

they even to oppose some of us personally to the bitter end, — are entitled to as much respect and consideration (so long as they are sincere) from us and their fellow-members of opposite views, as those who are ready with Mr. Sinnett to follow absolutely but our special teaching. A dutiful regard for these rules in life will always promote the best interests of all concerned. It is necessary for the parallel progress of the groups under Mrs. K. and Mr. S. that neither should interfere with the beliefs and rights of the other. And it is seriously expected that both of them will be actuated by an earnest and sleepless desire to respect the philosophical independence of each other, while preserving at the same time their unity as a whole — namely the objects of the Parent Theos. Society in their integrity — and those of the London Lodge, in their slight modification. We wish the London Society should preserve its harmony in division like the Indian Branches, where the representatives of all the different schools of Hinduism seek to study Esoteric Sciences and the Wisdom of old, without necessarily giving up for it their respective beliefs. Each Branch, often members of the same Branch — Christian converts included in some cases — study esoteric philosophy each in his own way, yet always knitting together brotherly hands for the furtherance of the common objects of the Society. To carry out this programme, it is desirable that the “London Lodge” should be administered by at least fourteen Councillors — one half openly inclining towards the Christian Esotericism as represented by Mrs. K., and the other half following Buddhist Esotericism as represented by Mr. S.; all important business to be transacted by majority of votes. We are well aware of and quite alive to the difficulties of such an arrangement. Yet, it seems absolutely necessary in order to re-establish the lost harmony. The constitution of the “London Lodge” has to be amended and can be so amended if the members would but try; and so bring about more strength in such friendly division than in forced unity.

Unless, therefore, both Mrs. Kingsford and Mr. Sinnett agree to disagree in details and work in strict unison for the chief objects as laid down in the Rules of the Parent Society, we can have no hand in the future development and progress of the London Lodge.

K. H.
December 7th, 1883,
Mysore.