

Из письма Ивана Ивановича Варфоломеева от 17-го февр.1936 г.

В газете "The Manchuria Daily News" #7186, Dairen, Saturday, February 1, 1936  
появилась следующая статья : -

" NICHOLAS ROERICH DROPPED FROM U.S.GOV'T.PAYROLL -  
Special to M.D.N.Washington January 30.

Because of his alleged implication in Chinese and Manchukuoan politics, Mr.Nicholas Roerich, a New York artist, was dropped from the payroll of the U.S.Department of Agroculture, and the hunting expedition, which he recently led into Asia, has been disbanded.

A protest against the political activities of Mr.Roerich; received from officials in the area in which the expedition was working, was responsible for the action . "

Н.довел до сведения друзей об этой статье и она вызвала много понятных вопросов.



June 25, 1936

Yesterday's Herald Tribune carried an article headlined: "Vandals Wreck \$20,000 Art in Borglum Studios". A few weeks ago an account appeared in all the newspapers of a similar vandalism perpetrated at the studios of George Grey Barnard.

As vandalism appears to be gaining in frequency the flag pole designed to fly permanently, (beside the American Flag), the Banner of Peace, symbol of a universal protection for all works of art, remains conspicuously naked at the building No. 310 Riverside Drive known to all as the Roerich Museum, birthplace of the Roerich Pact and Banner of Peace created by the Founder of Roerich Museum, Nicholas Roerich, as a permanent weapon against vandalism.

Shortly after the Barnard incident and on the same day as the Borglum story appeared, June 24th, 1936, the birthplace of this Pact and Banner was the scene of an outrage just as vandalistic. The three loyal resident trustees of Master Institute of United Arts and Roerich Museum, M.M. Lichtmann, 1st Vice President, Sina Lichtmann and Frances R. Grant, also both Vice Presidents, were being forced to gather such papers as were at hand pertaining not only to the Banner of Peace but to many other phases of the cultural work of this Institution of 15 years' standing and cram them into suit cases and remove them to make room for a group of plotters bent on crushing the Institutions and the Founders. This group included the president, Louis L. Horch, who but a short time ago proclaimed ceaselessly and in lavish terms his devotion to Nicholas Roerich and the Roerich Museum, but who now seeks redress for financial losses which he claims were occasioned when he temporarily quitted Wall Street to invade the domain of Culture; his wife, to whom he recently signed over the shares of stock in the Master Institute of United Arts, Inc. held by him in trust for the owners, Mr. and Mrs. Lichtmann and Miss Grant, without the latter's knowledge of or consent to the transference; and his wife's sister and her husband, also a business man, who have set themselves up as trustees of the Master Institute in place of the founders, original stockholders and incorporators, Prof. and Mme. Roerich and their three loyal co-workers above mentioned. The latter have appealed to the courts and are fighting to preserve the cultural work of Roerich Museum and Master Institute.

On the night of June 23rd, at midnight, without waiting for a court decision on an injunction which was then pending, the usurpers had broken and changed the locks on the private offices used for years exclusively by the three loyal trustees who now stood in their way, and the following morning Mr. Horch had appeared suddenly with a uniformed policeman and attempted to throw three people bag and baggage into the street. The policeman himself declined to arrest or evict the three vice presidents when he surveyed the situation, but for the rest of the day friends of the three trustees, lawyers for both sides and other interested parties and relatives swarmed the third floor, home of the Master Institute under the direction of Sina Lichtmann since the building was erected, and the shock and strain suffered by these innocent and respectable people and the maliciousness of the attack against them and the cultural Institutions for which they are fighting remain unparalleled. All studios had been locked also during the night and school activities were disrupted. None of the invaders had had any part previously in the particular work of the school and its Director, rarely setting foot inside her office. Her whole heart and the labor of 15 years had gone into the work represented by the various papers and files in this office, yet on this afternoon it was only by the most courageous and vigorous protest that she prevented these enemies from handling her papers and withholding



December 10, 1936.

The approach of the first anniversary of the dark day when the plot to usurp the Roerich Museum was openly put into operation forces us to decry a callous, slumbering public consciousness. The nature of the forces at work against the founders and supporters of this Institution should have been apparent to all after July 29th, for on that day the Chapel on the third floor, containing many paintings on religious subjects and Christian Saints and dedicated to St. Sergius of Radonega was found desecrated.

One morning late in June the Director of the Master Institute of United Arts, the School of Roerich Museum, accompanied by the Dean, arrived on the third floor at the usual hour to find that the locks on the doors to their private offices had been changed during the night, as well as the locks on all studios and rooms on this floor including the Chapel. Since matters were already in the hands of attorneys they were forced to await the signing of a court injunction to permit them to resume educational activities. Meanwhile, when the Dean requested permission to visit the Chapel as usual he was refused.

When the injunction was finally granted the Director returned to the School with the surrendered keys, - to resume educational work after a year of crippling opposition and a month of total paralysis. But it was too late to prevent the destructive element from striking. It was impossible to discover immediately how much and what kind of material had been taken from the files and personal cabinets, but what was immediately and shockingly apparent was that the Chapel had been invaded;- walls were stripped of the ancient ikons, religious paintings and gravures; withered flowers stood in vases half full of dark, stagnant water; - dust over all.

What kind of citizens are we, to look forward to a New Year when during the past one we permitted the name of a renowned cultural institution to be chisled off the face of the building which houses it by enemies in the dark of night; the educational life of the institution to be throttled in like manner; and finally the spiritual heart of the institution, the Chapel, to be desecrated while its defenders were illegally locked out and awaiting the court's decision?

This decision granted an injunction which prevented three original trustees from being thrown into the street because of their loyalty to an ideal. Since then this injunction has been under a constant threat until last week when the final appeal to have it removed was unanimously denied by the Appellate Court.

This indicates the inevitable fate of all who are involved in this shameful plot. But let us not imagine that we may escape judgement just because we perhaps are not prominently active in this affair. History will record the names of all who aided it directly and indirectly.



I have been asked to write my impressions of the meeting with Mr. Miller a few days ago.

Rad. had prepared papers showing evidence of contempt of court by the enemies, and called Mr. M. offering to bring them to his office. However, he proposed a meeting at lunch downtown with his friend, Mrs. S., & I, since we four had been together a few times when I was discussing my "case" with M. This lunch was carried through in the same amiable and jovial mood, although I am sure it was very difficult for Rad. at times. Mr. Miller's attitude, from the very beginning, was trivial, condescending and demeaning, and plainly showed that he came with certain opinions finally definitely adopted which were out of sympathy with us.

When Rad. handed him the papers he hardly deigned to look at them, and very bluntly asked immediately just what it was that we wanted after all, - just what was our objective in this case anyway, - (words and manner to the effect that it was all somewhat disgusting). To this he received a very pleasant and easy explanation that Rad. felt that if we could now bring the contempt action against our opponents it would be strongly in our favor. But Mr. M. waved aside all these words as a waste of time and assured Rad. that he was not referring to the detail about a contempt action, but that he simply meant to ask once and for all - just candidly - what was the meaning of the whole affair; what would we do, for instance, if we won the case? Did we wish to punish Levy? Would it be impossible for us, perhaps, to move a little farther down the street or around the corner with our share of the Museum or school? He used the word "bosh" several times; also the expression "down to brass tacks". It was plain that whenever Rad. used the words "Institution," "ideals," or "culture," he wished to substitute the word "bosh", and that he would accept rather some more understandable explanation as, for instance, a financial, or political, or personal one. Coming back to the subject of the contempt of court which we claim was committed in the enemies' interference with the School, he said it would be hardly wise to start something one could not finish, and that the whole story about "interference" would not "stand up", or "hold water" in court; - furthermore, that as far as someone's testifying as to the taking of papers from files was concerned, the publisher had said that this person was not a good witness since he could not identify anything.

Rad. ignored Miller's crudeness and answered amiably and thoroughly. This frankness and willingness to explain forced M. to smile and say, "Well, you are carrying the fight very bravely, but ...." - and then followed the point about the coming which he brought out in the same light as it was mentioned previously by the publishers and M. himself. People seem to be almost belligerent on this point, and stubbornly refuse to hear of the considerations of finances, health, and protection of name. (From a very ordinary human viewpoint it seems to me a little like shooting a man and then demanding that he get busy and bury himself.) It seems that everyone holds that such and such must happen regardless of consequences, when as a matter of fact we have not even an assurance that such and such would guarantee the victory. During the talk at luncheon the other day this was one of the major



points of difficulty and Rad. was forced to explain about the different psychologies in different places.\*\*

In my opinion Mr. M. certainly received more than a fair deal in his un-called-for cross-examination which was at times rude and over-bearing and directed antagonistically at our most vital points. It remains to be seen whether these explanations administered so pleasantly will gradually dispell some of the unworthy shadows in his mind. At least he was again very pleasant at the end and we parted on outwardly jovial terms.

Since it is obvious that M. recently has changed his attitude markedly, one can only say that either he is under a very dark cloud at present, or that he lives on the earthly plane only, or that he is purposely exaggerating an antagonism in order to get at the truth about which he is in doubt. Perhaps all three explanations are partially correct.

Throughout the conversation Mrs. S. and I hardly spoke at all, - sitting merely as witnesses for the most part.

\*\* How M. will gradually assimilate this idea is problematical. At the moment he seemed eager to accuse someone of deliberately sacrificing everything here (which was all he cared about) for something foreign (for which he did not care a rap).



At the hearing on Nov. 12th before Mr. Frankenthaler it appeared to me that favorable results just about balanced unfavorable ones.

When Maurice testified that he often had signed papers without reading carefully, (on advice of Levy), he added quietly and somewhat ruefully, "...but I would not do it now". His air - of one who has learned his lesson - was well counter-balanced by Frances' open righteous indignation in asserting that she had been, of course, willing and anxious to sign quickly a paper which Levy (who had come excitedly to her) said practically brought to a successful conclusion the battle which they had waged together, with other trustees, for a couple of years. Mr. Davis' testimony was very good from all standpoints; it established the furtiveness of the meeting of Dec. 16th and the dodging by the Levys and their lawyers, - and what he said was indisputable.

On the other hand, some things appeared to me not so favorably. I believe that Mr. Levy will prove to be a more dangerous opponent than Mr. Shapiro. He may make a better impression on the referee, as he seems less irritating and wiser. Furthermore, the referee made one significant remark: He said to Frances, "This one paper (agreement) you read thoroughly before you signed, and knew exactly what was in it, but the others you did not read - is that right?" And Frances answered affirmatively. (She mentioned the "sentiment" but it was stricken off the record.) This question by the referee may have been a gesture to our opponents to signify that he was alert to the interests of both sides. Also, judging from this hearing it seems to me that Mr. Plaut's presentation to the court is dangerously narrow, inasmuch as he has focussed everything on the one point of the transfer of stock certificates instead of broadly stressing the fact that Levy is a traitor to a cultural Institution. Of course, technically the issue is narrow but the referee is human and the procedure here is much more informal than regular court. We have plenty of material to illustrate motives in the background, such as the memorandums sent from over there almost a year ago, and the data collected by Sina in the struggle for the School. But after such a procedure as that of Nov. 12th our side might appear as a man who for a long time did not realize the value of something until it was taken from him, and now suddenly wants it back. The method of the co-workers was not too careless or childish to observe the wording of documents, but it was, and is, above technicalities and rests on faith. The stock itself was not valued as such so long as there was no treason, and its recovery is demanded now in order only to counteract the treason.

Of course, I trust that Mr. Plaut intends to establish the above eventually, I am only expressing a little worry at his method.

Incidentally I think that Mr. Plaut's saving quality of honesty demands special recognition, speaking comparatively at the present moment.

My apologies if I seem presumptuous in offering so many opinions.



Excerpt, showing how Mr.L.L.Horch used to signed certificates regarding paintings, for example to Belgrad:

I herewith certify that the paintings are original paintings by Professor Nicholas Roerich. I herewith also certify that I am authorized agent for Professor Roerich.

(signed)

---

Louis L.Horch, President .



February 21, 1939

8

Lawyers and friends agree that further procedure in either libel suit useless unless Arthur agrees to file here petition in bankruptcy thereby discharging debts, and that in Sun. case Arthur's presence at trial necessary.

Cable immediately advice.



On the afternoon of Aug. 2, 1935, Mrs. Lichtmann was in her office with an appointment and Mr. Fosdick was in the outer office typing. Mr. Horch came to the outer office and asked if someone was with Mrs. Lichtmann in her office. Mr. Fosdick answered in the affirmative and stepped to the door. Mr. Horch seemed in a great hurry, and asked Mr. Fosdick to take some papers in right away for Mrs. Lichtmann to sign, saying that they were very important and that he needed them immediately, repeating that there were 7 documents exactly the same and need not be read separately. Mr. F. accordingly interrupted the interview in Mrs. L.'s office and explained this to Mrs. L., who took the papers and started to look through them. Mr. F. stepped out, but as Mr. Horch seemed very nervous, and inquired whether they were being signed, Mr. F. returned to Mrs. L. and repeated Mr. H.'s statement that they were all alike. Mrs. L. then signed without studying them further and resumed her conference, and Mr. F. took the papers to Mr. H., who went away hurriedly.

The occasion remains impressed in memory because, at the time, it seemed that Mrs. Lichtmann was unduly deliberate in glancing even cursorily through the papers under the circumstances.



9

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

At about 10:00 A.M. on June 25, 1936 I was in Mrs. Lichtmann's office preparing to do some work for her as soon as she finished speaking over the telephone, when Mrs. Horch suddenly appeared at the door. (During the entire period of my association with the Roerich Museum - and for the last two years I have been here almost every day - I have never known Mrs. Horch to make a personal appearance at Mrs. Lichtmann's office prior to this occasion.) Mrs. Lichtmann excused herself over the telephone and asked of Mrs. Horch, "What is it, please?" Mrs. Horch answered, "I want to see what is going on here, - and what is being taken out." Mrs. Lichtmann said that we were taking nothing out, that this was her office and that we were working as usual. Mrs. Horch said she wanted the books (financial records of the school). Mrs. Lichtmann telephoned immediately to her attorneys, who advised that if the books were demanded she should surrender them on condition that Mrs. Horch sign a receipt for the same.

While Mrs. Lichtmann spoke over the telephone I stepped to the door and stood facing Mrs. Horch without saying a word. She mumbled something at me and, receiving no reply, disappeared. A moment later I walked out of Mrs. Lichtmann's office and found Mrs. Horch, her sister, and Miss E.J. Lichtmann speaking in low tones at the entrance to the outer office. I approached and stood silent whereupon I was accosted sharply by Mrs. Horch as to what I wanted. I did not speak. Mrs. Lichtmann, who had been informed of the arrival of the three people by Mr. Kimmell, came out of her office asking Mrs. Horch what she wanted. Mrs. Horch said, "I want to see the books, - where are the books!!" (loudly). Mrs. Lichtmann said, "The books are right here in my office, and if you want to take them you must sign a receipt. Come in, please, I want you all to see that the books are right here". We all then went into Mrs. Lichtmann's office. The books were lying in plain sight on Mrs. Lichtmann's desk. Mrs. Horch proceeded very slowly and deliberately to pick up, open and spread the books on the desk opposite Mrs. Lichtmann's, - Mrs. Newberger, her sister seemingly helping her, staying very close to her and remaining silent. Miss E.J. Lichtmann strolled completely around the office, examining closely the pictures on the wall, papers and books and furniture. As Mrs. Horch moved behind the desk preparatory to seating herself comfortably evidently, she looked up at me and, as if it was a last minute thought as a matter of form, said, "Do you mind if we use your desk here?" Mrs. Lichtmann did not wait for me to answer, but said simply that this was her office and that if they wished to examine the books they were at liberty to take them if they would sign a receipt and meanwhile anything that they wished to transact could be done in the outer office. They then gathered up the books and established themselves at a desk in the outer office (I think)

Miss E.J. Lichtmann left (to telephone their lawyers) and Mrs. Horch sat turning the pages and peering or pointing at one spot or another while Mrs. Newberger hung over her shoulder.



As Mrs. Lichtmann was attempting meanwhile to dictate to Mr. Kimmell in the same room, I walked over and stood at Mrs. Horch's other shoulder, whereupon she demanded to know what I wanted. Again receiving no reply, she asked me sharply if I understood English. I nodded in the affirmative but did not exchange any words with her, as Mrs. Lichtmann requested me to move away. Miss E.J.Lichtmann returned at length and indicated that they should take the books. She never spoke, an inclination or slight shake of the head meant yes or no to everything and Mrs. Horch acted accordingly. When Mrs. Horch told Mrs. Lichtmann that they had decided to take the books, Mrs. Lichtmann had Mr. Kimmell type a receipt and hand it to Mrs. Horch to sign. Mrs. Horch took the paper from Mr. Kimmell and passed it to Miss E.J.Lichtmann, who gave a negative sign whereupon Mrs. Horch refused to sign it. Miss E.J.Lichtmann disappeared again to return shortly with a differently worded document typed elsewhere. Mr. Kimmell pointed out that the latter paper did not specify from whom the books had been received, and after further discussion at length Mrs. Horch finally added the explanatory sentence in pen and ink. Long before the transaction was completed Mrs. Lichtmann, who remained near the typewriter away from Mr. Kimmell and the group, said, "Let them take the books without any receipt; we dont want to drag out this procedure - we want no receipt, - let them go ahead and take the books." But the question as to how it should be worded was so absorbing that the matter was carried to conclusion without regard to anything Mrs. Lichtmann said.

After Mrs. Lichtmann requested me to move away I remained in the background except for one moment when Mrs. Horch turned from Mr. Kimmell and asked just what it was that we wanted included in the receipt. Mrs. Lichtmann then asked me to explain that we wanted it to state from whom the books had been received, but as I approached to comply, Mrs. Horch broke in with, "Well, just who am I dealing with, - is it you then, Mr. Fosdick?" whereupon I remained silent and withdrew again.

Mrs. Horch was the only one of the visitors who spoke, and she made many remarks without waiting to be spoken to or answered, and interrupted many times with such remarks as, "Well, if you people are going to act like this!"... "Dont get excited!".... and, "Are we going to have to call a policeman?!"...etc.



The complete treachery of the trio is evidenced by their plan of attacking, through lawyers, the credibility of our side by asking questions which they think we cannot answer without betraying that which both sides considered sacred for fifteen years. They are relying on our loyalty to that which they have already renounced and betrayed to close our mouths and leave us exposed to dark suspicions and insinuations.

Their failure to attain the level of the loyal ones in knowledge and understanding of the work will prove their downfall, however, for they do not know just what the founders were working for and never understood their methods. These three, therefore, remain with their own selfish illusions which, having rotted in their grasp, are poisoning and destroying them. This self-induced malady having become unbearable finally, they rush into the street, crying, "We are bewitched!"

The founders have proclaimed practical idealism and the loyal co-workers have worked unceasingly and self-sacrificingly for the spreading of culture. That is what the loyal ones consider sacred, and they revere the founders as teachers.

The traitors have proclaimed that for fifteen years they revered some shadowy phantom which revealed itself through spiritualistic phenomena and promised them that if they would worship it in secret "mumbo-jumbery", under cover of a mask of cultural ideals, they would emerge eventually as powerful presidents of institutions, commanding respect and carrying the right to rule and possessing great wealth through manipulation of silver, for instance, or political connections.

If such was their dream and thus voodoo-istic their "service," then their confession has come none too soon. They should be left alone to begin anew the more lengthy and arduous but surer method of gaining power and wealth by working for it as other people do. The institutions should be allowed to proceed in their work purified by removal of this shameful element.



21  
12  
It is my belief that the steps taken by our friend in turning H. <sup>has</sup> been very useful --as it has meant that he is prepared when the chief pursues this with him, and is no longer against it. My friend also thinks it is good that we changed him, and he feels that the steady personal pressure has been most useful --although, as he says, H. is a timid & a dessiccated mind.

I also suggested to my friend that since H. is so timid, that perhaps it is useful --because in this case our friend can pursue the matter personally with the chief and alone, and in the other case, he can always accompany H. to the chief. This seems to me to be the best way.



правду? Каждый кто ознакомится со всем материалом упомянутым мною выше, невольно спросит г. Хорша: "когда же вы были искренни, тогда или теперь?" Подумал ли г. Хорш, что его теперешние заявления производят болезненное впечатление на его теперешних слушателей, на которых он пытается воздействовать с неизвестной, но во всяком случае мрачною целью. Для этой разрушительной цели он избрал время, когда я находился в почти недостижимом далеке, ибо почта была в особых условиях.

Восстанавливая в памяти весь материал накопившийся за 13 лет, хочу подчеркнуть что кроме всего рукописного огромного материала следует хранить в полном порядке и весь печатный, иметь его под рукою, ибо печатая все эти книги и брошюры все члены Совета брали на себя великую ответственность в истинности и точности всего сообщаемого. Доведя до сведения и общественного мнения все широко напечатанные факты о деятельности Учреждений, высказав определеннейшие заключения по поводу празднования десятилетия Учреждений, может ли г- Хорш или кто либо из членов Совета сказать, что он вводил в заблуждение или говоря по просту лгал в течение всего этого времени? Неужели г. Хорш хочет сказать, что он обманывал Правительство, общественное мнение и всех множайших сотрудников. Наша культурная программа настолько продумана и проверена на множайших фактах что мы совершенно определенно можем стоять на нашей просветительной точке зрения. Мы всегда ясно заявляли о значении Науки и Искусства, мы всегда заявляли об Основах Этики, мы всегда заявляли против роскоши, как явления не культурного, антипода красоты. Во всех моих книгах достаточно сказано и об этих основах жизни и задачах наших Учреждений. Никакого нового кредо нам писать не приходится и приходится лишь скорбеть видя перед собою такое мрачно-болезненное проявление, как теперешние действия г Хорша, при участии его малочисленной группы его жены и мисс Ест. Лихтманн. Желающие знать правду пусть кроме изучения рукописных документов обратятся ко всем печатным изданиям, широко распространенным с ведома всех членов Совета.