

FIRST REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

OF THE

SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH,

APPOINTED TO

INVESTIGATE THE EVIDENCE FOR MARVELLOUS PHENOMENA

OFFERED BY CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE

THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.



R E P O R T.

It may be remembered that on May 2nd, 1884, the Council of the Society for Psychical Research appointed a Committee for the purpose of taking such evidence as to the alleged phenomena connected with the Theosophical Society as might be offered by members of that body at the time in England, or as could be collected elsewhere.

The Committee consisted of the following members, with power to add to their number :—Messrs. Gurney, Myers, Podmore, and Stack. They have since added Mr. R. Hodgson to their number. The President is, by virtue of his office, a member of this as of other Committees.

For the convenience of Members who may not have followed the progress of the Theosophical Society, a few words of preliminary explanation may be added here.

The Theosophical Society was founded in New York, in 1875, by Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky, for certain philanthropic and literary purposes, with which we are not now concerned, and one of its objects is to serve as a channel through which some part of the occult wisdom alleged to be possessed by certain Adepts or Mahatmas in Thibet and elsewhere, might be communicated to the outer world.

The Society's headquarters were removed to India in 1878, and it has made considerable progress among the Hindus and other educated natives. "The Occult World," by Mr. Sinnett, at that time editor of the *Pioneer*, introduced the Society to English readers, and that work, which dealt mainly with phenomena, was succeeded by "Esoteric Buddhism," in which some tenets of the Occult doctrine, or so-called "Wisdom-religion," were set forth. With these doctrines, however, we have here no concern. These books have passed through several editions, and we have assumed that it was not necessary to print extracts from "The Occult World" in the Appendices to this Report.

During the past summer, Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky have spent some months in England, accompanied by Mr. Mohini, a Brahmin graduate of the University of Calcutta, who, we understand, has given up other prospects and avocations for the sake of aiding the Theosophical

cause. These visitors have added much to the interest already taken in London, Cambridge, &c., in the Theosophical system ; and the Committee are glad to acknowledge the ready courtesy with which opportunities of oral and documentary investigation have been afforded to them.

The Committee began by taking the evidence offered by Messrs. Olcott, Mohini, and Sinnett, in the presence of a shorthand writer. The greater part of the depositions of Colonel Olcott and Mr. Mohini is given in Appendices I. and II. Mr. Sinnett's dealt but little with phenomena not already described in "The Occult World," and we have, therefore, thought it unnecessary to print it here.

Colonel Olcott was thus examined on May 11th and 27th.

Mr. Mohini ,, on June 10th.

Mr. Sinnett ,, on June 13th.

Besides these formal examinations the Committee have enjoyed many other opportunities of acquiring information.

The meetings of the Cambridge Branch of the Society for Psychical Research were attended on

April 25th by Mr. Pādshāh.

May 8th ,, Colonel Olcott.

June 9th ,, Mr. Mohini.

Aug. 9th ,, Madame Blavatsky and Mr. Mohini,

and on each occasion the visitors permitted themselves to be questioned on many topics.

Other evidence has also been obtained from sources hereafter specified.

The Committee are therefore of opinion that the time has arrived for a First Report. They think, however (and the Council confirms this view), that such Report should not be included in the published Proceedings, but sent round as a private and confidential document to Members and Associates only. The reasons for this difference of treatment fall under two main heads.

1. Certain of the witnesses whose evidence is given below would dislike its actual publication. This is especially the case with Mr. Damodar and the lady hereafter styled Mrs. X.

It is not unlikely that this kind of semi-private circulation of evidence may be desirable on other occasions besides the present. The Committee, therefore, at the desire of the Council, wish to state as explicitly as may be possible in so delicate a matter, the kind of limitations which are thus intended to be imposed.

No part (not previously published) of this "private and confidential" Report can be printed or published elsewhere without infringing the

legal rights of the Council, to whom the Report is addressed, and to whom it belongs.

And it is also hoped that Members and Associates will deal with the Report as being in reality a confidential document, not to be allowed to pass from Members' own keeping, and to be shown only to persons on whose discretion complete reliance can be placed.

The Committee would venture to remind all readers of this First Report that the nature of the matter to be included in further Reports of this kind must largely depend on the manner in which the present document is treated.

2. But besides consideration for the witnesses who have given evidence, the Committee have another reason for not wishing this Report to be laid before the general public, namely, this, that they find themselves in a state of suspense of judgment as to the genuineness and significance of the alleged phenomena. They solicit criticism, as well as information, from persons who have paid attention to the matters in question. But they wish any expressions of opinion here given to be considered as provisional and hypothetical, not quoted as positive *dicta* or unanimous conclusions.

Understanding then, that this is a semi-private Report on the phenomenal side of Theosophy, three further questions at once suggest themselves, namely :—

I. What is to be our *prima facie* attitude as to the trustworthiness of Theosophical testimony ?

II. What is the total list of first-hand witnesses whose good faith or sanity is involved ?

III. What part of the phenomena which they describe is to be considered as within the scope of our inquiry ?

I. This first question is one which the Council has already had to consider, in the case of some zealous propagandists of special doctrines on the one side, and in the case of paid mediums on the other side.

As regards this latter class, the Council has altogether declined to accept the evidence of a paid medium as to any abnormal event ; not that it is considered that persons accepting money for psychical performances are necessarily untrustworthy, but because, in dealing with these matters, it is admitted that special stringency is necessary, and one obvious precaution lies in the exclusion of all the commoner and baser motives to fraud or exaggeration.

If, then, we saw reason to suppose that the persons mainly engaged in propagating Theosophy were actuated by some motive of this kind, we should probably decline to continue the investigation. But we may say at once that no trustworthy evidence supporting such a view has been brought under our notice.

Well, then, it may be said, are not the Members of the Theosophical

Society on much the same level as to credibility with the Members of the Society for Psychical Research? Ought we not to assume *bona fides* in the case of Theosophical evidence as readily as we should expect it to be assumed in the evidence of our own Committees?

To a certain extent we accept this analogy, but we demur to it on some essential points.

The attitude which it appears to us reasonable for a critic to hold with regard to some novel and extraordinary fact, (as Thought-transference), when attested by a Committee of the Society for Psychical Research, might be expressed in some such sentence as this: "I do not venture to accuse these gentlemen either of fraud or of imbecility; but human minds are fallible and human motives mixed; in all scientific experiments mistakes, and mal-observation, and non-observation of important facts, are liable to occur; and, therefore, before giving full credence to phenomena antecedently so improbable, I should like to see the Committee's testimony confirmed by some other observers."

And, in fact, the Thought-transference Committee thought it their duty, not merely to insist on the validity of their own evidence, but to corroborate it by the evidence of others, until (to quote Proceedings VI.) the phenomenon was attested "by a group of witnesses too large to be summarily discredited;" and a group, we may add, which we ourselves still feel the great importance of increasing.

It will be seen, then, that we accept in our own case the view, which we apply to the evidence of others, that without any wish to impugn the character or ability of a witness to abnormal phenomena, the critic is entitled to press for corroboration with an insistence which in any ordinary matter would seem unnecessary and offensive.

But there are three points on which the Theosophical evidence stands on a quite different footing from that of our Committees.

(1) In the first place, it is certain that fraud has been practised by persons connected with the Society. This appears from the charges brought against Madame Blavatsky by M. and Madame Coulomb (see note on the Coulombs, p. 25.) For even supposing it to be proved that the letters alleged by the Coulombs to have been written by Madame Blavatsky are forgeries, it will remain certain that the Coulombs themselves, who have long resided at the headquarters of the Theosophical Society in a position of trust, are tricksters, and that Madame Blavatsky, if not their accomplice, has been at least their dupe, to the extent, at least, of reposing confidence in utterly unworthy persons. Moreover, what is known as the Kiddle incident—and some other evidence privately brought before us by Mr. C. C. Massey—suggest, to the Western mind at any rate, that no amount of caution can be excessive in dealing with evidence of this kind.

(2) In the second place, Theosophy appeals to occult persons and methods.

Now we do not deny that good reasons may exist for the concealment either of persons or of processes from the knowledge even of honest and friendly inquirers. In all such matters our rule is to make no assumptions. We do not say: "You *ought* to show us your Teachers and explain your methods." We only say: "If your Teachers think it right to conceal themselves and their methods from us, we on our part feel it our duty to scrutinise all that is revealed with proportionate stringency." The difference between the Theosophical Society and the Society for Psychical Research is here almost diametrical. The Society for Psychical Research exists merely as a machinery for investigation, every step of which is open to the public, and in which any competent person who chooses may join. The Theosophical Society exists mainly to promulgate certain doctrines already formulated, these doctrines being supported by phenomena which are avowedly intended and adapted rather for the influencing of individual minds than for the wholesale instruction of the scientific world. Into such phenomena the *moral factor* seems likely to enter, in one way or other, to a marked extent.

(3) In the third place Theosophy makes claims which, though avowedly based on occult science, do, in fact, ultimately cover much more than a merely scientific field. The teaching embodied in "Esoteric Buddhism," the *Theosophist*, &c., comprises a cosmogony, a philosophy, a religion. With the value of this teaching *per se* we are not at present concerned. But it is obvious that were it widely accepted a great change would be induced in human thought in almost every department. To take one point only, the spiritual and intellectual relationship of East to West would be for the time in great measure reversed. "Ex Oriente lux" would be more than a metaphor and a memory; it would be the expression of actual contemporary fact. Now we know, indeed, that the suspicions which the Anglo-Indian authorities at first entertained as to the *political* objects of the Theosophical Society have been abandoned as groundless. But we can imagine schemes and intentions of a patriotic kind which, though quite innoxious to British rule in India, would effectually spoil Theosophic evidence for the purposes of occidental science. We must remember that in psychical research we must be on our guard against men's highest instincts quite as much as their lowest. The history of religions would have been written in vain if we still fancied that a Judas or a Joe Smith was the only kind of apostle who needed watching. "Fingunt simul creduntque"; "The end justifies the means"—these two sayings are the key to a good deal of ecclesiastical history.

Suspensions of this kind are necessarily somewhat vague; but it

is not our place to give them definiteness. What we have to point out is that it is our duty, as investigators, in examining the evidence for Theosophic marvels, to suppose the possibility of a deliberate combination to deceive on the part of certain Theosophists. We cannot regard this possibility as excluded by the fact that we find no reason to attribute to any of the persons whose evidence we have to consider, any vulgar or sordid motive for such combination.

But the difficulty of supposing such a confederacy will be sensibly increased by the introduction of each fresh person of hitherto unblemished probity who is to be not merely a disciple but a coadjutor; who, in plain terms, is not only to be taught the philosophy, but to be let into the trick. Much might, no doubt, be hoped from the mere complaisance and credulity of sympathising spectators. But each attempt to induce a man of character and position to sign an obvious falsehood, or to co-operate in an undeniable fraud, would be a source of fresh and serious danger. Let us take a parallel from English or American Spiritualism. Many worthy persons would find themselves quite able to give a somewhat loose account of a séance, under the inspiration of the great truth of the immortality of the soul. Many, for instance, would be willing to sign a statement that "a small gas-burner gave a good light" when, in point of fact, they could scarcely see their hands before them. They would say to themselves that the light was good, as light at séances goes. But if they were asked to state that the séance was held in *broad daylight*, a statement which they felt to be a lie, and to be meant as a lie, they would shrink from doing it. Similarly, many a sitter would be apt to recognise the medium's pocket-handkerchief protruded from the cabinet, as his own father. But few would go behind the curtains and help the medium to dress up.

Judging by this analogy, it becomes a matter of capital importance to determine, as nearly as may be, how many persons are actually committed to the alleged marvels, in a manner which mere complaisance or mal-observation fails to explain. This list, and the character of every name on it, must be scrutinised with anxious care.

II. And this brings us to our second question: What is the full list of witnesses whose good faith or sanity is involved? It is obvious that if we could account for all the phenomena described by the mere assumption of clever conjuring on the part of Madame Blavatsky and the Coulombs, assisted by any number of Hindu servants, we could hardly, under present circumstances, regard ourselves as having adequate ground for further inquiry. But this assumption would by no means meet the case. The statements of the Coulombs implicate no one in the alleged fraud except Madame Blavatsky. The other Theosophists, according to them, are all dupes. Now the evidence given in the

Appendix in our opinion renders it impossible to avoid one or other of two alternative conclusions :—Either that some of the phenomena recorded are genuine, or that other persons of good standing in society, and with characters to lose, have taken part in deliberate imposture.

The exact extent of this class cannot be determined without greater knowledge of the persons who have given first-hand evidence than we at present possess.

A great part of the evidence of these witnesses is given in full, or in summary, in the Appendices to this Report. But some statements, involving persons averse to publicity, have been made to us *in confidence*. Other statements, too general in form to be cited as exact evidence, have been made to us in explanation of the printed testimony.

III. We now proceed to our third preliminary question, viz.: What specific forms of occult phenomena are we to include in our purview? The depositions of these witnesses are of a very mingled kind, often resembling rather what used to be styled a "Narrative of Particular Interpositions" or "Special Providences," than a bare statement of definite facts. We must manage in some way to disentangle the strands of objective evidence from amidst much matter which, though subjectively equally impressive to the percipients, is by its very nature incapable of verification.

Now, first, let us consider at what points this Theosophical evidence comes in contact with the evidence already published in our own Proceedings. What is perhaps most interesting to us at the present stage of our inquiry, is the claim of the Theosophists that certain persons are able to exercise psychical powers at will; how far are the phenomena which they produce such as our own inquiries would lead us to regard as conceivably producible by means of traditional knowledge, or natural sensitiveness, beyond our own? And here, be it noted, a distinction is necessary. It is extremely improbable, *prima facie*, that the sum total of claims to knowledge and power advanced by the Theosophists on behalf of certain Adepts can succeed in approving itself in the Court of Science. But this does not mean that it is improbable that any psychical powers which may actually exist in man will be found operating with greater intensity in India than in England. On the contrary, this is very probable indeed; and in the only instance in which an accurate comparison has as yet been made, the results have pointed most markedly in this direction. It was not at University College, London, under Dr. Elliotson, but at the Calcutta hospital, under Mr. Esdaile, that the experiments were made which practically convinced the scientific world that absolute anæsthesia could be produced by mesmeric (or hypnotic) passes. Dr. Elliotson and his friends attempted the world's conversion in England with untiring pertinacity; but though their experiments succeeded

to an extent sufficient to convince fair-minded and attentive persons, their human material was too intractable to afford a conspicuous triumph. Esdaile, on the other hand, set to work at mesmerism almost by accident, and without any special knowledge whatever. But he found in the Hindus subjects so susceptible that a conspicuous triumph was, so to speak, forced on him unawares. Never did a man who expected so little achieve so much.

To our minds, the career of Mr. Esdaile is in many ways one of the most instructive pages in the history of science. And to those who have learnt how subtly all these nervous, psycho-neural, and psychical sensibilities are interblent, one of its most obvious lessons is : In psychical research, experiment on Orientals. And this our Committees have felt from the very first. We have always desired—we still desire—to establish a psychical laboratory at Calcutta or Madras.

The great difficulty of such a step, it is needless to say, would consist in our own remoteness from the Hindu mind,—in the reserve or reluctance which would prevent suitable subjects from offering themselves to our observation. But if we can get at any exact accounts of results achieved by Hindus among themselves, on lines which even our rudimentary experience has shown to be fruitful, then we ought certainly to be prepared to find that the Oriental results may have surpassed our own as markedly as Esdaile's *foudroyant* mesmerisation of an unknown blind Bengalee at many yards distance surpasses our laboured efforts to induce hypnotic fixation in some too wide-awake British eye.

Now, as regards this very point of *mesmerism*, there is a good deal of recent Oriental evidence more or less interlinked with Theosophy, but, for various reasons, we think it better to leave this to be dealt with as a part of a more general discussion of mesmeric processes and results. We here wish to concentrate attention on the testimony which the Theosophists offer to the occurrence of *telepathic* phenomena: since this testimony is of special interest and importance when considered in relation to the evidence, experimental or otherwise, on which our own conclusions as to the existence of "telepathy" are based.

In our own experiments on *Thought-transference* we have, as we believe, obtained the phenomenon in its most elementary form; we have dealt with the transmission by A of a mere thought or image into P's mind, A and P being both in the same room, and there being no insight on A's part as to the success or failure of the transmission. We have, however, further collected much evidence of apparitions of living persons to others at a considerable distance. In the large majority of cases these apparitions are stated to have occurred at a time of abnormal physical or mental condition (such as trance or the process of dissolution) on the part of the person whose apparition is seen,

and whom we call the "agent;" and frequently some knowledge of this "agent's" actual condition is affirmed to have been conveyed to the "percipient" by means of, or at the same time as, the apparition. Hence our evidence leads to the conclusion that such apparitions are "veridical," i.e., not mere hallucinations, but connected in some way with the agent, and implying some telepathic communication between him and the percipient. The cases, however, are in our collection very rare where we have any evidence of intention on the agent's part, or of what we may call *reciprocity*, i.e., consciousness on the part of both agent and percipient of the communication established between them; and it is clear that in many cases such evidence cannot be hoped for on account of the death of the agent at time of the apparition, and similar causes. Nevertheless a few cases, involving both intentional appearance and reciprocity, have come before us, some of the most interesting of which we will give. One gentleman, known to some of the Committee, appears on a few occasions to have voluntarily caused an apparition of himself to certain persons. We understand that he can only rarely produce this phenomenon, and cannot always recognise in himself the conditions under which he will be able to do it; still he can to some extent foresee the possibility and arrange test conditions. Unfortunately he is usually asleep when the apparition occurs, and is unable to remember or describe his part in the phenomenon; but on one occasion there seems to have been some consciousness on his part. Some evidence obtained from him is given in Appendix XL. In Appendix XLI. will be found another very interesting case of intentional though unconscious appearance of A during sleep to B, with the additional element of conversation between B and the phantom. B is known to all the members of the Committee, and some of them are acquainted with A. Unfortunately these experiments have been discontinued because they were thought trying to health. The following case, related orally to Professor Sidgwick two or three years ago, by the lady concerned, and now given from notes taken at the time, carries us in one respect further, since there would seem to have been both reciprocity and intention, but on the other hand no visual phantasm. This case has a special interest for us here, because it occurred in connection with a secret society which existed some years ago at Leghorn, with branches elsewhere, and which believed itself to have constant experience of phenomena very similar to those described by the Theosophists—instantaneous intercommunication at a distance, phantasmal appearances, conveyance and precipitation of letters, disintegration and reintegration of objects, &c. Two members of our Society visited Leghorn two years ago, with a view to obtain, if possible, some experimental results; but though they were received with much courtesy and kindness by the President of the Leghorn Society

—a gentleman of good position in his profession, and of independent means—they were disappointed in the hope of being in any degree admitted into the inner circle, and were indeed led to understand that the Society had broken up, and that the phenomena were in abeyance. The lady whom we before alluded to, and from whom we first heard of the Society, had been more successful in establishing relations with it than our members were. She told Mr. Sidgwick that one night in Paris she woke up and heard two members of the Leghorn Society, who were at the time in Italy, speaking for a few minutes; that she got up and wrote down the conversation; then wrote to one of the members of the Society, saying, “I have received a communication; has any one communicated?” and received a letter in reply, naming the members and stating truly what was said.

The narratives of Theosophical apparitions have much analogy to those above given: but they seem, in some cases at least, to be more complete than any of them, as combining *intention*, *reciprocity*, and *visual phantasm*: it is, therefore, of very special interest and importance to us to examine carefully the nature and extent of the evidence on which they rest.

Now in order to establish the habitual voluntary apparition, in India and elsewhere, of certain living persons, various distinct points will have to be proved.

A.—The evidence must first establish the ordinary physical existence of the persons thus appearing, and prove their identity with the alleged apparitions by the recognition of persons who have seen them in the flesh, or who have seen portraits certified to by persons who have seen the originals in the flesh.

If the existence of ordinary *physical* bodies appertaining to the “astral” or phantasmal bodies be unproved, the theory of voluntary “projection of the double” of course falls to the ground, though the phantoms may still have been observed.

B.—On the other hand, if the existence of the physical body be demonstrated, the evidence must then prove that the alleged phantasmal forms were not the real men themselves, nor other men personating them, nor illusions produced by optical apparatus, nor hallucinations generated by expectant attention, or by some mesmeric process.

C.—And, thirdly the evidence must show that these phantasmal appearances of living men were conscious and intentional; subserving some definite and ascertainable purpose, or corresponding to some objective fact independently known.

If this is not proved, the repeated apparitions of some one man would only suggest the operation of expectancy in producing hallucinations or determining their form:—unless, indeed, we can suppose a natural tendency on the part of some persons, while in the normal

state, to produce unconsciously phantasmal appearances of themselves to other persons.

We purpose in this Report to deal with the alleged apparitions or projections—to use the Theosophic term—of “astral forms” by three persons only, viz. :—

MR. DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR.

MAHATMA KOOT HOOMI.

MAHATMA M——.

We place Mr. Damodar first, because his ordinary physical existence is not disputed. Some information as to his antecedents, &c., is given by Colonel Olcott in Appendix I., Mr. Hume, in “Hints on Esoteric Theosophy,” and others.

We have some available evidence as to four occasions on which Mr. Damodar is alleged to have appeared where his body was not ; a power which he is said to have quite recently acquired in the course of his training for Adeptship, and whose exercise may therefore be considered as still experimental. These occasions are as follows, giving first the place where his actual body was situated, and then the place of projection.

1. Moradabad and Adyar, November 10th, 1883. (See Appendices I. and V.)
2. Saharanpur and Adyar, November 17th, 1883. (Appendix I.)
3. Adyar and London, May 23rd, 1884. (Appendix III.)
4. Adyar and London, August 15th, 1884. (Appendix III.)

The records of these appearances are a good sample of much evidence with which we shall have to deal. The incidents take place in an apparently unpremeditated way, in the midst of ordinary existence. Many persons are more or less mixed up with them, and, although they tend to centre round certain principal personages, no special effort seems to be made to secure the presence of some bystanders or the absence of others. Evidentially this *miscellaneous* character of the experiences has an obvious *drawback* in the want of clear test conditions, the difficulty of eliminating all chance of collusion on any one occasion. There is, however, a certain counterbalancing advantage in the increased risks of detection were anything underhand attempted where so many witnesses are concerned.

We shall endeavour to arrange the witnesses to each group of phenomena in four classes, viz. :—

First Degree.—Persons so deeply involved in the incident that a doubt of its substantial truth involves a doubt of their probity. In drawing up this list we must once more disclaim any offensive intention. We have explained already how important it is to ascertain

distinctly *how many* persons must be implicated in the plot (if plot there be) to force upon the world Theosophical phenomena. The more this list is lengthened the stronger will the argument in favour of the genuineness of the phenomena become.

Second Degree.—In this class we shall place persons whose reported evidence seems *prima facie* to place them in the first class, but with whom we have not yet communicated directly.

Third Degree.—Persons whose share in the incident is conceivably reducible to a hallucination, which, however, it is difficult to regard as purely accidental on account of the corroboration which it affords of other parts of the evidence. This is a very interesting class, whose existence seems hitherto to have been but little discussed. Yet there is no set of witnesses for whom persons familiar with such researches will more carefully watch. The analogy of some of our own narratives would suggest that if the force which produces telepathic phenomena is operating in a definite direction, it is not impossible that some cognate psychical incidents may overflow into the lives of persons altogether outside the main channel of influence. An illustration of our meaning here will be found in Appendix III.

Fourth Degree.—The fourth degree will consist of persons who, if a fraud were practised, may have been its dupes, and not its contrivers.

It is clear that there will be many grades in this class. Some persons have simply heard the “astral bell,” without being able to account for it. If that sound be fraudulently made, these witnesses must be considered as wanting in acumen, but not necessarily in fairness of mind or correctness of statement. Everyone admits that the *localisation* of sounds is difficult, and the *description* of sounds necessarily vague. But many of the witnesses in this class depose to phenomena of a much more unmistakable kind. If they positively assert that they saw a majestic human form walking with stately steps, and if that form should turn out to have been composed of bladders and a wig, these witnesses are probably lacking in something besides acumen. They must be taken as showing a degree of prepossession which leaves them divided by a very narrow line from our witnesses of the first degree, whose veracity is absolutely staked on the genuineness of the phenomena.

The evidence for the two first cases of Mr. Damodar’s astral journeys is given in Appendices I. and IV.

The evidence for the two latter cases (Adyar, London), which are closely connected together, will be found in Appendix III.

We have in all these cases evidence at both ends of the chain of communication, which, if accepted, would prove both reciprocity and intention.

Dividing the witnesses to the Damodar apparitions into our four classes we shall have some such arrangement as the following :—

First Degree.—Mdme. Blavatsky

Mr. Damodar

And perhaps also Col. Olcott

Second Degree.—Col. Morgan

Mrs. Morgan

Third Degree.—Mr. Ewen

Fourth Degree.—Mr. Brown

Mr. Keightley

Mrs. Z. and Miss Z. (ladies well known to the Committee)

Mr. Pādshāh

Mr. Gebhard

and others.

We come next to the alleged apparitions of Mahatma Koot Hoomi. And here a new point meets us. The physical existence of Mahatma Koot Hoomi is itself a contested matter. According to Theosophical statements, Koot Hoomi is a Brahmin, whose full name has not been given ; Koot Hoomi, alleged to be an ancient Brahmin family name,* forming a part only of the designation to which he is entitled. He is said to have been partly educated in Europe, and to have attended Professor Fechner's lectures ; after which, as we are informed, he became what is called an Adept, and took up his residence in Thibet.

What we have in his case to consider is whether we have evidence before us establishing the following four points :—

(1) The existence of a real person claiming to be Koot Hoomi, and to be possessed of occult powers.

(2) Apparitions of the same man.

(3) That the handwriting attributed to Mahatma Koot Hoomi is that of this person.

(4) That the apparitions are intentional, and Mahatma Koot Hoomi conscious of the communication.

(1) Besides Madame Blavatsky (whose testimony would, if it were

“ The name Koothoomi is mentioned as belonging to a Rishi, in *Vishnu Puran*. The precise reference I shall be able to give you later on. The book is translated into English by H. H. Wilson. There is, I believe, also a French translation by Burnouf. About the name, see also Monier Williams' *Indian Wisdom*, p. 305. There is a school of Sama Veda students founded by Koothoomi, and called after him Kauthoomi. The text of the Sama Veda according to this school is published by the Asiatic Society, in Calcutta. All Brahmans who belong to this school (and everything being hereditary, many Brahmans of the present day are supposed to belong to it by right of descent, even though ignorant of Sanskrit) may call themselves Kauthoomis.”—From a letter by Mr. Mohini M. Chatterji to Mr. F. W. H. Myers, who has verified the reference to Monier Williams.

accepted, establish all the kinds of phenomena alluded to in this report, and whom accordingly we shall not think it necessary to mention among the witnesses again), the persons who, according to the testimony before us, have seen and conversed with Koot Hoomi in the flesh are :—

Mr. Damodar. App. VIII., IX.

Mr. Mohini. App. XIX.

Mr. Bawaji Dhabagiri Nath. App.VI., XXII.

There is also a Hindu servant of Madame Blavatsky's, and Rama Sourindro Gargya Deva, of whom we know nothing, except that his name is affixed to the letter from which we quote in Appendix V. Mr. Sinnett's account of Mr. Bawaji D. Nath's prolonged acquaintance with the Mahatmas will be found in Appendix VI. The testimony of the remaining four witnesses is shown to relate to the same personage by the portrait which they all know. Moreover, the first three witnesses seem, on one occasion, to have seen him when they were all together (see Appendix VII.); and Mr. Mohini and Mr. Damodar were co-witnesses of a supposed apparition of him. (See Appendix II.) Mr. Damodar's testimony is the most complete, for he tells us that he resided with Mahatma Koot Hoomi and other Adepts for several days, while the other witnesses—except, of course, Mr. Bawaji—have only enjoyed occasional interviews with him.

(2) The persons who claim to have seen apparitions of Mahatma Koot Hoomi are—

Colonel Olcott. App. I., XVIII.

Mr. W. T. Brown. App. VII.

Mr. Mohini. App. II.

Mr. Sinnett ("Occult World," p. 155).

Mrs. X.

Mr. Damodar. App. VIII., IX.

And others whose evidence, on account of its inconclusiveness, we have not thought it necessary to give.

But here we think the evidence of most of our witnesses is less complete than it is for the existence of the real man.

In the accounts of the first three witnesses there is either insufficient detail to enable us to judge what the improbability is of their having been deceived, or the account fails to convince us that it was impossible that the so-called apparition should have been the real man, or some other person or thing dressed up to represent him.

The hypothesis of an accidental hallucination in the likeness of a known person or picture, would cover, we think, Mr. Sinnett's nocturnal visions. They were seen when he was in a confessedly abnormal state, and his mind, no doubt, full of the thought of Koot Hoomi. But it can scarcely be stretched to cover the cases of Mr. Damodar and

Mrs. X. This lady is well-known to one member of the Committee, and appears to him to be an exceptionally conscientious, accurate, and trustworthy informant. The reasons which she has given for withholding her name, and the bulk of her evidence, from even the limited public to which this paper is addressed, are fully intelligible to us. But we may say, in brief, that she reports herself to have distinctly and repeatedly seen Koot Hoomi in "astral body," in a country distant from India, before she had even seen his picture (which she subsequently recognised), and without discovering who he was; that she acted on communications made to her in these interviews; and that these communications were afterwards confirmed by letters in the Koot Hoomi handwriting, addressed not only to Madame Blavatsky and others, but to Mrs. X. herself, under such conditions that no other person, as she maintains, could possibly have had a hand in them.

Mr. Damodar's evidence is, up to a certain point, somewhat similar (Appendix IX.), but it goes further, for if it be suggested that Mrs. X.'s experiences must, in default of evidence to the contrary, be assumed to have occurred in dreams, this can at any rate not be maintained of apparitions about which Mr. Damodar, in Appendix VIII., uses the expression, "When making Pranâm (salutation) my hands passed through his form."

(3) We have no evidence that anyone has seen Mahatma Koot Hoomi writing, but Colonel Olcott and Mr. Brown both tell us that letters in the Koot Hoomi handwriting were brought to them by Koot Hoomi in the flesh.

(4) We have no direct evidence as to whether the apparitions of Koot Hoomi are produced consciously and intentionally, but we think that if the first three points were established by the evidence before us, this fourth point would be a legitimate inference from it.

As regards Mahatma Koot Hoomi, then, we have :—

Witnesses to his existence in the flesh :

First Degree : Colonel Olcott, Mr. Brown, Mr. Damodar, Mr. Mohini, Mr. Bawaji Dhabagiri Nath.

Witnesses to his belonging to a brotherhood claiming occult powers :

First Degree : Mr. Damodar, Mr. Bawaji Dhabagiri Nath.

Witnesses to his appearance in "astral form" :

First Degree : Mr. Damodar, Mrs. X.

Third Degree : Mr. Sinnett.

Fourth Degree : Colonel Olcott, Mr. Mohini, Mr. Brown.

We come next to the alleged apparitions of Mahatma M., and must take again the same four points in the same order.

(1) To his existence in the flesh we have three witnesses besides Madame Blavatsky, all of whom know his portrait. They are :—

Colonel Olcott, App. I., X.
Mr. Damodar, App. VIII.
Mr. Ramaswamier, App. XI.

Mr. Damodar's evidence is again the most complete, telling us that he saw him when staying with some of the Brotherhood in the Himalayas. Colonel Olcott's evidence is confined to a more or less detailed account of one short interview, and a statement that he has had others. Mr. Ramaswamier believes himself to have met Mahatma M. on horse-back, accompanied by two Chelas, near the borders of Thibet, and to have had a long conversation with him, but it seems just conceivable that this may have been a delusion due to long fasting.

(2) The witnesses to apparitions of Mahatma M. are :—

Colonel Olcott, App. I., XIII., XIV., XV., XVIII.
Mr. Damodar, App. XIII., XIV.
Mr. Ramaswamier, App. XIV.
Mr. Mohini and others, App. II.
Mr. and Mrs. Ross Scott and others, App. XIV.
Mrs. Gebhard, App. XXXIX.
Mr. Solovioff, App. XXXVIII.

Unfortunately, we think that in none of the cases described in detail, the possibility that what the witnesses saw was the real man or some one personating him, is completely excluded, except in Madame Gebhard's and Mr. Solovioff's. The evidence of this latter gentleman is among the most important which lies before us. Mr. Wsevolod Solovioff, Page of Honour to the Czar and son of the tutor of the late Czar, is a Russian author of high repute. In his case, as in that of Mrs. X., there was no previous inclination to mysticism, nor acquaintance with Eastern modes of thought. Phenomena personal to himself have directed him to the Theosophic group, into which he had not definitely entered until the occurrence narrated in Appendix XXXVIII. The *corroborative hallucination* is here complete and prolonged, and confirmed as it is by the evidence of another person, whom we will call Madlle. A., it is peculiarly difficult to explain by a mere accidental coincidence of morbid fancies.

The lady whom we have designated as Madlle. A. has given to one of us an account entirely confirmatory of M. Solovioff's, and adding other matter. But she does not wish to give written evidence at present.

(3) No one, so far as we know, has seen this Mahatma writing, but the supposed apparition, seen by Mr. Ross Scott and others (Appendix XIV.), brought a note in the M. handwriting.

(4) No doubt, here again, if the apparitions really occur, it is probable from the evidence before us that Mahatma M. intends them and is conscious of the communication, but we have no positive evidence of it.

We may then arrange the witnesses as to Mahatma M.'s apparitions in our degrees as follows :—

Witnesses to M.'s existence, in the flesh.

First Degree.—Col. Olcott.

Mr. Damodar.

and probably Mr. Ramaswamier.

Witnesses to the apparitions.

First Degree.—None.

Second Degree.—None.

Third Degree.—M. Solovioff, Madame Gebhard.

Fourth Degree.—The remaining witnesses named above.

Here, at present, the evidence as to projection of “astral form” closes. There are some scattered accounts of the appearance of other Mahatmas, but we do not find any direct evidence of the identification of these supposed phantoms with persons seen in the flesh. We, therefore, merely note their occurrence, in case further evidence should accrue. We have now to take note of a fact which it is fundamentally important to consider in drawing any final conclusion as to the value and drift of the testimony that we have been examining. By accepting as valid this evidence taken alone—apart from its Theosophic interpretation—we should not necessarily be carried far beyond the general conclusions which other Committees of our Society have already put forward. The additional step that it would take us is, as we have already pointed out, of great interest and importance; but it would not necessarily involve a materially greater divergence on our part from the opinions generally accepted among scientific men as to the limits of physical and psychical possibilities. But in fact we cannot separate the evidence offered by the Theosophists for projections of the “astral form,” from the evidence which they also offer for a different class of phenomena, similar to some which are said by Spiritualists to occur through the agency of mediums, and which involve the action of psychical energies on ponderable matter: since such phenomena are usually described either as (1) accompanying apparitions of the Mahatmas or their disciples, or (2), at any rate as carrying with them a manifest reference to their agency.

It is indeed possible to suppose that the projections of the “astral form,” as above narrated, are genuine, and yet that all the narratives of effects produced by “occult” means on ponderable matter are to be

explained as due to trickery, illusion, exaggeration, &c.; but though this supposition is possible, anyone who examines the evidence will see that it is extremely improbable. We feel bound to assume that the two bodies of evidence must stand or fall together, and this assumption alone, together with the fact that the Committee have had no opportunities of investigating experimentally the latter class of phenomena, is a sufficient reason why they should refrain from pronouncing a final judgment on any part of the evidence. They have, however, no hesitation in affirming that, in the case of both classes of phenomena alike, the quantity and quality of the evidence is—on the general principles adopted by the Society for Psychical Research—sufficient to justify serious and systematic investigation, so far as opportunities may be offered. They accordingly proceed to give a summary of the evidence that they have collected under the second of the two heads; which will be found in Appendices I., II., XVI.—XVIII., XX.—XXXV., XXXVII.

The alleged phenomena which come under this head consist—so far as we need at present take them into account—in the transportation, even through solid matter, of ponderable objects, and of what the Theosophists regard as their duplication; together with what is called “precipitation” of handwriting and drawings on previously blank paper. As these phenomena cannot always be clearly distinguished, it will be convenient to treat them all together.

The evocation of sound without physical means is also said to occur, and some cases of this will be found in the Appendices; but this phenomenon, even if genuine, may possibly be due to auditory hallucination telepathically caused.

A good many accounts of alleged transportation or precipitation of letters will be found in the Appendices—most of them independent of the “shrine” (see Appendix XXX., &c.) on which the Coulombs have thrown so much suspicion, and many of them at a distance from both Madame Blavatsky and the Coulombs. The most interesting, perhaps, in this last respect are two cases of letters received in railway carriages. (See Appendices I., II., and XXXII.) In the case of Appendix XXXII., we think it is almost impossible to frame a hypothesis of trickery which would not implicate Colonel Olcott.

For a case where a recognised letter and cards are said to have been transported see Appendix XVIII. We speak only of the transport of the letter from Bombay to Calcutta, omitting the evidence of transit from the ss. “Vega” to Bombay, which depends in great measure on the assertion of Mr. Eglinton, and is vitiated by the way in which he dealt with the test conditions.

Taking then only the evidence as to the fall of a letter in Calcutta which had previously fallen in Bombay, we have

Witnesses to the fall in Bombay and subsequent "evaporation;"
Friday, March 24th, 1882, 8 p.m., Bombay time :—

Mr. K. M. Shroff.

Mr. Martandrao B. Nagnath

Mr. Gwala K. Deb.

Mr. Dovat H. Bhavucha.

Mr. Damodar K. Mavalankar.

Mr. Bhavani Shankar.

Witnesses to the fall in Calcutta, Friday, March 24th, 1882, 9 p.m.
Madras time :—

Col. Olcott.

Col. Gordon.

Mrs. Gordon.

Two Adepts (supposed to be in astral form), viz., Mahatma Koot Hoomi; and Mahatma M., were seen by Colonel Olcott, but not by the others.

This is an important case, in spite of the weakness of the "Vega" portion of the story. For if the fall at Calcutta were fraudulent, it is difficult to believe that Colonel Olcott was a dupe.

Other cases of transportation or duplication of objects will be found in "The Occult World."

For cases where letters are asserted to have been seen actually forming themselves, see Mr. Bawaji D. Nath's evidence in Appendix XXII., and what Colonel Olcott says (on p. 59, Appendix I.) about the case where Judge Gadgill was present. Judge Gadgill's own evidence has yet to be obtained. See also Mr. Mohini's evidence in Appendix XLII.

For an instance of a letter purporting to come from Koot Hoomi, and received in a mysterious way after the Coulombs had been turned out, and while Madame Blavatsky was still in Europe, see Mr. Bawaji D. Nath's evidence in Appendix XXII.

The caligraphy of the letters is mainly of two types, the Koot Hoomi and the M. handwriting; and here we may conveniently discuss what bearing phenomena of this kind can have on the identity of the agents causing them.

Material evidence for the *individual identity* of a communicating intelligence is in common life generally obtained from *identity of handwriting*. But it seems doubtful how much, on the Theosophic theory, such identity would prove. If A can precipitate handwriting in his own style, may he not also be able to precipitate B's handwriting,—as in fact we hear in Colonel Olcott's deposition (p. 60) that Madame Blavatsky actually has done? An endless vista of perplexities thus opens before us. Fortunately, what we have primarily to determine is whether precipitation occurs at all. We must at any rate begin by refusing to allow our personages any powers beyond those of the ordinary forger. If we should decide that they can precipitate handwriting, it will then be time enough to discuss what the internal

evidence of handwriting, style, or continuity of matter may indicate as to their authorship. In the language of theologians, our epistles must be shown to be *genuine* before they are shown to be *authentic*.

In this connection we must mention the most serious blot which has as yet been pointed out in the Theosophic evidence.

The "Kiddle incident" has been so fully discussed already (in *Light* and elsewhere) that we shall not think it needful to give it in full details. Briefly, the case stands as follows :—

A certain letter, in the Koot Hoomi handwriting and addressed avowedly by Koot Hoomi from Thibet, to Mr. Sinnett, in 1880, was proved by Mr. H. Kiddle, of New York, to contain a long passage apparently plagiarised from a speech of Mr. Kiddle's, made at Lake Pleasant, August 15th, 1880, and reported in the *Banner of Light* some two months or more previous to the date of Koot Hoomi's letter. Koot Hoomi replied (some months later) that the passages were no doubt *quotations* from Mr. Kiddle's speech, which he had become cognisant of in some occult manner, and which he had stored up in his mind, but that the appearance of plagiarism was due to the imperfect precipitation of the letter by the Chela, or disciple, charged with the task. Koot Hoomi then gave what he asserted to be the true version of the letter as dictated and recovered by his own scrutiny apparently from the blurred precipitation. In this fuller version the quoted passages were given as quotations, and mixed with controversial matter. Koot Hoomi explained the peculiar form which the error of precipitation had assumed by saying that the quoted passages had been more distinctly impressed on his own mind, by an effort of memory, than his own interposed remarks; and, that inasmuch as the whole composition had been feebly and inadequately projected, owing to his own physical fatigue at the time, the high lights only, so to speak, had come out; there had been many illegible passages, which the Chela had omitted. The Chela, he said, wished to submit the letter to Koot Hoomi for revision, but Koot Hoomi declined for want of time.

It would have been very desirable that the alleged original precipitation, or a photograph of it, should have been sent to Mr. Kiddle and subjected to scientific scrutiny. It is alleged to have been seen by Mr. Subba Row and General Morgan, and since destroyed. This document could not of course have *proved* the truth of Koot Hoomi's explanation, but it would at any rate have afforded scope for certain tests which its alleged destruction renders impossible.

Further difficulties involved in Koot Hoomi's explanation were pointed out by Mr. Massey, who showed (among other points) that the quoted sentences seemed to have been ingeniously twisted into a polemical sense, precisely opposite to that in which they were written. It might, of course, be rejoined that this was the work of the Chela,

endeavouring to set forth what he thought his Master meant ; but the odd coincidence remains that words should have been originally quoted most of which were capable of being pieced together into a coherent meaning other than that intended by their original author.

And quite lately (*Light*, September 20th, 1884) Mr. Kiddle has shown that the passage thus restored by no means comprises the whole of the unacknowledged quotations ; and, moreover, that these newly-indicated quotations are antecedent to those already described by Koot Hoomi, as forming the introduction to a fresh topic of criticism ; especially as he had admitted the accuracy of the rest. We wait to hear Koot Hoomi's reply to this last charge. It will be somewhat difficult to extend much further the explanation of accidentally dropped connecting passages, which, nevertheless, leave behind them a coherent sense. In fact, an obvious criticism on the whole incident would be that a line of explanation *à priori* most improbable had been adopted, and that, furthermore, this improbable explanation had itself been strained to bursting.

Into this class of letters falls the only one which a member of our Committee has received. On August 11th, 1884, Mr. Myers was talking with Madame Blavatsky and others on the Kiddle incident, when Madame Blavatsky said that she felt Koot Hoomi's presence. She left the room, and in two or three seconds returned with a letter, which she said had fallen on a slab outside the door. This formed no test, of course. The letter was in the Koot Hoomi handwriting, and alluded to what had just passed in conversation. The subject, however, might have been purposely led up to. But the odd thing was that the letter included a verbal quotation (duly acknowledged) from a volume of essays of Mr. Myers'. It will not be maintained on any side that this publication has made its way into Thibet ; whereas a copy of the work had recently lain in a room where Madame Blavatsky had sat. The obvious inference would be that Madame Blavatsky is connected with the authorship of the letter. On the other hand, it seems strange that Madame Blavatsky (if she wrote the letter) should attempt, so to say, to purge the writer of the Koot Hoomi letters from the charge of having read the *Banner of Light*, and in the same instant should gratuitously indicate that this mysterious correspondent had, at any rate, read a book quite equally unlikely to be obtainable at Lhasa.

We have made inquiry from Dr. Hartmann as to the continued receipt of letters in the K. H. handwriting at Madras after the departure of Madame B. for Europe. Appendices IX., XXI., XXII., XXIII., XXIV., XXV., XXXVII. deal with this point. For the occurrence of the handwriting under circumstances which absolutely preclude its having been sent out or left behind by Madame Blavatsky, see Mr. Bawaji D. Nath's evidence in App. XXII. ; Mr. T. Vignia Raghava

Charloo's in Appendix XXIV., and Mr. Harisinghji Rapsinghi's in Appendix XXV.

Here, for the present, the Committee must close their review of the existing evidence for Theosophical phenomena.

That evidence is of a kind which it is peculiarly difficult either to disentangle or to evaluate. The claims advanced are so enormous, and the lines of testimony converge and inosculate in a manner so perplexing, that it is almost equally hard to say what statements are to be accepted, and what inferences as to other statements are to be drawn from the acceptance of any. On the whole, however, (though with some serious reserves), it seems undeniable that there is a *prima facie* case, for some part at least of the claim made, which, at the point which the investigations of the Society for Psychical Research have now reached, cannot, with consistency, be ignored. And it seems also plain that an actual residence for some months in India of some trusted observer,—his actual intercourse with the persons concerned, Hindu and European, so far as may be permitted to him,—is an almost necessary pre-requisite of any more definite judgment.

It may be said that the Council of the Society for Psychical Research possess already such a source of information in the person of Mr. St. George Lane-Fox, formerly a member of their body who has now joined the Theosophical Society, transferred his residence to Madras, and assumed an active part in Theosophical affairs. The Committee do not regard Mr. Lane-Fox's membership of the Theosophical Society as a disqualification in the research; for such membership is expressly admitted by the Theosophical Society to be compatible with an attitude of the freest inquiry; and this attitude many members of the Theosophical Society avowedly assume. But Mr. Lane-Fox, when he went out to Adyar, admittedly did not take this step on purely scientific grounds. He was deeply impressed by the *philosophy* set before him,—by the *teaching* of the Adepts or their exponents as well as by their alleged *powers*. He had, doubtless, satisfied himself as to the general validity of the evidence offered; but had the philosophy, the cosmogony, the theodicy of the Adepts been altogether *repugnant* to his mind, he would hardly, we imagine, have felt it incumbent on him to embrace them on the strength of the phenomenal evidence alone.

Now the capacity to recognise intuitionally exalted truth,—the faith to act on such recognition,—may, no doubt, be among the highest gifts of mankind. But, as we have already remarked, in psychical research we must be on our guard against men's highest instincts as much as against their lowest; and when we find so many competing religions appealing with confidence to the innate and self-evident truth and beauty of their respective tenets, we are warned to keep to our humbler task of simply testing, as well as we can, by ordinary scientific methods,

whatever evidence as to unknown powers or an unseen world is put before us,—of approaching all with the same absence of prepossession, whether we have to deal with the visions of Swedenborg, or the miracles at Lourdes, or the communications received at Spiritualistic séances.

Having necessarily to touch on so many delicate subjects, so many profound convictions, so many ardent hopes, we can only avoid giving offence by rigidly confining ourselves to those parts of each inquiry which can be tested by the same definite rules in every instance. It can never be our part (so to say) to discuss the policy of any Bill introduced, but only to determine whether the Standing Orders have been duly complied with.

We are of opinion, therefore, that it would be very desirable to receive the reports of some competent inquirer, who, while free from any prepossession *against* the wisdom or the peculiar psychical developments of the East, is, nevertheless, prepared to conduct his Indian investigations with a sole regard to definite evidential proof. But we could not, under present circumstances, recommend that any considerable portion of the funds of the Society should be employed in so remote and costly an inquiry. An opportunity has, however, presented itself of attaining the result at which we aim in a way that will entail no expense on the Society. A colleague whom we regard as thoroughly competent to conduct the required investigation, Mr. Hodgson, B.A., Scholar of St. John's College, Cambridge, is now on his way to India, and it is hoped that his letters from that country, or some part of them, may be submitted to Members and Associates in a Second Report of this Committee.

NOTE ON THE COULOMBS.

As some of our readers may not be acquainted with the nature of the connection of M. and Madame Coulomb with the Theosophical Society, and of their late attack on Madame Blavatsky, we think it best to give here a brief outline of such facts as seem to us important, without drawing any conclusions. Our information is mainly drawn from (1) a pamphlet by Dr. Hartmann, entitled "Report of Observations made during a Nine Months' Stay at the Headquarters of the Theosophical Society"; (2) two articles in the *Christian College Magazine* (Madras), of September and October last; (3) a pamphlet recently issued by the London Lodge of the Theosophical Society, and entitled, "The Latest Attack on the Theosophical Society."

M. and Madame Coulomb were attached to the Theosophical Society for several years. They lived at the headquarters of the

Society in positions of trust—Madame Coulomb as housekeeper and M. Coulomb as librarian and apparently general factotum. He is a skilful carpenter and mechanic.

Madame Blavatsky felt herself, we understand, to be under obligations to them for services rendered previously to the foundation of the Theosophical Society, and appears to have regarded them both as friends. And judging from what we know of their correspondence, namely, a letter from Madame Coulomb to Madame Blavatsky, given in Dr. Hartmann's pamphlet, and such parts of the extracts from letters to be hereafter alluded to, as Madame Blavatsky admits to be possibly genuine, it seems clear that what correspondence they had was of an informal kind, and such as would naturally pass between friends who knew that each would understand the other.

On the 21st of last February Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott sailed for Europe, leaving the management of the affairs of the Society in the hands of a Board of Control of which Mr. St. George Lane-Fox and Dr. Hartmann were members. Madame Blavatsky seems to have left her own rooms in charge of the Coulombs, who kept other members of the Society out of them. Adjoining Madame Blavatsky's room, and having a common wall with her bedroom, is the room containing the so-called shrine (which Dr. Hartmann asserts to be a simple cupboard with a solid immovable back), and the shrine hangs on the common wall. In this wall, behind the shrine, there had once been a door-way, but it had been walled up on both sides. Dr. Hartmann states that in December, 1883, "the shrine hung upon an apparently solid and plastered wall," and "the other side of the wall behind the shrine, on its side in the adjoining room, was equally plastered and also papered." He also quotes from Mrs. Morgan, "I can state for a fact that during . . . December, 1883, Madame Blavatsky . . . showed us the back of the shrine and the wall she had built behind it, where there had been a door; and the people were welcome to inspect this and see it was barred and bolted, yet she thought it would remove the last occasion of suspicion were it bricked up, and so had it done. The wall then presented a fine highly-polished white surface. This wall I afterwards saw papered, as I superintended the hanging of the paper."

Very soon after Madame Blavatsky's departure—in March—the Board of Control found that the Coulombs were guilty of gross misconduct, wasting the funds of the Society, &c., and were about to proceed against them when they were stopped by a letter in the well-known handwriting attributed to Mahatma Koot Hoomi, ordering patience. Things were, therefore, temporarily patched up; but towards the end of April, a letter, dated April 26th, came to Dr. Hartmann through Mr. Damodar K. Mavalankar, in the handwriting attributed to another Mahatma, accusing the Coulombs of betraying

the Society, stating that "when needed, trap-doors will be found, as they have been forthcoming for some time," and advising secrecy and action without delay. The secrecy was prevented by Colonel Olcott, who wrote a letter to Madame Coulomb, dated April 2nd, remonstrating with her and saying, among other things, that he had information that M. Coulomb had made trap-doors and other apparatus for trick manifestations,—or that she was saying so; for the phrase is not clear. On the 14th of May the Coulombs were dismissed from the Theosophical Society by the Council, and shortly afterwards compelled to give up the keys of Madame Blavatsky's rooms, when it was found that an entrance from the bedroom had been made into the walled-up space behind the shrine—though it is stated that the wall between this space and the shrine remained intact. There were also three movable panels in other parts of the rooms, which all appeared to be new. "M. Coulomb confessed," says Dr. Hartmann, "to having made all these tricks, holes and trap-doors with his own hand, but excused himself by saying that they were made by H. P. Blavatsky's order."

We next hear of the Coulombs in the first article in the *Christian College Magazine* already mentioned. That article contains selections "from letters and other documents in Madame Blavatsky's handwriting, left with strange recklessness in the possession of the Coulombs." "These, together with Madame Coulomb's explanations, are the authorities on which the conclusions of the article depend." These conclusions are, briefly, that all the alleged phenomena are tricks got up by Madame Blavatsky with the Coulombs; that there has been a figure of muslin, and bladders to represent Koot Hoomi; and that the shrine has a back door by which answers are put in—the apparatus for this operation being so ingenious that none but those in Madame Blavatsky's confidence have had any suspicion of its existence. The selections (which are, as we are told in the second article, "only scraps torn away from their context") by themselves would, if genuine, prove conspiracy in trickery between Madame Blavatsky and the Coulombs. Madame Blavatsky, however, asserts that they are, to a great extent, forgeries, and at best made up and altered from her real letters. She makes, moreover, the following positive points in her criticism:—(1) "There is no 'Maharajah of Lahore,' hence I could not have spoken of such a person, nor have attempted mock phenomena for his deception;" (2) . . . "in writing to her who saw the man every day. . . . I should simply have said 'Dewan Bahadur,' without adding 'Rajanath Rao, the President of the Society,' as if introducing to her one she did not know." (3) "How could I make a mistake in writing . . . about the name of one of my best friends . . . H. Khandalawalla." . . . The real name is N. D. Khandalawalla.

The letter in which this last mistake occurs purported to be written from Poona about a telegram which she wants sent to take in a Mr. Sassoon, cousin of Mr. A. D. Ezekiel. Mr. Ezekiel, writing to the *Times of India*, says about this letter :—"In one of the letters my name has been mentioned, and you will allow me to make a few observations. I know in detail all the particulars of Madame Blavatsky's last visit to Poona. Some of the particulars have inaccurately been put into the alleged letter. The telegram referred to therein was not at all meant, even in the most distant way, to suggest the possession of phenomenal powers by Madame Blavatsky, and she never attempted to put before me or Mr. Sassoon the telegram in any such light." Madame Blavatsky hopes also to get from Ramalinga, mentioned in this letter, a statement of his part in the affair.

In connection with these letters it should be mentioned that a forged letter, purporting to be written by Dr. Hartmann to Madame Coulomb, dated April 28th, 1884, is asserted by Colonel Olcott to have reached him some weeks later in an envelope addressed in an unknown handwriting, and with the postmark Madras. Apart from Dr. Hartmann's assertion it is clear from the statements in the letter that it is a forgery, but the forger is not known. The *Christian College Magazine* thinks it was forged by or for Madame Blavatsky "as a proof that forgery is in the air—that attacks upon Theosophy are being made through the forger's pen." On the other hand, the letter is calculated, if believed, to make mischief between the founders of the Theosophical Society and Dr. Hartmann and Mr. Lane-Fox, and it is undeniable that the Coulombs may have forged it with this object.

There remains one very important point to notice in the Coulomb letters. Throughout them the only persons implicated in trickery are Madame Blavatsky and the Coulombs. Other Theosophists are dupes. Mr. Damodar figures as a person for whom phenomena must be got up, and Colonel Olcott as a person who must not be allowed access to the "shrine" in Madame's absence, lest he should examine it too closely. This view, however, is very difficult to reconcile with other evidence before us: since these gentlemen *cannot* have been dupes in the case of all the phenomena with which they have been connected, whether these phenomena be genuine or not. (Note especially the various accounts of Mr. Damodar's "astral journeys" in Appendices I. and III., and Dr. Hübbe Schneiden's description of how he received a letter in a railway carriage (Appendix XXXII.). It seems hardly probable that they should first be dupes, and within a few months should join their deceivers in elaborate plots to impose on others.

NOTE BY MR. F. W. H. MYERS.

The Committee have deemed it unadvisable to insert in their Report anything beyond a mere *description* of the phenomena under review. To enter formally upon the *explanation* of those phenomena, as given by the Theosophists themselves, would, at the present stage of the inquiry, have been altogether premature.

On the other hand, it is thought by some persons that to many of our readers the evidence given in the Appendices will be hardly intelligible without some elementary statement of the theories which are pre-supposed by the Theosophical witnesses as underlying and connecting the isolated incidents which they attest.

An explanatory note is therefore added, for which the writer alone is responsible. Solely for the sake of clearness and conciseness the theory is stated in Theosophic terminology, and from the Theosophic point of view; although no kind of adherence to that view is anywhere implied. It may be added that Mr. Mohini has attested the substantial accuracy of the statement of the theory of the akâs.

The two main classes of phenomena described in this report are *projections of the double* and *precipitations from the akâs*. It will be convenient to explain first the latter of these performances.

In thus dealing with a *medium* or *state of matter*—the akâs—as familiarly as we ordinary men can deal with the matter which we know, the Adept is not in reality assuming any magical novelty of power. He is merely standing at a more advanced point than we in the evolutionary series in which all sentient beings are included. He has powers of analysis and synthesis as much ahead of ours as ours are ahead of the savage's, or as the savage's are ahead of the brute's. To the brute beast matter in its grossest and most complex forms—sand, mud, &c.,—is ultimate and unmodifiable. Of *spirit* the beast knows nothing; he is monistic from the materialistic side. The savage can convert water into steam and sticks into smoke, but he cannot re-condense the steam into water, still less re-integrate the smoke into wood. He has an idea of spirit, but this idea is still so near to matter that *air in motion* serves as its very type. We civilised men can see deeper into the structure of things; we can not only vapourise water and re-condense it, but also dissociate its elements and re-combine them. To us the air is mere ponderable matter, and although, when we conceive the luminiferous ether or “radiant matter,” we feel ourselves on the brink of immateriality, still we are learning to stretch our conceptions to embrace matter in several states which are only conjecturally known to us. But the gulf between the

objective and the subjective side of our experience remains unbridged. Such conceptions as "thought," "will," "life," "soul," we still class in the world of *mind* or *spirit*, as contradistinguished from the world of matter. Our dualism, however, is not so *unquestioning* as the savage's. We are capable of a speculative monism—of conjecturing that underlying all visible phenomena may be something akin to our own minds.

Now the difference in the case of the Adept is that he is *confidently* monistic. Not that he can fully see or perceive the underlying identity of spirit and matter. He too has a purely subjective side to his experience. The atma, the seventh principle, the pervading unity of things, remains incognisable to him save as an indwelling essence, which is the soul of his soul. But he has nevertheless made just that forward step which was necessary to make his monism a confident and not a merely speculative tenet. For he has obtained an experimental insight into the "mind-stuff," whose existence we can only conjecture; he has half bridged over the gulf between objective and subjective, by actually learning to see his own thought, his own will, as vibrations of the akâs, as well as feeling them as changes of his own consciousness. The gulf, we say, is thus *half* bridged over; it would need not an Adept's gaze, but a re-absorption of all things into absolute existence to bridge it over *entirely*, to recognise no difference between inner consciousness and external entities. Yet to see thought and will as vibrations in the akâs involves a deeper insight than would be involved in merely watching their correlated vibrations in the physical *brain*. For the akâs is the foundation of thought and brain alike; it is (in another sense than the poet's) "such stuff as dreams are made of;" it is the very fabric of the veil of illusion on which our world and we are projected as images from the unmanifested unity of things.

Thus much of explanation is necessary if we are to understand either the nature of the akâsic phenomena which the Adept can produce, or the means which he adopts to produce them. In the first place, to a person who can discern the akâsic substratum of ponderable things, our "chemical elements" are of course as conspicuously composite as organised matter is to ourselves. All substances known to us are modifications of the akâs; and the forces which hold them together, and govern their behaviour,—cohesion, gravitation, chemical affinity, electricity, magnetism,—are incidental cases of the deeper laws which regulate the structure and govern the behaviour of the akâs. An experimenter, therefore, who could deal with the akâs could overcome and renew the molecular cohesion of wood or iron as easily as we can vapourise water and re-condense it; he could precipitate any substance known to us from his great reservoir of re-

lately undifferentiated akâs as easily as we can accrete to our electrodes the desired elements of a chemical compound.

And this (to continue our statement of the Theosophical case) is just what the Adept can do. And he does it by the aid of no ponderable instruments, but by a trained and appropriate direction of the energy of his own thought and will. For, be it remembered, his own thought is *in pari materia* with the effects which he wishes to produce. Super-consciously, no doubt, his thought involves an inconceivable process in the unmanifested unity. Sub-consciously it involves a molecular vibration in the thinker's physical brain. But *consciously*,—as the Adept realises it and can direct it,—it is an impulse propagated through the akâs, which can be made either to impress the akâs without otherwise modifying it, or to modify it by condensation or segregation, into, or out of, any concrete substance desired. Thus, for instance, if an Adept in Thibet wishes to transmit a letter to a friend at Madras he can proceed in various ways. If his friend is himself gifted with occult power it will suffice for the Adept to imprint the intended words on the akâs by an effort of will. The disciple will then discern them in the akâs, and if necessary can himself precipitate them on to an ordinary sheet of paper. Or else the Adept can write his letter on ordinary paper in Thibet, and then disintegrate the paper,—keeping its particles, however, sufficiently close for ultimate reunion,—convey the disintegrated or *virtual* missive through intervening obstacles, and re-integrate it at Madras. Or he can write a letter in Thibet by ordinary means, elicit its astral image, project that image to Madras, accrete visible matter thereto, and thus create a *duplicate* of the original letter, which duplicate he can render either temporary or permanent. Or he can simply precipitate both paper and handwriting from the akâs at Madras, without any previous preparation or transmission.

One more point remains to be noticed. These powers of the Adept, as has been so often said, are not miraculous. They are inherent in all of us, in the same sense as the power to make electrical experiments is inherent in the savage. And just as the savage, who cannot even dimly conceive of electricity, is nevertheless unconsciously producing electric phenomena at every step he takes ; is modifying the electric conditions around him in a manner which would be perceptible to *savants* armed with the necessary instruments ; even so we are modifying the akâs around and in us by every thought which manifests itself in our brains. We do not consciously *stamp* our thoughts on the akâs, but they *make their mark* on the akâs none the less. We thus leave an involuntary but a permanent imprint, by means of which the Adept can track our moral and mental course in the akâs, partly as a dog can track our physical course by the

smell, and partly as we can track the dog's course if he has run before a row of instantaneously-recording photographic cameras.

All thought, therefore, is potentially visible, and the Adept habitually exercises, in the realm of the akâs, the same excursive faculty by which the mesmerised clairvoyant visits the earthly scenes to which his attention is directed ; or rather, by a mere act of abstraction, and without the motion through space of any part of his own identity, he can become cognisant of the contents of any part of the akâs which falls within the range of his mental vision. These last terms must, of course, be taken figuratively ; for the pictures are not disposed in the akâs in a simple spatial arrangement. Any given picture may be spatially co-existent with any number of other pictures, and *which* among all these pictures is discerned will depend on the affinities or on the choice of the spectator.

The Adept, however, may wish to do something more than thus read the thoughts of a person at a distance. He may wish to manifest himself in bodily form, to hold visible converse with some one who is unable reciprocally to discern the mere direction toward him of the Master's thought. What, then, can the Adept do? Can he disintegrate and reintegrate his own ponderable body, as he can a letter or a ring? No ; for although the molecules which constitute a piece of paper, or of metal, can be held at distance from each other and re-aggregated without injury, the subtler tissues of organic life would not survive such interruption.

But he can perform with his own body a process analogous to that *duplication* of objects of which mention has already been made in the case of inanimate things. The inanimate object, it has been implied, has an akâsic substratum, an astral body. It exists at once in the akâsic and in the ponderable world, and its double existence can be made manifest in discrete places simultaneously. Much more is this the case with the far more complex organism of the man himself.

For the doctrine of the involute or septenary constitution of man—a true *articulus stantis aut cadentis Theosophice*—the reader must be referred to Mr. Sinnett's works, and to the *Theosophist passim*. It is sufficient here to say that each of us is existing simultaneously on several different planes of being. As a general rule, we are conscious only of the lowest of these existences, that on the physical plane—nay, only of a part of *that* ; for even on the physical plane a large part of our existence is *below* the level of ordinary consciousness. Far more, however, of our existence is *above* our consciousness than *below* it, and the great achievement of Adeptship is an upward extension of consciousness ; a voluntary action and perception on a plane of being above that on which common life proceeds. Operating in this higher region, he has control over that *astral body* or more tenuous simulacrum of himself, which is a denizen of the akasic world just as his ponderable body

is a denizen of the physical world. He translates that astral body by an act of will ; and (just as in the case of the duplicated letter) he accretes thereto such ponderable particles as may suffice to render it visible to ordinary eyes, with a greater or less degree of apparent materiality. He cannot make it *permanent* ; for the connection of his astral with his physical body must be carefully maintained, and the astral body must be restored to the physical, which, if wholly severed from it, would become at once a corpse.

This, briefly, seems a fair statement of the Theosophic teaching ;—however differently the problems involved might be stated by the more idealistic monism of the West. In any case, the theory, it must once more be repeated, lies wholly outside the evidential questions with which alone the Society for Psychical Research is now concerned. It is stated here simply for convenience sake, as a clue to the terminology and habits of thought of the witnesses whose statements will now be given.

F. W. H. MYERS.

APPENDICES.

The following Appendices consist of accounts of a number of phenomena alleged to have occurred in connection with the Theosophical Society, and of some others. They all serve, we think, to illustrate our Report, but the reader will at once perceive that evidential value has not been the sole ground of selection, and that the evidential value of the different cases varies greatly. We have prefixed to most of the Appendices a few remarks which may help the reader to form an estimate of their respective importance.

APPENDIX I.

REMARKS.

Pages 1—6 of the following deposition, referring to two visits of Mr. Damodar in the spirit to the headquarters of the Society, contain some of the most important evidence we have. It will be seen that in the first case there is nothing in the circumstances which absolutely precludes a previous arrangement between Madame Blavatsky and Mr. Damodar, but of course Mr. Damodar must himself have been a party to it if there was one. The second case will have a still higher evidential value if we find that General and Mrs. Morgan (whose evidence we have not yet obtained) took notes at the time, confirming dates and circumstances, since these as described scarcely admit of previous arrangement.

Colonel Olcott's evidence is clear as to his having seen a living man whom he believes to be Mahatma M., and only less so, because the light seems doubtful, as to his having seen another living man whom he believes to be Mahatma Koot Hoomi. But unfortunately the evidence for apparitions of the Mahatmas is less strong, the only case here given in detail—the appearance at New York—leaving it doubtful whether his visitor may not after all have been the real man. However, his own conviction as to this and other appearances appears to be strong, and his evidence, as far as it goes, corroborates that of others.

The case of the letter said to have fallen in the railway carriage, is more fully described in Mr. Mohini's deposition, and that of the letter that fell at the house of Sir Jolindra Mohan Tagore is also there

dealt with. The third letter phenomenon, described on p. 58, may become very important if Judge Gadgill proves to be a good observer and to have an accurate recollection of the circumstances.

The next incident, namely, the alleged precipitation of a strange handwriting, seems, as described, within the powers of a conjurer. But the account illustrates remarks made in our Report.

The remaining case, the production of the portrait of Colonel Olcott's Master, Mahatma M., is interesting, because this is the portrait from which (as will be seen in subsequent Appendices) other persons recognise Mahatma M. when they see him or his supposed apparition. We can hardly regard it as evidence, however, without knowing more about the gentleman who is said to have drawn it.

Meeting on May 11th, 1884.

*Present: J. HERBERT STACK, Esq.,
F. W. H. MYERS, Esq.,
AND
COLONEL H. S. OLCOTT.*

MR. MYERS: We, that is to say, the Committee appointed by the Society for Psychical Research, understand that Colonel Olcott has cases to tell us of apparitions of living persons at a distance. Are there any cases of apparitions at a distance of persons who are not Mahatmas?

COLONEL OLCOTT: Among other cases, I may mention two instances of the projection of the double by a young Hindu gentleman named Damodar. He is a Brahmin of high caste, a man of modern education, and one of an extremely lovable character and exemplary life. He is Recording Secretary of the Theosophical Society, and for the past four years has lived at the headquarters of the Society, at first at Bombay, but now at Madras.

MR. MYERS: Just mention what his previous prospects were, and whether he relinquished anything?

COLONEL OLCOTT: His father was a wealthy gentleman occupying a high position in the Government secretariat at Bombay; and the son, besides his paternal expectations, had in his own right about 50,000 or 60,000 rupees. The father at first gave his consent to the son's breaking caste—a most serious step in India—so as to take up our work. But subsequently, on his deathbed, his orthodox family influenced his mind, and he demanded that his son should revert to his caste, making the usual degrading penance required in such cases. Mr. Damodar, however, refused, saying that he was fully committed to the work, which he considered most important for his country and the world; and he

ultimately relinquished his entire property, so that he might be absolutely free. From childhood he has been extremely pious, and knew, like all Hindus who are acquainted with the national literature, of the existence of those wonderful philosophers of the Himalayan slopes and Thibet, known in Chinese literature as the Great Teachers of the Snowy Mountains, and in India, in Sanscrit literature, as Mahatmas.* He endeavoured to become as quickly as possible the pupil of one of these men, known in recent Western literature as "Mahatma Koot Hoomi." This philosopher, with several others, has been from the first connected with the Theosophical Society's work. Damodar's object was realised after a time, and he came into personal relations with the Teacher in question. He began the course of diet and life which is prescribed for the development of the higher psychic faculties, and with extraordinary rapidity has reached the point where he can at will project his inner self from the physical body. The body becomes reduced to a state of inertness as regards intelligence; the eyes lose their brightness and thoughtfulness; and the motions of the body, when any are made, are mechanical.

MR. MYERS: Have you yourself seen any persons in this state?

COLONEL OLCOTT: Yes.

MR. MYERS: Have you seen Damodar in this state? . .

COLONEL OLCOTT: Yes.

MR. MYERS: Will you first give us Damodar's case, and then describe the state of his body while the spirit was away?

COLONEL OLCOTT: Here is a photograph (photograph produced) of Mr. Damodar taken while he was absent from the outer body and travelling in his inner self, or, as you call it, the "phantasm." I have also here two sets of documents with the names of witnesses from whom parole confirmation may be had, which seem to prove the possibility of a living man voluntarily travelling in the double, or phantasm, to a great distance and then exercising intelligence. The first, which we will call A, relates to the following occurrence:—At Moradabad, N.W.P., India, being on an official tour from Bombay to Cashmere and back, I was very strongly importuned by a gentleman named Shankar Singh, a Government official, and not then a Theosophist, to undertake the cure of two lads, aged 12 and 14 years respectively, who had each on arriving at the age of 10 years become paralysed. It is known, I believe, to many here that I have the power of healing the sick by the voluntary transference of vitality. I refused in this instance, having already within the previous year done too much of it for my health. The gentleman urged me again. I again refused. He spent, perhaps, 10 or 15 minutes in trying to persuade me and endeavouring to

* Maha-atma, a great soul.

shake my resolution ; but, as I still refused, he went to Mr. Damodar, who was travelling with me in his official capacity. Shankar Singh represented the case, and appealed to Mr. Damodar's sympathies, and at last persuaded him to go in the double, or phantasm, to the headquarters of our Society at Madras, and try to enlist the goodwill of Madame Blavatsky.

MR. STACK : What is the distance of Moradabad from Madras ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : The distance, approximately, by telegraph line is, I should say, 2,200 miles.

MR. MYERS : Was it known at headquarters that you were at Moradabad on that day ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : It was not known that I was at Moradabad, for, owing to the rapid spread of our movement in India, I, while on a tour, was constantly obliged to interrupt the previously settled programme, and go hither and thither to found new branches. All the elements are against any procurement. To understand the present case, you must know that it is the rule in those Eastern schools of mystical research that the pupils are not permitted to seek intercourse with Teachers other than their own. Hence, Mr. Damodar, who is the pupil—the Sanscrit word is *chela*—of the Mahatma Koot Hoomi, could not himself approach my own Teacher, who is another person. (Colonel Olcott here exhibited the portrait of his own Teacher, but preferred to withhold the name from publicity, though he mentioned it to the Committee.) Madame Blavatsky and I are pupils of the same Master, and hence she was at liberty to communicate with him on this subject. Mr. Damodar, preparatory to taking his aerial flight, then sent Mr. Shankar Singh out of the room and closed the door. A few minutes later he returned to his visitor, who was waiting just outside in the verandah. They came in together to the part of the house where I was sitting with a number of Hindu gentlemen and one European, and told me what had happened in consequence of my refusal to heal the boys. Mr. Damodar said that he had been in the double to headquarters (Madras), and had talked with Madame Blavatsky, who had refused to interfere. But while they were conversing together, both heard a voice, which they recognised as that of my Teacher.

MR. STACK : Not of Mahatma Koot Hoomi ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : No, that of my own Teacher. Mahatma Koot Hoomi had nothing to do with me in this affair. While they were talking they heard this voice, which gave a message, and Mr. Damodar remarked that, if I would take pencil and paper, he would dictate from memory the message. I did so.

MR. MYERS : You have the paper ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes. Shankar Singh then, in the presence of all

sat down and wrote a brief statement of the circumstances, and it was endorsed by 12 persons, including myself. (Colonel Olcott here exhibited the document marked B, given at p. 54.)

MR. STACK : I observe that the memorandum is dated 4.50 p.m. on the 10th of November, at Moradabad.

COLONEL OLCOTT : According to the best of my recollection it must have been a quarter past four when Shankar Singh first appealed to me to heal the boys, that being 35 minutes before the actual date of the memorandum. The memorandum states that Mr. Damodar added, after repeating the message, which he had received from headquarters, that he had asked Madame Blavatsky to confirm the thing to me by sending a telegram repeating the message or its substance, either to himself or to Shankar Singh. The next morning the expected telegram arrived.

MR. STACK : That was on November 11th ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

(Colonel Olcott showed on the back of the Shankar Singh memorandum a certificate to that effect signed by nine witnesses. He then exhibited the original telegram, which ran as follows :—

“ Class D.P. Indian Telegraph.

Local No. 64,

To (station) Moradabad.

From (station) Adyar, Madras.

words	day	hour	minute
49	10	17	15

To (person) Damodar

From person,

K. Mablaular.

H. P. Blavatsky.

Care of Colonel H. S. Olcott,

President Theosophical Society.

Voice from shrine
says Henry can
try parties once
leaving strongly mesmerised
Cajipatti oil rub
three times daily
to relieve suffering
Karma cannot be
interfered with Damodar
heard voice telegram
sent at his
request.

Moradabad 1—11—83

B. Batley,
(Telegraph Master.)”

(On the back of the telegram was the following :—

“ Received at Moradabad, N.W.P., at 8.45 a.m., November 11th, 1883, in our presence.

H. S. Olcott.

W. T. Brown, F.T.S.

Bhavani Shankar, F.T.S.

Parsbottam Dass.

Ishripershad.

Boolakee Das.

Permaishwari Sahai, F.T.S.

Chandra Sekhara.

Shankar Singh.

TokeNarain Swamy Naidu.”)

MR. MYERS : What is the distance between the Adyar telegraph office and the headquarters ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Adyar is a suburb of Madras, and is about three-quarters of a mile—perhaps a trifle less—from headquarters.

MR. MYERS : You consider, then, that the 25 minutes would be fairly occupied in finding the messenger, sending that distance, and getting the message into the telegraph office ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes. You can imagine for yourself. Our place is in the middle of a property 21 acres in extent, and Madame Blavatsky had first to write the message, then find a messenger and despatch him. This man had to travel three-quarters of a mile, and foot travelling in India is never done very fast, because the Hindn messengers are an indolent lot, never hurrying themselves. Then the message had to be received, registered, and get its date 5.15, the Telegraph Bureau counting time from midnight to midnight.

MR. STACK : It was practically an immediate reply ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

MR. STACK : I perceive that the telegram is endorsed on the back as having been received at its destination at 8.45 the following morning.

COLONEL OLCOTT : That is accounted for by the fact that the message was a “delayed” night message. There are three classes of messages in India, of which the deferred is the cheapest. It goes at the half rate, and the Government send it at any time they choose during the night, and deliver it by the first postal delivery the next morning.

MR. MYERS : Of course, the important thing is the date. How many persons were witnesses of the receipt of the Damodar message at the other end ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I have heard from the lips of Madame Blavatsky and Major-General and Mrs. Morgan.

MR. MYERS : Were they present at the time ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I do not recollect ; I had so much to do then on my official tour that I did not make the particular inquiries I otherwise might.

MR. MYERS : You do not know whether Damodar was seen by Madame Blavatsky.

COLONEL OLCOTT : She told me that she had seen him. At the headquarters resides M. Alexis Coulomb, Librarian of the Society.* He was at the time of Damodar's alleged visit engaged at some work in the room adjoining the writing bureau, where Madame Blavatsky was. Suddenly he came into the room and asked Madame Blavatsky where Mr. Damodar was as he had heard his voice in conversation with her.

MR. MYERS : From whom did you hear this ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : From M. Coulomb himself. He said, "I have just heard his voice distinctly." Madame Blavatsky said, "He has not returned." M. Coulomb seemed surprised ; he thought Mr. Damodar had unexpectedly returned, and could hardly be persuaded that he had not been in the room talking to Madame Blavatsky.

MR. STACK : Was this before Madame Blavatsky was conscious of Mr. Damodar's presence ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : She meant simply that his physical body was not there.

MR. MYERS : We come now to the corroboration of this. We can apply to the addresses of the several gentlemen whose names are given as witnesses. Can we also apply to the telegraph people ?

MR. STACK : We can find out whether a copy of the message is to be obtained.

MR. MYERS : You can tell us, Colonel Olcott, whether you would necessarily know if Mr. Damodar himself went to the telegraph office ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : He was under my eyes continually. He scarcely ever went out alone during the whole of the tour through Northern India.

MR. MYERS : You do not think that he could have obtained a messenger and sent out a telegram without your knowledge ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : No. Impossible. As chief of the party there, everything went through my hands ; and the local committees looked to me as the authoritative head of the whole thing.

MR. MYERS : Had Damodar seen Shankar Singh before ?

* We feel bound to state that at the time when Colonel Olcott gave us this evidence, he was aware that Coulomb (who has since been dismissed from his post) had been charged with making trap-doors for trick manifestations. In saying this, however, we do not in the least mean to imply that Colonel Olcott had any wish to mislead us.

COLONEL OLCOTT : No.

MR. MYERS : And Shankar Singh was an independent gentleman, in the employ of the Government at Moradabad ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I cannot give you exactly his station now, though you can learn it from headquarters. He is a gentleman. He has the rank of Thakur, which I think will answer to the rank of Highland Chieftain.

MR. MYERS : You consider that complicity between him and Damodar was physically impossible ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, both on account of the circumstances and of the character of Mr. Damodar, who is one of the most honourable and loyal natures I ever encountered.

MR. MYERS : But even apart from that, you think that he had no opportunity of coming into contact with Shankar Singh ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Impossible. I will state circumstances which will show, perhaps, the little probability there was of any such conspiracy. Notice had been put into the *Theosophist* some months before that I was going to make such and such official tours throughout India, and that persons who had sick friends to be treated might, within certain hours on the second day of my visit to each station, bring them to me to be healed. Shankar Singh had written to me long before my coming to Moradabad, asking me to undertake the cure of these boys, and offering to bring them to Madras to me. I refused to see anybody there, but told him that he could bring the boys to me when I came to Moradabad, in the course of my tour ; and it was in pursuance of that authorisation that he came and importuned me so. He said, "Here is something that you are, in a way, pledged to undertake," and that is what made him so urgent.

MR. STACK : Now, what is Damodar's second case ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : The second case is one of a similar character. On the night of the 17th of November, 1883—to wit, seven days later—I was in the train on my way from Meerut, N.W.P., to Lahore. Two persons were in the carriage with me—Mr. Damodar, and another Hindu named Narain Swamy Naidu, who were asleep on their beds at either side of the saloon compartment. I myself was reading a book by the light of the lamp. Damodar had been moving upon his bed from time to time, showing that he was not physically asleep, as the other one was. Presently Damodar came to me and asked what time it was. I told him that it was a few minutes to 6 p.m. He said, "I have just been to headquarters"—meaning in the double—"and an accident has happened to Madame Blavatsky." I inquired if it was anything serious. He said that he could not tell me : but she had tripped her foot in the carpet, he thought, and fallen heavily upon her right knee.

MR. MYERS : Do we understand that Damodar intentionally went to Madame Blavatsky's presence, then ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : No, he went to his Master's residence for the purpose of consulting him about something.

MR. MYERS : You speak of "his Master's residence." I thought that the residence of his Master was in the Himalayas ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Oh, he went there ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, he went there in the double. In the subjective or invisible side of nature, time and space are not appreciable. Finding his Master not at home, he followed him to Adyar, about 3,000 miles. Adyar, as I have already explained, is a suburb of Madras city, where the headquarters of the Theosophical Society are established.

MR. MYERS : Damodar went to Adyar, still wishing to find his Master ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, and while there he saw this accident.

MR. MYERS : Did he find his Master there ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : The Master had some business with Madame Blavatsky, and was there in the double. I thereupon tore a piece of paper out of some book, and on the spot made a memorandum, which was signed by myself and the second Hindu. (Colonel Olcott here exhibited the original memorandum marked D, and given at p. 55.) The next station reached by the train was Saharanpur, where a halt of half-an-hour for supper occurred. I went directly to the Telegraph Office, and sent a despatch to Madame Blavatsky as near as I can remember in the following words : "What accident happened at headquarters at about 6 o'clock ? Answer to Lahore." I now exhibit the Government receipt for that despatch (marked E, and given at p. 56). The next morning, on arriving at Lahore, I was taken to a camp which had been pitched for me on the plain just outside the northern wall of Lahore city. Finding on inquiry that no telegram had come for me, I showed the memorandum D to a number of gentlemen, and on the back got them to sign the following certificate :—"Lahore, November 18th, 1883, 9.30 a.m. The within memorandum shown to us now. Up to this time no telegraphic or other news of the accident has been received." While my party was absent from camp at breakfast, and I sat alone with a certain Mr. Ruttan Chand Bary, editor of the *Arya* magazine, he noticed the approach of a Government telegraph messenger, and I then volunteered to put into his hands, unopened, every telegram that might arrive for me until the one I expected from Madame Blavatsky should be received. Accordingly, the message delivered at that moment by the messenger was put into his custody until the return of the party from breakfast, when I preferred that it should be opened in the presence of

a number of witnesses. Upon their return it was opened, as will be seen by the following endorsement, which I now produce :—

“The within telegram, opened in our presence by Mr. R. C. Bary at 12 a.m. on the 18th of November, 1883.—Signed,

RAM CHURN.
DASS MALL.
RUTTAN CHAND BARY.
H. S. OLCOTT.
POKE NARAIN SWAMY NAIDEE.
GOPINATH.
JOWALA PERSHAD.”
And two others whose names are undecipherable.

MR. MYERS : Of course the important thing here again is the date of the despatch.

COLONEL OLCOTT : It is dated the 18th of November, 1883, at 7.55 in the morning. It is marked H, and is as follows :—

“Class P. Indian Telegraph. Local No. 985.

To (station) Lahore. From (station) Adyar, Madras.

Words	day	hour	minute
27	18	7	55

To (person) Colonel H. S. Olcott,
President Theosophical Society.

From (person)
H. P. Blavatsky.

Nearly broke right leg, tumbling from Bishop's chair, dragging Coulomb, frightening Morgans. Damodoss startled us.

Lahore, 18th of November, 1883.

J. U. .

Telegraph Master.”

MR. MYERS : I observe that this telegram is dated 7.55 on the morning of the 18th of November. Whereas yours was sent to headquarters on the evening of the 17th. Can you explain the delay ?*

COLONEL OLCOTT : The distance I should judge to be about 2,500 miles. The telegraph office at Adyar closes, I think, at 7 o'clock ; consequently, it would be received there only on the opening of the office in the morning.

MR. MYERS : When did you send off your telegram ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : It is dated 6 o'clock. The railway time-tables will show at what time our train arrived at Saharanpur station.

* Colonel Olcott's telegram was received by me about one o'clock a.m. that night, when I was in bed, and the whole house asleep. It is easy to verify the hour when it was received at, and sent by, the telegraph master to Adyar. I was not going to get up to write an answer in the night.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

MR. STACK : Damodar thought that Madame Blavatsky had tripped her foot in the carpet, whereas, in fact, she had fallen from a chair.

COLONEL OLCOTT : These details could be easily got.

MR. STACK : There is a difference between the two, and what strikes one naturally is, that if there had been an agreement to tell the story there would have been no difference.

COLONEL OLCOTT : Moreover, the presence of General and Mrs. Morgan at headquarters is confirmed by this telegram, and before that we travellers had no knowledge of their having come down from the Nilgiris.*

MR. MYERS : In your message you are sure that you gave no indication that Damodar had mentioned the Morgans as being present with Madame Blavatsky at the time ? †

COLONEL OLCOTT : Quite so. I refer you simply to my message as dictated to you from memory. It will not be found to differ from the actual message, except, perhaps, in some unimportant details. If you have influence with the Government, you can get a sight of the actual message in my own handwriting, and you will then be able to see what my telegram was.

MR. MYERS : It appears to be meant by the reply telegram that Damodar had actually appeared in visible form, for it says, "Damodoss,"—meaning, I presume, Damodar—"startled us." Was that his voice or his form ? ‡

COLONEL OLCOTT : I cannot tell you. Madame Blavatsky having herself vividly seen Damodar, might have, in writing the telegram in a hurry, supposed that others present saw him. But you can verify that fact by simply writing to the other witnesses whose names and addresses I will give you :—Major General H. R. Morgan, Ootacamund, and M. Coulomb, Adyar, Madras.

MR. MYERS : Are there any other persons, who are not adepts, with regard to whom you can give us evidence of the projection of the double ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I have seen Madame Blavatsky at a place 100 miles away from where I knew her body to be at the time.

MR. MYERS : Was anybody else present, or were you alone ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : It was in one of the public streets of New York.

* They had just arrived from Nilgherry Hills.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

† Let the original message from Colonel Olcott be read at the telegraph office. There was a time covering two years that the Government of India read all the messages to and from me. Cannot that which is done for purposes of police spying be now done for science ?—H.P.B.

‡ I heard his voice only ; but Madame Coulomb saw his form and screamed out his name, letting the chair go that she was holding while I stood on it, cleaning Master's portrait in the shrine. It was the chair that was unsteady on the thick carpet and, therefore, made me lose my balance.—H.P.B.

MR. STACK : Are we to understand that when a double appears it is as tangible as an ordinary body ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Not necessarily or ordinarily, but the sensation of solidity can be given at will, if the double is that of an adept and he wishes to make that impression upon your mind.

MR. STACK : Then there have been cases where the double has given the sensation of touch to the person to whom he appeared ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

MR. STACK : Have you yourself ever actually touched a double ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, but of a Mahatma.

MR. STACK : Not of an ordinary person ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : No.

MR. STACK : As to the projection of the doubles of such Mahatmas as have also been seen in the flesh, can you testify to the two parts of that—that you knew the Mahatma as an ordinary man and on other occasions have seen his double ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I can.

MR. MYERS : In the case of one or two Mahatmas ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I could name two cases where I have encountered the person both in the physical body and in the astral body. There are also a number of instances in my experience where I have seen the person in the astral body but not in the physical, and in the physical but not in the astral ; but in two cases I can state that I have known the person in both capacities.

MR. STACK : You need not mention all, but mention the two instances close together in which you saw a man in the flesh, and a short time afterwards saw him in the astral body, and under what circumstances ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : In both cases I saw them in the astral body first.

MR. MYERS : Will you mention, first, the circumstances of the apparition ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : The first case I will mention is the case already reported in the pamphlet called "Hints on Esoteric Theosophy—No. 1," to which I refer you. (See Appendix XV.) In that instance the person was my Teacher, whose photograph lies on the table here ; and I now exhibit the turban which he took off his head, when I demanded of him some tangible proof of his visit. (Turban produced.)

MR. MYERS : With regard to that visit as narrated, I wish to ask whether you have a precise recollection as to the condition of the door, whether it was shut or locked ? I wish to see on what ground you think it impossible that this was a living Hindu who left the apartment by ordinary means.

COLONEL OLCOTT : In the first place, I never saw a living Hindu

before I arrived in London on my way to India. I had had no correspondence with anybody until then, and had no knowledge of any living Hindu who could have visited me in America.

MR. MYERS : Of course, the idea of the apparition would be that it was somebody paid by Madame Blavatsky.*

COLONEL OLCOTT : The answer to that is that the man who visited me was instantly recognised by me from a portrait which I had in my possession—the portrait which you see there.

MR. MYERS : But that portrait was formed under the direction, to a certain extent, of Madame Blavatsky?

COLONEL OLCOTT : She was present, as well as myself, in the room while it was being drawn, but she gave no instructions as to how it should be drawn.

MR. MYERS : Was the Hindu you saw in New York indisputably the same as you subsequently saw in India?

COLONEL OLCOTT : The same.

MR. MYERS : And whom you saw in the astral body?

COLONEL OLCOTT : The same.

MR. STACK : He suddenly appeared?

COLONEL OLCOTT : He appeared when I was in my room before retiring at night. As it was my custom to lock my door, I presume that my door was locked at that time. I know that the door was not opened, for I sat in such a way reading that the door could not be opened without immediately attracting my notice.

MR. MYERS : In the description which you gave you said that the door had made no noise in opening if it had been opened. Do you consider it possible that it may have been open? Or do I understand that you now deny that?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I used that expression so as to leave the widest possible latitude for any theory of that kind. My own conviction is—in fact, I should be willing to affirm most positively—that the door did not open and that the appearance and disappearance of my visitor occurred without using the means of ingress or exit.

MR. STACK : In fact, you were in the habit of locking your door every night then?

COLONEL OLCOTT : And then we were in an “apartment house,” where the exterior door of the suite of chambers was closed with a spring latch. Of course, everyone, in such a case, invariably locks his own door leading into the outer passage; so that a person, to get in, would have to ring the bell.

* Madame Blavatsky having renounced her own fortune, her prospects of fortune as well as position—for the Cause of Truth—never had money enough to bribe a beggar.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

MR. MYERS : Then you conceive that there were probably two locked doors ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Although you knew that that was a needless precaution ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Not so, because in New York houses burglars get in by windows and various ways.

MR. MYERS : Who lived in your suite of apartments besides yourself ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : That was the headquarters of the Society, and Madame Blavatsky and I lived there ; and during the greater part of the time there were lady or gentlemen members of the Society stopping with us as visitors. Whether there were actually visitors in the house or not at the time I cannot remember.

MR. STACK : Judging from your expression as to his materialising his turban, your impression is that the Hindu who presented himself to you was not material ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : It would hardly be fair to say that, because I do not believe that there can be any appearance, either phantasmal or other, without the presence of matter. It would be better to say that he was in the state of an etherealised body.

MR. STACK : The question is, is it a tangible body ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : It is but faintly tangible, unless there is some special condensation of it by the will of the Mahatma.

MR. STACK : At his will he could make it tangible or intangible ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, as well as in the case of so-called "materialised spirits," of which I have seen more than 500 in my time, at the Eddy Homestead. In that case the phantoms were sufficiently ponderable to be weighed in a weighing machine.

MR. MYERS : But Mr. Stack's question was directed to this, whether you conceive that the rest of the phantom which appeared to you in New York was of equal solidity with the turban ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : The phantom man had a phantom turban on his head, and he fully materialised the turban only by drawing to it through the current—electric, odic, astral, ethereal, or whatever you please—which is constantly running between the projected phantasm and the body, all the residual coarser atoms of the head cloth upon the solid body left behind.

MR. MYERS : How tall was the Hindu who appeared to you in New York ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : He was a model of physical beauty, about 6ft. 6in. or 7in. in height, and symmetrically proportioned.

MR. MYERS : That is a very unusual height, and is in itself a tolerable identification.

COLONEL OLCOTT : Great stature is not so rare among the Rajpoots.

MR. MYERS : I presume that you were impressed by his height in New York ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Have you seen other Hindus of that height ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : No ; I have seen very tall Hindus, for I have been through the Rajpoot country ; but taking him all in all, he was the most majestic human figure I ever laid my eyes upon.

MR. STACK : Are there any cases where you and another saw the double at the same time ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : You will find in " Hints on Esoteric Theosophy " a number of instances of such apparitions. I am personally acquainted with all the witnesses, and I believe them to be, without exception, men worthy of perfect credence.

MR. MYERS : Were you yourself among the groups in several instances ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I was.

MR. MYERS : But in instances other than those recorded in the pamphlet ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : At various times, when I have been addressing public audiences, I have seen one or more of these Mahatmas in the audience, and other persons present have seen them.

MR. STACK : When the other persons present see them, is the perception similar to that reported of clairvoyants, that they have a special power ? or is it that the Mahatmas make themselves visible to certain persons and not to others ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Speaking of appearances of that kind in a large audience, it would be impossible for me to say how many persons saw them. My own opinion is that the perception was absolutely of the ordinary kind, and not clairvoyant, although in some cases I know of clairvoyant perception of Mahatmas having been had without other persons present seeing them.

MR. MYERS : When one of the Mahatmas appeared at the Theosophical Society's London meeting the other day he was very visible to some few persons and not at all to others.

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes. To four persons only.

MR. MYERS : We want now an account of seeing your Teacher in the flesh.

COLONEL OLCOTT : One day at Bombay I was at work in my office when a Hindu servant came and told me that a gentleman wanted to see me in Madame Blavatsky's bungalow—a separate house within the same enclosure as the main building. This was one day in 1879. I went and found alone there my Teacher. Madame Blavatsky was then engaged in animated conversation with other persons in the other

bungalow. The interview between the Teacher and myself lasted perhaps 10 minutes, and it related to matters of a private nature with respect to myself and certain current events in the history of the Society. (See Appendix X.)

MR. MYERS : How do you know that your Teacher was in actual flesh and blood on that occasion ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : He put his hand upon my head, and his hand was perfectly substantial ; and he had altogether the appearance of an ordinary living person. When he walked about the floor there was noise of his footsteps, which is not the case with the double or phantasm.

MR. MYERS : Do you conceive that he had travelled to Bombay in the ordinary way ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : He was then stopping at a bungalow, not far from Bombay, belonging to a person connected with this brotherhood of the Mahatmas, and used by Mahatmas who may be passing through Bombay on business connected with their order. He came to our place on horseback.

MR. STACK : Was he on that occasion dressed the same as in New York ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes. They wear ordinarily, when away from Thibet, a dress of white cotton—in fact, that is the common dress of Hindus.

MR. MYERS : Was that the only occasion on which you have seen him in the flesh ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : No ; I have seen him at other times.

MR. MYERS : Have you seen him three or four times in the flesh ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, more than that, but not under circumstances where it would be evidence to others.

MR. MYERS : And about how many times in the astral body ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Oh, at least 15 or 20 times.

MR. MYERS : And his appearance on all those occasions has been quite unmistakable ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : As unmistakable as the appearance of either of you gentlemen.

MR. MYERS : Generally, when you have seen him in the astral body you have been alone ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Not always. I have seen him in the presence of other people. But the others, except in the instances recorded in the pamphlet, have not seen him at the same time, and therefore my testimony would have to stand without corroboration.

MR. STACK : Has he appeared in the flesh to more than one person at a time ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : No ; save to the servant and myself at Bombay.

MR. STACK : He never attended a meeting of your Society, or anything in that way, in the flesh ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : No. There are reasons why that should be so, because a man who has developed himself into the state of a Mahatma is peculiarly sensitive to what you call the mesmeric influence of all persons with whom he comes into contact. It is a fact that every human being is giving out an influence which is perfectly perceptible and recognisable, not only by Mahatmas, but by many sensitive persons among you who are not able at all to define their sensation in any way. The old lines—

“ I do not like you, Dr. Fell,
The reason why I cannot tell,
Only this I know full well,
I do *not* like you, Dr. Fell ”—

indicate a case in point. These attractions and repulsions we all feel, and the whole theory of the mesmeric healing of the sick rests upon the fact that a certain influence can be imparted from one person to another. Therefore, these men cannot exist in the atmosphere of ordinary society, without taking special precautions, any more than a diver can go to the bottom of the water except with his diving-dress and a communication with the upper air.

MR. STACK : State, if you please, the other instances of your meeting a Mahatma in the physical body.

COLONEL OLCOTT : I have seen Mahatma Koot Hoomi in the body. While at Lahore I received from the Mahatma Koot Hoomi, through one of his associates—a former pupil—an intimation that he would visit me in the body. On the second night of my stay, I was awakened while asleep in my tent by someone putting his hands upon me. In the instant of awaking, having a vague impression that this might be an intruder, I seized him with both hands, at the same time asking him in Hindustanee who he was. He replied, “ Do you not remember me ? ” The tone of the voice immediately recalled the Mahatma Koot Hoomi, and it then flashed across my memory that I was to have been visited by him. In the next moment I was in full consciousness, and let go my hold of him, slipping my hands down the whole length of his arms to his hands, having first caught him by the shoulders. So I felt the substance of his arms all the way down. A brief colloquy ensued, and he then, as I lay in bed, took my left hand, and placing the fingers of his right hand into contact with my palm, I felt growing up, as it were, some substance underneath his fingers. In another moment he closed my hands upon this substance, said something more to me, bade me “ Good-night,” and went out of the tent. I then got up, and, going to the light burning in the tent, found that what he had left me was a small package enveloped in Chinese silk. On opening the package, I found within a letter in a

Chinese envelope to my address. (Colonel Olcott here exhibited the package.) The note is of a personal character, and need not be printed ; but I will allow you gentlemen to read it. The handwriting of the communication is identical with that of the many communications received at various times by Mr. A. P. Sinnett and many other persons.

MR. MYERS : This letter was received without the intervention of Madame Blavatsky ? *

COLONEL OLCOTT : Madame Blavatsky was at Madras at that time, a distance of perhaps 2,500 or 3,000 miles.†

MR. MYERS : The light in the tent was sufficient to allow you to distinctly recognise the features of your visitor ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Whom you had seen in the astral body ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, and whose portrait, phenomenally produced for Mr. Sinnett, by Madame Blavatsky at Allahabad, would give any one an accurate idea of his personal appearance. I am prepared to affirm that his hand was absolutely empty when he placed it in my palm, and that this packet was formed—or, to use a current phrase, materialised—upon my own hand.

MR. MYERS : Of course, people would say that conjurers would slip these things down their sleeves.

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, but that was not possible in this case. The sleeves worn by Asiatic people are very large and flowing, not tight like ours. It is important that I should mention that this communication contains a prophecy of the death of two public characters in India, who did actually die.

MR. MYERS : We can extract a passage from the letter ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : You may if you like.

MR. STACK : Are there any other instances in the experience of the Society of letters having been transmitted, say, from Europe to India, or from India to Europe—actual letters, not mere impressions ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Well, the other day, when coming from Paris to London, *via* Calais, I was in the railway carriage with Mr. Mohini, a Brahmin gentleman, now in Paris. I was reading a passage in a letter from a London gentleman to myself, which spoke of Mahatmas under their Chinese designation ; and at that instant a letter, exactly similar to the other as regards the envelope, dropped from the ceiling of the

* Why not write and ask St. G. Lane Fox, now at Adyar, Dr. Hartmann, Mr. Brown, and others ? Do they or do they not receive letters in the same handwriting ?—H. P. B.

† Madame Blavatsky is now here in Paris, and at Adyar, Madras, people go on receiving letters and answers from Mahatma K.H. in his own handwriting. The Board of Trustees having come to a wrong and very sudden decision, a letter was received from the Mahatma chiding them.—H. P. B.

carriage. Here is the letter (showing it), but it is too private to be put into the record *verbatim*.

MR. STACK : Were you and Mr. Mohini alone in the carriage ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

MR. STACK : Were the windows closed ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, but that is not material, because it was an express train going at high speed.

MR. STACK : You suppose that Mahatma Koot Hoomi sent that letter direct from India to the railway carriage ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, considering that he was in India or somewhere in Asia, and I was in the train in France.

(The letter, which was privately read by Mr. Stack and Mr. Myers, was found to contain distinct allusion to a conversation between the writer, Koot Hoomi, and Colonel Olcott at Lahore, explained to be a conversation on the night subsequent to the one already referred to, when the materialised letter was put into Colonel Olcott's hand. On this second occasion, Colonel Olcott explained, the interview was of about half-an-hour's duration, Mahatma Koot Hoomi being in the flesh.)

MR. STACK : What is the explanation of the Theosophical Society as to the power of Mahatmas to transmit letters instantaneously from India to Europe in this way ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : As Mahatmas do not work by miracle, but strictly according to natural law, it is necessary for them to have at this end of the line some person with whom they can establish a direct astral current. A medium of a certain sort would furnish that requirement if none other person were available.

MR. MYERS : Could they send a letter to you or Mr Mohini in the same way, not only in a railway carriage but at a meeting of the Society for Psychical Research ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : That I could not answer. I should think it doubtful ; for just as the attraction of the masts of an iron steamship will cause the needle to deflect, and require a certain circle of magnets around it so as to neutralise the effects of the iron, so without favouring polaric conditions a phenomena of this kind could not occur in the presence of persons not already in relation with Mahatmas, especially where the parties may be unfamiliar with the laws of psychic attraction and repulsion, and be prejudiced by their education against them to such an extent as to have rendered their "psychic aura" positively repellent.

MR. MYERS : You need not dwell upon that. We understand that difficulty. But we are asking whether it could not be done in the presence of this Committee ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I stated that I could not answer. It could not be done by me, because my training has not gone to that length that I could furnish perfect means of communication.

MR. MYERS : Mr. Mohini would need to be there ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Mr. Mohini and myself might not furnish the attraction, but if it were a question of Madame Blavatsky I would say distinctly yes. If her health was in a proper condition, she could produce something of that kind here just as well as in New York, at Simla, Madras, Odessa or elsewhere, as she has in the past.

MR. MYERS : Will you try to persuade her to do so ;* not in the presence of a large and hostile audience, but simply for the satisfaction of the Committee, to whom you have offered the investigation ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I will second any application made by the Committee to Madame Blavatsky.

MR. STACK : I think, Mr. Myers, you are asking for conditions that are not necessary. It would be perfectly possible for a Mahatma to communicate with a person alone in India, most confidentially ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : If you look at "Hints on Esoteric Theosophy" you will find there a certificate by Professor J. Smith, of Sydney University, to the effect that he opened three letters from three distant points, all delivered simultaneously on a certain day by a carrier, and that he found, in each of these, writing in the handwriting of my Teacher. (See Appendix XXVI.)

MR. STACK : To have the official stamp of the Bombay Post Office and the official stamp of the London Post Office of the same date on one letter is, of course, impossible by ordinary means, but according to the power of the Mahatmas it is possible. Why should not a Mahatma achieve a phenomena, which is so easy for him, and which would be so satisfactory to us ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : In one of the certificates in the pamphlet I have alluded to, it is stated that a letter was delivered at Bombay bearing the post-mark of Allahabad of the same date, the two places being about 1,000 miles apart. (See Appendix XXVIII.) What has been done once may be done again if the conditions are favourable, and the Mahatmas are pleased to exercise their powers.

The Committee then separated.

*No one could persuade me to do so, unless Master commanded me to sacrifice myself once more.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Notes and remarks on the Psychical Research Society's Meeting on May 11th, 1884.

N.B.—The shorthand writer's report was sent to Colonel Olcott to revise, and Madame Blavatsky added a few notes.

I. (See p. 2 of MS.) Why not get information about Damodar's affair from the proper authorities at Bombay. His *voluntary* renouncement of all his fortune is on record. His family is known as well as his antecedents. A man does not renounce wealth, family ties, all in this world, for the pleasure of becoming the partner of a *swindling* society, and in four years he had time to find out whether the Mahatmas, Society, Founders and all are one big fraud.

II. (From p. 2 to 14.) Why not write to some trustworthy, unprejudiced person in India to examine all those telegrams, original messages, and even search in the Records of those dates other telegrams from Damodar and myself. I give full permission to do so. I shall be very glad—as glad as in the case of Mahatma K.H.'s telegram from Jhelum—to give an opportunity to finally settle all such questions of *conspiracy*—for, indeed, it does become rather monotonous.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

On p. 26 of MS., it is not mentioned by Colonel Olcott that at the time he saw Master's *double*, his own sister, Mrs. Mitchell, was living there. And he also forgot to say that several persons at Gringauum saw the horse of the Mahatma and himself when he left on another evening.—H.P.B.

Copies of documents referred to in Colonel Olcott's evidence, but not given in their order there.

B.

PSYCHIC TELEGRAM.*

Received by D.K.M. and delivered to Colonel Olcott at Moradabad at 4.50 p.m., 10th November, 1883.

"Henry can try the parties once, leaving strongly mesmerised. Cajapati oil to rub in three times daily to relieve sufferers. Karma cannot be interfered with."

D.K.M. at the same time told us that he had received this message through the shrine at Adyar (headquarters) a few moments before, he having gone there in the Sukshma Sharira at the request of Shankar Singh to ask whether Colonel Olcott would be permitted to treat mesmerically two children in whom Shankar Singh was interested. He said that he had also asked Madame Blavatsky to give Colonel Olcott a confirmation of his visit, and the order received through the shrine

* See *Theosophist*, No. 51, p. 88.

from Colonel Olcott's Gura by sending a telegram to him, D.K.M. or Shankar Singh, repeating its substance or literal words,

SHANKAR SINGH.
BHAVANI SANKAR.
W. T. BROWN.
PURMESHRI DASS.
PARSHOTHAM DASS.
ISHRI PRASAD.
NARCOTTAM DASS.
L. V. V. NAIDU.
CHIRANJEE LALL.
H. S. OLCOTT.
TOKE NARAINASWAMY NAIDU.
PRAN NATH PANDIT.

The telegram mentioned by D.K.M. has just been received (8.45 a.m., November 11th) as a deferred or night message of 34 words, in which the above exact words are repeated. Madame Blavatsky says, "Voice from shrine" spoke the words, and adds that D.K.M. heard the voice, and the telegram is sent at his request.

ISHRI PRASAD.
W. T. BROWN, F.T.S.
H. S. OLCOTT.
BHAVANI SANKAR.
PURASHOTHAM DASS.
CHANDRA SEKHARA.
TOKE NARAINASWAMY NAIDU.
L. VENKATA VARADARAJULU NAIDU.
SHANKAR SINGH.

D.

In train at Nagul Station, S.P. and D. Railway, at 5.55 p.m., 17/11/83. D. K. M. says he has just been (in Sukshina Sarira) to headquarters. H. P. B. has just tripped in carpet and hurt right knee.* Had just taken K. H.'s portrait from shrine. Heard her mention names of General and Mrs. Morgan. Thinks they are there. Saw nobody but H. P. B., but *felt* several others.

H. S. O.
TOKE MARAINA SAWNEY NAIDA.

F.

On the back of the last paper, and marked F., is the following :—

"Lahore, 19/11/83, 9.30 a.m. The within memorandum shown to us now. Up to this time no telegraphic or other news of the accident has been received.

GOPINATH.
GOVIND SAHAY.

Shown to us at 11.15. News not yet known.

RUTTUN CHAND BARY.
RAM CHUND BARY.
DASS MULL."

* From which she is suffering to this day, the bruise having become a dangerous inner wound under the knee-cap, as two French surgeons can testify.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

E.

S.P.L. No. 1 Tele.

L.S.C. No. 16 Tele.

Voucher for Sender.

	No. 54.	
Class	No.	Station to
P	82	Adyar
		Ordinary private.
		Rs As
9 words		1 2
		<hr/>
		1 2
		<hr/>
(Signature)	Saw Doss.	
Station	S. Pur	Date 17/11/83.
		Rupees one and annas two only."

G.

(This appears on the back of the telegram—marked H., and given in report of the conversation—from Madame Blavatsky to Colonel Olcott, and stating :—

"Nearly broke right leg, tumbling from bishop's chair, dragging Coulomb, frightening Morgans. Damadass startled us).

"The within telegram opened in our presence by Mr. R. C. Bary, at 12m. on the 18/11/83.

RAM CHURN.	
DASS MALL.	JOWALA PERSHAD,"
RUTLAN CHAND BARY,	and two others.
H. S. OLCOTT.	
TOKE MARAIN SAWMY NAIDA.	
GOPINATH.	

Meeting on May 27th, 1884.

Present : J. HERBERT STACK, Esq.,
 EDMUND GURNEY, Esq.,
 FRANK PODMORE, Esq.,
 F. W. H. MYERS, Esq.,
 AND
 COLONEL H. S. OLCOTT.

MR. GURNEY : Let us begin our examination to-day with the subject of handwriting phenomenally conveyed in closed letters or telegrams and brought through the ordinary post.

* * * *

COLONEL OLCOTT : Cases of writing inside of enclosed letters, and of the substitution of another letter inside of a closed envelope, for the writer's letter, which has been abstracted without any destruction of the envelope, have occurred even since we left India.

MR. STACK : How are letters in India usually fastened up ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : With adhesive envelopes.

MR. STACK : Not with wax ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Oh, wax is sometimes used.

MR. STACK : I thought that wax did not suit in India ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : It does not, but it is the case that registered letters are always sealed in five places. You will remember that in the statement by Professor Smith, in the letter which I showed you and Mr. Crookes, he there says that a letter addressed by him to this same Mahatma, and sent enclosed in a letter to Madame Blavatsky, and which was sewed through and through many times, with silk of different colours, had been removed, and another paper substituted inside without the threads having been broken. That has not been published,* but I can give you, if you wish it, a copy of the letter from Professor Smith, who is Professor of Chemistry and of Applied Science at Sydney University.

MR. STACK : You might, if possible, select some strong case, which can be corroborated by two witnesses, of a letter having been abnormally delivered through the air or in any other way.

COLONEL OLCOTT : I think I mentioned to you at my last examination about the letter which was delivered to me in the railway carriage while I was on my way from Paris to London, *viâ* Calais. There is Mr. Mohini to corroborate that. Then there is the letter which Professor Smith tells about in "Hints on Esoteric Theosophy." I will mention one more case out of a great many that occur to my mind. In the year 1882, Madame Blavatsky and I were the guests of the Hon. Maharajah Sir Jolindra Moham Tagore, a member of the Vice-Regal Council at Calcutta. On the occasion I am now about to refer to, there were present, besides Madame Blavatsky and myself, Baboo Norendra Nath Sen, editor of the *Indian Mirror*, and one of the best known of native publicists ; Baboo Mohini, and the late Baboo Peary Chand Mittra, a Bengalee writer and philosopher. A question arose as to the time of my departure from Calcutta. I had arranged a certain date, but was importuned to postpone it. I replied that I had received no instructions from my own Guru to the contrary, and should certainly adhere to my programme. We were sitting in a small room, separated from a larger one by a wooden screen partition, perhaps 8ft. in height, with a door

*Since the report of this examination was submitted to me for review, I have learned that this circumstance has been published in a recent edition of Mr. Hume's "Hints on Esoteric Theosophy."—H. S. O.

in it. Madame Blavatsky requested Mohini to look outside the screen, to see if anyone was in the room. He did so, and reported that there was no one upon that floor. No sooner had he taken his seat again in our group than, with a whizzing sound, a letter darted almost horizontally across the room from a point just above where the wooden screen was morticed into the wall of the building, and fell at our feet. On its being opened it was found to contain a distinct order from my Guru that I should stop at Calcutta,* as requested. All the people who were present can corroborate my statement.

MR. STACK : All saw the letter ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

MR. STACK : Is Baboo Norendra a Theosophist ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : He is now.

MR. GURNEY : Was he then ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I think not. He is one of the best known men in India.

MR. PODMORE : Did the letter seem to come from the wall ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : It appeared to me so. I saw the letter as it was in projection.

MR. PODMORE : Do you think that Madame Blavatsky knew it was coming ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Certainly. Whenever anything is coming she feels the power, just as whenever there is a thunderstorm she can feel a change in her system. I can tell you another case where there were more than a dozen witnesses. The Council of the Theosophical Society, or at least those members of it who were within easy reach of Bombay, had met at the Bombay headquarters, I think in the year 1882, and were discussing a certain matter in a room in one of the three bungalows which constituted our headquarters. This room had no hangings; there was nothing about to interfere with a full sight of the whole place—the walls and the ceiling. A question came up as to whether it was the pleasure of the Mahatmas that a certain recommended course of action should be taken by the Council, and a gentleman named J. S. Gadgill, judge of the Varishta Court of Baroda State, and a man of the highest character, remarked that he thought that if the Mahatmas really wished the thing done now would be the opportunity for them to signify it by some means. One of those present suddenly called attention to a collection of vapour that had that instant appeared in the air up towards the corner of the room; and all present, looking, saw this take the form of a letter, which fell upon a spot not beneath perpendicularly, but, if I remember

* The whole circumstance was published in the *Indian Mirror*, about that date, April, 1882, and I refer the curious to it for corroboration of the facts.
—H. S. O.

aright, obliquely. The document was addressed, I think, generally to the members of the Council, and on being opened it was found to contain a message, in the handwriting of my Guru and signed with his cryptograph, stating that it was his desire that the proposed measure should be adopted. Judge Gadgill, and one or two others, knowing that they had to deal with some very difficult sceptics at Baroda, who would demand if they had taken the precaution to examine the premises and see if the letter could have been delivered by any mechanical device, thereupon made a search of the place, and even got a ladder and went upon the tiled roof. He will tell you that the examination made then, and a subsequent and more careful one, which was made in my own presence and with my assistance—for I held the ladder—left no ground for suspicion of bad faith. Another class of very striking phenomena is that which occurs in the hanging cabinet at headquarters called the Shrine, where letters are written by parties addressed to the Mahatmas, put into a silver bowl which is inside the cabinet, and on the door being closed and re-opened, sometimes instantaneously, the letter deposited is found to have disappeared and the answer to it to have taken its place.

MR. GURNEY : That you have seen ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, again and again. It has been seen by many persons at headquarters, and even since we have left India.

MR. GURNEY : That has happened without Madame Blavatsky's presence ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : It has happened since we have been in Europe many times.

MR. GURNEY : For that there are many witnesses ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

MR. GURNEY : How many—about ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Forty, I should think.

MR. PODMORE : You say that the answer sometimes appears almost immediately ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes. Sometimes the answer comes in the man's, own envelope. The name of the Mahatma is erased from the envelopes and the name of the party asking the question is substituted for it. Sometimes when he opens the letter he finds that his has departed and another taken its place.

MR. PODMORE : Are the answers of great length ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Sometimes. At one time when an experiment was made it took the man 20 minutes to write the reply addressed to him.

MR. PODMORE : And within what interval did the answer come ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Instantaneously.

* * * *

MR. GURNEY : Now let us turn to the precipitation of handwriting.

COLONEL OLCOTT : There was a case that occurred in a native Indian State, in the presence of the judge of the court previously mentioned, and the Assistant Prime Minister, and I myself saw a portion of the phenomenon. Madame Blavatsky had told these gentlemen, in a discussion on the conservation of energy and the correlation of forces, that there is no more waste of once evolved intellectual energy than there is of matter; that the akasa is a perpetual storehouse of ideas, as well as of images of once-existing forms; and that a person who knows occult dynamics can bring out of the akasa, not only the sounds of spoken language, but also the symbols of writing. As they asked for an illustration, and she was then in a proper state of health, she took a sheet of notepaper, and asked them to observe it well, so that they would know it again. She then requested them to select some person who was least of all likely to have been in correspondence with her or myself. They named a gentleman who was known to have a bitter hostility to us and our Society, and whom we only knew by name. She then stepped to the centre of the room, and asked the two witnesses to turn her slowly about until she should face in that direction of the compass where this gentleman had passed most of his time. When they had done so, she asked them to retire from her so far as the door of the room. At that moment I came upstairs, and they told me what was going on. A minute had scarcely elapsed before she came towards us, holding the sheet of notepaper in her hand, and laughing. The Hindu gentlemen seemed very greatly surprised on reading its contents, for, although in the very handwriting of the party named by them, it was a friendly note to myself, humorously apologising for his unwarranted hostility to us and our cause. Both these gentlemen assured me that it was the very writing of the person named. The name I will give you, though not for publication.

MR. PODMORE : Do you think that the matter of that letter came from Madame Blavatsky's brain?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Entirely.

MR. PODMORE : She had never seen the handwriting before?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Never. That gives you a curious idea of what the resources of this occult science are.

MR. MYERS : Do I understand that there was a case of the precipitation of a picture by Madame Blavatsky in New York, which was afterwards recognised as being of somebody the artist had never seen?

COLONEL OLCOTT : There was a portrait drawn by a gentleman who had never seen a Hindu, but who had some artistic talent, and was asked to sit down and make a drawing of an ideal Hindu head. The materials were not in the house, and as there was a shop close by I

went out myself and got some paper and crayons. . . . When I had returned with the paper the gentleman sat down and went to work. Madame Blavatsky and I engaged in conversation. The gentleman worked quietly on, and at last produced a picture of which I have shown you a photograph. That, although not a drawing of high class, is a striking portrait of my Guru.

MR. MYERS : As you can vouch from personal knowledge, I suppose ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : And also from the corroborative testimony of several people who know him personally, and who have seen this portrait. Persons have actually recognised him after they have seen the portrait, by the portrait.

MR. MYERS : Can you tell us of any who have done so ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Damodar is one, and Ramaswamier another.

MR. MYERS : Those persons recognised him ? On what occasion ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : The case of Ramaswamier was a beautiful one of cumulative identification. First, he saw the portrait, which hangs in my room, at headquarters. Next, he saw the Mahatma in the double, by moonlight, on a balcony at the Bombay headquarters. (See Appendix XIII.) Finally, he met him in the flesh at Sikkim, at about noonday, held a long conversation with him about the Theosophical Society, and received from him various messages to individuals. (See Appendix XI.) He was also instructed to give me a certain password, which had been agreed upon between himself and myself, to be used for the purpose of identifying any communication alleged to come from him.

MR. MYERS : Have you since found the password to have been used by the Guru ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Who is the artist who took this portrait in New York ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : He is a private gentleman, whose name I do not wish to bring into this matter. There is a power about the portrait which makes it distinctive. It is as marked a portrait as any that hangs in the Royal Academy.

MR. MYERS : Do you think that the artist experienced any peculiar sensation when he was drawing it ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Not the slightest.

MR. MYERS : Has he become a Theosophist ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : Yes, but he occupies an official position, in which it is not desirable that he should be recognised as belonging to our Society.

MR. MYERS : Can you tell us of any case where the mind of other persons has been influenced by a person possessing occult power ?

COLONEL OLCOTT : I cannot think at the moment of any instance

that would be valuable for your purpose, although I have a great deal of knowledge as to impressions from one mind to another without any suspicion on the part of the impressed mind that the action was going on. Not only in my own case, but in that of others have I known that to be so. I have known whole articles to be written by a person who supposed that he himself only was engaged in the composition, when in reality the whole thing was put into his mind by an outside influence—a Mahatma. I may say generally that this power of impressing ideas upon the minds of others is enjoyed by proficient in occult science, and that when properly exercised the agency can never be detected. It will appear to the subject of the experiment that his own mind has been at work without the slightest control.

MR. STACK : Then it would be impossible to establish a case ?

MR. MYERS : Unless the inspirer had previously informed someone else of the article he was going to inspire.

COLONEL OLCOTT : If you were to call the subject of such an experiment he would be ready to take his oath that his mind had received no impression from that of anybody else.

The Committee then separated.

APPENDIX II.

REMARKS.

Mr. Mohini's deposition begins with accounts of three supposed apparitions, in none of which the possibility of his being deceived seems to us, from his description, to have been completely excluded. In the first two the light and the distance are both weak points. The third case is better because the distance of the figure from Mr. Mohini was at one time only a few feet, and he has no doubt that he recognised in it the person whom, as we now know, from his letter to the *Pall Mall*, (see Appendix XIX.) he had met some months previously in the flesh, and who had presented himself to him as Mahatma Koot Hoomi. We cannot, from what Mr. Mohini tells us, feel so strongly as he does that the circumstances make it impossible that the figure on the balcony could have been a real man, but it seemed at any rate improbable that it was not the same man, whether in the body or in "astral form," whom he had previously met. Mr. Mohini goes on to cases of transportation of letters. The first he gives is that of the letter falling in the house of Maharajah Sir Jolindra M. Tagore, already described by Colonel Olcott. Putting Colonel Olcott's account and Mr. Mohini's together, we find that the letter is stated to have referred to two subjects of the conversation within a few minutes of its falling, which is worthy of

note, as though the subjects were not improbable ones, it would be more difficult to lead up to two than to one.

The case of the letter found on Mr. Keightley's table has also some weight, but we must here draw attention to the danger of assuming too confidently that a letter or other object was not previously on a table or in a drawer because it was not previously observed there. It is a matter of everyday experience that we may overlook things even when searching for them, and this is of course still more likely to occur when we are not thinking of them.

It is hardly necessary to make more comment on the letter in the railway carriage than is implied in the questions asked at the time. This case, taken in connection with that in Appendix XXXII., seems to force on us one of two alternatives : Either the appearance of these letters was an occult phenomenon or Colonel Olcott threw them.

Meeting on June 10th, 1884.

Present: J. HERBERT STACK, Esq.,
F. W. H. MYERS, Esq.,
E. GURNEY, Esq.,

AND

F. PODMORE, Esq.

MR. MOHINI M. CHATTERJI was examined.

MR. MYERS : Have you seen any instances of apparitions of living persons at a distance, either of Mahatmas or others ?

MR. MOHINI : I have seen apparitions of Mahatmas.

MR. MYERS : On how many occasions ?

MR. MOHINI : On several occasions—five or six, I should think.

MR. MYERS : And how have you identified them ?

MR. MOHINI : From portraits.

MR. STACK : As to the Mahatmas you have seen as apparitions, have you seen them also as ordinary human beings in the flesh ?

MR. MOHINI : Oh, yes.

MR. STACK : Will you mention the first instance that occurred in point of time ?

MR. MOHINI : It was in the month of December, 1882, that I saw the apparition of one of the Mahatmas for the first time. I do not remember the precise date, but it can be easily ascertained. It was a few days after the anniversary of the Theosophical Society was celebrated in that year. One evening, eight or 10 of us were sitting on the balcony at the headquarters of the Society. I was leaning over the railings, when at a distance I caught a glimpse of some shining

substance, which after a short time took the form of a human being. This human form several times passed and re-passed the place where we were. I should think the apparition was visible for four or five minutes.

MR. STACK : How far did it appear to be from you ?

MR. MOHINI : About 20 or 30 yards.

MR. MYERS : In what way can you be sure that it was not an ordinary person ?

MR. MOHINI : From the position in which it appeared. It appeared at a place where there was a declivity in the hill, the house being at the top of the hill. There was also a bend at the spot, so that if an ordinary human being had been walking there it would have been impossible for him to have been seen. I saw the whole figure, however, so that it must have been floating in mid-air.

MR. MYERS : Other persons besides yourself saw it ?

MR. MOHINI : Oh, yes. One was Novin Grishna Bannerji, who is deputy collector at Berhampore, Moorshedabad, Bengal. Another was Ramaswamier, who is district registrar at Madura, Madras. A third was Pundit Chandra Sikir, who lives at Bareilly, N.W.P.

MR. MYERS : All those witnesses saw the same figure that you did ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Who observed it first ?

MR. MOHINI : It was first observed by Ramaswamier and myself.

MR. MYERS : And all agreed that it could not be a real man walking in that way ?

MR. MOHINI : Certainly. It seemed to us to be the apparition of the original of the portrait in Colonel Olcott's room, and which is associated with one of the Mahatmas.

MR. MYERS : In fact, Colonel Olcott's Master ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. MYERS : What amount of light was there at the time ?

MR. MOHINI : This occurred about half-past nine or 10 o'clock on a bright moonlight night.

MR. MYERS : The figure walked up and down ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes, and then disappeared.

MR. MYERS : In what way did it disappear ?

MR. MOHINI : It seemed to melt away.

MR. STACK : Could you distinguish the features at the distance at which you were ?

MR. MOHINI : Oh, yes, and the dress, the turban, and everything.

MR. MYERS : What height did the figure appear to be ?

MR. MOHINI : I should think it was six feet or so—a very tall man.

MR. MYERS : Because we heard from Colonel Olcott that his Mahatma was something like 6ft. 5in. in height.

MR. MOHINI : I could not tell exactly, but it was very tall. I had seen the portrait several times. It was the first picture of a Mahatma I had ever seen, so that it made a great impression upon me.

MR. MYERS : When was the second time that you saw an astral appearance ?

MR. MOHINI : Two or three days after that. We were sitting on the ground—on the rock, outside the house in Bombay, when a figure appeared a short distance away. It was not the same figure as on the first occasion.

MR. MYERS : In what way are you sure it was not a living man ?

MR. MOHINI : You could easily find that out from the colour. This was the same shining colour as before.

MR. MYERS : Did the apparition seem to walk or to float ?

MR. MOHINI : It seemed to float. There was no sound accompanying it.

MR. MYERS : You say that it was a shining substance. Was it phosphorescent ?

MR. MOHINI : It seemed like phosphorus in the dark. The hair was dark, and could be distinguished from the face.

MR. GURNEY : Going back to the first apparition, it seems somewhat startling to be told that you could recognise the face at such a distance off, and in moonlight. Do you feel sure that if you had seen the face alone you would have recognised it ?

MR. MOHINI : I cannot answer that. I saw the whole thing, and the whole thing, taken together, produced upon me the impression that it was the apparition of the original of the portrait in Colonel Olcott's room. Had I seen the face alone, peering out of the dark, I do not know whether I should have recognised it or not.

MR. STACK : Do all the Mahatmas dress alike ?

MR. MOHINI : No. Colonel Olcott was present on the first occasion, and, as I have already stated, the apparition that appeared was that of his Master.

MR. MYERS : On the two occasions did all who were present see the apparitions ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes,

MR. MYERS : Can you give us the names of the persons who were present on the second occasion ?

MR. MOHINI : They were the same persons that were present on the first occasion.

MR. MYERS : Did the apparition say anything on the second occasion ?

MR. MOHINI : No.

MR. MYERS : We will now come to the third occasion on which you have seen an apparition.

MR. MOHINI: The third instance which I will describe was the last that occurred just before my leaving India. We were sitting in the drawing-room on the first-floor of the house at Adyar. It was about 11 o'clock at night. The window looks over a terrace or balcony. In one corner of the room there appeared a thin vapoury substance of a shining white colour. Gradually it took shape, and a few dark spots became visible, and after a short time it was the fully-formed body of a man, apparently as solid as an ordinary human body. This figure passed and re-passed us several times, approaching to within a distance of a yard or two from where we were standing near the window. It approached so near that I think that if I had put out my hand I might have touched it.

MR. STACK: Did you see the face clearly?

MR. MOHINI: Oh, yes; very clearly.

MR. MYERS: And it was Mr. Sinnett's correspondent?

MR. MOHINI: Yes.

MR. STACK: How did you identify him as Koot Hoomi?

MR. MOHINI: Because I had seen his portrait several times before.

MR. STACK: Had you ever seen him in the flesh?

MR. MOHINI: I cannot answer that.* I explained to you the reason why I could not. Colonel Olcott can, but I cannot.

MR. MYERS: Are we to understand, then, that, when favours are accorded by a Mahatma for the sake of the Chela's own spiritual advancement, there is a rule which forbids the Chela to describe them, with the view of preventing spiritual pride?

MR. MOHINI: I have not been told the reason, but that is, I believe, the reason.

MR. MYERS: Will you continue your account?

MR. MOHINI: After a while I said that as I should not see him for a long time, on account of my going to Europe, I begged he would leave some tangible mark of his visit. The figure then raised his hands and seemed to throw something at us. The next moment we found a shower of roses falling over us in the room—roses of a kind that could not have been procured on the premises. We requested the figure to disappear from that side of the balcony where there was no exit. There was a tree on the other side, and it was in order to prevent all suspicion that it might be something that had got down the tree, or anything of that kind, that we requested him to disappear from the side where there was no exit. The figure went over to that spot and then disappeared.

MR. MYERS: You saw its disappearance?

* Mr. Mohini subsequently answered this question. (See Appendix XIX.)

MR. MOHINI : Oh yes, it passed us slowly until it came to the edge of the balcony, and then it was not to be seen any more.

MR. MYERS : The disappearance being sudden ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. GURNEY : Was the height of the balcony such that any one could have jumped down from it ?

MR. MOHINI : The height was 15 or 20 feet, and, moreover, there were people downstairs and all over the house, so that it would have been impossible for a person to have jumped down without being noticed. Just below the balcony there is an open lawn. There were several persons looking at the moment, and my own idea is that it would have been perfectly impossible for a person to have jumped down.

MR. STACK : Why ?

MR. MOHINI : There is a small flight of steps just below the balcony, and if a man had jumped from the balcony he must have fallen upon the steps and broken his legs. When the figure passed and re-passed us we heard nothing of any footsteps. Besides myself, Damodar and Madame Blavatsky were in the room at the time.

MR. MYERS : Did this figure speak ?

MR. MOHINI : Not on that occasion. What it did could not be called speaking.

MR. STACK : Were you all in the room when this occurred, or on the balcony ?

MR. MOHINI : In the room, with the window open.

MR. MYERS : What light was there on the balcony ?

MR. MOHINI : The moonlight, and the figure came to within a short distance that the light, which was streaming out of the window, fell upon it. This was at the Madras headquarters, about either the end of January or the beginning of February last ; in fact, just before I left Madras.

MR. STACK : What kind of roses were they that they could not be grown at Madras ?

MR. MOHINI : I said that they could not have been produced on the premises, though, indeed, I have not seen any such roses at Madras.

MR. STACK : What was the colour of the figure ? Was it perfectly natural ?

MR. MOHINI : When it came, it was just like a natural man.

MR. MYERS : Can you give any reason why this figure was different in colour and aspect from those which you saw on the former occasions ?

MR. MOHINI : The luminosity depends upon whether the principles which go to make up a double are there, without any gross particles being attracted.

MR. MYERS : Gross matter is present when the figure is non-luminous ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. STACK : This figure looked like an ordinary man ? If you had not believed that it was the Mahatma Koot Hoomi, you would have thought it was an ordinary man ?

MR. MOHINI : I never would have thought that it was an ordinary man, because it was such a striking figure.

MR. MYERS : Turning now to the transmission of solid objects, can you tell us whether you have yourself been witness to the appearance of letters or other objects in places where they could not have been conveyed by ordinary means ?

MR. MOHINI : I have.

MR. MYERS : Can you describe one or two typical cases ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes, I can. The first was in the house of Maharajah Sir Jateendra Mohan Tagore, recently a member of the Legislative Council.

MR. MYERS : Would he testify to this ?

MR. MOHINI : It was in his house, but he was not present. It was there that I for the first time saw a letter conveyed to us by occult agency. The circumstances were referred to in Colonel Olcott's deposition. The facts are substantially as stated by him ; but there is one thing that he omitted to mention. In the course of conversation between myself, the editor of the *Indian Mirror*, the late Perachund Mitra, and Norendra Nath, the latter asked what good a person could do by joining the Theosophical Society. The letter which was delivered to us in the way Colonel Olcott described quoted that phrase, and went on to reply to it. The letter fell down before us within two or three minutes after this remark was made by Norendra Nath.

MR. MYERS : Showing, as I gather you maintain, that these letters brought by occult means sometimes contain references to events of the moment ?

MR. MOHINI : Certainly. I may say that a full account of this was published in the *Indian Mirror*, of the 14th of April, 1882, I think.

MR. STACK : The *Indian Mirror* is an ordinary daily paper ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes. The reason why this incident was published in that paper was that the editor was present.

MR. STACK : Was he a Theosophist, then ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Does your recollection of the circumstances attending the falling of the letter fully coincide with that of Colonel Olcott ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Perhaps you will now proceed to the Parisian case ?

MR. MOHINI : I was staying in Paris, occupying apartments at No.

46, Rue Notre Dame des Champs. Mr. Keightley and Mr. Oakley were in the house with me. On that morning we were discussing as to whether we should go into the country, to a place where Madame Blavatsky was then staying, and we decided upon doing so. The two gentlemen I have named went to their respective rooms to get ready to start by the next train. I was sitting in the drawing-room. Within a few minutes, Mr. Keightley came back from his room, and went to that of Mr. Oakley. In doing so he passed me, and I followed him.

MR. STACK : Was the drawing-room between the two bedrooms ?

MR. MOHINI : The hall also intervened, I think. To go from one bedroom to another the easiest way was through the drawing-room. Arriving in the bedroom we found Mr. Oakley talking with Madame Blavatsky's Indian servant. Mr. Keightley inquired if Mr. Oakley had called. Mr. Oakley replied in the negative, and Mr. Keightley then returned to his own room, followed by myself. There was a table in the middle of the room occupied by Mr. Keightley. He had passed the edge of the table nearest the door, and was about one foot and a-half distant—I had not yet entered the room—when, on the edge of the table nearest the door, I saw a letter. The envelope was of the kind always used by one of the Mahatmas. Many such envelopes are in my possession, as well as in the possession of Mr. Sinnett and others. The moment I caught sight of it I stopped short and called out to Mr. Keightley to turn back and look. He turned back and at once saw the letter on the table. I asked him if he had seen it there before. He answered in the negative, and said that had it been there he must have noticed it, as he had taken his watch and chain out and put them on the table. He said that he was sure the letter was not there when he passed the spot, as the envelope was too striking not to have caught his sight.

MR. STACK : What are these envelopes ? Are they peculiar to the use of Mahatmas ? Or are they ordinary Thibetan envelopes ?

MR. MOHINI : I have only seen them used by Mahatmas.

MR. STACK : They are made of paper, and have Chinese characters on them, I think ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. STACK : The reason I ask is that Colonel Olcott, in his conversation, spoke of them, I think, as if they were Thibetan envelopes. I thought they might be in general use in Thibet.

MR. MOHINI : I have never been to Thibet, nor have I ever received a letter from thence. Indeed, I do not believe that there is any postal service with Thibet.

MR. GURNEY : It would not be a hopeful place to communicate with, then.

MR. STACK : But they might manufacture such envelopes for use among the officials there.

MR. MOHINI : I have seen one Thibetian pedlar, but he did not offer me any such article for sale. Returning to Mr. Keightley, he also said that he had been looking for something on the table.

MR. MYERS : What other persons had been in the apartment ?

MR. MOHINI : Myself, Mr. Keightley, Mr. Oakley, and Madame Blavatsky's Indian servant.

MR. MYERS : Our object would be to ascertain whether anybody could have placed the letter in the room during Mr. Keightley's absence. Do I understand that while Mr. Keightley was absent from his room yourself, Mr. Oakley, and the Indian servant were in his sight all the time ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Was the outer door of the house closed at the time ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Do you feel morally certain that nobody was secreted in the room ?

MR. MOHINI : I do. The letter was directed to myself, and it was opened in their presence.

MR. MYERS : What were the contents of the letter ?

MR. MOHINI : The letter referred to some matters of a private character, and ended with a direction to me to take down my friends to the place in the country.

MR. MYERS : Thus appearing to show a knowledge of events of the moment ?

MR. MOHINI : Just so.

MR. MYERS : Could the letter have been written some days before, and the allusion as to taking your friends into the country inserted afterwards ?

MR. MOHINI : No ; because Mr. Keightley and Mr. Oakley only came to the house by accident that morning.

MR. STACK : On what floor were these rooms ?

MR. MOHINI : On the first floor.

MR. MYERS : Upon what did the windows look ?

MR. MOHINI : One of them looked out upon the yard.

MR. MYERS : Do you consider it impossible that somebody could have climbed up to the window and thrown the letter into the room ?

MR. MOHINI : Absolutely impossible. Mr. Keightley was only absent a few seconds.

MR. MYERS : Could nobody have reached the window without a ladder ?

MR. MOHINI : Certainly not.

MR. MYERS : Do you remember whether the window was open or not ?

MR. MOHINI : Most likely it was not open.

MR. MYERS : Was the yard which you referred to the court-yard of the hotel ?

MR. MOHINI : The back court-yard.

MR. MYERS : Had you observed any men moving about in the yard during your stay ?

MR. MOHINI : I had not observed any.

MR. MYERS : What language was the letter written in ?

MR. MOHINI : In English, and I recognised the handwriting as that of Mr. Sinnett's correspondent. Were I to show it to Mr. Sinnett he would at once identify it.

* * * * *

MR. MYERS : Perhaps we had better go on now with the case in the railway carriage. Colonel Olcott gave us an account, and it would be interesting to have Mr. Mohini's account.

MR. MOHINI : Colonel Olcott and I were coming from Paris to Calais. When we were about half-an-hour's journey from Calais, Colonel Olcott and I being alone in the compartment and the train in full motion, suddenly my attention was called to what seemed to me like a flash of white light on the roof of the compartment, and immediately afterwards I found a letter drop near my feet. Colonel Olcott looked startled, and cried out, "What is it ?" I picked up the letter, and finding that it was addressed to Colonel Olcott, I handed it to him.

MR. GURNEY : Can you describe how you and he were seated in the carriage ?

MR. MOHINI : I was seated at one window, and he, on the same seat, at the other window. He was reading a newspaper.

MR. GURNEY : Were you so situated that you would have been sure to have caught sight of any movement on his part ?

MR. MOHINI : Certainly.

MR. GURNEY : You were not asleep ?

MR. MOHINI : No, I was looking in front of me.

MR. MYERS : Two theories have been raised to account for this occurrence. One is that the letter was inserted by some agent of evil at the Paris station—stuffed into some crevice at the top of the carriage, from which it fell down through oscillation, after the train had been sometime in motion. Another is that the letter might have been thrown into the carriage window.

MR. MOHINI : The first theory is untenable, because how could the agent of evil tell what compartment we should take ?

MR. MYERS : Did anybody go into the compartment at Paris ?

MR. MOHINI : Nobody but the porters with our luggage. Again, the theory as to the letter being thrown into the carriage window is not very probable.

MR. MYERS : Was the window open or shut ?

MR. MOHINI : My impression is that the window on my side was shut.

MR. PODMORE : At what rate was the train going at the time ?

MR. MOHINI : The usual rate of an express train at full speed. As to the second theory, the contents of this letter referred to what Colonel Olcott had to do in London. Any other letter would have been perfectly *mal apropos*. And how could a confederate depend upon what compartment the letter would enter, if he threw it at a passing train ?

MR. MYERS : If your window had been open, the letter might have come from the compartment just ahead of you, because experience shows one that if pieces of paper are thrown out of window from a train in motion they often enter one of the compartments behind.

MR. STACK : Did you, or Colonel Olcott, see the letter first ?

MR. MOHINI : Colonel Olcott spoke first, but when he spoke the letter was fully in my sight.

MR. STACK : He was reading, you say. Could he have jerked the letter up without your seeing it ?

MR. MOHINI : Impossible.

MR. STACK : Or could you have done it without his seeing it ?

MR. MOHINI : That is best for him to say.

MR. GURNEY : All we want to do is to get such information as will convince a hostile critic. If you were in the compartment, neither reading nor asleep, you would probably have been looking out of the window, in which case such a thing might have escaped your eye.

MR. MOHINI : Had my back been turned such a thing would have been possible, but my back was not turned. I stated before that my attention was attracted by a flash of white light.

MR. GURNEY : But I can still imagine your failing to see the jerk of the hand and yet seeing the thing when it fluttered up.

MR. STACK : Did the letter come from Colonel Olcott's side of the compartment ?

MR. MOHINI : It came from the roof, and fell near my feet.

MR. PODMORE : At the top of the compartment was there no possible means of communicating with the next compartment ?

MR. MOHINI : No. I remember that there was a piece of glass which I was told would have to be broken if you wanted to stop the train. That attracted my attention, as we have no such thing in India.

MR. PODMORE : Was the lamp in the centre of the compartment ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. MYERS : You have now given your account of the circumstances which Colonel Olcott narrated to us, and in which both of you were concerned. Turning to another matter, I believe that you were at

headquarters on the occasion of Damodar's visit there in the double to consult with regard to mesmerising the paralysed boys at Moradabad. Will you tell us what you were witness of or cognisant of at headquarters at that time?

MR. MOHINI : In a strict sense I was not witness of anything. I only heard what M. Coulomb told me within half-an-hour of the occurrence. He told me that he was attending to some work in a room adjoining that in which Madame Blavatsky was seated—the writing-room. He heard Damodar's voice speaking to Madame Blavatsky ; and as Damodar had been absent, he thought he would go into the room and welcome him back. He went into the room, but found nobody but Madame Blavatsky there. He said he had heard Damodar's voice, and asked how it was that he was not there.

MR. MYERS : Speaking of communication at a distance, have you ever heard the astral bell mentioned in Mr. Sinnett's books?

MR. MOHINI : Yes, I have heard it several times.

MR. MYERS : When Madame Blavatsky has not been present?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Who has been present then?

MR. MOHINI : Mr. Judge and Mr. Keightley were present the last time I heard it.

MR. MYERS : Only you three?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. MYERS : And you all heard it?

MR. MOHINI : Yes.

MR. MYERS : Can you describe the sound?

MR. MOHINI : It is a very peculiar sound. It is not like anything that I know of. It is something like the sound of a silver bell when struck.

MR. STACK : Has the sound generally been at a distance?

MR. MOHINI : In the same room sometimes,

MR. GURNEY : The sound is very sweet?

MR. MOHINI : Very sweet.

MR. GURNEY : Mr. Sinnett speaks as if it came from a distance.

MR. MOHINI : It seems to be at a distance, then to come near, and then it fades away again.

MR. GURNEY : When it came on the occasion you refer to, did it prelude or announce anything?

MR. MOHINI : That would be a matter of inference on my part.

MR. GURNEY : Was it connected with any other phenomenon?

MR. MOHINI : No. It occurred in my bedroom. We three were together, and all heard it. The ringing has happened so many times, and under so many different circumstances, that it would take me a long time to describe them. I have seen Madame Blavatsky put up her

hand and make a downward movement, when instantly something like a musical tune has been produced.

MR. GURNEY : Immediately afterwards ?

MR. MOHINI : Almost simultaneously.

MR. GURNEY : How long does it generally continue ?

MR. MOHINI : Sometimes it is a single bell, and sometimes it is like a musical tune. It lasts 10 or 15 seconds.

MR. STACK : Mr. Sinnett calls it an occult bell, and you appear to call it an astral bell.

MR. MOHINI : I simply call it a bell. There is one other circumstance that I think I ought to state. It seemed to me a crucial test. I was seated one night with Madame Blavatsky in her room. I had addressed a certain question to one of the Mahatmas, and Madame Blavatsky told me I would have a reply, and should hear the Mahatma's own voice.

MR. GURNEY : Had you asked him before ?

MR. MOHINI : Yes, by letter. I had asked him the question ; to which Madame Blavatsky said I should have a reply in his own voice. Madame Blavatsky said, " You shall hear his voice." I thought how should I know that it was not Madame Blavatsky ventriloquising. I began to hear some peculiar kind of voice speaking to me from one corner of the room. It was like the voice of somebody coming from a great distance through a long tube. It was as distinct as if a person were speaking in the room, but it had the peculiar characteristic I have indicated. As soon as I heard the voice I wanted to satisfy myself that Madame Blavatsky was not ventriloquising. A word was uttered and Madame Blavatsky would repeat it. It so happened that before she had finished speaking I heard another word uttered by the voice, so that at one and the same time there were two voices speaking to me. Madame Blavatsky, by whose side I was seated, repeated the words for no particular reason, so far as I am aware, and I came to the conclusion that the Mahatma had known what my thoughts were.

MR. MYERS : Are we to gather that you were always yourself disposed to place implicit confidence in this ?

MR. MOHINI : To begin with, I certainly was not. I thought that Madame Blavatsky had something to do with it, feeling, as I did, that it was strange that the Mahatmas should select foreigners to do this when there were 250,000,000 Hindus to work upon ; but after much thought and study I was satisfied.

The examination thus terminated.

APPENDIX III.

The evidence for the two (Adyar, London) cases of Mr. Damodar's "astral" journeys, which are closely connected together, was obtained directly by and for the Society for Psychical Research. Although not in our view conclusive, it is, we think, deserving of consideration.

The Journal of the Society for Psychical Research for June, in an account of a meeting held at the Garden Mansion, May 28th, contains the following passage (pp. 75-6) :—

"At the conclusion of the Literary Committee's Report some further discussion was raised on Colonel Olcott's evidence, and Mr. E. D. Ewen, of Chattisgarh, Central Provinces, India, stated that he had himself a few days ago (on Friday, May 23rd, at about 10 p.m.) received a visit from Mr. Damodar in the astral body. He (Mr. Ewen) had gone to an upstairs room, at 77, Elgin Crescent, W., to replenish his tobacco-pouch. He was in the act of doing so from a store of tobacco in a drawer, when he suddenly perceived Damodar standing beside him. He recognised Damodar distinctly, having previously known him personally in India. His first impression was that Damodar had come to see Colonel Olcott, who was in the house at the time. He (Mr. Ewen) rushed out on to the landing, and called to Colonel Olcott. As he stood on the landing, just outside the door of the room in which he had seen Damodar, Damodar appeared to pass through him, to emerge from the room without sensible contact, although the door was not wide enough to admit of a normal exit, while Mr. Ewen stood in front of it, without a collision, which Mr. Ewen must have felt. After thus apparently passing through him, the form of Damodar descended the stairs for some little way and then seemed to disappear through a closed window.*

"It was here suggested by the members of the Committee for Inquiry into Contemporary Apparitions of the Living in India, that a telegram should be sent to India to obtain, if possible, corroboration for this narrative. It was not, of course, considered possible to prove that no communication other than such telegram could have been sent to Mr. Damodar before an answer could be received from India; but it was felt that it would at any rate be interesting to observe what light might be thrown by Mr. Damodar's reply on the question whether Mr. Ewen's vision was of a purely subjective character. Colonel Olcott assented to this suggestion, and offered that the telegram should be sent in his name, so as to ensure a reply from Mr. Damodar. Accordingly, at the close of the meeting (7 p.m.), the following telegram was despatched from the Westminster (Parliament Street) Telegraph Office (Mr. F. W. H. Myers being present, on behalf of the Committee, with other witnesses): 'Olcott to Damodar, Adyar, Madras. Have you visited London lately? Write Myers full details.' It was considered desirable that the reply should be directed to a member of the Committee, and any reply will be at once reported to the Committee."

To this telegram we received no reply. We heard, however, from Madame Blavatsky that she had had a letter from Mr. Damodar, in which he ex-

* Mr. Ewen has since sent us an account of this incident, which will be found below.

pressed his decided unwillingness to reveal his own intimate proceedings for the information of the Society for Psychical Research. Madame Blavatsky added that he had enclosed a letter which was to be shown to us or not, as she thought fit. This, of course, suggested that the letter was to be shown only if it fitted the circumstances; yet on that supposition, it was hardly diplomatic in Madame Blavatsky to mention it at all. In any case, both letters, we were told, had been lost. Mr. Ewen's vision thus very decidedly lacked confirmation.

Common fairness, however, forbade us positively to conclude either that an unseen letter of Mr. Damodar's contained compromising matter, or that his reluctance to divulge his own affairs to satisfy our curiosity was a merely simulated feeling.

The next incident to be recorded was the receipt by Mr. Myers of the following letter from Messrs. Pādshāh, Keightley, and Gebhard. Mr. Gebhard is a leading manufacturer in the town of Elberfeld, Prussia, and enjoys much local distinction both as an administrator and a philanthropist. Mr. Keightley, who is a graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, has spent many weeks in close companionship with the Theosophic group now in England, and has shown a cordial willingness to assist us in our inquiries. Mr. Pādshāh is a young Parsee gentleman, who was recommended to one of us by Professor Wordsworth, of Ephinstone College, Bombay, where he was elected to a Fellowship. He has, however, resigned this emolument, mainly, as we understand, because the conditions of residence connected with it would interfere with his services to the Theosophic cause, which he has warmly embraced. He must, therefore, be considered as an enthusiastic but a disinterested disciple.

77, Elgin Crescent, Notting Hill, W.,

Saturday, August 16th.

Dear Mr. Myers,—Madame has just told me that she saw Damodar last night, quite distinctly, standing in a corner facing the chair in which she was seated in the drawing-room. There were present in the room, Mr. and Mrs. Oakley, Mr. Gebhard, and others, who do not seem to have known or felt his presence. Madame tells me that he had come to ask what it was she had told him about some trunk the night before. It appears she had told him the previous night to take care in the Custom House of a certain trunk taken by Babula, who has proceeded to India to-day. Damodar, unable, however, to make himself more distinct, as Madame desired, seems to have not understood her. So he appeared again this morning more than once, asking, "Why do you not answer about the trunk?" Madame tells me she related the appearance the night before to Mrs. Z., Mrs. X., and Miss Z. The circumstance would have been thought of no more, but on my consulting Madame this afternoon about some articles about to appear in the *Theosophist* she naturally spoke of Damodar; and among other things, very enthusiastically of his latest development. It occurred to me that this was a splendid chance for the S.P.R.; you had repeatedly desired me to commit to paper what I have seen or might see, and there are many friends in England and India who are ready to trust my word. I suggested I should write to you, and wait for D.'s letter, where he *might* refer to his astral presence. But that would be no test. I suggested an immediate

despatch of a telegram, and also a letter to you signed by Mr. Keightley and Mr. Gebhard, who had come some time before, and myself. Mr. Keightley made some difficulties as to the value of the test, alleging that our word may not suffice for the S.P.R. I prefer to think otherwise. And, accordingly, the telegram is decided upon. It is in these terms :—

To Damodar,

Theosophist Office, Madras.

Telegraph instantly what you told me last night.

BLAVATSKY.

You will see that I have suggested the telegram should be from Madame Blavatsky, to undo any difficulty Damodar might make to reply to others—for instance, to S.P.R.

Madame is going to-day to Elberfeld, and I shall open the answer as soon as D. telegraphs it, and send you a copy.

I hope Damodar will make no difficulties now, and the test will be, we trust, if not complete, at least of considerable scientific value.—I remain, dear Mr. Myers, yours sincerely,

B. J. PADSHAH.

I came in this afternoon, between 3 and 4, while Madame was talking of Damodar's visit and the matter of the trunk, to Pādshāh, Mr. Gebhard, and Mrs. Z.

The above statement is correct, so far as it relates to myself, and Madame has had, I believe, no opportunity of telegraphing Damodar without my knowledge, as I have been in the house most of the day.

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY.

I herewith certify that Mr. Pādshāh's version is correct, and that I was in the room with Madame Blavatsky when she told the occurrence about the different apparitions of Damodar . . . upon which Mr. Pādshāh proposed as a test to telegraph at once to Damodar. I wrote the telegram at once myself.

GEBHARD (Consul of Persia, Elberfeld, Germany).

This letter was speedily followed by the annexed telegram :—

B. J. Pādshāh to F. Myers, Cambridge.—August 17th.

“Damodar telegraphs Blavatsky Master wants you here to-night don't fail look into your pocket.”

Mr. Damodar's original telegram, dated Madras, August 17th, 9.10 a.m., is now in possession of the Committee, and is in precisely the same words. This telegram was forwarded to Mr. Myers, who was on the Continent at the time, and unable to communicate at once with the Committee. The turn which the incident had thus taken was obviously unfavourable to Mr. Damodar's reputed powers. It appeared that on the first occasion on which he had accepted a test, he had distinctly failed to satisfy it. An alleged transcorporeal interview of Damodar's had been selected without previous notice, and for the very reason that a distinct and concrete topic had formed the subject of discussion. It was about the *trunk* that the senders of the telegram wished to hear. Mr. Damodar had replied without delay. Tele-

gram despatched from Notting Hill, August 16th, say 5 p.m. English time (say 10 p.m. Indian time) ; received probably at Madras too late for delivery that night. Answer despatched from Adyar 9.10 a.m., August 17th, Indian time ; received in London 6.58 a.m. English time. But the reply, so far from containing any allusion to the trunk, referred only to a statement that Mahatma M. wished to see Madame Blavatsky, and that she would find a letter from him to that effect in her pocket. It seemed as though a vague, quasi-private message had been purposely pitched upon by Mr. Damodar as incapable of disproof. Madame Blavatsky could of course say that he had given her such a message, and that she had found such a letter, but that both had been too private for open mention at the time.

On August 30th Mr. Myers proceeded to Elberfeld and inquired of Mr. Keightley (who was staying at Mr. Gebhard's along with Madame Blavatsky, Mr. Mohini, Colonel Olcott, &c.), whether he had received Mr. Damodar's telegram and what he thought of it. He replied that the party had left London on August 16th, and arrived at Elberfeld on the 17th. On arriving they were met by a telegram from Mr. Pádsháh, reporting Mr. Damodar's reply. The whole party, said Mr. Keightley, were surprised and distressed at what seemed to them also the conspicuous failure of the intended test. Madame Blavatsky said that she had in fact received such a message, and had found such a letter in her pocket ; but, of course, recognised the inadequacy of such statement. It then occurred to her to consult her private diary. This was said to be contained in a despatch-box which had been in Mr. Keightley's charge from the time when it was packed and locked, just after the telegram had been sent to Damodar, and just before the party left London by an evening train, August 16th, for Elberfeld, *viâ* Queenborough and Flushing.

She at once asked Mr. Keightley to go and fetch the despatch-box.

In her diary was found the entry here translated, which was then seen by all present.

Translation of entry in Madame Blavatsky's private journal, written partly in Russian and partly in English, and dated August 15th, 1884.*

I saw suddenly Damodar this August 15th. While looking on I called, trying to find out some one near me to call attention to him. I was sitting under the looking-glass, and tried to make myself heard by Mrs. Z., who was sitting near Mrs. Oakley. Upon seeing him, I said to him : "*Damodar, can't you make yourself visible to all ?*" Instead of answering, he says to me something very strange, that he had seen me the night before, and could not understand what I wanted from him. He said : "*You came to me about two, I could not understand what you were asking me for. Is it for a trunk sent here ?*" Then a few minutes later he again appeared and said : "*Master wants you here to-night. Don't fail. Look into your pocket.*"

This entry changed the aspect of affairs. It now seemed much more unlikely than before that Mr. Damodar had invented a reply on the mere chance of its proving appropriate. At any rate, there was the evidence of Mr. Keightley and others to show that this reply corresponded to an entry of the interview apparently made by Madame Blavatsky before it arrived, and if the genuineness of Damodar's visit be assumed, the wording of the

* The words underlined are written in English in the original.

Gebhard-Pādāhāh-Keightley telegram (due to Mr. Gebhard) certainly was likely to suggest that what was asked for was the *command* which Damodar transmitted, and not the *inquiry* which he made. He asked Madame Blavatsky about the trunk; he told her to pay an incorporeal visit to Adyar and to find the written summons in her pocket. More evidence, however, remains. On Wednesday, September 10th, a letter from Damodar was received at Elberfeld by Madame Blavatsky in the presence of Mr. Keightley, who noted its registered envelope; * and believes that the letter had gone first to London and been forwarded to Elberfeld. Notwithstanding Mr. Damodar's request for privacy, the Committee has been permitted to use this letter for this form of private circulation. We give it here (and we may note that the handwriting appears to agree with that of a communication sent to us by Mr. Damodar through Dr. Hartmann):—

Adyar, Madras, 16th August, 1884.

Respected Upasika,—I could not make out what you wanted here when you came here on the morning of the 15th, at about two or three of Madras time. So in the night I attempted to come and ask you. It was between 10 and 11 in the night here—so it must be between five and six in the evening of London time. Who was that gentleman talking with you under a big looking-glass, and who was that short old lady? I think there were several others in the room at the time, but I could not make out how many, or who they were. If I had known that at that time you would be amidst so many people, I would not have attempted to come. I might have seen you later when you were alone. And why was it that you asked me to make myself visible to all? You know I am too much of a beginner yet in this line. It was only because you asked me to do so I attempted. Whether I succeeded or failed, I do not know. And in all this affair, the main object I came for was not quite accomplished. I wanted to know exactly what you had come here for? I heard something about a trunk, but whether you wanted me to take care of something you had sent, or whether you wanted me to send you something, I do not quite remember. However, I have sent you a parcel, and I believe it is that which you mean. Did you find in your pocket that Tibetan order from the MASTER to come here, to notify you about which he sent me to you again? I hope, yourself, nor the friends who were there, will not speak about this to any one, and not make a public talk of it in the Society for Psychical Research, and such other places. I am sure Mr. Ewen and others would have done it, if I had not asked you privately to prevent the publication of the fact of Mr. Ewen having seen me when I came to see you and Col. O., and committed a blunder. I hope I have not committed a mistake in sending you the parcel. Ever yours respectfully and sincerely,

DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR.

* Mr. Keightley noticed that the envelope was registered, with *Damodar*, he believes, written in the corner, and that the letter was actually in the envelope—the letter being in Damodar's handwriting. But Mr. Keightley and Madame Blavatsky between them then lost the envelope. We sent, however, a description of the letter to the Post Office officials, and have obtained through their kindness, a statement, on behalf of the Registered Letters Branch, October 1st, 1884, that "the letter herein inquired for was sent to the W.D.O. in the box made up on Sunday, the 7th ult.," a day precisely corresponding to its receipt at Elberfeld on the 10th. It seems almost certain, therefore, that if the letter was a forgery, it was at any rate put into an envelope which had really come from India.

It is to be noted that all the circumstances mentioned in this letter are correct. Two points refer to assertions made by Madame Blavatsky at the time, viz. :—

1. "Astral" visit of Mdme. B. to D.
2. Ineffectual attempt of Mdme. B. on that occasion to explain something about a trunk.

The next five points are confirmed by Messrs. Keightley, Pádsháh, and Mrs. Z.

3. Hour of D.'s visit to 77, Elgin Crescent.
4. Presence of short old lady (Mrs. Z.)
5. Presence of gentleman under looking-glass talking (Mr. Keightley).
6. Presence of several other persons.
7. Request of Mdme. B. that D. would make himself visible to all.

The letter also contains :—

8. Mention of letter from Mahatma M. (already mentioned in telegram).
9. Mention of Mr. Ewen's vision of D. when D. meant to see Col. O., with explanation of D.'s silence on the point when inquiry was made.

On the whole, therefore, though we cannot say that the possibility of collusion between Madame Blavatsky and Mr. Damodar is excluded, there remains nothing in the incident described—except its marvellous nature—to suggest that collusion was probable.

Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott have repeatedly offered to assist us in India to examine all telegrams sent by or to any members of their group during the existence of the Theosophical Society, and we hope that an opportunity may be afforded of doing this.

It is worth remarking that the true message as to the trunk was not conveyed after all. Madame Blavatsky's servant, Babula, was conveying to Madras a box (*Americanicé* trunk) containing frames for the portraits of the Mahatmas, and Madame Blavatsky was anxious that Damodar should see these frames uninjured through the Custom-house at Madras.

Now let us once more revert to Mr. Ewen's vision. Mr. Ewen eagerly agreed to telegraph to Mr. Damodar for corroboration. Mr. Damodar refused to make any reply. Now here there was plainly no *previous concert* between Mr. Ewen and Damodar. But it is, of course, possible that Mr. Ewen (a Scotch gentleman of honourable repute, whose organisation is highly nervous) may have simply had a *hallucination*. It would, however, in any case be a remarkable coincidence that Mr. Ewen (who is not, on his own showing, subject to any hallucinations which are not afterwards found to have corresponded to some objective event) should for once have had a merely illusive hallucination, and should then have seen Mr. Damodar, with whom he was only slightly acquainted,—the very person and under the very circumstances which would afterwards admit of being worked up into false evidence, quite independent of Mr. Ewen's will. This is an example of what we mean by witnesses whose *corroborative hallucinations* afford evidence of some value to one of these phantasmal occurrences.

PRIVATE REPORT FOR THE PSYCHICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION.

" 32, Queen's Terrace, Ayr, N.B.

" October 17th, 1884.

" One evening in June last (the)* while staying (spending the evening) with Mrs. A., at 77, Elgin Crescent, Notting Hill, after making a few experiments (in seeing aura) with Mr. Stack and Colonel Olcott, we were sitting smoking, and chatting. And my supply of tobacco having given out, I went upstairs to Colonel Olcott's sitting-room, to procure some more from a box which was kept there. While filling my tobacco pouch I became aware that some one was in the room, and turning round, I saw in the corner of the room my friend Mr. D. K. Mavalankar, whom at the time I knew to be in India. Feeling that he must be in 'Astral form,' I was rather startled, and on his slightly lifting his hand, and taking a step forward, as if about to address me, I thought that he must want Colonel Olcott. So I went to the door of the room and called out, 'Colonel, come here, Damodar is here !' Colonel Olcott did not hear correctly, and called out, "What is it ?" I then went out of the room, on to the landing of the stairs ; and leaning over the banisters, repeated, "Damodar is here !" to Colonel Olcott, who by that time was at the bottom of the stairs. As I did so, Mr. Mavalankar passed behind me, and apparently walked out at the staircase window on my right. Colonel Olcott, who was coming upstairs at the time, did not see him.

" Mr. Mavalankar was dressed in a pair of loose white drawers, and was naked above the waist except for a white scarf, or something like it, over his shoulders and head—what he would probably wear as a sleeping costume.

" As far as I can now remember this occurred at (or a little after) 11 p.m.

" I had never before seen Mr. Mavalankar in 'Astral form,' and had I not known him to be in India at the time, I should have found it difficult to believe that he was not in the ordinary flesh and bone.

" Any further information on this subject in my power, is heartily at the service of the P.R.A., and I need scarcely say that I shall be happy to answer any questions bearing thereon.

" E. D. EWEN,

" Hon. Cor. Sec. Scottish T.S."

APPENDIX IV.

Mr. Brown's account of one of the events more fully described by Colonel Olcott in his deposition.

Extract from Brown's "Some Experiences in India," pp. 14, 15.

" Moradabad was visited on 10th November, and there an event occurred which furnished a proof of the much-doubted fact that an occultist can project his inner self or soul instantaneously to any place at any distance.

" Colonel Olcott, as we have seen, had been ordered by his *Guru* to desist from treating patients until further notice, and, when application was made to him by Mr. Shankar Singh, of Moradabad, on behalf of two orphan children, he was under the necessity of refusing the request. Damodar,

*Mr. Ewen previously gave the date as recorded in the "Journal" (see above), but has forgotten it since.

however, became interested in the matter, and said that he would ask for permission to be granted for this special case. His *Guru*, as we know, is Mahatma Koot Hoomi, while Colonel Olcott's and Madame Blavatsky's *Guru* is Mahatma M——, but by going to Adyar, in astral body, Damodar was enabled, through Madame B——, to communicate with Mahatma M—— without the knowledge of the Colonel. Accordingly Damodar retired to his room, went into *samadi*, projected himself to Adyar, Madras (a distance, as the crow flies, of over a thousand miles) and returned in a few minutes with a message from Mahatma M——. The Mahatma had spoken along the communication line established between himself in the Himalayas (where he resides) and his Chela, Madame Blavatsky, at Adyar. At Moradabad the words were taken down to dictation and the document signed and authenticated by all the gentlemen present. Damodar had informed us that he had requested Madame Blavatsky to corroborate the fact of his astral visit by telegram, and to repeat the words of Mahatma M—— heard through 'the Shrine.' Next morning a deferred night message was received from Madame B——, which was officially marked as having been dispatched twenty-five minutes after the time of Damodar's reported visit, and in it the visit was fully corroborated and the Master's words repeated *verbatim*. The telegram was opened in the presence of those who had heard the message dictated on the previous day, and is in the following terms: 'Voice from Shrine says "Henry can try parties once, leaving strongly mesmerised Cajaputte oil—rub three times daily to relieve suffering. Karma cannot be interfered with." Damodar heard voice.—Telegram sent at his request.'" —*Vide Theosophist* for December, 1883, pp. 88-89.

APPENDIX V.

From *The Theosophist*, December, 1883, p. 81.

"HIMALAYAN AND OTHER MAHATMAS."

(An Open Letter to Madame Blavatsky.)

BY RAMA SOURINDRO GARGYA DEVA.

(We know nothing as yet about the writer of this letter.)

[EXTRACT.]

. . . . "I come to the consideration of positive proofs required by the Spiritualists from us to demonstrate to them the actual existence of our Masters. We can offer them no better one than the fact of some of us (the writer included) *having lived long years with them*. . . .

"Yes ; I most emphatically declare that the holy Sages of the snowy range—the Blessed Himalayan Mahatmas—do exist, and *Guru Deva Koot Hoomi* has this one point in common with his presumptuous critics of the West, that he is as much a living man as they. I have lived with Him ; and some of us, *Chelas*, whose names from time to time have appeared in your journal, still live under their protection and in their abodes. I, the writer, am one of the privileged."

APPENDIX VI.

From "The Occult World," pp. 154-5 (Fourth Edition).

"Two more witnesses who personally know the Brothers next come to me at Simla, in the persons of two regular Chelas, who have been sent across the mountains on some business, and are ordered *en passant* to visit me and tell me about their master, my Adept correspondent. These men had just come, when I first saw them, from living with the Adepts. One of them, Dhabagiri Nath, visited me several days running, talked to me for hours about Koot Hoomi, with whom he had been living for ten years, and impressed me and one or two others who saw him as a very earnest, devoted, and trustworthy person. Later on, during his visit to India, he was associated with many striking occult phenomena directed to the satisfaction of native inquirers. He, of course, must be a false witness, invented to prop up Madame Blavatsky's vast imposture, if he is anything else than the Chela of Koot Hoomi that he declares himself to be."

Dhabagiri Nath is elsewhere referred to as Mr. Bawaji.

APPENDIX VII.

From "Some Experiences in India." By Mr. W. T. Brown, pp. 15-17.

"Some important incidents might be recorded in connection with the Colonel's visit to Lucknow and Delhi, and also perhaps with my own and Mr. Naidus' special tours to Gorakhpore, to Rawal Pindi, and Peshawur, but the place to which our narrative really next pertains is the city of Lahore. Here, as elsewhere, Colonel Olcott delivered stirring addresses to large audiences; but Lahore has a special interest, because there we saw, in his own physical body, Mahatma Koot Hoomi himself.

"On the afternoon of the 19th November, I saw the Master in broad daylight, and recognised him, and on the morning of the 20th he came to my tent, and said, 'Now you see me before you in the flesh; look and assure yourself that it is I,' and left a letter of instructions and silk handkerchief, both of which are now in my possession.

"The letter is as usual written seemingly with blue pencil, is in the same handwriting as that in which is written the communication received at Madras, and has been identified by about a dozen persons as bearing the caligraphy of Mahatma Koot Hoomi. The letter was to the effect that I had first seen him in visions, then in his astral form, then in body at a distance, and that finally I now saw him in his own physical body, so close to me as to enable me to give to my countrymen the assurance that I was from personal knowledge as sure of the existence of the Mahatmas as I was of my own. The letter is a private one, and I am not enabled to quote from it at length.

"On the evening of the 21st, after the lecture was over, Colonel Olcott, Damodar and I were sitting outside the *shamiana*, when we were visited by Djual Khool (the Master's head Chela, and now an Initiate), who informed us that the Master was about to come. The Master then came near to us, gave instructions to Damodar, and walked away. . . .

"At Jammoo I had another opportunity of seeing Mahatma Koot Hoomi

in propria persona. One evening I went to the end of the 'compound,' and there I found the Master awaiting my approach. I saluted in European fashion, and came, hat in hand, to within a few yards of the place on which he was standing . . . After a minute or so he marched away, the noise of his footsteps on the gravel being markedly audible."

APPENDIX VIII.

Mr. Damodar's experiences, as recounted here and in his communication to ourselves (given in Appendix IX.), are so prolonged and so varied that it seems impossible he can have been altogether deceived, and we therefore regard his evidence as some of the most important we have.

From *The Theosophist*, December-January, 1883-84, pp. 61, 62.

"A GREAT RIDDLE SOLVED."

By DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR, F.T.S., CHELA.

"On my return to the Headquarters from the North, where I had accompanied Colonel Olcott on his Presidential Tour, I learnt with regret and sorrow of further and still more malignant strictures by certain Spiritualists on the claims of the Founders of the Theosophical Society to be in personal relations with the Mahatmas of the sacred Himavat. For me, personally, the problem is of course *now* solved. It being impossible, I shall not even undertake to prove my case to those who, owing to prejudice and misconception, have determined to shut their eyes before the most glaring facts, for none are so blind as those who will not see, as the saying has it. I should at the same time consider to have ill-performed my duty were I not to put my facts before those earnest seekers after truth, who by sincere aspiration and devoted study, have been bringing themselves closer and closer to the 'Occult World.' The best way, I believe, to carry conviction to an intelligent mind is to narrate the facts in as plain and simple a way as possible, leaving speculations entirely out of consideration.

"At the outset I must state what is known to many of my friends and brothers of the Theosophical Society, viz., that for the last four years I have been the CHELA of Mr. Sinnett's correspondent. Now and then I have had occasion to refer publicly to this fact, and to the other one of my having seen some of the other VENERATED MAHATMAS OF THE HIMALAYAS, both in their astral and *physical* bodies. However, all that I could urge in favour of my point, viz., that these GREAT MASTERS are not disembodied spirits but living men—would fail to carry conviction to a Spiritualistic mind blinded by its prejudices and preconceptions. It has been suggested that either or both of the Founders may be mediums in whose presence forms could be seen, which are by them mistaken for real, living entities. And when I asserted

that I had these appearances even when alone, it was argued that I too was developing into a medium.

"In this connection a certain remark by Mr. C. C. Massey in a letter to *Light* of November 17th, is very suggestive, inasmuch as that gentleman is not only far from being inimical to us but is a Theosophist of long standing, bent solely on discovering truth and—nothing but the truth. The following extract from the said letter will show how great are the misconceptions even of some of our own fellow-members :—

"Nevertheless, were it an open question, free from authoritative statement, so that such a suggestion could be made without offence by one who would, if possible, avoid offence, I should avow the opinion that these letters, whether they are or are not the *ipseissima verba* of any Adept, were at all events penned by Madame Blavatsky, or by other accepted *Chelas*. At least I should think that she was a medium for their production, and not merely for their transmission. The fact that through the kindness of Mr. Sinnett I have been made familiar with the handwriting of the letters, and that it bears not the remotest resemblance to Madame Blavatsky's, would not influence me against that opinion, for reasons which every one acquainted with the phenomena of writing under psychical conditions will appreciate. But *I am bound to admit that there are circumstances connected with the receipt by Mr. Sinnett of other letters signed 'K.H.' which are, as regards those, apparently inconsistent with any instrumentality of Madame Blavatsky herself, whether as medium or otherwise, and the handwriting is in both cases the same.*

"Bearing well in mind the italicized portion in the above quotation, I would respectfully invite the Spiritualists to explain the fact of not only myself, but Colonel Olcott, Mr. Brown, and other gentlemen having on this tour received severally and on various occasions letters in reply to conversations and questions on the same day or the same hour, sometimes when alone and sometimes in company with others, when Madame Blavatsky was thousands of miles away ; the handwriting in all cases being the same and identical with that of the communications in Mr. Sinnett's possession.

"While on my tour with Colonel Olcott, several phenomena occurred,—in his presence as well as in his absence—such as immediate answers to questions in my Master's handwriting and over his signature, put by a number of our Fellows, and some of which are referred to in the last number of *The Theosophist*, while others need not be mentioned in a document going into the hands of the profane reader. These occurrences took place before we reached Lahore, where we expected to meet in body my much doubted MASTER. *There I was visited by him in body, for three nights consecutively for about three hours every time, while I myself retained full consciousness, and in one case, even went to meet him outside the house.* To my knowledge there is no case on the Spiritualistic records of a medium remaining perfectly conscious, and meeting, by previous arrangement, his spirit-visitor in the compound, re-entering the house with him, offering him a seat and then holding a long converse with the 'disembodied spirit' in a way to give him the impression that he is in personal contact with an embodied entity ! Moreover HIM whom I saw in person at Lahore was the same I had seen in astral form at the Headquarters of the Theosophical Society, and the same again whom I, in my visions and trances, had seen at His house, thousands of miles off, to reach which in my astral Ego I was permitted,

owing, of course, to His direct help and protection. In those instances, with my psychic powers hardly developed yet, I had always seen Him as a rather hazy form, although His features were perfectly distinct and their remembrance was profoundly graven on my soul's eye and memory ; while now at Lahore, Jummoo, and elsewhere, the impression was utterly different. In the former cases, when making *Prandm* (salutation) my hands passed through his form, while on the latter occasions they met solid garments and flesh. Here I saw a *living man* before me, the same in features, though far more imposing in His general appearance and bearing than Him I had so often looked upon in the portrait in Madame Blavatsky's possession and in the one with Mr. Sinnett. I shall not here dwell upon the fact of His having been corporeally seen by both Colonel Olcott and Mr. Brown separately, for two nights at Lahore, as they can do so better, each for himself, if they so choose. At Jummoo again, where we proceeded from Lahore, Mr. Brown saw Him on the evening of the third day of our arrival there, and from Him received a letter in His familiar handwriting, not to speak of His visits to me almost every day. And what happened the next morning almost every one in Jummoo is aware of. The fact is, that I had the good fortune of being sent for, and permitted to visit a Sacred *Ashrum*, where I remained for a few days in the blessed company of several of the much doubted MAHATMAS of Himavat and Their disciples. There I met not only my beloved Gurudeva and Colonel Olcott's Master, but several others of the Fraternity, including One of the Highest. I regret the extremely personal nature of my visit to those thrice blessed regions prevents my saying more of it. Suffice it that the place I was permitted to visit is in the HIMALAYAS, not in any fanciful Summer Land, and that I saw Him in my own *sthula sarira* (physical body) and found my Master identical with the form I had seen in the earlier days of my Chelaship. Thus, I saw my beloved Guru not only as a *living man*, but actually as a young one in comparison with some other Sadhus of the blessed company, only far kinder, and not above a merry remark and conversation at times. Thus on the second day of my arrival, after the meal hour I was permitted to hold an intercourse for over an hour with my Master. Asked by Him smilingly, what it was that made me look at Him so perplexed, I asked in my turn :—'How is it, MASTER, that some of the members of our Society have taken into their heads a notion that you were "an elderly man," and that they have even seen you clairvoyantly looking an old man past sixty ?' To which he pleasantly smiled and said, that this latest misconception was due to the reports of a certain Brahmachari, a pupil of a Vedantic Swami in the N.W.P.—who had met last year in Tibet the chief of a sect, an elderly Lama, who was His (my Master's) travelling companion at that time. The said Brahmachari having spoken of the encounter in India, had led several persons to mistake the Lama for himself. As to his being perceived clairvoyantly as an 'elderly man,' that could never be, he added, as *real* clairvoyance could lead no one into such mistaken notions ; and then he kindly reprimanded me for giving any importance to the age of a Guru, adding that appearances were often false, &c., and explaining other points.

"These are all stern facts and no third course is open to the reader. What I assert is either true or false. In the former case, no Spiritualistic hypothesis can hold good, and it will have to be admitted that the Himalayan Brothers are living men and neither disembodied spirits nor the

creatures of the over-heated imagination of fanatics. Of course I am fully aware that many will discredit my account, but I write only for the benefit of those few who know me well enough to see in me neither a hallucinated medium nor attribute to me any bad motive, and who have ever been true and loyal to their convictions and to the cause they have so nobly espoused. As for the majority who laugh at, and ridicule, what they have neither the inclination nor the capacity to understand, I hold them in very small account. If these few lines will help to stimulate even one of my brother Fellows in the Society or one right thinking man outside of it to promote the cause the GREAT MASTERS have imposed upon the devoted heads of the Founders of the Theosophical Society, I shall consider that I have properly performed my duty.

Adyar, Madras, 7th December, 1883.

APPENDIX IX.

(Communicated to us by Mr. Damodar K. Mavalankar, Joint Recording Secretary of the Theosophical Society.)

Adyar (Madras), India.
23rd September, 1884.

MEMORANDUM.

Since it is considered desirable to collect evidence regarding the occurrence of occult phenomena during Madame Blavatsky's absence, I shall say here a few words concerning the same. I must first state that I had the moral certainty concerning the existence of the Himalayan Mahatmas long before I heard of the name of the Theosophical Society, nay, even before it was formed in America. Being of a religious turn of mind, it was the constant end and aim of my aspirations to come in contact with personal relations with the Yogis. When some of the orthodox Brahmins told me that in this Kali Yuga no true Yogi could be found, I always argued that either no Yogi could have existed in *any* Yuga, or that if any existed before there must be similar persons now, however small may be their number at the present time. Our sacred literature was too full of the events of the lives of such great men, and I could never believe that it was all the fiction of a poetic brain. These men must have their successors living in some secluded part of the world, watching the destinies of the world, and assisting every individual effort to rise in the scale of progress. Moreover, there is so much of evil in the world that the equilibrium could not be preserved except the other pole were represented by the living Yogis. For such arguments and belief I was looked upon as a religious enthusiast, and being constantly engaged in the performance of religious rites and observances, not on a few occasions fear was entertained that I might run away into the jungles in search of the Mahatmas. In my childhood I had a very dangerous illness, and doctors gave me up for lost. While my relatives were every moment expecting my death, I had a vision which made such a deep impression on my mind that I could never forget it. Then I saw a certain

personage—whom I then considered to be a Deva, i.e., God—who gave me a peculiar medicine ; and curiously enough, I began to recover from that time. Some years after that, while I was one day engaged in meditation, I saw the identical Personage and recognised him as my Saviour. Once more He saved me from the clutches of death. It was some years after this last occasion that the founders of the Theosophical Society came to India ; and within a few months I joined the Society. Since then I have witnessed several phenomena, both in the presence and absence of Madame Blavatsky, in the company of others or while alone. These several accounts have from time to time been published in the *Theosophist* over my own name. There are several other occurrences not so mentioned, which I wrote about in private correspondence to Theosophical friends in London and New York. Especially the account of my going to the Mahatmas and staying with them last year, will be of interest to inquirers after truth. This account was published in the *Theosophist* for January, 1884. (See Appendix VIII.) I may here add that some time after I joined the Society, I saw several Mahatmas, both in their astral form and physical bodies, one of whom was the Mahatma known as Mr. Sinnett's correspondent and the author of the letters published in "The Occult World." And when I saw Him, I at once identified Him with the majestic Power I had seen in my youth thrice, He who had saved my life twice and appeared once during my meditation. I have got several letters from Him and others ; and all those, written by the same person, whether received by me direct or through anybody else, bear the same handwriting. Latterly, since They have chosen to give me verbal instructions, I have been receiving very few written communications. But even these few I have been receiving since Madame Blavatsky's departure to Europe. One especially may be noted here. As there were certain difficulties here, I wrote a letter to the Mahatma and put it in the Shrine. In the same letter I had enclosed another letter addressed by Mr. P. Shrinevas Row to the Mahatma. It lay in the Shrine for some time. One day I received a letter from Madame Blavatsky from England. In it was enclosed the Mahatma's reply. That reply was in answer to the question put by me in the Shrine, about which I had written nothing to Madame Blavatsky. After receiving the reply, I went up to the Shrine to look on the packet put by me there, but I found it had disappeared. The key being in my possession nobody else could have taken it. However, I was sorry that there was no reply to Mr. Shrinevas Row's letter. But the same afternoon, while Mr. T. Vijayaraghava Charloo was working in the office, as usual, he found the Mahatma's reply to Mr. Shrinevas Row on his table, in a place where there was nothing a minute before, he being at his table all the while. I have received several letters for the Mahatma from various members during the last few months ; and some of the replies to them were received by me to be sent to the writers, while others were received by my colleagues in the office or sometimes by the writers direct. Before joining the Society, as well as after, during Madame Blavatsky's absence as well as her presence, under a thousand and one different circumstances, I have received several letters for myself or for others from different Mahatmas, have seen them, talked to them, heard their voices, and seen several kinds of phenomena.

DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR, F.T.S.

APPENDIX X.

This is another account by Colonel Olcott of an interview which he describes in his deposition before the Committee.

From "Hints on Esoteric Theosophy," No. 1, p. 80.

"This same Brother once visited me in the flesh at Bombay, coming in full daylight, and on horseback. He had me called by a servant into the front room of H. P. B.'s bungalow (she being at the time in the other bungalow talking with those who were there). He came to scold me roundly for something I had done in T. S. matters, and as H. P. B. was also to blame, he *telegraphed* to her to come, that is to say, he turned his face and extended his finger in the direction of the place she was in. She came over at once with a rush, and seeing him dropped on her knees and paid him reverence. My voice and his had been heard by those in the other bungalow, but only H. P. B. and I and the servant *saw* him.

"Another time, two, if not three, persons, sitting in the verandah of my bungalow in the Girgaum compound, saw a Hindu gentleman ride in, dismount under H. P. B.'s portico, and enter her study. They called me, and I went and watched the horse until the visitor came out, remounted and rode off. That also was a Brother, in flesh and bones; but what proof is there of it to offer even to a friend like yourself? There are many Hindus and many horses.

"H. S. OLCOTT."

APPENDIX XI.

In the following account of Mr. Ramaswamier's interview with his Guru, it is difficult to maintain the theory of personation. It seems just conceivable, however, that it may have been a dream or vision arising from his long fast. Unfortunately, the appearance on the balcony to which he refers is one which, owing to the circumstances of the case, the exposure of the Coulombs renders peculiarly suspicious. An account of it is given in Appendix XIII. On the whole, we think Mr. Ramaswamier's evidence must be regarded as important.

ACCOUNT BY S. RAMASWAMIER, F.T.S.

From *The Theosophist*, December, 1882, pp. 67-69. (See also p. 76.)

Abridged from "HOW A 'CHELA' FOUND HIS 'GURU.'" (Being extracts from a private letter to Damodar K. Mavalankar, Joint Recording Secretary of the Theosophical Society.)

"When we met last at Bombay I told you what had happened to me at Tinnevely. My health having been disturbed by official work and worry, I applied for leave on medical certificate and it was duly granted. One day in September last, while I was reading in my room, I was ordered by the audible voice of my blessed Guru, M—— Maharsi, to leave all and proceed immediately to Bombay, whence I had to go in search of Madame Blavatsky wherever I could find her and follow her wherever she

went. Without losing a moment, I closed up all my affairs and left the station." Mr. Ramaswamier then describes how after journeying about, he at last found Madame Blavatsky at Chandernagore, and followed her to Darjeeling. "The first days of her arrival Madame Blavatsky was living at the house of a Bengalee gentleman, a Theosophist, was refusing to see any one; and preparing, as I thought, to go again somewhere on the borders of Tibet. To all our importunities we could get only this answer from her: that we had no business to *stick to and follow her*, that she did not want us, and that she had no right to disturb the Mahatmas, with all sorts of questions that concerned only the questioners, for they knew their own business best. In despair *I determined, come what might*, to cross the frontier which is about a dozen miles from here, and find the Mahatmas, or—DIE." He describes how he started on October 5th, crossed the river "which forms the boundary between the British and Sikkhim territories," walked on till dark, spent the night in a wayside hut, and on the following morning continued his journey.

"It was, I think, between eight and nine a.m. and I was following the road to the town of Sikkhim whence, I was assured by the people I met on the road, I could cross over to Tibet easily in my pilgrim's garb, when I suddenly saw a solitary horseman galloping towards me from the opposite direction. From his tall stature and the expert way he managed the animal, I thought he was some military officer of the Sikkhim Rajah. Now, I thought, am I caught! He will ask me for my pass and what business I have on the independent territory of Sikkhim, and, perhaps, have me arrested and—sent back, if not worse. But—as he approached me, he reined the steed. I looked at and recognised him instantly. . . I was in the awful presence of him, of the same Mahatma, my own revered *Guru* whom I had seen before in his astral body, on the balcony of the Theosophical Headquarters!* It was he, the 'Himalayan BROTHER' of the ever memorable night of December last, who had so kindly dropped a letter in answer to one I had given in a sealed envelope to Madame Blavatsky—whom I had never for one moment during the interval lost sight of—but an hour or so before! The very same instant saw me prostrated on the ground at his feet. I arose at his command and, leisurely looking into his face, I forgot myself entirely in the contemplation of the image I knew so well, having seen his portrait (the one in Colonel Olcott's possession) a number of times. I knew not what to say: joy and reverence tied my tongue. The majesty of his countenance, which seemed to me to be the *impersonation* of power and thought, held me rapt in awe. I was at last face to face with 'the Mahatma of the Himavat' and he was no myth, no 'creation of the imagination of a *medium*,' as some sceptics suggested. It was no night dream; it is between nine and ten o'clock of the forenoon. There is the sun shining and silently witnessing the scene from above. I see HIM before me in flesh and blood; and he speaks to me in accents of kindness and gentleness. What more do I want? My excess of happiness made me dumb. Nor was it until a few moments later that I was drawn to utter a few words, encouraged by his gentle tone and speech. His

*I refer the reader to Mr. Ramaswamier's letter on "Hints on Esoteric Theosophy," pp. 72 and 73, for a clearer comprehension of the highly important circumstance he refers to.—D. K. M. (See Appendix XII.)

complexion is not as fair as that of Mahatma Koot Hoomi ; but never have I seen a countenance so handsome, a stature so tall and so majestic. As in his portrait, he wears a short black beard, and long black hair hanging down to his breast ; only his dress was different. Instead of a white, loose robe he wore a yellow mantle lined with fur, and on his head, instead of a *pagri*, a yellow Tibetan felt cap, as I have seen some Bhootanese wear in this country. When the first moments of rapture and surprise were over and I calmly comprehended the situation, I had a long talk with him. He told me to go no further, for I would come to grief. He said I should wait patiently if I wanted to become an accepted *Chela* ; that many were those who offered themselves as candidates, but that only a very few were found worthy ; none were rejected—but all of them tried, and most found to fail signally, especially — and —. Some, instead of being accepted and pledged this year, were now thrown off for a year The Mahatma, I found, speaks very little English—or at least it so seemed to me—and *spoke to me in my mother tongue—Tamil*. He told that if the *Chohan* permitted Madame B. to go to Pari-jong next year, then I could come with her. . . . The Bengalee Theosophists who followed the ‘Upasika’ (Madame Blavatsky) would see that she was right in trying to dissuade them from following her now. I asked the blessed Mahatma whether I could tell what I saw and heard to others. He replied in the affirmative, and that moreover I would do well to write to you and describe all. . . .

“I must impress upon your mind the whole situation and ask you to keep well in view that what I saw was not the mere ‘appearance’ only, the astral body of the Mahatma, as we saw him at Bombay, but the *living man, in his own physical body*. He was pleased to say when I offered my farewell *namaskarams* (prostration) that he approached the British Territory to see the Upasika. . . . Before he left me, two more men came on horseback, his attendants, I suppose, probably *Chelas*, for they were dressed like *lama-gylongs*, and both, like himself, with long hair streaming down their backs. They followed the Mahatma, as he left, at a gentle trot. For over an hour I stood gazing at the place that he had just quitted, and then, I slowly retraced my steps. Now it was that I found for the first time that my long boots had pinched me in my leg in several places, that I had eaten nothing since the day before, and that I was too weak to walk further. My whole body was aching in every limb. At a little distance I saw petty traders with country ponies, taking burden. I hired one of these animals. In the afternoon I came to the Rungit River and crossed it. A bath in its cool waters renovated me. I purchased some fruits in the only bazaar there and ate them heartily. I took another horse immediately and reached Darjeeling late in the evening. I could neither eat, nor sit, nor stand. Every part of my body was aching. My absence had seemingly alarmed Madame Blavatsky. She scolded me for my rash and mad attempt to try to go to Tibet after this fashion. When I entered the house I found with Madame Blavatsky, Babu Parbati Churn Roy, Deputy Collector of Settlements and Superintendent of Dearah Survey, and his Assistant, Babu Kanty Bhushan Sen, both members of our Society. At their prayer and Madame Blavatsky’s command, I recounted all that had happened to me, reserving, of course, my private conversation with the Mahatma. . . . They were all, to say the least, astounded ! . . . After all, she will not go this year to Tibet ; for which I am sure she does not care,

since she saw our Masters, thus effecting her only object. But we, unfortunate people ! We lose our only chance of going and offering our worship to the 'Himalayan Brothers' who—I *know*—will not soon cross over to British territory, if ever again.

"I write to you this letter, my dearest Brother, in order to show how right we were in protesting against 'H.X.'s' letter in *The Theosophist*. The ways of the Mahatmas may appear, to our limited vision, strange and unjust, even cruel—as in the case of our Brothers here, the Bengalee Babus, some of whom are now laid up with cold and fever and perhaps murmuring against the Brothers, forgetting that they never asked or personally permitted them to come, but that they had themselves acted very rashly. . . .

"And now that I have seen the Mahatma in the flesh, and heard his living voice, let no one dare say to me that the Brothers *do not* exist. Come now whatever will, death has no fear for me, nor the vengeance of enemies ; for what I know, I KNOW !

"You will please show this to Colonel Olcott, who first opened my eyes to the *Gnana Marga*, and who will be happy to hear of the success (more than I deserve) that has attended me. I shall give him details in person.

"S. RAMASWAMIER, F.T.S.

"Darjeeling, October 7th, 1882."

In the account on p. 76 of *Theosophist*, Mr. Ramaswamier says that he recognised the Mahatma "on account of his great resemblance to a portrait in Colonel Olcott's possession, which I have repeatedly seen."

APPENDIX XII.

Though in the following statement Mr. Mirza Moorad Alea Beg gives us no details, his assertions are very strong, and commit him nearly as fully as Madame Blavatsky and Mr. Damodar are committed, to the existence and powers of the Mahatmas apart from the Theosophical Society.

From *The Theosophist*, August, 1881, p. 230.

"THE OCCULT WORLD" AND THE "SPIRITUALIST."

"Having just read in the London *Spiritualist* a review of Mr. Sinnett's book, 'The Occult World,' I find in it more than a doubt expressed as to the reality of the 'Brothers,' that body of mystics to which the personage known as 'Koot Hoomi Lal Singh' belongs. The Editor of that paper would have his readers believe that the said person is a creation of Madame Blavatsky's fancy. 'Mr. Sinnett,' he says, 'has never seen Koot Hoomi, nor does he mention that any other Theosophist in India has had that privilege.'

"As some other persons may express the same doubts, and also some, while admitting their genuine character, may attribute them to agency other than that to which Madame Blavatsky refers them (the so-called 'Brothers,' &c.), I hereby declare that not only have I within the last few days *seen* one of the persons so designated at the Headquarters of the Society at Bombay, but that I have very good reasons (which I cannot go into more fully now) to

know that the said persons are *not* 'spirits' but real human beings exercising powers out of the ordinary. Both *before* and *after* my connection with the Theosophical Society I have known and conversed with them *personally* and witnessed the most wonderful results (which would ordinarily be described as miraculous), but I must emphasise my declaration that I *do not* regard them as *supernatural* and am altogether materialistic (or rather *naturalistic*) in my conceptions of the agency producing them. Further I testify that I have the strongest conviction, based on reasons which, though authoritative, are purely natural and physical, that the said 'Brothers' are a mysterious fraternity, the ordinary location of which is the regions north of the Himalayas.

"MIRZA MOORAD ALEE BEG, F.T.S.,
"Acting President of the 'Saorashttr Theosophical
"Society' at Bhaunagar."

"The criticisms upon Mr. Sinnett's book 'The Occult World' force upon me the duty of testifying from *personal* experience and knowledge to the fact that those whom we call our 'Brothers of the First Section,' of whom 'Koot Hoomi Lal Singh' is one, and who possess the so-called 'miraculous' powers, are real and living beings and not disembodied spirits as the Editor of the *Spiritualist* would have his readers think. It is but by a long course of study and training that such can be attained. It is *not belief* with me but *knowledge*, for, if I have seen one of them, I have at least seen about half a dozen on various occasions, in broad daylight, in open places, and have talked to them, not only when Madame Blavatsky was in Bombay but even when she was far away and I here. I have also seen them at times when I was travelling. I was taken to the residences of some of them and once when Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky were with me. Further than that I cannot say, and shall not give any more information either about them or the places they reside in, for I am under a solemn obligation of secrecy and the subject is too sacred for me to be trifled with. I may, however, mention that I know 'Koot Hoomi Lal Singh' personally and have seen and conversed with him when Madame Blavatsky was here as also when she was far away. But under what circumstances I am not at liberty to disclose.

"We Hindus who know the 'Brothers' think it equally absurd and ridiculous to insinuate that either Madame Blavatsky is a lunatic or an impostor, or that persons like Mr. Sinnett could have ever become her dupes. Neither is she a medium, nor are the 'Brothers' 'disembodied Spirits.'

"DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR, F.T.S."

"I have had the honour to be a member of the Theosophical Society for upwards of two years, and during that period my relations with the Founders have been so cordial and intimate, that I can with confidence leave myself entirely to their guidance, so deep is my trust in the purity of their motives and the steadfastness to the cause they represent. Not this alone. They have not once raised false hopes which only end in vain regrets. What they have asserted they have proved abundantly. And I have to thank Madame Blavatsky in a very especial degree for having given me opportunities to realise,—what is generally supposed to be the mere creatures of that lady's imagination—the existence of the 'Brothers.' Other deserving Fellows of our

Society have had the same felicity as myself. So long as I live I shall continue to offer my heart-felt homage to the Himalayan Brotherhood, who from their far retreat condescend to watch the progress of this Society, and even the interests of some of its individual Fellows.

“S. J. PADSHAH, F.T.S.

“We, the undersigned Theosophists, having read in the London *Spiritualist* the review of Mr. Sinnett's book ‘The Occult World’ and the doubts thrown therein upon the actual existence of a Brother of our First Section known as Koot Hoomi Lal Singh, with the sole object, as we infer, of supporting the theory of ‘disembodied Spirits,’ consider it our duty to protest.

“In common with some other Theosophists of Bombay, we have had, on several occasions, the honour to see these ‘Brothers’ of our Society's First Section. We have thus been led to know that they represent a class of living, not ‘disembodied’ men or ghosts—as the Spiritualists would insist upon; that they are in possession of the highest virtues and psychic capabilities, and have, as we are assured from the opportunities we have been permitted to enjoy, ever exerted such powers for beneficent purposes, regarding the whole humanity as a Universal Brotherhood, but keeping aloof from the world for reasons best known to themselves.

“MARTUNDROW BABAJEE NAGNATH, F.T.S.

“BHAVANISHANKAR GANESH MULLAPOORCAR, F.T.S.”

APPENDIX XIII.

The whole force of the evidence in the following case depends on what value can be attached to a recognition by moonlight of a person on a balcony above you. Apart from this recognition, personation through the agency of the Coulombs would appear to be peculiarly easy in this case.

We give the case chiefly on account of the references to it by Colonel Olcott and Mr. Ramaswamier in Appendices I. and XI.

“Hints on Esoteric Theosophy,” No. 1, pp. 72, 73.

[CERTIFICATE.]

“Bombay, December 28th, 9 p.m., 1881.

“The undersigned, returning a few moments since from a carriage ride with Madame Blavatsky, saw, as the carriage approached the house, a man upon the balcony over the *porte cochère*, leaning against the balustrade, and with the moonlight shining full upon him. He was dressed in white, and wore a white *Fekta* on his head. His beard was black, and his long black hair hung to his breast. Olcott and Damodar at once recognised him as the ‘Illustrious.’* He raised his hand and dropped a letter to us. Olcott jumped from the carriage and recovered it. It was written in Tibetan characters, and signed with his familiar cypher. It was a message to Ramaswamier, in

* A name by which Colonel Olcott's *Chohan* is known amongst us.—H. X.

reply to a letter (in a closed envelope) which he had written to the Brother a short time before we went out for the ride. M. Coulomb, who was reading inside the house, and a short distance from the balcony, neither saw nor heard any one pass through the apartment, and no one else was in the bungalow, except Madame Coulomb, who was asleep in her bedroom.

"Upon descending from the carriage, our whole party immediately went upstairs, but the Brother had disappeared.

"H. S. OLCOTT.

"DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR."

"The undersigned further certifies to Mr. — that from the time when he gave the note to Madame Blavatsky until the Brother dropped the answer from the balcony, she was not out of his sight.

"S. RAMASWAMIER, F.T.S., B.A.

"District Registrar of Assurances, Tinnevely.

"P.S.—Babula was below in the *porte-cochère*, waiting to open the carriage door, at the time when the Brother dropped the letter from above. The coachman also saw him distinctly.

"S. RAMASWAMIER.

"DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR.

"H. S. OLCOTT."

APPENDIX XIV.

Personation does not seem impossible in this case considering the distance, and that there may have been modes of ingress to the room known only to the Coulombs. Still less does it seem impossible that it can have been the real man in the flesh.

"Hints on Esoteric Theosophy," No. 1, pp. 75, 76.

"The undersigned severally certify that, in each other's presence, they recently saw at the headquarters of the Theosophical Society" (at Bombay) "a Brother of the First Section, known to them under a name which they are not at liberty to communicate to the public. The circumstances were of a nature to exclude all idea of trickery or collusion, and were as follow :—

"We were sitting together in the moonlight about 9 o'clock upon the balcony which projects from the front of the bungalow. Mr. Scott was sitting facing the house, so as to look through the intervening verandah and the library, and into the room at the further side. This latter apartment was brilliantly lighted.

"The library was in partial darkness, thus rendering objects in the farther room more distinct. Mr. Scott suddenly saw the figure of a man step into the space, opposite the door of the library; he was clad in the white dress of a Rajput, and wore a white turban. Mr. Scott at once recognised him from his resemblance to a portrait in Colonel Olcott's possession. Our attention was then drawn to him, and we all saw him most distinctly. He walked towards a table, and afterwards turning his face towards us, walked back out of our sight. We hurried forward to get a closer view, in the hope

that he might also speak ; but when we reached the room he was gone. We cannot say by what means he departed, but that he did not pass out by the door which leads into the compound we can positively affirm ; for that door was full in our view, and he did not go out by it. At the side of the room towards which he walked there was no exit, the only door and the two windows in that direction having been boarded and closed up. Upon the table, at the spot where he had been standing, lay a letter addressed to one of our number. The handwriting was identical with that of sundry notes and letters previously received from him in divers ways—such as dropping down from the ceiling, &c. : the signature was the same as that of the other letters received, and as that upon the portrait above described. His long hair was black and hung down upon his breast ; his features and complexion were those of a Rajput.

“ROSS SCOTT, B.C.S.

“MINNIE J. B. SCOTT.

“H. S. OLCOTT.

“H. P. BLAVATSKY.

“M. MOORAD ALI BEG.

“DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR.

“BHAVANI SHANKAR GANESH MULLAPOORKAR.”

APPENDIX XV.

The first part of this extract is the account in “Hints on Esoteric Theosophy,” to which Colonel Olcott refers in his deposition, &c.

“Hints on Esoteric Theosophy,” No. 1, pp. 79, 82, 83.

“One evening, at New York, after bidding H. P. B. good night, I sat in my bed-room, finishing a cigar and thinking. Suddenly there stood my *Chohan* beside me. The door had made no noise in opening, if it *had* been opened, but at any rate there he was. He sat down and conversed with me in subdued tones for some time, and as he seemed in an excellent humour towards me, I asked him a favour. I said I wanted some tangible proof that he had actually been there, and that I had not been seeing a mere illusion or *maya* conjured up by H. P. B. He laughed, unwound the embroidered Indian cotton *fehla* he wore on his head, flung it to me, and—was gone. That cloth I still possess, and it bears in one corner the initials (—*) of my *Chohan* in thread-work. . . .”

“I do not know whether or not there is any significance in the fact of my *Chohan's* visiting me on the night of the 27th, but you may. He made me rise, sit at my table and write from his dictation for an hour or more. There was an expression of anxiety mingled with sternness on his noble face, as there always is when the matter concerns H. P. B., to whom for many years he has been at once a father and a devoted guardian. How I do hope you may see him ! You would confess, I am sure, that he was the finest possible type of *man*.

“H. S. OLCOTT.”

* A peculiar monogram, which cannot be reproduced in type—Tibetan, I believe—which this Brother always uses.—H. X.

APPENDIX XVI.

The following letter has been received from a lady known to several of the Committee:—

My dear Mr. Myers,—I see no difficulty whatever in telling you what happened in my presence, a few days ago, at Mrs. A.'s house, where I had been dining with Madame Blavatsky.

In the midst of conversation, referring to various subjects, Madame Blavatsky became silent, and we all distinctly heard a sound that might be compared to that produced by a small silver bell.

The same phenomenon was produced later on, in the drawing-room, adjoining the dining-room.

I was naturally surprised at this manifestation, but still more by the following incident: I had been singing a Russian song that I brought with me that evening, and which seemed to give much pleasure to my audience.

After the last chord of the accompaniment had died away, Madame Blavatsky said, "Listen," and held up her hand, and we distinctly heard the last full chord—composed of five notes—repeated in our midst.

I have, of course, not the slightest means for giving any kind of explanation, but the facts were such as I have stated.

O. N.

APPENDIX XVII.

"Hints on Esoteric Theosophy," No. 1, pp. 27-8.

"Take the sounding of the astral bell, which dozens of us have heard indoors and out of doors, morning, noon and night, close to us and far away up in the air—when large parties were gathered together, and when we have been alone in the room in which Madame Blavatsky was, and on at least two occasions in rooms more or less distant from her—caused by the exercise of her own powers, according to her statement, at times when we were waiting to hear it, and caused by the Brothers, according to her account, to attract her attention, at times when we were not in the least expecting it, and when she was in earnest conversation with us, herself speaking, on one occasion at any rate, when the bell rang out.

"The sound, by the way, is quite *sui generis*. You can most nearly imitate it by striking the finger wetted on the edge of a finger-glass half full of water, and drawing it for a second along the edge.

"A. O. HUMÉ."

APPENDIX XVIII.

This evidence has been commented on in our Report.

Account by Mrs. Gordon, from "Hints on Esoteric Theosophy," No. 1, *vide* pp. 109-125.

[EXTRACT.]

"Colonel Olcott had told me that he had had an intimation in the night from his *Chohan* (teacher) that K. H. had been to the *Vega* and had seen Eglinton. This was at about eight o'clock on Thursday morning, the 23rd. A few hours later a telegram, dated at Bombay 22nd day, 21 hour 9 minutes,

that is to say 9 minutes past 9 p.m., on Wednesday evening, came to me from Madame Blavatsky, to this effect :—‘K. H. just gone to *Vega*.’ This telegram came as a ‘delayed’ message, and was *posted* to me from Calcutta, which accounts for its not reaching me until midday on Thursday. It corroborated, as will be seen, the message of the previous night to Colonel Olcott. We then felt hopeful of getting the letter by occult means from Mr. Eglinton. A telegram later on Thursday asked us to fix a time for a sitting, so we named nine o’clock Madras time, on Friday, 24th. At this hour we three—Colonel Olcott, Colonel Gordon, and myself—sat in the room which had been occupied by Mr. Eglinton. We had a good light, and sat with our chairs placed to form a triangle, of which the apex was to the north. In a few minutes Colonel Olcott saw outside the open window the two ‘Brothers’ whose names are best known to us, and told us so; he saw them pass to another window, the glass doors of which were closed. He saw one of them point his hand towards the air over my head, and I felt something at the same moment fall straight down from above on to my shoulder, and saw it fall at my feet in the direction *towards* the two gentlemen. I knew it would be the letter, but for the moment I was so anxious to see the ‘Brothers’ that I did not pick up what had fallen. Colonel Gordon and Colonel Olcott both saw and heard the letter fall. Colonel Olcott had turned his head from the window for a moment to see what the ‘Brother’ was pointing at, and so noticed the letter falling from a point about two feet from the ceiling. When he looked again the two ‘Brothers’ had vanished.

“There is no verandah outside, and the window is several feet from the ground.

“I now turned and picked up what had fallen on me, and found a letter in Mr. Eglinton’s handwriting, dated on the *Vega*, the 24th; a message from Madame Blavatsky, dated at Bombay, the 24th, written on the backs of three of her visiting cards; also a larger card such as Mr. Eglinton had a packet of, and used at his *Séances*. On this latter card was the, to us, well-known handwriting of K. H., and a few words in the handwriting of the other ‘Brother,’ who was with him outside our windows, and who is Colonel Olcott’s Chief. All these cards and the letter were threaded together with a piece of blue sewing silk. We opened the letter carefully by slitting up one side, as we saw that some one had made on the flap in pencil three Latin crosses, and so we kept them intact for identification.”

Mrs. Gordon thus sums up the more salient features of the phenomenon :—

“(1) Mr. Eglinton was personally unknown to Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, the former having not even written to him once, the latter once only—in acknowledgment of a letter of introduction from a London friend. Mr. E.’s views and theirs respecting mediumistic phenomena were in conflict. Collusion, therefore, was out of the question. (2) Mr. E.’s personal ‘Spirit-guide,’ using the direct voice while the medium was entranced, told me that he had now become acquainted with the ‘Brothers,’ and would try to do a phenomenon after Mr. Eglinton’s departure by steamer from Calcutta. (3) A corroborative intimation came to me from the ‘Brothers’ through Madame Blavatsky, by telegram after Mr. E. had left Howrah, and while his vessel was in the stream. (4) At 8 a.m. on the 23rd, Colonel Olcott

informed us that during the night his 'Guru' had told him that K. H. had visited the *Vega*; a telegram received later in the day from Bombay corroborates this statement. (5) By appointment we sit in Mr. Eglinton's late bed-chamber at a designated hour. Colonel O. sees the doubles or astral forms of two Brothers whom he names; one extends his arm towards me and at the same instant a packet of papers falls vertically upon my shoulder: (it falls not from, but *towards* Colonel Olcott and Colonel Gordon, therefore it was not thrown by either of them). (6) A good light was burning and we could see each other's movements. (7) In the packet were a letter from Mr. E., dated the same day, on the *Vega*, and announcing that he should read the letter to a certain lady on board, and ask her to mark the envelope; * also a note from Madame Blavatsky, dated at Bombay, the 24th, certifying to the reception of the letter from Mr. E.; and (on one of Mr. E.'s own blank cards) messages from the two Brothers whom Colonel Olcott saw outside our windows. All these points the sceptic must dispose of: to account for any one or two will not suffice. Though every other item were brushed away, the phenomenal delivery of the papers would stand as a marvellous example of the power enjoyed by our mystical Chiefs over the forces of Nature."

A few days later she published the following certificate which reached her by post on the 28th March:—

"At 8 p.m. (Bombay time), on Friday, the 24th March, 1882, we were spending our time with Madame Blavatsky in the room as the wind was blowing powerfully outside. Madame told us that she felt that something would occur. The whole party, consisting of seven persons, then adjourned on the terrace, and within a few minutes after our being there, we saw a letter drop as if from under the roof above. Some of us saw the letter coming slanting from one direction and drop quite opposite to where it came from. The letter on being opened was found to contain a closed envelope to the address of Mrs. Gordon, Howrah; on the reverse side were three crosses ††† in pencil. The envelope was of bluish colour and thin. The open letter written in red pencil contained certain instructions to Madame Blavatsky, and accordingly she put the envelope together with three visiting cards, and strung them all with a blue thread of silk and put the packet as directed on a book case, and within five minutes after it was put there it evaporated, to our no small surprise.

"K. M. SHROFF,

"Vice-President Bombay T. S.

"GWALA K. DEB, F.T.S.

"DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR, F.T.S.

"MARTANDREW B. NAGNATH, F.T.S.

"DORAB H. BHARUCHA, F.T.S.

"BHAVANI SHANKAR, F.T.S."

"The packet was taken away from the book case at 21 minutes past 8 p.m. (9, Madras time). A letter from Mr. Eglinton to myself was also received by me. In it he confesses to a firm belief in the 'Brothers.' Speaks of K. H. having visited him two nights ago (the 22nd) on the *Vega*, &c.

"H. P. BLAVATSKY."

* It should be noted that the envelope marked by this lady was for some reason opened, and the three crosses, which was a different mark to hers, put by Mr. Eglinton on a new envelope in the presence of witnesses. There was therefore no proof of identity between the letter received and that shown on the *Vega*.

APPENDIX XIX.

THE THEOSOPHICAL MAHATMAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "PALL MALL GAZETTE."

Sir,—Since an attempt is now being made by the opponents of the Theosophical Society to discredit the whole movement by circulating the report that the "Mahatmas," or Eastern Adepts, are but "crafty arrangements of muslin and bladders," I ask permission to say a word. I have sacrificed all my worldly prospects, as is well known in my native city of Calcutta, to devote myself to the propagation of the esoteric philosophy of my race, in connection with the Society so unjustly slandered. Needless to say I should not have taken this step, with many others of my countrymen, if the Theosophical Society were but a sham, and the Mahatmas vulgar "concoctions of muslin and bladders." To a Brahman, like myself, it is repugnant to speak of the sacredly confidential relationship existing between a spiritual teacher and his pupil. Yet duty compels me in this instance to say that I have personal and absolute knowledge of the existence of the Mahatma who has corresponded with Mr. Sinnett, and is known to the Western world as "Koot Hoomi." I had knowledge of the Mahatma in question before I knew Madame Blavatsky, and I met him in person when he passed through the Madras Presidency to China last year.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

MOHINI M. CHATTERJI.

12, Platzhofstrasse, Elberfeld, Germany, September 30th (1884).

APPENDIX XX.

The weak point of the first case in this Appendix is in the almost necessary uncertainty as to the previous absence of the writing. We have already commented on the value of evidence of this sort in our remarks on Mr. Mohini's deposition. (Appendix II.)

The second case does not appear to us evidentially of much importance, because it was at the open window the ribbon fell, and Madame Coulomb was with Dr. Hartmann at Bombay.

From the Supplement to *The Theosophist*, April, 1884, p. 65.

"Enclosed is an article, entitled 'Chastity;' to which a little history is attached, that may perhaps interest my brother-Theosophists.

"I left Wadhwan on the 15th of February in company with Madame Blavatsky and Baboo Mohini M. Chatterjee. We were on our way to Bombay, returning from a visit to his Highness, the Thakore Saheb of Wadhwan. A few hours before we started, Madame Blavatsky had read the said article, corrected a few words and returned it to me. I read it carefully to see what corrections she had made, and whether I might not myself make some changes. I only found a few words corrected, folded the paper, put it in my pocket-book, deposited the pocket-book in my satchel, locked the same, entered the car and put the satchel on my seat, where it never left me and never was out of my sight, until the event which I am about

to describe occurred. We travelled on, Madame Blavatsky being in the same car. Towards evening Madame Blavatsky requested me to let her see that article again. I took it out of my satchel, unfolding the paper before handing it to her, and as I did so, imagine my surprise to find on it four long lines written on a space which was blank before, in the well-known handwriting of our Master, and in a different kind of ink than that used by Madame Blavatsky. How that writing could have been done in my satchel and during the shaking of the car, I do not pretend to explain.

"Another incident occurred when I was alone by myself. On the morning of the 20th of February, I received a curious Thibetan medal from our Master through Madame Blavatsky. I then accompanied her on board the steamer on which she was to sail for Europe. On my return to the shore I went into a native jewellery shop and bought a locket to deposit my medal, but could not find a chain long enough for my purpose. I then returned to my room, and paced the floor, studying what to do in regard to the chain. I finally came to the conclusion that I would buy a rose-coloured silk ribbon. But where to get it, being a stranger in Bombay; that was the question. My pacing the floor brought me again in front of the open window, and there right before me on the floor lay exactly the very silk ribbon, brand new, and just the one I wanted.

"A. B., F. T. S.
(Dr. T. Hartmann.

"Bombay, 21st February, 1884."

APPENDIX XXI.

This Appendix should be taken in connection with the next, as they deal to some extent with the same phenomena.

From Supplement to *The Theosophist*, August, 1884, p. 113.

"I beg to place upon record certain phenomena noticed by me after Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott left Madras to proceed on their present European tour.

"I. On the 17th February, 1884—(Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott were then in Bombay)—I was favoured with a kind letter from our Master, Mahatma K. H. It was a long letter in the Mahatma's handwriting, showing me how the spread of Sanscrit literature was likely to prove advantageous to the country; directing me to assume the superintendence of the Triplicane Sanscrit School; and giving me wholesome instructions and advice as to the encouragement to be given to the school-masters and pupils, &c. The letter was handed to me personally by Brothers Messrs. Damodar and Bawaji who furnish the following particulars as to the way in which the letter reached them. That afternoon Mr. Bawaji—who was for some time writing at a certain table in the office room of the Headquarters,—rose and approached the table at which Mr. Damodar was seated; but the latter,—acting upon the impulse which he just then had—immediately desired the former to go back to the table which he had left a few seconds before, Mr. Bawaji did as he was told; and found

the above mentioned letter on the table at a place where there was no paper before. It was enclosed in a note addressed by the Mahatma K. H. to Mr. Bawaji himself, desiring him to hand over the letter to me personally—which was accordingly done ; and I need hardly add that the instructions of the Mahatma have been duly followed by me. I may also add that the letter contained a reference to a certain fact about the then working of the School, of which nobody at the Headquarters was or could be aware.

“II. On the 4th March, 1884—(Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott were at this time on the ocean, having left Bombay on February 20th for Marseilles)—I, owing to certain domestic afflictions, felt exceedingly miserable ; could not take a morsel of food ; and remained in the most wretched condition of mind all that day. But in the evening, between 5 and 6 p.m., I proceeded to Adyar, in the hope of finding some consolation there ; and was seated in the office-room of the Headquarters, talking to Mr. Bawaji, without, however, mentioning to any body the circumstance of my being in an unhappy condition. In the meantime, Mr. Damodar stepped in ; and I at once expressed to him my desire to see the ‘Shrine.’ He very kindly conducted me to the occult room upstairs forthwith ; and unlocked the ‘Shrine.’ He and I were standing hardly five seconds looking at the Mahatma K. H.’s portrait in the ‘Shrine,’ when he (Mr. Damodar) told me that he had orders to close the ‘Shrine’ ; and did so immediately. This course was extremely disappointing to me, who, as the reader will have perceived from the above, was sorely in need of some consolation or other at that time. But ere I could realise the pangs of this disappointment, Mr. Damodar re-opened in an instant the ‘Shrine’ by orders. My eye immediately fell upon a letter in a Tibetan envelope in the cup in the ‘Shrine,’ which was quite empty before ! I ran and took the letter, and finding that it was addressed to me by Mahatma K. H., I opened and read it. It contained very kind words conveying consolation to my aching heart ; advising me to take courage ; explaining how the laws of *Karma* were inevitable ; and finally referring me to Mr. Damodar for further explanation of certain passages in the letter.

“How my presence before his portrait attracted the instantaneous notice of the Mahatma, being thousands of miles off ; how the Mahatma divined that I was miserable and was in need of comfort at his hands ; how he projected his long and consoling letter from such great distance into the closed cabinet, within the twinkling of an eye ; and, above all, how solicitous he, the great Mahatma, is for the well-being of mankind, and more especially of persons devoted to him,—are points which I leave to the sensible reader to consider and profit by. Enough to say that this unmistakable sign of extraordinary kindness on the part of the great Master armed me with sufficient energy to shake off the miserable and gloomy thoughts, and filled my heart with unmixed comfort and excessive joy, coupled with feelings of the sincerest gratitude to the benevolent Mahatma for this blessing.

“III. Two days before the current new year’s day of the Hindus (26th March, 1884), I wrote a long letter to Mahatma K. H., soliciting instructions and advice in respect of certain important matters, and handed it to Brother Mr. Damodar to be put in the ‘Shrine,’ at about 6.30 in the evening. And on the following day, at about 2 p.m., Brother Mr. Damodar sent me a closed letter, which was in the familiar handwriting of Mahatma K. H., containing

replies on all points referred to in my letter, besides valuable information on other matters which he considered necessary that I should understand. On inquiry, I learnt that the aforesaid letter had fallen upon Mr. Bawaji's table during the few seconds which intervened between his leaving the table on some business and re-joining it afterwards *in the office-room*, the only two persons in this room not having left their seats in the interval.

"All these three phenomena, transpiring as they have done, during the absence of our Founders from Madras, speak volumes for themselves ; and I record them for the benefit of my Brothers.

"P. SREENEVAS ROW.

"Madras, 9th July, 1884."

In a subsequent communication sent to us by Mr. P. Sreenivas Row through Dr. Hartmann, he mentions some other instances of similar phenomena, and adds that raps have been made in apparent connection with a portrait of Mahatma Koot Hoomi in his own house.

APPENDIX XXII.

The following communication sent to us by Mr. Babajee D. Nath through Dr. Hartmann contains important evidence.

1. He asserts that he saw a letter actually forming itself on his table.
2. That about the 1st of last August, some time after the Coulombs and servants supposed to be attached to them had been expelled, and while the founders of the Society were still in England, he being alone in the room, a heavy packet fell with some noise, and was found to contain letters, &c., in the Koot Hoomi handwriting.
3. The statements in paragraph 9 involve the occurrence of Koot Hoomi's handwriting without the direct agency of Madame Blavatsky.

Mr. Babajee also gives us the important information that he has lived in Thibet, and knows the Mahatmas personally.

"Having been called upon to give an account of the phenomena that have taken place independent of, or during the absence of, Madame H. P. Blavatsky, I beg to state as follows :—

1. "I was present when Rawal Shree Hurreesinghjee Roopsinghjee (of Varel, Kathiawar, Guzeratha) opened the Shrine and found a reply inside his unopened letter. This phenomenon is described in the last paragraph but one of his letter published on p. 87 of the Supplement to the *Theosophist* for June, 1884.

2. "One morning in February, 1884, I was addressing wrappers for subscribers to the *Theosophist*, at my desk in the *Theosophist* office at Adyar. There lay on my desk a bundle of about one hundred wrappers to be addressed ; and next to it on the desk was also stretched out the mailing register of subscribers. In the course of addressing the wrappers, I suspected

that a subscriber had changed his address, and that the change was omitted to be noted in the register ; to satisfy myself on this point, I left my desk and went to the desk of an assistant manager in the same office-room. I returned within a minute to my desk. Damodar K. Mavalankar had not stirred at all, but was working at his desk as usual. We were only three in the room. On approaching my desk, I saw *distinctly* an envelope and paper *forming* themselves, and in a few seconds, on the partly addressed wrapper lay an envelope (or rather a closed letter) to the address of Mr. P. Sreenivas Row, Small Cause Judge of Madras. This phenomenon is recorded in paragraph 4 of his letter dated 9th July, 1884, published at p. 113 of the Supplement to the *Theosophist* for August, 1884.

3. "A similar phenomenon happened when we three alone were in the office-room, and it is described in paragraph 2 of Mr. Sreenivas Row's letter above quoted.

4. "One evening, my friend and brother, T. Vijaiaraghava Charloo Garu (whom we familiarly call here as Ananda), was sorely troubled at heart by some private affairs. During the night he slept in his usual place on the verandah as myself and Damodar. Early in the morning he rolled up his bed and put it away. Damodar asked him funnily whether he could not notice anything strange in his bed. I forget the exact words. In reply Vijayaraghava Charloo Garu rushed at once to examine his bed, and found there where he laid his head a note from Mahatma K.H. in a Chinese envelope—giving him the consolation and encouragement he then so much needed. This happened on 27th February, 1884, after Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott had left for Europe.

5. "On or about the 1st August, 1884, I was examining whether the wrappers addressed to subscribers (to the *Theosophist*) were correct, sitting in the room next to our office-room ; on a large camp table were spread the addressed wrappers. With some noise fell a heavy packet (with a covering letter to me) on the wrappers. The letter contained some wholesome and timely advice to me, and directed me to hand over the packet to Mr. St. George Lane-Fox. I accordingly gave it, and found that in the packet was a Chinese envelope and letter addressed both to Dr. F. Hartmann and to Mr. Lane-Fox. When the packet fell on my table, there was nobody then in the room or in the office-room. I was alone. The letter and contents were in the well-known handwritings of Mahatma K.H. and of B.D.S.

6. "Mr. Peter Davidson (F.T.S., of 9, Arbeadie Terrace, Banchory, Kincardineshire), wrote a letter dated 27th February, 1884, to the address of Mr. W. T. Brown, who is now with us here. Mr. Brown handed over the letter to Damodar in the morning, as soon as the letter was received by the mail, after reading it. The two founders, Madame B. and Col. O., had left India then. Damodar left Davidson's letter on our office table. As I was all along in the office and writing on the table, I know that the letter remained uninterfered with, until in the afternoon we found an endorsement in blue pencil by Mahatma K.H., directing me to answer Mr. Davidson, to whom I accordingly wrote a letter, dated 21st March, 1884.

7. "M. R. Ry. G. Sreenivas Row Garu, Sule Registrar of Cumbum, Kurnool District, India, wrote a letter dated 15th January, 1884, to the address of Damodar, who gave it to me for reply. Early in the morning at 7

a.m., I arranged all the papers to be answered on my desk, with which nobody ever interferes. I put this letter of Sreenivas Row in a prominent place on the table, and then after locking the office-room and taking the key with myself, I went out to take a bath ; at about 8 a.m., I returned and opened the office door ; on approaching my table, what do I find ? Endorsement on Sreenivas Row's letter in blue pencil, in the handwriting of Mahatma K. H., ordering me to answer the letter. There is not the least possibility of doubt in this case.

8. "Mr. Stanley B. Sexton, F.T.S., No. 2, Park Row, Chicago, Ill., U.S. America, wrote a letter dated 1st January, 1884. It was received on the 18th February, 1884, by Damodar, who after reading it, put it on the large table in the centre of our office where he and I were sitting and working opposite each other. On the morning of the 19th idem (next day), at about 8 a.m., Damodar searched for the letter, but could not find it *anywhere* in the office-room ! He asked me and another Brother (an assistant manager), working in the room, if we saw it. We did not even touch it, but still examined all our papers, desks and drawers in vain. An hour or two after I found Sexton's letter on my own desk, with an endorsement from Mahatma K.H., in his blue pencil handwriting, ordering me to reply. All this I take down from the record then made by me of the circumstances. My desk is in a secluded corner, with a large cupboard to its left, a table of mine to its right (a tin partition wall and wire-work behind the table), and in the front of my desk a glass door with strong bolts, never opened for many months. And, during the hour or two, nobody came into the room, all of us three in the office working at our respective places without stirring.

9. "M. R. Ry. P. Iyaloo Naidu Garu (retired Deputy Collector of Arnee, now at Chudderghat, Hyderabad, Deccan, India) is an old and very devoted member of the Theosophical Society. On the 20th April, 1884, he wrote a letter to Damodar, enclosing therewith a letter for Mahatma K.H. Damodar was then at Ootacamund, and, as I was in charge of the office, I sent the letter to him. When it was returned to me, I found remarks and endorsements not only on the envelope (of the letter to Damodar), but also inside the letter to the Mahatma—in his well-known blue pencil handwriting. Though, of course, the letters were received by me (opened) from Ootacamund, still this fact proves that phenomena do occur during Madame B.'s absence. Under similar circumstances, I received endorsements in Mahatma K. H.'s handwriting on the letters of Mr. M. A. Lane (of St. Louis, U.S.A.), dated 25th February, 1884, and of Professor J. D. Buck, M.D. (Dean of Pultney Medical College, Cincinnati, O., U.S.A.), dated 18th March, 1884.

10. "On or about the 27th March, 1884, at about 10 a.m., one morning, there were in the office-room, only, (i.) myself, at my desk ; (ii.), Damodar, in his usual place at the large table in the office ; (iii.), Vijaiaraghava Charloo at his desk in a corner ; (iv.), Mr. Nawtamram Ootamram Trivedi (F.T.S., of Surat, Bombay Presidency); and (v.), a peon, who does not know English, nor anything about phenomena or the Society. The peon was taking copy of an official letter in a copying book, by the copying machine. None of us left our seats. I heard a noise suddenly, and found a letter to Nawtamram's address lying on the floor between Damodar and the addressee. The letter contained allusions to some advices given by Mr. T. Subba Row (at his house)

to our guest and brother of Surat, as well as some remarks on phenomena, which remarks our guest stood in real need of.

11. "One morning (I do not remember the date—of course, after the Founders left India), only three of us were in the office-room :—(i.), myself ; (ii.), Damodar ; and (iii.), T. Vijaiaraghava Charloo Garu. Damodar told me to look at my table for a communication from the Master. I searched everywhere, but to no purpose ; I was not to be deceived by my senses, for I heard a noise. Both Damodar and Vijaiaraghava Charloo Garu were at their seats. I went from place to place, searched not only my table, but the tables of the other two. Damodar told me at length to look into a tin box which I had placed on my table, and in which I keep postage stamps and some cash for sundry expenses. A few minutes before, I opened it and took stamps from it. There was, of course, no letter of the Master in it. I looked as desired, after opening the tin box, and found there a letter.

12. "In conclusion, I have to add that, even before Madame Blavatsky had left for Europe, I had received messages at different times and places, direct from Mahatma K.H., independent of, and far away from, Madame Blavatsky and others at the headquarters ; and that I have seen and lived awhile in Thibet, and seen the Masters in their physical body, and conversed with them. But as a narration of the details of these experiences involves much of my personal life, and as I am not prepared to adduce proofs and evidences touching those facts, I leave them out of consideration.

"BABAJEE D. NATH.

"Adyar (Madras, India), 13th September, 1884."

APPENDIX XXIII.

The chief point of interest in the following evidence lies, we think, in the use of Teloogoo characters. Madame Blavatsky left Adyar for Europe on February 7th.

A reply to Mr. Myers' inquiry contained in his letter of 13th ultimo.

"On the 11th February last, I received a letter from Mr. Damodar K. Mavalankar, dated 8th idem, Adyar. In it there was a message in pencil by Mahatma K.H., regarding a very important point.

"On the same day, viz., 11th February, I received another envelope by the same post, 'From Bhola Deva Sarma,' in which there was a Thibetan envelope containing a message in Teloogoo characters on a point very important to me, with the initials of our revered Guru Deva M.C.

"In the last month (August) I was anxious about my journey to this country from Hydrabad, and often thought of the Mahatma M.C. About the 26th idem I examined my clothes, &c., at Hydrabad, and found the initials of the Mahatma M.C. on a cap which I use during my meditation.

"P. IYALOO NAIDU, F.T.S.,

"Pensd. Dep. Collector, Arnee.

"19th September, 1884."

APPENDIX XXIV.

The following account has also been sent to us through Dr. Hartmann. The paragraph marked 4 seems of importance in establishing the fact that the handwriting of Mahatma Koot Hoomi can occur independently of the agency of Madame Blavatsky.

“Having been asked to give an account of the phenomena that have occurred during the absence of Madame H. P. Blavatsky, I beg to state as follows :—

1. “In a few days after my arrival at the Headquarters, when Madame Blavatsky was at Ootacamund, and Colonel Olcott was on his Southern tour, Mr. P. Sreenivasa Row, Judge of the Small Cause Court, Madras, came to the Headquarters, and after a few minutes’ conversation, wished to see the Shrine upstairs. Messrs. Damodar K. Mavalankar, Babaji D. Nath, Babu Balai Chand Mullick and myself, went with him to the Occult-room and opened the Shrine. Then he said he wanted to put a letter in it. He did so, and the doors of the Shrine were shut and opened. The letter gone and there was a reply in a Chinese envelope. The time expired between shutting and opening may be two or three minutes. To read that reply took him more than quarter-of-an-hour.

2. “On early morning of the 27th February, 1884, after Madame Blavatsky left India for Europe, I found a letter, addressed to me in the familiar handwriting of the Mahatma K.H., underneath my head in my own bed.

3. “Subsequently, on two occasions, I found a certain remark made by the Mahatma K. H. in newspapers, after I finished reading and putting them on my table for the scrap-book.

4. “On two occasions (I do not remember the dates) I found letters addressed to Mr. P. Sreenivasa Row, by the Mahatma K. H., on my table when I was doing my office work during the day.

5. “In March, 1884, at about 10 a.m., there fell a letter in our office-room to the address of Mr. Navatamram Ootamram Trivedi, F.T.S., in reply to a letter given by him the previous day, when Messrs. Damodar K. Mavalankar, Babaji D. Nath, N. O. Trivedi, myself and a peon were present in the office.

6. “One morning, at about 11 o’clock, I found on my table a letter addressed to Dr. F. Hartmann, Chairman Board of Control, in the familiar handwriting of the Mahatma K.H. containing certain instructions about the management of the Headquarters during the absence of Messrs. St. George Lane-Fox and Damodar K. Mavalankar, at Ootacamund. I delivered the message to the Doctor. Intuitively it struck me that there was something more from the Master. There was none in the office. I went to Mr. Babaji D. Nath’s table and just then saw a letter wrapped up by a covering letter to the address of Babaji D. Nath. The enclosed letter, written by a Chela and approved by the Mahatma K. H., contained instructions to carry out our office work, supervision of the garden, &c.

7. “I have also witnessed several other phenomena that took place downstairs, though they did not occur on my table. Therefore I have to say that phenomena, independent of the Shrine and Madame Blavatsky, have occurred where there could not possibly be electric wires, trap-doors, panels, &c.

“T. VIJIA RAGHAVA CHARLOO.

“Adyar, Madras, India,
“24th September, 1884.”

APPENDIX XXV.

The following statement also requires that the handwriting of Mahatma Koot Hoomi should occur independently of the agency of Madame Blavatsky.

I was at headquarters very often during my sojourn with my friend H. H., the Thakore Sahib of Wadhwan at Madras, whither we had gone last March for the celebration of his marriage with the daughter of the Hon. Gujpati Row. One day I asked Mr. D. M. Mavalankar to let me put a letter from me to my revered Master K. H. in the Shrine. It was in a closed envelope and was regarding private personal matters, which I need not lay before the public. Mr. Damodar allowed me to put the letter in the Shrine. The day after I visited again the Shrine in company with my wife. On opening the Shrine I did find my letter unopened, but addressed to me in blue pencil, while my original superscription: "My Revered Master" had a pencil line running through it. This was in the presence of Mr. Mavalankar, Dr. Hartmann and others. The envelope was intact. I opened it, and on the unused portion of my note was an answer from my Master K. H. in his, to me, familiar handwriting. I should very much like to know how others will explain this, when as a fact both Founders were thousands of miles away.

HARISINGHJI RUPSINGHJI, F.T.S.

Varal, 9th September, 1884.

APPENDIX XXVI.

The following statement of Professor Smith is that referred to by Colonel Olcott in his deposition, and is, of course, interesting as coming from him. We understand, however, that Indian ceilings are unlike ours, being boarded, not plastered. It is, therefore, conceivable that letters may be pushed through them, and all accounts of letters falling at the headquarters of the Society must therefore, we think, be regarded with suspicion. There is the additional possibility, too, in this case that Madame Blavatsky may have thrown it.

"Hints," &c., p. 97.

Statement of the HONOURABLE J. SMITH, Member of the Legislative Council, N. S. W., Professor in Sydney University, President of the Royal Society, N. S. W., &c., &c.*

"Dear Colonel Olcott,—While the following facts are fresh in my memory I place them on record for your use.

"On the evening of 31st January, when the daily batch of letters were being opened, one was found to contain some red writing different from the body of the letter. Colonel Olcott then took two unopened letters and asked

* The Honourable Professor Smith, on his way home from Australia, was stopping for a few days at our headquarters.—H. S. O.

Madame Blavatsky if she could perceive similar writing in them. Putting them to her forehead she said one contained the word 'carelessly' and the other something about Colonel Olcott and a branch at Cawnpore. I then examined these letters and found the envelopes sound. I opened them and saw the words mentioned. One letter was from Meerut, one from Cawnpore, and one from Hyderabad. Next day at tiffin Colonel Olcott remarked that if I were to get any letters while here there might be some of the same writing in them. I replied that there would be 'no chance of that, as no one would write to me.' Madame Blavatsky then looking fixedly for a little said, 'I see a Brother here. He asks if you would like some such token as that we have been speaking of.' [I cannot give the exact words.] I replied that I would be much gratified. She rose from the table and told us to follow her. Taking my hand, she led me along the verandah, stopping and looking about at some points till we reached the door of my bedroom. She then desired me to enter alone and look round the room to see if there was anything unusual, and to close the other doors. I did so, and was satisfied the room was in its usual condition. She then desired us to sit down, and in doing so took my hands in both of hers. In a few seconds a letter fell at my feet. It seemed to me to appear first a little above the level of my head. On opening the envelope I found a sheet of note-paper headed with a Government stamp of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, and the following words written with red pencil, *in exactly the same handwriting as that in the letters of the previous evening*: 'No CHANCE of writing to you inside your letters, but I can write *direct*. Work for us in Australia, and we will not prove ungrateful, but will prove to you our actual existence, and thank you.' A fair review of the circumstances excludes, in my opinion, any theory of fraud,

"(Signed) J. SMITH.

"Bombay, 2nd February, 1882."

APPENDIX XXVII.

Much the same remarks as we have already made about Appendix XXVI. apply to the following account.

"Hints," &c., p. 101.

Statement of MR. KAVASJI MERVANJI SHROFF, a Parsi Gentleman,
and others.

"On Tuesday, the 7th February, 1882, at about 6 p.m., I was at the headquarters, Breach Candy, of the Theosophical Society. The party consisted of Madame Blavatsky, Colonel Olcott, His Highness the Rajah of Wudhwan, his Minister, Mr. Ganpatrow N. Land, Rawal Shree Hari Singhjee of Sehore, Mr. Dorabjee H. Bharucha, a fourth-year medical student, and the Secretary, Mr. Damodar K. Mavalankar, and myself.

"We sat in the open porch of the upper bungalow, looking out upon the ocean. The conversation related to the sad ignorance of the Aryan

philosophies which prevailed among the people of India. Various remarks were exchanged, and Madame Blavatsky was speaking with some feeling about the past treatment the Founders of the Society had suffered at the hands of many who ought to have been warm friends. Suddenly she stopped, looked fixedly out into the compound, rose to her feet and then reseated herself. She said one of the Brothers was there listening, but we could see no one except ourselves. Presently, to the great surprise and astonishment of those present, a note, darting across the open space around, came in a slanting direction and dropped on the table that stood by the Dewan Sahib. It was addressed to "all whom it may concern," and its contents referred to the subject of our conversation. Then she informed me that she had received a letter from a gentleman of Lahore. She wished me to read that letter. A search was made for that letter, which could not be found in her papers. She then assured us that she still felt something more would occur. She then wished us to go to the guest-chamber inside the bungalow, but before the whole party entered, she asked the Rajah and myself to first go into the room with a lamp—it was now dusk—and to examine the place thoroughly. We did so, and were satisfied that no one from outside could possibly have any communication. The wooden ceiling of the room was perfectly intact. The windows and doors were closely fastened. After our careful examination was over, and we had satisfied ourselves that everything was right, she directed the whole party to enter the room, and the only remaining open door was also shut. The party stood around a table on which I had placed the lamp. She then asked us to form a ring, each held the hand of one standing by him, so not one of the party had his hands free. We stood still in that posture for perhaps a minute, when, to our great amazement, there dropped a letter addressed in my care to the active members of the Theosophical Society. The envelope contained the missing Lahore letter above referred to, and a separate note of a full page written in a red crayon in a large bold hand, and also quoting expressions that had just fallen from us in the porch outside. The letter descended from above us fluttering in the air and dropped at the foot of one of our party. We all agreed that even if it had been desired there could by no possibility have been any trick of hand in this case.

"K. M. SHROFF."

"We certify to the correctness of the above statement.

"DAJI RAJ THAKORE SAHIB OF WUDHWAN ;

"RAWAL SHREE HARI SINGHJI RUPSIINGJI,
"of Sehore,

"Cousin to H.H. The Thakore of Bhownugger.

"GUNPUTROW N. LAND,

"Karbhari of Wudhwan.

"DORABJI HORMUSJI BHARUCHA,

"Student, Grant Medical College.

"DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR."

APPENDIX XXVIII.

This statement of Martand Rao Babaji Nagnath is the one referred to by Colonel Olcott, on p. 53 of his deposition. It must, however, we think, be regarded as of small value, because postmarks can be imitated, and it seems improbable that an unaddressed letter would have been stamped at the post-office and not subsequently missed. It is, of course, curious that a "brother" should seem to "disappear on the spot," but Mr. Martand Rao does not seem to have been very near. It seems curious in another way, that the "brother" should think it worth while to have the letter stamped at the post-office, when he was going to deliver it himself.

"Hints," p. 103.

Statement of MARTANDRAO BABAJI NAGNATH, a Brahmin.

"On another night a Brother came in his own physical body, walking through the lower garden (attached to Colonel Olcott's bungalow) and stood quiet. Madame Blavatsky then went down the wooden staircase leading into the garden. He shook hands with her and gave her a packet. After a short time the Brother *disappeared on the spot*, and Madame coming up the stairs opened the packet and found in it a letter from Allahabad. We saw the envelope was quite blank, *i.e.*, unaddressed, but it bore a triangular stamp of Allahabad Post Office of December the 3rd, 1881, and also a circular postal stamp of the Bombay Post Office of *the same date*, *viz.*, 3rd December. The two cities are 860 miles apart.

"I have seen letters, or rather envelopes containing letters, coming or falling from the air in different places, without anybody's contact, in presence of both Theosophists and strangers. Their contents related to subjects that had been the topics of our conversation at the moment.

"Now I aver in good faith I saw the Brothers of the first section and phenomena in such places and times, and under such circumstances, that there could be no possibility of anybody playing a trick.

"MARTANDRAO BABAJI NAGNATH.

"Bombay, 14th February, 1882."

APPENDIX XXIX.

The remarks we have already made about Appendix XXVI. apply here.

"Hints," p. 106.

Statement of BAL NILAJI PITALE, a Brahmin.

It was at Girgaum, and at night, in Colonel Olcott's room. On this occasion the Naib Dewan of Cochin was present. A very interesting conversation was going on about the material advancement of the people, spiritual science, &c. During the conversation, the Dewan asked for Madame Blavatsky's card. She said that she had only one by her then, but he asked for another — one brought to him in a phenomenal

way. In the meantime something fluttered on the wall about two feet from the ceiling—which was about 15 feet high—and an oblong piece of paper was seen to drop on Colonel Olcott's table. It turned out to be a fac-simile of the card given to the Dewan. The third time I saw a phenomenon was at the Crow's Nest Bungalow at Breach Candy. One of the members of the Society had brought with him a medium. He is one of the graduates in medicine of the local University. He has been lately practising mesmerism, and wished to show Madame Blavatsky how far he had advanced in his studies. While the experiments were going on, Madame Blavatsky asked the operator to ask his subject, who was in a partially clairvoyant condition, when she would receive a letter from Ceylon that she expected. The answer given was that she would not receive it when expected. She then asked the company, numbering about 17 persons, to stand up and form a circle, clasping each other's hands. This was done immediately. But lo! in the twinkling of an eye a piece of paper fluttered in the air, visible about three feet from the ceiling, and then slantingly dropped on the floor. The paper turned out to be a letter from Ceylon enclosed in an envelope addressed to her in red ink. The reason why the persons were asked to form themselves into a circle and clasp each other's hands was that nobody should afterwards insinuate that it was thrown by any one composing the group. The impression that is left on my mind after beholding these phenomena is that they were *bond fide* scientific experiments.

“BAL NILAJI PITALE.

“Bombay, 14th February, 1882.”

APPENDIX XXX.

We give this chiefly as an interesting account of the mode of dealing with the “Shrine.”

The case of the letter from Mahatma Koot Hoomi enclosed in one from Madame G——, must not, we think, have much stress laid on it, as it was probably forwarded to Mr. Brown, from Adyar.

From Mr. Brown's “Some Experiences in India,” pp. 6, 7, 17.

“One evening, shortly after my arrival at Adyar, some letters were being sent by Chelas to their Masters, and I was permitted to enter the ‘Occult Room’ and see the process going on. The letters were put into an almirah, in a richly ornamented recess called by some ‘the Shrine.’ There were some seven of us then present, four of whom were Chelas. These gentlemen, after placing their letters as aforesaid, offered up incense and prostrated themselves according to the Hindu manner of evincing devotion and respect. In about two minutes Madame, who was standing by my side in an attentive attitude, received a psychic telegram, and indicated that the answers had come to hand. The almirah was accordingly opened, and, in place of the letters ‘posted,’ others were there, enclosed in Tibetan envelopes and written on Tibetan paper. D. K. M. (a Chela of the Master Koot Hoomi) discovered something more than was expected, and exclaimed, ‘Here is a

letter from my Master for Mr. Brown !' I then received from his hands a memorandum, written with blue pencil, and in the following terms :—' Why feel uneasy ? Perchance we may yet become friends : I have to thank you for your defence of Esot. Bud.—K.H. W.T. Brown, B.L., F.T.S.' . . .

"I need not dwell upon the disappearance of Damodar for several days, for he himself has told us his experience, and in whose company he spent his time (*vide Theosophist* for January, 1884, pp. 61 and 62), but while he was away I received, by occult means, another letter from his Master. It was enclosed in an envelope, which had been addressed by Madame G——, and had come by post from Germany. This was very significant, because it proved to my mind that the Master was aware of the part which Madame G—— had had in bringing me into the light of Theosophy. The writing is the same as usual and the contents are as follows :—' I have pleasure in granting, in part at least, your request. Welcome to the territory of our Kashmir Prince. In truth my native land is not so far away but that I can assume the character of host. You are not now merely at the threshold of Tibet, but also of all the wisdom it contains. It rests with yourself how far you shall penetrate both, one day. May you deserve the blessings of our *Chohans*.—K. H.' "

APPENDIX XXXI.

The following is from Madame Fadéeff, aunt of Madame Blavatsky, a widow of the well-known Russian General Fadéeff, and is addressed to Colonel Olcott, who asked for an account of a letter received by her in Russia in 1870.

Cher Monsieur et frère,—Je suis toujours prête à rendre service lorsque c'est en mon pouvoir de le faire, et surtout lorsqu'il ne s'agit, comme dans le cas présent, que de dire la pure vérité.

En effet, j'ai écrit à M. Sinnett, il y a deux ou trois ans, en réponse à l'une de ses lettres, et je crois me rappeler lui avoir raconté ce qui m'était arrivé apropos d'une lettre reçue par moi phénoménalement, lorsque ma nièce était de l'autre côté du monde, et que par le fait personne ne savait où elle était,—ce qui nous inquiétait précisément. Toutes nos recherches avaient abouti à *rien*. Nous étions prêts à la croire morte, lorsque,—c'était, je crois, vers l'année 1870, ou sitôt après, je reçus une lettre de celui que vous appelez, je crois, Kouth-humi,—qui me fut apportée de la manière la plus incompréhensible et mystérieuse, dans ma maison, par un messager à figure asiatique, *qui disparut sous mes yeux mêmes*. Cette lettre, qui me priait de ne rien craindre, et qui m'annonçait qu'elle était en sûreté, je l'ai toujours, mais à Odessa. Sitôt de retour, je vous l'enverrai, et je serais très contente si elle peut vous servir.

Pardonnez moi, mais il m'est difficile, je dirai, presque impossible, de comprendre comment il peut exister des gens assez bêtes pour croire que, soit ma nièce, ou vous même, avez *inventé* les hommes que vous nommez les Mahatmas ! Je ne sais si vous les connaissez personnellement depuis long-

temps, mais ma nièce m'en a parlé, et très longuement il y a des années déjà. Elle m'a écrit qu'elle avait reçu et renoué ses relations avec plusieurs d'eux, avant même d'écrire son "Isis." Pourquoi les aurait-elle inventé ces personnages? A quel propos, et quel bien peuvent-ils lui faire s'ils n'existent pas? Vos ennemis ne sont ni "lâches" ni malhonnêtes, je pense; ils sont, s'ils vous accusent de cela, simplement de pauvres *idiots*. Si moi, qui ai toujours été, et espère jusqu'à ma mort rester une fervente chrétienne, je crois à l'existence de ces hommes,—quoique je me refuse à croire à *tous* les miracles qu'on leur attribue—pourquoi d'autres n'y croiraient-ils pas? Pour l'existence d'un d'eux, au moins, je puis certifier. Qui donc a pu m'écrire cette lettre pour me rassurer au moment où j'avais le plus besoin d'une telle assurance, si ce n'est un de ces adeptes dont on a parlé? Il est vrai que l'écriture m'est inconnue; mais la manière dont elle me fut délivrée était tellement phénoménale, que nul autre qu'un adepte dans les sciences occultes aurait pu la produire ainsi. Elle m'y promettait le retour de ma nièce,—et la promesse a été remplie. Enfin je vous l'enverrai et dans une quinzaine de jours vous la recevrez à Londres.

Veillez, cher Monsieur et frère, agréer l'expression de mes sentiments distingués.

(Signé),

NADJEDA FADÉEFF.

Paris, ce 26 Juin, 1884,

Copié *textuellement* sur l'original ce 28 Sepr. 1884,

à Elberfield.

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY, F.T.S.

N.B.—This letter was registered, and the envelope bears the postmark, "Paris, 26 Juin, 1884."

B. K.

Cher Monsieur,—A peine arrivée à Odessa, je compte pour mon premier devoir de vous envoyer ce que vous m'avez demandé. Quoique cette lettre n'est pas signée, mais il n'y a aucun doute qu'elle parvienne directement d'un de vos mattres. Je crains seulement qu'elle ne soit endommagée pendant le voyage, vu la fragilité du papier sur lequel elle est écrite.

Agréez, Monsieur, l'assurance, des sentiments distingués et de vive considération de votre très dévoué.

(Signé),

NADJEDA FADÉEFF.

Odessa, ce 6 Juillet, Dimanche, 1884.

Pour copie textuelle.

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY.

Copy of enclosure, which is on rice paper.

Les nobles parents de Mad. H. Blavatsky n'ont aucune cause de se désoler. Leur fille et nièce n'a point quitté ce monde. Elle vit et désire faire savoir à ceux qu'elle aime, qu'elle se porte bien et se sent forte heureuse dans la retraite lointaine et inconnue qu'elle s'est choisie. Elle a été bien malade, mais ne l'est plus; car grâce à la protection du Seigneur Sang-gyas elle a trouvé des amis dévoués qui en prennent soin physiquement et spirituellement. Que les dames de sa maison se tranquilisent donc. Avant que 18 lunes nouvelles se lèvent—elle sera revenue dans sa famille.

The envelope containing the letter copied above is addressed.

A L'HONORABLE,

TRES HONORABLE DAME—

NADYEJDA ANDREEVNA

FADEEW

ODESSA,

and bears a memorandum in Russian, signed NADEYDA ϕ , closing with the date, 11, 1870.

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY.

I have seen this letter, which certainly appears to be in the K. H. handwriting.—F.W.H.M.

APPENDIX XXXII.

The following is from Dr. Hübbe Schleiden, who is a well-known German savant and publicist, author of "Ethiopien," and other works. We have already pointed out the importance of his evidence in commenting on Mr. Mohini's. It will be seen from Dr. Hübbe Schleiden's letter to Mr. Myers that Madame Blavatsky was in England at the time of the incident.

Elberfeld, August, 1884.

Dear Madam,—You requested me to state to you the particular circumstances under which I received my first communication from Mahatma K.H. I have much pleasure in doing so.

On the morning of the 1st of this month Colonel Olcott and I were travelling by an express train from here to Dresden. A few days before I had written a letter to the Mahatmas which Colonel Olcott had addressed and enclosed to you, which, however, as I now hear, never reached you but was taken by the Masters whilst it was in the hands of the post officials. At the time mentioned I was not thinking of this letter, but was relating to Colonel Olcott some events of my life, expressing also the fact that since my sixth or seventh year I had never known peace or joy, and asking Colonel Olcott's opinion on the meaning of some striking hardships I have gone through. In this conversation we were interrupted by the railway-guard demanding our tickets. When I moved forwards and raised myself partly from the seat in order to hand over the tickets, Colonel Olcott noticed something white lying behind my back on that side of me which was opposite to the one where he was sitting. When I took up that which had appeared there it turned out to be a Tibetan envelope, in which I found a letter from Mahatma K.H., written with blue pencil in his well-known and unmistakable handwriting. As there were several other persons unacquainted to us in the compartment, I suppose the Master chose this place for depositing the letter near me where it was the least likely to attract the unwelcome attention and curiosity of outsiders.

The envelope was plainly addressed to me, and the communication contained in the letter was a consoling reflection on the opinion which I had five or ten minutes ago given on the dreary events of my past life. The Mahatma explained that such events and the mental misery attached to it were beyond the ordinary run of life, but that hardships of all kinds would be the lot of one striving for higher spiritual development. He very kindly expressed his opinion that I had already achieved some philanthropic work for the good of the world. In this letter were also answered some of the questions which I had put in my first-mentioned letter, and an assurance was given me that I was to receive assistance and advice when I should be in need of it.

I dare say it would be unnecessary for me to ask you to inform the Mahatma of the devoted thankfulness which I feel towards him for the great kindness shown to me, for the Master will know of my sentiments without my forming them into more or less inadequate words.—I am, dear madam, in due respect, yours faithfully,

HÜBBE SCHLEIDEN.

To Madame Blavatsky, Elberfeld, Platzhoffstrasse, 12.

Elberfeld, 9/11/84.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your question about the letter from Mahatma K.H., which I received in a railway carriage of an express train while in motion, I beg to say that it appears to me absolutely impossible that the letter could have been brought into the train by any supposed agent of Madame Blavatsky's. It is true we had not changed carriages since leaving Elberfeld, but the letter did not at all fall out of the air, but was found behind my back when I moved, and must, therefore, have been deposited between my back and the cushion of the seat against which I was lying. There was no possibility of getting there for any matter in one of the three or four aggregate states known to our Western science. Besides, Madame Blavatsky could have nothing to do with this letter, which was a reply to questions which I had written on Tuesday, the 29th July, and which left Elberfeld on that or the following day for London, addressed to Madame B. Now, these questions could not have been delivered in London before Thursday or Friday of that week, and a reply could, in the ordinary postal way, not have been in Elberfeld before Saturday or Sunday. The event of my receiving the reply of the Mahatma, however, occurred on Friday morning, the 1st August. I may mention here that Madame B. assured me she never found my questions enclosed in the letter to her; these must have been taken out while in the hands of the post. My best proof of the genuineness of this phenomenon, I find, though, is the contents of the letter, for it was not only a reply to the said questions, but also referred to the conversation I was just at that time having with Colonel Olcott. I cannot doubt that this handwriting of the Mahatma must, therefore, have been precipitated by him at that very instant and transmitted to me by a magic process which lies beyond the power of ordinary men.—I am, dear sir, yours very truly,

HÜBBE SCHLEIDEN.

To F. W. H. Myers, Esq., Cambridge.

APPENDIX XXXIII.

It should, perhaps, be noted in considering the following careful narrative by Mr. Keightley, that it does not, strictly speaking, exclude the possibility that the post-card may really have been delivered (to the servant) by an earlier post, thus giving time for it to be tampered with. The same remark applies to Appendix XXXV. Baboolah is Madame Blavatsky's Indian servant.

20, Stanley-gardens, Kensington Park-road, W., Tuesday, Nov. 24.

"Dear Mr. Myers,—Mohini has asked me to give you details as to how I received the post-card in Paris bearing the "cryptogram" of one of the Mahatmas.

I was in my room at our apartment, Rue Notre Dame des Champs, when I heard the door-bell ring. Perhaps a minute later I got up and opened my room door, which faces that of the apartment, as I had not heard any one answer the bell. On opening the door I found Baboolah just going to close that of the apartment, and saw the back of the postman just turning away from the door. The card in question I saw in Baboolah's hand, and received it direct from him. It was the only letter or card which came by that delivery.—Yours very sincerely,

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY.

In a subsequent letter, Mr. Keightley adds :—"I was able to give the details as to how I received the card from a memorandum which I made on the back of it."

Mrs. X., Mr. Gebhard, and Mr. R. Gebhard have given us oral evidence.

Mrs. X. saw a red mark growing between her pillow-case and the pillow, shortly after she had risen, and before anyone had entered the room. This turned out to be a letter in the K. H. handwriting.

Miss Z., well-known to some members of the Committee, writes :—"As I approached the table I perceived on the pink cover a large white envelope. I took it up, looked at it, and found that it was closed and evidently contained a letter, but there was no superscription. I had the letter in my hand for a little while, and then looked at it again. To my great surprise I found that where but a few moments previously there had been a blank space, there was distinctly visible a name and address written in purple ink, in a handwriting which I well knew as being that of one of the Mahatmas."

APPENDIX XXXIV.

The weak point of the evidence in the following case appears to us to lie in the absence of any proof of the identity of the paper on which the picture appeared with the blank sheet originally taken, since no special precautions to secure this are recorded. Apart from this, the case has some interest, since it is not easy to procure a drawing of so much value as, according to Mr. Donovan and Mr. LeClear, this must possess. The evidence, however, does not tell us whether the portrait produced was that of the person whose likeness was asked for.

From "Hints on Esoteric Theosophy," No. 1, pp. 83-86.

The following are extracts from some of the papers, referring to this remarkable picture.—H. X.

"City and County of New York, ss.

"William Q. Judge, being duly sworn, says that he is an attorney and counsellor-at-law, practising at the Bar of the State of New York; that he was present at the house of Madame H. P. Blavatsky, at No. 302, West 47th Street, New York City, on one occasion in the month of December, 1877, when a discussion was being held upon the subject of Eastern Magic, especially upon the power of an Adept to produce phenomena by an exercise of the will, equally or surpassing those of mediumship. To illustrate the subject, as she had often done in deponent's presence previously by other experiments, Madame Blavatsky, without preparation, and in full light, and in the presence and sight of deponent, Colonel Olcott, and Dr. L. M. Marquette, tore a sheet of common writing paper in two, and asked us the subject we would have represented. Deponent named the portrait of a certain very holy man in India. Thereupon laying the paper upon the table Madame Blavatsky placed the palm of her hand upon it, and after rubbing the paper a few times (occupying less than a minute) with a circular motion, lifted her hand and gave deponent the paper for inspection. Upon the previously white surface there was a most remarkable and striking picture of an Indian Fakir, representing him as if in contemplation. Deponent has frequently seen it since, and it is now in possession of Colonel Olcott. Deponent positively avers that the blank paper first taken was the paper on which the picture appeared, and that no substitution of another paper was made or was possible.

"WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

"Subscribed and sworn to before me this 20th day of March, 1878.

"SAMUEL V. SPEYER, Notary Public, New York County."

"State of New York, City and County of New York, ss.

"I, Henry A. Gumbleton, Clerk of the City and County of New York, and also Clerk of the Supreme Court for the said City and County, being a Court of Record, do hereby certify that Samuel V. Speyer, before whom the annexed deposition was taken, was at the time of taking the same a Notary Public of New York, dwelling in said City and County, duly appointed and sworn and authorized to administer oaths to be used in any Court in said State, and for general purposes; and that his signature thereto is genuine, as I verily believe.

"In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand, and affixed the seal of the said Court and County the 20th day of March, 1878.

"HENRY A. GUMBLETON, Clerk."

"The undersigned, a practising physician, residing at No. 224, Spring Street, in the City of New York, having read the foregoing affidavit of Mr. Judge, certifies that it is a correct statement of the facts. The portrait was

produced, as described, in full light, and without there being any opportunity for fraud. Moreover, the undersigned wishes to say that other examples of Madame Blavatsky's power to instantly render objective the images in her mind, have been given in the presence of many witnesses, including the undersigned ; and that, having intimately known that lady since 1873, when she was living with her brother at Paris, the undersigned can and does unreservedly testify that her moral character is above censure, and that her phenomena have been invariably produced in defiance of the conditions of mediumship, with which the undersigned is very familiar.

" L. M. MARQUETTE, M.D."

So much for the circumstances attending the production of the portrait ; now let us see what are its artistic merits. The witnesses are well qualified, Mr. O'Donovan being one of the best known of American sculptors, and, as alleged, an experienced art critic, and Mr. LeCclear occupying a place second to none as a portrait painter :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPIRITUALIST."

" Sir,—For the benefit of those among your readers who may be able to gather the significance of it, I beg to offer some testimony concerning a remarkable performance claimed by Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky to have been done by herself without the aid of such physical means as are employed by persons usually for such an end. The production referred to is a small portrait in black and white of a Hindu Fakir, which was produced by Madame Blavatsky, as it is claimed, by a simple exercise of will power. As to the means by which this work was produced, however, I have nothing at all to do, and wish simply to say as an artist, and give also the testimony of Mr. Thomas LeCclear, one of the most eminent of our portrait painters, whose experience as such has extended over 50 years—that the work is of a kind that could not have been done by any living artist known to either of us. It has all the essential qualities which distinguish the portraits by Titian, Masaccio, and Raphael, namely, individuality of the profoundest kind, and consequently breadth and unity of as perfect a quality as I can conceive. I may safely assert that there is no artist who has given intelligent attention to portraiture, who would not concur with Mr. LeCclear and myself in the opinion which we have formed of this remarkable work ; and if it was done as it is claimed to have been done, I am at utter loss to account for it. I may add that this drawing, or whatever it may be termed, has at first sight the appearance of having been done by washes of Indian ink, but that upon closer inspection, both Mr. LeCclear and myself have been unable to liken it to any process of drawing known to us ; the black tints seem to be an integral part of the paper upon which it is done. I have seen numbers of drawings claimed to have been done by spirit influences, in which the vehicle employed was perfectly obvious, and none of them were of more than mediocre artistic merit ; not one of them, certainly, could be compared at all with this most remarkable performance of which I write.

" WM. R. O'DONOVAN.

" Studio Building, 51, West 10th Street, New York."

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

"Dear Sir,—My experience has not made me at all familiar with magic, but I have seen much of what is termed spiritualistic phenomena. Among the latter so-called spirit drawings, which were thought by the mediums and their friends very fine, but the best of which I found wanting in every element of art.

"I do not wish to be censorious, but an experience of 50 years in portrait-painting has perhaps made me exacting, when it is a question of paintings alleged to come from a supernatural source. This much by way of preface to the subject of my present note.

"I have seen in your possession a portrait in black and white of an Indian religious ascetic, which is entirely unique. It would require an artist of very extraordinary power to reach the degree of ability which is expressed in this work. There is a oneness of treatment difficult to attain, with a pronounced individuality, combined with great breadth. As a whole, it is an *individual*. It has the appearance of having been done on the moment—a result inseparable from great art. I cannot discover with what material it is laid on the paper. I first thought it chalk, then pencil, then Indian ink; but a minute inspection leaves me quite unable to decide. Certainly it is neither of the above.

"If, as you tell me, it was done instantaneously by Madame Blavatsky, then all I can say is, she must possess artistic powers not to be accounted for on any hypothesis except that of magic. The tint seems not to be laid on the surface of the common writing paper upon which the portrait is made, but to be combined, as if it were, with the fibres themselves. No human being, however much genius he might have, could produce the work, except with much time and painstaking labour; and, if my observation goes for anything, no medium has ever produced anything worthy of being mentioned beside it.

"THOS. LECLEAR.

"Studio Building, 31, West 10th Street, New York."

APPENDIX XXXV.

See remarks made on Appendix XXXIII.

From *Light* of July 12th, 1884.

OCCULT PHENOMENA AT PARIS.

"The undersigned attest the following phenomenon. On the morning of the 11th of June, instant, we were present in the reception-room of the Theosophical Society at Paris, 46, Rue Notre Dame des Champs, when a letter was delivered by the postman. The door of the room in which we were sitting was open so that we could see into the hall; and the servant who answered the bell was seen to take the letter from the postman and bring it to us at once, placing it in the hands of Madame Jelihovsky, who threw it before her on the table round which we were sitting. The letter was addressed to a lady, a relative of Madame Blavatsky's, who was then visiting her, and came from another relative in Russia. There were present in the room Madame de Morsier, Secretary-General of the 'Société Théosophique d'Orient et d'Occident,' M. Solovieff, son of the distinguished Russian

historian, an attaché of the Imperial Court, himself well known as a writer; Colonel Olcott, Mr. W. Q. Judge, Mohini Babu, and several other persons. Madame Blavatsky was also sitting at the table. Madame Jelihovsky, upon her sister (Madame Blavatsky) remarking that she would like to know what was in the letter, asked her, on the spur of the moment, to read its contents before the seal was broken, since she professed to be able so to do.

"Thus challenged, Madame Blavatsky at once took up the closed letter, held it against her forehead, and read aloud what she professed to be its contents. These alleged contents she further wrote down on a blank page of an old letter that lay on the table. Then she said she would give those present, since her sister still laughed at and challenged her power, even a clearer proof that she was able to exercise her psychic power *within* the closed envelope. Remarking that her own name occurred in the course of the letter, she said she would underline this through the envelope in red crayon. In order to effect this she wrote her name on the old letter (in which the alleged copy of the contents of the sealed letter had been written), together with an interlaced double triangle or 'Solomon's seal,' below the signature which she had copied as well as the body of the letter. This was done in spite of her sister remarking that her correspondent hardly ever signed her name in full when writing to relatives, and that in this at least Madame Blavatsky would find herself mistaken. 'Nevertheless,' she replied, 'I will cause these two red marks to appear in the corresponding places within the letter.'

"She next laid the closed letter beside the open one upon the table, and placed her hand upon both, so as to make (as she said) a bridge along which a current of psychic force might pass. Then, *with her features settled into an expression of intense mental concentration*, she kept her hand quietly thus for a few moments, after which, tossing the closed letter across the table to her sister, she said, 'Tiens! c'est fait. The experiment is successfully finished.' Here it may be well to add, to show that the letter could not have been tampered with in transit—unless by a Government official—that the stamps were fixed on the flap of the envelope where a seal is usually placed.

"Upon the envelope being opened by the lady to whom it was addressed, it was found that *Madame Blavatsky had actually written out its contents; that her name was there; that she had really underlined it in red, as she had promised; and that the double triangle was reproduced below the writer's signature, which was in full, as Madame Blavatsky had described it.*

"Another fact of exceptional interest we noted. *A slight defect in the formation of one of the two interlaced triangles as drawn by Madame Blavatsky had been faithfully reproduced within the closed letter.*

"This experiment was doubly valuable, as at once an illustration of clairvoyant perception, by which Madame Blavatsky correctly read the contents of a sealed letter, and of the phenomenon of precipitation, or the deposit of pigmentary matter in the form of figures and lines previously drawn by the operator in the presence of the observers.

"(Signed)	VERA JELIHOVSKY.
"{ " }	VSEVOLOD SOLOVIOFF.
"{ " }	NADEJDA A. FADEEFF.
"{ " }	EMELIE DE MORSIER.
"{ " }	WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.
"{ " }	H. S. OLCOTT.

"Paris, 21st June, 1884."

APPENDIX XXXVI.

Compare Appendix XIV.

77, Elgin Crescent, W., 4/10/84.

Dear Mr. Myers,—I send you a copy of the certificate of Ross Scott and wife, as to the identity of Schmicheen's portrait of the Mahatma M.

Of course this is no positive *proof* of the existence of the Mahatma ; it only shows that by hook or by crook the artist has contrived to produce in London a speaking likeness of a form of a man which the Scotts saw at Bombay Headquarters in '82. And that *might* have been some paid Hindu made up to look like the profile portrait given me in New York, and drawn by a friend who had never in his life seen a Hindu. But in any case, the evidence is worth *something*, and I place it at your service.—Faithfully yours,

H. S. OLCOTT.

[COPY.]

“Colonel Olcott having to-day shown us a portrait in oils, we at once recognised it as a very good likeness of a form which, in January, 1882, we saw at the headquarters of the Theosophical Society in Bombay, and said to be that of one of the Mahatmas known as the teacher of Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott.

“(Sgd.) ROSS SCOTT
“(Bengal Civil Service).

“(Sgd.) MARIA J. B. SCOTT.

“Bonn, Germany, 27th September, 1884.”

APPENDIX XXXVII.

This letter from Dr. Hartmann to ourselves hardly gives enough details to establish anything beyond the receipt at Adyar, after Madame Blavatsky's departure, of letters apparently in the handwriting of Mahatma M. and Mahatma K. H.

Statement of F. HARTMANN, F.T.S.

“Some of my experience in regard to occult phenomena has been told in the ‘Journal of the Theosophical Society’ and in my pamphlet entitled: ‘A Report of Observations made during a nine months’ stay at the headquarters of the Theosophical Society at Adyar.’ Besides the letters mentioned in these publications I have received several others from Mahatma K. H. and other Mahatmas and their Chelas ; but as the contents of most of those letters were of a confidential character, and as no one likes to submit his private correspondence to the gaze of the public, I can only refer to the receipt of such additional evidence, without giving the contents of the letters received. Moreover, the majority of those letters bear no date, and as their appearance was such a frequent occurrence as to form almost one of the habitual incidents of our daily life, no particular notice was taken as to the date of arrival. Anything that happens only once in a lifetime may be looked upon as wonderful ; but if the most wonderful things happen every

day, the wonder and astonishment ceases. What interested us was not so much the fact that such letters can be sent as the intelligence they contained.

“Madame Blavatsky left Bombay on the 20th of February. I accompanied her on board of the steamer, and after my return to the shore an incident happened, which is described on p. 65 of the ‘Supplement to the *Theosophist*.’ From Bombay I went to Poona, and remained two days with Mr. A. D. Ezekiel. Mr. Ezekiel is a great sceptic, and he made me promise that if any occult phenomena should happen after my return to headquarters, I would let him know it. Therefore, when soon after my return a letter from the Mahatma K. H. was received, I wrote to Mr. Ezekiel about it. After sealing my letter another phenomenon happened. I therefore opened my letter again and added the new occurrence. I then put my letter in the mail bag, after which again an occult incident took place, in consequence of which I had to re-open my letter a second time. Ever since then, during the last seven months and during Madame Blavatsky’s absence, I have on many occasions received occult letters, and they arrived in various ways. One was from Mahatma K. H., handed to me by Damodar, who received it in my presence from the hands of the *Astral form* of a Chela; one letter, enclosed in a Tibetan envelope and written by another Mahatma, I found lying on my writing desk, when after a moment’s absence I returned to my room; one letter written by a Chela, and approved by Mahatma K. H., I found in my tobacco box, which a moment before contained nothing but tobacco, and there was nobody visible in the room except Damodar and myself; one letter I found in a drawer, which contained no papers whatever when I opened it, but when I was about to close it, there lay the letter, and there was nobody in the room but myself. I received letters from Damodar K. Mavalankar, while he was in Ootacamund, to which were added annotations and remarks by K. H., to say nothing of letters received from Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, in which another Mahatma had made annotations. An attempt to go into all the details would be useless, because these letters did not come for the purpose of giving ‘test phenomena’ under ‘scientifically prepared conditions.’ Their genuineness rests upon the perception by the senses of him who witnesses them, and upon his own common sense, experience, and discrimination, but their recital cannot carry conviction to the quarrelsome sceptic. Far from being desirous to convince such sceptics, I do not even consider it desirable that they should be convinced; I therefore only state the facts, having been requested to do so, and whether the public will believe them or not is entirely immaterial to me.—Respectfully,

“F. HARTMANN, M.D.”

APPENDIX XXXVIII.

“Ayant reçu une lettre de ma compatriote, Mme. Hélène Blavatsky, dans laquelle elle m’informait du mauvais état de sa santé et me priait de venir la voir à Elberfeld, je me suis décidé à faire ce voyage. Mais puisque l’état de ma propre santé me forçait à certains ménagements, j’ai préféré m’arrêter à Bruxelles, que je n’ai jamais vu, pour me reposer, la chaleur étant accablante.

“Je suis parti de Paris le 24 Août. Le lendemain matin, au Grand Hôtel

de Bruxelles où je m'étais arrêté, j'ai rencontré Mlle. A. (fille de feu ambassadeur russe à—et demoiselle d'honneur de l'Impératrice de Russie). En apprenant que je me rendais à Elberfeld pour voir Mme. Blavatsky, qu'elle connaît et estime beaucoup, elle s'est décidée à m'accompagner. Nous avons passé la journée ensemble, comptant partir le lendemain par le train de neuf heures du matin.

"A huit heures, étant déjà complètement prêt à partir, j'entre chez Mlle. A. et je la trouve dans un grand embarras. Toutes ses clefs, qu'elle a l'habitude de garder toujours sur elle dans un petit sac et qu'elle a eu dans ce sac en se couchant, avaient disparu pendant la nuit, quoique la porte de sa chambre fut fermée à clef. Ainsi toutes ses malles étant fermées, impossible d'emballer les effets dont elle venait de se servir. Nous fûmes obligés de remettre notre départ jusqu'au train d'une heure de l'après midi, et fîmes venir le serrurier pour ouvrir la plus grande malle. Lorsqu'elle fut ouverte toutes les clefs que nous cherchions se trouvèrent au fond de la malle, *ainsi que la clef de cette malle, attachée comme d'habitude avec les autres*. Ayant à nous toute notre matinée, nous voulûmes faire une promenade, mais soudain je me sentis dans un état d'étrange faiblesse et en proie à un irrésistible besoin de dormir. Je me suis excusé auprès de Mlle. A. et me suis retiré dans ma chambre, m'empressant de me mettre au lit. Mais je ne pus m'endormir et restais les yeux fermés, lorsque tout à coup, dans l'état de veille, j'ai vu devant mes yeux fermés toute une série de paysages inconnus, qui se sont gravés dans ma mémoire avec leurs moindres détails. Lorsque cette vision fut dissipé, je me sentis remis de ma faiblesse et me rendis auprès de Mlle. A., à laquelle certainement j'ai raconté ce qui venait de se passer en lui dépeignant les paysages dans tous leurs détails.

"Nous sommes partis par le train d'une heure, et voici qu'après une demi heure de route Mlle. A. me dit en regardant par la fenêtre : 'Tenez, voici un de vos paysages !' Je l'ai reconnu à l'instant, et jusqu'au soir j'ai revu, les yeux ouverts, tout ce que le matin j'avais vu les yeux fermés. J'étais content d'avoir raconté ma vision en détail à Mlle. A., car elle pouvait en attester la réalisation. Il faut dire que la route entre Bruxelles et Elberfeld m'est complètement inconnue, car c'était la première fois de ma vie que je visitais la Belgique et cette partie de l'Allemagne.

"En arrivant à Elberfeld le soir, nous nous sommes arrêtés dans un hôtel et nous nous hâtâmes de nous rendre auprès de Mme. Blavatsky dans la maison de M. Gebhard. Le même soir, les membres de la Société Théosophique qui entourent Mme. Blavatsky nous ont montré deux superbes portraits à l'huile des Mahatmas M. et Koot Houmi. Le portrait de M. surtout produisit sur nous une impression extraordinaire, et ce n'est pas étonnant qu'en revenant à notre hôtel nous en parlions encore et l'avions devant nos yeux. C'est à Mlle. A. de raconter ce qu'elle a vu et senti pendant la nuit suivante. Mais voici ce qui m'est arrivé :

"Fatigué par le voyage, je dormais paisiblement lorsque tout d'un coup je fus réveillé par la sensation d'un souffle bien chaud et pénétrant. J'ouvre les yeux et dans la faible clarté qui entrain dans la chambre par les trois fenêtres, je vois devant moi une grande figure d'homme vêtu d'un long vêtement blanc et flottant. En même temps j'ai entendu ou senti une voix, qui me disait, je ne puis préciser en quelle langue, bien que je le compris parfaitement,

d'allumer la bougie. Je dois dire qu'au lieu de m'effrayer je restais tout à fait tranquille, seulement je sentais mon cœur battre avec une force redoublée. J'ai allumé la bougie et en l'allumant j'ai vu à ma montre qu'il était deux heures du matin. La vision ne disparaissait pas. C'était un homme bien vivant qui était devant moi. Et j'ai reconnu à l'instant même en lui le bel original du portrait que nous avions vu le soir. Il s'assit près de moi sur une chaise, et commença à me parler. Il parla longtemps, touchant les questions qui m'intéressent, mais la plus grande partie de cet entretien ne peut être rapportée ici car il s'agissait de choses tout à fait personnelles. Je puis dire, cependant, qu'entre autre il m'a annoncé que pour le voir *dans son corps astral* j'a dû passer par beaucoup de préparations, et que la dernière leçon me fut donnée le matin même lorsque j'ai vu, les yeux fermés, les paysages que je devais revoir en réalité le même jour. Puis il me dit que je possède une grande force magnétique en voie de développement. Alors je lui demandai ce que je devais faire avec cette force. Mais, sans répondre, il disparut.

"J'étais seul, la porte de ma chambre était fermée à clef. J'ai cru à une hallucination et même je me suis dit avec effroi que je commence à perdre la tête. A peine ai-je eu cette idée que j'ai revu à la même place l'homme superbe aux vêtements blancs. Il hochait la tête et en souriant me dit : 'Soyez sûr que je ne suis pas une hallucination et que votre raison ne vous quitte pas. Blavatsky vous prouvera demain devant tout le monde que ma visite était réelle.' Puis il disparut. J'ai constaté à ma montre qu'il était près de trois heures. J'ai éteint la bougie et je me suis rendormi immédiatement d'un profond sommeil.

"Le matin, en arrivant avec Mlle. A. près de Mme. Blavatsky, la première chose qu'elle nous dit avec son sourire énigmatique : 'Eh bien ! comment avez-vous passé la nuit ?' 'Très bien,' lui ai-je répondu, et j'ai ajouté, 'Vous n'avez rien à me dire ?' 'Non,' fit-elle, 'je sais seulement que le Maître a été chez vous avec un de ses élèves.'

"Le soir du même jour M. Olcott a trouvé dans sa poche un petit billet, que tous les théosophes ont reconnu pour être de l'écriture de M., conçu en ces termes : 'Certainement j'étais là, mais qui peut ouvrir les yeux à celui qui ne veut pas voir ?—M.'

"C'était la réponse à mon incredulité, puisque toute la journée je tâchais de me persuader que ce n'était qu'une hallucination, ce qui fâchait Mme. Blavatsky.

"Je dois dire qu'à peine revenu à Paris, où je suis actuellement, mes hallucinations et les faits étranges qui m'entouraient se sont complètement dissipés.

"VSEVOLOD SOLOVIOFF.

"1 Octobre 84.

"Paris."

With regard to the foregoing statement it should be noted that Mahatma M. is said to speak no Western language with fluency. M. Solovioff speaks Russian and French. We cannot venture to conjecture in what language the conversation can have been conducted; nor could M. Solovioff remember any individual word or expression made use of on either side.

One of the Committee has seen the letter found in Colonel Olcott's pocket,

which is in the M. handwriting. It is further to be noted that the meeting of M. Solovioff and Mlle. A. at the hotel at Brussels was apparently fortuitous, M. Solovioff not being aware that Mlle. A., with whom he was only slightly acquainted, was at Brussels at all.

The lady here styled Mlle. A. recounted her experience to one of us ; but, for reasons which we comprehend and respect, she does not wish to commit it to paper.

APPENDIX XXXIX.

Mrs. Gebhard, of Elberfeld, well known to one member of the Committee, writes as follows with regard to an incident which occurred at a meeting of the London Lodge of the Theosophical Society, on April 7th, 1884. On that occasion, Madame Blavatsky, who had come in unexpectedly, and was sitting among the audience, suddenly called to Mr. Mohini, as though she saw some one. Mr. Mohini joined her in a lobby, and appeared also to perceive some one, whom he saluted with respect. Colonel Olcott's speech, however, was not interrupted, and nothing was said to show who it was that Madame Blavatsky and Mr. Mohini thus greeted. At the end of the meeting, they both stated that they had seen Mahatma M.

"On the 7th of April last, being at a meeting of the Theosophical Society at Mr. Finch's rooms, Lincoln's Inn, I had a vision, in which I saw the Mahatma M. At the moment I was listening attentively to Colonel Olcott's opening speech to the Society. I saw standing on my right side, a little in front, a very tall, majestic-looking person, whom I immediately recognised to be the Mahatma, from a picture I had seen of him in Mr. Sinnett's possession. He was not clad in white, but it seemed to me to be some dark material with coloured stripes, which was wound round his form. The vision lasted only a few seconds. As far as I could learn, the only persons besides myself who had seen the Mahatma were Colonel Olcott, Mr. Mohini, and, of course, Madame Blavatsky.

MARY GEBHARD."

APPENDIX XL.

(1)

Extract from Mr. B.'s Diary.

On a Sunday evening, in November, 1881, I determined, with the whole force of my will, that I would project my spirit, by some means or other, into a house at Kensington, in which resided two ladies of my acquaintance, Miss — and Miss E. —.

I resolved to make my presence perceptible in the room which I knew to be occupied by these ladies at night, and I determined that the time of my appearance should be at 1 o'clock on the morning of Monday.

At the time of my experiment I was at Bayswater, and I arrived at the above-mentioned determination before going to sleep, at about 11.30 p.m.

On the following Thursday I went to see the ladies in question, and, in the course of conversation (without any allusion to the subject on my part), the

elder one told me, "that, on the previous Sunday night, she had been much terrified by perceiving me (when awake) standing by her bedside, that she screamed as the apparition advanced towards her, and that she awoke her sister, who saw me also."

I asked her if she was sure she was awake at the time, and she replied most decidedly in the affirmative. Upon my asking her the time of the occurrence, she replied, "1 o'clock in the morning."

This was the first occurrence upon which I tried an experiment of this kind, and its complete success startled me very much.

B.

[In answer to an inquiry, he says : "The entry in my diary is not dated, but I recollect having made it within a week or so of the occurrence of the experiment, and whilst it was perfectly fresh in my memory."]

Statement by Miss —.

On a certain Sunday evening, about 12 months since, at our house in Kensington, I distinctly saw Mr. B. in my room, about 1 o'clock. I was perfectly awake, and was much terrified. I awoke my sister by screaming, and she saw the apparition herself. Three days after, when I saw Mr. B., I told him what had happened ; but it was some time before I could recover from the shock I had received, and the remembrance is even now too vivid to be erased from my memory.

January 18th, 1883.

(2)

From Mr. B.

On Friday, December 1st, 1882, at 9.30 p.m., I went into a room alone, and determined that I would project my spirit (or astral body) into a house at Kew, situate in — Road, and occupied by Miss —.

Whilst making this experiment, I fell into a mesmeric sleep, and seemed actually to be in the above-mentioned house, and saw the interior of the sitting-room, which appeared to me to be empty. At 10 p.m. I awoke, and wrote down a brief account of my experiment.

Upon going to bed on this same night, I determined that I would visit the same house at 12 p.m., and that I would make my presence perceptible in the large front bedroom.

On the following day, I went to — Road to spend the evening, and met there a married sister of Miss —, a Mrs. L.

I had not seen this lady for two years, and my interview with her then was of the briefest description, consisting only of the interchange of a few commonplace words following a ballroom introduction.

In the course of conversation (although I did not dream of asking her any questions on such a subject) she told me, that on the previous evening she had seen me distinctly upon two occasions. At about 9.30, she had seen me in the passage, and had followed me into a room, upon entering which she found it vacant. At 12 p.m., when wide awake, she had seen me enter the front bedroom, walk round to the bedside where she was lying, and take

her hand in my own, gazing intently at it the while. She recognised me at once, and awoke her sister, and told her about the matter.

Directly Mrs. L. had told me this, I took the paper from my pocket, which I had written on the previous evening, and showed it to those present, thereby causing much astonishment and incredulity.

I asked her if she was not dreaming at the time of the latter experience, but she stoutly denied this.

Mrs. L. is a lady of highly imaginative temperament, and told me that she had been subject, since childhood, to psychological fancies, &c., thus causing me to be very cautious about her testimony; but when I realised the exact coincidence of the date and time, I was convinced that it was more than a flight of the imagination which she had experienced, and I therefore induced her to write a brief statement of her impressions and sign it.

At the time of the experiment I was five miles away.

B.

On Friday, December 1st, 1882, I was on a visit to my sister at Kew, and about 9.30 p.m. I was going from the bedroom to get some water from the bath-room, when I distinctly saw Mr. B., whom I had only seen once before, about two years ago, walk before me past the bath-room towards a bedroom at the end of the landing. About 11 o'clock we retired for the night, and about 12 o'clock I was still awake, and the door opened and Mr. B. came into the room and walked round to the bedside, and there stood with one foot on the ground and the other knee resting on a chair. He then took my hair, which is long, into his hand, after which he took my hand in his, and looked very intently into the palm. "Ah," I said (speaking to him), "you need not look at the lines, for I never had any trouble." I then awoke my sister; I was not nervous, but excited, and began to fear some serious illness would befall her, she being delicate at the time, but she is progressing more favourably now.

H. L.

(3)

From Mr. B.

March 22nd, 1884.

Dear Mr. Gurney,—I am going to try the experiment to-night of making my presence perceptible at (address given), at 12 p.m. I will let you know the result in a few days.—Yours very sincerely,

B.

April 3rd, 1884.

Dear Mr. Gurney,—I have a strange statement to show you, respecting my experiment, which was tried at your suggestion, and under the test conditions which you imposed.

Having quite forgotten which night it was on which I attempted the projection, I cannot say whether the result is a brilliant success, or only a slight one, until I see the letter which I posted you on the evening of the experiment.

Having sent you that letter, I did not deem it necessary to make a note in my diary, and consequently have left the exact date slip my memory.

If the dates correspond, the success is complete in every detail, and I have an account signed and witnessed to show you.

I saw the lady (who was the subject), for the first time last night, since the experiment, and she made a voluntary statement to me, which I wrote down at her dictation, and to which she has attached her signature. The date and time of the apparition are specified in this statement, and it will be for you to decide whether they are identical with those given in my letter to you. I have completely forgotten, but yet I fancy that they are the same.

B.

On Saturday night, March 22nd, 1884, at about midnight, I had a distinct impression that Mr. B. was present in my room, and I distinctly saw him whilst I was quite widely awake. He came towards me, and stroked my hair, in the same way in which he did when he appeared to me at Kensington. I voluntarily gave him this information, when he called to see me on Wednesday, April 2nd, telling him the time and the circumstances of the apparition, without any suggestion on his part. The appearance in my room was most vivid, and quite unmistakable.

L.—
(Witness) A.— (Full signatures given.)

(Mr. B.'s account. Copied, April 7th, 1884.—E. G.)

On Saturday, March 22nd, I determined to make my presence perceptible to Miss —, at 12 midnight, and as I had previously arranged with Mr. Gurney that I should post him a letter on the evening on which I tried my next experiment (stating the time and other particulars), I sent a note to acquaint him with the above facts.

About 10 days afterwards I called upon Miss —, and she voluntarily told me, that on March 22nd, at 12 o'clock midnight, she had seen me so vividly in her room (whilst widely awake) that her nerves had been much shaken, and she had been obliged to send for a doctor in the morning.

I asked her to sign a statement of these facts (which I drew up at her dictation), and she did so.

B.

APPENDIX XLI.

The following has been communicated to us by the persons concerned, both of whom are well known to the majority of the Committee:—

"One evening, early in 1878, A. resolved to try and appear to B. at some miles distant. A. did not inform B. beforehand of the intended experiment, but retired to rest shortly before midnight, with thoughts intently concentrated on B., with whose room and surroundings, however, A. was quite unacquainted. A. soon fell asleep, and awoke next morning unconscious of anything having taken place. On seeing B. a few days afterwards, A. inquired, 'Did anything happen at your rooms on Saturday night?' 'Yes,' replied B., 'a great deal happened. I had been sitting over the fire with M., smoking and chatting. About 12.30 he rose to leave, and I let him out myself. I returned to the fire to finish my pipe, when I saw you sitting in

I

the chair just vacated by M. I looked intently at you, and then took up a newspaper to assure myself I was not dreaming, but on laying it down I saw you still there. While I gazed without speaking, you faded away. Though I imagined you must be fast asleep in bed at that hour, yet you appeared dressed in your ordinary garments, such as you usually wear every day.' 'Then my experiment seems to have succeeded,' said A. 'The next time I come, ask me what I want, as I had fixed in my mind certain questions I intended to ask you, but I was probably waiting for an invitation to speak.'

"A few weeks later the experiment was repeated with equal success, A., as before, not informing B. when it was made. On this occasion B. not only questioned A. on a subject, which was at that time under very warm discussion between them, but detained A. by the exercise of his will some time after A. had intimated a desire to leave. This fact, when it came to be communicated to A., seemed to account for the violent and somewhat peculiar headache which marked the morning following the experiment; at least, A. remarked at the time that there was no apparent cause, physical or otherwise, for the unusual headache, and, as on the former occasion, no recollection remained of the event, or seeming event of the previous night."

APPENDIX XLII.

The following account of a letter seen in the process of materialisation is part of a communication to ourselves from Mr. Mohini M. Chatterji, dated December 3rd, 1884.

"At Bombay, in 1882, I witnessed a most remarkable instance of materialisation of letter. I was in a room with Mr. Damodar and two other friends. Two or three feet from us Mr. Damodar was writing at a table; we were otherwise engaged. Mr. Damodar suddenly called out to us. We went up to the table, and saw a letter in the process of materialisation; it seemed to grow. First was seen a small bit, which expanded until an envelope was fully formed. It was addressed to one of us in the familiar handwriting of a Mahatma. The addressee took it up, and found there were in reality two letters, but so closely pressed together as to be easily mistaken for one. In fact, he was not sure that the second letter, which was to me, did not form itself in his hand. It is to be stated that Madame Blavatsky was not in the room at the time of this occurrence.

(Signed) "MOHINI M. CHATTERJI."

LONDON :
NATIONAL PRESS AGENCY, LIMITED,
13, WHITEFRIARS STREET, E.C.