

Address of the Honorary President (1987).  
Theosophical History Centre.  
read at  
The Second International Conference on Theosophical History<sup>1</sup>

JIDDU KRISHNAMURTI  
AND “THE RETURN OF MADAME BLAVATSKY”  
“...a failure ...a retardment ...a misfit...”

*“Madmen are they, who, speculating but upon the present, wilfully shut their eyes to the past when made already to remain naturally blind to the future!”*,

*-The Mahatma Koot Hoomi<sup>2</sup>*

*“...we do not ‘require a passive mind’ but on the contrary are seeking for those most active, which can put two and two together once that they are on the right scent...”*

*- The Mahatma Koot Hoomi<sup>3</sup>*

### **INTRODUCTION: HISTORICAL “ROOTS”**

THE LATE JOHN B. S. COATS, International President of The Theosophical Society-in 1947 the only then-or-future leader of a body in organized theosophy who spontaneously offered congratulatory appreciation of this writer’s pamphlet (from The Theosophical University Press)<sup>4</sup> rebutting the atrocious biography of Madame Blavatsky by Gertrude Marvin Williams<sup>5</sup> (when she had personally declined to offer any surrebuttal)-, in his Presidential Address of *December-1977* to the 102<sup>nd</sup> Annual Convention of the T.S., courageously speculated upon the fact that, “We have thought for many years about the statement that at the end of the century there would be another effort made by the Elder Brothers to introduce some new keynote into the existing chord of human life. We need to be extremely open-minded if we hope to recognize what that keynote is... Do not let us fall into the... trap in supposing that the teaching of the end of this century will be exactly like that of 100 years ago. It may, indeed, be very different. The emphasis may be on something that we have not considered to be very important in the past, but which today has assumed a quite different importance in the eyes of those who stand behind the scenes.

Probably we have assumed that the Torchbearer as H.P.B. called him would come from the East, in the physical sense, but though his teaching may come from the East symbolically, he might, after all, appear in the West...”<sup>6</sup>

To my audience today-perhaps more than any other- it should be “intuitively” apparent, if not by sheer rational deduction drawing upon the course of events in the field of theosophy since the beginning of 1975 at least, that the “emphasis” most evident-and a very important one it is, critically vital to the whole future course of the Movement!-is simply this: conscientious study of the historical roots of the Theosophical Movement in all its aspects, philosophical, phenomenal, and organizational-mundane and arcane.

To those among my audience who may appreciate “signs in the heavens,” I would like to point out some significations which appear to have escaped everyone else. First, that as the individual has a “horoscope” timed to his/her birth, so do all beginnings; and at the “birth” of this 25-year Occult Cycle, that is at Oh, Om, Os (Greenwich Mean Time) on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January, 1975, the planet Mercury, denoting “the Message” and “Message-bearer,” was in the 18<sup>th</sup> degree of Capricorn and on the Descendant of the horoscope of the Theosophical Society (as calculated for Alan Leo, see 1001 Notable Nativities), while at the same time Saturn, *signifying impediment, obstruction, delay*, was transiting the opposing 16<sup>th</sup> degree of Cancer and conjunction the Ascendant of the Theosophical Society and Movement (only 1 degree and 11 minutes separating the two planets). At this moment today, July 19<sup>th</sup>, 1987, Venus in transit is in the 17<sup>th</sup> degree of Cancer (Venus, “the Lesser Benefic,” having been the Ruler of the January 1975 Ascendant). And nine days ago there was a Full Moon at 18°15' Capricorn, falling within one-half degree of this writer's Midheaven, both this Midheaven and current Lunation being conjunction the January 1975 Mercury.

Moreover, the January 1975 “birth chart’s” Midheaven in the 10<sup>th</sup> degree of Cancer also at this moment is being approached by Mercury (indicative of “writing, reporting, speech”) transitting the 9<sup>th</sup> degree of Cancer, both co-joining this writer’s own Venus (Ruler of his Ascendant) positioned less than one-half degree from exact conjunction with that 1975 Midheaven-all three being in powerful, dynamic aspect with Mme Blavatsky’s own Moon (“publicity”), Ruler of her Ascendant, in the 10<sup>th</sup> degree of Libra. Significantly, the Moon in transit, at this very moment, occupies 17°15' Taurus, opposite the Jupiter of the Theosophical Society; and is exactly 90° from 17°15' Aquarius, the position of HPB’s own Jupiter, lithe Greater Benefic.”

Most importantly, however, ask any competent astrologer for the meaning of Saturn, “the Greater Malefic,” harbinger of what some would call “evil Karma,” transitting an Ascendant in opposition to Mercury transitting the Descendant-and after you hear the answer you will better appreciate the implacable Fate, meted-out to the Theosophical Society and the Movement in connection with its expectation of receiving an Initiate-Adept or a Mahatma-Messenger during this dreary quarter-century Cycle. While this last is the “bad” news seen by “starlight” cast upon Shambhalha’s Cycle in our century, the *good news* is that in the Mercury-Saturn contact we also see “STUDY” (indicated by Mercury) of “THE PAST” (signified by Saturn)-most appropriate, indeed, for an “emphasis” on History!

In 1974, on the very eve of this Cycle, this writer observed that, “the importance of history is but one degree removed from the importance of philosophy itself... Madame Blavatsky’s greatest books, *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine*, are compendiums of history as much as of philosophy... So, history devoid of fact is myth; just as philosophy divorced from action and unjustified by history is no better than myth” (from *Theosophical Notes* published by

Victor A. Endersby, Napa, California; October 10, 1974, pp. 5, 6; 1.).

The 4<sup>th</sup> of this month marked the *last day* of the first half of the 25-year Occult Cycle denoted by H.P. Blavatsky as the then-coming quarter-century for Shambhalha's next "Effort" to specially enlighten Humankind, particularly some in the Western world-, this past July 5<sup>th</sup> being the exact *mid-point* of this cyclic period. In my privately duplicated monograph of *25 December 1977*, with very limited circulation, *1877-1977 : Shambhalha's Fifth "Centennial Effort" Gives Birth to the Sixth,*<sup>7</sup> one reads "The Message of H.P. Blavatsky was fourfold: Primordial Buddhism, The Living Ancient Wisdom, expressed in terms of: (1) Philosophy, (2) Science, (3) Ethics, and (4) History. The fourth of these has been the least appreciated ... And yet, without a solid historical base in factual events on this globe, without experiential reality in the life of the Human Race-without individuals and groups, -the 'carriers' and their 'footprints on the sands of time,' their beginnings, landmarks, vicissitudes and defeats along the way, up to and including the span of H.P.B's Mission, and right down to this very day-, the Philosophy, the Science, and the Ethics which constitute Occultism (if these could be said to exist at all without objective experiences) would be no better than myth... Madame Blavatsky sought always to disclose and trace back, step-by-step thru clues and facts of known history (by citing a myriad of authorities whom scholars could respect), the moral, spritual and intellectual roots and runners of the Wisdom-Religion and its arch-Bearers, as are to be found imbedded in the annals of historical record ancient and modern.

"This was a most extraordinary departure from the common mode of so-called occult teaching..." Continuing, in 1977 I maintained that what theosophists had one-and-all "never guessed, was that the level of wisdom already provided and intended by the Chohans of Shambhalha to be [in 1975 and after] the one true and only 'installment', one prepared and fitted

for this present generation and for the new Cycle now underway... was to be (and is) something quite different than the expected, an (unforeseen) Message that is rooted in and springs from history, particularly the course of history which runs back 146 years to 1831 and beyond to the earliest physical beginnings of preparation for the last Mission from the World-Center of Occult Truth (a Mission that was far, far more important-to the past that preceded it, to the present, and to the future-than ever has been guessed!).” The challenge and “task” of delineating this history was seen to be “not something that can be approached by anyone beholden to organized theosophy or to anyone of its centers; nor can it be undertaken for the contrived purpose of aggrandizing some ‘successor to HPB’ or someone living, neither some ‘line of succession.’ It must be an over-view of events such as can be seen only by one conscientiously dedicated solely to the truthful defence and vindication of HPB and her Brother-Adepts and Their 1875-1891 Teaching.”

And that there are the necessary historical records available to assure the success of this task, testifies to the fruitfulness of the clash and conflict of opinions on historical matters, as in the tides of controversy, polemics, attacks and counter-attacks, rebuttals, surrebuttals and attempted justifications of beliefs-from the Childs-Holmes case and the Coulomb-missionary-SPR Committee conspiracies, down through the Judge-Besant battle to the warring of separate camps of organized theosophy in this century, and similar skirmishes unto this day. Each, for party purposes, has *forced* the public disclosure of testimony and privately-held evidence, sometimes of crucial importance in the pursuit of truth, which otherwise would have been ignored and irretrievably *lost* to history and historians. Thus, too, has been provided-as nothing else could-the necessary grist for “the mills of the gods” in this significant last-quarter of the XX<sup>th</sup> Century. I repeat with emphasis what I declared more than two decades ago: no telling

defence of Mme Blavatsky could ever have been made without the *help* of Mme Coulomb's pamphlet of November 1884, nor if lacking Dr Richard Hodgson's Report of 1885! And we may be sure that if this Movement had at once assumed a *monolithic* character behind a tranquil facade, the public record and its prospects for the truth-seeking historian today would be only whatever bland recital of self-glorification that monolith's own lackey-historians would have wanted it to be—"canned history" impenetrable from without and free of the spur of *informed* criticism. (Even now, I myself have been summarily denied-by two of the three major world-centers of organized theosophy-access to printed documents privately issued almost one-hundred years ago!) Instead, original and essential documentation has survived (and even when, at one most critical juncture, a "communication from the Masters" was received "ordering" some of it to be destroyed!), and, to a great degree, is spread before the world of this and future generations in a manner no censor could suppress, resulting in something almost *unprecedented* in "the history of religions"!

And it is only because of this "fortuitous preservation" that this writer in December 1977 was enabled to allude to a "grand 'Secret to the Mystery of "HPB" herself (ultimate knowledge of 'her' occult identity, status and Mission," a secret "which came into his possession and understanding as far back as early 1949, howbeit not publicly disclosed [though, I should now add, substantially revealed at that time in letters to the late Boris de Zirkoff], leaving this writer to wonder for decades whatever might be done with such stupendous information..." (from section titled, "The Only 'Message from the Masters' Merited or Needed-A 'History Lesson' in (as H.P.B. Foresaw the 'Future Need')-'Clear Judgment,'" (op. cit., pp. 24-25).

What was thus promised almost ten years ago, is now delivered-and you today will be the first living recipients of it, of a treasure gained by diligent prospecting and mining since February

12, 1940, of the goldfields of theosophical history. At this I am most grateful for the unforeseen and immeasurably appreciated opportunity to serve and (by proxy) to address you today as Honorary President of The Theosophical History Centre, and that during the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary-year of my own first work published in defence of Madame Blavatsky. In return, I am happy to reciprocate by giving you a portion of what is to me the greatest treasure this life will ever have brought me, but something which, quite naturally, will be variously received. Depending upon individual reaction, it will be considered either (a) the most extraordinary and bizarre, or (b) the most preposterous and disgusting, or (c) the most informative and important, addition to theosophical thought since May 8, 1891.

Completed just four days ago, one draft of this paper would have required two-and-a-half hours for the reading!-a fact which necessitated its re-writing three times thereafter while attempting to condense content without forfeiting clarity or credibility, having all the while to fend off distressing health and environmental problems prolonged beyond patience. Due to severe limitation of space and, especially, time, the best I can manage to now offer is, so to say, a miniaturized, encapsulated summary; the naked truth or “skeleton” (as it might best be seen in view of its omission of the immensely greater mass of supportive data extant) of what I suggest to you may be considered that promised new measure of “occult lore” (to use the terms of HPB in her Theosophical Glossary, p. 214) to be provided by the “Great Brotherhood” of the Masters of Compassion for our time, as in “the last quarter of every century”, especially “to enlighten a small portion of the Western nations...”

It is in no sense a psychic revelation, a “reading of Akashic Records,” a “communication from the Masters” personally received, nor the product of “dreams and visions.” It consists simply of an interlocking series of rational deductions gleaned from the printed historical record

available to all, the putting-together of a hidden message meant for us and our posterity, originally fragmented and scattered as it was, here and there throughout the known writings of HPB and her Brothers, received before May 8, 1891 and altogether in print before the world for the last 50 years or more.

That it was known a “puzzle-master” someday would appear at the proper time and put it to the true and only use for which it originally was intended, is not an extravagant conjecture if we accept the assurance of the Mahatma Koot Hoomi that there “shines only for the highest Chohan...” (the Maha Chohan, Master of All Masters) “...the *Light of Omniscience* and infallible Prevision on this earth...”<sup>8</sup> And that no one otherwise has managed to discern it is simply a testimony to human indifference, to widespread disinterest by “theosophists” in their historical “roots,” to distraction by trivial so-called “theosophical” diversions leading nowhere, and especially to the resistance of commonplace thought-the Lower Mind, if you will-, generally impervious to the intimations of Intuition (our only channel of personal consciousness sensitive to Spiritual Knowledge and-Spiritual Memory).



CONCLUDING  
The Address of the Honorary President [1987].  
Theosophical History Centre.  
read at  
The Second International Conference on Theosophical History<sup>1</sup>

JIDDU KRISHNAMURTI  
AND “THE RETURN OF MADAME BLAVATSKY”  
“...a failure ...a retardment ...a misfit...”

HELENA P. BLAVATSKY-“THE GREAT MYSTERY”

*“...the time is not quite ripe to let you entirely into the secret...you are hardly yet prepared to understand the great Mystery, even if told of it...”*

-“K.H.’s Confidential Memo about Old Lady.”<sup>9</sup>

*“...the personality known as H.P.B. to the world (but otherwise to us).”*

-The Mahatma Koot Hoomi<sup>10</sup>

*“You can never know her as we do, therefore---none of you will ever be able to judge her impartially or correctly. You see the surface of things...holding but to appearances, we---judge but after having fathomed the object to its profoundest depth...”*

- The Mahatma Koot Hoomi<sup>11</sup>

*“Our greatest trouble is to teach pupils not to be befooled by appearances.”*

-The Mahatma K.H.<sup>12</sup>

*“When, therefore, people express a desire to ‘see a MAHATMA, they really do not seem to understand what it is they ask for. How can they, by their physical eye, hope to see that which transcends that sight? And supposing they see the body of a MAHATMA, how can they know that behind that mask is concealed an exalted being?’”*

-H.P.B.<sup>13</sup>

*“...many of us would be mistaken for madmen, by you English gentlemen. But he who would become a son of Wisdom can always see beneath the rugged surface.”*

-The Mahatma Koot Hoomi<sup>14</sup>

*“What could people know of me? The exterior carcass fattened on the life-blood of the interior, wretched prisoner, and people perceived only the first, never suspecting the existence of the latter Bound up, as I was, from head to foot by my pledge, an oath involving my future life---aye, even lives---what could I do since I was forbidden to explain all...?”*

-H.P. Blavatsky<sup>15</sup>

*“I (the inner real ‘I’) am in prison and cannot show myself as I am with all the desire I may have to No, you do not hate me; you only feel a friendly, indulgent, a kind of benevolent contempt for*

*H.P.B. You are right there, so far as you know her the one who is ready to fall into pieces. Perchance you may find out yet your mistake concerning the other---the well hidden party.”*  
-H.P. Blavatsky<sup>16</sup>

*“The day will come when posterity will learn to know me better.”*  
-H.P. Blavatsky<sup>17</sup>

Please Note: Readily accessible and valuable background information, bearing upon “the great Mystery” of Madame Blavatsky, can be found in two books---luckily, both available in recent reprintings from The Theosophical Publishing House: William Kingsland’s *The Real H.P. Blavatsky*, particularly pp. 87-8, 99, 212 and 249; and Mary K. Neff’s compilation, *The Personal Memoirs of H. P. Blavatsky*, especially Chapters XXXIII, XXXVII, and XXXIX.

IN THE LAST PARAGRAPH of *The Secret Doctrine*, we read this curious statement:  
“These two volumes only constitute the work of a pioneer who has forced his way into the well-nigh impenetrable jungle of the virgin forests of the Land of the Occult.” How many of its readers have sought to understand why the author speaks in the male and not female gender? Colonel Olcott tells us that, more than once, the Masters, in referring to HPB, indicated they were relating to “our Brother H.P.B.”<sup>18</sup> Moreover, why is it that no one has addressed the question of selfish injustice and obviously self-serving manipulation inherent in the accepted picture of Master-Adepts enticing a trusting Western female “sensitive” to act as their mouthpiece and agent (what Boris de Zirkoff was pleased to call their “neophyte messenger”!), sending her forth into the fiery furnace of tribulations, tortures and onslaughts from every side--even unto martyrdom in a very real sense-, at the mercy of a hostile and wicked world in the Black Age of Kali Yuga, while they themselves remained secure and secluded in what they could call their “snowy retreat”?! If not such a victim, WHO then, was sent-or, to put it better, which one of Their number volunteered to go?

This writer, by January 1949--and after having been, since age 15, diligently engaged in exploring evidence on the life of Mme Blavatsky--already had made the discovery that “the well hidden party” and true author of the great literary heritage attributed to the daughter of Col. Peter

von Hahn, was none other than a ChoKhan of Shambhalha,<sup>19</sup> otherwise known as “Maha Sahib” or “Master Serapis” and the Master of Mahatmas M (Morya) and K.H. (Koot Hoomi),<sup>20</sup> “the Paraguru, in fact.”<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, this writer continued to remain ignorant of any conclusive evidence to corroborate his even more advanced thought, viz., that the Paraguru,<sup>22</sup> Mme Blavatsky’s “Master, the God within,”<sup>23 24</sup> was also one of the Nirmanakayas, Those Whom she has identified as Beings “higher and holier than...our living Masters...”<sup>25</sup>

It was not until some 30 years later that a contributor to The Blavatsky Foundation donated as gift a copy of The Theosophy Company’s 1946 reprint titled, Letters That Have Helped Me (from William Q. Judge, compiled by “Jasper Niemand”, i.e., Mrs Archibald Keightley)--a work he had never thought to purchase, supposing it to be of like content to the Theosophical University Press volume of the same title (also by W. Q. Judge) and a copy of which latter he long had possessed. Imagine then his surprise and delight upon opening the former, after quite some delay, to find on pages 280-281 the following extract from a letter of Mme Blavatsky to William Q. Judge, originally quoted in The Irish Theosophist, June 1895:

“...Affairs and events may be turned off by unseen hands into such a groove that you will be unanimously elected for life--just as Olcott and I were--to go on with the work after our deaths. Do you understand what it means? It means that, unless you consent, you force me to a miserable life and a Miserable Death, with the idea preying upon my mind that there is an end of Theosophy. That for several years I will not be able to help it on, and steer its course, because I will have to act in a body which will have to be assimilated to the Nirmanakaya, because even in occultism there are such things as a failure and a retardment and a misfit...”

It is an incredibility-or is it a symptom?-that, insofar as I am aware, no leader of organized theosophy, no theosophical author, lecturer or historian during the last 92 years has deigned to make any mention at all of these priceless words of Mme Blavatsky!!

JIDDU KRISHNAMURTI: A "MYSTERY" UNTO HIMSELF!  
"MAN, KNOW THYSELF."

Questioner: "Are you the Christ come back?"

Krishnamurti: "Friend, do not concern yourself with who I am; you will never know."<sup>26</sup>

Not only did the words of HPB's trepidation, published not until four years after her death (presumably going to press the very month of JK's birth!), confirm this writer's "intuitive" conclusion of January 1949 respecting "the Nirmanakaya," their content also strongly reinforced a sheer "hunch" of mine conceived now more than 40 years ago, viz., that the same Nirmanakaya-being the Spiritual Ego or Immortal SELF, the "Inner Man" and "the chief divine Master, the God within" of Madame Blavatsky -afterwards sought "reimbodiment" in Jiddu Krishnamurti; but that the intended "incarnation" proved a failure, or as one would say, unlike HPB, JK failed to become "assimilated to the Nirmanakaya..."<sup>27</sup>

As to why this failure came to pass, the deciding force was Karma-Karma from which, we are told, not even the highest gods are exempt-and Karma acting in accord with an Occult Law feared in both the East<sup>28</sup> and in the West<sup>29</sup>--dictating that the teacher must pay his part for the sins of the pupil when the latter misuses and perverts to selfish and evil purposes knowledge the former has imparted to the latter.<sup>30</sup> Thus, HPB likened the Theosophical Society, having her "magnetic fluid,"<sup>31</sup> to a "Frankenstein" monster turning to "rend" and "devour" her;<sup>32</sup> and she repeatedly identifies herself as its "scapegoat"<sup>33</sup> and the "lightning rod" to bear its Karma.

As for JK, he remained unenlightened: “Why did they ever pick on me?”<sup>34</sup> -“Lord! how I hate it all and I dislike all the publicity and I shall have it all my life. Heavens, what have I done to deserve this?”<sup>35</sup> And, so it appears, he remained to the end a “mystery” unto himself!<sup>36</sup> But we may be sure that the suffering Nirmanakaya, Who had been willing to sacrifice not one life but two so as to carry the Torch of Truth to Western lands in our era---knew all.

“DAMODAR” AND “DAMODAR” RETURNED:  
TWO IN TEN THOUSAND MILLIONS

*“The poor boy, whether dead or alive, has no happy times now, since he is on probation and this is terrible.”*

-Madame H. P. Blavatsky<sup>37</sup>

*“I do not know when, if ever, he will come back to us. That he will, I believe; and I should not be surprised if he comes when H.P.B., reincarnated and, like himself, changed beyond all recognition, will resume the world-work she had to drop on ‘White Lotus Day’ in 1891. It would be too unreasonable to imagine that the Lords of Karma would keep anyone of the best workers - of the Theosophical movement idling about on the other planes of existence, when the cry of the suffering world for light and guidance is rising to their celestial abodes.”*

-Colonel Henry Steel Olcott<sup>38</sup>

*“He will return...”*<sup>39</sup>

-Helena Petrovna Blavatsky

*“Tell him, O Aspirant, that true devotion may bring him back the knowledge, that knowledge which was his in former births.”*

-The Voice of the Silence<sup>40</sup>

*“I may be in any other body, but my Individuality will be the same as now and I shall know myself as Damodar.”*

-Damodar K. Mavalankar<sup>41</sup>

With only “a failure and a retardment and a misfit” (even now gone), instead of a Nirmanakaya free to exercise His awesome powers, when not so paralyzed and imprisoned, as it were; and with neither Mahatma nor Initiate-Adept in the role of XXth Century “Messenger of Shambhalha,” are we to suppose that “the Highest of the Nirmanakayas,” none other than the Thrice-Blessed Sakyamuni Buddha- “the Maha Chohan, to whose insight the future lies like an

open page”<sup>42</sup> -, failed to prudently provide for just such an eventuality? Was there not a “back-up,” a “stand-in” and substitute long-prepared to take the place of “a failure and a retardment and a misfit”?

And, if so, who might it be? Was not Damodar K. Mavalankar, in 1885, named by the Masters to serve in her stead if HPB herself--then seriously ill---died before the “end of the term” (December 31, 1899)?<sup>43</sup> And after Damodar vanished into the Himalayas,<sup>44</sup> never again to be seen in the flesh by any Theosophist, was it not HPB herself who lamented that he was not available “to refute Hodgson’s... lies...”?<sup>45</sup> And, in writing to Judge Khandalavala, she revealed that, alone, it was only Damodar (outside, of course, the Initiates of Shambhalha) who had her “secret” and knew “the whole truth”<sup>46</sup> -that “whole truth” which would be revealed to the world ONLY AFTER HER DEATH.<sup>47</sup>

So, has Damodar, indeed, returned?<sup>48</sup>

In view of what is now on public record,<sup>49</sup> I say he has.

Walter A. Carrithers, Jr.

## NOTES & SOURCE-REFERENCES:

---

<sup>1</sup> A paper substantively as here appears, but to which has been added-“fleshing-out,” so to say, the “skeleton” summary originally offered-some further documented elucidations, together with source-references, as follow.

<sup>2</sup> [ML] The Mahatma Letters To A.P. Sinnett, etc.; Third & Revised Edition (T.P.H., 1972); p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> ML, p. 273.

<sup>4</sup> The Truth About Madame Blavatsky: *An Open Letter to the Author of “Priestess of the Occult” Regarding the Charges Against H.P. Blavatsky*; Covina, California; 1947.

<sup>5</sup> Priestess of the Occult (Madame Blavatsky); Alfred A. Knopf; 1946.

<sup>6</sup> [CT] The Canadian Theosophist, March-April, 1978, p. 10.

<sup>7</sup> Inquiries for copies should be directed to: The Secretary, The Blavatsky Foundation, Post Office Box 1543, Fresno, Ca 93716; U.S.A.

<sup>8</sup> ML, p. 418.

<sup>9</sup> [ML] The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett, etc.; Third & Revised Edition (Theosophical Publishing House; 1962); p. 201.

<sup>10</sup> [LMW-I] Letters from the Masters of The Wisdom: 1870 1900; First Series (Third Edition); p. 50.

<sup>11</sup> ML, p. 309.

<sup>12</sup> ML, p. 257.

<sup>13</sup> [HPB:CW-VI] H.P. Blavatsky: Collected Writings, vol. VI, p. 240.

<sup>14</sup> ML, p. 274.

---

<sup>15</sup> [L/HPB] The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to A.P. Sinnett, etc. (current reprint, Theosophical University Press); pp. 103-04.

<sup>16</sup> ML, pp. 458, 459.

<sup>17</sup> [ODL-I] Old Diary Leaves, Vol. I, by H. S. Olcott, p. 14.

<sup>18</sup> ODL-I, p. 293; p. 247-: “One Mahatma writing me... speaks of it-the H.P.B. body-as ‘the old appearance’; again, in, he writes about ‘it and the Brother inside it’” And p. 291-: “various Mahatmas, in writing to me about H.P.B. and her body, spoke of the latter as a shell occupied by one of themselves.”

<sup>19</sup> ML, p. 154. Mahatma K.H.-: “I send you an explanation written with the special permission of the Chohan (my Master).”

<sup>20</sup> In a letter of June 1879, Mahatma Morya refers Col. Olcott to “the direct orders of our beloved Lord and Chief-him whom you know under the name of S.- and Maha Sahib...” (LMW-n, Second Series; 1925 Edition; pp. 67, 68), to which the Compiler, C. Jinarajadasa, adds by footnote-: “‘Maha Sahib’, an appellation given to the Master Serapis must be distinguished from ‘Maha Chohan.’”, Just as the Chohan “Maha Sahib” is not the “Maha Chohan” (Who ‘dwells’ in Shambhalha), so, contrary to befuddled thinking of some, “Maha Sahib” cannot be the Master Morya, a fact Col. Olcott, for one, was never able to quite digest even after June 1879 when thus first told the truth of separate identity (“Maha Sahib” not being “Sahib,” a designation often used by Olcott for the Master M.) Compare this with HSO’s confusion, e.g., L/HPB, p. 330. Also, see especially LMW-I, p. 113.

<sup>21</sup> In her article, “The Theosophical Mahatmas,” in The Path for December 1886 and reprinted in Raja Yoga or Occultism (The Theosophy Company (India) Ltd.; Bombay, 1931; p. 16), HPB writes, “And now repeating after the Paraguru-my Master’s MASTER [i.e., MASTER



---

of the Mahatma Morya, HPB's Rajput Master]-the words He had sent as a message to those who wanted to make the Society a 'miracle club' instead of a brotherhood of Peace, Love and mutual assistance-'Perish rather the Theosophical Society and its hapless Founders',..."

Here, HPB's allusion is to that document which generally has been misconstrued as giving the "view of the Maha Chohan" (see-: LMW-I, pp. 2-11; and HPB:CW-xn, pp. 240,498, Compiler's comments). Why this misunderstanding ever should have arisen is, on the face of it, difficult to comprehend, inasmuch as its very content presents "the Brothers" as "we devoted followers of that spirit incarnate of absolute self-sacrifice... the man of men, Oautama Buddha..." (LMW-I, p. 9). We are told (The Secret Doctrine, Vol. III, 1897 Edition; p. 377) that, "this once mortal vehicle-the subtle body-of Gautama is still present among the Initiates" and that, "The esoteric school teaches that Gautama Buddha" is now "a Nirmanakaya, higher than whom... there is none known" (The Voice of the Silence; Peking Reprint; p. 97). Logically, this dictates that the highest of the Chohans-the Maha Chohan--must be none other than Sakyamuni Buddha-"our great Buddha-the patron of all the adepts..." (ML, p. 43).

<sup>22</sup> In their book, *The Theosophical Movement: 1875-1925*, historians of The United Lodge of Theosophists write (p. 378):- "Still another most interesting sidelight on the 'mystery of H.P.B.' ...may be found in *Lucifer* for October 15, 1888... There... H.P.B. takes occasion to make some remarks regarding the Masters. She says (italics ours):

...among the group of Initiates to which his [Mr. Sinnett's] own mystical correspondent ['K.H.'] is allied, are two of European race, and that one who is that Teacher's superior [the Master 'M'] is also of that origin, being half a Slavonian in his 'present incarnation,' as he himself wrote to Colonel Olcott in New York.

---

“Just why H.P.B. should put the phrase ‘present incarnation’ in quotes is worth some intuitional effort, as is also the fact that ‘H.P.B.’ was herself precisely and exactly ‘half a Slavonian’ in her ‘present incarnation’.”

Even ignoring a host of other facts discrediting the “revelation” of Wm. Q. Judge and/or Robert Crosbie-apparently built upon the former’s similar moonings-, that HPB’s “Inner Man” was the Mahatma Morya, it requires no “intuitional effort” to reject this fantastical notion when once one finds the Mahatma Koot Hoomi’s written declaration, in a letter of 1882 -counter-signed, “Approved M.:”, and sent to the latter’s “faithful chela,” Ramaswami Iyer-, that, “I am not the only Master there [in Tibet], nor is M.: Chohan” (LMW-II, pp. 94-5). He Who was “half a Slavonian in his ‘present incarnation’”, could only have been Master M’s “MASTER” and that One Whom Mahatma KH calls, “our ‘Rock of Ages,’ my Cho-Khan”-and before Whom He confessed “feeling myself--uncomfortably so-like a worm of yesterday” (ML, p. 38).

<sup>23</sup> Writing to Dr. Elliott Coues, 30 April 1889, she acknowledges being in “the service of my chief divine Master, the God within; and my terrestrial or earthly Master, who is beyond the Himalayas” (from Dr. Elliott Coues-a pamphlet by Wm. Q. Judge).

Again, there has been universal misunderstanding of the origin of “Letter 47” in LMW-I (pp. 113-116), which is simply a record handwritten by HPB of remarks of extraordinary importance expressed-not by “K.H.” as has been believed, but-by the Paraguru, her “chief divine Master,” demonstrating what has not heretofore been recognized, viz., that, having two “Masters,” one “within” and one “without,” it is not true that when speaking of “Master” (unnamed), HPB always means the Mahatma Morya (the penultimate sentence of “Letter 47” ends with, “added Master smiling”-cf. its opening sentence). Thus, too, when she elsewhere

---

speaks of “my authority,”<sup>24</sup> reference can well be to the generally unknown and unrecognized authority of “the Brother inside,” Their Superior, to Whom the lesser Mahatmas could conceivably-and with every confidence-have delegated the right occasionally to act in Their behalf both by communication in the latters’ handwritings and by apparitional “appearances”! If, to this, objection is made that the suggestion weakens somewhat the evidence for the independent existence of Mahatmas other than the Master Serapis-even moreso than HPB’s own isolated and ignored prophecy, “I-dead, say Society goodbye to the Masters” (ML, p. 467)-, the reply has to be that it is simply stupid to argue that aeons of human evolution have delivered into existence only one Mahatma! And this is so even if only one such “Mahatma” might prove to be sufficient-for Humanity’s external Spiritual Guidance.

<sup>24</sup> The Early Teachings of the Masters, edited by C. Jinarajadasa (The Theosophical Press, Chicago, 1923); 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> pages unnumbered, of “Introduction”, in part: “Therefore the only thing I can be reproached with-a reproach I am ever ready to bear though I have not deserved it, having been simply the obedient and blind tool of our occult laws and regulations-is of having (1) used Master’s name when I thought my authority would go for naught, when I sincerely believed [I was] acting agreeably to Master’s intentions...; and (2) of having concealed that which the laws and regulations of my pledges did not permit me so far to reveal...” (italic added-i.e., the unrevealed “that” being her “secret”, the concealment of which prevented HPB giving the true explanation, in absence of which she was compelled to be “ever ready to bear” a “reproach... I have not deserved” Cf. Note 46).

<sup>25</sup> CT, Vol. IV, p. 130. To a member of her Esoteric School (E.S.T.), HPB wrote, “There are Nirmanakayas-Mahatmas of a still higher and holier nature than our living Masters-who have been liberated from Their earthly bodies ages ago.”

---

<sup>26</sup> [K: YofA] Krishnamurti; *Years of A waking*, by Mary Lutyens (John Murray, London; 1975); pp. 261, 262.

<sup>27</sup> ML, p. 281-: “The Tchang-chub (an adept who has, by the power of his knowledge and soul enlightenment, become exempt from the curse of unconscious transmigration)-may, at his will and desire, and instead of reincarnating himself only after bodily death, do so, and repeatedly-during his life if he chooses. He holds the power of choosing for himself new bodies-whether on this or any other planet [? “globe,” i.e. trans-physical “plane”] -while in possession of his old form, that he generally preserves for purposes of his own” (cf. LMW-n, p. 23, letter from the Master Serapis).

[SD-III] *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. III (First Edition, 1897), pp. 61, 62-: Thus, “when an Adept reaches during his lifetime that state of holiness and purity that makes him. ‘equal to the Angels,’ then at death he can avail himself of an entirely new physical body, whether that of a newly-born infant [as in the case of JK] or-as Shankaracharya is reported to have done with the body of a dead Raja-by ‘entering a deserted sheath’ [as in the case of Helena von Hahn-but at just what juncture (heretofore unsuspected) can be shown on available documentation], and living in it as long as he chooses. This is what is called ‘continuous existence’.” But, “The highest Adept, put into a new body, has to struggle against it and subdue it, and finds its subjugation difficult” (Ibid., p. 570). The obdurate resistance is centered in the congenital action of the “physical brain”-“the greatest enemy of spiritual memory”-which is “under the sway of the lower animal mind” (Ibid., p. 511). This “subjugation” of the lower to the higher, being a prerequisite of the “assimilation” process, progressing as it must through a series of crises (as with HPB at Ozoorgetty and later on the battlefield of Mentana in 1867), can take the better part of a lifetime-or may fail altogether. (A close inspection of HPB’s career shows us that it was

---

only after a term of “10 and 7 years” following 1851-and only then by extraordinary intervention [Mentana, etc.]-that her volcanic and innately intractable brain-mind became more and more voluntarily subservient to, and one-with, her “God within...” Thus, even in the case of Nirmanakayas, “There are conscious, as well as unconscious, incarnations” (Ibid., p. 418)-the latter sometimes leaving Mahatmas and lesser Adepts “in obscuratation,” occult “failures” in part or in whole, as with Jiddu Krishnamurti.

<sup>28</sup> “...the sins of the disciple [Shishya] recoil upon him [the Guru]”-Tantra Shastra. See p. lxxii, Tantra of the Great Liberation (Mahanirvani Tantra), translation from the Sanskrit, with Introduction and Commentary by Arthur Avalon (Sir John Woodroffe); Dover reprint; 1972 (American paperback edition).

<sup>29</sup> See: (a) pp. 17-8, 20 of An Essay on the Fundamental Principles of Operative Occultism, by Manly Palmer Hall (1930).

<sup>30</sup> (a) ML, p. 280-: “To sum up: the misuse of knowledge by the pupil always reacts upon the initiator...” (Mahatma KH).

(b) HPB:CW-XII, p. 228-: “Result on Karmic lines:... every man of Science, however well-meaning and honorable, once he has allowed himself to become the unconscious instructor of one who learns but to abuse the sacred science, becomes, of course, morally the confederate of every crime committed by this means”-(HPB).

(c) See CW:HPB-XII, pp. 584-586, of “Preliminary Explanations to No. III of the Instructions” by H.P. Blavatsky, for the Eastern School (E.S.T .).

(d) SD-III (1897), p. 588-: “...it is dangerous to influence others... ‘Thus,’ H.P.B. said, ‘if you are badly taught by me or incited thereby to do something wrong, you would go on after my

---

death and sin through me, but I should have to bear the Karma... Even Buddha made mistakes. He applied his teaching to people who were not ready; and this has produced Nidanas'."

(e) T. Subba Row to HPB-: "You have been guilty of the most terrible of crimes. You have given out secrets of Occultism-the most sacred and the most hidden." (L/HPB, pp. 95-6). Though, obviously, no such "crime" in the eyes of the Paraguru and the MahaChohan, it is true, nevertheless, that the risk of such disclosure and the future dangers attendant thereupon were, indeed, "most terrible..." (as consequent effects proved)-but consequences the Chohans were willing to suffer and bear for the sake of sowing Their seed of Truth.

(f) ML, p. 476-: "...we have profaned Truth by giving it out indiscriminately-and forgot the motto of the true Occultist: To know, to dare, and to keep silent" (HPB).

(g) L/HPB, p. 97-: "In my zeal and devotion to the Cause, I have permitted publicity and as Subba Row truly says 'committed the crime of divulging things most sacred and holy, that had never been known to the profane before' and now comes my Karma."-(HPB).

(h) [PM/HPB] Personal Memoirs of H.P. Blavatsky by Mary K. Neff; p. 295-: "I have had to bear the Karma in case of failure..." (H.P.B.).

<sup>31</sup> "In a private letter to Mr. W.Q. Judge, written about 1887, she says:-'I am the Mother and Creator of the Society; it has my magnetic fluid... Therefore I alone...can serve as lightning conduct or of Karma for it.'" (H.P. Blavatsky: Her Life and Work for Humanity, by Alice Leighton Cleather; 1922; p. 26).

<sup>32</sup> Letters That Have Helped Me (The Theosophy Co., 1946), p. 283-: "And it does seem hard that I should have created a 'Frankenstein' only to turn round and try to rend me to pieces!" (HPB, 1887) and p. 282-: "Well, I have raised a 'Frankenstein' [the T .S.], and he seeks to devour me... the fiend" (HPB to Wm. Q. Judge).

---

<sup>33</sup> PM/HPB, p. 295-: "I had to offer myself as the scapegoat for atonement... I did."

"...the Karma of the Theosophical Society falls upon me. I am the scapegoat. I am made to bear all the sins of the Society.... What an awful Karma to bear!" (HPB, p. 57, H.P. Blavatsky: Her Life and Work for Humanity, by A. L. Cleather).

<sup>34</sup> The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant, by Arthur H. Nethercot, p. 230.

<sup>35</sup> K:YofA, p. 145.

<sup>36</sup> Attention is directed to the APPENDIX. Prompted by reading Mary Lutyens' quasi-biography of Krishnamurti (K:YofA, especially Chapters 18-21), and inspired by an enlightening comparison of both likenesses and differences between strange psychic experiences of HPB (beginning at Ozoorgetty; see Incidents in the Life of Madame, by A.P. Sinnett; Redway, 1886; pp. 147-152), and of JK (starting in August, 1922, at Ojai), this writer, in June 1979, began work on the draft of a letter to the latter, hoping to provoke some interest and self-insight on the addressee's part, into the otherwise unexplained originating factors resulting in those mysterious effects which JK called "the Process" and "the Benediction."

When completed, condensed and typed (as here reproduced by photocopy), this "Private and Confidential" letter was dispatched by Registered Mail (Return Receipt Requested) via The Krishnamurti Foundation Inc., Ojai, California. The letter (which there is no reason to believe was ever seen by the addressee) was not acknowledged except by a secretary who dismissed it, saying in effect: K. never likes to give attention to subject matter of this sort. But, strangely enough, it was just at this juncture in time that JK reversed himself on this long-standing rule and privately gave considerable attention to just this very subject, his self-identity! (See Krishnamurti: Years of Fulfillment, by Mary Lutyens; Avon Books, 1984; pp. 220-237.) With a note-taker present, the authoress was privileged to have extended conversations on, as her pertinent Chapter title puts it, "Who or What is Krishnamurti?", during meetings with JK, June

---

4<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> and October 19<sup>th</sup>, 1979-two of the discussions ending when “the pain in his head and neck” became “so bad that he had to go and lie down,” typically a deterrent to his “talking about such matters as we had been going into” (Ibid., pp. 229, 231). Additionally, in July 1979, a most curious episode intervened at his Saanen Gathering, “an uproar in the tent” when raucous demands were made in the audience that JK “should ‘reveal his secret’” which he was accused “of withholding”(p. 233).

Upon the latter’s death (the Nirmanakaya’s “Liberation”) in the culminating year of the 7-year cycle thus inaugurated (4 July 1979), this writer was freed from the written promise of silence therein made, and resolved at once to publish the identification herein set forth. By the end-date of 4 July 1986-oddly enough, the unanticipated celebration of the centenary of this world’s most famous Torchbearer (the Greek Goddess “Liberty” in New York harbor)-, he had in original draft the whole of the essential core of the present treatise (and under the same title). At that point, however, many months of delay intervened, in the course of research (the results yet to be published) uncovering extensive documentation bearing upon obscure aspects of JK’s otherwise perplexing career and the unacknowledged commonplace 20<sup>th</sup> Century sources of JK’s teachings, evolved as these latter were over some sixty years of alterations self-contradictory both over time and in context..

<sup>37</sup> [D&PTM] Damodar and the Pioneers of the Theosophical Movement, by Sven Eek (T.P.H., Adyar); p. 534, HPB to Dr Franz Hartmann.

<sup>38</sup> ODL-III, pp. 267-68.

<sup>39</sup> The Theosophist, August 1932; HPB to Judge N.D. Khandalavala, 21 March, 1889.

<sup>40</sup> The Voice of the Silence, (Peking edition); pp. 37-8.



---

<sup>41</sup> D&PTM, p. 72. Who can say when HPB was first able to identify her Spiritual “Individuality”? Certainly not before 1851.

<sup>42</sup> LMW-I, p. 45 (Mahatma KH).

<sup>43</sup> D&PTM, p. 19. The Masters had arranged that “if H.P. Blavatsky, who was very ill, should die,” Damodar, if present, was “to take her place as the link between the Masters and the Society” If, in such an eventuality, Damodar-who, even then was preparing to go to Tibet-had not “returned”, Col. Olcott, as an intermediary, “would have to fill the gap for the time being.” (H.S. Olcott to Miss Francesca Arundale, 9 February 1885.)

<sup>44</sup> It was not until 7 May 1979 that this writer first revealed to anyone the full range of his original and exclusive discoveries gained by many years of study of the available record of Damodar’s career. This was done in the course of a long telephone conversation (4:30 to 7:15 p.m., P.D.S.T.) with Michael Gomes, as per memo-for-record made the same date. One fact then emphasized during the course of my exposition was that-although previously unrecognized by anyone-all theosophical historians erred in subscribing to the mythology that DKM had “gone to Tibet” for his “initiation” or “to study with the Masters” or to “seek out” or “be with Them” in response to Their “summons.” But, as HPB herself later wrote to Judge Khanalavala (21 November 1889; *The Theosophist*, August 1932), his journey did not have even “the Masters’ permission...” Moreover, his purpose simply was to impress and persuade the MahaChohan to use His authority to insure HPB’s “vindication”-it being an accepted notion at Adyar that, as the Judge himself had declared, only the intervention of “a Mahatma” could confound and publicly discredit the Coulomb-missionary machinations and claims. Alluding to Damodar’s mysterious disappearance and uncertain fate, in writing to Dr Franz Hartmann, she stated, “I do not give myself out as infallible in this case. But I do know what he told me before going away... ‘I go for

---

your sake. If the MahaChohan is satisfied with my service and my devotion, He may permit me to vindicate you by proving that. Masters do exist" (D&PTM, p. 533). In his impetuosity, Damodar's (unvoiced) geographical goal could have been nothing short of Shambhalha itself! That DKM's "Inner Man" eventually arrived there (and, from thence, ultimately was "sent" to the West-noting the Masters tell us no visitor is permitted to return bodily to the world from its precincts unless he be a high Initiate), is a possibility seriously to be considered.

<sup>45</sup> D&PTM, p. 533. HPB to Dr Hartmann: "We want him sorely now to refute all Hodgson's... lies, as much as my 'spy' business and forgery-the blackguard..."

Contrary to popular myth and the deceits of Dr Richard Hodgson, it was not the Coulombs who "exposed" Mme Blavatsky, but Damodar K. Mavalankar who, acting alone in May 1884, exposed the Coulombs and thwarted their "trapdoor" plot (see pp. 617-20, in this writer's monograph, "Richard Hodgson," D&PTM, pp. 612-24-the only guested Section in this definitive work on the career of DKM, Dr Eek's original compilation on Damodar having appeared in print in 1940, the year this writer first discovered the writings of HPB). Not only did Damodar, by his extraordinary courage and initiative, thus protect and save HPB and the Masters' Cause from greater dangers planned, he spearheaded the Defence afterwards when, following the September 1884 debut in print of the Coulomb-missionary attack, and prior to his leaving Madras early in 1885, 8 of the 10 articles he last wrote for circulation or publication were counterattacks thereto (Ibid., pp. 483-515)a record of dedicated concentration on Defence unmatched for more than 50 years, and unsurpassed for sixty-two or more.

Of all the would-be defenders of Mme Blavatsky-from Col. Olcott and Sinnett to Dr Hartmann and T. Subba Row-, interviewed by Dr Richard Hodgson, this chief for the prosecution reserved for Damodar alone this crowning accolade:- He. "espoused the

---

Theosophical cause and the claims of Madame Blavatsky with a burning intensity of antagonism to those who alleged that these claims rested on a foundation of dishonesty”

(Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research, vol. III, p. 310). It was indeed fortunate for Hodgson that, after they both for the last time departed Adyar on the same day, Damodar was unable to read and reply to the former’s dishonest Report when it appeared in print ten months later!

<sup>46</sup> In the letter of 21 November 1889 to Judge Khandalavala, and naming Damodar, HPB wrote, “...he was the only true, devoted friend I had in all India, the only one who having the Masters’ and my secret, knew the whole truth and therefore knew that whatever people thought, being blinded by appearance, I had never deceived anyone-though I was bound by my oath and pledge to conceal much from everyone, even Olcott.” (Elsewhere, H.P.B. Speaks, I, pp. 85-6, she identifies her “two most faithful co-workers” as “Colonel Olcott, President of the Theosophical Society, and Damodar K. Mavalankar, manager of The Theosophist...”)

<sup>47</sup> PM/HPB, p. 295. HPB-: “When I am dead and gone in this body, then you will know the whole truth.” But leaving aside then the circumspect Masters, who would there be, except Damodar,-someday to tell?

<sup>48</sup> “He will return one day and then he may tell a good many meddlesome marplots [those who “mar” the original “plot” or plan, those who spoil the intended design] some unpalatable truths they richly deserve” (Madame Blavatsky to Judge Khandalavala, 21st of November, 1889). In light of HPB’s remark, prior to her last leaving India and following DKM’s own departure, that, “No one will ever see him now, I expect”-she supposing he “must be far away in the regions of our Masters” (ML, p. 461)-, it is plain that her still-later prophecy of his “return” was not meant to place this future event within the lifetimes of those then living. Moreover, it

---

was not in Damodar as a reinvigorated, living body (rescued from terminal tuberculosis by a Master's touch) returned from Tibet one future day, that she afterwards hoped to see a caretaker for the T.S. "to go on with the work after our deaths"-though the Masters at one time had chosen Damodar, when embodied, as Their most likely "link"-, but in W. Q. Judge, as we have seen!

How then might one expect Damodar to "return" except by reimpodiment? We are told (HPB: CW-VI, pp. 244, 245) that, depending upon the degree of "training and discipline" obtained, "the occultist" in his "progress" may "so control himself as to be able to control his future states," and thus "shorten the duration of his Devachanic states between his two incarnations" down to a reduced period varying "from twenty-five to two hundred years..."

Again, in the SD-III, it is written, "Of the voluntary and conscious incarnations of Adepts there are two types-those of Nirmanakayas, and those undertaken by the probationary chelas who are on their trial" (p. 365). "...The degree of such powers of course vary greatly...the lowest of these degrees would allow an Adept [in footnote: "The word 'Adept' is very loosely used by H.P.B Here it seems to mean... an uninitiated disciple-Eds."], who has been greatly trammelled during life in his study and use of his powers, to choose after death another body in which he could go on with his interrupted studies [work], though ordinarily he would lose in it every remembrance of his previous incarnation." Nor would this be his only loss: even "an Initiate in his new birth... has to acquire phenomenal powers anew, passing through all the successive stages" (Ibid., p. 386).

And by what objective evidence might such a "return" be detected, recognized? Certainly not by "dreams and visions" of a past life (however convincing to the dreamer or seer but conveying no sense of conviction to anyone else!), nor retrospective (much less, hypnotically-induced) "recollections"-which even when "confirmed" by obscure documentation or by

---

independently ascertainable facts from the past, might always be taken for knowledge unconsciously gleaned clairvoyantly, if not tapped from some hypothetical “cosmic reservoir” (or “the Akashic Records”), or even impressed by some passing “spook”! For her part, Mme Blavatsky (SD-III, pp. 367-368, 371) rightly indicated the chief reliable criteria, in every case below the level of great Initiate-Adepts at a certain very advanced stage of Spiritual Introspection-, to be the demonstrable similarity of personal dedication and purpose, of the individuals’ deepest preoccupations and interests, ambitions, knowledge, skills, talents and achievements. These stand foremost as the superior and decisive objective indicators linking the outer activity of one life with that of the next (providing, of course, that upon rebirth, Karma permits the returning entity a brain capable of assimilating the earlier tendencies).

Not only “men of genius,” she writes (Ibid., p. 371), but “every remarkable man of the age, who soars beyond the common herd with some abnormally developed special capacity in him, leading to the progress and good of mankind... is a reincarnation of an individuality that has gone before him with capacities in the same line, bringing thus a dowry to his new form, that strong and easily re-awakened capacity or quality which had been fully developed in him in his preceding birth. Very often they are ordinary mortals, the Egos of natural men in the course of their cyclic development.”

As “an instance of an Adept” to illustrate the “lowest” degree of “such” power, HPB (Ibid., pp. 367-68) cites the “well-known personage of the fifteenth century-Cardinal de Cusa; Karma, due to his wonderful devotion to the Esoteric study and the Kabalah led the suffering Adept to seek intellectual recuperation and rest from ecclesiastic tyranny in the body of Copernicus” (“the founder of modern astronomy,” as one authority has it). She then proceeds to

---

point out how “all the theories and hypotheses-all the ideas-of Copernicus” are to be found anticipated in the writings of the Cardinal, “keynotes to the discoveries of the great astronomer.”

<sup>49</sup> Of the conservatively estimated ten thousand millions of intelligent-or quasi-intelligent-bipeds who have walked this earth in the last century-and-one-half, two and only two are distinguished on the record as both having in common two identifying marks of attainment, viz., (1) each in his day has been recognized as being the one individual spearheading as pioneer the defence of Madame Blavatsky; and (2) each is shown as one of the only two (outside Shambhalha's circle of Initiation) known to also possess (before now) HPB's “secret.” Only those who would deny even the possibility of Karma and Reincarnation as natural facts of reality could honestly presume to dismiss this unique parallelism, this coincidence and the enormous odds against it being a fluke of chance, especially when viewed in the light of HPB's prophecies and the time-frame of these predictions.

And so, in what is now on public record: .

*Firstly*, for the refutation of “Hodgson's lies”-which Damodar, of all, was best prepared to expose-, see (as yet only “preliminaries” in print to more devastating exposures still in manuscript): (a) Obituary: The “Hodgson Report” on Madame Blavatsky: 1885-1960 (T.P.H., Adyar, 1963), the first and only book in her defence to be reviewed in the pages of the Society whose Committee of 1884-85 so notoriously condemned her, and a book in which neither critic nor any defender of Hodgson has yet found (during its 24 available years) so much as a single reportorial error to document; and (b) its author's complete and fully documented refutation of the principal hostile review to it (his “The ‘Hodgson Report’ on Madame Blavatsky’;” The Journal of the Society for Psychical Research, December 1969; pp. 188-197-the first defence of HPB to appear since 1885 in any publication of the same Society, and, to date, a rebuttal also

---

unscathed by any criticism). Nevertheless, with the single exception of a published statement by the then-President (1979-1985) of The Blavatsky Foundation (Michael Gomes in *The Theosophist*, February 1985, p. 183; “The Coulomb Case: 1884-1984,”)-and though itself in print for almost 19 years, it otherwise has been *universally ignored* by the chieftains, editors, historians, authors and mouthpieces of organized theosophy. Yet this rebuttal, putting to rout as it did its distinguished reviewer, a former President of the S.P.R. and President of the British Psychological Society, remains today the unstained highwater-mark of the Blavatsky Defence.

While drawing attention and discussion in a number of \_non-theosophical books-as well as gaining several thousands of words of commentary even in the official journals of both the British and American Societies for Psychical Research, the published research and findings of this writer for the HPB-Defence, since first appearing publicly some 40 years ago, have been accorded only the niggardly sum-total of *two-and-one-half sentences* of commentary-and that in footnotes only-in the six books of related theosophical history/biography published during this period by the three major groups within organized theosophy! From this alone, it is apparent one does not have to be a gifted prophet to foresee the sort of reception this immediate presentation will receive at the hands of the same people, those for whose hoped-for enlightenment its author has futilely squandered the best years of his life and sacrificed an accessible but unearned income totalling at least a quarter-million dollars.

*Secondly*, the present exposition is itself only a preliminary revealing of that “Grand ‘Secret’ to the ‘Great Mystery’ of ‘H.P.B.’,” a “secret”, of which once apprised, only Damodar K. Mavalankar could so quickly and so readily penetrate upon *his* return.

---

And as this writer foretold in print ten years ago: “It will prove to be ‘the stone which the builders rejected’-to those of the past, ‘a stumbling block and a rock of offense’; but for those who will build a new edifice on the ruins of the old, it will become ‘the chief corner-stone’ and ‘will dash to pieces all who fall upon it’.”



APPENDIX



THE BLAVATSKY FOUNDATION

TAX-EXEMPT • NON-PROFIT • STATE-CHARTERED  
To promote public knowledge of the life & works of Helena P. Blavatsky

POST OFFICE BOX 1543  
FRESNO, CALIFORNIA 93716  
Tel. (209) 237-7789



OFFICE  
OF  
THE SECRETARY

Mr J. Krishnamurti,  
care of, The Krishnamurti Foundation,  
Post Office Box 216,  
Ojai, California 93023.

Personal and Private

July 4, 1979

Brother Pilgrim!

I have been reading the very interesting and informative, partial account of your life as written by Mary Lutyens. This perusal prompts me to offer a certain observation which may be new to you, and to ask one question—which latter you may or may not wish to answer.

The description in this book of what is called "K's strange 'process'" brings to mind the fact that—apparently overlooked by your confidants of the early days, those including Dr Besant and Bishop Leadbeater—there is on record one report of another who seems to have experienced something of the same sort of strange (outwardly painful but inwardly illuminating) ordeal as have you. I refer to the experience of Madame Blavatsky herself in the early 1860's when isolated and all but alone in the wild forests of Mingrelia in the Russian Caucasus (related in A. P. Sinnett's Incidents in the Life of Madame Blavatsky, 1913 edition, pp. 115-120). In this phase, it appears hers was but a transitional ordeal (which "we learn that no doctor could understand"), though lasting at least "four months" (and continuing at Tiflis)—and it was out of this that, to quote her own and her family's account as reported to her biographer, "the nature of her powers seems to have entirely changed" ("It is not H.P.B. who was from that time forth victim to 'influences' which would have without doubt triumphed over a less strong nature than hers; but, on the contrary, it is she who subjected these influences—whatever they may be—to her will." Op. cit., pp. 119-20). I infer that, for her, this process was an important part of what Madame Blavatsky in a private letter later called, "the assimilation to the Nirmanakaya," while in the same letter also expressing her expectation of having to once again attempt this "assimilation" after rebirth in a new body, and during this century (the 20th).

In her Key to Theosophy, H.P.B. states (what—in so far as I can gather—is so very close to the heart of your message today): "The Spiritual 'I' in man is omniscient and has every knowledge innate in it; while the personal self is the creature of environment and the slave of physical memory."

May I ask if you would care to put on record whether there has ever emerged an inner intimation at any time suggesting that perhaps the karma of H.P.B. was yours from birth?

Be assured that any reply you may care to make to this extraordinary question (as well as the question itself) will be treated with the utmost confidentiality so long as you live. And may that be not one day short of your heart's desire!

"The Masters do not guide... they only watch over and protect..." (Op. cit., page 299).

Most Respectfully Yours,

Walter A. Carrithers, Jr.