obviously is intended to force me to do. You have written your letter to me; I now write my letter to you, and it is up to you to choose.

I thank you for your very kind expressions directed to myself in which you speak of your "respect and love" for me as a man, and what you call my personal weaknesses: I do not know quite what you mean because you do not know me sufficiently well to know either my weaknesses or my strength. That I have weaknesses I am the last to deny, but if I had no strength I certainly would not be in the position I now am in.

As to your contact with me "professionally," of which you speak, and that you thereby "naturally formed an opinion" of my possibilities, let me remind you, my dear doctor, that you saw me once, perhaps twice, and you examined my lungs, my heart, my liver, and my kidneys, and you found nothing wrong in any organ, although you did say that I had a functional, but not organic, disturbance of the liver which could be cured by the curing of my chronic indigestion.

I suppose, if I am to take these words at their face-value, that I am not a fit Theosophical Teacher, and that I am not a Messenger of the Masters in your opinion, because I have a functional disturbance of the liver! Well, who has not? Have you never been sick? Along that line of reasoning, H. P. Blavatsky, who had three mortal diseases, was totally unfit to be the Masters' Messenger; and Mr. Judge who was filled with tuberculosis, was totally unfit to be a Messenger; and K. T., although her vitality was enormous and her body was wonderful, but who, nevertheless, was a chronic sufferer from various things, was also not fit to be the Masters' Messenger.

I think this is simply stupidity on your part, my dear doctor, and I do not think you reflected when you wrote these preposterous lines.

Thank you for your kind words regarding my "strong points," and thank you for saying that these strong points "made you the logical Successor to K. T. among the men left around her." But you ask "by what other rights you assumed the role of sole spiritual Leader and Teacher, I for one, am in a

most serious quandary." Well, dear boy, stay in your quandary if you take pleasure in it. If you cannot see the sunlight of a cloudless day, whose fault is it? It is not the fault of the sun; it is not my fault; it is your fault. But I am sorry for you, very sorry, and this is the reason that I am writing this long letter to you. As I told you in the beginning of this letter, at first I felt inclined to laugh at you when I read your letter for the first time.

You are quite right in stating that the closer I am to the Master the more kindly will I be disposed to lend ear and heart to the yearnings and questionings of your soul. I indeed have done so, and have done so for many months. I have been your true friend, and have tried to save you against yourself, and have tried to show you the proper way to handle certain situations which distressed you; and I will say that in a certain minor degree you recognized this in a most gentlemanly way. But in other ways you did not, Hyman, and I must tell you the truth.

Your own circumstances would have been very different if you had been willing to adopt my suggestions: to cease your criticisms of other people with whom you were displeased and with whose methods you could not agree. They happened to be in charge, and you were not; but certainly you are not the proper person to criticise them.

You say that you would "gladly forget the waters that have passed under the bridge, and humbly sit at your feet and do your bidding, whether it be practicing medicine or cleaning cess-pools, were I able to see now in some way that which H. P. B. showed when she claimed guidance and possession by the Masters." So you want me to show you signs and wonders, is that it? Well, I am sorry to tell you that you will never receive them. If you cannot see the real signs and wonders that exist, no merely material signs and wonders would ever be believed by you, because you would question then whether they were true or false.

You apparently forget, my dear doctor, that there is one thing a chela and a Messenger of the Masters will never do, and that is: Show signs and wonders to critical and skeptical minds merely in order to convince them. The idea is idiotic, and if you had read the books of H. P. B. and the Masters' Letters with the attention that you say you have, you would have found this statement repeated over and over and over again.

But statements such as the one I have just made about signs and wonders you do not appear to have noticed. I claim "guidance," to use your words, by the Masters on the same grounds that H. P. B. and that Judge and that K. T. did, and on no other grounds; and in answer to your final question: "Are you the Messenger of the Masters?" I will answer: I am, and I have already so stated in public and in private, by word of mouth and by printed character, and I am amazed that you can ask me this question! If you want proof of it, look for the proofs where you looked for them in the case of H. P. B. and Judge and K. T., and you will find them.

Thank you for the extracts that you have made from "Five Messages." This seems to be some book I have not heard of, although I don't question the authenticity of the two extracts you have typed. There were many more than five Messages that H. P. B. sent to her students.

As regards your joining the Lodge at Los Angeles, with Judge Finlayson as President, I can only suggest that until you have your own mind clarified of its skepticisms and doubts and criticisms, it might be best to wait a bit. Later you may possibly help the Lodge there.

Before closing, my dear Hyman, I want to call your attention to a few facts which are both exoteric and esoteric. Blavatsky gave no legal proof that the Masters had appointed her. The proof was brought with her in her own splendid spiritual and intellectual equipment, and in the doctrines that she gave to the world. Blavatsky never appointed Judge by any legal docu-

ment. The proofs that Judge had were his spiritual and intellectual equipment and his unfailing devotion to duty; and those who knew him recognized this, and felt the Buddhic Light in his soul.

* Judge never appointed K. T. by any legal document. The proofs that K. T. gave of her mission and of the reality of her being the Messenger of the Lodge, were the same that Blavatsky and Judge gave. Changing circumstances, my dear boy, mean changing methods, and K. T.'s therefore were different from Judge's, as Judge's were different from Blavatsky's; but the policy is the same from beginning to end.

My methods are different from K. T.'s, but they are almost identical with H. P. B.'s. My policy is the same as was K. T.'s secret policy, and as was H. P. B.'s and Judge's. Last, but not least, let me ask you a plain question: Do you think even if K.T. had not appointed me as her Successor, which she most emphatically did, it would have been better for me to remain in the background and to have left our beloved Society without any leadership at all?

But even if she had not mentioned to a soul that I was to be her Successor, even if she had not told me this; even if the Masters had not themselves appointed me, even if I had not been from childhood a chela and knew what was coming to me, even if the membership of the Society throughout the world had not been looking upon me for years, as they had been looking upon me, as the Successor of K. T., or, at any rate, as the logical man to fill that place: even if all these things had not existed, would it have been better for me, as a faithful student, to have remained in the background and let the Society go to pieces for lack of a Leader?

Now, think it over. I must stop now, Hyman. I have written a long answer to your letter, because the appeal from your heart touched me. There are parts of your letter, the skeptical and doubting parts, which are ludicrous; but there are other parts which I am going to accept as emanating from a distressed and sincere mind, from you, from the better part of you in short; and therefore I have written this letter. I have put myself on record in it. I have tried to open your soul to understand, and I can do nothing more. It is now "up to you," to use the vernacular. If you succeed in seeing the light, well and good; I shall be happy, and my hand is always out-stretched.

My feelings towards you have not changed a whit. In one sense I even admire your courage in writing to me as you have done; but while I can admire your courage, I have not an atom of respect for that aspect of your mind which runs to these little and carping criticisms of things which you yourself say you do not understand. If you don't understand them why on earth do you criticize? Can't you see your position is not a logical one nor a sensible one?

But Lischner's heart I respect, and Lischner's friendship I value; and these are words of truth. I have made my last effort, Hyman Lischner, to save you, and I shall never again write to you as I have written here at such length. You must make your decision, and may the immortal gods and the Buddhic Light of the great Lodge be with you!

Please remember me to your dear wife whom I so truly respect, and be assured that I close this long letter with a sincere expression of my hope for your happiness and for your material success in the future. I am always the friend of the true inside Lischner, no matter what choice you may make, and sign myself,

Fraternally and loyally yours,
G. de P.

GdeP/evs

November 17, 1929.

Doctor Gottfried de Purucker,

Point Loma, Calif.

Dear Dr. de Purucker:

I am sincerely grateful to you for your long and interesting letter of September fifth. I have given it a great deal of time and thought, and if it has done nothing else, it has stimulated a greater effort of self-study and discrimination. I am also grateful for your apparent attempt to prove your position on the plane of reason and logic, for it encourages me in my effort to break through the maya of so-called "faith" or "intuition," (i.e. psychologized thoughts or emotions planted by an outside mind, no matter whether that mind be that of an Adept in truth or in pretension.) Until a year or two ago I accepted a great deal on "faith," often without logical basis. In order to make the point clearer I should like to cite an instance: if an Official of the Organization offered various grave criticisms or condemnations of one who might have ventured to have had "uncertainties" in his mind, or differed in his opinions, I for one accepted that Officer's statements as authoritative—that is, backed by K. T. I took it for granted that he was absolutely doing the right thing. The question whether it was just or kind or otherwise, apparently did not occur to me as long as I had "faith." Of course, the real blame lay with myself but I am just wondering how many of the comrades, even of those who are still on the Hill, have experienced some such awakening at some time. Of course I am not referring to those who have had some personal axe to grind. I am referring to those who have reached a point of awakening in their Theosophical cycle of evolution where, rising above any emotional influence, they began to try to **discriminate for themselves** and were not afraid even to make mistakes, or lose an opportunity of being "saved."

I am reminded of the well-known fact that evolutionary progress is very slow, even with the best of us; whether as individuals or nations we are apt to repeat our mistakes cyclically over and over again. The Pioneers of America came here to escape intolerance, and after a short time, they themselves imposed a similar limitation on their own minds;—of course circumstances altered, and their intolerances did not perhaps assume the crude form of that of the old country. Is it not quite possible that some of our Theosophists, in their cyclic return to the failings that man is heir to, may have fallen into a phase of "faith," "revivalism" and "intolerance" suited to the subtlety of the religious belief they now embrace? Is there not danger of the same old "play" in a different guise, upon the traditional human craving for **salvation** through an intermediary, or dependence upon authority? Is there not danger of an attempt to captivate the minds and hearts of men and "women" too, as you are wont to say, by the same old "spell" and "fascination" of ceremonial religion, or what the Master terms "misguided mysticism"? Is there not danger of succumbing to the "charms" and personal gratification of close association with those who claim communion or familiarity with God, or the Gods?

How human nature, in its various stages of subtlety, hates to be disillusioned and thrown upon its "lonely" self to face "realities!" How the simple naked truth often seems cold and disappointing in a heavenly dream world built perhaps with ones own ideals and aspirations, but mixed with the flimsy stuff of personality, credulity and emotionalism or fanaticism (mis-called "enthusiasm")—and held together by the power of suggestion of an outside—perhaps ambitious mind.

As I have stated in another letter, it is not my purpose to argue or debate with you. Yet I realize that my letters and yours—particularly the last one—are in effect absolutely **argumentative** in character. I present certain problems, you attempt to answer them, which in turn calls forth other questions on my part. You may now close the argument or debate by not answering my letter; or I could close the same by either accepting on "faith" that you have reached the state of perfection called adeptship, which you consider

your predecessor to have attained; or bluntly state that claim to be ludicrous and preposterous. Considering that there are still a number of people on the Hill whom I love and respect, and who are inclined apparently to accept you at your word, I owe it to them, to you, and to myself, to freely express my reasons for my "uncertainties."

I too will therefore attempt to take up the points in your letter "seriatim." Firstly, may I ask you to kindly specify where in my letter I have complained of your criticisms, or shown sensitiveness to them;—or wherein are you justified in referring to that letter as a "running commentary of criticisms," particularly of what "H. P. B. or W. Q. J. have done." I cannot see the value or logic of your repeating that you or I have faults or weaknesses. Who would pose as being free from such? I find that the real difficulty lies in admitting specific failings. The spirit and essence of my letter of September first is one of uncertainty, questioning, and seeking explanation of certain actions or declarations, particularly by those who claim authority.

Since you yourself proposed to take up the points in my letter seriatim, I naturally supposed you would meet them specifically with facts, reasoning, and logic in disproving or approving. Whether you have done that consistently or not can best be ascertained by disinterested minds reading your letters and mine, and I should welcome such an opportunity. I should also like an unbiased opinion as to whether there is not a tendency in your letters to much irrelevant talk, combined with a phase of sophistry and quibbling which does not befit the position you have assumed. I do not mean to be disrespectful; I want with all my heart to give you the benefit of the doubt, but to be true to myself I must speak frankly, even as I would to an older brother. I have a strong and natural affection and attachment for you and all the comrades I have been associated with on the Hill. My heart is yearning to actively sustain, in my humble way, the work inaugurated by H. P. B., particularly in the society of the comrades I have grown up with since boyhood. I wish to God you would make it possible for me, and many others I know, to conscientiously cooperate and support you in an effort to bring back or transform the work on the Hill along the simple, direct and honest lines laid down by H. P. B.—real Esotericism and Mysticism without any "mist."

While the real impulse of the Theosophical Movement of 1875 "moves on," it already suffers from an accumulation of malignant excrescences, of "successors," claims, titles, rituals, "New" inner teachings, denominations and so forth. Most of these Theosophical "denominations" or sects seek to strengthen their positions by various pronouncements concerning "new cycles," "esoteric messages," "secret" understandings with the Master, or "predecessor," etc. These pronouncements usually offer an excuse for innovations, reversals of policies, creations of honorary positions, granting of concessions, "plenary indulgences," etc. In other words, pronouncements to suit any expediency.

It is pleasing to note what you say with regard to "faith," and I just wish to ask you, or some of the other comrades, whether the principles or theories enunciated in your letters have been consistently put into practice on the Hill since its establishment. Judging by some of the very radical changes you have precipitately and hurriedly instituted, for some of which I would like to commend you, I would say you cannot really think so.

I am afraid that you have not read my letter sympathetically enough, to note that I stated clearly that H. P. B. did not really have to produce so-called outer proofs;—the fact that she did produce such proofs simply showed her generosity and thoughtfulness, like other real Messengers of the past. It may interest you to know that in dictating that letter of September first to my wife, she remarked that "G. de P. will think that you wish to embarrass him by expecting him to perform occult stunts or miracles, etc.," and I replied that you could not think so in truth, for I am simply relating what one or more did, who I am sure were "Messengers," whereas in G. de P.'s case, I know

nothing of him that approaches my conception of one perfect enough to be considered an adept, or on the threshold of adeptship. However, I thought that if you are in the position that you claimed to be in, you would find a way; that is why I said **"some way" to prove your claim.** You see we happen to know a few, right here in Los Angeles, who claim guidance by a Master or Masters, not counting Annie Besant and others whom **"you do not like."** Their erudition, (esoteric and exoteric), intellectual conceptions, and understanding of human nature at least equal yours, as far as the majority who call themselves Theosophists can judge. Some of these claimants also bring forth "new teachings" such as H. P. B. "could not reveal in her time." (On closer study these are usually found to be merely imperfect repetitions or interpretations of her teachings, and of other brilliant minds associated with her at the time,) or they also "revive ancient archaic ceremonies or rites." As the Master says—"They want something new. A Ritual to amuse them." (Letter, Feb. 1882). [See p. 35]

Do you or any Theosophist familiar with the early history of the T. S. deny that H. P. B. gave **"abundant proof of her own occult power and her communication with the Masters?"** In fact the biggest blows aimed at her during her life, by her enemies, were through the efforts to prove her occult phenomena fraudulent. Also recall the vehement defense and testimony by men and women of high scientific and moral standing, including that of W. Q. J. as to the genuineness of occult phenomena produced by H. P. B. All messengers had such detractors and defenders as to evidence even of their occult powers.

You repeat publicly and privately that K. T. left a body of trained students, such as she herself did not have at the beginning of her leadership; claiming, therefore, that you are in a better position now to give out teachings that were at the time held back by her. The truth of this is questioned by those who ought to know. Is it not a fact that W. Q. J. left a much greater body of members and specially trained students, brilliant Theosophists, old pupils of H. P. B. and his own? Most of these, as also many newly acquired members, have left the Point Loma Organization, or have died. Of the Raja Yoga School, the most promising and most lasting institution founded by K. T. there are only a handful left, who are **apparently** ready to accept you at your claims.

With respect to authority, I referred particularly to authority over persons—I may not have expressed myself clearly. I sincerely hope, however, that you will continue to show liberality and tolerance both in private and public to those "who may question your esoteric standing"—it will prove another commendatory innovation on the Hill.

Regarding the comparison of your own position with that of Mr. Judge, it is vital to note again that W. Q. J. did have **definite authoritative documents** of appointment to the position he held in the E. S., and he **was** duly elected to the position he held in the T. S. and when occasion arose he offered to prove his limited claims of communications with the Masters. Besides, even those who opposed W. Q. J. admitted that he received communications from the Masters, at least, while H. P. B. was alive.

You write at length, giving your own version of what I meant to convey, and you **say what I did not**, and then proceed to demolish these supposed assertions by argument, or by exclaiming "it is extraordinary that you cannot see this yourself." You cannot find anywhere in my letter that I allege occult powers or stunts were a proof of H. P. B.'s communication with the Master. On the contrary you will find the following stated briefly: "the then new and marvelous scientific, religious thought, she (H. P. B.) brought forth, was **proof enough** that she was the Messenger the impress they (the Messengers) left by word and deed on the minds of men ever remained a proof of their divine mission."

I will repeat again that which no one can deny that all "Messengers"

known in history as such, including H. P. B. in the present cycle, have, particularly on their first appearance, volunteered proof of their own occult powers and their occult relationship with the Lodge. This does not mean denial of the truth of the following statement in one of the Master's letters: "It is not physical phenomena that will ever bring conviction to the Hearts of the unbelievers in the "Brotherhood," but rather phenomena of **intellectuality, philosophy** and logic." It is interesting to note that you apparently wish to express the same thought and you repeat: "The two things by which any Messenger of the Lodge proves his standing are **Spiritual**" (instead of philosophical) "and Intellectual qualities," or "capacities," knowledge," "grandeur," "development," "status," "standing," "equipment." You use the adjective "logical" once but in a modified sense. To my mind the statement in the Master's letter referred to above is simpler and less confusing. The word "spiritual" begs the question, it is like saying you can prove a claim to "spirituality" by "spiritual qualities." ("The Mahatma Letters," p. 246).

On reading your letter more than once, one becomes aware of a certain type of "psychology" you employ; for instance, you declare yourself on your own "say so" "Leader and Teacher," and then you proceed to question my right as a "pupil" to "think that I know more than my Leader and Teacher does," and you scoff at me further by asking: "are you a chela, are you so evolved spiritually to be competent to criticize or to judge?" That sounds quite familiar—I left my religious fold in my youth, and turned to Theosophy, because I considered myself sufficiently "evolved spiritually" to be competent to criticize and judge. I am not yet foolish enough to make any claims to chelaship. I repeat I am not criticizing, but only analyzing all that presents itself to me, and searching my heart and mind, and I appeal to you, to the comrades, for the light of logic and reason.

Throughout your letter you argue well with me and constantly repeat your claims (direct and implied) to spiritual knowledge, and assert secret and personal relationship between yourself and the Masters since childhood, that the "Buddhic Light" reveals itself through you, that your position is equal to that of H. P. B. as a "Messenger," that you are her "Successor" and sole intermediary between the Masters and the Theosophical Society, that you have been actually visited during the waking state by a Master and a chela, etc., all as I said, on the assumption that your own "say so" is sufficient, and substantiated because accepted by Mr. Fussell and Mrs. Lambert, and later repeated in circular letters. Yes, I say, clever psychology and "ancient" too. To one who is studying the history of the Theosophical Movement in the light of esoteric as well as exoteric writings and documents of the Masters, H. P. B., W. Q. J. and others, such bold assumptions or claims on your part or on the part of others—on their own "personal assertions" are very serious, and are fraught with grave consequences to all concerned; and I repeat, were you able to **demonstrate** the Truth of that one claim—"nothing else matters"—there would be no need of your thirteen page letter, nor my lengthy detailed analysis or dissection of the same.

Furthermore, I did not say that "your fate as Leader was then and there settled." I said "your fate as Leader on **true or false** lines, was sealed or settled," depending of course, principally, upon whether your claim, as presented by Mr. Fussell, regarding that of your definite personal communication with the Master, was true or false. I repeat, that is the **crux of the question**. Also please let us have a due sense of proportion with respect to our "world organization" or our "own Movement." It has dwindled down to a number not larger than that of a single lodge right in Los Angeles, a fairly recently organized "Theosophical Society." I say this and speak so freely, because I believe that the "Hill" with its very small outside membership, can form the vehicle for a splendid work in continuation, and the application of the teachings brought to us in this age by H. P. B. and you could play a leading part in it on a good honest common sense ground. What an opportunity! In my limited circle I did not realize, until some Sundays ago, what is going on in the world! On the same evening several halls of large capacity were filled

with audiences listening to lectures on Theosophy. One of them I attended personally, where the speaker's name was not even announced. He claimed nothing for himself, but the inspiration of H. P. B.'s or W. Q. J.'s writings. His voice and personality were anything but fascinating, but the substance of his address was most surprisingly sound, deeply philosophical, scientific and ethical, and yet simple. It did one's heart good to see an audience of over a thousand men and women (the former predominating) listening attentively to an exposition of pure Theosophy, without any stage effects or posing or any attempt at "personal charm." It is most remarkable to meet everywhere in business and in professional life, men and women, young and old, who are actually calling themselves Theosophists. It is no exaggeration to say that there are thousands of them in Los Angeles. I have personally already met more than a half dozen physicians prominent in the profession, who are earnest students of Theosophy.

Please bear in mind your own admission that my statement "The Masters have withdrawn from direct visitations to individuals in the T. S. etc. is true." What logical reason can you offer that this does not apply to you? Don't you think that the increasing lapse of time from the commencement of the impulse or cycle of 1875 plays an essential part in this "withdrawal" or recession? It is also well to bear in mind that **imagination** can play havoc with certain temperaments. See what H. P. B. had to say at one time regarding Col. Olcott, of whom she and the Masters thought so much. (The Path, March, 1896).

May I ask you whether the official constitution of the U. B. and T. S. (not the E. S.) was followed exactly as prescribed regarding your "appointment" as Leader and Official Head of that organization? May I also ask you at this point, besides a change in wording, what particular change do you offer in the new Constitution? And whether that constitution is in "line" with what H. P. B. formulated for the T. S. during her life? You yourself have admitted that **K. T. was not herself towards the end of her life**. Supposing the new Leader should also become subject to manifestations of a psychos-thenia, or infirmities of age, or also possibly meet with an apoplectic stroke, so as to interfere, to some extent at least, with his normal faculties—what then? What practical significance is there in any possible new provision or change in the constitution when the sole authority and sole veto power rests with that Leader?

What you tell me in "confidence as to a gentleman" that K. T. frequently spoke of you in terms which were deliberately used by her to attract attention "away from you," as her successor, is ingenious. According to the same logic, there are a great many who left the "Hill," or who are still there, that could also claim "successorship," for certainly she did frequently speak of them in terms to attract attention "**away**" from them. The only difference in your case is that, in addition to the terms of camouflage, as you think, she definitely and repeatedly made the statement to a number that you were positively not to be her "successor." There must still be some on the Hill who remember the Telegram, and the announcement on the Bulletin Board to that effect.

I confess that in spite of your assertions to the contrary one can still see in your letter only the presentation of the luring varicolored lights of so-called "faith", "belief", and "emotionalism", and not the pure white light of reason. To the direct and clearly implied questioning of my mind, your reply, for instance, by asking me "another": "How do you know the manner of the official appointment of an Esoteric Teacher?" Or again you make the following "reasonable" remark: "I do not think you would have been in the present state of mind, if the Masters had consulted you as to the proper method of **K. T.'s appointing me.**" Of course if you continue in the same line of "psychology" and assume the premises that your appointment by the Master is an established and accepted fact, then you are quite right,—what right have I to criticize the **manner** or method of that appointment? Or the

manner or the method of conducting the meetings through which that appointment was revealed by Mrs. Lambert and Mr. Fussell?

I also question the fairness of your statement "you don't like Mrs. Lambert." It evades affirmation or denial of the following statement in my letter, "regarding her **reputation** for lack of veracity and sincerity she held with the great majority of the workers on the Hill." Incidentally we happen to know that your own opinion of Mrs. Lambert in that particular regard, until recently, did not differ much from those of mine and other members; even now, the best that many on the Hill can say with apparent gladness and satisfaction is that Mrs. Lambert "has less to say now, and that G. de P. is compelling her to take a back seat."

It is not for me to say whether my letter does, or does not deserve the criticism you offer when you say for instance that it is "contradictory, illogical, vague, etc." Your criticism that "I arose when the Pledge was called for," may be true, but again I challenge your fairness. Supposing that I admitted that I had not the courage to protest at that moment as you say, and "I was swept off my feet by the spirit of enthusiasm that prevailed" (the contrary being the truth)—**does that answer my question** as to "the fairness of requiring the members to rise immediately after the above declaration by J. H. Fussell and Mrs. Lambert, and repeat the pledge without first being given time for deliberation"? How do you know that I did not think of doing just what you suggest, "leave the Temple." Perhaps I did not think it wise to act on impulse, or create a scene by walking out, or perhaps I was not sure what was right to do under the circumstances, and therefore did nothing to attract attention at the time at least? Under the circumstances perhaps I had the right to a "mental reservation" regarding "the outer head in all my relation to this work for Universal Brotherhood." Perhaps my comrades next to me may have observed that I did not raise my hand at the time!

I am rather surprised when you say that mine "is the only communication of any kind, written or verbal, that you have received—criticizing or finding fault, or suggesting suspicion, or anything that is false or wrong." For your information may I say that I have contacted a great many members, young and old, prominent and not prominent, and found views more radical than mine. It is important that you re-read your letter and complete the quotation of two sentences of my letter by adding what I said **first**—that "I have known you for sometime"—i.e. besides having "contacted you professionally" and "I have naturally formed an opinion of your **possibilities**." It is again interesting to note that you put words and statements in my letter that are not there, and proceed to argue them and even refer to them as evidence of "stupidity" or "idiotic" on my part. I have not in my letter of September first nor will I now, discuss my diagnosis of your physical or nervous condition, I will admit, however, that it formed a very important factor in my questioning your right to your audacious claims. Suffice to say that I told you at the time of my examination and attendance on you only that which I, as a physician, thought would be of benefit to you, and even of that you omit important points.

I wish you had been more **specific** in your references. You refer repeatedly to my criticism of other people. I challenge you to name others besides Mrs. Lambert and Dr. Wood, and in the case of these two you practically agreed to my views at the time, cautioning me as to my manner and tact in approaching or contacting them. I was sincerely grateful for your help and sympathy in that line, as well as your kind interest as a respected friend and brother in my business problems. You may not be aware that your views differed very materially from those of K. T. at the time, a fact that I can prove. Your statement that "I am not the proper person to criticise," is again unfair, to say the least. In my letter of August 17, I offered to prove to you guilt of **criminal neglect**. Of other cases of criminal neglect you yourself are quite aware, but you apparently believe in overlooking such mere details for the sake of the "great cause." I was under such psychology myself up to not so long ago. Please bear in mind that I will make no criticisms of these two

persons, or others that I cannot substantiate, and that I will not do so unless I think it necessary to prevent further harm. See my letters to you before K. T.'s death.

The extracts sent you are from specific messages sent by H. P. B. to the American Theosophists, and published originally in the "Path," and in the annual convention reports from 1887-1891, and reprinted in booklet form later.

I now come to what I think to be the most logical phase of your letter. First let me repeat what I said to a dear friend of mine after what I called the third E. S. meeting. "It would have been easier for me to follow G. de P. had he not made the claim of the visitation by the Master, etc." As I said I did not think it was quite fair for you to claim belief under the glamour of a Master's visit to you on your own "say-so" before your name was even announced, and before any other information was imparted to the members generally. I would rather follow you, the man, as I have known you, and give you a chance, as you say, to do things, to change, to grow, to accomplish, and have you leave it to my intuition to recognize that "G. de P. of today" and his "spiritual and intellectual equipment" as it became evident to me and by which, as you say, the true Leader can be recognized.

Admitting your suppositions only, I would consider the following in your letter as the most logical and the most worthy of consideration: "Would it have been better for me to remain in the background and to have left our beloved Society without any Leadership at all?" Or as you repeat "Would it have been better for me, as a faithful student, to have remained in the background and let the Society go to pieces for lack of a Leader?" It seems to me I anticipated, in part at least, an answer to those questions in my letter, when I said—"which to my mind made you the logical successor to K. T. among the men left around her."

Permit me to do a little supposing on my own account. Suppose that under the circumstances you assumed the initiative, stepped forward and tried to save the Institution or Society, and addressed yourself to the comrades of recognized ability and wisdom, including the greater number who for one reason or other left the "Hill." I am referring particularly to those who were at one time or another considered very desirable, and placed on a very high pedestal; men and women of brilliant minds and warm hearts, whose only guilt was perhaps to voice some "uncertainties" or to suggest changes, some of which you are now hastily instituting in conformity with "K. T.'s secret policy." Supposing you address them in some such words—let us forget what possible differences of opinion, what possible grievances, just or otherwise, we might have had, what possible understanding or "misunderstanding of the real K. T.", she is no more here. Here is a wonderful vehicle for carrying on a Theosophic work along lines laid down by H. P. B. Let us advise together like true brothers and sisters, on sane balanced lines. Let us cooperate, adjust wrongs, perhaps decide upon new policies, to suit a "new Theosophic era" or the progress of the times, etc. Omit, for the time being at least, any "super claims."

Since you have no documents of appointment in the E. S. or T. S. your initiative and your Leadership, if you have it in you, would according to your own words, naturally assert itself. "The phenomena of philosophy, intellectuality and logic" would manifest soon enough to the degree that you are inspired by the "Brotherhood" or by your "Higher Self." Those who by virtue of their past standing in the Society, past accomplishments, experiences, common aims and ideals—aye, by the virtue of the same "phenomena," would be entitled to share counsel with you, would, I am sure, support or confirm the standing or position you are entitled to both in the E. S. and T. S. as it was done in H. P. B.'s time. Of course you must also suppose that Mr. Judge's

statement that there was no successor appointed, and that there can be no successor to H. P. B. holds good now as then. He wrote:

"MADAM BLAVATSKY HAS NO 'SUCCESSOR,' COULD HAVE NONE, NEVER CONTEMPLATED, SELECTED OR NOTIFIED ONE. HER WORK AND STATUS WERE UNIQUE . . . ALL WHO ENJOYED HER CONFIDENCE WILL UNITE WITH ME IN THE ASSERTION THAT SHE NEVER HINTED AT 'SUCCESSION,' 'ALLEGIANCE' OR 'GUARANTEE'." . . . "THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IS A BODY GOVERNED BY RULES EMBODIED IN ITS CONSTITUTION. ITS OFFICERS ARE ELECTED BY VOTES. . . ." (W. Q. J. Lucifer, Mar. 1892.)

"I DO NOT WISH TO PLACE MYSELF ON THE HIGH LEVEL OF H. P. B." (W. Q. J., Nov. 3, 1894.)

H. P. B. had the authority to appoint one or more as her "representative" in the E. S. and it was that position to which Mr. Judge was appointed, that he retained, and laid claim to, after her death. The following are some of the documents which W. Q. J. did have and did use, in laying claim to the position he assumed.

ESOTERIC T. S. SECTION

"AS HEAD OF THE ESOTERIC SECTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, I HEREBY DECLARE THAT WILLIAM Q. JUDGE OF NEW YORK, U. S. A., IN VIRTUE OF HIS CHARACTER OF A CHELA OF THIRTEEN YEARS' STANDING AND OF THE TRUST AND CONFIDENCE REPOSED IN HIM IS MY ONLY REPRESENTATIVE FOR SAID SECTION IN AMERICA, AND HE IS THE SOLE CHANNEL THROUGH WHOM WILL BE SENT AND RECEIVED ALL COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF THE SAID SECTION AND MYSELF, AND TO HIM FULL FAITH, CONFIDENCE AND CREDIT IN THAT REGARD ARE TO BE GIVEN. DONE AT LONDON, THIS FOURTEENTH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1888, AND IN THE FOURTEENTH YEAR OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY." (SEAL). H. P. BLAVATSKY.

(Notice that H. P. B. made appointment by "legal documents.")

LONDON, OCTOBER 23rd, 1889.

" . . . THE ESOTERIC SECTION AND ITS LIFE IN THE U. S. A. DEPEND UPON W. Q. JUDGE REMAINING ITS AGENT AND WHAT HE NOW IS. THE DAY W. Q. J. RESIGNS, H. P. B. WILL BE VIRTUALLY DEAD FOR THE AMERICANS. W. Q. J. IS THE ANTASKARNA BETWEEN THE TWO MANAS (es?), THE AMERICAN THOUGHT AND THE INDIAN—OR RATHER THE TRANS-HIMALAYAN ESOTERIC KNOWLEDGE. DIXI. H. P. B.
P. S.—W. Q. J. HAD BETTER SHOW AND IMPRESS THIS ON THE MIND OF ALL THOSE IT MAY CONCERN.

W. Q. J. had a photograph of the Master autographed as follows: "To my dear and loyal Colleague, W. Q. J. 1889."

Note, these are only two of other "documents" that W. Q. J. did have and did use to prove his position, and which was recognized at a meeting of the International Council in London. This was followed by election to the presidency by the general membership of the American and even the European section. Whatever happened afterwards through "treachery" as you say, or

mistaken ideas as Mr. Judge declared, did not alter his position, and he asserted himself accordingly. And accordingly prominent Theosophists, men and women of high integrity, intelligence and learning, rallied around him, and he made wonderful strides in the few years at his disposal. William Q. Judge in turn did not even appoint a representative as Outer Head. A Council of Theosophists, including K. T. met and I have the word of all but two or three of that Council then present, either in their writing or from direct personal information,—that after a continuous three-day and night struggle K. T. was selected by them to head the Society. The agreement was reached in the nature of a compromise because K. T. seemed the most “promising” at the time;—because some believed that W. Q. J. thought well of her, and principally because she had the initiative, personality and genius to assert herself, and direct all of them. Whether it was wise or not to keep the full truth away from the general membership, or allow them, by inference and otherwise, to believe that there were actual documents left by W. Q. J. appointing K. T. his “Successor,” is a worth-while study for those who are actively interested. Other profitable studies suggest themselves at this time for “those who dare,” such as the history of facts and progress of the T. S. since its conversion into the U. B. and T. S. and what soon became its overshadowing personality, Katherine Tingley; or the history of the numerous things she started and never completed, or the numerous promises and prophecies not fulfilled.

Pardon the digression and let us continue with the supposition that you call together Leaders of thought and action and who claim to be Theosophists since H. P. B.’s, W. Q. J.’s and K. T.’s time and meet together in “the name of the Master,” and address them as William Q. Judge did after H. P. B.’s death:

“CONSIDER THE POSITION OF THE SCHOOL: WE ARE NO LONGER A BAND OF STUDENTS TAUGHT BY A VISIBLE TEACHER; WE ARE A BAND OF STUDENTS MUTUALLY INTERDEPENDENT, FORCED TO RELY ON EACH OTHER FOR OUR USEFULNESS AND OUR PROGRESS, UNTIL OUR VERY BROTHERLINESS IN MUTUAL HELP SHALL DRAW A VISIBLE TEACHER BACK AMONG US. H. P. B. REMAINS ONE OF OUR HEADS THOUGH H. P. BLAVATSKY IS “DEAD” AND THE HEADS OF THE SCHOOL HAVE NOT WITHDRAWN THEIR GUIDANCE IN WITHDRAWING THE PRESENCE CHOSEN TO REPRESENT THEM FOR A TIME ON WHICH WE HAVE REJOICED TO LEAN.”

“ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT IS IT THAT AT THE PRESENT JUNCTURE WE SHOULD BEAR IN MIND THE WORDS OF H. P. B. WRITTEN AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY. IN LAYING STRESS ON THE KNOWLEDGE AND WISDOM THAT WILL BE REQUIRED BY THOSE ON WHOM IT FALLS TO CARRY ON THE WORK OF THE SOCIETY AFTER HER DEPARTURE, SHE EXPLAINS THAT THOSE QUALITIES ONLY CAN SAVE THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY FROM ENDING IN FAILURE.”

“WE WHO WRITE TO YOU CLAIM OVER YOU NO AUTHORITY SAVE SUCH AS SHE DELEGATED TO US. WE ARE YOUR FELLOW STUDENTS, CHOSEN BY HER—THE MESSENGER OF THE MASTERS OF WISDOM—AS THEIR CHANNELS TO THE MEASURE OF OUR ABILITY DURING THIS PERIOD OF DARKNESS”

“WE BELIEVE IN H. P. B. AND IN THE MASTERS, AND IT IS ENOUGH TO US THAT THEY SAY: ‘GO AND CARRY ON OUR WORK ALONG THE LINES ON WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN INSTRUCTED’”

"FOR THE USE OF ALL OF US THERE ARE WRITTEN TEACHINGS LEFT BY H. P. B. IN OUR HANDS THAT WILL GIVE FOOD FOR STUDY AND THOUGHT FOR MANY A YEAR TO COME AND THOUGH THE MAIN DUTY OF THE ESOTERISTS IS SERVICE TO OTHERS AND NOT PERSONAL ADVANCEMENT IN KNOWLEDGE IT IS CHARACTERISTIC OF HER THOUGHT FOR US THAT BEHIND HER SHE LEFT INTELLECTUAL AND SPIRITUAL FOOD FOR THE EARNEST STUDENT, AS WELL AS THE CHARGE TO COMPLETE HER UNFINISHED WORK."

(Extract from an address by W. Q. J. to the E. S. members, also signed at the time by A. B.)

I venture to state, and I know whereof I speak, that you would get support such as you cannot dream of in your present situation—even the financial problems on the "Hill," would probably be solved very quickly. Your name would go down in the history of Theosophical annals as an impersonal benefactor. Are you big enough to heed the suggestion that comes from the heart of an humble individual? I dare to warn you that the enlightened time and tide of the present day is against you in creating a following of whole-hearted, big-minded men and women—or any kind of a **permanent** following if you continue along the lines of "Apostolic succession," "ritualistic religion," "personal appeal" and "emotional revivalism." I venture to predict that before long your position, even on the Hill, will become untenable by the very new liberties and indulgences you are granting to counteract the personal unhappiness and dissatisfaction of many of the members—young and old, for such is human nature. Those few who hold positions of honor and power, and such members who are encouraged to self-denial, asceticism, and sacrifice, be it even for a supposed ideal, are apt to be attached more permanently and more contentedly than those who become interested or remain interested only for selfish reasons, such as direct and inferred promises of benefit and comfort, or direct contact with the Masters.

I tell you thinking men and women are shocked at the crude method of broadcasting, through penny postage open mail, your direct personal relationship with the Masters, and what is infinitely worse, your repeated promises and offering of the old, old bait that you will place others in "**personal communication**" with Them, with a safe proviso—"those who are found in the future to be worthy, etc." After a profuse flow of words, words, words, you sign yourself "**Yours Mystically.**" What a profanation!

"**NOTHING IS PROMISED: EACH WILL HAVE JUST WHAT HE OR SHE DESERVES—NO MORE, NO LESS.**" (H. P. B. in a letter to W. Q. J. giving permission and instruction regarding the formation of the E. S. T.)

It matters not what changes, even for the good, you make on the "Hill" or elsewhere. No need of waiting for time "to show what is within you" as you say, your fate is sealed, I repeat, unless you have the unusual courage to face yourself, your sane self, not your imaginary self. Please do not mistake me—I am convinced that outwardly you are apt to, with a pose, brush this letter aside as the ravings of a mad man. I am also painfully conscious that quite a few of my beloved comrades are apt to endorse your gesture, charitable or otherwise.

I speak so freely and boldly, because I love, and think highly of your possibilities, on impersonal and rational lines; and because I **want to protest**, with all the power there is in my being, against this awful mockery, and the attempt to create what I believe to be, a new sect in the divine name of Theosophy.

This letter was drafted spasmodically, as I could spare the time, during a course of over two months. The periodical receipt of your "E. S." and "T. S."

circulars helped considerably in the **evolution** of my present conclusions. I was particularly interested in your first E. S. paper, dated August 8th, a report of what I would probably call the fourth E. S. meeting. It seems you did not think it necessary to report the preceding E. S. meetings following the death of K. T. and to which I referred in my last letter.

This paper contains apparently the first "inner" teaching, which your "three predecessors" "could not reveal" in their time—you, as the privileged "Fourth Successor," did, solemnly, I imagine, impart to your "Companions" and "Neophytes" in the following words:

"Let me begin by telling you something which, in justice to my great Predecessors I should say **they never could tell you** and that is, what happens to a Messenger when sent forth as H. P. Blavatsky was The Mesenger gives up, resigns a certain portion of the principles of his inner constitution But in doing so, it leaves the Messenger a psychological cripple This explains the many and sudden and often perplexing changes of mood, etc."

Without giving the proper credit, you have taken this time the whole thought bodily, and very prosaically out of the 16th letter of the book "The Mahatma Letters," to A. P. Sinnett, compiled by A. T. Barker. (You recall once at Headquarters perhaps, about one year ago, in response to a query of mine, you told me that you read or knew of that book, adding that K. T. did not approve of its publication). You even repeat the very phrase "**psychological cripple**" used in that letter. You certainly have the advantage over your "predecessors," to be permitted now to "reveal" this inner teaching. It can be so helpful and convenient. I do not feel competent to discuss the idea, but it is quite easy to see, for those who **feel free** to read the Master's Letter, that you have taken that truly mystic teaching simply stated by the Master, and made a lengthy wordy dissertation, with the inevitable result that your interpretation or application of it is erroneous and misleading, to put it mildly.

Please note that the Master speaks of "a purely physiological excitement," and no interference or interruption with the conception of what is right or wrong, in other words, "a psychological cripple," not a moral cripple.

Again I say I have looked into the history of the Theosophical Movement, I have given our interviews, your public utterances, your circulars, and your letters a great deal of thought, study and energy. My letter is a conscientious, frank analysis, as far as time and space will permit. My ultimate attitude and the final step I may take, is of utmost importance in my life, and it will depend entirely upon your response or no response.—As far as I am concerned, I still consider myself a member of the Organization to which I devoted thirty years of the best part of my life, and, as indicated before, I should consider myself absolutely failing in my duty to that Organization, to Theosophy, and to those who brought it in this Age, if I stood by indifferently.

"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 ALONE CAN BIND THE WHOLE OF HUMANITY INTO ONE BROTHERHOOD**" "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."

HELENA P. BLAVATSKY.

Digitized by Edm. Theos. Soc.

Yours loyally,

HYMAN LISCHNER.

P. S.—"No Master of Wisdom from the East will himself offer or send anyone to Europe or America after that period (Dec. 31, 1899) until the year 1975."

H. P. B. in 1888.

INTERNATIONAL THEOSOPHICAL HEADQUARTERS

Point Loma, California

G. de Purucker, Private Office

November 29, 1929.

Hymn Lischner, M. D.,
Beaux Arts Bldg.,
Los Angeles, California.
My Dear Boy!

Digitized by Edm. Theos. Soc.

With a mixture of good-natured humor directed in your direction, and amazement, I received your long letter of November 17, 1929—a letter eleven pages long, in single-spaced typing.

It would be both childish and stupid to continue the argumentation any longer. I have had my say in the long letter I wrote to you, in an attempt to give you help, dear boy, and I remain with that letter; and you have had your answer in this long letter you have written to me. We might as well call it a closed incident. I have neither time nor nervous energy to spend in any more brain-mind argumentative wandering and vague disputations.

Keep your own view, dear fellow, and one day perhaps you will clasp hands with me in the sincere bonds of comradeship and friendship that used to exist, and which were never broken by any act of mine towards you.

I challenge you on your own statement, however, to work along with the Theosophical Society of which you have been a member so long, and which you say you love. There is no reason why, if you have opinions about me and want to argue them, I should have any hard feelings towards you. My heart contains towards you nothing but kindness, sympathy for your mental distress, and for the phase of Pledge-fever through which you are passing, but not a word of blame or condemnation.

I am not a child, dear Hyman, but a sincere comrade wishing you well. Give me your hand and we can go along together in Theosophical activity—that is, if you wish. My hand is outstretched. Some things in your letter I heartily approve of. Other things I will frankly say are absurd. But as they are your views, I do not mean this offensively, and you are entitled to hold them; but I know that some day the light will come to you, and your heart will turn to me again.

Give my regards to your dear wife, for whom I hold always sincere respect and liking, and believe me to be

Fraternally and loyally yours,

GdeP/evs

G. De PURUCKER.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

Founded at New York City in 1875

G. de Purucker, Leader

International Headquarters, Point Loma, California

LEADERS

H. P. Blavatsky - 1875-1891
William O. Judge - 1891-1896
Katherine Tingley - 1896-1929

Drs. H. & F. Lischner,
720 Beaux Arts Bldg.,
Los Angeles, Calif.
Dear Hyman and Frances:

December 30, 1929.

This is the first year for very many years that no Christmas-New Years

Greetings have passed between us;—and yet, this is not altogether correct, because I am determined that the New Year shall not go by without my sending you, as in the old days, and during all the years that we have known one another, my best wishes for a Happy New Year;—and never shall I, nor will any one of us forget the splendid and loyal service that you rendered to our beloved Katherine Tingley.

Best wishes to both of you and to the children for a beautiful and Happy New Year from your true friend.

(Signed) JOSEPH H. FUSSELL.

P. S.—I am writing you in a day or two on an official matter.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

Founded at New York City in 1875

G. de Purucker, Leader

International Headquarters, Point Loma, California

August 1, 1930.

Dr. Hyman Lischner,
706 Beaux Arts Bldg.,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Dear Hyman:

I was really very glad to see you and Frances once again when you made your little visit here last Wednesday, and especially for this reason: namely, that it shows that there is a tie between both you and me. Perhaps the next time you come, and to use your own words, it may be that you will wish "to leave me alone," for a while longer, though I certainly do not ask you to do it—we may get a little closer—but I think even now we should be able to understand one another a little.

Because of what you said, namely that you hold me very largely responsible for certain things that have happened in your life—I am going to take a still further responsibility, for I certainly do not overlook that which already exists. I am taking, in fact, the responsibility of letting you know what has given me such happiness in my life, and when I pass this on to you it is **not** with the idea that you do **not** know it nor even have it as **your own attitude**—as it is mine. It is this, that if one would be true to oneself—if one will follow the instruction passed on by H. P. B., the instruction which is given to all disciples, and repeated by her in "The Voice of the Silence"—to **follow the heart doctrine** and to make the eye-doctrine subservient to it, one will find the gates of knowledge open before him and not only of knowledge, but of peace.

And one other thing, Hyman—**do not worry about me**. I am not worrying about you, nor am I trying to bring you to my way of thinking. You must decide for yourself just the same as I must decide for myself, and if each of us holds to his highest ideals and follows first the path of Love, we shall find the way. If I have it aright you have a wish to help me, or possibly to bring me to your way of thinking. I do indeed thank you for thinking of me and for realizing how close the tie is between us, but each of us must find his own way and if you have found your way and it has brought you peace and heart-understanding, as well as mind-enlightenment, then I am glad for your sake, and to the extent that I also have found these, I know that you will be glad for my sake. If one will follow the path of Love and will trust—I have sufficient confidence in our Sacred Teachings to feel assured that as far as I do so, I shall find knowledge.

Affectionate greetings to you and Frances, also to the children.

Always your friend and brother,

JHF:C.

JOSEPH H. FUSSELL.

August 11, 1930.

Mr. Joseph H. Fussell,
Point Loma, Calif.
Dear Mr. Fussell:

I was glad to receive your friendly letter of Aug. 1st and I fully concur with all the sentiments expressed in it, however I must say it does not solve my present problems or elucidate the vital issues immediately at stake.

First, may I correct some impressions your letter seems to convey regarding my attitude. In your letter to me of January 3rd, 1930, you said: "some day I am looking forward to seeing both of you again and I hope also that then many matters which now you do not understand will be cleared up." My letters of January 11th suggested some such matters besides those in my correspondence with Prof. de Purucker, which I begged you to read and try to clear up for me. I purposely indicated frankly some of my problems and my desire to talk over things with you personally—you apparently responded immediately saying "I should be glad to see you and Frances," etc.

What happened when we did come to see you? After an exchange of greetings and expressions about the weather and my not looking well, etc. you continued to flit from one question or remark to another without permitting me to complete an answer to most of them. In response to an incomplete remark of mine regarding the possibility of my being mistaken or wrong, etc., you said in some such words "there is the difference between you and myself—I am sure of the light while you are in doubt," etc. Soon after (you being in a hurry) while escorting us to the automobile I succeeded to edge in a direct appeal for some explanation, but you put me off again by suggesting that I write down my questions, adding that I must be brief and you will answer them. I readily agreed to your suggestion. Evidently my ready acquiescence to write down my questions did not accomplish your object, and so you followed with a final stereotyped advice "wait six months before writing down your questions."

Dear Mr. Fussell, I think you know, or ought to know, that I am not worrying about any personal differences of opinion or belief, if I am worrying at all. As I have indicated in my letters to you and to G. de P. I am deeply concerned in what you and G. de P. are attempting to do officially in the name of Theosophy and H. P. B. with the work and organization of which I have been a co-member for over thirty years. The following quotations from a circular signed by Joseph H. Fussell and issued March 27, 1910, may be of special interest at this time: "Absurd pretensions" "This unfortunate misguided woman" "where we may ask is her moral code?" "Our protest is not against Mrs. Besant as a personality, but against these things, which under the sacred name of Theosophy, etc."—"but when by our silence we should be permitting a wrong it becomes our bounden duty to our fellows to protest and to give warning so far as lies in our power."

Now, my dear Mr. Fussell, I not only beg, but I demand of you, as Secretary of the same E. S. T. and T. S. in which we have been members together for so many years, that you answer my questions without evasion or equivocation. (They are all of more than six months standing).

Note the following from an E. S. Circular, dated Feb. 18, 1898, and signed by KATHERINE A. TINGLEY, OUTER HEAD.

"IN THE EVENT OF MY DEATH MEMBERS SHOULD NOT ACCEPT A SUCCESSOR EXCEPT ONE ATTESTED TO BY ME, NOT ONLY BY MY OWN SIGNATURE, BUT THAT OF THREE WITNESSES WHO HAVE BEEN TRIED AND NOT FOUND WANTING. THE DOCUMENT TO WHICH MY SIGNATURE WILL BE ATTACHED WILL BE KEPT IN A SAFE PLACE AND PRODUCED AT THE RIGHT TIME. I MENTION THIS IN ORDER THAT MEMBERS MAY MORE FIRMLY REALIZE THAT MAT-

TERS CONNECTED WITH THE SCHOOL ARE PROPERLY CARED FOR."

Are we justified in accepting a successor to K. T. when she especially warned us **against** doing so unless a document such as described by her is produced?

Why did you not produce such an "attested document at the right time" instead of the round-about way in which you and Mrs. Lambert (!) announced G. de P. as successor to K. T., preceding the announcement with the claim that you "were informed" that the "Outer Head was visited by the Master," etc.?

In short, have you, as an officer and member, followed K. T.'s definite written instructions, or have you too had some inner or occult vision which made you disregard the written instructions, and expected the members to replace these with your or Mrs. Lambert's assertions, or with G. de P.'s claims to occult communications or knowledge of "K. T.'s secret wishes"?

My dear Brother, there are very few people in the U. B. and T. S. whom I have loved and respected personally as much as I have you—and my attachment for you is still real and genuine. I would give a great deal not to be compelled to question your convictions or ideals. Much depends on how you reply to and face now my earnest challenge and pleadings.

With heartfelt greetings from Frances and myself,

Your faithful and loyal comrade,

HYMAN LISCHNER.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

Founded at New York City in 1875

G. de Purucker, Leader

International Headquarters, Point Loma, California

Dr. Hyman Lischner,
Los Angeles, Calif.

August 13, 1930.

Dear Hyman:

I have just received your letter of August 11th, and having a few moments I reply immediately. Otherwise, there might be considerable delay, as the work piles into my office so fast. In view of our past association and the close tie that there is between us—and this includes also your wife, Frances—I do not hesitate to write you in perfect frankness.

Not all the argument in the world will bring you light. The question that you are seeking to answer can be answered only by yourself. Follow the promptings of your heart and you will find that the doors of knowledge will be open to you. For me there is no higher path for the attainment of knowledge than that pointed out to us by H. P. B. in the "Voice of the Silence:" "Self-knowledge is of loving deeds the child"—and as you know, self-knowledge is the key to all knowledge.

It is not that I think in any way that you do not seek to do loving deeds, for I think there is something beautiful and true deep down in the nature of both of you. My reason for quoting it is merely to pass on to you what the line of my own endeavor is, and to urge that you continue to travel along that path. It is the only path that will bring enlightenment and peace.

G. de P. asks me to send you his affectionate greetings for the sake of "Auld Lang Syne" and with affectionate greetings from myself to both of you, dear Hyman and Frances, I am, as always, your true Comrade.
JHF:C.

J. H. F.

November 14, 1930.

Dr. Hyman Lischner,
706 Beaux Art Bldg.,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Digitized by Edm. Theos. Soc.

Dear Hymn:

(E. S. Confidential)

I have had no answer to my letter to you of January 30th regarding the L. of L. and E. S. papers. I can hardly bring myself to the point of feeling that you do not recognize an obligation in respect to your Pledge of honor—I mean in the L. of L. and the E. S.

You may not, as indeed I understand, accept the present Leadership of the T. S. and E. S.; but there has been no discontinuance of either body. So, as Secretary of the E. S. as also of the L. of L. which office I have held for many years, holding the same office indeed under W. Q. J., I again ask you **as a matter of honor** to return all papers of the L. of L. and E. S. which you have received from this office.

In respect to No. 1 of the E. S. Reports issued by G. de P. which was sent you because of your tacit acceptance of him at the E. S. meeting which you attended here in the Temple of Peace in July, 1929, and because before the sending of it to you, there had been received no notice of your resignation, or anything to that effect, and because we regarded you as a man of honor, I now formally ask the return of that particular paper, that is the No. 1, just above referred to. I ask also that you will convey this same request to your wife Frances.

I take it as a matter of honor, the paper having been marked "Strictly Private and Confidential" and having been sent you in good faith, that you have furthermore held it **strictly private**, as a gentleman and as a man of honor.

I do not forget the old days of close and affectionate friendship. Some day we shall meet again—and I look forward to the time when there shall be no mists or clouds between us, when we shall work together again.

Best wishes to you both.

Every fraternally,

JOSEPH H. FUSSELL,
Secretary General E. S.

JHF:C.

P. S.—For your information, the E. S. Report No. 1, above referred to is dated August 8, 1929 and was mailed about Oct. 23, 1929. It was mimeographed and not printed, and with it also was sent a letter which being also **strictly private and confidential**, should likewise be returned. J.H.F.

January 11, 1931.

Mr. Joseph H. Fussell,
Point Loma, Calif.,
Dear Mr. Fussell:

I received your letter of Nov. 14th. Your reference to my "obligation" in respect to my "Pledge of Honor" and your demand "as a matter of honor" that I "return all papers of the L. of L. and E. S. which I have received from this office" to you, strikes me as both comical and tragical. It is a tragedy for me to come to the growing realization that the man I thought so much of, the man I loved and still love as my own brother, has been and is employing a sophistry and policy akin to Jesuitry.

I have appealed to you in person, I have appealed to you by letters, for the documentary evidence of K. T.'s appointment of G. de P. as her successor. By that same "Pledge of honor" which you refer to in your letter—am I not bound "to obey" K. T.'s definite "orders" "Not to accept a successor" unless

an attested document as described by her in the E. S. Circular of Feb. 18, 1898—is produced? You have evaded a direct answer to every question and request of mine by the continued use of “honeyed words” and “piously quoting scripture.”

With no authentic document left by K. T. for her successorship (Note 1) the organization known as the L. of L. or E. S. T., of which she claimed to be the “Head and Heart,” ceased functioning at her death—and all offices of that organization, including the secretariship, naturally ceased functioning at the same time. Even while K. T. was alive no one in the L. of L. had the authority, without her orders, to either demand or receive the resignation of a member. In short, under these circumstances each member may consider himself his own “Outer Head” now, and as such he may use his own discretion as to what is still esoteric and what is not, or what he may reveal and what he may not, in a somewhat similar sense as Mr. A. Trevor Barker used his own discretion in publishing “The Mahatma Letters.” (Note 2).

As we know, K. T. gave out no esoteric teachings during her life-time,—she promised a good deal, and even outlined the four or five heads under which she would give her teachings; but she never got to it. There were a number of circular pamphlets issued in the way of digests of H. P. B.’s teachings, prepared by students such as Dr. Coryn or yourself. These were marked E. S. T. and sometimes signed by K. T. Later on there were also interpretative lectures given by G. de P. The bulk of the copies of H. P. B.’s instructions I did not receive through you, when secretary of the L. of L. (being told that they were out of print). Old students were kind enough to allow me to copy what I have from those in their possession.

I understand that you are pursuing the well-known policy of “avoiding to give explanations which you have not got,” you resort to the old “mystery” gag. You confidentially tell the believers that K. T.’s orders to the members, that in the event of her death they should not accept a successor except one attested to, etc.—were expressed to meet an “emergency” at the time these instructions were written; but that that emergency has since passed. In other words you wish us to believe that her orders served a purpose while K. T. was alive, but do not apply to the time of her death to which her instructions specifically refer. As I said to G. de P. this is Mystery with real “mist.”

Up to the time of K. T.’s death, did any member of the L. of L. receive written instructions from her countermanding or changing her written orders of 1898? In the first announcement of G. de P. as “successor” to K. T. by yourself and Mrs. Lambert, neither of you made any reference whatever to K. T.’s written promise and instructions of Feb. 18, 1898, regarding her successor, or of any instructions superceding those of that date. After yours and Mrs. Lambert’s roundabout declarations that G. de P. was the O. H., and incidentally giving information that he had been visited by a Master, etc., you immediately asked the members to rise and recite the pledge to the O. H. (Note 3). Soon after you heard some criticism, including possibly also mine, for I spoke freely of my feelings the next day to my good old chum and “member of the cabinet” Maurice Braun, so that at the following “E. S.” meeting you pronounced the “first warning” for those “not in perfect and complete sympathy . . . with the present outer head, are requested to rise and leave.” I asked the president of one of your lodges whether he recalled K. T.’s instructions regarding successorship—he said “yes,” but that he supposed that there was some document left; and all those in charge on the “Hill” must surely have taken care of it, and have been acting accordingly.

The fact that a number of the remaining followers of K. T. became followers of G. de P. does not bind those who, at least with equal right, chose to do otherwise. I also wish to emphasize the fact that for me there has been no L. of L. since K. T.’s death, and unless the subject matter of your communications to me is of a purely personal nature, with no relation to the good of the public, and the Theosophical Movement in particular, I cannot, and will

not be bound to secrecy by the heading "E. S." "Confidential" or "strictly private," etc. on communications sent to me by you.

As I have written to you, and to G. de P. before now, you are both dealing with matters vital to the welfare of the Theosophical Movement, aye, in my opinion as well as that of others who know you both intimately, you are undermining its best interests with your sophistry and subtle personal appeal under a "garb of sanctity." Your "Report No. 1" of pretended esotericism, with its glamour of ceremony, including the "swipe" about the "psychological cripple" (see my letter to G. de P. of Nov. 17, 1929), together with other facts, proofs, and correspondence accumulated by me, may prove helpful to those who would rather think than believe. (Note 4).

As to my "tacit acceptance of G. de P."—see also my letter of Sept. 1, 1929 to G. de P. That meeting you refer to, when you and Mrs. Lambert craftily roped everyone present into what might be taken as a "tacit acceptance," was the last one to which I accepted an invitation. What you call "No. 1 of the E. S. reports issued by G. de P." was sent to me after my interview and my letters to G. de P. questioning his sucessionship, and protesting against his "preposterous claim."

As I have indicated to you in other letters, I am not addressing you personally, or indeed attacking anyone personally. I would write thus to a brother of my own blood, and I still feel towards you as such, and, as I told you before, I am ready to serve you personally in whatever way I can, and whenever necessary. I still cannot help but believe in your sincerity, in spite of your long continued sophistry and practices in accordance with the principle of "the end justifying the means." Attachments for one reason or another are not easily dissolved, in spite of what we may say or do at times, and most likely we will meet and work together again in this or in another life. I hope the "mists or clouds" as you say, may have lifted for both of us by then.

With sincere good wishes to you from Frances and myself, believe me

Sincerely and fraternally yours,

HYMAN LISCHNER.

P. S.—While rereading this letter a few other inconsistencies have occurred to me, which might be referred to now. I will write them as footnotes to my letter. Perhaps this is not in the best form, but it will save time and energy and serve the same purpose.

Note 1—K. T. did apparently leave one authentic document—her "last will" in which she calls on her "cabinet officers" and on "the officials of our Theosophical Work at Point Loma" to carry out her instructions; but she markedly leaves out any mention of a "successor." By the way, very few members are aware even of the existence of such a will,—why was it not published in any of the communications or publications sent out to the members? One would think that such an important document as the last will and testament of the erstwhile "Leader and Official Head" of the "International Theosophical Organization" should be of tremendous interest to all the members and to their friends. Only some months after her death, under legal and economic pressure, this "will" had to be filed for probate, and some of the newspapers published it—otherwise it probably would never have seen the light of day. [p. 35].

Judging from his letter to me of Sept. 5, 1929, G. de P. relies almost entirely upon "esoteric mysteries" to support or explain his claim of "sucessionship" to K. T.—as the "Messenger" in her place and his like claim to be "H. P. B.'s successor and fourth Leader of the Theosophical Movement." Here we see him ambitiously emulating a wellknown "religious" policy, as he prudently suggests that no one but a Chela can possibly understand these "mysteries." To be exact, he addresses me thus—"you are touching upon esoteric mysteries, and methods of esoteric training, about which you cannot possibly know anything, because you are not a Chela." Such details as his

kneeling impressively before the chair formerly used by K. T. or signing himself "Gottfried" to a telegram announcing her death, and his "ascension," are significant.

He also says "that the constitution of the T. S. (I suppose he means the U. B. & T. S.) has nothing to do with the method of working in the E. S." How does he explain on "exoteric" lines his claim to be "successor" to K. T. as "Leader and Official Head" of that organization since he has no authentic or legal document to show his appointment by K. T. to that office, as provided for by the constitution of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society? Do you consider that part of the constitution that refers to the appointment of a "successor" by K. T. also an "emergency" clause, which served an "esoteric" purpose during her life only, but was to be disregarded when the time actually arrived for its application? G. de P. conveniently resorted to the very "exoteric" method of framing a "new constitution," evidently to meet the present "emergency" of more securely establishing himself as "Leader" on formal or legal lines.

Note 2—It is interesting to recall that you, and a good many others, know how much your former Outer Head K. T. disapproved of, and denounced the publication of "The Mahatma Letters," and what excellent "yes men" you and your present Outer Head were, particularly when K. T. denounced any one or anything. I wonder if it has not occurred to some to question why, during all these years, since the publication of these letters by A. T. B. no review, recognition, or even mention of them was ever made in any publication whatever emanating from Point Loma. Only many months after K. T.'s death, in one of the "Forums" you suddenly, "without flinching," refer to the book in a way indicating your and G. de P.'s approval of its publication, even putting it on a par with the "Secret Doctrine" itself. This must have been during the time that you and G. de P. were making "fraternal gestures" to Mr. Barker, or, to use your words of our last interview, "putting a bee in his bonnet."

Another interesting fact,—my letter to G. de P. NOV. 17, 1929 (Pages 19-22) contains a suggestion to him "to assume the initiative" and "call together Leaders of thought and action who claim to be Theosophists since H. P. B.'s W. Q. J.'s and K. T.'s time, and meet together 'in the name of the Master,'" etc. He apparently thought "the time was ripe" and made immediate use of this suggestion, but failed to "heed" my humble challenge and warning "to omit . . . any super claims" and work along sane and rational lines. Incidentally it is regrettable that G. de P. did not make that "fraternalization guesture" a few weeks earlier than he did, in which case he would not have used that word "**treachery**" when referring to Annie Besant in his letter to me of Sept. 5, 1929. Of course it was so soon after his "Teacher's" death that he could not but reflect her **great love** for A. B. Your own kind reminiscence in the 'Forum', regarding G. de P. meeting A. B. in earlier days, is interesting; but you omit to relate, and what is so well known to many, the "fraternal sentiments" G. de P. repeatedly expressed with regard to her. You might, for instance, quote G. de P.'s kindly reference to A. B. regarding her claim to the possession of H. P. B.'s ring when he "knew" that K. T. had the genuine one! (?)

I am also reminded of the Peace Ambassador "Prof." Eck's gesture (we all know he was always good at that art; perhaps not as finished as his present Teacher, but then he is still young). I refer particularly to his gracious act in kissing the hand of A. B. and saying that she reminded him of his former Teacher K. T. Really, dear brother Fussell, how do you "swallow" that? Was that too "K. T.'s secret wish?"

How do you reconcile the placing in the presidency of your ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Lodge, or your ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Lodge, men who left Point Loma "in disgrace," and who, according to K. T., were subject to the same weakness that she insisted our friend ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ was subject to. Bear in mind I am quoting K. T.

W. Q. J.

only in that which can be verified. Is there any need now of reminding you of some of the confidential information K. T. passed around regarding G. de P. himself. Judging from his letter to me, he is aware of it to a degree at least, but he has an ingenious explanation for the same. (Read his letter of Sept. 5, 1929). Do you recall the opinion K. T., G. de P., Mrs. Lambert and yourself held of your present president of your ~~San Diego~~ lodge? Could it be in the "Master's plan" that sometimes people should be villified, and when "the time was ripe" should be extolled and placed in positions of honor? It so happens, as you are aware, that I have intimate knowledge regarding the leading personnel of these American lodges, and some of those now in Europe to whom you so frequently refer in the "Forum." I am touching on this only because I look upon it as a duty to call attention to the basis on which G. de P. is building up his **personal following**, and your exaggerated claims for the strength and progress of his T. S. He is certainly a "fisher of men," bartering and baiting with offices, honors, titles and even "**promises**" of placing members "**in personal communication with either one of the great Teachers.**" (G. de P. Letter to T. S. and E. S. members, July 29 and Oct. 21, 1929, sent out indiscriminately in open mail).

Note 3—See Lucifer, Page 63, vol. 3, where H. P. B. publishes the Pledge for the benefit of "those who are about to sign" the same, that they may understand its meaning, etc.

Note 4—A question of ethics:—Is one obliged to return to the thief goods that he stole, and attempted to sell (psychologize or impress with?) H. L.

February 17, 1931.

Dear Mr. Fussell:

I have hesitated a long time in writing, and then in sending this letter to you, believing this would lead to the breaking of the last tie of friendship with the comrades on the Hill, also including that between yourself, and me. I naturally did not relish addressing you in this vein—perhaps I shrank from the criticism I knew would fall on me from those I have loved all these many years. I have finally decided, however, that sentiment must sway me no longer in the presentation, at this time, of a few facts, in plain terms that may be of some service to others. It is all very proper for those who do not know you both, (or who are not familiar with the inside facts regarding conditions and persons at Point Loma previous to, and following the death of K. T.) to limit their analyses or discussions to G. de P.'s, or your public utterances, and to show you the tolerance and courtesy due to those assuming representative positions. It is different, however, in my case: As you are aware, I have had, during the last several years especially, opportunities of intimate contact with K. T. and those immediately associated with her. I loved both you and G. de P. with all my heart. I respected G. de P. in spite of the intimate insight I had into certain personal destructive tendencies in him, for at that time they concerned only himself alone, but it is **not so now**. I do not think it should be necessary to discuss you personally, for as far as I know you make no pretenses for yourself. Your "complex" is to build up **another** personality—you are, so to say, the "cardinal" in the case. As to G. de P. I might begin in the spirit of good old comradeship, and pronounce the current phrase, which, by the way, is a good occult injunction, "be yourself—Prof. be yourself!"

It is evident that you are both relying a great deal upon the impressions G. de P. can make by his display of "personal charm," his efforts to create a psychic impression or, as his believers say "shed a Buddhist light" i.e. through his asthenic eyes, his saintly slanting smile, or his ability to juggle his words, words, words,—all this in spite of his slight stammer and the subtle tremor of his lips. To point out just a few of the more evident characteristics of this self-anointed new "vehicle," by one who knows him well, may be helpful in some instances. (I recall your very explicit character analyses of such as

Bishop Leadbeater, Alexander Fullerton, etc.). Even while G. de P. is spinning his web of fraternalization, he warily and unmistakably places himself in a position of "sole head of such a universal T. S. . . . through and from whom the teachings of the Wisdom Religion of Antiquity shall flow, etc." (G. de P. T. S. and E. S. letter Sept. 21, 1930).

The following from an editorial H. P. B. in Lucifer, Vol. 3, Page 207 strengthened my purpose to do my humble duty as I see it:

"READY TO LAY DOWN OUR LIFE ANY DAY FOR THEOSOPHY—THAT GREAT CAUSE OF THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD FOR WHICH WE LIVE AND BREATHE — AND WILLING TO SHIELD, IF NEED BE EVERY TRUE THEOSOPHIST WITH OUR OWN BODY, WE YET DENOUNCE AS OPENLY AND AS VIRUNTLY THE DISTORTION OF THE ORIGINAL LINES UPON WHICH THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY WAS PRIMARILY BUILT AND THE GRADUAL LOOSENING AND UNDERMINING OF THE ORIGINAL SYSTEM BY THE SOPHISTRY OF MANY OF ITS HIGHEST OFFICERS."

HYMAN LISCHNER.

P. S.—I just realize that when I address you as "Mr' Fussell, I am addressing the well-known intellectual mouthpiece of the "old Theosophic era," when you so ably condoned all the cruel and bigotted policies that existed at, and emanated from Lomaland, particularly after K. T.'s apoplectic stroke in 1925.

I am still rubbing my eyes at your remarkable transformation to "Dr' Fussell, which ushered in, with equal agility, the "new Theosophic era" with its new gestures and compromises.

"A person, vain enough to want to be called a 'Doctor of Theosophy' would be a sorry kind of a Theosophist"—H. P. B.

The Theosophist, July 1884, P. 245.

This letter would not be complete without giving due credit to the third member of the "old committee," "Mrs." Ethel Lambert, for her wellknown brand of crude bigotry and heartlessness, as conceived of and practiced by her on the children and the adults placed in her charge (see my letter to G. de P. Sept. 1, 1929 offering proof of the last statement, and his evasive answer Sept. 5, 1929). The title "M. A." which "the Committee" gratuitously appended to her name, as well as the substitution of a new name for the once "internationally famous Raja Yoga School," will not blot out the sad memories and regrets former pupils and their parents bear, concerning the Raja Yoga School and its principal, Ethel Lambert. In your new Prospectus of the school, you do not dare to publish a list of all former scholars, as other schools and colleges do. The "Committee" is well aware that at least 90% of those who were connected in any way with the school or with Mrs. Lambert, are unhappy at the very thought or mention of the years they spent there.

The following is from a letter by H. P. B. to Prof. H. Corson regarding a Dr. Child whom she called "fraudulent prophet":

"You will surely blame me for it as many others did, but I cannot help it. I sooner will forgive murder, or worse than that, theft, than a lie; and Dr. Child is a biped lie, as you know it yourself. I have promised myself, and proclaim to the world my indomitable resolution to take this Philadelphia hydra with his seven lyeing-heads by the teeth and claws, and not to relinquish my hold until I strangle it fairly on the spot, though I may be bitten and wounded by it. Lies and untruthfulness or cheating must be considered the greatest crime in our sacred cause, for they are the more dangerous in a belief that allows so much margin for deception and self-illusion, and ought to be persecuted above everything else." (Letter 9, page 163).

H. L.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

Founded at New York City in 1875

G. de Purucker, Leader

INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Point Loma, California

March 8, 1931

Dr. H. Lischner,
Suite 720 Beaux Arts Bldg.
Los Angeles, Calif.

Dear Dr. Lischner:

Your letter of January 11th, continued on February 17th, and posted from Los Angeles on March 5th, was misssent by the post-office to Encanto. It did not arrive in time for Dr. Fussell to do more than to glance through it hastily before his departure this morning for Los Angeles.

In his absence I acknowledge for him the receipt thereof and take it upon myself to warn you, as an old Comrade whom K. T. loved and who, I know, once loved K. T., that the very uncharitable and utterly un-theosophical spirit which permeates your letter is not creditable to you and, I fear for your sake, will seriously undermine your health if further cultivated. Why not be again a kindly human being instead of a self-righteous poser? No one of the friends whose reputation you now try to sully is capable of doing you an injury. The way of kindly, friendly feeling will enable you to serve Theosophy far better than the way your letter indicates you are going will ever accomplish. In the bottom of your heart do you not know yourself that this is a fact?

As always,

Sincerely and fraternally yours,

IVERSON L. HARRIS

Assistant Secretary General

March 21, 1931

Mr. Iverson L. Harris,
Point Loma, Calif.,
Dear Iverson:

I am disposed to write to you regarding your communication of the 8th inst. I feel sincerely sympathetic towards you. You are, to a large extent, a victim of your education, and the psychology you are attempting to pass on. Who can tell, ten or fifteen years ago I too might have written some such letter as you have written to me, under similar circumstances.

Who can tell what awakening and what broad realization you might be capable of, if you ever chose to get out into the open and get a whiff of fresh air. I am sure you would not be the "bad actor" that K. T. assured many of us you would prove to be, if you ever "got outside" on your own resources. All that I can see that might happen to you would be a rather sudden disillusionment, with an opportunity of seeing yourself in a normal relationship to humanity. You might feel "very small" at first, but you would soon adjust yourself to the new focus and outlook on life, depending, of course, on your ability and willingness to "face facts";—a form of

"spiritual exercise" long neglected in Lomaland.

Perhaps some of the "Committee" in Lomaland, or else some of your friends now outside, would be willing to give you first-hand confirmation regarding K. T.'s estimation of your past behavior and future possibilities. I personally believe that you must have some "spunk" in you somewhere, judging from K. T.'s own reports of your frequent outbursts of "rebellion", particularly during your last trip to Europe with her.

I repeat, I do not blame you, because you do not yet fully realize the "Jesuitry" of suggesting or "forboding evil" for those who do not "conform". It is an old trick resorted to frequently in Lomaland by a few in authority. It is a form of hypnosis; so is the evasion of facts, and the play on sentiment or appeal to emotion. May I, as a physician, call attention to the fact that the subject against whom any form of hypnosis is directed, is injured only to the degree that he is passive, or to the extent of his own indulgence in self-illusion. If the subject is "on to" the would-be hypnotist, the effect on the former is "nil", while, in the case of the latter, the reaction is invariably detrimental. The weaker the body, and the more neurotic the temperament of the would-be hypnotist, the sooner and the more evident the reaction. G. de P. might also take note of this.

I hope you also can, on further thought, realize that "the way of kindly friendly feeling" is not a dark alley. We know that theoretically, at least, the path of true love is lighted by wisdom and discretion, and is guarded by a readiness and courage to see and show facts as they are, in order that we may warn and protect, as far as we feel it our duty to do so, the objects of our love and concern. (note the "virulent" sentiments expressed in my quotation from a letter by H. P. B. to a Dr. Corson).

Instead of dissipating energy in a pious sense of horror, or in calling me names, why not, dear friend, on your own account and initiative, read all the correspondence between G. de P., J. H. Fussell, and myself, that led up to my last letter (I will gladly send you copies of the same if you cannot get them), and try to dispassionately face each fact, and meet each issue in the light of reason and logic? You are still young—I should think it would be of true benefit to you, regardless of whether you agree with me or not.

Yours sincerely,

HYMAN LISCHNER

IN THE NAME, THEN, OF LOGIC AND COMMON SENSE, BEFORE BANNING EPIETHETS, LET US SUBMIT OUR DIFFERENCE TO THE ARBITRAMENT OF REASON.
LET US COMPARE ALL THINGS, AND PUTTING ASIDE EMOTIONALISM AND PREJUDICE AS UNWORTHY OF THE LOGICIAN AND THE EXPERIMENTALIST, HOLD FAST TO THAT WHICH POSSESSES THE ORDEAL OF ULTIMATE ANALYSIS.
(P. 140—"A Modern Panarion," H. P. Blavatsky.)

Last Will and Testament of Katherine Tingley

Dec. 15th, 1926. This is my last will. Out of my rights or possessions, I will to Philo B. Tingley, my husband, \$15,000.00 as only a part of my indebtedness to him, given to me at different times during the last twenty-five years to help the Theosophical work (a loan). This amount to be paid him at \$125.00 a month as long as he lives.

I should trust as a sacred duty to my cabinet officers, that that they see that Miss Florence Ross is given a free home at T. S. and U. B. Headquarters as long as she lives, and five dollars a month in hand. And that Mr. and Mrs. Seely have the same.

That the property of the Laurels at Newburyport (my property), be sold and be used to keep up the Children's Juvenile Home at Pt. Loma and that all other claims of mine be turned into the Theosophical University at Point Loma, to be used for its support, except \$500 to each of my step relatives; two—a half brother and half sister, Wanda Westcott and her brother. (I do not know his name). These two are all who are relatives.

I insist that my indebtedness to Mrs. Emily Neresheimer for money to help the work, I borrowed, shall be paid to her as soon as possible and any money after the sale of Cuban property be used for Lotus work at P. L.

That under all circumstances the officials of our Theosophical work at Point Loma will set aside \$5000 to be to Mrs. Helen Harris at \$50 per month. This amount from claims I have on different Depts. of our Theosophical work.

Signed by me in the presence of Mrs. Helen Harris this day.

(Signed) KATHERINE TINGLEY.

Witness:

Helen Harris (Signed)

Filed: Oct. 18, 1929.

J. B. McLees, Clerk.

By: L. L. Bailey, Deputy.

The following "ritual" may be of particular interest to members of some of the "modern" "Orders:"

"Strictly private and Confidential No. 1
For E. S. Members ONLY.

Stenographic Notes of E. S. Meeting in the
Temple of Peace, Point Loma, California.

Thursday Evening, August 8, 1929

The Outer Head, Gottfried de Purucker,
Presiding"

J. H. Fussell: "This is the first warning under the new regulations: The rules of the Oriental School will be strictly enforced. All, therefore, not in perfect and complete sympathy with the principles of the Oriental

School, which is the E. S. T., and with the present Outer Head, are requested immediately to rise and leave the Temple; and if there be any such, let him or her be assured that such leaving will not be held against him or her in any way as a member of the Theosophical Society; but such action will be respected as that of an honest man or woman." (Organ Music)

Mr. Fussell: "Comrades, I repeat: Under the new regulations, the rules of the Oriental School will be strictly enforced. All therefore not in perfect and complete sympathy with the principles of the Oriental School and with the present Outer Head are requested to rise and leave this temple. This is the second warning." (Gong—7 Strokes)

Mr. Fussell: "Comrades, take heed and listen well: Under the new regulations, the rules of the Oriental School will be strictly enforced. Anyone, therefore, not in perfect and complete sympathy with the principles of the Oriental School, this Lodge of Light, are requested immediately to rise and leave this Temple. If there be any such, they can be assured that such leaving will not be held against them in any way as members of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, but they will be respected for their honest and sincere action. This is the final warning."

Mr. Fussell: "You will all please rise, intone the Sacred Word three times, and repeat the pledge." (Organ Music)

The Outer Head: "Companions and Neophytes: As you have been apprised, the Esoteric Section is the same as the Oriental School, a school which has come down from immemorial time in the care of the Great Sages, under their guardianship, and taught by Them, of which our own division here, or section, is the inner court of the Temple of Divine Wisdom.

"The Oriental Rite, as Companion Joseph H. Fussell has advised you this evening in my name, does not mean that it is a copy of any modern Oriental School; but comprises the ritual, the rules, and regulations of the archaic school of the Wisdom-Religion, of which I have just spoken. Henceforth these rules will be strictly enforced; the regulations will be strictly carried out.

"And I will say this, Comrades: It will depend upon you alone and not upon me, what progress you will make towards joining the Companions of higher degrees. Seven are the degrees of initiation, as I have already told you when I was the servant of her, my Predecessor, who has passed on. The first three are schools of discipline and learning. The fourth is similar, but greater by far; for in it begins the nobler cycle of initiatory training, whereby the aspirant, the neophyte of those higher degrees, shall be put into direct personal communication with the Masters of Wisdom.

"I repeat, progress in our School, as indeed everywhere else in life, is a matter of individual initiative, of unwavering loyalty to principles which you will find in your pledge, which you have accepted; and last, but not least, of devotion to your Teacher, who, it is my duty to say, sitting in solemn session, is no longer the man but the mouth-

piece, the body, infilled with the presence of One of Them. It is so this evening. Let your minds be stilled; let your minds be quiet. Hear and learn. He is with us. [*]

"Many are the mysteries, Companions, that in future sessions we shall undertake to study together. This evening's session or meeting is one of preparation, of introductory initiation through the mind and through the heart into an understanding of what will follow. I hope to explain to you in brief form some very holy things, things which, if you understand not now, you cannot understand what will follow.

"These things likewise will explain much to you about the three Great Ones who have preceded me and who have been your teachers. They will explain much of the so-called 'contradictions' of character that these three showed to the eyes of a non-understanding world. And how could that world understand? As a great Sage once said, when his enemies reviled and persecuted him: 'Father, forgive them: they know not what they do.'

"Now, Companions, please remember one thing; the life of an Esoteric Teacher is not only a very difficult one, but one beset with perils of which you know naught. He is in some ways helpless. He needs your surrounding strength and guard and watch. If you give it, you will receive in turn treasures more precious than anything on earth; for you will receive the secrets of the Universe. You will be taught how to bring yourselves to see; in seeing to understand, and in understanding yourselves to teach.

"Let me begin by telling you something which, in justice to my great Predecessors I should say they never could tell you, but just hinted at in their writings: and that is, what happens to a Messenger when sent forth as H. P. Blavatsky was, or when called to take up the torch and to carry on as W. Q. Judge and Katherine Tingley were. In a general letter that G. de P. [*] sent out to you, you were told somewhat. He pledged himself in a manner that could not be put in public print; and it was in this way. It happened also to H. P. Blavatsky and to W. Q. Judge and to Katherine Tingley: The Messenger gives up, resigns, a certain portion of the principles of his inner constitution, in order that those principles may not stand in the way of the divine light streaming through him as a channel of communication with the Lodge, that divine light streaming from the great Maha-Chohan of our Order, from Him whom we call the Silent Watcher of mankind.

"But in doing so, it leaves the Messenger a psychological cripple. He is a complete man in every sense of the word except that this portion of his constitution, which may be called the personal individuality or the lower part of the reincarnating ego, is taken from him and held under akasic guard with us. This explains the many and sudden and often perplexing changes of mood and of manner; the strange and wayward manner also, in which speech may be delivered or actions performed, as witness the great-hearted H. P. Blavatsky, or our own beloved Katherine Tingley in particular:—misunderstood, derided, reviled, persecuted, they were in this sense the helpless

and unprotected martyrs of our noble Work; for with this particular principle abstracted, they were psychological cripples, and greatly, greatly weakened in dealing with the ordinary affairs of men.

"But oh! how gloriously infilled with the spirit, the truth, the noble light of the Tathagatas, the Buddhist splendor! Being so, they could teach, and teach truth and give you it undimmed, pure, perfect.

"Companions, study yourselves. In yourself lies the pathway to Wisdom and the gods. This is the first lesson that every neophyte must learn; and in the higher grades of companionship, the learning is merely an extension of this, even as a child learns his letters, these letters lead on to knowledge; and if the soul of him be manifesting, they lead on to Wisdom. Know yourselves; for in so knowing you will know all the mysteries of the Boundless Universe.

"Be bold in your learning, but not overbold. Be courageous as you press forward on this old, old Path of the ages, leading to the heart of the Universe; but be not rash. Guard well your speech, lest something pass out with the unseen words: for you can never recall it. Listen and learn! Forgive and love! Listen and learn! Forgive and love!

"The Rite that you will witness this evening is descended to us directly from early ages in the history of mankind on this earth, from what H. P. Blavatsky called the early Atlantean days. It is the first Rite—initiation combined with elementary teaching such as you have received. It cannot be varied; it cannot be changed; for, as we have received it, we pass it on. Thus have ye heard. Thus have I heard." (Sounding of bell.)

Mr. Fussell: "Neophyte..... advance. (He advances, and is escorted to the Outer Head, before whom he kneels.)

I repeat the original pledge of the probationers of the Esoteric Section, which H. P. Blavatsky gave to her pupils in the Esoteric Section:

(Note. Here follows the Pledge in full. I note in the second clause of the pledge Dr. de Purucker uses the term "Outer Head" in the singular, while I have it that H. P. B. used it in the plural—"Outer Heads."
—H. L.)

The Outer Head: "Companion probationer, you have heard this pledge: Do you accept it without any mental reservations whatsoever? Answer."

The Neophyte: "I do."

The Outer Head: "I sign thee, Brother, with the triangle of fire, and use the oil, its symbol, in so doing. The baseline now made with pure water represents in this degree the cleansing and purifying influences of the Will. And with oil once more I trace a line around your head, symbol of the mystical crown of initiation, the pathway upon which you are entering. I seal you to the work of the Lodge of the Masters of Compassion." (Sounding of Bell.)

The Outer Head: "Rise, Companion." (He

is escorted from the platform.)

(The same ceremony of initiation is repeated with other neophytes.) (Organ Music.)

Mr. Fussell: "Comrades, the Outer Head requests that members on meeting him outside of these Temple-services and meetings of the Esoteric School, pay him no more attention than formerly. It is only in Esoteric work, as our Teacher, when he is the representative of the Lodge and of the Masters, that he is to be treated as such.

"All those newly admitted companions please rise and advance. Will all present, also, please rise and listen to the Charge of the Outer Head.

To our newly received companions:

(Reads) "As the most newly received of our body, and the youngest amongst us, you are now as children again beginning in purity and innocence a holy life. You have passed through the state of fullgrown material life to that of spiritual infancy, and, to the extent of the purity of your endeavor you will be truly reborn.

Who can tell your destiny in the future? It may be your lot to be raised to the very highest pinnacle in our Order, or it may be your title to remain ever humble workers in the ranks; but whatever the position you may be elected to fulfil, whether you remain seemingly unrecognized and unknown, or are adorned with the purple robe and the star, treasure always in your heart of hearts the memory of this hour and preserve your purity and soul-simplicity. For this, the token of battles with self fought and won for aeons, is the outward and inward mark of growth and the only sign of greatness. Great is the honor due to men of learning; wide is the respect for noble statesmen; profound the obeisance to kings and sovereigns; but the whole world—men of learning, statesmen, kings alike—must bow before a little child.

You are now co-disciples with us, Brothers, Comrades in the Army of Love, fellow-laborers in the grand and noble task of the regeneration of Humanity. I CHARGE YOU to see to it that ye cherish well this sacred duty, this imperial obligation. Greater than all worldly honor; more honorable than any position in the State your fellow citizens may honor you with; farther reaching and greater responsibility than the offices imposed by men upon all the princes and rulers of the earth, it is for you, admitted now and

forever members of the Brotherhood of Compassion, to discharge it with steadfastness, uprightness and determination.

And you, fellow-members, who stand witness to the reception of these new comrades amongst us, remember the sacred duties you owe to them and discharge them with fidelity. Treat them with kindness; watch over them as Brothers; bear with them when passing through any of the gateways of purification; for, as others have treated you with compassion, and as the Masters have tendered you a helping hand through many a failure in the past, so do you now watch over and labor to help our latest comrades and fellow-servants. By your words and acts set them examples of an iron determination to overcome the lower nature, of self-sacrificing labor for others, and an absolute fidelity to the traditions and rules of our Order, in principles of conduct that have ever graced the lives of those who have mounted the stairway of wisdom. So shall we all be as brothers and sisters, as children of the One Parent, fellow guardsmen and custodians of the sacred truths imparted to us by the Teachers, whose servants we are, and who ever work for the regeneration of the world and that salvation of mankind to which we have devoted our lives."

The Outer Head: "Companions, it is very late in the evening, and we shall soon part; but I call your attention to one thing and I ask you to think over it with care. It is this: The old, the ancient, the archaic ceremony or rite, which you have witnessed this evening is one which you cannot understand with your brain-minds; for every movement of it is symbolic, and every part of it is holy; but you can understand it with the motions of the spiritual soul within you; and it is an appeal to that, your Higher Nature.

"And, dear Companions of this degree, if you wish to know whether you actually stand on this beautiful pathway of initiation beginning so lowly and going up to heights beyond the most lofty human imagination, then study your own reactions to what has happened here tonight. If there is in your hearts the slightest feeling other than that of a sense of overbrooding holiness and of the presence of a great and sweeping spiritual power among us, then, dear Companions, I advise you to abstain from entering this Temple again.

"Close the Meeting. Brother Fussell." (Gong—7 strokes). (Sacred Word 3 Times).

*A Master has said:

"That new wine cannot be poured into old bottles and that he would find his life must first lose it. Be on your guard against hypocrisy, for nothing is hidden that shall not be revealed and nothing concealed that shall not be made known; and all that has been uttered in darkness shall be heard in the light, and what has been whispered in chambers shall be proclaimed from the house-tops. There are days that are coming when one stone shall not be left upon another without being torn down. Take care that you are not deceived, for many shall come in My Name saying: 'I am He, and the time is near'—but do not go after them."