

Unofficial

*ps*

# SOME REASONS WHY

THE MEMBERS OF

THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD AND THEO-  
SOPHICAL SOCIETY DO NOT ENDORSE  
MRS. BESANT NOR THE SOCIETY  
OF WHICH SHE IS PRESIDENT

---

Ever since the action taken by members of the parent Theosophical Society (founded by H. P. Blavatsky in New York in 1875) at the Boston Convention in 1895, followed immediately by similar action taken by all the faithful members in other parts of the world, the members of the parent Theosophical Society (now the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society of which Katherine Tingley is Leader and Official Head, with International Headquarters at Point Loma, California) have refused to endorse Mrs. Besant or the society of which she is president, or in any way to regard her as a member of or identified with the true Theosophical Society. And this first public protest made by the Boston Convention in 1895 has been continually justified; every year since then new reasons have been added for making it.

---

BY  
**JOSEPH H. FUSSELL**  
Point Loma, California, U. S. A.

*subm. p. 8.*

---

PRINTED BY  
"The San Diego News" Press, San Diego, California



## FOREWORD

In giving the following reasons for this protest I desire to say at the outset that I do not in any way wish it to be understood that I implicate all members of Mrs. Besant's society, or regard all of such members as being directly responsible for what I hold are grave evils, existing either in fact or potentially, in that society, so-called "Theosophical," and hence defiling the fair name of Theosophy. On the contrary, I believe that many of those members are earnest in their search for truth, but that they are ignorant of the true history of the Theosophical Movement. Did they realize what evils threaten their society from within, and the full import of some of the Leadbeater-Besant teachings; and on the other hand, did they realize even a little of the purport of the true Theosophical teachings—which are as old as the ages—given again to the world in our day by H. P. Blavatsky; did they realize how H. P. Blavatsky lived and suffered for Theosophy and to keep its teachings undefiled for the purification of human life; did they realize these things, they would not give even their negative support to those Leadbeater-Besant doctrines which are diametrically opposite to the teachings of true Theosophy. For the teachings given by H. P. Blavatsky publicly as well as those given to her faithful pupils and still kept sacred by them, inculcate, and insist upon the necessity of following, the highest moral code—not mere ideals however lofty, but the **practice** of Theosophy as a **sine qua non** of human progress, spiritual enlightenment, and true happiness.

Did the members of Mrs. Besant's society really seek to know and follow the teachings of Theosophy in order that they might help to lift the burdens of humanity, they would protest as I am protesting. And I am bringing to the attention of my readers no mere gossip, no speculation or inference, but well attested facts, and direct statements made by Mrs. Besant, every one of which facts and statements can be substantiated. From the standpoint of commonsense and simple morality, they are blocks in the path of those searching for the Truth.

I am not writing in defence of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, which is the original Theosophical Society founded by Madame Blavatsky in New York in 1875, nor am I writing in defence of the true teachings of Theosophy. These teachings need no defence. The parent Society, now called the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, needs no defence. It is strong and secure, doing a vast humanitarian work, and actively working in the world as a united harmonious body.

I am writing to give information to the public, to enquirers, and searchers after truth; to point out certain pitfalls and dangers, and to give warning that they may not fall therein. I am writing because a continual demand is made for answer to these questions, namely, to show wherein the true Theosophy differs from certain teachings put forward by Mrs. Besant and in her society, and because the public is entitled to know. Finally I am writing for the public good. It is not a pleasant subject. It is, however, a duty to speak of these things, a sacred duty not to be evaded.



... at another time as

## SOME REASONS WHY THE MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD AND THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY DO NOT ENDORSE MRS. BESANT NOR THE SOCIETY OF WHICH SHE IS PRESIDENT

For many years past at all public meetings of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, in the literature of the Society and in correspondence with enquirers the following or similar announcement has been made:

IMPORTANT—Your courteous attention is asked to the following, viz: that the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society which is the continuation and expansion of the original Theosophical Society founded by Mme. H. P. Blavatsky, continued under her successor, William Q. Judge, and of which their successor, Katherine Tingley, is the present Leader and Official Head, with International Headquarters at Point Loma, California, is not in any way connected with the so called "Theosophical" Society of which Mrs. Annie Besant is president; and further that many of the teachings put forward and advocated by Mrs. Besant and the members of her society are not considered by the members of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society as being consonant or in harmony with the pure Theosophical teachings promulgated by Mme. H. P. Blavatsky, the Foundress of the Society.

Frequent inquiries are made to the International Theosophical Headquarters at Point Loma from a large circle of friends and from inquirers and correspondents from all parts of the world asking:

"What are the reasons for making such a declaration?"

"Why do you not recognize or endorse the society of which Mrs. Besant is president?"

"Why do you insist on making it known that the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society is in no way connected with that society?"

"What are the teachings put forward by Mrs. Besant which you do not accept and which it is claimed are not in harmony with the pure Theosophical teachings promulgated by H. P. Blavatsky, and taught in the original Theosophical Society, founded by her (now the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society)?"

In particular, new members of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society ask what explanation can they make, because there are many of the public who know little or nothing of the teachings of Theosophy or of the history of the Theosophical Movement, and hence have no means of judging whether statements, put forward under the name "Theosophy," are in any way related to or representative of its teachings.

It is no more right that statements utterly foreign to and having nothing in common with the pure teachings of Theosophy should be taken as Theosophy, than it is right that unchristian teachings utterly foreign to the spirit of Christ should be put forward as Christianity. I have therefore prepared this statement giving some of the reasons why the above protest is made; why it is necessary, and a duty, to make it.

### I.

FIRST: In defence of the innocence of youth, for the protection of the children and the sacredness of home-life, and for the public welfare, I ap-



peal to parents, guardians, educators, and all lovers of home, and make this protest:

BECAUSE of Mrs. Besant's persistent endorsement, laudation and defence of C. W. Leadbeater, in her writings, speeches and in the Law Courts of Madras, proclaiming him before the world as a "Theosophical" teacher, as an initiate, "perhaps the most trusted of his Master's disciples, on the threshold of divinity"; and this in spite of his having confessed to giving degrading advice to young boys—advice which Mrs. Besant herself has characterized as "most mischievous and dangerous," and "dishonorable and unmanly," and yet, at the same time, she would have the public believe he is a spiritual teacher, a man of noble character and pure life—this man, who has given "dishonorable and unmanly" advice, who has confessed to teaching young boys an unclean habit which is regarded by physicians, reformers, alienists, and educators, as being at the root of most of the crime, insanity and physical and mental break-down of the present day, and the combatting of which is one of the most serious problems of our civilization. This degrading advice according to the statements of two of his victims, which have not been disproved, was moreover given by Leadbeater on the plea that it was "Theosophical."

Does any sane person wonder that lovers of Theosophy, which inculcates the highest moral teaching, should protest and refuse to let it be considered that they were, however remotely, associated with, or that they endorsed, such a man as a "Theosophist," or in any other way?

The following is an extract from an exhibit introduced in the case, **Narayaniah vs. Besant**, recently tried in the Madras High Court, in which Mr. Narayaniah sought to regain possession of his two sons, the elder of whom has been declared to be the "Coming Christ," from the guardianship of Mrs. Besant. This exhibit consisted of a letter dated January 25th, 1906, sent by an American lady to Mrs. Besant and making specific charges as follows:

### The Charges Against Leadbeater

"First, that he is teaching young boys given into his care habits of . . . and demoralizing personal practices.

"Second, that he does this with deliberate intent and under the guise of occult training or with the promise of the increase of physical manhood.

"Third, that he has demanded, at least in one case, promises of the utmost secrecy."

The testimony of the boys is such that it is not fit for publication, but one boy said to his mother:

"Mr. Leadbeater told me it would make me strong and manly."

Another boy, when asked what excuse Leadbeater gave for such conduct, said:

"Mother, I think that was the worst part of the whole thing. Somehow he made me believe it was Theosophical."

### Leadbeater Acknowledges Truth of Charges

In his reply to these charges in a letter written after consultation with Mrs. Besant, Leadbeater acknowledged that he did give the advice referred to. At an official inquiry held, in consequence of these charges, before Col. Olcott, who was at the time president of the society in which Mrs. Besant and Leadbeater were members, Leadbeater confessed to having given the advice referred to. At the conclusion of this official inquiry his resigna-



tion, which had previously been placed in Col. Olcott's hands, was accepted. Mrs. Besant later wrote that to re-instate him would be "ruinous," and that she would not re-admit him into her society unless he publicly declared the teaching was "wrong."

### Defence of Leadbeater Dictated by a "Master"!

Then a defence of Leadbeater and of his advice was written by Dr. van Hook, who at the time was the chief official (General Secretary) of Mrs. Besant's Society in the U. S. A. Dr. van Hook claimed it was dictated to him verbatim by a "Master"! His defence received Mrs. Besant's approbation, who also declared it was written under "high influence." Let us see then what this "Master" or "high influence" has to say.

It was most easy for Mr. Leadbeater with clairvoyant vision to see what thought forms were hovering about certain other boys not yet addicted to this degrading practice. . . . Hence the "crime" or "wrong" of teaching the boys the practice alluded to was no crime or wrong at all, but only the advice of a wise teacher. . . . The introduction of this question into the thought of the Theosophical world is but the precursor of its introduction into the thought of the outer world.

That is, that this "Master" in Mrs. Besant's Society, this "high influence," so acknowledged by Mrs. Besant, advocates the introduction of what he himself characterizes as a "degrading" practice. And to this defence of Leadbeater, Mrs. Besant gave her approbation, and very soon after, though she had previously declared that to re-admit him into her Society would be "ruinous," and having also declared she would **not** re-admit him unless he first publicly declared his teaching was "wrong"—she broke her word and re-admitted him not only without his making such public declaration but with "honor"—this teacher of "degrading" practices to the young! SHAME!

### Mrs. Besant's Report Declared False

And it is asserted by some who were members of her society at that time that she issued a false report to the public regarding Leadbeater's re-admission, namely, by publishing in her official magazine, November, 1911, that "by an **unanimous** vote of the General Secretaries, of the Sections of the Society throughout the world, Mr. Leadbeater has again entered the (her so-called) T. S."; whereas two of the General Secretaries, namely, of Germany and Scandinavia **DID NOT VOTE**. This, coupled with the opinion of Mr. Justice Bakewell in the Madras High Court that she broke her promise to Mr. Narayaniah to separate his boys from Leadbeater; and the statement made by Mr. Justice Oldfield in the Appellate Court that "judged by ordinary standards she deviated from common honesty"; and the statement of the Senior Presidency Magistrate before whom were tried the alleged defamation cases which she brought against Dr. Nair and Dr. Rama Rao, namely, that she first denied that she had ever said that Leadbeater's advice was the "only practicable advice in those cases," in which she acknowledged he gave it, but that she afterwards admitted that the idea of such words was contained in one of her letters sent to members of her society—this seeming disregard of truth on the part of Mrs. Besant, or, to use the words of Mr. Justice Oldfield, "her standard of conduct"; and the statement that "her principal witnesses . . . who belonged to Adyar were consciously or unconsciously committed to corroborate her, and would adopt no higher standard than hers to do so," is of itself a good and sufficient reason why all the members of the original Theosophical Society (now



entitled the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society) refuse to endorse her or in any way regard her as a representative of Theosophy, or entitled to stand as an exponent of its teachings.

### Judgments of the Court

Further, in the complaint in the case above referred to (Narayaniah vs. Besant), Mr. Narayaniah made most serious charges against Leadbeater of gross misconduct with his son, the "Coming Christ." The original case was heard before Mr. Justice Bakewell who ordered Mrs. Besant to return the boys to their father. Mrs. Besant appealed against the decision. The appeal was heard before the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Oldfield, who rendered separate concurring judgments. Following are extracts from the opinions of the learned judges after giving due weight to evidence on both sides. Such opinions from such high and impartial sources cannot be lightly set aside.

Mr. Justice Bakewell, before whom the original case was tried, in delivering judgment characterized Leadbeater as holding opinions

which are certainly immoral and such as to unfit him to be a tutor for boys . . . and render him a highly dangerous associate for children.

He further said:

It is true that both he and defendant declared that he has promised not to express or practice those opinions, but no father should be obliged to depend upon a promise of this kind.

I am of opinion that . . . in any case he (the father) is entitled to insist that this training shall not be continued, and that he was also entitled to insist that his children should not be allowed to associate with a person of Mr. Leadbeater's opinions, and now that his wishes have been disregarded, he can demand that his children shall be restored to his custody. . . .

The defendant (Mrs. Besant) has also, in my opinion, broken the understanding by which she was allowed to take them beyond the jurisdiction.

### Plaintiff Acted in Good Faith

#### Leadbeater's Behavior "Unseemly and Indecorous"

In rendering his judgment in the appeal case, the Chief Justice, in regard to the serious charges of gross immorality and misconduct which Mr. Narayaniah, the father of the boys, had brought against Leadbeater, declared:

The question as to how far the father acted in good faith is of course of the greatest importance with reference to the question of the boys' welfare, because it is obvious that their interests would be greatly prejudiced if they were handed over to the guardianship and custody of a man prepared to make charges of this character in connection with his boys knowing them to be false. . . . Very great stress has been laid by the defendant (Mrs. Besant) upon the fact that the plaintiff has made a criminal charge of a very revolting character in which his own son was involved. I am not impressed by this. The father honestly believed that something had happened which would justify the second charge. He was placed in a terrible predicament. If he sought to bring the man to justice he exposed himself to accusation that he was bringing a charge against the child. If for the sake of saving the child he did nothing he exposed himself to the accusation of allowing a terrible crime to remain unpunished.

The plaintiff in cross-examination said: "My accusation was against Mr. Leadbeater associating with the boys and not against the boy himself. I never said anything against my boy. My complaint was against Mr. Leadbeater."

It appears to me that there are undisputed facts which might not unreasonably have given rise to serious suspicions against Mr. Leadbeater. . . .



In my judgment his behavior in connection with these boys was unseemly and indecorous.

### Mrs. Besant's Own Standard of Conduct She "Deviated from Common Honesty"

As to Mrs. Besant's own standard of conduct Mr. Justice Oldfield, in rendering his judgment, said regarding the promise alleged by Narayaniah to have been given by Mrs. Besant that she would separate the boys from Leadbeater:

Plaintiff cannot be expected to support any portion of his case against these two persons (Mrs. Besant and Leadbeater) with the evidence of witnesses from Adyar (Mrs. Besant's headquarters); and it is probable that defendant's (Mrs. Besant's) principal witnesses, who belong to Adyar, were, consciously or unconsciously, committed to corroborate her and would adopt no higher standard than hers to do so. What her standard of conduct is appears from the evidence as to the circumstances in which the understanding (the promise to remove the boys from Leadbeater) above referred to was reached . . . she (Mrs. Besant) made a pretence of having complied with plaintiff's wishes and had taken the boys to Europe, (where they later joined Leadbeater) . . . when thereby she was really effecting the objects she had in mind from the beginning. She may have been able to justify this conduct to herself in the light of her great enthusiasm. But judged by ordinary standards, she deviated from common honesty. And this is material, not merely with reference to her duty to plaintiff, but also as regards the presumption of her trustworthiness, on which we have been invited to act in other connections. . . . The learned Judge's (Mr. Bakewell's) discussion of the two incidents specified in plaintiff's particulars (charging gross misconduct on Leadbeater's part) ended only in a decision that they did not occur, and it is only by implication that he can be held to have decided that plaintiff did not allege them honestly and in good faith. . . . I at once agree with his conclusion that the incidents were not established, since as regards each the direct evidence was that of one witness only and the corroboration for it was insufficient to justify an affirmative finding. But plaintiff's good faith cannot be dealt with so easily. . . .

The question of the fact is not whether plaintiff (the father of the boys) had evidence on which he could reasonably expect to convince a Court of the truth of his charges, but whether he honestly believed, when he made them, that they were true. . . . Now it is material first that plaintiff (the father of the boys) had adduced all the evidence available to him.

#### Conclusion in Plaintiff's Favor Justified

Defendant (Mrs. Besant's) attempt to prove that other innocent occurrences on other dates before Exhibit A, were the foundations on which these charges were founded, and her attempt to show that his subsequent conduct has been irreconcilable with his belief in the truth of those charges have failed and accordingly he must be held to have proved as much as the circumstances admitted of his proving and as the Court should require. So far as the material available justifies a conclusion, it is one in plaintiff's favor. He has established in my opinion that he acted on an honest belief, if not literally in the charges as they were made in the particulars, yet in a substantial foundation for them. And therefore I hold that grounds of appeal, Nos. 27 and 28, have not been substantiated and that the learned Judge's (Justice Bakewell's) order as to costs is not justified. (This was that the plaintiff should pay Mrs. Besant's as well as his own costs.)

I therefore concur in dismissing the appeal with costs and, allowing the memorandum of objections with costs, would modify the decree by making each party liable for his and her costs in the Court of first instance.

There are therefore not only the charges against Leadbeater, and the statements of some of his victims (which have not been disproved); there are not only Leadbeater's written acknowledgment and his confession before the Official Committee of having given the advice to "several" boys, but there are the impartial, well-weighed opinions of the Judge of the High Court of Madras and of the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Oldfield of the Appellate Court.



And yet Mrs. Besant speaks of this man as a spiritual teacher (!) of noble character and pure life (!) on the threshold of divinity (!) while in almost the same breath she characterizes the advice he gave as "dishonorable and unmanly," and "most mischievous and dangerous." The inconsistency is too apparent to need comment.

### A Serious Question

Let me ask unprejudiced and impartial readers, let me ask the fathers and mothers of children, is there not here sufficient justification for asking the following questions, can the teachings of Leadbeater be regarded as sane, moral teachings, are they not a menace to moral and social welfare? Have not all true Theosophists, believing as they do that morality is the basis of true knowledge, progress and happiness, good and sufficient reason for refusing to acknowledge as Theosophical, in any true sense of the word, the society of which Mrs. Besant is president, and in which Leadbeater is regarded as an "honored" member, her co-worker and "fellow-initiate"? Is there not good and sufficient reason for publicly repudiating all connection with or endorsement of such society? Were there no other reason than this it were sufficient for this protest. But there are other reasons:

### II.

BECAUSE of Mrs. Besant's "deliberate" assertion made in 1907 (re-published in 1910) in order, as she said, that members of her Society might know what would be her "policy" as President, viz: and I quote her exact words:

I do not consider that the Theosophical Society has any moral code binding on its members.

She says:

Our religious liberty of opinion—irreligious licence, say dogmatists—is secure.

But may we not have religious liberty and the enforcement of a common level of conduct, above which members may rise, but below which they may not sink? Shall we give liberty of opinion on moral as well as on religious questions? Here some members call a halt. They would not allow a member to hold opinions leading to murder, theft, adultery, any sexual irregularity, or other evil ways. Does the Theosophical Society enforce on its members a moral code, the transgression of which is punishable with expulsion? I do not consider that the Theosophical Society has any moral code binding on its members.

What, in plain English, is the logical inference of this but that, though some members call a halt (and well they may, certainly all self-respecting members) Mrs. Besant does not, and she would allow a member in her society to hold opinions leading to murder, theft, adultery, etc., or in other words, some will say, "immoral license," for she "considers" that her society (which she calls "Theosophical") has no moral code binding on its members. What can one think of this? Is it that she fears to lose some of her members if she insists on a moral code? Is it that she puts members and membership fees above moral worth? And I do not ignore or overlook the fact that she claims that her Society inculcates high ideals. What I do say is that however high the ideals inculcated they are nullified by such a statement as the above, and so I ask:

### Is Not Mrs. Besant's Society Responsible?

Is not the question justified whether in the first place the advocacy of such opinions and teachings just above referred to is not a menace to moral and social welfare, and whether in the next place Mrs. Besant's so-



called "Theosophical" society to the extent to which it endorses Mrs. Besant, whether it does not also endorse and assume responsibility for such teachings? Is not this of itself sufficient cause for making this protest, for if not contradicted, if no protest were made, (seeing that the public ignorant of the facts, might be led to think that Mrs. Besant were speaking of the original Theosophical Society) would not people be justified in thinking that members of the original Theosophical Society, now the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society under the direction of Katherine Tingley, endorsed Mrs. Besant's teachings, and the so-called "Theosophical" society of which she is president? I therefore emphatically protest against any assertion that "The Theosophical Society has no moral code binding on its members"—a statement which I declare is wholly false. I do not dispute Mrs. Besant's right to "consider" that her so-called "Theosophical" Society has no moral code. That is her affair; but if by that term "Theosophical," she intends to imply the original Theosophical Society I pity her ignorance, and say further that being no longer (since 1895) a member of the parent Theosophical Society founded by Mme. H. P. Blavatsky, the International Headquarters of which are now at Point Loma, California, Mrs. Besant is incompetent to speak for it. She doubtless has a right to speak for the so-called "Theosophical" Society of which she is president; but if it is true as she "considers," viz: that it, the Society of which she is president, "has no moral code," that of itself is sufficient to show it is not the true Theosophical Society, and has no right nor title to the name Theosophical, and this irrespective of any "ideals" which she may claim her society inculcates.

### III.

BECAUSE of Mrs. Besant's assertion, published (1911) by her officially as President of her so-called "Theosophical" Society that the Theosophical Society (implying the true Theosophical Society as founded by H. P. Blavatsky) "leaves aside the law of Moses"; which, however, contains such injunctions as the following: "thou shalt do no murder; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not bear false witness; thou shalt not covet; honor thy father and thy mother." Does any sane, moral, person hold that these commandments can be left aside? Mrs. Besant's complete statement is:

It (the Theosophical Society) leaves aside the law of Moses to walk in the spirit of the Buddha, the Christ. It seeks to evolve the inner law, not to impose an outer.

Is not this mere sophistry? For in order to walk in the spirit of the Buddha, the Christ, must not all these commandments first be kept? They cannot be left aside. The inner law cannot be evolved if the outer be not first kept. The less is included in the greater. Jesus himself said, speaking of the Law of Moses, "I came not to destroy (not to set aside) but to fulfil." So likewise all who would walk in his path will not seek to destroy, nor to set aside, but to fulfil the law. He said further that "not one jot nor one tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Does Mrs. Besant who, if we accept the logical inference of her own statement, allows opinions in her society "leading to murder, theft, adultery," etc., does she claim that all the law of Moses has been fulfilled in her society and may therefore be left aside? That there is another aspect of the law of Moses namely, the *lex talionis* is not overlooked. This was, however, not the fundamental law of Moses but rather an expression of the spirit of the times. That this interpretation is correct is shown in the Encyclopaedia



Britannica, ninth edition, in the article "Israel" where mention is made of "the quite universal code of morals which is given in the decalogue as the fundamental law of Israel." It is to be noted, however, that Mrs. Besant's reference to the law of Moses is unqualified. If Mrs. Besant be a "spiritual" teacher as she claims, such a statement that "it (the Theosophical Society) leaves aside the law of Moses," cannot be regarded as having been made heedlessly, but deliberately, and must be taken in its full meaning. To use a term of Euclid is this not a *reductio ad absurdum*, and is not the only conclusion this, namely, that Mrs. Besant is not a spiritual teacher, and cannot be regarded as a "fit and proper person" to represent Theosophy?

### No Right Nor Title to the Name Theosophical

Again I ask, is not the question justified, whether the advocacy of teachings given by Mrs. Besant in the so-called "Theosophical" Society of which she is president, viz: in regard to the law of Moses and the moral code, and her endorsement of such a man as Leadbeater—whether such things are not a menace to moral and social welfare? As a member of the original Theosophical Society I protest against the assertion that the Theosophical Society, by which I mean the original Theosophical Society, now the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, sets aside the law of Moses, as being wholly false. And if it be true, and we have Mrs. Besant's own statement as basis, that the so-called "Theosophical" Society leaves aside the law of Moses—this of itself is sufficient to show that her society is not the Theosophical Society, and has no right nor title to the name Theosophical. To call it "Theosophical" would be to misrepresent Theosophy, and to mislead the public. The justice of this protest must, I am convinced, appeal to all who really seek the public welfare; and even without any other reason this were sufficient for declaring that we do not endorse Mrs. Besant nor the society of which she is president, nor many of her teachings. And this alone were sufficient to apprise the public of the difference in teaching, with regard to the moral law, between the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, i. e., the original Theosophical Society founded by H. P. Blavatsky, and the pseudo-Theosophical Society of which Mrs. Besant is president.

#### IV.

(4) BECAUSE of the absurd claims made by Mrs. Besant and her followers as to the "Coming Christ," tutored by Leadbeater, one of the most prominent members of her society, declared by her to be "on the threshold of Divinity," but who was recently declared by Mr. Justice Bakewell in the Madras High Court as holding opinions which are "certainly immoral and such as to unfit him to be a tutor of boys" and "render him a highly dangerous associate for children;" and whose advice Mrs. Besant herself characterized in the High Court, Madras, as "dishonorable and unmanly" and yet she placed in his care the education of the "Coming Christ."

#### V.

(5) BECAUSE of the abnormal and preposterous claims—the influence of which I assert cannot be considered otherwise than as most harmful, unwholesome and tending towards insanity—made by Mrs. Besant and Leadbeater, of knowledge of past incarnations of themselves and others through thousands of years, of their clairvoyant visits to Mars and other planets, of the power to read auras, see atoms, and their pseudo-occult claims generally, a tissue of absurdities, harmful in their influence, turn-



ing the attention of inquirers away from the duties and the responsibilities of sane living, and tending to produce disorders of the mind. And yet Mrs. Besant, this so wise woman, had not spiritual light enough, in spite of all her claims, to keep her from publishing an article, over her signature, in her magazine, (March 1910) proclaiming as a "Theosophical worthy," Alexander Fullerton who, up to a short time previous, had held the highest official position in her Society in the U. S. A., and who at about that very time was arrested (Feb. 18, 1910) in New York for writing obscene letters to a young boy. Could my readers have seen those letters they would have been horrified beyond words to think that such a man could have held one of the highest official positions in a so-called "Theosophical" Society, and be named by Mrs. Besant as a "Theosophical worthy." Where was her clear vision which she claims to possess?

Fullerton confessed to the writing of the letters and was sent to the State Lunatic Asylum. In 1909 during the actual period of his writing those letters, Mrs. Besant visited him in his room in New York, he being ill at the time, and yet with all her claims to superior knowledge she appeared to have had no discernment of his real character, or in regard to his connections with young boys with whom he was closely and daily associated;—for if she had, why did she not censure him, why did she not take steps to save him and her Society from disgrace, why did she publish his name as a "Theosophical Worthy"?—as if in flagrant disregard of the fact that the practice of the highest morality is a *sine qua non* of Theosophical worthiness. Against such seeming indifference to moral welfare and the fair name of Theosophy I protest.

## VI.

(6) BECAUSE of the influence, which I regard as most harmful and pernicious, of the colossal egotism and mutual laudation of Mrs. Besant and Leadbeater one of another, claiming to be fellow initiates, and to have "stood in the presence of the Supreme Director of evolution on this globe"—a statement introduced in evidence in the recent suit against Mrs. Besant in the Madras Court; claiming to have read the mind of the Logos; to have clairvoyantly witnessed the dawn of evolution of this world millions of years ago; to have been associated together as "monkey-creatures" on the moon (this statement being made jointly by Mrs. Besant and Leadbeater in an account written by them in collaboration); to have incarnated many times on earth in company with the "Lord Maitreya" and "Jesus," and other great ones, as well as other present members of Mrs. Besant's society, changing sexes and family relationships, now husband of this one and now wife of that, with large families, Jesus being sometimes a man, sometimes a woman!

### Some Astounding Statements

In order that the reader may know some of the astounding statements actually made by Mrs. Besant and Leadbeater as joint authors, I quote the following verbatim from the book referred to. In this book (published in 1913) the various characters referred to are given fanciful names, e. g. of stars, etc., a key to which is given, and in the following brief extracts the present name of the individual referred to is inserted within parentheses after each.

P. 34.—There is a hut in which dwells a Moon-man, his wife and children; . . . A number of these monkey-creatures live round the hut, and give to their owners the devotion of faithful dogs; among them we notice the future Sirius, (Leadbeater), Herakles (Mrs. Besant), Alcyone (the "Coming Christ.")



son of Mr. Narayaniah) and Mizar, (also son of Mr. Narayaniah, both of these boys being minors), to whom we give their future names for the purpose of recognition, though they are still non-human.

P. 15.—Herakles, (Annie Besant), twelve lives further on, was seen as a woman laboring in the fields, advanced enough to cook her rats and other edibles instead of eating them raw, AND WITH A WHOLE PACK OF BROTHERS AS HUSBANDS—Capella, Pindar, Beatrix, Lutetia.

On referring to the table giving the key to the characters in the book, we find that "Herakles" is Annie Besant, and "Lutetia" is Charles Bradlaugh; "Capella" is S. Maude Sharpe; no key is given to the names "Pindar" and "Beatrix," the other two husbands of Herakles (Annie Besant).

P. 119.—The lives of Herakles (Annie Besant) were not remarkable in any way for a long time. They were spent in fighting, when the body was that of a man, in having very numerous babies when it was that of a woman.

P. 252.—They were Alcyone's sons, Uranus and Neptune, and his daughters Surya and Brihaspati.

Note that Brihaspati, according to the key to characters, is "the Master Jesus," who is introduced to us here as a girl!

P. 276.—Among the juniors chosen to form the first pioneer families we noticed Herakles (Annie Besant)—a son of Corona and Theodoros—with Sirius (Leadbeater) as wife, Sirius a tall, rather muscular woman, a notable housewife, and very kind to her rather large family, among whom we observed Alcyone (the present "Coming Christ") Mizar, Uranus, Selene (Jinarajadasa, a former pupil of Leadbeater) and Neptune.

To this extract just given there is a footnote, referring to Appendix VII for the complete lists. Turning then to Appendix VII, we find "Herakles (Annie Besant) married Sirius (Leadbeater) and they had as children," and here ten children of this "rather large family" are named, "and some others unrecognized." How many "unrecognized" is not stated.

### Leadbeater's Wives in Former Incarnations

P. 290.—Sirius (Leadbeater) was also born in Mashonaland, where he married Alcyone.

This Alcyone according to the key, is Krishnamurti, whose father Mr. Narayaniah in the recent case, Narayaniah vs. Besant, has been seeking to regain possession of from the guardianship of Mrs. Besant, and objecting to Leadbeater's association with the boy; in his complaint he charged Leadbeater with gross misconduct with the boy Alcyone. One argument put forward by Mrs. Besant why the boy should be permitted to associate with Leadbeater, was "because they were associated together in past lives." In the present instance just quoted, they are referred to as husband and wife! What think you who read this; parents, guardians, and all who have regard for morality and sanity? Is further comment necessary?

P. 294.—Sirius (Leadbeater) and his wife Mizar (Nityananda).

In the extract from p. 290 Sirius (Leadbeater) is referred to as husband of Alcyone (Krishnamurti) and now as husband of Mizar (Nityananda, younger brother of Krishnamurti). Is it any wonder that the father of these two boys should object to Leadbeater's association with them, or seek to regain possession of them from Mrs. Besant? Both the boys are minors. Were their names and the recital of their alleged relationships with Leadbeater in past lives, given with the permission of Mr. Narayaniah, their father?

### A Desecration of Sacred Names

P. 328.—The alliance was cemented by the marriage of Corona (Julius Caesar) . . . to Brihaspati (Jesus).



And in Appendix IV, (p. 487) we are told that Brihaspati (Jesus), again a woman, is married to Mars (here the key name is of a Great Teacher most revered by all true Theosophists). Is not such misuse of sacred names as Jesus, and others revered by all true Theosophists, a desecration? And many more instances could be given, but is it necessary? Is it to be wondered at that members of the original Theosophical Society (now the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society), faithful students of H. P. Blavatsky, William Q. Judge, and Katherine Tingley, refuse to acknowledge such a recital of promiscuous relationships and changes of sex as in any way a part of the teachings of Theosophy? Is it not a desecration of home life and its most sacred ties? Should not self-respecting mothers and fathers hesitate before permitting their children or anyone whom they love to come under the influence of such teachings? Are such teachings conducive to sanity and morality, or are they pernicious and degrading? Are they part of the "spiritual" teaching which Mrs. Besant and Leadbeater claim to give? Should not parents think well before they permit such books or teachings in their homes; should they not weigh these questions most seriously, if they have any regard for the sanctity of home life and the moral welfare of their children? Of what value are Mrs. Besant's and Leadbeater's fine phrases and talk about high ideals when they have the effrontery to put forward such things, written by them in collaboration as the result of their "occult" researches? No true occultism, but pseudo-occultism in very truth, as the humblest of the true students of Theosophy knows. They claim too, to be able to see thousands of years into the future, and again put themselves as among the great ones of the earth, among the future Leaders of the spiritual evolution of humanity! Yet, one of them, Leadbeater, Mr. Justice Bakewell declared to be "a highly dangerous associate for children," and Mrs. Besant declares his teaching to be "dishonorable and unmanly" and yet calls him her "fellow-initiate"!

Jesus said "the pure in heart shall see God," but Leadbeater who has confessed to teaching degrading habits to young boys, said, and the same has been published and circulated among members of Mrs. Besant's society, with her approval, thus making her a party to it,—this man of "immoral opinions," and "a highly dangerous associate for children," asserts: "I have stood beside your President in the presence of the Supreme Director of Evolution on this globe, and I know whereof I speak."

But there is more. Of Mrs. Besant, one of her devotees, the secretary of the "Coming Christ," has said, "we know she will become one of the greatest rulers the world has ever known (!)—ruler of Gods (!) and men." Do such assertions as these tend towards sanity or insanity? Can it be said they are other than fulsome adulation? And what must be Mrs. Besant's vanity that she accepts such and permits the same to go out to members of her society? Are not the members of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society justified in disclaiming all connection with such? Should we not be failing in our duty to searchers after truth did we not protest against such presumptuous and unwholesome assertions, and did we not publish the fact that they are no part of Theosophy and are not endorsed by the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, the original Society founded by H. P. Blavatsky, nor by the members thereof? Would not our silence justly give cause to the public to think we were party to such madness?

### Protest Justified

Are not the members of the parent Theosophical Society (now the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society with headquarters at



Point Loma, California) justified on all occasions in protesting against any supposed possible endorsement of such claims or teaching? And that such claims should be made in the name of Theosophy, what is it but a prostitution of that sacred name and its spiritual truths for personal ends and self-glorification?

Is it any wonder that many earnest people turn away from Theosophy in disgust? Can they be blamed for condemning Theosophy as a whole, and the parent society as well as the so-called "Theosophical" Society of Mrs. Besant, when they have had no explanation, no means of distinguishing between true Theosophy and its counterfeit? What said Jesus the Christ: "Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites!"

Note, however, that against the presumptuous claims of Mrs. Besant as a "spiritual" teacher; and of her devotee, that she is to become "one of the greatest rulers the world has ever known—ruler of Gods and men," Mr. Justice Bakewell in the High Court of Madras in the recent case, Narayaniah vs. Besant, in which Mrs. Besant was ordered to restore the "Coming Christ" and his brother to their father, Mr. Narayaniah, expressed the opinion that Mrs. Besant broke her promise given to the father as to separating the boys from Leadbeater. This opinion was upheld in the Appellate Court by Mr. Justice Oldfield, who said:

She may have been able to justify this conduct to herself in the light of her great enthusiasm; but, judged by ordinary standards, she deviated from common honesty. This is material not merely with reference to her duty to plaintiff (the father of the boys) and in connection with the decision as to terms of the understanding, but also as regards the presumption in favor of her trustworthiness; on which we have been invited to act in other connections.

## VII.

(7) BECAUSE of Mrs. Besant's disregard of the spirit of Brotherhood which is the *sine qua non* of a true Theosophist, and because of the disintegrating influence which she attempted to introduce into the Theosophical Society by her outrageous attack upon and persecution of our loved and revered Teacher, William Q. Judge, successor to H. P. Blavatsky; showing thereby her disregard of H. P. Blavatsky, whom she had acknowledged as her teacher, by trying to force William Q. Judge to resign, when H. P. Blavatsky had said "the day W. Q. J. resigns, that day will Theosophy be dead for America"; Mrs. Besant apparently seeking Mr. Judge's resignation for the reason that he stood next in succession to the presidency of the Society and was therefore an obstacle in the path of her ambition, for in her letters to Mr. Judge and others she gave out that she was willing to suffer, should she have to take that office. Because of this persecution of William Q. Judge, the members of the original Society took action at the Boston Convention in 1895 and elected him President for life, thereby repudiating all connection with Mrs. Besant. Similar action was taken immediately thereafter by all true Theosophists in other parts of the world.

## VIII.

(8) BECAUSE, in her official magazine, *The Theosophist*, Mrs. Besant has repeatedly attempted, without one iota of fact as basis, to vilify Katherine Tingley, the present Leader and Official Head of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society which is the continuation of the original Theosophical Society founded by Madame Blavatsky. To give but one instance out of many: in her magazine, *The Theosophist*, Mrs. Besant has made the utterly baseless accusation against Katherine Tingley of



“tireless malignity against the Theosophical Society”—a most preposterous and absurd, as well as caluminous charge, whether the original Theosophical Society is meant, seeing that Katherine Tingley is devoting her whole life to Theosophy, and to maintaining the dignity and purity of its teachings and the dignity and good name of the original Theosophical Society which was founded by H. P. Blavatsky; and equally false even if Mrs. Besant, as she doubtless does, refers to the so-called “Theosophical” society of which she is president. She also accuses Katherine Tingley “of ceaseless vituperation of herself” (Mrs. Besant)—another calumnious statement without one iota of fact as basis. Also because of her accusing Katherine Tingley of having an emissary in India in connection with the recent case, Narayaniah vs. Besant, above referred to, in the Madras High Court; and in her original answer to the complaint in that case making the following baseless accusation against Katherine Tingley, declaring that

The persistent and malignant campaign against both herself (Mrs. Besant) and the Theosophical Society that has been carried on in the Hindu newspaper, instigated and supported by Mrs. Katherine Tingley from America . . . . shows deliberate malice and utter disregard of truth.

The Court characterized the whole of Mrs. Besant’s written statement to be “prolix, verbose and argumentative,” and in one of its paragraphs, namely, the one just quoted as “HIGHLY SCANDALOUS.” He ordered the whole answer to be stricken out.

### A Tissue of Falsehoods

So far as Katherine Tingley is concerned there is not even a shadow of the truth in the statement just quoted; it is a tissue of falsehoods without one grain of truth, and hence I ask, whose is the deliberate malice and utter disregard of truth? Such a false accusation cannot be regarded other than as wilful defamation, and I am informed that therein Katherine Tingley has good grounds for libel action against Mrs. Besant.

And further because of most cruel attacks during several years past on our Leader Katherine Tingley, which attacks have had their basis in Mrs. Besant’s calumnious statements and in some of the absurd teachings herein above referred to, giving rise to misconceptions and gossip, and to misrepresentations of Katherine Tingley’s work in published articles. Did we not protest, well might Katherine Tingley and ourselves be held answerable for permitting the counterfeit Theosophy to go unchallenged and its false teachings to be spread abroad, thereby causing many searchers after truth to lose their way.

FINALLY BECAUSE of the ridiculous statements made in the name of Theosophy by members of Mrs. Besant’s Society in the U. S. A. and elsewhere as to “weighing the soul,” “verbatim reports” as to the life of children in the next world, uncanny and fanciful theories as to exchange of souls between Bacon and Shakespeare and other repellent nonsense; claims on the part of some of her members, following Leadbeater’s and Mrs. Besant’s unwholesome example, as to memory of reincarnations during 70,000 years, and other claims as to occult (!) knowledge (?), none of which things have anything to do with true Theosophy but are evidence only of its counterfeit.

These are some of the reasons why at all public meetings of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, in the literature of the Society and in correspondence with enquirers the above announcement is made.

JOSEPH H. FUSSELL.

Point Loma, California, March 5, 1914.



## THEOSOPHY AND "CO-MASONRY"

### **The Original Theosophical Society Does Not Endorse "Co-Masonry"**

A large number of members of the original Theosophical Society (now the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society) are also members of the Masonic body, and for them there exists another reason for protesting against any supposed identification or connection with or endorsement of Mrs. Besant or her so-called "Theosophical" Society by the parent Theosophical Society founded by H. P. Blavatsky, and now known as the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, with Headquarters at Point Loma, California.

The additional reason for making this protest is the claim made by Mrs. Besant and certain women members of her society to belong to a so-called "Co-Masonic" order in which it is claimed in its "Declaration of Principles," said to be issued "under the auspices of the Supreme Council of Universal Co-Masonry," that "It (Co-Masonry) is Freemasonry opening its Temple to women."

Not only is the claim made by Mrs. Besant and certain women in her society to belong to the so-called "Co-Masonic" order, but notice of the same and of "Masonic" meetings attended by Mrs. Besant and other women has been published in the official journals of Mrs. Besant's so-called "Theosophical" Society, thus making it appear to those of the public who are ignorant of the fact that Mrs. Besant's society is not the true Theosophical Society, that the true Theosophical Society sanctioned and endorsed "Co-Masonry"; and so tending to bring the true Theosophical Society, now the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, into disrepute for supposed endorsement of a so-called "Masonic" body, to-wit, "Co-Masonry," which as Masons we cannot regard in any other light than as clandestine and spurious.

A further protest is made by members of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, who are also members of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, against the claim that so-called "Co-Masonry" is the "Ancient and Accepted Reformed Scottish Rite," for the same reason as above stated, viz., that because of the association of Mrs. Besant and certain women members in her society with "Co-Masonry," Mrs. Besant claiming to be a 33 degree member of the "Supreme Council of Universal Co-Masonry" it would appear to the public ignorant of the purposes and work of the true Theosophical Society (the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society) as though the true Theosophical Society endorsed and sanctioned a body claiming to be the Ancient and Accepted "Reformed" Scottish Rite, to-wit, "Co-Masonry," which we as members of the A. & A. S. R. regard as clandestine and spurious.

### **For the Information of the Public**

For the information, therefore, of the public, and for the information in particular of all the Brethren of the Masonic Order, both of the F. & A. M. and of the A. & A. S. R., this statement and protest is made, namely, that neither the original Theosophical Society (now the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society) which is under the direction of Katherine Tingley, successor to H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge, nor the members thereof, nor, in particular, those of the members thereof who are mem-



bers of the Masonic Fraternity, accept, endorse, or are in any way connected with, or recognize the body known as "Co-Masonry."

### "Co-Masonry" Associated With Mrs. Besant's Society

That there is necessity for making this protest will be further seen from the following extracts showing how "Co-Masonry" is associated with the so-called "Theosophical" society of which Mrs. Besant is president.

In Mrs. Besant's official magazine, *The Theosophist*, October, 1909, in an editorial, is the following:

On Sunday afternoon we held a Masonic meeting for the initiation of two men and one woman, the Deputy of the Supreme Council in the United States having fraternally granted me the power to act within his jurisdiction.

In the official publication of Mrs. Besant's society in the U. S. A. in 1910 is an article "The Object of Co-Masonry," signed "ANNIE BESANT, 33d degree Co-Mason," from which I quote the following:

Co-Masonry has arisen from the bosom of masculine Masonry in order to bring women into that ancient fraternity on exactly the same terms as men.

Women Masons are now found all over the world. . . .

The entry of women into Masonry hand and hand with men. . . .

From the same official publication of Mrs. Besant's society published in the U. S. A., in a quarterly letter from the president (Mrs. Besant) dated Jan. 31st, 1911, the following statement occurs:

We had nine Lodge meetings in all, . . . . and three Masonic meetings. . . . (Signed) Annie Besant.

From another extract from the same publication, September, 1910, the following postscript is appended to a report of so-called "Theosophical" meetings in England:

P. S. Perhaps it may interest our Masonic brethren to know that Universal Co-Masonry was not neglected on this occasion, . . . and at which the mysteries of the Masonic Order were duly celebrated. (Signed) ELIZABETH SEVERS.

In a magazine entitled "Universal Masonry," published in the U. S. A., October, 1910, under the heading "Mrs. Annie Besant and Masonry," occurs the following:

Our frontispiece this month pictures, in Masonic regalia, the very Illustrious Sister Annie Besant, 33d degree, Vice-President of the Supreme Council of Universal Co-Masonry (Ancient and Accepted Reformed Scottish Rite), Grand Inspector General for Britain and the British Dependencies, Hon. Past Master of "Human Duty Lodge" No. 6, London, and the present R. W. M. of "The Rising Sun of India Lodge," Adyar, Madras.

Mrs. Besant is known as president of the (so-called) Theosophical Society. . . . She is a Mason.

Regarding the magazine just quoted from, it is significant to note the following, published in the *Adyar Bulletin*, under the heading "Theosophy & Masonry," referring to three women members of Mrs. Besant's so-called "Theosophical" society:

Those members of our Society have started a new Masonic Journal, . . . entitled *Universal Masonry* . . . Most of its contributors are well known Theosophists [so-called]. Members of the Craft will not fail to interest themselves in the new production.

Further evidence is surely not needed to show the close association between "Co-Masonry" and Mrs. Besant's so-called "Theosophical" society.



## Masonic and Theosophical Bodies Distinct

We protest therefore not only as Masons, but because, as shown in the above given extracts, of the exploitation of the body known as "Co-Masonry" in connection with the so-called "Theosophical" Society, by which the public might be led to believe was implied the original Theosophical Society founded by Mme. Blavatsky; making it appear to the public, ignorant of the facts, as though the Masonic body as such were, in one of its Branches or Rites, connected with the Theosophical Society or worked with it; whereas even though some of the same broad teachings of morality and symbolism may be taught in both, and both have their basis on, and work in accordance with, the broad principles of Brotherhood and Fraternity, the two bodies, Masonic and Theosophical (using both terms in their legitimate and true sense) are entirely and wholly distinct as is well known to all worthy Masons as well as to all true Theosophists who are Masons.

### New Age Magazine Quoted

We are not concerned with the fact, if it be a fact, that the alleged "Co-Masonry" may claim to put forward some of the noble teachings of Masonry, about which no secret is made, they being published to the world; for is not the alleged "Co-Masonry" founded upon a falsehood, seeing that, in its published "Declaration of Principles," quoted above, it is said, "It is Freemasonry opening its Temple to women"? Regarding this, the reader's attention is called to a statement entitled "Notes from India" by George Fleming Moore, 33 degree, editor of the *New Age Magazine*, (in the Oct., 1910, and Feb., 1911, issues) the Official Organ of the Supreme Council of the Thirty-Third Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry for the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America. This same article was reprinted by permission by the Aryan Theosophical Press, Point Loma. We quote from this article as follows:

It seems to us that any man or any woman who knowingly and intentionally claims to be a member of a society from which they are excluded by its fundamental laws, such a person is not acting with any regard to moral or ethical principle.

If a woman claims to be a Mason it seems to us that she must know that the claim is false. If she falsely claims to be what she is not the moral feature of the act is quite clear. If a man knowing that women cannot be made Masons join a society which claims to make them Masons, his act becomes as bad as that of those whom he assists.

The crime always consists in the intent. If the persons propagating a society give it the name of another well-known society, seeking thereby to give the impression that it is such well-known and established society or connected with it, the theory of our law, and of the law of England, perhaps, is that this amounts to the perpetration of a fraud on the persons induced to join such society, and the Post Office Department treats it thus. Wilson claimed to give "Masonic degrees" which had no connection with real Masonic lodges, and his scheme was treated as a fraud by the United States Government.

Are the members of this Universal or Co-Masonry aware of the existence of the statutes? And if so, do they admit that they come within their scope?

**And they claim not to be ignorant.**

Is it not a fraud to claim to be a Mason when you are not connected with a real Masonic Lodge? . . .

Thousands of good women belong to the Eastern Star Lodges, to the Rite of Adoption, and they are doing great work. But the ladies who belong to these bodies do not claim to be what they are not—do not sail under false colors—do not seek to obtain credit by pretending to have knowledge which they do not possess.

**Freemasonry is built on good morals.**



### Some Pertinent Questions

Here are some questions on the formation of "Universal Masonry" that are pertinent. (Asked of a supporter of "Co-Masonry.")

1. Is it not a fact that the Old Charges of Freemasonry and Masonic Obligations prohibit the admission of women into Masonry?
2. Do you as a Universal Mason, repudiate that obligation and Old Charges?
3. If you repudiate them how can you claim to be a Mason when all other Masons, including the French Masons, recognize them?
4. If you recognize the Old Charges, then are not Mrs. Besant and your other women members, falsely claiming to be Masons?
5. If Mrs. Besant and your women members are not Masons, is it honest for them to claim to be Masons?
6. Do you think that honest people will sanction any society which uses dishonest methods in its work? Or methods which the civil government denounces as "fraudulent"?
7. Does not your Co-Masonry claim to have been derived from the Grand Orient of France?
8. Is it not true that the Grand Orient of France has denounced it as clandestine?

The reprint of "Notes from India," just quoted from, to which is appended "A Statement on 'Co-Masonry' by Katherine Tingley," the present Leader of the original Theosophical Society, may be obtained on application to the undersigned.

### Violation of Solemn Obligations

One further word, in regard to the claim that "It (Co-Masonry) is Freemasonry opening its Temple to women," even assuming this to be true (which I do not, nor will any true Mason), how else could it be save through the unfaithfulness of some Mason unworthy of the name? And any knowledge so imparted to "Co-Masons" would hence be entirely unreliable and the fact would remain that, by claiming to make use of such knowledge, they put themselves in the position of building on a foundation of unfaithfulness and the violation of most solemn obligations. To profit by such violation and unfaithfulness would be nothing less than dishonorable, and make such women, and equally so the men associated with them, participators in such unfaithfulness and such violation of solemn oaths.

### The Original Theosophical Society Does Not Endorse "Co-Masonry"

The members of the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society (i. e., the original Theosophical Society) for this as well as for other reasons, make this statement therefore, for the information of the public, viz., that neither Mrs. Besant nor the society of which she is president, nor "Co-Masonry" nor anyone claiming to be a "Co-Mason" is in any way connected with or endorsed by the Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society, the International Headquarters of which are at Point Loma, California.

JOSEPH H. FUSSELL, '32, A. & A. S. R.

Point Loma, California, March 5, 1914.