

b. To achieve this it will be helpful to have a *friendly* inter-theosophical forum among knowledgeable theosophists who will study and discuss perceived incongruities in basic or popular theosophy and see in what way we can develop an integrated body of teachings. I need to emphasize the word “friendly” or brotherly because any unfriendly or aggressive attitude will just derail such efforts to bring about a general consensus as to what is the theosophy that we wish to popularize. This need not be an official inter-organizational forum. A group of well-known and respected theosophists from various societies would be enough to lead other theosophists to a reasonable consensus. This can be initiated by, for example, Theosophy Forward or the International Theosophical Conference. The effort may fail, but it is worth pursuing.

c. Such a group will inevitably arrive at certain principles that will guide such a joint inquiry and research that will serve as the basis for arriving at a broad consensus. For example, they will most probably acknowledge that scientific findings that are reasonably conclusive should be given due consideration in case it conflicts with any Theosophical teachings, such as that there are no canals or forests on the physical surface of Mars.

d. For certain controversial areas, more joint research and exploration would be necessary. For example, *is the astral body the kama rupa or the linga sarira?* There is room for actual quasi-scientific research on this issue because of the vast information now available on out-of-body experiences, near-death experience, etc.

e. There will probably remain certain areas that are difficult to tackle, such as the definition of the monad (*is it the atma-buddhi or the anupadaka monad?*) primarily because they rely on the assertions of individuals rather than based on experience. Part of the problem is the use of the same terms for different things (monad, astral body, logos, etc.). It would have been helpful if a different term had been used when a later writer introduced a new idea or concept. Although this is water under the bridge, it is still possible to review the confusing nomenclature and create qualifying adjectives to distinguish one term from another (especially if theosophists cannot agree on the actual teachings), and present a less confusing body of teachings to the public.

4. An area of bitter dissension is about historical personalities, primarily C. W. Leadbeater and W. Q. Judge: