

AN OPEN LETTER

TO

MR. WADIA

BY

J. NITYANANDA
J. KRISHNAMURTI



KROTONA, HOLLYWOOD, CALIFORNIA

OCTOBER 1, 1922

Krotona, Hollywood, California.
October 1st, 1922.

My dear Wadia:

It was with considerable regret that we read the pamphlet which you so kindly sent us giving the reasons for your resignation from the Theosophical Society of which Dr. Annie Besant is the President. It is a pity that such an enthusiastic worker as yourself should have taken such a deplorable step, and it is a still greater pity that you should have circulated this unwise pamphlet which seems to us to lay bare conclusions based on complete misconceptions,—although you assert them, with great emphasis, to be the result of twenty years of mature and honest thought.

Undoubtedly, the Theosophical Society has lost a courageous and persevering worker and we, who intend to devote our lives to this Society, will feel the absence of your companionship, though,—and it is almost unnecessary to say this,—our friendship will ever be the same. Many are the sincere friends that you have left behind in the movement that you have been so eager to condemn and they will, we are sure, lament with us your withdrawal from our midst. All the constructive work that you have done in the Theosophical Society will be a happy remembrance of your worth. In this Society so full of renunciation and self-abnegation, where nearly all are unceasingly striving for the enlightenment which we feel our Society is pre-eminently able to bestow, few have been favored with the privileges that Karma has strewn in your pathway. Hence our grief is all the greater.

The tone of your pamphlet convinces us that you have definitely chosen a path wholly different from the one which we intend to follow, and in answering your accusations, we are not urged by a desire to enter upon a controversy with you, personally, or with those who feel it their unfortunate duty to attack the Theosophical Society, which is so full of generous forbearance.

The reasons for our entering into this discussion are two. First, there is prevalent in some circles an impression, grotesque in its misconception, humorous in its lack of imagination, that we two are in some manner profoundly sympathetic with the views which you have but recently expressed in public, and which you seem to have discussed privately with your friends for some time past. The appearance of your pamphlet gives us the opportunity to present our true point of view. Second, there are naturally in this Society some members who are still balancing the pros and cons, and the perusal of your pamphlet alone would point out the one side of the

question and may serve to prejudice them; there will be many who will defend this Society, and we would wish to be numbered among these. Besides this, there are some whose decision will be affected by impulse and we would not like to leave to you the whole field of influence. You see, my dear Wadia, that we are quite frank. We do not wish what we consider to be your false judgment to have unchecked sway.

In reading your pamphlet we were impressed by four points.

1. Your extraordinarily sweeping assertion that the Theosophical Society is at present disloyal to Theosophy.

2. The persistent inference right through your pamphlet that H. P. B. was, is and ever will be the sole, true and infallible source of all theosophical wisdom and that her books are the only true exponents of Theosophy.

3. You unhesitatingly take it for granted and publish it to the world that your own judgment is absolutely incapable of error and that your inferences and deductions are conclusive since they are based upon your own penetration.

4. Convinced of your sincerity, you unhappily take it upon yourself to cast aspersions on the sincerity, honesty and intellectual capacity of all those who have refused to come to the same conclusions that you have. Besides this you have made grave insinuations against the present leaders of the Theosophical Society, especially with regard to the probity of their character as teachers.

We can concede that the first two points can be the outcome of genuine enthusiasm, "zealous, if not wise," but calmly and superciliously to remark that all those who should be so unfortunate as to disagree with you are merely "children in the valley playing with moving shadows and mistaking them for realities and failing to see their illusory nature," seems to us to be the attitude of one of those "children in the valley," rather than that of one who "on the lofty and serene mountain peak" has "his feet planted on the eternal snow of pure reason."

Now let us analyze these points.

1. The Theosophical Society is disloyal to Theosophy: What exactly do you mean by this statement? From your further remarks the natural inference is that the leaders of the present day Theosophical thought within the Society,—chief among whom are the President of the Theosophical Society and the Right Reverend Charles W. Leadbeater,—have promulgated teachings contrary to that of H. P. B. Since he holds no official

position within the Theosophical Society, Bishop Leadbeater stands within the same category as any of us. Any influence that his teachings may have acquired is owing entirely to that intrinsic value which you so eagerly recognize in the teachings of H. P. B. Your contention then must be that Dr. Besant officially and Bishop Leadbeater unofficially, have led the Theosophical Society away from the teachings of H. P. B., and in one of your statements you almost suggest that this has been done purposely and even with considerable guile. The sentence which we refer to is as follows: "It is necessary to see the chain of events forged; for each event in itself appears innocuous, and in certain instances, even assumes a subtle form of correct Theosophy. When succeeding events in their true import and inner significance are linked up, the disloyalty to the 'original programme', referred to by H. P. B., emerges clear and unmistakable."

We fear that your statements in this connection are liable to be misconstrued. There are two possible interpretations to your accusations: 1. That "Theosophy is not an evolving system of thought" and that this entire system of thought is contained in the works and the teachings of Madame Blavatsky, standing in no need of further amplification, expansion or detailed development. 2. That this system of thought as given forth by H. P. B. was not complete in itself and is capable of further development, but that Dr. Besant and Bishop Leadbeater have not been and are not capable of amplifying and expanding this system of thought by independent investigation, and that they have gone seriously astray from the "original programme."

Now let us examine with dispassion these two possible explanations of your statements. We find it impossible to know which one of these two you have in mind; it may be that you intend only the one or the other or indeed both; but we gather that you purpose to convey both these ideas. "Theosophy is not an evolving system of thought." Such is your statement. Theosophy, it seems to us, gives, to put it briefly, an explanation of the why and wherefore of the universe so that we may, if we so desire, live in consonance with the laws of evolution and not live in harmful ignorance. If you mean that in the consciousness of Parabrahm "Theosophy is not an evolving system of thought," you will certainly find strong and almost unanimous support. But if you put forward the idea that the works of H. P. B. are equivalent to the consciousness of Parabrahm, we would suggest, in all humility, that the claim is rather a large one to make, even for so great a person as H. P. B., especially, coming from one who finds it so easy to see in others an "absence of all sense of proportion, enlightened intelligence and sound reasonableness." We are sure that you did not intend to put forward seriously this extravagant proposition.

Now as to the second interpretation, that Dr. Besant and Bishop Leadbeater have been and are incapable of amplifying and expanding this system of thought. It is not our intention to take them up point by point and refute your arguments; we intend only to deal with the underlying principles. For your one assertion that Dr. Besant and Bishop Leadbeater are incapable of truly expanding and amplifying the doctrine left behind by H. P. B., there will be many thousands who will maintain the contrary, and it would be foolish for any one to declare that they were all either ignorant, intellectually dishonest or that they were merely blind followers. Who then, shall judge? After all, it is the denial of one against the affirmation of the many. We certainly do not hold that the majority are always in the right, but it is for everyone to decide for himself. Neither you, my dear Wadia, nor we, wish to make people blindly accept our beliefs; they will find, as they have already found, truth in the teachings of all our leaders. You would confine the truth to the one leader, whereas we, with many others, have found truth also among her great successors.

We are all treading on unexplored ground when we discuss spiritual capacity, and you have taken upon yourself to pronounce judgment, for you have condemned the leadership of Dr. Besant and Bishop Leadbeater. You have brought forward certain reasons in support of your judgment which you no doubt consider irrefutable. But during the life time of Madame Blavatsky, equally "intelligent" people as yourself have come forward with the same arguments to prove her a charlatan. The commandments from the Masters, "messages, orders and instructions," were issued with the same frequency as today, probably with greater frequency. Indeed, if we had been living in those fortunate days, the "terrible" H. P. B. would have given us greater trials, for you seem to regard these as trials, and there were many Wadias issuing pamphlets, all showing their own righteousness, the accuracy of their own judgment, proving how she herself had strayed from the "original impulse." Now that the great lady is dead, you kindly come forward, elbowing your way to the front, declaring that you "accept H. P. B. as the Messenger of the Great Lodge, because of the intrinsic merit, value and truthfulness of her message." Is it not possible that there are some who are wise in their own generation who do not wait for the message to be sanctified by the death of the Messenger? There are many thousands today, all over the world, who are only too willing to make the same asseverations about Dr. Besant and Bishop Leadbeater, that you make about H. P. B. But you consider yourself in a position to condemn them as either unfortunately ignorant or intellectually dishonest — put plainly, humbugs. Is this the attitude of one who has been on the "mountain top," and who has seen us, the poor children, "playing in the valley"?

Then you declare that "the noble ideals of Theosophical ethics are

exploited and dragged into the mire of psychism and immorality." After twenty years, which you say you have spent in work in and for our Society, are we to take this appalling phrase as your considered opinion of the results of the work done under Dr. Besant's term of office? Dr. Besant has worked over thirty years for the moral and political regeneration of your country and ours, and her whole life has been consecrated to the service of humanity, yet these are the terms in which you acclaim her sacrifices! We feel infinitely sorry that you should have allowed yourself to put down on paper such statements. For, please remember that these very words have been hurled, with equal irresponsibility, against the light bringer—Madame Blavatsky. The passion of the moment precipitates us into extravagant follies, the cause of bitter regret in years to follow. Who amongst us dares to throw stones at those or at any who have striven so nobly and who have brought so much happiness to thousands, and who have gone through so much suffering for what they were convinced was truth? Your resignation from the Theosophical Society will cause many to feel sorrowful, but your pamphlet will be the cause of still greater sorrow.

2: Now we will take the second point, i. e., that H. P. B. is the only source of true Theosophy. Again we cannot think that you intend to convey this idea in all seriousness. It is this spirit, it seems to us, that has been the cause, throughout the ages, of religious wars, bitter persecutions, the cruel and fanatical inquisitions, and it is the cancer that slowly but surely poisons the primary purity of all religions. My God is the one God, and all other Gods are but evil Bhuts; this is the battle cry of the ignorant and the blind. It is but a sacrilege to exploit her name in such a cause. One of the essentials of Theosophy, it seems to us, is that we should recognize truth wherever it may be, whoever may teach it, and in whatsoever religion it may be found. For

“Beware of prejudices! Light is good in whatsoever a lamp it is burning. A rose is beautiful in whatsoever a garden it may bloom. A star has the same radiance whether it shines from the East or from the West.”

Such has been your earnest and sincere study in twenty years that the light of truth comes in only at one window, or at least so it seems to us who differ from you. Can you not realize that all the true and beautiful things which you say of H. P. B. find an echo in our hearts, not only for her, but her great successors, who have “toiled in the field of Ancient Hermitage”? In the future when our present leaders shall have passed away, the same spirit of bigotry will surely raise the cry, “Back to Besant,” “the lion-hearted, eagle-eyed spiritual Hercules,” “follow the straight line of the

Masters of A. B.," and when asked why "Back to Besant?" they will surely reply, "If not back to A. B., then forward to A. B. What concerns us are A. B.'s *teachings*, and the sacred duty of Theosophists is not to whittle away the doctrines of her books." You, who are so fervent in destroying what you consider are the dogmas, the bigotries, the blind extravagances of those who seek other paths than yours, are the first to come forward triumphantly with your own priestess, shaped by your own imagination, in a church-like, dogmatic society of your own fabrication. It is so easy to find apt and pertinent citations from books to vindicate one's own theories, especially when the authors themselves are incapable of explaining their true import. We think it was Talleyrand who said that given a letter of some innocent citizen, he would find in it enough to hang the unfortunate writer. Surely it would be no difficult task to fill these pages with quotations from the books of H. P. B. to prove that you, yourself, my dear Wadia, are one of those against whom we should take warning. Indeed, you yourself have conveniently provided us with just such an excerpt: H. P. B.'s warning about "false prophets of Theosophy and their monstrous exaggerations and idiotic schemes and shams." Again, "Let no man set up a popery instead of Theosophy * * * *; no one belonging to the Theosophical Society ought to count himself as more than, at best, a teacher-pupil—one who has no right to dogmatism." And would you have us all accept H. P. B. as our Pope, with you as her *only* interpreter? As a friend of ours said, "for my part the tyranny of a book is heavier and more cruel than the tyranny of an individual because it is less elastic and there is no appeal. And directly texts are used to budgeon an opponent it seems to me that their spiritual inspiration has disappeared." All the aspersions that you have unfortunately thought fit to cast upon the Theosophical Society, the insinuations against our present leaders, and the intolerant reflections that you have made against those members of the Theosophical Society who, exercising their right of independent thought, have arrived at conceptions of Theosophy at variance with yours, all these are supported by quotations from H. P. B., interpreted by yourself. This spirit of hard unfaith in those who have been your friends, companions and co-workers for near twenty years is one of the many tragedies that seem to be necessary to ensure the success of our movement.

3: Our third point we have expressed briefly, and to dilate upon it would be an infringement upon the rules of friendship and courtesy.

4: Now we will deal with the last point which draws attention to your sweeping declaration that "the Theosophical Society is no more a Society of the seekers of Wisdom, but an organization where the many believe in the few and blind following has come to prevail, where we have unverifiable pronouncements on the one hand, and extravagant credulity on the

other; where we have false notions of devotion and allegiance, beliefs in false doctrines and worship of personalities.”

These are some of the extravagant reproaches that you unkindly hurl at us which, in their turn, serve as weapons against our leaders who have led us into the “muddy stream which quenches our thirst while, at the same time, poisoning us.” You apparently strongly object to the present tendencies of the Society because you say it has strayed from the path which the Masters desired it to take. Your reason for this statement is based upon your interpretation of Madame Blavatsky’s teachings and those who follow their own interpretations, exercising as much intelligence as yourself, and who have arrived at sincere beliefs contrary to yours, are all condemned by you as “children mistaking shams for realities,” and the promptings of their intelligence and intuitions you condemn as “superstitions and false doctrines.” You are willing to admit intelligence and a sincere desire for knowledge in those who arrive at the same conclusions as yourself; these you would welcome as brother Theosophists and true, but if they should choose to follow some other interpreter your contempt for their intelligence and even for their honesty knows no bounds. They are no longer “seekers of wisdom” but gullible children. This seems to us again the same spirit of intolerance which predicts for all unbelievers eternal damnation. Innumerable members of the Theosophical Society are sincerely struggling to acquire the Divine Wisdom and on their path they are willing to accept help from all who proffer it. Does not this constitute a Society of “seekers of Wisdom”? If this does not suffice, what is your conception of a “seeker of Wisdom”? A dogmatic Catholic, a fanatic Mohammedan and a bigoted Hindu each will declare, fervently, that a true seeker can only be found in his own particular religion and that outside of their religion there can be no wisdom. Each would point to the purgatory awaiting the infidel. You, in your turn, assure us that we are drifting on to a “sandbank of thought where we will remain a stranded carcass.” Why this dire prophecy? Because we have found Truth where you can not find it; because we believe in things that you haughtily scoff at; because our intelligence has pointed out a different path from your own; because we accept and welcome as true Messengers, not only Madame Blavatsky, but also Dr. Besant and Bishop Leadbeater; because we would accept the interpretation of those who have been personal disciples, who have been trained by H. P. B., rather than your interpretations; because “of the illumination their message brings and the inspiration to which it gives birth”; because the teachings given since the death of H. P. B. have the “overwhelming evidence of their validity”; because “their consistency is thorough”; because “we have tested with reverence and humility and the best of our intellectual capacity” the quality of these teachings; because we shall tread the path to our goal unhesitatingly, and because we also have seen the vision.

You further remark that the Society is now "an organization where the many believe in the few and where blind following has come to prevail." This blunt statement seems to us rather a futile objection because in any school, all who think it worth while to attend it, must of necessity follow the guidance of the teacher whom they have chosen, in other words, "many believe in the few." This is so obvious that we need not labour the point. But your main objection seems to be that there should be no such belief in the particular "few" that you have in mind, and since you yourself have no belief in this particular "few," you are positive that the belief of others in this particular "few" is merely blind following not based on "enlightened intelligence and sound reasonableness." This seems to us one more example of the intolerant and dogmatic attitude which you adopt throughout the pamphlet towards the members of the Society which you have left.

We have ourselves heard time out of number, in public and in private; both Dr. Besant and Bishop Leadbeater declare that it is their intention to amplify and to expound by independent investigation the teachings first given forth by Madame Blavatsky. We have ourselves heard time out of number, in public and in private meetings, both Dr. Besant and Bishop Leadbeater reiterate, with great emphasis, that the results of their clairvoyant investigations should be examined and weighed and that their teachings should not be accepted blindly, and that those who are willing to follow them should use their own independent judgment in all things concerned. Naturally, as in all movements of this kind, there are no doubt some followers for whom unquestioning devotion is the path to enlightenment, and since you have lived for some time in India, you will of course understand what a glorious and noble rôle Bhaktas have played and still do play in Hinduism. You know us two, well enough, and we have discussed the matter so often that you are well aware that blind acceptance is not our line of evolution, though we do not condemn those who take a wholly different path. Yet, the conclusions to which we have come are diametrically opposed to yours. We hope that you do not think that we presume too much when we say that we have exercised as much intelligence and honesty of purpose as you maintain you have. There are thousands exactly in our position.

Again you say that we have "unverifiable pronouncements on the one hand and extravagant credulity on the other." Do you mean to tell us that you personally have verified and tested all the statements that H. P. B. has made in her books? We are sure that you cannot possibly make this super-human claim. But what you do mean, no doubt, is that certain personal experiences have given you proofs that Madame Blavatsky was worthy of your confidence. All those other statements of H. P. B., which you per-

sonally have not had the capacity to prove for yourself, you do not condemn as "unverifiable pronouncements," unworthy of your attention, but you would take the attitude of a student who listens with profound attention and respect to the teachings of one who had proved his wisdom partially, and you would consider it an honorable duty to wait till you could personally establish their soundness before you could justly condemn them. In your lectures, we have ourselves heard you expatiate on details which certainly are not of your personal experiences, yet since you have placed such absolute faith in your teacher you take the truth of some of her statements for granted. This seems to us to be one of the elementary understandings that should exist between a teacher and a pupil, whether in spirituality, chemistry, mathematics or any other science. This sane and intelligent attitude seems to us to prevail among the deeper and hence more useful students in our condemned Society. Your extravagant conclusion that this attitude is not to be found among us cannot be laid on the heads of the members, but we consider it to be, the *ipse dixit* of the seeker who sets out on his search, with preconceived opinions—"the fault, dear Brutus," is not in the T. S.

This reasoning, it seems to us, applies with equal force to many of your imputations against the Theosophical Society, but there is one statement which we cannot pass without comment.

In your letter of resignation to the President and to the General Council of the Theosophical Society you express your view that "the noble ideals of Theosophical ethics are exploited and dragged into the mire of psychism and immorality." Ever since the inception of our Society, this particular form of slander has been the favorite weapon of nearly every one who posed as the only true "defender of the faith." In your zeal to hurt the Theosophical Society, perhaps you have forgotten that our Society has never seen such halcyon days of psychism as when our leader was the great Blavatsky. We are quite sure that all those who vied with each other to hurl filth at her did not in any way affect the splendor of her message. We are also quite sure that she was often more amused than annoyed by their gross attacks, the prurient minds who indulged in their favorite game, seeking to find in her morals a target for their base assault. These onslaughts on her character have in no way diminished the gratitude and the respect which the members all over the world feel towards her, nor is the brilliancy of her teachings in any serious degree tarnished. Now that she is dead, all those who have grievances against the Theosophical Society find in her name a convenient weapon with which to bludgeon their opponents.

Your intense desire to denounce the Theosophical Society has led you to put forward this scandalous fabrication about the "mire of immorality";

it is so utterly false that it is difficult to grasp the thought that lies behind this statement. Do you intend to convey the impression that individuals have been immoral? If this is the case would one dare to assert that the ideals of some religion or sect have been "dragged into the mire of immorality" because some follower of that religion or sect had been immoral? If a weak brother fails on his path towards the truth, is that path any the less sacred? Surely this is a confusion of personalities and principles. We are indeed sorry that you have allowed yourself to join those whose passion for slander seems stronger than their desire for truth.

It would be no difficult task to find mere intellectual arguments to refute every one of the charges you make with such ease against the Theosophical Society, its leaders and its members; probably, if we set ourselves to the task, we ourselves could find innumerable imperfections in the fabric of our Society. None of us are so confident or so wilfully blind that we are not able to see the limitations and defects of our Society, and we are as enthusiastic in our desire to discover our weaknesses as any merely destructive critic. It seems to us, that in order to be a true and sincere Theosophist, one is bound to welcome all friendly and constructive criticism based on a real sense of brotherhood and a love of the Society. In the past, we ourselves have often indulged in irresponsible and vain criticism, which, though not without some foundation of truth, did not help the object upon which we passed our judgment, nor did it encourage true insight in us. In fact, the main function of this form of criticism is to bolster up our vanity and maintain us in our conceit. Our Society has never lacked criticisms, and we greatly hope that it never will; every Tom, Dick and Harry who considers he has a grievance based either upon some personal hardship or on some other equally puerile cause of distress, immediately thinks that it is his solemn and sacred duty to rush into print, and satisfy his hurt vanity in virulent language. Another noticeable fact is that these traducers have never been known to lack a grand and noble motive for their flow of abuse. Indeed, they are invariably "standing on the lofty and serene mountain peak with their feet planted on the eternal snow of pure reason," while those who are unfortunately traduced are also invariably "playing like children with empty shells in the valley of illusion." Though our carping, critical faculties are in no way inferior to yours, we, for our part, would wish to remain faithful to this condemned Society, though many have deserted her, to join other societies which, no doubt, in their turn will receive their dread disapproval. We sincerely hope, and we wish to emphasize this especially, that the Society will always welcome fair-minded, generous and kindly criticism. But we would like to point out that all genuine and keen desire to accept criticism is blunted and deadened when the denunciation is harsh and vindictive. It has been a surprise to us that those who

have been so assiduous in the study of Theosophical doctrines, at the first hearing of a faint rustle of trouble, should forget to practice what they have so painstakingly learned.

Many of the troubles, both grave and trivial, we believe have had their beginnings in some personal affront, prejudice or personal bias, or because the sensibilities of some one have been unconsciously ignored. Having thus been personally wounded, they proceed to gather material to keep open that wound, and by continually dwelling upon their injuries, they proceed to build up a mountain out of a molehill in their imagination. We are sure the process of this gradual accumulation is in most cases entirely unconscious, but as time goes on, this purely personal matter has been evolved into a principle, affecting the very foundations of the Theosophical Society, and now they are convinced it is their duty to proselytise, to promulgate their prejudices, and to issue innumerable pamphlets. The rupture which once might have been healed by a little determination to judge impersonally has now become so seriously widened that it becomes almost beyond cure. Then former friendships, gratitude, reverence, and that most essential quality—kindliness, are all forgotten. And now comes the time, surely somewhat late in the day, to unfurl the banner of impersonalities. Now comes the time, when their questionable actions are to be excused, for they have discovered that they alone are fighting for the truth. Then follows the triumphal secession and sudden and vociferous discovery of the only movement where one may safely seek for the truth. Finally, weary of bickering, criticising and self-glorification, we settle down to the business of pointing out to the unenlightened world how much happier they would be if they would only follow the path of “true Theosophy”; with us as exemplars, who have not yet learned to treat fellow Theosophists as brothers!

You have made a number of statements about the E. S., forgetting, no doubt, the sacred promise that you have given. Since it is a religious promise, we can hardly realize that an Indian has actually broken it. Yet the appearance, in black and white, bearing undeniable testimony of the breach of your honourable obligation, will bring, we are sure, intense remorse that you should have been betrayed into such an astounding course of action.

There are naturally many sides to every question, and all will find enthusiastic, well-balanced and thoughtful supporters, but the great need of the world, today, in every branch of life and thought, is the unifying spirit, for it is the emphasis of the separative instinct that is responsible for the present chaos, so full of despair. Take ourselves, as an example. We are

all three of one mind as to the eventual goal for each one of us; so far have we advanced from the narrow influence of religious bigotry; yet, when we come to the means of achievement, the path to be followed towards the goal, we then see how little has been the advance from the devastating influence of bigotry. Why do we waste so much time, and the little energy with which we are blessed, in fighting with each other about which path we should take, when each one of us needs every atom of energy to reach any path at all? Let us reserve our feeble strength to the one really terrifying task ahead of us, that of scaling the precipitous peaks. How do we know that our two paths may not meet after the bend, or that they will not meet until the bitter end? Can we not wait to lampoon each other till we have reached the heights of Parabrahm?

Theosophy is the "corner stone" of all religions; and, we hope, that our Society is tolerant enough to harbour and to give shelter to the reformers of all religions. Every Theosophist-reformer will apply to his religion Theosophy according to his inspiration, and this will no doubt result in some practical movement, and all such movements will be opposed, we suppose, by all the intolerant members of the Society. It is one of our strongest desires to see, started in India, a movement which will elucidate and simplify Hinduism in the light of Theosophy; theoretically this will meet with but little opposition while this desire does not descend further than the mental plane but when an active organization begins to materialize and find some enthusiastic supporters, the orthodox Hindu will join with the intolerant Theosophist in an effort to crush such a reform. In the Society a cry will be raised that the Theosophical Society is being Brahmanized, that Theosophy is being exploited for the sake of Hinduism and other complaints with which we are now being familiarized will again be heard. Theosophy, as you say, is the "Cause of our Motherland," as it is the Cause of every country. This phrase which you have used makes us hope that you will give us your tolerant help in India, when the time comes to apply Theosophy to Hinduism.

Your action in leaving the Theosophical Society, in our opinion, may be likened unto a son who has been nurtured with care, and who abandons his mother on some trivial misunderstanding which he would fain present to the world as a serious breach. We hopefully await the day of the happy reconciliation, and it lies entirely with the son to bring this about.

We remain, always your sincere friends,

J. NITYANANDA,
J. KRISHNAMURTI.