

Addressing the Critics of *The Judge Case*

Ernest Pelletier

There have been a few critics since *The Judge Case: A Conspiracy Which Ruined the Theosophical Cause* [TJC] was published, and a number of students have contacted me to express their appreciation for clarifying ambiguities they had been mulling over for years. Some have remained silent when I expected them to comment; others have taken the information in stride. David Pratt, for example, proceeded to make pertinent changes to his website after examining information presented. I anticipated that a few serious and sincere students of theosophical history would grasp the importance of the new evidence presented, would understand the seriousness of my discovery and demand answers. I have responded to few of the probing questions. At this time I wish to address some of the points raised by critics and other important issues concerning TJC.

Katinka Hesselink wrote the first book review. It was posted on her website in December 2004. In it she mentions that important articles previously published in *Theosophical History* (TH) had been left out of TJC. The articles she refers to were by her mentor Henk Spierenburg. What she perhaps failed to realize is that much of the materials quoted by Spierenburg were from original documents already included in the Chronology section of TJC. I had indicated in the first paragraph of the “Explanatory Notes” that whenever possible, quotations were provided from original sources. I do thank her for bringing attention to Spierenburg’s valuable contribution to the Movement.

Troubling, however, is the following. On instructions from Henk Spierenburg, one copy of TJC was air-mailed to him and one to Hesselink; both were sent at the same time. Three days later Spierenburg e-mailed that he had just received his copy late that evening and that he was surprised at the size of the book, adding, “This is not a book, it’s a whole library!” A few days later he wrote again, claiming that he had already “read the first plan” of Hesselink’s review and that it was to be posted on “Lucifer7 in English”. I wondered how she could have written a review of this huge book so quickly as she could only have received it at about the same time as Spierenburg. Reading her review, it was obvious that she had barely skimmed through the book. She is a member of the Adyar Society, and after reading her review, it also became clear where she stood: If Adyar maintains “Judge is guilty” then it must be so.

Hesselink jumps to the standard conclusion: “At the heart of the supposed conspiracy is a Brahman from India” named Chakravati. With a more careful perusal of the Supplement she would have realized that the incriminating evidence actually points to Navroji Dorabji Khandalavala (NDK) as the one who conspired to ruin the Theosophical Cause. She never even mentions his name in her review, nor Exhibit “A” which implicates him as the major conspirator. This piece of material evidence is central to the Judge Case and was published for the *first time . . . ever*, but Hesselink missed entirely the four pages of new evidence presented. I was taken aback when she wrote on December 18th, just after her review appeared, asking if it went to the core of the book, adding, “What is your main thesis and the main supporting point?” It became evident that she had approached it with a preconceived point of view. In my response I pointed out the importance of Exhibit “A” but there was little that could ameliorate the situation.

The Supplement in TJC ties together the available known details outlined in the Chronology, and additionally, included the newly revealed, unknown to most, inculpatory evidence (Exhibit “A”) which implicated N.D. Khandalavala as the one who conspired against the Founders of the Theosophical Society, and the original Theosophical Cause. Exhibit “A” demonstrated to me and to others that W.Q. Judge was designated the primary target. This new evidence also raises important questions when taken in conjunction with the original facts of the case, such as: What new insights can be deduced with its addition? Was H.P. Blavatsky (HPB) aware of Khandalavala’s true nature?

Some background information is helpful here — N.D. Khandalavala was a Court Magistrate in Poona and one of the first to join the Society. He was also one of the members of the 1885 Committee which unanimously decided not to support Blavatsky’s preference to prosecute her defamers in a Court of Law at the time of the difficulties with the Coulombs and the missionaries. He became suspicious of Blavatsky and her Mahatmas when the *Madras Christian College Magazine* started publishing letters attributed to her in their September 1884 issue.

In this Madame Blavatsky was denounced as being an imposter and having performed so-called “Occult Phenomena” in a fraudulent manner by the assistance of a woman named Coulomb and her husband¹

¹ *Report of the Result of an Investigation Into the Charges Against Madame Blavatsky, Brought by the Missionaries of the Scottish Free Church at Madras. . . . Madras, India, 1885, p.3.*

Judge was in Adyar at the time. He received a letter from NDK asking him to check out the originals of the published letters if possible and, one presumes, thereby ease his suspicions. Judge replied on September 17th, 1884 [see *TJC* Part 1, p.333].

In the summer of 1890, five years after having been forced out of Adyar, Blavatsky personally handed an Open Letter² to Bertram Keightley. He was to deliver it to the Indian members upon his arrival in India where he was sent by HPB because of misconduct while in America, for which he had consequently been put on probation [see *TJC* Part 1, pp.339-341]. This letter was not a test as to whether or not Keightley would deliver the letter but rather a test of Khandalavala's loyalty. According to Olcott, Keightley showed the letter to "one of our strongest Indian members [Khandalavala], who begged him not to show it to another person" [*TJC* Part 1, p.349].

Khandalavala did not publish quotes from HPB's Open Letter until eight years later in *The Theosophist*, October 1898, and it was not published in its entirety until *thirty-two* years after its arrival in India, in the January 1922 issue of *The Theosophist*. In his Compiler's comments, Boris de Zirkoff stated that "with the 'climate' prevailing at the time in the Indian T.S., the reasons which Khandalavala does not specify [for withholding the letter] are easy to determine".³ In her letter, HPB stated her position *very* clearly regarding the Indian members:

The fact is this: In my position half measures are worse than none. People have either to believe entirely in me, or to *honestly* disbelieve. No one, no Theosophist, is compelled to believe; but it is worse than useless for people to ask me to help them if they do not believe in me. Here in Europe and America are many who have never flinched in their devotion to Theosophy; consequently the spread of Theosophy and that of the T.S., in the West, during the last three years has been extraordinary.⁴

On September 17th, 1884 Judge had responded to Khandalavala's request for precisely the same reasons [see *TJC* Part 1, p.333]. Six years later, Blavatsky had to address the very same problem — again.

NDK was highly respected by the Indian members, and his legal counsel was sought by Col. Olcott and Annie Besant regarding most theosophical legal matters, including (in late 1893) if they should pursue

charges of fraud against W.Q. Judge. After re-examining the letter Judge had originally sent to him on September 17th, 1884, he advised them to prosecute [see *TJC* Part 1, p.365].

Blavatsky did try to warn us about the looming doom facing the Movement. At the very least she warned Judge, whom she called her *only* friend and colleague, about that possibility. Judge stated: "In 1888 she wrote to me privately:"—

Night before last I was shown a bird's-eye view of the Theosophical *Societies* [italics added — there was only one then]. I saw a few earnest reliable Theosophists in a death struggle with the world in general, with other — nominal but ambitious — Theosophists. The former are greater in numbers than you may think, and *they prevailed*, as you in *America will prevail*, if you only remain staunch to the Master's programme and true to yourselves.⁵

Judge had made the commitment to the Masters, and the results in America were extraordinary. In fact Judge's "influence stood high" in Europe as well until "the Besant attack (backed by Olcott), followed, alas, by Judge's death".⁶

The second review, by Brett Forray, appeared in *Theosophical History*, April 2005. Forray claims that not enough information was presented in *TJC* about Besant's life before entering Theosophy. I wish to draw attention to my article published in *Fohat*⁷ which dealt with this very subject. References to it are provided, as they are too many other items which were not specifically included in the text of *TJC*. Numerous books about Besant are also readily available; it was therefore deemed unnecessary to repeat it in this context.

Although he obviously read the book more carefully he makes assumptions similar to Hesselink's. Forray's main argument also hangs in favor of Chakravarti, and he attempts to discredit Judge's early judgement to work with the man. He seems to prefer that Judge would have rejected Chakravarti outright when he first laid eyes on him than to give him the benefit of the doubt — to give Chakravarti the chance to expose his true virtues. Anyone with knowledge in occult laws does not discard an individual before giving that person a chance.⁸ Keeping to Forray's pattern of thinking, are we to assume that

² It was addressed "To my Brothers of Aryavarta" and has been published as "Why I Do Not Return to India".

³ *Blavatsky: Collected Writings*, Vol.12, Theosophical Publishing House, Wheaton, IL, 1980, pp.248-249.

⁴ "Why I Do Not Return to India." *The Theosophist*, Jan.1922, p.369; *B:CW*:12, p.165.

⁵ *Lucifer*, Vol.8, June 1891, p.291.

⁶ From copy of letter from C.B. Collings to Dr. Stokes, July 31, 1929 in the Archives of Edmonton TS.

⁷ "Annie Besant: Her Passions and Her Relationships" Part 1, *Fohat*, Vol.4, No.4, Winter 2000, and Part 2, Spring 2001; the full text can also be found under 'articles' on Edmonton TS's website: TheosophyCanada.com

⁸ One of Judge's sayings was to never cast one out of one's heart.

Blavatsky also made an occult error by accepting the Coulombs at the TS headquarters, knowing that they would be trouble? Jasper Niemand [Julia Keightley] a close colleague of Judge in New York, wrote about him: “He worked with anyone who was willing to do Work in the real sense, careless whether such were personal friends, strangers, or active or secret foes.”⁹ The history of the theosophical movement is littered with friends who were given that chance but turned and subsequently became traitors or enemies. Why should Judge be held accountable to a different standard than Blavatsky or the Mahatmas? or for that matter, Olcott, President of the Society? Examples of persons who were given a chance and failed are too numerous to detail here, but a few people come to mind: Professor Elliott Coues, Richard Harte, A.O. Hume, A.P. Sinnett, Solovyoff; some would include Alexander Fullerton, C.C. Massey who founded the Society for Psychical Research, and even T. Subba Row, among others.

Forray’s argument does expose a significant flaw with one of the accusations brought forward against Judge which should be examined. Both Olcott, as President of the T.S., and Besant were convinced that Judge was conspiring to take over the Society — that his ambition was to take over the Presidency. Olcott became convinced through his friend Richard Harte, who wrote that Judge had “become filled with personal ambition to rule or ruin” [TJC Part 1, p.344]. Blavatsky berated Harte for his comment, writing:

I will not permit Judge to be lowered or humiliated in [The Theosophist]. Judge is one of the Founders and a man who has ever been true to the Masters. . . . And Judge will be the President of the T.S. after our death or the T.S. will die with us. [TJC Part 1, p.344]

In an earlier letter to Judge, Blavatsky wrote:

If you have no more personal ambition than I have— & I know you have not, only combativeness . . .¹⁰

Judge’s willingness to fight to defend both Blavatsky and the Theosophical Cause is well documented, but where is the hard evidence that he had personal ambition to rule the Theosophical Society? We can excuse some of Olcott’s and Besant’s ignorance regarding Blavatsky’s personal appraisal of Judge as it is contained in personal correspondence not available to them at the time, but it is difficult to understand why today’s students of Theosophy do — knowing that there are so many passages where Blavatsky praises

his actions. Perhaps I should remind critics of Blavatsky’s own words about Occultism and Judge:

Ingratitude is a crime in Occultism, and I shall illustrate the point by citing the case of W.Q. Judge. He is one of the three founders of the Theosophical Society, the only three who have remained as true as rock to the Cause. While others have all turned deserters or enemies, he has ever remained faithful to his original pledge.¹¹

Olcott, on the other hand, openly disliked the concept of the Esoteric Section because he was afraid it would take away from his Presidency. He had earlier been rebuked by the Masters for some of his thoughts but he was no longer in contact with Them. After the death of HPB, Olcott had no one left who could reprimand him when he stepped out of line. He was also ignorant of Judge’s closer connection with the Masters and often harbored jealousy towards Judge. A few months before his death Olcott admitted to Laura Holloway-Langford that he had wronged Judge.

Another argument brought forward by Forray was that the Black Magicians alluded to in TJC “are never identified” and should have been named. He doesn’t agree that members of the Society were being influenced by Black Magicians and completely disregards Franz Hartmann’s personal experiences at Adyar, as well as the case of Dharmabaghi Nath [TJC Part 1, pp.364-365]. He also totally ignores previous comments by Blavatsky on the issue as to what happened at Adyar after she left there in 1885 [see TJC Part 1, pp.348, 406]. Judge is once again being held more accountable for reiterating the same message and earlier warnings given to him by HPB. In her 1888 letter she warns Judge about the powers of darkness:

And last night I saw ∴ and now I feel strong — such as I am in my body — and ready to fight for Theosophy and the few true ones to my last breath. The defending forces have to be judiciously — so scanty they are — distributed over the globe, wherever Theosophy is struggling against the powers of darkness.¹²

Perhaps closer attention should be paid to comments made by Charles Johnston regarding Besant and how she was influenced.¹³ Johnston first met Blavatsky in the spring of 1887 and later married her niece. He is considered one of the best Oriental Scholars of his time. Johnston wrote:

Mrs. Besant ceased to be a member of the Theosophical Society in 1896, after she had fallen un-

⁹ *Letters Than Have Helped Me*, Vol.2, 1918, Quarterly Book Department edition, p.115.

¹⁰ Letter dated August 12, 1887, *Theosophical History*, Vol.5, January 1995, p.165.

¹¹ “Preliminary Explanation to No. III. Of The Instructions Esoteric School of Theosophy”, first appeared in *The Canadian Theosophist*, Vol.XIX, March 1938, p.16; reprinted in *BCW*, Vol.12, TPH, 1980, pp.593-594.

¹² *Lucifer*, Vol.8, June 1891, p.291.

¹³ Charles Johnston (1855-1931) joined the T.S. in 1885. He married HPB’s niece, Vera de Zhelihovsky. Johnston was a brilliant scholar and an accomplished Sanskritist and Orientalist who wrote many articles and translated into English many Indian scriptures as well as others from German and Russian texts.

der Brahmanical influence and had violated fundamental theosophical principles; with her gift for publicity, she carried a certain number of people with her, and the same gift has added to their number. But, since the year 1896, what Mrs. Besant has said or done has been quite irrelevant to real Theosophy, or relevant only so far as she misuses that sacred name as a label for her activities. Her work is a travesty of Theosophy, and it has become a sacrilegious travesty.¹⁴

Perhaps we should examine Johnston's personal observation about Besant's "gift" a little closer. He was not the only one to make similar observations — there have been many others. Besant's extraordinary oratory skill and persuasiveness can only be equated to some political leaders who get elected to office. Their skills of persuasion have led to devastating results to the masses. We have seen some of those devastating results during the twentieth century. Somehow people get swept by these "gifted" individuals and forget to do their own assessment of the facts. Perhaps the time has come for serious students interested in the actual theosophical historical facts to re-examine and scrutinize Besant's claims, occult and otherwise.

Another critic is Daniel Caldwell, a member of TS in America. Caldwell has focussed on the two words "a friend" mentioned by Judge. I would argue, however, that he has not pursued the correct source for answers. He wrote me: "I am planning to pursue an on-line investigation and discussion (hopefully on Theos-Talk) of this claim of tampering with W.Q. Judge's Sept. 17, 1884 Letter to N.D. Khandalavala." This line of investigation would be better directed to Radha Burnier, the President of the Adyar Society, asking her to provide the original document (Exhibit "A") for examination by specialists to determine whether words could have been suppressed as Judge indicated. Hopefully he has in fact done that. In another letter he asks: "What is Ernest Pelletier suggesting as the method of 'covering up' the words?" and tries to lure me into an open investigation by suggesting that if the words were covered up, to what end? I did not respond as Caldwell has a way of transforming a discussion into an inquisition, especially on Theos-Talk. I have seen too many e-mail discussions degenerate into fruitless intellectual arguments and hostility. Constant nit-picking at this or that point is used as a diversionary tactic to deflect attention from the central point of the Judge Case. There is a vast difference between being open-minded and merely planting seeds of doubt. Doubt is a faculty of the lower mind, employed to usurp a person's will, thereby making them susceptible to being influenced. In this instance, it is regarding Judge's veracity.

It seems very few people have in fact understood the magnitude of findings published in *The Judge Case*. Judge is the only individual who acknowledges the existence of this document which, as he says, "could be used against me" [*TJC* Part 1, p.379]. Besant never used it in her *Case Against W.Q. Judge* nor did she ever publicly mention the existence of this pivotal document. There seems to have been some reluctance on the part of Olcott and Besant to publicize this so-called piece of evidence. Judge wrote:

On the 19th I formally and peremptorily demanded them [the papers HSO and AB had at the Judicial Committee review of July 1894]. She said she had given them to Col. Olcott, who said they had been just sent off to the mail to go to India; this I repeated to Mrs. Besant and said I would publish the fact to the public. She hastened to Col. Olcott, and he said he had made a mistake, as the papers were in his travelling case. He then, in Dr. Buck's presence, in a great hurry, as I sailed on the 21st, allowed me a hasty look at the papers on July 19th, I taking a copy of one or two short ones. [*TJC* Part 1, p. 108]

If we take Judge's above description of events as true, and there are no reasons why we shouldn't, it appears that Besant and Olcott were seriously concerned about Judge exposing this whole affair to the public. What were Besant and Olcott afraid of? They could have easily reminded Judge that it was his own reputation that would have been in question. Why were they so concerned about Judge publicly saying he was being denied evidence? Yet Judge, on the other hand, did not appear fazed by the prospect and was in fact willing to initiate it.

Because this letter has been denied public scrutiny we can only surmise from historical accounts that Besant and Olcott knew that someone had tampered with the 1884 letter to N.D.K. Therefore they must have also either suspected or known that a fraud had been committed and that Judge was *not* the person to have committed the fraudulent act. They could not therefore allow Judge to make a copy of Exhibit "A" nor could they allow him to go public. By delaying Judge from reviewing the evidence against him until the last minute they were able to keep the document in their possession as well as prevent Judge from going public. This piece of evidence has existed for over one hundred years with no mention of it anywhere by Adyarites. Judge, himself stated:

The last item [Exhibit "A"] brought forward by the prosecutor should, if a good piece of evidence, have been produced in the beginning of the charges. [*TJC* Part 1, p.379]

¹⁴ A lecture by Charles Johnston, on April 25th, 1926, at the Convention of The Theosophical Society. *Theosophical Quarterly*, Vol.24, July 1926, p.14; *TJC* Part 2, pp.32-33.

The facts related to the book *The Judge Case* are:

1. Material evidence (Exhibit "A") mentioned by Judge has been presented.
2. This evidence has been presented without Adyar's involvement.
3. Two people closely aligned with Adyar have personally admitted to my wife and me that Adyar has material evidence which, in their mind, incriminates Judge to be a fraud.
4. That this evidence is kept in the Archives in Adyar, away from public scrutiny, and that access to this material is strictly in the control of the President of the Adyar TS.
5. That the reason claimed for keeping this evidence hidden is supposedly to protect Judge's integrity.
6. That this evidence is only shown to individuals the President of the Adyar TS deems trustworthy.

Looking back, one could ask: what if Judge had gone public in 1894? Perhaps this whole incident would have been exposed. Perhaps that was Judge's great mistake. But as he claimed in his *Reply to the Charges* ". . . it was not a great piece of evidence", adding:

This letter proves nothing whatever except that I wanted to show this man that forgery could be committed. The prosecutor has hoped to make it appear by this letter, that the execution of a forgery was nothing to me. But if it be put forward to sustain that view, it is weak, because the imitations in it are poor, whereas the prosecutors say that my alleged imitations in messages are perfect. [TJC Part 1, p.379]¹⁵

Judge was not overly concerned because "it proved nothing". However, keeping it hidden for well over one hundred years has enabled Adyar to distort *perception* of said proof and historical truth. Perhaps we will eventually learn who is in fact incriminated.

The possibility of the following theory regarding how the letter could have been tampered with has been corroborated by experts. My wife and I both have vivid recollections of specific classroom incidents during our early school years. It was customary for teachers to keep various student records in a large book in which data was written down with fountain pens. Occasionally the teacher would make an incorrect entry and ask a student to go get a bottle containing a clear liquid substance from another classroom. This magical bottle was shared among several teachers. The student was usually advised to be very careful when carrying it. The teacher would lift the glass dropper from the bottle and deposit a drop or two of this substance onto the ink/error then quickly apply

a blotting paper and press down on the wet area until all the liquid was absorbed. After a few minutes, sometimes fanning the wet record book until it was dry enough, the correction was entered at the same spot. All the prior writing had been thoroughly removed.

Advice was sought as to what this substance was. My father-in-law, who had a great memory for details and had just written a book on local history, remembered the process but not the name of the substance. I then turned to experts and contacted the Headquarters of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), K-Division, in Edmonton. I was provided with the name of a specialist in handwriting forgeries at their Forensic Crime Lab. Although not allowed to enter the compound, I did manage to speak to a male individual. I gave a description of Exhibit "A" and Judge's description of the letter after he had inspected it on July 19th, 1894 following the Judicial Committee in London. After providing him with a short historical account of events he had no hesitation stating that the words could certainly have been removed, and that making ink disappear is well researched and well known in forensic science. He stated that the type of ink would have to be determined in order to establish what substance would work best at eliminating the ink from the page. My query piqued his interest and he expressed that he would love to work on this particular case on his own time but that his police oath prevented him from working on any civilian cases. He did provide me with the name of a retired forensic document specialist who does consulting work for police forces around the world.

I discovered that this next expert was a senior RCMP Forensic Document Examiner, that he had over 30 years of experience, and that he had completed almost three thousand case files. Many of these files required complex examinations of countless fraudulent and forged documents, followed by expert testimony at all levels of Court. Unfortunately this individual did not live in Edmonton. I consulted him by phone, repeated details of the case as outlined in *TJC*, and told him that it appeared a fraud had been committed. He agreed that if there had been any writing behind the added note that it should have been visible on the back side of the paper. He said that it was common years ago for professionals to have a bottle of substance (likely alcohol or acetone based) that would render ink invisible. However, in order to prove conclusively that a fraud had been committed he would have to examine the original document and a chemical analysis would have to be performed to ascertain the type of ink used. I informed him that the original document was being kept in India and

. . . continued on page 23

¹⁵ See also *Reply by William Q. Judge to Charges of Misuse of Mahatmas' Names and Handwritings*, reprinted in full in *TJC* Part 2, Appendix A, pp.95-115.

the Judge Case and show any proofs of his guilt — or else declare him innocent.

As the birth is more important than the death, every April 13th could be a priority date. If it takes 20 years or more to see justice done, it will still be worthwhile.

In the short term, such letters would help build a growing consciousness (both inside and outside the Adyar TS) about some key facts of the movement's history. With or without short term results, each step of the initiative would be valid in itself. Such an action would raise consciousness. It would provide an instrument for some theosophists to practice *a brave declaration of principles*, a *valiant defence of those who are unjustly attacked* and a *loyal sense of duty to the teacher*. Open letters could go to Adyar with different contents, written from very different perspectives and in different places, with the same central idea of *Justice to William Judge*.

. . . **Reply** continued from page 14

that it would be next to impossible to get Adyar to release it for analysis. He said that there were many types of ink and that the ones generally used at that time were India ink or Iron Gall ink, with the latter being the most common.

In the fall of 2005 while doing research at the Alberta Provincial Archives, I also consulted the Conservator of the Archives, a specialist in Government Records and Preservation. She studied the copy of the letter and stated that forgeries of this type are especially common. Once again, however, the original would have to be examined in order to detect the residue on the paper to determine what kind of ink detergent was used to make the ink disappear.

In summary, here are the salient points at issue from the evidence cited:

- Three handwriting specialists in forgeries were consulted and they all agreed without hesitation that the likelihood was there for the letter to have been tampered with.
- All three agreed that the original document would have to be closely examined and tested to determine the means through which the words “a friend” were suppressed.
- NDK had a history of doubts. He suspected that Blavatsky was a fraud and that she was deluded about her Masters.
- NDK was a Court Magistrate and would have had access to the kind of substances mentioned above for correcting errors in order to keep his Court records nice and tidy.
- One would assume that Judge, being a Lawyer, was also aware of such a substance.

Dallas TenBroeck was one of the few theosophists I consulted about this before the end of January. He wrote:

Excellent idea. (. . .) Publish documents and facts. (. . .) I think what should be aimed at is tolerance and fraternity among the various Theosophical Societies and let by-gones be agreed on, rectified officially, and then joint progress proceed in harmony — that is if the principle of BROTHERHOOD is made primary to all.

All those interested in commenting, helping, or in giving their opinion about such a broad idea — so far kept as an *abstract* proposition — can write to: Carlos Cardoso Aveline, Cx. Postal 5111, Ag. Brazlândia, CEP 72.701-970, Brasilia, Brazil.

Email: carlosaveline@hotmail.com.

Best regards, Carlos

- When carefully analysing Judge's choice of words (“It could be used against me by suppressing the words, ‘witness these by a friend’”) after he was allowed to see the document (Exhibit “A”) on July 19th, 1894, one can comprehend what he meant and who would have been the person who suppressed those words.
- As detailed in *TJC*, NDK had full access to the letter before it reached Adyar — before it became accessible to Olcott, Besant and others.
- NDK was the one who gave legal advice to prosecute Judge.
- NDK was motivated by Indian pride to protect his beliefs and customs.
- NDK has a history of suppressing other documents. For example, Olcott admitted that NDK had begged others to suppress HPB's Open Letter.

Karma has come full circle; now is the time for Adyar to release those important documents which have been purposely kept from public scrutiny — save to those deemed willing supporters of Adyar's point of view. It is time for Adyar to release themselves from the heavy burden which has been the cause of great divisions within the Movement. Adyar has a history of disposing of Lodges or Societies which they fear may be against them. Their attitude has not been any different than that of the Jesuits who claim “if you are not with us then you are against us.” Their sense of entitlement has created much division which has gone completely against the Masters' wishes to form a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood. This is the opportune time, perhaps the last chance, for Adyar to admit their culpatory behaviour and reach out to rectify this century-old problem. 🙏