



Theosophical
Historical

A Quarterly Journal of Research

Volume V, No. 5 January 1995
ISSN 0951-497X

THEOSOPHICAL HISTORY

A Quarterly Journal of Research

Founded by Leslie Price, 1985

Volume V, No. 5

January 1995

EDITOR

James A. Santucci
California State University, Fullerton

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Robert Boyd

John Cooper
University of Sydney

April Hejka-Ekins
California State University, Stanislaus

Jerry Hejka-Ekins
Nautilus Books

Robert Ellwood
University of Southern California

Joscelyn Godwin
Colgate University

J. Gordon Melton
Institute for the Study of American
Religion
University of California, Santa Barbara

Leslie Price
Former Editor, *Theosophical History*

Gregory Tillett
Macquarie University

Karen-Claire Voss
San Jose State University

Theosophical History (ISSN 0951-497X) is published quarterly in January, April, July, and October by James A. Santucci (Department of Religious Studies, California State University, Fullerton, CA 92634-9480 U.S.A.) The journal consists of eight issues *per* volume: one volume covering a period of two years. The journal's purpose is to publish contributions specifically related to the modern Theosophical Movement, from the time of Madame Helena Blavatsky and others who were responsible in establishing the original Theosophical Society (1875), to all groups that derive their teachings—directly or indirectly, knowingly or unknowingly—from her or her immediate followers. In addition, the journal is also receptive to related movements (including pre-Blavatskyite Theosophy, Spiritualism, Rosicrucianism, and the philosophy

of Emanuel Swedenborg to give but a few examples) that have had an influence on or displayed an affinity to modern Theosophy.

The subscription rate for residents in the U.S., Mexico, and Canada is \$14.00 (one year) or \$26.00 (two years). California residents, please add \$1.08 (7.75%) sales tax onto the \$14 rate or \$2.01 onto the \$26 rate. For residents outside North America, the subscription rate is \$16.00 (one year) or \$30.00 (two years). Air mail is \$24.00 (one year) or \$45.00 (two years). Single issues are \$4.00. Subscriptions may also be paid in British sterling. All inquiries should be sent to **James Santucci**, Department of Religious Studies, California State University, Fullerton, CA 92634-9480 (U.S.A.). Second class postage paid at Fullerton, California 92634. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Theosophical History (c/o James Santucci), Department of Religious Studies, California State University, Fullerton, CA 92634-9480

The Editors assume no responsibility for the views expressed by authors in *Theosophical History*.

* * * * *

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPTS

The final copy of all manuscripts must be submitted on 8½ x 11 inch paper, double-spaced, and with margins of at least 1¼ inches on all sides. Words and phrases intended for *italics* output should be underlined in the manuscript. The submitter is also encouraged to submit a floppy disk of the work in ASCII or WordPerfect 5 or 5.1, in an I.B.M. or compatible format. If possible, Macintosh 3 ½ inch disk files should also be submitted, saved in ASCII ("text only with line breaks" format if in ASCII), Microsoft Word 4.0–5.1a, or WordPerfect. We ask, however, that details of the format codes be included so that we do not have difficulties in using the disk. Should there be any undue difficulty in fulfilling the above, we encourage you to submit the manuscript regardless.

Bibliographical entries and citations must be placed in footnote format. The citations must be complete. For books, the publisher's name and the place and date of the publication are required; for journal articles, the volume, number, and date must be included, should the information be available.

There is no limitation on the length of manuscripts. In general, articles of 30 pages or less will be published in full; articles in excess of 30 pages may be published serially.

Brief communications, review articles, and book reviews are welcome. They should be submitted double-spaced.

All correspondence, manuscripts, and subscriptions should be sent to:

Dr. James A. Santucci
Department of Religious Studies
California State University
Fullerton, CA 92634-9480 (U.S.A.)
FAX: 714-449-5820 E-Mail: JSANTUCCI@FULLERTON.EDU
TELEPHONE: 714-773-3727

Copyright © 1995 by James A. Santucci

Layout and composition by Robert L. Hütwohl, 924 Alto St., Santa Fe, NM 87501 USA, using Adobe type 1 typefaces: ITC Garamond 1, Linotype Univers and Linotext, with an adapted Sanskrit-Tibetan diacritical Garamond typeface designed by Mr. Hütwohl.

THEOSOPHICAL HISTORY

Contents

January 1995
Volume V, Number 5

Editor's Comments

James Santucci	145
----------------------	-----

Correspondence

Kazimierz Tokarski	151
Joanne Stead	151

Book Notes

<i>Journal Inedit De Ricardo Viñes</i>	
Robert Boyd	153
<i>The Mystic Life Of Alfred Deakin</i>	
John Cooper	154
<i>A History For A Nation</i>	
John Cooper	154
<i>Australia's First Fabians</i>	
John Cooper	154
<i>Hands Full Of Life</i>	
John Cooper	154
<i>The Forgotten Christians of Hangzhou</i>	
Craig Ihara	155

Communications

Theosophy and Theosophic Thought Seminar	
Joscelyn Godwin	156
Pansophy as an Alternative to Theosophy: A Short Informal History	
William R. Laudahn and supplemented by Jerry Hejka-Ekins	157

From the Archives

The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to W.Q. Judge: Part IV: Letter Dated Aug. 12, 1887, and Part IVa: Letter from Bertram Keightley to W.Q. Judge With Notes by Michael Gomes	163
--	-----

Article

Stranded Bishops (Part IV of the OTO)
Peter-Robert König 169

Book Reviews

*The Rose Cross and the Age of Reason. Eighteenth-Century Rosicrucianism
in Central Europe and Its Relationship to the Enlightenment*
Joscelyn Godwin 176

Theosophy In The Nineteenth Century: An Annotated Bibliography.
Robert S. Ellwood 178

Editor's Comments

Tenth Anniversary for *Theosophical History*

Theosophical History made its first appearance in January 1985. Founded by Leslie Price, the journal was designed to serve as an independent forum (*i.e.* free of any Theosophical organization) wherein the sometimes controversial history of the Theosophical Movement could be examined by scholars both within and outside the Movement. Mr. Price intended the journal to be “a purely historical channel for printing new papers, publishing archives for the first time and reprinting rare historical sources.” (I/1: 2) The scope of *Theosophical History* ranged from the central focus of the origin of the Theosophical Society in 1875 to the investigation of other Theosophical societies in the modern era, of eras other than the modern where theosophical impulses and currents were manifested, of Theosophical leaders other than those within the Adyar T.S., and of other individuals and organizations whose roots are in Theosophy. The result was the publication of original articles and archival material that might not have been published in any other journal. Articles such as Leslie Shepard’s “The *Anacalypsis* of Godfrey Higgins—Precursor of *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine*,” and David Board’s “The Brotherhood of Light and The Brotherhood of Luxor” and archival material such as Mr. Price’s publication of material from the Society of Psychical Research graced the pages of the journal from Volume I, number one to the last volume published under his editorship: volume III, number two (April 1989).

When I assumed the editorship of *TH* in January 1990—by happenstance this issue also marks my fifth anniversary as editor—I accepted and strongly supported Mr. Price’s statement of purpose. Indeed, I would not have taken on the editorship had it been otherwise. Because of the nature of the subject-area that *TH* covers, it should be stressed once again—especially for the sake of new readers—that *Theosophical History* is primarily a history journal that attempts to incorporate within the articles that appear herein accepted historical methodology. As a history journal, the following observations should be borne in mind:

- (1) Historical research is based on the acquisition of raw data—primary source materials—based on the observations and experiences of the participants in the historical drama. It is not based on belief systems, or should not be, although I dare say that some works that purport to be historical border on the theological.
- (2) This raw data extracted from primary sources is often insufficient and sometimes too suspicious for the historian to give a fair evaluation. Written sources may not be as reliable as we would like them to be, but there usually is no alternative source.
- (3) Historians, like their sources, are human, so we must accept the fact they are subjective

in their outlook. What historians do with facts is sometimes akin to what economists do with statistics; therefore, the reader must have the responsibility of critically evaluating the material.

(4) More often than not, academic historians approach a topic from a non-participative standpoint, no matter what their belief-systems might be. As a result, there should be no ideology or hidden agenda on the historian's part that would interfere with a fair reading of the data. That this should be the case does not always make is so, however. Historical monographs and articles often leave much to be desired.

(5) Because of the nature of esotericism and occultism, the argument can be made that the investigator needs to go beyond empirical and positivistic evidence in order to reach the truth. This may indeed lead to insightful and intuitive revelations, but they cannot but be leaps of faith. For many, occult history presents a logical and consistent pattern in history, the presence of superior intelligence behind world events, order behind chaos, but as H.A.L. Fisher (*History of Europe*, preface) wrote:

One intellectual excitement has been denied me. Men wiser and more learned than I have discovered in history a plot, a rhythm, a predetermined pattern. These harmonies are concealed from me. I can see only one emergency following upon another as wave follows upon wave; only one great fact with respect to which, since it is unique, there can

be no generalizations; only one safe rule for the historian: that he should recognize in the development of human destinies the play of the contingent and the unforeseen.

Historians—unlike theologians, ‘occult historians’, or mythicists—must base their observations on empirical evidence, however limiting or limited it may be. What this journal strives to accomplish is to discover what happened in the Theosophical world, not what *should* have happened in conformity with the prevailing doctrine accepted by those within this society or that. Historians can only look to the past and can only conjecture—very imperfectly I might add—about the future; theological and mythical viewpoints foresee a preordained and certain future. Historians are often mythographers and mythologists; occult historians are mythopoic in approach. When it comes to theosophical history, we make no claims of being judges or arbitrators; we are only observers following established methods that guide us in our observations. As observers of the human species, we expect to see both their profundity and foolishness, their integrity and transgressions. It is not our role, however, to divinize or demonize; that is best left up to the propagandists and ideologues. Since historians often view the claims and actions of our subjects with some degree of skepticism, we should not object to others having a similar opinion about the observations of historians. After all, these probes into the recesses of time are, as it were, the observations of an astronomer through an imperfectly focused telescope.

* * *

In This Issue

This issue presents a mixed bag of offerings. First, a note on Mr. Laudahn's communication. One of the purposes of this journal is to offer oral history or first person accounts of organizations, societies, groups, or individuals that are related to Theosophy. One example of an oral history of an organization is Mr. Bernardino del Boca's description of the "Green Village" ("The First Practical Expression of Theosophy in Italy: The "Villaggio Verde") in the III/5 (Jan 1991) issue of *Theosophical History*. The present communication is Mr. Laudahn's memoir on the Pansophic Fellowship. Very little is known about this group, so whatever Mr. Laudahn could remember about it and its founder, Joseph Ramsperger, is supplemented by material housed in the archives of Associate Editor Jerry Hejka-Ekins. It is hoped that this communication might generate more information on Mr. Ramsperger, either here in the U.S. or in his native country, Switzerland.

This is the first appearance of Mr. Laudahn in the journal although he has had several articles published in Theosophical magazines. Retired since 1976 and currently a resident of the Theosophical community of Taormina adjacent to the Krotona Institute in Ojai, California, Mr. Laudahn joined the T.S. (Adyar) in 1972 after having been associated with the United Lodge of Theosophists and the Theosophical Society (Pasadena). He is married to Gertrude Mann, herself a member of the T.S. (Adyar) since 1924.

Also appearing in this issue is Mr. P.R. König's fourth contribution on the O.T.O., "Stranded Bishops," his previous articles appearing in IV/3 ("The OTO Phenomenon"), IV/6-7 ("Theodor Reuss as Founder of Esoteric Orders"), and V/1 ("Veritas Mystica Maxima"). In the present article,

Mr. König discusses the Gnostic Church of Jules Doinel, Reuss's involvement with the "Gnostic Neo-Christians" [the O.T.O.], and notables such as William Bernard Crow, E.C.H. Peithmann, E.T. Kurtzahn, Herbert Fritsche, and M.P. Bertiaux.

I might add here that Mr. König has published a considerable amount on the O.T.O. in 1993 and 1994. Three of his books were announced in the July 1994 issue: *Der Kleine Theodor—Reuss—Reader* (1993), *Das OTO—Phänomen: 100 Jahre Magische Geheimbünde und ihre Protagonisten von 1895—1994* (1994), and *Materialien zum OTO* (1994). A fourth book has just arrived, *Der OTOA—Reader* (München: ARW, 1994): the O.T.O.A. referring to the Ordo Templi Orientis Antiqua.

Turning now to the Blavatsky letters from the Andover-Harvard Divinity School Library that first appeared in the April 1994 issue [background information on the letters appears in the Oct.–Jan. 1992-1993 double issue], the present installment includes a letter dated August 12, 1887 from H.P. Blavatsky to W.Q. Judge and an accompanying letter from Bertram Keightley to Judge. Further intrigues against H.P. Blavatsky and doctrinal disagreements involving T. Subha Row and his fellow cohorts, Alfred Cooper-Oakley and Nield Cook, are raised.

The rest of the issue covers short and extended reviews of books, including a second review of Michael Gomes' *Theosophy In The Nineteenth Century: An Annotated Bibliography* by Robert S. Ellwood. The importance of this bibliography as a research tool cannot be overstated and so deserves a second notice. The second full-length review is of Christopher McIntosh's *The Rose Cross and the Age of Reason. Eighteenth-Century Rosicrucianism in Central Europe and Its Relationship to the Enlightenment*. The reviewer, Joscelyn Godwin, describes it as a "priceless

contribution to our knowledge of eighteenth-century esoteric movements,” one of a number of significant works that have been published over the past few years.

Dr. Godwin was also kind enough to write a report of the “Theosophy and Theosophic Thought” Seminar held at the American Academy of Religion last November. The Seminar will continue for another four years and there will be periodic updates on the activities of its participants.

* * *

The Theosophical Enlightenment

State University of New York Press (SUNY) recently released Joscelyn Godwin’s *The Theosophical Enlightenment* (ISBN 0-7914-2151-1 and 0-79140-2152-X [pbk.] as the latest installment in its Western Esoteric Traditions series under the general editorship of David Appelbaum. Parts of the book have appeared in *Theosophical History* in four separate—and well-received—articles under the general title, “The Hidden Hand” (III/2-5, April 1990–January 1991). In Dr. Godwin’s own words:

This is an intellectual history of occult and esoteric currents in the English-speaking world, from the early Romantic period to the early twentieth century. The Theosophical Society, founded in 1875 by Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, holds a crucial position as the place where all these currents temporarily united, before diverging again. The book’s ambiguous title points to my thesis that Blavatsky’s Theosophy owed as much to the skeptical Enlightenment of the eighteenth century as it did to the

concept of spiritual enlightenment with which it is more readily associated.

The book deserves to be given a lengthy and careful evaluation, so in all fairness an assessment of the work will appear only then.

* * *

American Theological Library Association

I have just been informed that *Theosophical History* has passed the journal evaluation process of the American Theological Library Association. All issues will be indexed in ***Religion Index One***. This will make the contents of the journal accessible to all academic libraries that subscribe to the *Religion Index*.

* * *

Patrologia Latina Database

In 1844 the Parisian publisher l’Abbé Jacques-Paul Migne embarked on one of the most ambitious projects in classical studies: the collection and publishing of all the writings of the Church Fathers—understood by Migne as the “whole intellectual patrimony of the Church”—in Latin from the first century to the beginning of the thirteenth century C.E. Entitled the *Patrologiae Cursus Completus* or in this instance, the *Patrologia Latina* [PL], this grand project, completed in 1855, consists of 217 quarto volumes, with four additional volumes prepared between 1862 and 1865. The PL covers the Latin Fathers from Tertullian (200 C.E.) to Pope Innocent III (1216). As I write, this great collection is being converted into elec-

tronic form by Chadwyck-Healey Inc. on CD ROM (ISBN 0-89887-113-1) and magnetic tape (ISBN 0-89887-114-X). So far, 99 volumes have been completed with two additional releases expected in May (58 volumes) and December (64 volumes) of this year.

In using the database, single word or combination of words and short phrases can be searched in a single work, author, or volume or across the entire database. There is also a full text display of all the works identified for the search items. In addition, Greek words and phrases can be searched as well. Indexes of both Latin and Greek words and authors are also available. For more information, Chadwyck-Healey can be contacted at the following addresses:

(North America)

1101 King St., Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel: 800-752-0515 Fax: 703-683-7589
e-mail: mktg@chadwyck.com

(outside North America)

The Quorum, Barnwell Road
Cambridge CB5 8SW, United Kingdom
Tel: 01223 215512 Fax: 01223 215514

(France)

Chadwyck-Healey France S.A.
50 rue de Paradis, 75010 Paris
Tel: 1 44-83-81-81 Fax: 1 44-83-81-83

(In Spain and Latin America)

Chadwyck-Healey España S.L.
Calle Recoletos 11, 28001 Madrid
Tel: 575 23 14 Fax: 575 98 85

* * *

Krishnamurti Centennial Conference

A Krishnamurti Centennial Conference will be held at Miami University from May 18–21, 1995 under the direction of Professor S.S. Rama Rao Pappu. The Conference is intended to examine Krishnamurti's contributions to contemporary thought. Information on the Conference should be directed to Professor Pappu, Department of Philosophy, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056 (Tel.: 513-529-2439; fax: 513-529-3841; e-mail: rrpappu@miavx1.acs.muohio.edu).

* * *

Mike Ashcraft

Mike Ashcraft (first mentioned in IV/8: 250) recently completed his Ph.D. dissertation on Point Loma through the Religious Studies Dept. of the University of Virginia. The title of the dissertation is "The Dawn of the Cycle": Point Loma Theosophists and American Culture, 1896–1929." It will soon be available through University Microfilms, Inc. Mike's address is the Department of Religion, Carleton College, 1 North College St., Northfield, MN 55057 (telephone: 507/663-4229; e-mail: washcraf@carleton.edu.).

* * *

Nautilus Books

Jerry Hejka-Ekins, one of the associate editors of *Theosophical History*, is well-known in Theosophical circles as one of the most knowledgeable

individuals dealing with the history of the Theosophical movement. He has an outstanding collection of Theosophiana in his archives and library (known as the Alexandria West Library) and has been most generous in sharing his holdings with researchers. Of the many items on his plate is his firm, Nautilus Books, a business which specializes in Theosophy, occultism, mythology, folklore and Religious Studies. Special subject catalogues are compiled by him on an occasional basis, including upcoming catalogues on health and alternative healing, the occult arts, and the Eastern and Western esoteric traditions. Book searches are conducted *gratis*. If you wish to be included on the mailing list, please mail your request to Nautilus Books, P.O. Box 2903, Turlock, CA 95380 [telephone: 209/ 669-7394].

* * *

Todd Pratum

In the Editor's Comments section of the July 1994 issue Todd Pratum was mentioned as a dealer who specialized in titles in the the areas of Theosophy, esotericism, Hermeticism, and gnosticism. Since that writing, he has moved to the following address: 422 Larkfield Center, No. 254, Santa Rosa, CA 95403. His telephone and fax number is 707/525-8750.

* * * * *

Correspondence

Reprinted below are excerpts of a letter from Mr. K. Tokarski (Kraków, Poland), dated 18 October concerning some points of clarification contained in his article, “Wanda Dynowska-Umadevi: A Biographical Essay,” published in the V/3 (July) issue of Theosophical History. A few passages have been slightly amended to conform to the rules of English grammar and to capture more perfectly Mr. Tokarski’s intent.

. . . I would like to touch upon subjects which would throw light on the activity not commonly known of Polish Theosophists.

Let me begin with a point of interest which you have probably noticed, that the Polish people connected with the Order of the Star in the East preferred using in Poland the name the Aurora Union [*Związek Jutrzenki*]. The point was not to use the name which might raise associations with the red star, the symbol of the Soviet Union. The Polish people knew from the very beginning how treacherous and dangerous the Soviet regime was.

On the group photograph found on page 94, the uniformed figure to Mrs. Besant’s right is [as noted] General of the Polish Army Michel Karaszewicz-Tokarzewski. He took part in World War II in 1939 fighting against the German invasion. Thereafter, he was the first organizer of the underground Home Army during the German occupation of Poland. When organizing the clandestine resistance movement, he initially relied on the members of the Polish Theosophical Society. These leading activists, loyal to the Polish

government in exile in London, were of high moral principle and courageous. Among the most prominent of these loyalists was the Theosophist Ms Janina Karas, a staff officer at the Home Army Headquarters.

After the end of World War II, Poland unfortunately came under the strong influence of the Soviet Union. The true Polish patriots were prosecuted by the Communist regime and a number of Polish Theosophists were imprisoned, where they were subjected to brutal interrogations. We can safely say that Polish Theosophists during the most difficult period when they were subjected to Nazi occupation and a Communist regime passed the test of history with flying colors and displayed a heroic love of their country.

* * *

From Joanne Stead (Leigh-on-Sea, Essex)

Re *Theosophical History* V/1 (Jan 1994), pages 23-25 in “Part III of the OTO” by P.R. König, [who] refers to “the Czech dancer Rudolf *de* Laban (1879–1958).”

Whilst living in England he went by the name of Rudolf LABAN but in *The Art of Movement* (I should say LABAN Art of Movement) *Guild* magazine (Special Birthday Number December 1954) he is referred to as Rudolf *von* Laban. He was it is said: “born in Hungary of French descent.”

In the various tributes for his 75th birthday on December 15, 1954, a “Mary Wigman” mentions

“Summer 1913: Switzerland, the Lago Maggiore and the lovely country around Ascona.” Presumably she is the Mary Wiegemann referred to by Mr. König above.

I worked briefly for The Laban Art of Movement Centre about 1955 as Warden when it was at Addlestone in Surrey, England and had residential students, and met Mr. Laban as he lived there too.

He also linked up during World War II in UK with the pioneer industrial Consultant Mr. F.C. Lawrence of Manchester, England and they devised The Laban Lawrence Test for Selection and Placing of workers in industry etc. *“There is only one thing which no man living can alter or hide—his basic unconscious movement.”*

Somehow or other I found out about this side of Rudolf Laban’s work before I went for [my] interview as Warden. When I got there I was asked if I would not like to “stroll in the garden.” I knew Mr. Laban’s study windows overlooked this garden so I declined to exhibit my basic movements! But when I eventually left the job after a brief spell, Mr. Laban told me that “Your gift is: PEOPLE—though they can be irritating at times!”

The above letter is dated October 5, 1994. In a subsequent letter dated October 21, Ms Stead continues her discussion of Rudolf Laban.

I have been re-reading *The Laban Art of Movement Guild* magazine Special Birthday Number December 1954 and the quote I gave [above] is on page 38 and comes from “extracts from an article in the October 1954 issue of *Scope Magazine for Industry*... and is headed RUDOLF LABAN.

In the above extract was also: “It seemed to us, studying many of the case histories and

talking with Laban-Lawrence trained observers who are always present at interviews, sitting quietly observing and recording the applicant’s movements, that among the system’s finest achievements is its ability to take square pegs out of round holes” . . . and it goes on to talk of “the workman whose rate of rejects is unusually high, who is always grouching, who is a potential trouble-maker” and says, “Observing him at his machine, annotating his movements, it invariably happens that the man is unsuitably employed. His natural movement may be quick and fluid, whereas the work he is on is slow and jerky . . . doing work contrary to his natural rhythm, cannot but produce a careless and discontented worker.”

“His basic movement remains constant and reveals his true self. For movement is the outward expression of the spirit”

Mr. Laban said his interest in industry “happened twenty-five years ago when I was directing a great pageant in Vienna. The cortege was four miles long, with 10,000 people taking part, and over 400 crafts represented.... This gave me the opportunity to go into factories and workshops to study their basic movements. To my surprise, these people started to complain. Not only about their human and economic difficulties, but that they were tired, over-worked, bored. And from that, I started a sort of consultancy, it worked with workmen, but not with management. Management was at first suspicious. But enlightened management slowly took it up. Only when I came together with Lawrence at the beginning of the war did I take it up professionally.”

* * * * *

Book Notes

JOURNAL INEDIT DE RICARDO VIÑES: ODILON REDON ET LE MILIEU OCCULTISTE (1897-1915). By Suzy Lévy. Paris: Aux Amateurs de Livres, 1987. Pp. 236. Paperbound. No price given.

This valuable title will be of great service to those francophones among T.S. clientele who would like a handy reference of mini-biographies elsewhere mostly unavailable of late XIXth century French occultists directly or indirectly connected with HPB: Lady Caithness, Duchess of Pomar, founder of the esoteric journal, *L'Aurore d'un Jour Nouveau*; Léon Bloy; Emile Schuffenecker (1851–1934), the artist who encouraged Gauguin to pursue painting rather than work as a stockbroker for the Société Bertin; Dr. Gérard Encausse, the Parisian pediatrician who managed a truce with boredom by taking up magic as a hobby and adopting the esoteric name of Papus, all of which will give but a hint of the treasure trove contained therein.

La Librairie du Merveilleux has often been noted in passing references, and the author provides a generous account of its history, founded as it was by Papus-Encausse and Lucien Chamuel to serve as a meeting place for an independent group interested in esoteric studies. Those who gathered there included Sar Peladan; Stanislas de Guaita; Barlet; Count Antoine de La Rochefoucauld, amateur artist and faithful supporter of Odilon Redon in his own journal, *Le Coeur*. La Librairie du Merveilleux was later absorbed by La Librairie Générale des Sciences, created by Paul Chacornac.

Concerning La Librairie de l'Art Independent directed by Edmond Bailly, pseudonym of Henri-Edmond Limé, member of the Theosophical Society, it became a book shop that was also one of the foremost meeting places of the members of the hermetical movement. Toulouse-Lautrec, Moreau, Degas and Redon were regular visitors there, as were Mallarmé and Satie and Debussy.

Ricardo Viñes was an eminent Catalan pianist born at Lérida, Spain in 1875, and was considered the equal of Liszt's pupil, Emil von Sauer. This journal recounts the social meetings with artists and musicians and his readings in occultism which resulted from his frequent visits to the aforementioned book shops.

While the jottings in Viñes's journal often recount amusing anecdotes, there is surprisingly little in the way of appraisal of the artistic work of Odilon Redon himself. Obviously there was a friendship with the whole family that transcended any sort of criticism. And as for buying art work, Viñes mentions collecting pieces by the Japanese artist Hokusai more frequently than works by compatriots. What then was under discussion at the salon meetings that Vines reported? Mostly newly-discovered scientific developments to which people sought rational answers in some detail. No matter that it all happened almost a century ago, these matters have still a familiar ring.

Robert Boyd

* * *

THE MYSTIC LIFE OF ALFRED DEAKIN. By Al Gabay. Oakleigh, Victoria, Australia: Cambridge University Press, 1992. 208 pp. ISBN 0 521 41494 (pbk.). \$25.

For those interested in politics and mysticism this is a must book. Deakin was the second Prime Minister of Australia and according to many the most successful. In this detailed and fascinating biography Gabay outlines his journey through Spiritualism, Swedenborgianism and Theosophy. At the University of Melbourne he met the famous psychical researcher Richard Hodgson. He read Blavatsky and knew both Olcott and Besant, and he was for a short time a member of the Theosophical Society.

This book is highly recommended.

John Cooper

* * *

A HISTORY FOR A NATION. By Stuart Macintyre. Carlton, Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1994. 250 pp. \$19.95.

This book is of lesser interest to the Theosophical historian. It is the biography of Sir Ernest Scott, who was appointed to the chair of history at the University of Melbourne in 1912 and became one of the founders of the field of Australian history. However, it is as Ernest Besant-Scott that he is better known to Theosophists, for he married Mabel Besant, the daughter of Annie Besant in London in 1892, and then moved to Melbourne where he became editor of *The Austral Theosophist*, which lasted for fourteen issues.

John Cooper

* * *

AUSTRALIA'S FIRST FABIANS. By Race Mathews. Oakleigh, Victoria, Australia: Cambridge University Press, 1993. 284 pp. ISBN 0 521 44133 1. \$29.95.

Here we find that many of the important Fabians were Theosophists, including Ernest Besant-Scott, Henry Champion and John Ross. This is an outstanding history of early Fabianism in Australia as written by a former Victorian Parliamentarian with the foreword by a former Prime Minister, Gough Whitlam.

John Cooper

* * *

HANDS FULL OF LIFE. By Norna Kollerstrom Morton. Springwood, Australia: Butterfly Books (P.O. Box 107), 1993. ISBN 0 947333 66 5. \$20.00.

Norna Kollerstrom is the daughter of the veteran Theosophists Gustav and Gertrude Kollerstrom and the wife of a General Secretary of the Australian Section of the Theosophical Society, Harold Morton. It was at the Kollerstrom home that C.W. Leadbeater lived before they all moved to the Theosophical center at the Manor in Mosman, where she married Harold Morton in a ceremony conducted by Bishop Leadbeater. Later Harold worked for the Theosophical radio station 2GB, named for Giordano Bruno, who was believed to be the previous incarnation of Annie Besant. This station was lost to the Theosophists and is now a major commercial radio station.

This is a charming autobiography written by a remarkable woman. However, the text tells little of Theosophy in Australia. Or of her brother Oscar, who was one of the disciples chosen for

Krishnamurti and whose occult Initiation is detailed in Leadbeater's *The Masters and the Path*. The photos are of interest—the Kollerstrom home, the wedding, Oscar and family photos.

Another volume which I will review, when I get it, is the story of Walter Burley Griffen and the occult history of the Australian federal capital Canberra.

John Cooper

* * *

THE FORGOTTEN CHRISTIANS OF HANGZHOU. By D. E. Mungello. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Publishing, 1994. 248pp. ISBN 0-8248-1540-8. No price.

As the title states, D. E. Mungello tells the story of some forgotten Christians of Hangzhou (circa 17th & 18th century), based largely on materials found in the Jesuit library of Zikawei in Shanghai. It is a story that begins in 1611 when three Jesuits arrived to found the first Roman Catholic mission in Hangzhou and ends with the eventual disappearance of the Christian community sometime in the 18th century. The personalities and the events of those interim years provide an intriguing chapter in the history of Catholicism in China which will be especially fascinating to those interested in Neo-Confucian China, the history of Christianity in east Asia, or the interface of cultures east and west.

More specifically, the “forgotten Christians” Mungello tells us about are second and third generation Hangzhou Christians, Fr. Prospero Intorcetta and the converted literatus, Zhang Xingyao. The study of the latter is especially revealing since Zhang came from, and continued

to think of himself as being in, the literati tradition. His view of Christianity, as revealed in the later chapters, was that it supplemented and transcended the truth as found in the *Chinese Classics* and *The Four Books* (p.83).

Unfortunately for readers of this journal there is very little in these pages about esoteric religion. The only chapter that discusses Buddhism (Chapter 5) is on Zhang's *Refutation of All the Falsenesses of the Buddha* (*Pi lueshuo tiaobo*) and consists primarily of Zhang's more or less standard Confucian criticisms of Buddhist otherworldliness and immorality. Daoism comes in for similar condemnation.

Although these forgotten Christians are of considerable intrinsic interest, they had little historical impact. In fact, the work Mungello focuses on, the *Examination of the Similarities and Differences between the Lord of Heaven Teaching and the Literati Teaching* (*Tianzhujiào Rujiao tongyi kao*), was not even published, probably because of the increasingly hostile Chinese attitude toward Christianity. Furthermore, Zhang seems not to have inspired any other literati to his point of view. The author says that the experiences of these forgotten Christians “contradicts the image of the Sinocentric Confucian literatus whose mind was closed to foreign influences.” (p.2) Given that Zhang stands practically alone as an example of an open-minded literatus, his life is less a counterexample than an exception that proves the rule.

Craig K. Ihara¹

* * * * *

¹ Craig K. Ihara is professor of philosophy at California State University, Fullerton.

Communications

Theosophy and Theosophic Thought Seminar at the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion: Chicago, 21 November 1994

Joscelyn Godwin

It may seem incredible to outsiders that there are over five thousand professors of religion who get together every year to read papers, hire and network, and enjoy the amenities of luxury hotels and interesting restaurants. More incredible is the fact that, thanks to Jim Santucci's efforts, Theosophical historians now have a place on their program, seeing that our studies are neither canonical nor politically correct.

Following AAR policy, this Seminar is charged to research the topics of its title for four more years. Its findings will then be gathered into a publication. The idea of a seminar is that participants do not read papers, but report on the state of their research and then discuss it among themselves and with the audience. The crowd that overflowed the seminar room showed that there is lively interest in our subject. Beside Jim Santucci, who presided with grace and, when necessary, discipline, there were nine participants. Four of them were French and five were not professors of religion, setting a good example of ecumenism.

First came Antoine Faivre of the Sorbonne, holder of the only professorial chair in the world

devoted to esoteric studies, whose attendance at the AAR is a welcome fixture. He spoke on "The Place of Theosophy in Relation to Other Modern Esoteric Currents." This made it clear from the outset that we were not just talking about the Theosophical Society, but about a stream of teachings originating in antiquity and chiefly represented in modern times by Jacob Boehme and his disciples. The other currents he defined were Alchemy, Hermetism, Christian Kabbalah, Paracelsism, and Rosicrucianism. The specific elements of Theosophy he named as the triad God-Man-Nature, the primacy of the mythical, and direct access to superior worlds.

Jean-Pierre Laurant, also of the Sorbonne, followed with "Theosophy Disguised as a Religion: An Aspect of Secularization in the Nineteenth Century." He showed how Blavatsky's Theosophy took on many of the qualities of the religions it disavowed, and how the details of the process, especially as culminating in Krishnamurti's independent career, accorded with the general trend towards secularization and the dismantling of religious attitudes.

The report of Jean-Louis Siémons, "Theosophy in a Universal Perspective," was read *in absentio*. It argued for Blavatskian Theosophy as the latest in a series of attempts to formulate a universal wisdom. This wisdom, innate to humanity, transcends religious and racial differences, and concerns the highest experiences and knowledge of which we are capable.

After these three papers, James B. Robinson responded. In discussing the problem of distin-

guishing mysticism from theosophy, he pointed out that a difference between Neoplatonism and early Christianity is that in the first, “theo-sophia” is *attained*, being universalist and attainable by all humanity, whereas in the second, it is *bestowed* as part of revelation. He also emphasized the unacknowledged contribution of H.P. Blavatsky to the history religion.

The charge to the Seminar had included the questions “What is theosophy and what are its phases of development?” The next set of papers addressed the second of these. Michael Gomes reported on “Laying the Foundations of Belief: The Evolution of Theosophical Literature in the Nineteenth Century.” He showed how the definition of modern Theosophy was arrived at gradually, through the books of HPB, Sinnett, Judge, Besant and Leadbeater. These succeeded in putting ideas before the public, especially concerning Eastern religions, that had been stated before but had not sunk in.

Marla J. Selvidge next spoke on “Anna Bonus Kingsford and Edward Maitland: Twin Souls of Christian Theosophy.” This was a welcome view from someone not already identified with esotericism. Selvidge saw the authors of *The Perfect Way* not as theosophists but as pioneers of the feminist critique of Christianity.

Joscelyn Godwin’s presentation summarized both Christian Chanel’s “Max Theon and the Theosophical Society” (replacing the contribution of Leslie Price) and his own “Theosophy versus Theosophers: The Theosophical Society and the Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor.” This introduced the audience to Max Theon, an enigmatic character who bears comparison with Blavatsky in many respects, and to the secret order which he was Grand Master, which enrolled many Theosophists in search of practical instruc-

tion in occultism.

John Patrick Deveney, responding, said that while HPB is the irreducible object in the path of everyone in the past century with pretensions to “the spiritual,” mysticism, or magic, she is also being seen as having ascertainable roots and complex connections. No time rivals the present in the excitement of the material now emerging.

All the participants had much more to say, of course, than these brief notes can cover. Many of them will return to continue the seminar’s work in Philadelphia next November. And eventually, they plan to produce a monumental work in two parts: (1) a definition and history of theosophy in the broad sense, (2) a history of theosophical societies from 1875 to the present. This will have the dual purpose of integrating the Theosophical Society with the wider current of Western theosophy, and of telling its history from a non-partisan point of view.

* * *

Pansophy as an Alternative to Theosophy: A Short Informal History

W.R. Laudahn

[Mr. William Laudahn recently sent to *Theosophical History* a memoir concerning his association with the defunct Pansophic Fellowship. We have annotated Mr. Laudahn’s remarks with comments and material drawn from the Alexandria West Library, which houses the archives of the Pansophic Fellowship, as well as Victor Endersby’s *Theosophical Notes*.

The intertextual annotations are in italics, and footnote annotations are in brackets.

Jerry Hejka-Ekins, Associate Editor]

Once upon a time there was a dream that the “all-wisdom” of Pansophy would triumph over the “divine-wisdom” of Theosophy. This vision either arrived in a flash or developed over time. In any case, the concept came from Plato’s World of Ideas and became flesh in the person of Joseph Ramsperger.

Joe discriminated by loving some ideas and hating others. Like Paul, Mohammed and other founders of spiritual movements, Joe had no academic background. He was self-motivated and self-taught. Unlike Paul and Mohammed, Joe’s idea did not move and shake the world.

Most of the people and documents associated with Pansophy are long-gone, and keeping historical data was not their forte. My memory will suffice, as I was there. It was vaguely understood by his followers that Ramsperger and Theosophy had met before and they agreed to disagree on certain vital points, which became areas of conflict, turning many ‘seekers’ off!

Ramsperger wrote to Victor Endersby, the editor of *Theosophical Notes*, a letter that contains some autobiographical information:

I landed on these shores in December 1922. My first interest was to get acquainted with the English language. I went to all kinds of lectures and one day I also dropped into the U.L.T. in the Metropolitan Building. I found the atmosphere very sympathetic. I hardly understood anything and had no idea what it was about; . . .

Luckily I got acquainted with a lady that had the patience to explain to me some of the basic ideas of Theosophy. I had heard the

word only about twice before. She gave the first blow to my firm conception that death was the end of all. But I progressed rapidly in learning English and grasping some of the teaching.

In 1924 I went to Frisco [San Francisco] to work for about 6 months. I went at once to the U.L.T. Lodge then on Market Street. I attended all classes and lectures. I will never forget there was a very fine lady there leading the classes. She had lots of patience straightening me out of my confused ideas about the teachings. On Sunday’s there was a man on the platform giving lectures. I hardly understood anything he was saying but he seemed so very serious and earnest that I never missed a lecture.

On returning to Los Angeles, I joined at once the U.L.T. again and became an ardent student, attending classes and lectures. The people were in general always ‘very nice’, however I all the time had a feeling of strangeness between them and me, there never was any approach of friendship. . . .¹

Of those in Pansophy, I was the only one associated with Theosophy by way of the United Lodge of Theosophists (U.L.T.).

Coming to America from Zurich, Switzerland soon after the War, Joe first arrived in Montevideo, Uruguay. He noted that the first man he met “spoke plain German.” No one knows how long he stayed there, but the final move was to Los Angeles, California. There he found work as a technician with the old Singer Sewing Machine Co.² Joe often mentioned Singer, now called The

¹ This and all following intertextual quotations are from a letter by Joseph Ramsperger to Victor Endersby, dated 26 January, 1956. Archives.]

² [By the time Mr. Ramsperger began the Pansophic Fellowship, he was beyond retirement age, and was working as a janitor in an office building.]

Singer Companies, reflecting a branching-out from one product only.

Joe, too, wanted to reach-out. He started by building a modest home on a sunny slope above Sunset Blvd.³ Ramsperger recalled that “not a soul” helped him. A bachelor, Joe revealed that a woman once seemed to be romantically inclined to him. But he complained or explained that “she was twice as big as I am.”

In his seventies⁴ when I knew him in the decade 1955-65, Joe did not own much, not even a car in highly mobile Southern California. He used public transportation to go to and from work, or wherever. Sometimes he was given a ride. One fine evening I drove him to a Sunday meeting at the U.L.T. headquarters at Grand Ave. and 33rd St. The seats were comfortable, the temperature was just right—and Little Joe fell fast asleep! I didn’t awaken him, for dreams are sometimes better than cold reality.

In political reality Joe leaned to the Left.

I have been a worker all my life and an ardent Socialist all my life . . .

A headline about Nikita Khrushchev’s boast that the Soviets would “bury” us prompted Joe to observe that Communism and the Soviet Union were the “wave of the future.” Absent Theosophy from the big picture, Joe wanted Pansophy to ride that wave. But Pansophy fell apart about 30 years before Communism imploded. Ramsperger, Marx, and Lenin shared a failed dream.

To the—unofficial—left of Center, Theosophy has opposed Communism and Atheism. H.P. Blavatsky can be quoted on numerous occasions

³[He lived on Marsden Street.]

⁴[He was born about 1882.]

as favoring Freedom and Pantheism, that the divine Absoluteness is All-in-All. This is “the God beyond god.” (Pantheism is news to some Theosophists.) But the very words “Divinity” and “God” turned Joe off.

That is why he turned to *The Mahatma Letters*.

Then it happened, one day, in the public library, I came across the Mahatma Letters. I took them from the shelf and started to read, it was the tenth letter. After reading that letter I knew that here I had found the real “Fountain of Wisdom.” Their letters were just what I needed, they gave me the real awakening. H.P.B.’s angels, gods, Deity, divines etc. always jarred me. But these letters had nothing of the kind, here I could agree one hundred percent. These letters explained the many puzzles and inconsistencies I came up to in the S.D. [Secret Doctrine].

From that time on my enthusiasm has never slackened. It is my life. To my astonishment and sorrow people in the U.L.T. had no enthusiasm for those letters. Contrary, they became very serious and even annoyed by [my] mentioning them, somebody even called them spiritual dynamite. I continued attending meetings and classes but was treated with more and more fridity, finally they gave me to understand that I was no more wanted. This was the end for the time being attending their affairs.⁵

The famous “Letter X” starts out by saying that “[n]either our philosophy nor ourselves believe in a God . . . Therefore, we deny God both as philosophers and as Buddhists..in our system

⁵[At that time, there were strong feelings among the associates of U.L.T. that since the Mahatma’s letters were intended to be private correspondence, their publication was inappropriate. Therefore discussion of these letters at meetings was discouraged.]

(there is) no such thing as God, either personal or impersonal. Parabrahm is not a God, but absolute immutable law, and Iswar is the effect of Avidya and Maya, ignorance based upon the great delusion.”⁶

In his fight against delusion and divinity, Joe ran ads in the newspapers directing the public to open meetings on one evening a week. The place was an upper room in an old commercial building on Spring Street between 5th and 6th Streets in Los Angeles. Joe paid the rent, as his small group was never a gold mine, nor was it so intended.

After Mr. Ramsperger left the U.L.T., he eventually joined the Point Loma Society for two years. Speaking about his membership at the Point Loma Society, Mr. Ramsperger explained:

One evening I gave a lecture on Masters ideas about religion, God and churches. It was like a bombshell, some of the members did not even talk to me any more because of my godlessness. Soon they let me feel, most of them, (a few agreed with me) that I was persona non grata from them. And they ostracized me as they did in the U.L.T.

So I left them and with me came the boy [an un-named friend, about 17 years old.] and his girl and some friends. Then the boy had a good idea. He suggested that we start a little study group for ourselves. So we did. First we met in homes, then for a while we shared an office with a lawyer. Then we sub-rented an office from the humane league for animal defense of which I and some others were members. We had an ad in the paper “Theosophy the Science of Life.” Very few came through the ad, most came through personal contact.

And we kept on going, generally about ten or twelve. There was no ‘leader.’ We started a system. We made sheets of quotations from the Mahatma Letters, the S.D., Light on the Path, and even scientific books. These quotation sheets we discussed to our best understanding.

Finally we agreed to drop the name theosophy, form an organization under a new name which was “Pansophy.” About seven years ago [1949] we rented a place of our own, with our own furniture, and we still keep on. We have ups and downs, troubles and adversity as is everywhere. But the main thing we are keeping it alive. The organization amounts to very little, we do not ask for membership, nor do we have dues or collections, only voluntary contributions, and we never yet got any well to do people who would step in.

Those who returned a few times were invited to Little Joe’s small home. Through a filtering process, certain favorites became an Inner Group. The only names I recall of other insiders are a Mr. Hamilton, a Mr. Martin⁷, and a Mrs. Dodge.

We had very few Theosophists, mostly people who never would have gone to a theosophical lodge meeting.

I only saw and heard Hamilton two or three times. A civil-engineer, he was a notch or two above the rest of us in social and occupational status. Therefore, he was to be the front man and President if, as, and when Pansophy ever become popular. Because he stood for more democracy in the group, he didn’t see eye-to-eye with Joe and seldom appeared.

Joe got a job for Martin in the Singer plant. Martin had been a jeweler and watch repairman.

⁶ *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett from the Mahatmas M. and K.H.* Transcribed and Compiled by A.T. Barker. Second edition (London: Rider & Co., 1948), 52.

⁷ [We have identified this person as the late Mr. Martin Howe, an associate of U.L.T.]

He also claimed to have been “a priest of the Order of Melchizedek.” Speaking for himself he observed that “a woman would be crazy to marry me as I could not give her the loving she would want.”

As for Mrs. Dodge, she was thought to be a fairly well-off widow, but not in the same league with the really rich spinster with the same last name who was associated with Theosophy in the Besant-Leadbeater period. A.H. Nethercot wrote in *The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant* that “for many years the bank account of Miss (Mary) Dodge became virtually the bank account of the Theosophical Society.”⁸ No one can say that about Pansophy’s Mrs. Dodge! Our Dodge was an “economy model.”

How about the former “Insider” writing this article? I was a Los Angeles County employee of the Sheriff’s Department in an administrative capacity. Joe used to remark about how unusual it was for such an employee to be interested in something like Pansophy! Not married at the time, I had a “steady girl friend” for some 16 years. Caroline, an attractive and “pleasingly plump” woman, was separated from her alcoholic husband.

That was a problem, but my core interest was similar to Joe’s except that I was more into history and mystical philosophy. All of this is embraced by the wisdom of Sophia, as in TheoSophia. For awhile, Pansophy and Little Joe seemed to fit into this picture.

Of slight build, Joe loomed large in the eyes of his Pansophic associates, some of whom found

him hard to get along with. An old man, Ramsperger was set in his ways, but he had his moments. On occasion he would slip into a few words of his native German. One evening Joe was reading aloud to the class from the *Mahatma Letters* about the Skandhas, or reincarnating tendencies in Buddhist philosophy. I will always remember how excited he became when he said “und now come mit der Skandhas!”

Some real characters showed up at our meetings (well it was L.A. in Southern California!). When I was conducting a discussion downtown the subject was about the beginning of the world. A man asked, “Will we mention Genesis in the Bible?” As I responded in the negative, he walked out, full of fury.

At Joe’s house, two young men claimed to have contact with the Occult World by way of an unseen medium named “Karmac.” We never saw Karmac or the hidden side of things. As if to offset that loss, we had one gain. A member whose name escapes me, talked a lot about “Karmac.” Finally, in a lapse, the member called him “Carmichael.” We all had a good laugh.

Joe subscribed to Victor Endersby’s *Theosophical Notes*⁹, but he took exception to some of the contents. He wrote a long letter to Endersby explaining just where Pansophy, as Joe determined, differed from the position found in the *Notes*. I was delegated to type and reword the epistle. At the next nightly meeting at Joe’s house, he read the letter and complained about how long

⁸ Arthur H. Nethercot, *The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1963), 181.

⁹ [Mr. Ramsperger requested a subscription to *Theosophical Notes* in a letter dated June 21, 1951. He explained that he was belatedly responding to an article recommending the journal, published in January issue of *The Canadian Theosophist*. Mr. Endersby replied on June 28th, sending him the June issue and back issues to February. Archives.]

it was! We never did hear from Endersby.¹⁰

For several years, Joe also subscribed to *The Scientific American*.¹¹ He decided not to renew because the magazine contained “so many ads” and the pure materialistic posture was as bad as the religious point of view. He became especially upset about a book review full of negation about Apollonius of Tyana. We admired Joe for this, he wanted a more balanced approach.

In theory, Pansophy was balanced with “all” compared to “Theo” in Theosophy. More than a Grand Man, however, mystical divinity is All in the unity of eternal Spirit and ephemeral Matter. While Joe was not a strict scholar, neither was he a mystic. He had a blind spot or two, but remained a good man and true.

Compared to the All, no mere part or person can be perfect or complete. As parts of Pansophy, persons departed one by one. In 1962, Mr. Hamilton resigned. That was a blow. I didn’t say anything, but sympathized with his position. A few years later, I too felt it was time to go.

Shortly thereafter someone told me that I had been considered for a leading role in Pansophy, perhaps as Joe’s successor. I said to myself, “Now they tell me!” It looks like I missed my chance to join the growing ranks of Spiritual Leaders. Well,

they come and go, as do various forms of theosophy (and pansophy). The mysterious Source remains and contains All-Divine-Wisdom, or Pantheosophy!

* * * * *

¹⁰ [A letter that fits this description, was dated September 9, 1956. It is four typewritten pages, single spaced, and reproduced in its entirety in the September 1956 issue of *Theosophical Notes*, with Mr. Endersby’s commentary. A second letter of 4 1/2 pages, single spaced, dated Nov. 1, 1956, was reproduced in the December issue, with Mr. Endersby’s comments. Both letters were signed by Mr. Laudahn, under the title; “Recording Secretary, Pansophic Council.” Archives.]

¹¹ [In the Pansophic Fellowship Archives are scattered articles cut from *Scientific American*. The subject matter of the material is germane to Theosophical teachings being compiled by the group.]

From the Archives

The Letters of H.P. Blavatsky to W.Q. Judge: Part IV: Letter Dated Aug. 12, 1887, and Part IVa: Letter from Bertram Keightley to W.Q. Judge

With Notes by Michael Gomes

In the hope of settling the growing animosity between Elliott Coues and W.Q. Judge, Mme. Blavatsky telegraphed them from London on August 12, 1887. Judge's copy in the Archives of the Theosophical Society, Pasadena, reads: "Master suggests your being what I am Secretary for life if ready for sacrifice he will help. Upasika." Coues in turn would take the position of President of the Society in America. H.P.B. gives further explanation on how this was to be accomplished in her next letter to Judge to be published in this series. "Begin by being elected both of you for a year and then if you are prepared to pledge yourselves both for life—then affairs & events may be turned off by unseen powers into such a groove that you will be unanimously elected for life,—just as Olcott & I were—to go on with the work after our deaths." But apparently the membership in America did not approve of such a plan, for Blavatsky revealed to Coues two years later: "In those days I wrote to about fifty Theosophists asking them to elect you as President, & they all turned back on me & declined. Some of your best friends did so—if you want to know. This is why I washed my

hands of the whole thing, & got mad with Judge & you for putting me in such a position. Master had asked you if you would consent to be president of the American Section for life, but the Masters did not undertake to influence all the Theosophists to elect you—and if they won't elect you, what can I do?" (Blavatsky to Coues, Apr. 30, 1889, *The Canadian Theosophist*, Sept.-Oct. 1985, 90).

Mme. Blavatsky was now settled in England, "in the midst of the howling wolves" as she describes it. Since she voices concern about what she believed to be "dark plots" going on against her at the Indian headquarters at Adyar, it is worthwhile to include the letter from Bertram Keightley (1860–1944) that she sent to Judge and on which she has added a postscript.

The new villains here are T. Subba Row (1856–1890) of Madras, whom Blavatsky had patronized as a high chela of the Mahatmas, and his English protégés Alfred Cooper-Oakley (1853–1899) and Jonathan Nield Cook. They all drifted out of the Society within a year, Cooper-Oakley becoming the Registrar of the University of Madras. Subba

Row's "attack" on her that she mentions consisted of his describing the seven-fold classification of principles adopted by Theosophists as "unscientific and misleading" in a lecture on the *Bhagavad-gītā* at the annual December Theosophical convention at Adyar. When this appeared in print in the Feb. 1887 issue of *The Theosophist*, H.P.B. defended the seven-fold classification as "the right one" in the April issue. This provoked a detailed reply by Subba Row in the May *Theosophist*, which brought another reply from her in the August issue which also contained the conclusion of Subba Row's article. (All the articles in question are still available in *The Esoteric Writings of T. Subba Row*, Adyar: Theosophical Publishing House, 1980.)

* * *

Aug. 12 [1887]

My dear W.Q.J.

To explain my telegram of today know, that for several days I kept thinking over your letter & that of Coues—feeling the great responsibility you wanted me to assume.¹ The night before last, however, I was shown a bird's eye view of the present state of Theosophy & its Societies. I saw a few earnest, reliable Theosophists in a death struggle with the world in general, with other—nominal but ambitious—theosophists. The former are greater in numbers than you may think, & they prevailed as you in America will prevail, if [2] you only remain staunch to the Masters programme and true to yourselves. And last night I saw .: & now I feel strong—such as I am in my body, and

¹ The next six sentences were published in *The Irish Theosophist* (June 15, 1895): 156.

ready to fight for theosophy & the few true ones to my last breath. Are you ready to help me to carry on the sacrifice—that of accepting & carrying on the burden of life, which is heavy? My choice is made & I will not go back on it. I remain in England in the midst of the howling wolves. Here I am needed & nearer to America; there, in Adyar—there are dark plots going on against me & poor Olcott (which you will understand better by reading Bert's letter & the enclosed one from Olcott) and I could only defend myself—not do any good to the Cause or Society. The defending forces have to be judiciously—so scanty they are—distributed over the globe wherever Theosophy is struggling against the powers of darkness. Let O.² remain at Adyar—I will remain here. If you & Coues carry out the plan we will have four great & strong centres. America, Paris, India, England.

The words said by .:—"Let both unite & carry out their idea of secret council. But to work effectively two conditions are necessary: (1) work in good faith & full accord, pledged to support each other & remain united in weal or woe success or failure. The latter will never be allowed to reach its acme, if they are true to each other. (2) In order [3] to silence the ("kickers") & opponents both President & General Secretary must be elected for life." This can be done by your direct followers & has to be done if you would ensure success & have .: to help you in the U.S.A. as "Illarion"³ helps here. The President being permanent no kicks will do any good. There is not a man in all the U.S. who is better fitted to fight for theosophy & his Society than E. Coues; there is no man there more devoted to Them & cause, nor

² H. S. Olcott.

³ The Greek adept Hilarion.

more fitted than you are. These are .:.’s words. Both, you have faults & shortcomings—but your fitness & the peculiar qualifications of both for [4] theosophical work are by far greater. Your polarities so utterly different, can but help to attract people to both ends. They are your strength & power when united in one—the ruin & cause of failure when separated. Unite, unite, I say; & you will have culminated the object for which, after breaking metaphorically each others noses you were led to reconciliation.⁴ Take my place in America now & after I am gone—at Adyar. If you have no more personal ambition than I have—and I know you have not, only combativeness—then this will be no more sacrifice for you than it was for me [5] to have Olcott as my President, damn him from morn to night, & still recognize that there is no better man for the work than he is.

“This is no sacrifice for him,” said I—“if I only know my W.Q.J.” —“No; none in reality, but the illusion that it is one, may yet be strong in the ‘old’ man’s body”— .:. remarked. Is it so? I hope not.

Dixit—I have no more to say till I receive your answer. I am “yours truly” in the work, for ever. Dispose of me—I will be your thing & help you with all my powers. When—if you do—agree, write to me the instructions & my part of the work &—wait & see.

[6] The “plot at Adyar.” It began a little after the last anniversary. I received an Address signed by 107 names headed by Subba Row, Cooper Oakley, Nield Cook begging me to return to Adyar for the next anniversary. Then S.R. came out with his attack on myself & the 7 principles. (See Bert’s letter.) Today poor Miss Cook⁵ who is dying of a

cancer writes to Bert in despair to ask what has fallen upon her brother at Adyar. C.O. & S.R.⁶ They intrigue to prevent my returning to Adyar, bringing forward the scare of “Russian spy,” of padris etc. They write letters (not S.R.) incessantly that Master is against me & directs S.R. (!) how to palliate the evil I have done!! That the L.L. is positively lost, having fallen under my evil influence & being psychologized by me. Olcott as [7] you see writes that the Council has passed a unanimous resolution to ask me to postpone my return.

I knew all this; I knew the meaning of Nield Cook’s sentence: Subba Row is the only one to save the Society (founded by me!!) & he is preparing a great Reform. Poor fools!

Well I have raised a “Frankenstein” & he seeks to devour me. You alone can save the fiend & make of him a man. Breath into him a Soul if not the Spirit. Be his Saviours in the U.S. & may the blessing of my Superiors & yours descend on you.⁷

Yours—the “old woman,”

but one ready to offer you her inner life, if you begin & proceed with the work

HPB

Please draw Coues attention to a new book that appeared by our enemy Lillie “Buddhism in

⁴ The following two sentences were printed in *The Irish Theosophist* (June 15, 1895): 156.

⁵ Probably Miss Louisa Cook, who joined the Society in 1884 and died September 7, 1887.

⁶ Alfred Cooper-Oakley and T. Subba Row.

⁷ This paragraph appeared in *The Irish Theosophist* (June 15, 1895).

Christendom.” Read pp. 358 & 404 & tell me if there can be found any worse libel than this!⁸

* * *

Part IVa: Letter from Bertram Keightley to W.Q. Judge

30 Linden Gardens
Bayswater
London W.
[August 1887]

My dear Judge,

Things at Adyar are looking so threatening that I feel as if I ought to write to you about them; so that you may be prepared for anything that may happen. I shall show this letter to H.P.B. & shall not send it unless she approves of it; tho’ of course I can only write what I have heard myself & the conclusions I have been led to form.

1. Ever since H.P.B. came to Europe both Arch⁹ & I have been receiving vaguely mysterious warnings about—I had almost said—against her. She was said to be going to destroy the T.S. by founding a rival society; she was going to “psychologise” us all; to get us under her influence &c &c. Various hints were given that she was “abandoned” by the Masters, that she was no longer their agent; that she (HPB) was really dead

⁸ Arthur Lillie, *Buddhism in Christendom, or, Jesus, the Essene* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887). On page 358 Lillie made an attack on Mme. Blavatsky’s *bona fides*, including the unprecedented claim that the Mahatma Koot Hoomi emerged from the shrine at the Adyar headquarters of the T.S. Page 404 gave an inaccurate account of the Theosophical teaching of the seven human principles.

⁹ Archibald Keightley.

& that some one—not quite white—was occupying her body (this last being only very vaguely implied).

2. It was said that “no consistent philosophy or doctrine had been given out”; that S.R. might be (perhaps) induced to supply this want; that the T.S. must be put on a new & sounder basis.

All this has been “dribbled” over gradually since H.P.B. came back to Europe. To the hints about her I never paid one moment’s attention—I had my own opinion [2] & stuck to it. The other part as to the philosophy &c sounded plausible—we all know how incomplete our knowledge is—and certainly the organization of the Society is capable of improvement.

However I did not pay much heed to this either as it was not my work & I did not think it would lead to anything.

Then Mrs. O.¹⁰ came back to England & began trying to set us against H.P.B. I thought it was personal disappointment &c—combatted her assertions & thought no more of it.

Now came S.R.’s attack on the seven Principle teaching in his first Bagavat lecture. This brought all the above back to my mind & I grew suspicious. The attack continued & developed against H.P.B., Esoteric Buddhism & even the teaching in the Master’s letters; in S.R.’s Microcosm article.

H.P.B. has told me that S.R. has never written her a line since she left India, tho’ she has written to him several times; & I know that her reply to his strictures re the 7 Principles was sent direct to him accompanied by a most kind letter authorising

¹⁰ Mrs. Cooper-Oakley. H.P.B. describes a visit from her in London during the summer of 1887 in *The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett*, 238–39. Whatever differences they may have had must have been resolved, for Mrs. Cooper-Oakley became one of Blavatsky’s personal Inner Group pupils in 1890.

him to suppress or alter the reply as he chose.

Now at the time of the Coulomb row when Lane Fox [3] was in India, there was a regular attempt made to oust both H.P.B. & the Colonel from the Society altogether. Lane Fox got entangled innocently in this scheme as he was desirous of reform & was made use of by people he had not gauged rightly. He has seen thro' the game since however.

A week or two ago a letter was received from Adyar in which it was stated that a Mahatma had seen S.R.'s "Microcosm" article & had written a letter to him approving it.

To sum up it is quite clear that Cooper-Oakley, Nield Cook & S.R. are in the same boat. Now C.O.¹¹ is under his wife's thumb & sees with eyes & hears with her ears & does as she suggests. And she—well I know from personal experience, that she is the most dangerous & intriguing of women & that she is anything but friendly to H.P.B. & the Colonel personally or to the true interests of the T.S.

Thus the conclusion would seem to be that there is a regular plot or conspiracy going on at Adyar against H.P.B., the Colonel & even the Masters or at least their teaching & the line which they have laid down for the Society. Who is really at the bottom thereof I cannot tell. I do not think either C.O. or N.C. are anything but blind tools who have drawn S.R. into acting with them [4] by flattering his vanity, poisoning his mind against H.P.B. & perhaps by working on his fear that H.P.B. may give out too much real knowledge to us Westerns. For S.R. is a Brahmin & has all a Brahmin's secretiveness & desire to retain esoteric knowledge as an exclusive possession of his caste.

On the whole therefore I am half disposed to think that some one much more cunning & powerful is pulling the strings which make all these puppets dance. Anyhow—be that as it may—I feel very sure of one thing, namely, that they mean to keep H.P.B. out of India & if possible to ruin & destroy her influence in the T.S. & the weight & value of any teachings revealed thro' her.

Nor is this all, for I more than suspect that we shall see S.R. & the other two splitting off & forming a new society of their own in opposition to the T.S. if they fail to obtain control of the latter.

Moreover I am very much mistaken if the Colonel too does not suspect that something of this kind is going on. He more than hinted as much in letters received a few days ago in reply to several written to him by Finch¹² & others here.

H.P.B. has also shown me two letters from Olcott in which he seems partly awake to the danger. He strongly [5] urges her to return at once to Adyar; but then goes on to impress on her that she must be very diplomatic & conciliatory & "perhaps she may win S.R. back again." The Colonel must be blind to the real nature of the attack when he recommends such a temporising policy, & above all when he wants H.P.B. to fling herself alone & unaided into the camp at Adyar—for he does not propose to remain there himself but speaks of going off to Japan & leaving her alone at H.Q. In this he is most certainly unwise & I trust H.P.B. won't think of going to Adyar unless she has some protection & some one to help her there. Otherwise her last strength will be wasted in endless quarrels & difficulties & the last days of her life will be bitter indeed.

¹¹ Alfred Cooper-Oakley.

¹² G. B. Finch, President of the newly formed Blavatsky Lodge of the T.S., organized soon after H.P.B.'s arrival in England in May 1887.

Judging from his letters the Colonel has not grasp enough of the situation to deal with it, or even to be a real support for H.P.B. He is too much afraid of S.R. & the Englishmen at Adyar on one hand &, worse than all,—he seems to have got some crooked notions about H.P.B. into his head on the other. He lays to her credit all the rows & squabbles which have arisen in the T.S. & generally seems not to have full confidence in her wisdom.

Therefore, the more I think, the more I am opposed to her going back to Adyar unless some real friends can go with her; & even then I am doubtful whether any permanent change for the better could be effected.

[6] That is all I have to say & I hope you will give it careful consideration. Of course you will consider this letter as a private & personal one. #
fraternally yours

Bertram Keightley F.T.S.

P.S. I have shown this to H.P.B. & she wants me to give it to her to send on to you with what she is writing—so I do. She approves the contents.

#¹³ I asked him to let you show the contents to Prof. Coues, as I had an interest he should see it. He consented. He knows nothing of our new relations, nor shall anyone know of them except us three. We must save the original T.S. at any cost. Bert did not tell you half of what goes on at Adyar for he does not know it, but all he says is perfectly true & you have to act upon it accord-

ingly. C.O. writes to everyone he can think of trying to undermine the earlier teaching & upset our Masters philosophy & all. It is a regular conspiracy of which poor O.¹⁴ knows next to nothing. But so long as this lasts I refuse to return to Adyar, [nor shall?] Master allows this to go on. Bad times my poor Judge more strife & fight than ever. May They bless you two & help you for the work. We have all the Dugpas against us.

Yours, HPB

¹³This note is in Blavatsky's handwriting.

¹⁴Olcott.

Stranded Bishops (Part IV of the OTO)

P.R. König

It is my opinion that the Swiss leader of the OTO [Ordo Templi Orientis], H.J. Metzger, was responsible for linking the OTO-phenomena to that of “apostolic succession,” that is, with the “antioch-jacobinic succession, syro-Malabar-line of Mar Athanasius since 1877.”¹ In order to understand this assertion the reader will need to bear in mind the following three, very simplified, lines of succession:

- A: Vilatte-line;
- B: Gnostic Church of Jules Doinel (1842-1902);
- C: split under Joanny Bricaud (1881-1934).

A. Paulose Kadavil Kooran (Mar Athanasius, 1833-1907), legate of Ignatius Peter III of Antiocha, was Syrio-Jacobinic bishop of Kottayam in Malabar. On 29 July 1889 he consecrated Joseph René Vilatte, who took the name Mar Thimoteus I. He was born in 1854 and was ordained on 7 June 1885 “as a priest of the Swiss “Christkatholische Kirche,” a branch of the “Altkatholische Utrechter Union.” Vilatte then proceeded to consecrate a vast number of bishops, but these consecrations and the Orders he founded were not recognized by the Jacobite Church, the Syrian-Antiochan Church or the Roman Catholic Church.

¹ Metzger’s publication of Crowley’s *Ecclesiae Gnosticae Catholicae* (Zürich, 1955), 4. Also in Metzger, *Erleuchtetete* (Zürich, 1964).

Leaving aside dates and full details, the following line of succession leads to the OTO-phenomena: Alvarez, Vilatte, Gulotte, Hussay, Giraud and Joanny Bricaud (not before 21 July 1913). Vilatte died in 1929.

B. On 21 September 1890 in France a new church was formed: Jules-Stanislas Doinel founded “L’Église Gnostique” and called himself Patriarch Valentin II. Doinel had close friends within Theosophy, for example with Lady Caithness.² In 1891 the theosophist Gérard Encausse (Papus) (1865-1916) founded Martinism and in 1892 entered Doinel’s church.

In 1894 Doinel surrendered his office to the Martinist Bernard-Raymond Fabre des Essarts (Synesius, 1848-1907). In 1901 Bricaud became involved. On 24 June 1901 Theodor Reuss became Martinist “Inspecteur Spécial” for Berlin, his superior was Papus. In 1906 the name of the Gnostic Church was changed into the “Église Gnostique de France.”

In 1907 Patriarch des Essarts died and Bricaud (now Jean II) took his place. But in 1908 a gnostic schism occurred: the wing of Lyon under Bricaud called itself firstly “Église Gnostique Catholique” (EGC) but soon “Église Gnostique Universelle” (EGU); the “original” “Église Gnostique” of Paris was taken over by Léon Champrenaud

² Forestier, 63. Also Joscelyn Godwin, *Theosophy in France* (London: Theosophical History Centre, 1986).

(Theophane) and disintegrated in 1926 under Paul Genty (Basilides).

C: Papus remained faithful to his Patriarch Bricaud. In 1911 EGU became the official church of Papus' Martinism. In 1912 Bricaud made Reuss a "Légit Gnostique" although Bricaud did not receive a valid apostolic succession until 1913.

After the death of Papus in 1916, Charles Détré took over both Memphis-Misraïm (MM) and Martinism, then both were taken over by Bricaud when Détré died in 1918. Similar to the split of the Gnostic Church in 1908, the French OTO was torn apart in 1918. The alleged history of Lucien-François Jean-Maine will be discussed below, in brief.

Gnostics and Templars

On 15 March 1908³ Reuss gave Papus a charter conferring MM-titles. This was re-done on 24 June 1908, this time bestowing MM-titles to Papus, Détré and Bricaud.⁴ The papers are devoid of any reference to the OTO or the Gnostic Church. On 21 April 1912 Aleister Crowley received MM-and OTO-degrees valid for England and Ireland (not America) but again, no Church was mentioned.

Around 1917 Reuss translated Crowley's Gnostic Mass into German in order to distribute the text among his followers on Monte Verità (see *Theosophical History* V/1: 23f.). In the epilogue Reuss spoke of himself as "present Head of the Gnostic Neo-Christians [that is, the OTO], Sovereign Patriarch and Primate of the Gnostic Church." At the same time and place he spoke of Patriarch Bricaud of whom he [Reuss] was only the Swiss legate of

EGU. Why Reuss equated his [own?] church with Bricaud's remains unanswered.

On 18 September 1919 Reuss was made a Gnostic Legate for Switzerland by Bricaud again. Reuss reciprocated by making Bricaud "délégué générale" of the French OTO. Bricaud now initiated the idea of introducing Crowley's Gnostic Mass as "religion for the 18° freemasons," which led to the definite rupture between OTO and freemasonry in 1920.

In 1921 Bricaud's stationery bore the legend "Église Chrétienne moderne Néognostique," which is strongly reminiscent of Reuss' "Aufbauprogramm und Leitsätze der Gnostischen Neo-Christen O.T.O."⁵

One mass no church doth make

Although neither Reuss nor Crowley were ever consecrated (at least not in the flesh), several branches of OTOs recently pretended that both Reuss and Crowley were bishops and Patriarchs. They also claimed that the office of Headship of OTO (OHO: [*Outer Head of the Order*]) equals the Patriarchship of a (or "The") Gnostic Church, which position should go along the lines of apostolic succession. The question arises as to the authenticity of such claims.

Robert Amadou, an authority on French occultism wrote a letter dated 31 March 1990 (translated):

1. The matters of OTO are strange to me. 2. I am not aware that either Reuss or Crowley ever received valid apostolic succession. 3. Re: history of the French Gnostic Churches I have never seen the slightest evidence to suggest that a) Papus ever received any other

³ Caillet, 46. See also Clymer, *Book of Rosicruciae*, II, 254.

⁴ Caillet, xx. Encausse: 33°, 90°, 96°. Détré: 33°, 90°, 95°.

⁵ Bad Schmiedeberg 1920, reprint in *AHA* 2 (Bergen/Dumme), 1992: 13, and *Der Kleine Theodor Reuss - Reader*.

consecration than the one conferred by Jules Doinel in 1892; b) that Bricaud ever would have consecrated Crowley a bishop.”

Therefore, if Reuss ever had a valid consecration to give away before 1912, it would only have been Doinel’s spiritual one.

The question arises as to whether Reuss’ MM/OTO-Charter to Crowley in 1912 could be interpreted as evidencing the conferring of gnostic apostolic succession or not. Since Bricaud only received valid consecration via Giraud for EGU after July 1913⁶, his appointing Reuss a gnostic legate in 1912 was not apostolic.

Did Bricaud consecrate Reuss after 1913? If so, did Reuss consecrate Crowley between 1913 and 1914 while they were in London? Did they ever meet afterwards (for example after 1918)? While Crowley travelled to the US in 1914, Reuss published in “Honesty is the best policy”⁷ that Crowley should be Grandmaster of the OTO only for England. In 1919 Reuss again was made a gnostic legate through Bricaud. Would Reuss have then consecrated Crowley since he never used thelemic rituals? In November 1921, Reuss got rid of Crowley and separated Thelema from the OTO.

Karl Germer, Crowley’s heir, reported that Reuss met Crowley in 1922 in Palermo, Italy,⁸ but this has not been substantiated by documents or diaries. However, Crowley’s diary for 27 November 1921 notes: “I have proclaimed myself O.H.O. Frater Superior of the Order of Oriental Templars.” Crowley’s diaries between 1914 and 1920 do not mention any church at all. Reuss’ OTO-statutes of 1917 (of which Crowley’s 1919-version, *Liber III*,

only abbreviates versions already published in 1912 and 1914) do not equate OTO with the Gnostic Church. Crowley’s version only says that the “wisdom and the knowledge” of several organisations—including the Gnostic Church—should be incorporated in the OTO, but not the organisations themselves. Yet Crowley’s acknowledgement in the *Giant’s Thumb* (1915) does seem to link the OHO to the Gnostic Church.⁹

William Bernard Crow

If ever Crowley equated OHO with Patriarchship, it was in August 1944 when he made the teacher of biology and Theosophical priest of the Liberal Catholic Church (up to 1935), W.B. Crow (d. 28 June 1976), a “Sovereign Patriarch of the Gnostic Church and Vicar of Salomon with full rights, power . . .” etc. etc. With this, the question as to who is Patriarch of the Crowley-OTO Gnostic Church is fully answered! Crow only performed consecrations twice after August 1944: on 3 September 1944, Henry George Brook; on 11 April 1972, Kermit William Poling (Mar Titus), Patriarch of the upmost conservative orthodox Catholic Church of America in Pennsboro, West Virginia. “On 16th August 1948, the “Grand Master of the Order of the Holy Wisdom” (*i.e.* Crow) assumed the 33°, 90° and 97° and included the XII° OTO (Crowley in later years developed a twelve degree OTO-system¹⁰).

⁶ Forestier, 167.

⁷ Reuss/Crowley, Schmiedeberg 1915, 4.

⁸ Karl Germer to C.H. Petersen, letter dated 6 January 1954.

⁹ “To The Most Holy King Of The Whole Earth Most Reverend Father In The Lord Of The Gnostic Catholic Church Frater Superior O.H.O. Of The Religious And Military Order Of The Temple Oriental And Occidental,” that is Theodor Reuss, New York 1915.

¹⁰ Warburg Ms 30.2 Gerald Yorke Collection, reprinted in *AHA* 8/91: 16.

It remains noteworthy that NONE of the existing OTO-branches possess the ONLY Crowley-consecration-line.

E.C.H. Peithmann and E.T. Kurtzahn

Dr. Peithmann (Basilides, born 3 May 1865) published in approximately 1904 a “Gnostic Catéchisme” which is reminiscent of the 1899 “Catéchisme explained by the Gnostic Church” of Louis-Sophrone Fugairon (Sophonius).¹¹ Fugairon was bishop under des Essarts and later under Bricaud. Peithmann found Reuss’ OTO “useless.”

In 1920, Peithmann founded in Germany the “Altgnostische Kirche von Eleusis” (Ancient Gnostic Church of Eleusis) to rebuild/transform the sexual force and the semen’s resurrection from slavery. He believed that a lustful life and orgasm should be avoided and therefore turned his back on Crowley around 1929.

Peithmann was expelled by the Nazis in March 1933 and moved to the United States, never recontacting his members, the last of which died in 1986.¹²

Moving in the same circles as Peithmann was the Reuss-OTO-member Ernst Tristan Kurtzahn (born 29 November 1879). A very enthusiastic Ariosophian, he also wrote books about Rosicrucians (1920), the Tarot (1920) and finally about the Gnostics and their Invisible Church (1925), where he unveiled the mysteries of ascetical sex-magic, of death and of women and the Devil.

¹¹ Bricaud wrote a “Catéchisme Gnostique” in 1907.

¹² Letter from Ewald Dorpheide, secretary of the sexmagical oriented Ordo Saturni, a derivation of the Fraternitas Saturni. Dorpheide visited the last member of Peithmann’s Church one year before he died. Article on the Fraternitas Saturni in *Nuit-Isis* 5, poorly translated; see Corrigenda in *Nuit-Isis* 6.

At the same time as Arnoldo Krumm-Heller, Kurtzahn (alias Daïytanus), participated in Reuss’ OTO-meetings around 1920. In the magazine *Weltloge* (no.1, 1924), Kurtzahn called himself “Ekklesiarch” of the EGC.

Although Arnoldo Krumm-Heller met Charles Leadbeater in 1930 in London, he did not hold any Liberal Catholic Church consecration, since he set his face against Theosophy. He wrote that he was consecrated Bishop of “Iglesia Gnostica” in London at a congress of the “Antigua Iglesia Gnostica” with the charge to revive this Church. I was not able to find any specific evidence, however. Soon thereafter, Krumm’s powers were confirmed by “Basilides” and he was charged to take care of Spain and America.¹³

Herbert Fritsche

Constant Chevillon became Bricaud’s successor in France when Bricaud died in 1934. The EGU received another valid apostolic line when Giraud consecrated Chevillon on 5 January 1936 into the Vilatte-line (see *Theosophical History* V/1 for what Chevillon thought about the OTO). Chevillon consecrated Reuben Swinburne Clymer in 1938 and in 1939 allegedly Arnoldo Krumm-Heller (1879-1949, dealt with in *Nuit-Isis* 9). “Dr. Krumm-Heller was Bishop of the Gnostic Church, using the English Ritual, and by the death of Peithmann (1943) was designated as the Patriarch of the Gnostic Church for Germany-Austria.”¹⁴

¹³ Krumm-Heller, “Recuerdos de mi peregrinacion,” in *Rosa-Cruz* (Berlin) IV/3 (1930): 229, 232 (Interview with Charles Leadbeater).

¹⁴ Clymer, 268.

Allegedly Krumm-Heller, shortly before he died in 1949, gave over his office of Patriarch of the EGC (EGU?) to Herbert Fritsche (1911-1960). In 1957 Fritsche made Metzger a bishop and the latter inherited the Patriarchship following Fritsche's death in 1960 in a mental hospital.¹⁵

While Metzger's OTO letterhead only listed the OTO, MM, FRA (Fraternitas Rosicruciana Antiqua), AASR (Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite) and FLH (Brotherhood of Light), his Church stationary equated this EGC with the EGU, even though this church was and still is led by present French patriarchs.

In Metzger's system of OTO, that is, Ordo Illuminatorum (see *Nuit-Isis* 7), the highest degrees, the Illuminati, are priests of the EGC. Like the pietistic model of individualistic piety already assumed by E.T. Kurtzahn, Patriarch "+ H. Josephus M[etzger]" saw his church as "Ecclesiola in Ecclesia" and sought contact with the established churches on a level of ecumenicity. But when he sent a telegram to Pope John XXIII he attracted the attention of the authorities, who soon found out that the Swiss Abbey of Thelema, between 1963-1967, bought 3800 hosts¹⁶, incense and even the wine for the Mass from official Catholic sources.¹⁷ When Crowley's Gnostic mass officially was announced in daily newspapers the gutter press was attracted and caused a scandal in 1972.

¹⁵ A close collaborator of Metzger saw the papers from Fritsche to Metzger, but nothing between Krumm-Heller and Fritsche. Interview with M. Kumer on 8 September 1991.

¹⁶ Metzler, "Vertrauliche Mitteilungen", appr. 1968.

¹⁷ Horst Knaut in *Quick* (München) 29 (12 July 1972): 30.

Jean-Maine, Bertiaux and the "Caliph"

Since no documentary evidence is available, I only can outline the alleged history as given in several sources (e.g. listed at the end of this article).

- Lucien-François Jean-Maine, born 11 January 1869, received MM on 15 August 1899 and consecrations in 1907 (1908?) through Papus and on 11 January 1918 through Bricaud. However, in none of the old French EGC/EGU - or OTO-magazines is his name mentioned.

- Hector-François Jean-Maine, born 18 January 1924 was first consecrated on 27 January 1949 by Robert Ambelain, then on 25 January 1953 by his father, again by Ambelain on 2 November 1959, and in the EGU on 2 November 1963. On 2 November 1968 he consecrated Michael Paul Bertiaux. Finally, he received consecration by Marc-Antoine Lullyanov on 18 January 1972.

- M. P. Bertiaux, born 18 January 1935, allegedly a confirmed Roman Catholic, was made a priest by the Protestant-Episcopal Church on 24 June 1963 and on 15 August 1963 was made Bishop by Hector-François Jean-Maine. Bertiaux went to Haiti for the Anglican Episcopal Church, and converted there to Voodoo. In Chicago he worked near Wheaton for the Theosophical Society under Dr. Henry Smith.

The following gnostic lines came to Bertiaux (abbreviated): Marcion (Ambelain, Robert Bonnet); Basilides (Adhémar, Shreves, Lully and on 31 August 1968 Saint-Charles); Valentinus (in the 1970s Adhémar, Marraga, Barber, Rodriguez).

Bertiaux consecrated Jack B. Hogg Jr. on 2 June 1968 who, on 12 August 1974, consecrated the present "Caliph", (head of the re-established American OTO of 1977, see *Nuit-Isis* 6).

Based on the new idea that “Caliph,” OHO, and Patriarch are identical, and in order to give his OTO-group a traditional Gnostic background, the following consecration scheme was invented by the “Caliph”:

a) Papus, Reuss, Crowley, McMurtry, Breeze
b) Vilatte, Lines, Boyle, Wadle, William Wallace Webb, Lully, Bertiaux, Hogg, Breeze.¹⁸

a): Nothing may be added to what already has been expressed at the beginning of this article, except that it is claimed that the so-called “Caliphate” letters should imply consecration, per postal intercourse, although no church or anything similar is mentioned. McMurtry only was allowed to act in emergency for the Californian branch of the OTO under supervision of Karl Germer (see *Nuit-Isis* 6).

b): W.W. Webb: “Wadle never made me a bishop.”¹⁹ When I found this out, Breeze took a new stance on consecrations (transmitting the “Holy Spirit/Ghost”) by letter.²⁰ “I don’t particularly care,”²¹ and he announced a forthcoming new “EGC”-“OTO” policy. In the meantime one had to be satisfied that “Elevation to the Sovereign Sanctuary of the Gnosis *ipso facto* makes one a

Bishop and leadership of such a body *ipso facto* makes one a Patriarch.”²²

“The Gnostic Catholic Church Scandal” was documented between 1989 and 1990 in the *Bablasti Papers*.²³ No consecrations took place any longer in the “Caliphate” Church until in a back-dated *Magical Link* (V/3, appeared in February 1992!) the “Caliph” announced the Holy Ghost now being regulated with the IV°- and VII°-Crowley-OTO-initiation-rituals²⁴ and that it should not be dependent upon the apostolic succession of a “Wandering Bishop” type. But since Phyllis Seckler at the same time (Spring 1992) equated the EGC with the EGU²⁵ there is cause for more endless discussions again. In October 1994 the term “catholic” was dropped in the “caliphate” Gnostic Church.

The constitution of the pertinent Gnostic Church makes the “Caliph” Patriarch of this church, which is technically illegal in the United States.²⁶ Furthermore, I was not able to find the incorporation note of the “Caliphatic” OTO.²⁷

¹⁸ *Gnostic Gneus* (California) I/3 (1989): 4.

¹⁹ W.W. Webb, letter dated 6 March 1990, also on 17 October 1989.

²⁰ Consecration by postal intercourse between Webb and Lully/Bertiaux was admitted by Webb in a letter dated 17 October 1989.

²¹ *Magical Link* III/4, postdated 1990, appeared in Autumn 1989.

²² *Bystander* I/4 (December 1986)

²³ New Orleans.

²⁴ IV°: Priest/Priestess, VII°: Bishop.

²⁵ *In the Continuum* (Oroville 1992): 23.

²⁶ *Aurora Borealis* (Edmonton) I/9 (1986): 8.

²⁷ NYS Department of State, Division of Corporation and State Records, letter dated 10/23/90 to L.S.: “We have no record of a corporation filed with this office under the name ORDO TEMPLI ORIENTIS.”

Ed. Due to the most complicated interconnection of dates and events I must refer the reader to the following sources. When not footnoted in the text I refer to these books:

1. Bain, Alan. *Bishops Irregular*. Bristol: Alan Bain, 1985.
2. Ward, G., Bertil Persson and Alain Bain. *Independent Bishops*. Detroit, Michigan: Apogee Books, 1990.
3. Melton, J.Gordon. *Encyclopedia of American Religions*. Second edition. Detroit 1987.

Unfortunately, the above three sources contain much false information!

4. Anson, P. *Bishops at Large*. London 1964.
5. Brandreth, Henry R.T. *Episcopi Vagantes*. London 1947. Second edition. London: St. Willibrod Press, 1987.
6. Clymer, R.S. *The Book of Rosicruciae*. Quakertown, PA 1946-49.
7. Plazinski, Edmund. *Mit Krummschwert und Mitra*. Augustin-Buisdorf 1970.
8. Haack, F.-W. *Gottes 5 Kolonne*. Augsburg 1977.
9. _____. *Freibischöfliche Kirchen im deutschsprachigen Raum*. München 1980.
10. Ibid. *Religion und Dekoration*. München, 1990.
11. Frick, Karl. *Licht und Finsternis*. Graz: Akademie Verlag, 1978), pages 337, 341, 513 and 517.
12. Howe, Ellic and Helmut Möller. *Merlin Peregrinus*. Würzburg 1986, page 226.
13. Le Forestier, René. *L'église gnostique*. Paris 1946. Second edition published in Mailand 1989.
14. Caillet Serge. *Franc-Maçonnerie*. Paris: Cariscritp, 1986.

15. Robert Amadou's *Preface* to Kostka, Jean (Jules Doinel), "Lucifer Démasqué." Genf 1983. First edition published in 1895.

16. Thibauderie, Ivan de la. *Églises et évêques Catholiques non Romains*. Paris.

17. Succession lists in *AHA* (Bergen) 11 (1991): 6 and 12.

18. *Nuit-Isis* (Oxford) 1988f.

19. König, P.R., *Der Kleine Theodor Reuss-Reader*" München: ARW (P.O. Box 500 107, D-80971), 1994. ISBN 3-927890-13-8. The book contains the OTO rituals of Reuss and many of his rare and sex-magical writings.

© 1994 P.R. König, Switzerland²⁸

²⁸ I would like to thank Clive Harper for a number of helpful comments made on an earlier draft of this article.

Book Reviews

THE ROSE CROSS AND THE AGE OF REASON. EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ROSICRUCIANISM IN CENTRAL EUROPE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE ENLIGHTENMENT. By Christopher McIntosh. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992 (Series: Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, no. 29). Pp. viii + 212. ISBN 9004095020. \$63.00.

Christopher McIntosh, already a well-known author of serious esoteric works (*The Astrologers and Their Creed*, 1969; *Eliphas Lévi and the French Occult Revival*, 1972; *The Rosy Cross Unveiled*, 1980; *The Devil's Bookshelf*, 1985), completed a doctoral dissertation at Oxford University in 1989, of which this is a revised version.

The book is a priceless contribution to our knowledge of eighteenth-century esoteric movements. Based on manuscript and early printed sources in European libraries, it sets out the history of the "Order of the Golden and Rosy Cross" and places it in its social, religious, and political contexts. McIntosh argues for seeing the "complex of theosophical, mystical, hermetic and Pietistic tendencies of which Rosicrucianism was part" (p.21) as a third stream, distinct from the obvious antagonism between the established churches and the Enlightenment philosophy. He shows how the third stream reacts against exoteric religion, thereby often allying itself with the skeptical Enlightenment's revolt against Churchianity; yet it also seeks to satisfy "a spiritual thirst that could not be quenched by rationality" (*loc. cit.*).

Historians who approach the Rosicrucian movement from the outside, i.e., without esoteric sympathies, are often restricted in their imaginations about it, and tend to see in black and white terms "which side it is on." In the present case, this has led to a view of Rosicrucianism by scholars as a Counter-Enlightenment movement, because it seems to them as "irrational" as can be. McIntosh shows what every historian of Theosophy knows: that esotericism is as likely to ally itself with the "left wing" in this conflict, being in its own way much more rational than exoteric religion with its dogmas, its faith, and its fundamentalism. The primary thesis of the work is that the Golden and Rosy Cross Order owed as much to one side as to the other.

The "new" Rosicrucians of the eighteenth century differed markedly from the originals of the early 1600s. Instead of looking forward to the reformation of the world, McIntosh says, they looked back to the theosophic and alchemical tradition, never stronger than at the first Rosicrucian period (the time of Khunrath, Maier, Boehme, etc.). Nor did they oppose the Catholic Church as the first Rosicrucians did: the Thirty Years War had intervened, leaving religious tolerance as the only viable stance in their fragmented country. Likewise Jews were at first admitted to the order.

The ingredients of the order included a strong influence from Pietism, via the founding father Samuel Richter ("Sincerus Renatus"), and a close connection with Freemasonry, especially the col-

orful high degree systems. The large proportion of aristocratic members included radical thinkers as much as conservatives, while a crossover in membership with the Illuminati of Bavaria implied a great range of spiritual styles. The language and symbolism of the order was alchemical, and many members were operative alchemists (a whole chapter is devoted to this). Unlike the Enlightenment thinkers, the order was rather negative towards sexuality and the body, being Gnostic in its theology.

When Frederick William II succeeded Frederick the Great in 1786 he was already a Rosicrucian and under the influence of his mentors Bischoffswerder and Wöllner. The King made the mistake of meddling in the religious life of Prussia, and trusting to the advice of a trance medium. The villain of the piece seems to have been a Pietist pastor ironically named H. D. Hermes. By 1790, attacked alternately as a tool of the Counter-Enlightenment and as a branch of the Illuminati, the order was virtually defunct.

A chapter on Rosicrucianism in Poland and Russia, admittedly based only on German sources, introduces further complications, especially the role of the publisher N. I. Novikov, by whom “the Russian reading public was introduced to a whole range of mystical and esoteric writings” (p.156). Another illuminate came to the throne in the person of Tsar Alexander I, designer of the Holy Alliance. McIntosh argues that this was directly connected to the order’s activities, being a recreation of what had been attempted by the Prussian king’s mentors.

A chapter on Hans Heinrich von Ecker und Eckhoffen’s “Asiatic Brethren” is the fullest account in English of this offshoot of the Golden and Rosy Cross: unique mainly because “it welcomed Jewish members (at least for a time) and was

steeped in Jewish esoteric lore” (p.161). Otherwise known as the *Fratres Lucis*, this order and its survivals bring us up to the period of Bulwer-Lytton, supposedly initiated in Germany into something of the kind. It also suggests connections with that other *Fratres Lucis* of the 1870s, possibly linked with H.P.B. and her “Brotherhood of Luxor,” which as David Board has pointed out means also “Brotherhood of Light.” McIntosh does not go so far historically, but his documentation of the earlier order is an indispensable bedrock for speculation on the later ones.

The book is enhanced by a huge bibliography and by the few engravings that can definitely be traced to the order. (The publisher has printed one of them in reverse.) Dr. McIntosh has produced a solid work of scholarship that establishes his main argument beyond reasonable doubt. As always, he writes with the intention of giving pleasure as well as instruction.

Joscelyn Godwin

* * *

THEOSOPHY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY. By Michael Gomes. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1994. Pp. vi + 582, with author index. ISBN 0-8240-8094-7. [Religious Information Systems, vol. 15; Garland Reference Library of Social Science, vol. 532]. \$88.

This excellent resource represents the fruits of an exhaustive search for published primary sources on nineteenth-century Theosophy, plus all relevant secondary literature. A glance at the Contents will give a sense of what this volume offers. Chapter 1 is a Historical Introduction; Chapter 2 covers Histories and Biographies by Theosophists and Non-Theosophists; Chapter 3 gives Background Works for *Isis Unveiled*, *The Secret Doctrine* and nineteenth century occult works generally; Chapter 4 presents works of H.P. Blavatsky; Chapter 5 works about her; Chapter 6 literature on the Mahatma Letters and A.P. Sinnett; Chapter 7 other nineteenth century works by Theosophists; and Chapter 8 deals with Critical Issues: the Coulombs, Richard Hodgson, and the S.P.R. Report; "Solovyov's Modern Priestess of Isis," Coleman and the plagiarism charges; "Elliott Coues and the N.Y. Sun Libel Case," and the Judge case. A final Chapter 9 lists and annotates Theosophical periodicals of the era. If there are omissions, apart from a few secondary works which have already appeared since this manuscript was sent to the publisher, they are few and far between.

The Historical Introduction includes a colorful and fascinating account of the bibliographer's world-ranging travels in the course of tracking down this material. Each subsequent chapter has a few pages of incisive introduction, and each entry a few descriptive lines, often in the form of a key quotation from the work itself.

Chapter 8, on Critical Issues, will undoubtedly be of prime interest to many readers. In a ten-page introduction, Gomes concisely summarizes, with documentary references, the salient facts and charges in each issue. Though the chapters on the life of H.P. Blavatsky provide less extensive treatment of the vast panorama of critical issues surrounding her career, such as her travels during the hidden years before 1874, the alleged child, or the relation to Metrovitch, there are scattered references and guidelines for the researcher on where to go. A good example of Gomes' approach is his treatment of a biography undoubtedly well-known to many readers of this journal, Marion Meade's *Madame Blavatsky: The Woman Behind the Myth* (item 1022).

Heavily indebted to Williams' 1946 biography (item 1211), and like its model the storyline of what should be frequently carries away her pen from describing what actually happened. "Two mornings after her [H.P.B.'s] return from Chittenden, full of optimism and self-possession, she opened the *Daily Graphic* to find catastrophe staring up at her. In a sarcastic article by Dr. George Beard, the Eddy brothers were denounced as frauds..." (p. 126). But unless she was as imaginative as Meade she could not have seen Beard's letter to the editor there, for it appeared in the N.Y. *Sun*! "Some years later, Jennie Holmes would admit to a founder of the Theosophical Society that Madame had arranged the spurious phenomenon for Olcott's benefit" (p. 135). But as I have shown in item 839, Jennie Holmes said no such thing. Unfortunately these slips of the pen are not isolated incidents and mar the portrait of Blavatsky as a witty old scallywag. Reviewed by item 1254.

This book is bound to become the Bible, or perhaps one should say the Secret Doctrine, of all future research on H.P. Blavatsky and Theosophical history. Not only is it a synopsis of sources which far surpasses all previous bibliographies, but it is also a collocation of witty and sometimes wise opinions on them, and withal a pocket treasury of Theosophical history and its controversies.

However, some may feel that in his treatment of the controverted issues, Gomes is too inclined to be defensive of the conventional Theosophical position. Personally, I do not detect any improper bias in this direction, but I suppose it is fair to say that, while obviously not credencing every claim made by any Theosophist, he is more sceptical of claims advanced by the opposition. But he has certainly done enough to be entitled to a point of view so long as it is well-supported, as manifestly it is here, and in any case, regardless of one's position on Theosophy, I would like to think that any fair-minded person will feel that it is time now for careful re-examination of the standard charges advanced over and over against Blavatsky and early Theosophy. As Gomes points out, for far too long critics have simply repeated time and time again, often at second hand, a small number of accusations, such as those of the Hodgson Report and Coleman on plagiarism, without bothering to take a fresh look at the original prosecutor's brief. Gomes gives us the materials and the arguments to do so. The case for the defense on these points needs to be authoritatively stated. This Gomes has implicitly done, and, more importantly, he backs it up with formidable scholarship with which any future scholar, pro or con, will have to contend.

Let it be emphasized, though, that *Theosophy in the Nineteenth Century* is not primarily an

advocacy book but simply an excellent and lively annotated bibliography, which presents everything accessible to the editor on all sides. The definitive history of Theosophy, like the definitive biography of Helena P. Blavatsky in all her variety, is yet to be written. The writers of these books (if they are other than Gomes, who really ought to be the one) will find much of their spadework already done for them by Michael Gomes. Not let them turn on their word processors and get to writing.

Robert S. Ellwood

* * * * *