

Mr. Curtis Fuller, Publisher,
FATE Magazine,
500 Hyacintha Place,
Highland Park, Illinois 60035.

May 5, 1967

Dear Sir:

The considerable delay in the writing of this letter has been occasioned by the most disastrous succession of family events it has been my misfortune to experience-including death, a bad accident with protracted hospitalizations, combined with my own prolonged indisposition from a serious of viral infections, an operation, and the distressing complications of bungled medical treatment-,all on top of the forced abandonment of a long-established family enterprise (by reason of a governmental exercise of eminent domain), and, additionally, the task of getting under way a new business which has taken up to 80 hours a week of my time. Although not the least important of my interests, the matter of this letter has therefore had to be postponed until this time, and it is possible now only by putting off some related work which ought, perhaps, to precede it.

I must recall to your attention the review (FATE Magazine, June, 1964, pages 103 and 106) of my book, OBITUARY: THE "HODGSON REPORT" ON MADAME BLAVATSKY: 1885-1960. This book is still available and is being sold by the publisher and its agents; and the intention is to keep the contents in print indefinitely. So the delay in this letter does not out-date discussion of the subject, especially so when review copies for American editors generally have yet to go out, having been held up, for one reason, until a résumé of overseas Press Opinion could be compiled first (as you know, reviews for a work of this kind are extremely difficult to obtain in this country-the last biography of Madame Blavatsky, that by John Symonds, here received only three reviews outside of theosophical periodicals, so far as I know, and I myself wrote two of these). Some examples of world press and expert opinion so far expressed are:

“ I must say that I read your attack on Mr. Hodgson with very much interest, and I hope that the SPR will make some attempt to reply to it.”

-Eric J. Dingwall, M.A., D.Sc., Ph.D., Member, and formerly Research Officer, of the London S.P.R.

“Mr. Waterman writes with passion and devotion... many students will find his intensity stimulating and will perhaps go on to study again the age of miracles in which Madame Blavatsky lived, the age when spiritualism, hypnosis and psychic phenomena attracted so many followers and made so many converts.”

-A.A., *The International Journal of Parapsychology*

“I for one welcome this well-documented destruction of the infamous attack made on Mme Blavatsky... the now discredited ‘Hodgson Report’... In this most careful pamphlet the lies are exposed and destroyed.”

-Christmas Humphreys, QC, Commissioner of the Central Criminal Court, London; Ed., *The Middle Way*

“Mr. Waterman endeavors to show in the present publication that Dr. Hodgson’s report was a highly prejudiced one, that this can be demonstrated by an examination of the testimony not of H.P.B. and her witnesses but of the principal prosecutor (Hodgson) and his chief witnesses (the Coulombs)... Mr. Waterman has taken enormous pains to study this case, and... is still continuing with the research of which the present booklet is only the first product.”

-T.M.P.M., *Journal of Indian History* – vol.xlii, University of Kerala, Trivandrum, India

“...very interesting and provocative reading”

-Prof. C.J. Ducasse, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., 2nd Vice-Pres., American Society for Psychical Research

“This book describes in minute detail the deliberate falsehoods in Hodgson’s report... this book is a welcome effort to ensure that justice should be done to a very great personage.”

-Lord Dowding, Air Chief Marshal, R.A.F., author of *Many Mansions*, etc. From *Two Worlds*, London

“Obviously this book will be of interest to students of this particular case and may open a new line of thinking on an intriguing piece of psychical history.”

-John Young, M.I.M.C., Hon. Ed., *The Magic Circular*, journal of England’s leading association of conjurors and stage magicians

“Mr. Waterman has done a masterful job... It is high time that such a book as this should be made available and it ought to be in every library...”

-Max Freedom Long, Editor, *Huna Vistas*

“...meticulous ...with such illuminating results.”

-M.C. Debenham, Editor, *The Speculative Mason*

“*Famous Medium Rehabilitated...* “*Obituary. The “Hodgson Report” on Madame Blavatsky...* completely answers the traducers of this famous medium and Theosophist... In this most careful booklet the lies are exposed.”

-*Psychic News*, London

Now respecting your magazine’s review of this book, I begin by directing attention to our exchange of letters in 1963, when, as you recall, I initiated an effort to have FATE returned to newsstand sale in this city, after it had been banned for about a year, I think, by the local distributor. Your letter of August 2, 1963, informed me that this restriction was due “not to the content of FATE Magazine, but to the fact that it is difficult for him to make a profit out of it.” And you closed by saying, “I do appreciate your interest however, and I want to tell you also that

I enjoy reading your book reviews in FATE Magazine.” In my reply of acknowledgement, August 8, 1963, the closing paragraph reads:

By book post I am sending you (and also Mr. Geier) a copy of a booklet just issued by the publisher in India, under my pen-name (this last fact is confidential). It is titled, “Obituary: The ‘Hodgson Report’ on Madame Blavatsky: 1885-1960”, and is replete with a tremendous amount of new and original information brought to a light in my research of that very interesting, controversial case. I think you will find it quite intriguing; and I hope you or Mr. Geier or some reviewer conversant with the methodology of Psychological Research may be able to review it for FATE.

On November 27, 1963, you wrote as follows:

Your letter of August 8th, concerning “The Hodgson Report” has been going the rounds here between me and the editorial department, whose members have been reading the book and arranging for review.

So it is that I have only recently had the letter back for acknowledgement and for comment on your discussion of the fact that the Fresno wholesaler refuses to handle it, because we have taken the matter up with our national distributor and also with our field men, who are out in California covering the matter and dressing the newsstands.

If you know of any large magazine stores in Fresno, we would contact them direct. Other than that, I honestly do not know how to proceed, but I do thank you for your interest.

Earlier, under the dateline of February 6, 1963, Managing Editor, Mr. Geier, wrote, in part, as follows:

Hi, Walt!

Wasn't in any particular hurry for the book reviews, just glad to know they were coming in and to have at least one on hand to fill space in an issue. Feel a review is worth waiting for if it turns out good...

Many thanks indeed for informing us of the newsstand situation relative to FATE in Fresno. Think like this we are very glad to know and to straighten out. I called Curt Fuller's attention to it and he is now checking with Fresno...

Again-thanks for telling us. Be glad to hear later whether FATE appears on Fresno stands.

Best,

(signed) Chet

February 29th, 1964, I sent you the names of two possible outlets for Fresno sales, adding:

I hope your field men find an outlet with one of these.

Am pleased to hear you intend having a review of my book on the "Hodgson Report" on Madame Blavatsky. There has been more than twenty reviews to date, mostly overseas as I have not-with but one or two exceptions-sent out review copies in this country. Mr. Geier might want to know that it is now obtainable from The Theosophical Press, P.O. Box 270, Wheaton, Illinois, \$1.25 clothbound.

Sincerely yours...

As you doubtless learned, through this effort on my part, a local bookstore undertook to sell your publication, and advertised it in a local newspaper until eventually the newsstand distributor resumed its circulation.

Meanwhile, the promised review of my book, as arranged by the "members" of your "editorial department" made its appearance under the name of one David Techter. I am

constrained to give this-shall I call it review?-special attention for three reasons: (a) the fact that, during the four years since my book's initial appearance, this is the only attempted rebuttal made in defence of the "Hodgson Report"; (b) the fact that this has appeared in a magazine with a "paid circulation" of "above 100,000-the greatest circulation any magazine serving the psychic-occult-metaphysical field has ever achieved"; and (c) the fact that, by the very virulence of its sweeping verdict, this demands a direct and complete reply.

This "review" consists of 12 sentences and head with title, etc., not one of which does not contain at least one error of some kind; and not one of which accurately reflects even a single idea expressed in my book. As a pretended review of anything, it is a miserable effort, indeed, and can hardly do credit to anyone so badly misinformed-or so hoodwinked-as to either publish it or believe it. (For proof of this appraisal and related comments on this attack you have published, see the enclosed copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Techter and dated May 15, 1967, at this juncture particularly (1) to (7) of II and III on page 11.)

For a number of reasons, the content of this review astonished me, coming as it did in the wake of our mutual exchange of letters. For one thing, I was surprised to see it advertising the book as selling for "about \$1.00, available from the author..." For another, it simultaneously revealed that Waterman is "a pseudonym, incidentally [sic]..." Taken with the latter disclosure and with the fact that the review does not give the author's address (nor, indeed even the true post address, "Madras 20," of the publisher, though both appear in the book itself), the former statement of availability as an ostensible direction for prospective buyers, appears to be a deliberately devised cul-de-sac. And in conjunction with the last line of my letter of February 29, giving the true American price and supplier-which price and source was as readily available to the review, simply by phoning the next county of his state, if the information of February 29th

arrived too late for press (which I doubt)-, it strikes one as a patent device to discourage sale of the book among FATE's readers.

But, as a matter of record, this book has never been for sale by its author-prior to publication, he signed a contract not to sell copies; and, if taken as from him, this asinine statement (deliberately fabricated by someone) could have made trouble between him and his publishers.

As for the reason behind such obstructive tactics, I cannot imagine what it might be-unless, indeed, Richard Hodgson happens to be a sacrosanct hero to those responsible. That there was a motive of some kind-at least on the part of the review-, and that it has dictated an effort to deliberately embarrass the author seems evident from the reviewer's mischief-making remark concerning pseudonymous authorship of this book. This disclosure was entirely irrelevant, out of place, and uncalled-for, and ought never to have passed the Editor's desk. I can only conclude that, for some reason, the revelation given in my letter to you of August 8, 1963, was made known to Techter despite my explicit restriction there that "(the last fact is confidential)"; and, in gross violation of this misplaced confidence, his deliberate exposure of the use of a pen-name was thereafter broadcast worldwide by FATE Magazine. That "the editorial department" was aware that this revelation had been given as "confidential", when it approved his review for publication, is obvious from the first sentence of your reply of November 27, 1963 (above). This information, I may say, had been given in the first place only lest Mr. Geier ask me to review my own book-I now only wish he had! Certainly there were good reasons for this use of nom-de-plum; and violation of this confidence might well have imperiled certain delicate negotiations now happily completed (the completion of which has been a contributing factor in the decision to answer this review at this time).

Juxtaposed in context as it is (“this little diatribe by Waterman (a pseudonym, incidentally,)” this disclosure by Techter is calculated to make the reader take Waterman for some ranting fanatic, hiding behind a false name. Perhaps FATE’s readers would not have been so easily taken in-and I have no doubt all but a few were taken in-by the reviewer’s wild allegations against this book, had they known that, for three-and-one-half years (from August 1960 to February 1964, inclusive), Waterman, under his real name, was also (and aside from the Managing Editor, under his nom-de-plum and true name, too) this magazine’s chief book-reviewer, with more reviews to his credit and with more than three times more lead reviews than the next most prolific reviewer. This fact, I venture, could be taken as some kind of evidence of the value your editors put on my circumspection as a reporter. To this might be added the fact that-so far as I know-no factual criticism was brought against any one of these many reviews, while one of them elicited an offer (which, regrettably, had to be declined by reason of pressing time-demands for research on the Blavatsky case) from America’s principal publisher of occult books, to act as editor for a definitive recapitulation of the famous Piper case, supervised for the Society for Psychical Research by Hodgson during the last 18 years of his life. Moreover, you may note that the first of these reviews-unsolicited, by the way, and made the lead review for that month-is not only the longest review but one to appear in FATE up to that time (the “New Books” section having been inaugurated four-and-one-half years earlier), but it remains the longest review of a biography FATE has ever presented in its review section. The biography was, of course, John Symonds’ work on-Madame Blavatsky.

A second review of the Symonds book on Madame Blavatsky was prepared by Waterman over his true name for THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH-a society of which Dr. Richard Hodgson was, for so many years, the most

distinguished Secretary-, and where, after being passed by the Publications Committee (among whose members were such competent critics as Dr. J.R. Rhine), it appeared not just as a review (as it was submitted) but as the second longest of the papers featured in the July, 1962 number. This was, in fact, the only neutral study-and the longest notice-of Madame Blavatsky to appear during the last 73 years in the official organ of a recognized Society for Psychical Research (though, of course, the Society is not responsible for individual opinions so expressed). An important addition thereto was the account of the writer's successful five-year effort to have a search made for, and to obtain microfilm copies of, such unpublished documents as might still remain from the Blavatsky case, in the archives of the British Society for Psychical Research. Important reference was given in this paper to the previously unsuspected, and historically vital but suppressed context of one of these Blavatsky case documents drawn up by the official committee investigating Mme Blavatsky, which reveals that, contrary to previous general belief, Mme Blavatsky had produced phenomena for members of the investigating committee, phenomena which the Hon. Secretaries of the S.P.R., Edmund Gurney and F.W.H. Myers, once in company with Sir William Barrett, initiator of the S.P.R., admittedly could not explain away as fraud.

The gutless attitude of the majority of the present-day S.P.R. leaders towards any criticism of Hodgson-however mild-is best illustrated by the fact that, while the April, July and October 1962 quarterly numbers of the A.S.P.R. JOURNAL were reviewed in the December, 1962, S.P.R. JOURNAL (pp. 423-5), and while these three numbers contain seven signed papers plus "Presidential Remarks by Dr. Gardner Murphy," the review for the S.P.R. membership touched upon the latter and devoted more than two pages to six of the papers-but gave NOT A

SINGLE WORD to even the existence of this major paper on Madame Blavatsky, the central figure in the most famous case in the history of the S.P.R. itself!

Seeing that these S.P.R. leaders were thus unwilling to permit their readers to know of even this mild critique published by their esteemed sister-Society, it is not surprising that the only (private) mention given by them in print concerning Waterman's book-when challenged by some of their own members at the Society's Annual General Meeting of 1965-characterized it as a book of "smears... beneath contempt..."As if in failure to face up to the unwelcomed facts and momentous implications of this irrefutable indictment of a Member of Council and (later) Officer of the S.P.R. (as well as of the A.S.P.R.), the Editors of both the British and American Societies for Psychological Research-together with other equally timid editors to whom Dr. Hodgson is likewise a great hero-have avoided reviewing this book in their JOURNALS (in the former case, at least, despite interest shown by certain Members of Council in seeing some such possible review). These same Editors, however, displayed no such reluctance when Sir Wm. Crookes and F.W.H. Myers and Edmund Gurney came under recent public attack, for then the S.P.R. and A.S.P.R. JOURNALS soon appeared with defenses of one or more of these former Officers of the Society for Psychological Research. But naturally we shouldn't expect these devotees of Dr. Hodgson to pay serious attention to anything critical of him if they are unable to refute it-or if they are prudent enough not to pretend to!

Concerning other original research studies in Parapsychology case histories, made by the writer (who, for more than 18 years, has been a Member of both the British and American Societies for Psychological Research), one might cite various testimonials. Thus Dr. Hereward Carrington, the late Dean of American Psychological Researchers, responded to an (yet unpublished) original re-examination of the Amherst case:- "It is hardly necessary to say that I read your paper

with the greatest interest and enthusiasm. P.R. [Psychical Research] has waited for some 40 years for this to be written, and it seems to me you have done an excellent job, and an important one. I wonder what the S.P.R. people will think of it when they read it!" Of another still-to-be-published critique of a Hodgson "exposure", he wrote: "I have read your letter and paper with very great interest, and congratulate you on your energy and acute criticism. Very good..." Likewise, the late Dr. Nandor Fodor, whose general knowledge of the field was probably unequalled, after receiving for perusal some "sample chapters" of a work rebutting another S.P.R. "exposure," replied: "I think you have done magnificently. It is a work that should be done... I would like to see you going on and enlist some of the younger blood. I do think your book is very important..."

After reading some of the complimentary remarks made by the Publisher, the Editor, and the Managing Editor, in reference to writings I had submitted to, and which were purchased for, FATE Magazine, I find it hard to understand how these three parties, familiar as they were with the character of my previous work, could be so enchanted by Techter's undocumented, unsupported denunciations as to think the author capable of producing so mean and lying a book of nonsense as he pictures in his review. I have in mind, additionally, your own 350-word inter-office memo sent to me by the Editor, August 20, 1958, concerning another similar and serious critique of mine relating to another famous controversial case in Parapsychology:

I have scanned this material and while the author has a tremendous fund of knowledge, I feel that it is not suitable for publication in FATE... It is my view that a specialized study of this nature, while valuable as a professional work, has such limited interest except to the true specialist in the field that publication

would have to be subsidized... While I am inclined to sympathize a great deal with the author I feel that he has devoted his considerable talents to a subject whose very narrowness further limits its appeal. It is strictly a research job of considerable magnitude but limited market... scholarship indeed but not FATE-type material... I am sorry to give you this negative report on Mr. Carrithers' material but I do feel that he could become a valuable author for FATE and should be encouraged to contribute to the magazine. But apparently he will need a certain amount of guidance to know exactly how the material should be presented for popular consumption.

Lastly, one might note that fact that in 10959 the writer was awarded First Prize for his entry in the International Essay Contest of The American Federation of Astrologers. This competition from entries from many states and 13 foreign countries. The winning paper, which realized several hundred dollars in prize and sale money, was a review of original discoveries in conjunction with an analysis of working methods of the Uranian System (Hamburg Schule) of Astrology and its use of planetary midpoints, etc. As the publisher of FATE'S ASTROLOGY FORECAST, "America's largest Astrology magazine," you may be in a position to appreciate this citation.

Of course, none of these facts, relevant though they are to the question of the writer's reliability, can of themselves guarantee that he has not gone berserk and-as charged by Techter-resorted to outright falsehood in concocting a book of nonsense. But I venture to say that, set against these facts of record, Techter's puerile review with its pontifical verdict could only be believed if he were to back it up allegation-by-allegation, charge-by-charge, with documented proof and references, book and page-as, indeed, I directly challenge him to do.

In no single instance does his pretended review portray any one of the many specific ideas and new discoveries, facts of evidence newly published, or original deductions this book brings to bear upon this case for the first time. In this work, after a delay of almost 80 years, one finds, among other things:

- (I) For the first time, critical notice taken of Dr. Hodgson's 1892 rebuttal to critics of his 1885 Report.
- (II) For the first time, a comprehensive study of the pro-and-con claims relating to the disputed "trap doors and trick machinery" of the famous Adyar Shrings and its surroundings.
- (III) For the first time, a comprehensive study of the pro-and-con claims relating to the disputed "trap doors and trick machinery" of the famous Adyar Shrings and its surroundings.
- (IV) For the first, a full-scale reproduction, and a critical examination, of Richard Hodgson's "Plan of Occult Room, with Shrine and Surroundings..." together with inquiry into its provenance and the reliability of its depiction of "feet and inches..."
- (V) For the first time, a direct point-by-point, thoroughly-documented comparison of the relative veracity of accused (Mme Blavatsky) and accuser (Dr. Hodgson), taking into account the latter's amazingly feeble (and completely futile) efforts to convict his would be victim of lying.
- (VI) For the first time, an equally verified comparison of Dr. Hodgson's charges and the Coulomb testimony, together with an invincible demonstration of his necessary and-at many decisive junctures-total reliance upon portions of the latter,

when he was not suppressing other equally valid or equally invalid (as circumstances might show) portions of the same testimony.

- (VII) For the first time, and most important of all, a defence of Madame Blavatsky built of “incontrovertible facts founded on testimony which incredulous critics cannot assail, the testimony not of H.P.B. and her witnesses but of the principal prosecutor and his chief witnesses.”

Besides these broad, new approaches to the case, new approaches to the case, the book delineates a myriad of specific individual discoveries and deductions born of my 15 years of energetic pursuit of the subject, a pursuit that has brought together what is possibly the largest accumulation of published and unpublished source records on the case anywhere (my library inventory runs to more than three times the number of titles on the case given in Gertrude Marvin Williams’ printed bibliography, itself by far the largest compilation ever published by a critic of H.P.B.). Consequently, I have published more titles on this controversy than any other researcher living or dead since H.P.B.’s contemporary and public defender, A.P. Sinnett. One of the most important of these discoveries, now published for the first time, is given on page 47 of the book:

...the very strange fact-scarcely to be believed by the critics of Mme. Blavatsky-that, contrary to all previously published opinion of skeptics and believers alike... the S.P.R. Committee of 1884-5, in its official “Statement and Conclusions,” did not adopt, did not approve, did not even deign to acknowledge Dr. Hodgson’s charge that H.P.B. wrote or instigated the writing of Mahatma letters “in a feigned hand.” The prosecutor did not convince the jury on this one,

prejudiced though it was at the last-it doubtless had heard more from his experts, Netherclift and Sims, than the public was ever allowed to hear!

In his parody of a review, Techter nowhere gives his reader the slightest inkling of so much as one of these many important new additions to the defence arsenal, and, instead of letting his audience know it for what it is, with its Plates, and numerous footnotes and several hundred references to original sources, book and page-one of the most meticulous, thoroughly documented and extensively annotated polemic studies in the history of psychical research, considering its size and whatever one may think of the conclusions it arrives at-, he caricatures the book as “this little diatribe by Waterman...”! Surely this is perverse distortion with a vengeance. And, in his most pretentious claim, he proceeds to charge that “a close comparison of Waterman’s claims with Hodgson’s statements will show that the former consist of half-truths, misinterpretations, quotations lifted from context, and outright falsehoods.” Note the all-embracing sweep of this monstrous verdict-it is not merely that “Waterman’s claims” contain all these horrid things, but that “the former consist of” nothing else!

But where is this “close comparison...”? His scatter-shot review with unsupported accusations is no substitute for it; and if Mr. Techter has it in his pocket, by all means he ought to produce it at once for the Editors of FATE, “a fact magazine specializing in true stories and articles on psychic and paranormal subjects...” according to what C.S. Geier, Managing Editor, wrote me June 18, 1957, adding, “We like full details as to names, dates, and places” (which, if true, leaves some room for Techter to document his pretended exposé of “Waterman’s claims”). But, as you can see from the enclosed copy of my letter of May 15th to Mr. Techter, I deny his accusations categorically, and, before his publisher, editors and the public, I defy and will defy him to make good his abusive claims and to prove his charges are anything more than brainless

calumny or base lying. In fact, as my accompanying letter demonstrates, by documented proof, with reference to book and page, in more than 60 major or enumerated sections, his review exhibits more than two dozen false and grossly misleading statements about this book and displays more than a dozen equally spurious statements concerning that “masterful report by Richard Hodgson” which it purports to defend! Moreover, this completely referenced dissection further reveals that the review bears internal evidence of a greater dependence on the 4-page advertising flyer circulated in announcement of this book (said flyer being sufficient source for Techter’s ‘quotations’) than it does on the book itself; and, that the review conveys no more knowledge than what could be gained from reading the flyer and two or three pages of the actual volume the review purports to portray. Finally, as with its representation of the contents of the book, this abject review so butchers “the masterful report” in ideas it pretends to depict that, again from internal evidence only, there is nothing to disprove and much to uphold the conclusion, that, contrary to what Techter’s readers were told, he had not even read the “Hodgson Report” when he boasted that “a close comparison of Waterman’s claims with Hodgson’s statements” thoroughly discredits OBITUARY: THE “HODGSON REPORT” ON MADAME BLAVATSKY: 1885-1960.

In the four years since this book’s publication, only David Techter has come forward against it and in defence of the 1885 S.P.R. Committee Report on theosophical phenomena. Of more than 30 reviews around the world, only that in FATE Magazine has dismissed the book as worthless. In fact, this odd review is exceptional on several points. I must confess that as a FATE book-reviewer myself, when I received it I was somewhat taken aback by the kind of language you, Mr. Fuller, as Publisher, and your Editor, Mary Margaret Fuller, and your then-Managing Editor, Mr. Geier, permitted Techter to use in the pages of your publication, a publication for

which I had until then, considerable respect. In describing the book he uses such derogatory epithets and opprobrious terms as: (i) “diatribe”; (ii) “dangerous”; (iii) “half-truths”; (iv) “misinterpretations”; (v) “quotations lifted from context”; (vi) “outright falsehoods”; (vii) “farrago of nonsense.”

I have recently completed a careful re-reading of the “New Books” department which has appeared in your magazine monthly beginning with the February, 1956, number. Up to the including the current issue for June, 1967, 518 books have been reviewed therein. In all this great number, over the span of 11 years and 4 months, there has not been another instance in which even so much as one of these seven disparaging descriptions was applied to any book-let alone all to one book!-nor any like charge brought against another author. The vast gulf between the unrestrained abuse of this review and all others ever published in “New Books” is best appreciated by observing that even the closest approach to the use of even one of these vituperative epithets occurs when a reviewer complains that a book is “in some respects dangerous” because it appears to miscalculate the effects of an hallucinogenic drug, the use of which has since been proscribed by law.

Never before or since in the pages of your periodical has such an avalanche of mud been let loose to bury a book and its author. Totally apart from any question of fact at issue, I have consulted two local attorneys-one a specialist in copyright law-for legal determination on simply the legal propriety of this review. The finding of one was that legally it was “defamatory” and other attorney agreed that it was libelous under the law. (Both, however, advised against legal action, saying that the expense involved could not be offset by any compensation for damages which might be looked for as award to the hitherto unknown author of an obscure work in a

controversial field, published in limited edition in India with, as yet, no widespread attempt to promote sales in America.)

I trust, however, that, having brought these facts documented in detail to your personal attention, a sense of fairplay on your part-so essential in a field so controversial as that chosen for the subject of your magazine-will dictate rudimentary justice towards this book, its author, and the great lady and cause it defends. By retracting in the pages of this magazine, on behalf of its Publisher and Editors, the false and baseless charges fabricated by David Techter for his vicious review, you will not only open the eyes of countless thousands, you will in effect erase this imbecilic blot from the pages of FATE Magazine.

Sincerely yours,

(signed)

Walter A. Carrithers, Jr.

P.S. As one consequence of the appearance of this book, it has now been reported in print that a correspondent of mine and a technical investigator of international repute has obtained from Dr. Paul L. Kirk, Professor of Criminology at the University of Berkeley-perhaps America's best-known criminologist (and but recently celebrated as the chief witness for the defence in the famous retrial of Dr. Sam Shepherd)-a report which in effect shows among other things that, after ample professional comparison of certain photographic specimens of handwriting illustrated in the "Hodgson Report" (and said by Hodgson to be by Madame Blavatsky in both her undoubted script and in "a feigned hand" meant to be taken for "Mahatma" writing), Professor

Kirk reached an opinion which overturns Hodgson's amateur theory that these specimens of disputed Mahatma writing and undisputed Blavatsky writing were by the same hand.

W.A.C. Jr.

463 North Second Street

Fresno,

California 93716.

Via Registered Mail,

Return Receipt Requested.