

**Chapter 20 from *Krishnamurti & The Wind***  
**by Jean Overton Fuller**  
**(London: The Theosophical Publishing House, 2003), pp. 165-173**  
**Published on the Internet with permission of the author**  
**© 2003 Jean Overton Fuller**

## **20. SCOTT AND ANRIAS: WOOD AND THE BLIND RISHI**

This is perhaps a moment at which we may pause in the story to consider sallies against Krishnamurti by two anonymously and pseudonymously publishing authors, who knew each other, and whose books, which achieved wide popularity in the 1930's are cited still. First, there is *The Initiate in the Dark Cycle*, last of a trilogy of *Initiate* books and the only one that need concern us here. Originally published as *By His Pupil*, Cyril Scott later acknowledged authorship of them. The storyteller tells of meeting in worldly London a man of strikingly original ideas, who seems as other men until he passes through a solid wall - so he must be an Initiate. Through him the author meets Viola, whom he marries - the change of flower-name thinly veiling Scott's wife, Rose. It is in the third book that she and the author fall to talking with their friends about Krishnamurti. They query whether one could call a Teacher a man who maintained that nobody, however exalted, could teach anyone anything at all. They liken Krishnamurti to a World-Piano-Teacher come to tell us "all piano professors were so many obstacles to our ever learning the piano." <sup>1</sup>

The quip is unfair, because Krishnamurti has always excepted from his remarks, here somewhat misunderstood, those things - skills - which require for their acquisition time and practice, such as learning to speak a foreign language or play a musical instrument. If someone had told him he wanted to learn to play the piano, Krishnamurti would certainly have said he should go to a piano teacher.

Scott may not have known that Krishnamurti had already founded two schools for children in India; later he would found ones in the west. Though the object was to create a spiritually favourable ambience, the teachers employed had all to have proper qualifications in their subjects.

Then Viola says of the theosophists: <sup>2</sup>

They've been taught, too that the Masters are their Elder Brothers, lovingly trying to guide them . . . Krishnamurti comes along and tells them that Masters are only crutches.

He did not say the Masters were only crutches, but that an intermediary was only a crutch. What he was getting at was dependence on persons professing to transmit messages from Masters. If there is a universal telepathy, an aspiration of the mind must draw a response (Blavatsky would say through the pineal gland) which will be direct, as when the answer to a question just comes to one.

Viola continues: <sup>3</sup>

They're floundering hopelessly in the void, poor things . . . They're wondering if what they were taught before was only a lovely fiction . . .

Yes, many were, and it must be conceded he was taking them through his own dark night of the soul. She says:

He's taken everything from them - reincarnation survival, meetings with their loved ones after death

Yet, when he knew that Rosalind had had a child, his immediate hope was that it might be Nitya come back - so very close to him that he could tend her cradle.

Viola says that for her, Krishnamurti is "simply the Apostle of Negation". <sup>4</sup> Actually, we shall later find him saying he proceeds by negation of the false - because the most holy things can never be defined affirmatively. If one tries to say what love is, one can never find a definition of it that does not in some way fall short. But one can very well say what it is not: it is not desire to achieve domination over, to possess and exhibit . . . When one has seen these urges for what they are, there is the chance for the real thing, love, to come through. Viola continues: <sup>4</sup>

We're told we can't reach the goal through worship, or art or beauty . . . Why on earth not?

I think the trick phrase here is "reach the goal through". As soon as one does something with an ulterior end in view, even if a spiritual one, it ceases to be pure. Many a painter, composer or poet must have felt at times that something was coming through that he did not know he had in him, but to set about his work with the intention of becoming more spiritually advanced through it would be self-defeating. Shelley says, even the greatest poet cannot say "I will compose poetry", for "some invisible influence" is "an inconstant wind" <sup>5</sup> - Krishnamurti would add, "which cannot be summoned by will; it comes, or not, as it will."

Scott and his wife and friends discuss whether Krishnamurti is teaching *Advaita*, a total monism in which people have no existence, Scott quotes from one of his *Star* bulletins:

The "I" is the limitation of separateness . . . remove this wall of limitation.

When Krishnamurti attributes a bad sense to the words "I" and "me", he has in mind the competitive sense and illusion that "my" good can be obtained at the expense of "yours". I really do not think he is saying we do not exist. Consciousness needs its vehicle, be that only a single cell of the finest matter, but the cells' walls are permeable, permitting a universal telepathy. The waves of life pass through it so that we are never separated. St. Paul says it beautifully, "We are members one of another." <sup>6</sup> The meaning is

not that we do not exist. If I may quote from my paper on Scott an image that came to me while I was writing it: if I look at a rose, loving the depths of its colour, the shape into which its petals curl, its perfume, that is one thing; but if I see myself looking at the rose, there is no more the rose, but only me. While I was looking at the rose, there was only it and I was not.<sup>7</sup>

Later in the story, the Initiate takes the author to a hidden house in the country and introduces him to a mysterious Sir Thomas, whom it is implied is a Master. The author asks him about Krishnamurti, and is told that since he took the Arhat initiation he ceased to be the medium of the Lord Maitreya: "Better if he had retired from public life to meditate in seclusion, as Arhats did in bygone days."<sup>8</sup>

No, Krishnamurti took but a poor view of retiring to meditate in seclusion, which seemed to him a denial of life and human relationship, and he took his mission to be, precisely, to travel round and round the world and teach, since he had accepted his role as World Teacher.

Then the supposed Master is made to say a most malicious and unworthy thing:<sup>9</sup>

Like the proverbial manservant who knows he's about to be given notice, *he* gave notice first.

No, he did not give notice. He accepted the job. Sir Thomas went on:

"In other words, he cut himself adrift from the White Lodge, and repudiated all of us."

But, no. He had taken on the job. Scott makes Sir Thomas go on:

"Also instead of giving forth the new Teaching so badly needed, he escaped from the responsibilities of his office ... by reverting to a past incarnation, and an ancient philosophy of his own race ... which is useless for the Western World in the present Cycle."

No. The ancient philosophy of his race, the philosophy of the *Vedas* seeks *moksha*, liberation from life in physical form, as indeed does Buddhism: incarnation is regarded as a misery to be escaped from. It is Krishnamurti who asks why this end should be sought; who constantly returns one to the everyday life of this world that we are in, which we do not have to make a misery of living in. It has beauties enough to offer. A life of spiritual integrity can be lived here. And that should be more useful to the Western World.

David Anrias appears in this book as a character whom the author and his wife have just met. Viola says Krishnamurti's philosophy is no use to her:<sup>10</sup>

"Naturally" David replied. "It's not much use to *any* woman. In fact, only those who have practised Raja Yoga as men in past incarnations, like H. P. B. and A. B. can get anything out of it at all.

But this is just not true. Some of those quickest at grasping what Krishnamurti is talking about have been women. Some of them have appeared in this story already; more will appear as it progresses.

And what has Raja Yoga to do with it? The name, Kingly Yoga, suggests control over the lower by the higher. But Krishnamurti shifts the emphasis from control to perception, and the whole beauty of his teaching is that it can be understood by anybody, without preparation; or at least, preparation gives no advantage.

Sir Thomas says: "Guru not allowed by Krishnamurti" but "long-continued meditation" without the protection of a Master had its dangers.<sup>11</sup>

Here there are two misunderstandings. Krishnamurti never allowed or disallowed anything. One may learn from many things and many people, including sometimes from a guru. Formal meditation, in the sense of sitting with lowered eyelids, he had given up and did not encourage others to practise. Serious thought about anything was meditation, but could be done on the wing, as it were, while walking down a street ... To set aside a particular time for it had come to seem to him a little pseudo, getting oneself into a "state" without necessarily becoming kinder, wiser or more insightful.

Finally, Sir Thomas pats his dog, and says, "My friend, if even the King told you your Master was superfluous, I don't think you'd believe him, eh?"<sup>12</sup>

The analogy is false, because the dog's relationship with his master is direct and true, his affection without *arrière pensée*. There is no corrupting thought such as that by going about with the master he is going up the ladder, making spiritual progress - though in fact this is so.

I would not like it to be thought that I dislike Scott; I enjoy playing his music and as an observer of life he has many perceptive and interesting things to say. But the story told in the *Initiate* trilogy is fictitious, and I have tried in my paper on him to show the partial models amongst his acquaintance from whom the characters in the books are made up; but neither he nor his wife could understand Krishnamurti. Perhaps they do now. The wife, at any rate, was beginning to have glimmerings as appear in her own later books, she too being an author.

In the same year, 1932, appeared *Through the Eyes of the Masters, Meditations and Portraits*, by David Anrias. I wrote to Adyar to ask what they could tell me about him and had a reply from Pedro R. M. Oliveira, International Secretary, saying that according to their records his name was Brian Ross. He did not appear to have become a member of the Society but stayed there for two years before going back to England. According to the 'Introduction by the Author of The *Initiate* etc', he returned to England in 1927, so we have 1925-27 as the approximate time of his being out there.

His first chapter is on 'The Rishi of the Nilgiri Hills', the Adept he claims as his own particular Master, but who is the only one of whom he does not

provide a portrait 'unexplained'. I will consider later the question of the possible relationship of Anrias with this venerable Hindu, but here cite only the reason ascribed to him for the Masters to be allowing their portraits to be drawn - for the restoration of the faith in them destroyed by Krishnamurti, who "depreciated the value of the Masters as Teachers and Guides." <sup>13</sup> Here is the old misunderstanding. Krishnamurti never depreciated the Masters -real ones, though he felt that a lot of people had illusionary conceptualizations of them. I do not feel that this was a mistake which this Rishi would have made. Anrias has him say some <sup>14</sup>

like Krishnamurti, who have been inspired by Devas associated with the new forces to assume the role of Shiva, the Destroyer, have lost touch with their original ray . . .

I simply do not believe this. The author's idea of the Master Rakoczy as the Crown Prince of Austria-Hungary who shot himself is, I am sure, inspired by a film called *Mayerling*, not by that Master - who fought for an independent Hungary against Austria. Anrias seems to have true perceptions about some things, but is not to be relied on. He has the Maitreya say to him: <sup>15</sup>

In order to co-operate more completely with the Devas, Krishnamurti took initiations along their line of evolution. The essential nature of these Devas, used as agents of the Great Law, being perforce impersonal and detached, it came by degrees to influence his whole point of view, making him appear unsympathetic and even inhuman.

I have heard some serious theosophists express themselves impressed by this as an explanation, yet it seems to me to rest on a misconception. The word *bdeva* is Tibetan, the initial *b* being silent, and means shining one, and it applies to a whole range of entities that do not have bodies denser than the etheric - the whole realm of what we would call the kingdom of faerie and upwards through all the grades to the highest angels. But the distinguishing characteristic of the devas is their specialization; they do only one thing; they tend the growth of plants, they live in and so inspire music, they tend women in childbirth, or a shrine, blessing those who come to worship at it; but only the one thing. The deva at the shrine does not accompany the worshipper back to his home or take any interest in his activities other than worshipping at that shrine. A human, on the other hand, does many things: lives perhaps in a family, has perhaps a spouse and children and is concerned with them, has a professional occupation, for the earning of a living, and perhaps a leisure-time occupation as well, reads books . . . so many things. Krishnamurti was not a narrow specialist and indeed disliked specialization, preferring open involvement, and he could change a baby's nappies and hose out a cow-shed as well as drive a car. Roles so specialized as those of the devas must render them impersonal, but Krishnamurti, in his platform manner

was cool, had relationships that were very personal, some of them very warm, and one would have expected the Maitreya to know that.

I am in doubt as to the relationship of Anrias with the adept he claims as his special teacher. Scott in his Introduction says: <sup>16</sup>

After years of effort he succeeded in establishing a rapport with the Adept known as the Rishi of the Nilgiri Hills, to whom he acquired the capacity of mentally "tuning in". This venerable Sage specialises in Astrology and it is to his tuition Anrias owes . . .

But in his book, *The Initiate in the Dark Cycle*, Scott said: <sup>17</sup>

he told us . . . he used to retire for months at a time to a place in the Nilgiri Hills, where he practised meditation under the tuition of the Master whom Madame Blavatsky referred to as the Old Gentleman of the Nilgiri Hills. This master specialises in astrology in relation to cosmic forces.

In this version he was instructed by the master on the physical plane, in the other not.

Now this is the yogi of whom Olcott reproduces in his *Old Diary Leaves*, the portrait made for him by Madame Blavatsky.<sup>18</sup> He thought she called him Tiravala, though he imagined she meant Tiruvalluar; a Southern Indian, a landed proprietor, living in the Nilgiri Hills; he of the "pencils"<sup>19</sup> and "Old Horse"<sup>20</sup> incidents who studied "the relationship of cosmic cycles with fixed points in stellar constellations".<sup>21</sup> Quoting from Madame Blavatsky's diary, he refers to him as "N-" but in her diary we read "Narayan".<sup>22</sup> Leadbeater, when writing *The Lives of Alcyone*, gave him the star name "Jupiter", and it is as such he refers to him in *The Masters and the Path*.<sup>23</sup>

But it is Ernest Wood who gives us the most intimate portrait of the ascetic. One reached him by the Madras-Mysore railway line, getting off at Tiruvallam (on my atlas Tiruvallar) from which one walked across some fields and ridges of earth that bordered cultivated plots, to his cottage. He was slight of stature, had a white beard and wore only a loin-cloth.<sup>24</sup> He was a Tamil speaker and his name was Nagaratnaswami, though the locals called him the Kurruttu Paradeshi, blind wanderer. Though poor, he was proprietor of some land, and though blind he got about between villages in the Nilgiri Hills by bullock-cart, the mystery to Wood being how the little bullock knew which turnings he had to take, his driver being blind. Wood stayed with him for a week at a time.

The sage told him a mistake <sup>25</sup> had been made by theosophists in describing him as the Master of Madame Blavatsky's Master. What he had told someone who came out from Adyar to see him was that she and he had the same Master, who was also Wood's Master. His name was Sitaram Bhavaji and he had been in London since 1850.<sup>26</sup> Now this accords with what Madame Blavatsky always said, that it was in London, in 1850, she first met Morya, when he came over in the train of the Prime Minister of Nepal and rode in

the Procession through Hyde Park. The name Morya, by which he allowed her to call him in her writings, is surely derived from that of the great southern Indian dynasty of Mauryas or Moryas, founded by the Emperor Chandragupta Maurya or Morya, a contemporary of Alexander the Great, grandfather of the Emperor Asoka who reigned 272-32 B. C. They were a Kshatriya dynasty, hence foe to the Brahmins and protector of the Buddhists against the Brahmins, so our Morya, a Rajput Kshatriya, probably meant by this choice of a pseudonym to signify his inheritance or continuance of Chandragupta's intent to break up the caste system.

Nagaratnaswami told Wood he met this great Mahatma when the latter visited southern India. Working with him there was a Kashmiri Master, "a younger man who had been educated at Oxford." This obviously is Koot Hoomi, who Blavatsky said was at an English University and whom she styles "a Northern Brahmin" and Subba Rao and Leadbeater give as a Kashmiri Brahmin. While researching for my *Blavatsky* I noticed that Olcott, in relating his visit with her to the Golden Temple, said he noticed amongst the guardians a Master described in terms he normally reserved for Koot Hoomi. I did not see how anyone could figure amongst the guardians of the Golden Temple, if only for the moment, unless a Sikh: and this brought me to the considerations I expressed in the chapter, "The Sikhs: Morya and Koot Hoomi" in my biography of Blavatsky. Yet there is not necessarily a dichotomy involved. One can only be born a Brahmin but one can become a Sikh. The five original Sikhs were of the four castes plus one outcaste, who vowed to end the caste system. Many Rajputs became Sikhs and so there is no impossibility in a Kashmiri Brahmin's having done likewise. Both Morya and Koot Hoomi insisted that Brahmins joining the Theosophical Society and wishing to become their pupils must break caste, as Damodar did - and of course Krishna and Nitya did.

The name Koot Hoomi has caused great perplexity, meaning nothing in any known language. The *Vishnu Purana*, however, refers (in H. H. Wilson's translation, book III, p.60) to a Kuthumi who was one of the original transmitters of the *Vedas*, and it occurred to me that Madame Blavatsky might have decided to spell the name Koot Hoomi in order to prevent English people from pronouncing the *th* as in "thumb". I suggested that in a letter to the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London and received a reply from their C. Shackle, Head of Indiology and of the Modern Languages and Literature of South Asia, saying my letter had been seen by his colleagues and "none of us can come up with a better explanation than the one you suggest." Leadbeater writes the name Kuthumi, and English people do, in consequence, pronounce the *th* as in "thumb" instead of separately, as should be as in cart-horse or out-house.

Thus, I think we may regard the Master whom Leadbeater taught the boy Krishna to regard as his own Master (under the Maitreya and the Buddha) as

a Kashmir Brahmin who had broken caste and become a Sikh. The Sikhs have always had good relations with the Buddhists, as well as with the Sufis. One could say they are somewhat eclectic.

So was it Koot Hoomi who supplied that bit of Shankara which Ernest Wood detected in the booklet *At the Feet of the Master* which Krishna apparently brought out of his sleep? We shall never know.

Nagaratnaswami knew that a great teacher was coming and told Wood that he (Wood) would not leave India until after the coming of Nanjunda (Maitreya), the One who was to be Expected. Wood would be the teacher of the one who was to be his teacher.<sup>27</sup> Wood remembered this when he was detailed to give lessons in English, Sanskrit and arithmetic to Krishna.

Was Nagaratnaswami still living when Anrias came, roughly in the late 1920s? The astrology of Anrias is western. He casts his charts in what is known as the Tropical (meaning Turning) Zodiac, in which 0 Aries is by definition the intersection of the ecliptic and the equator at the vernal equinox. As this precedes the solar year by a tiny fraction, it comes by the precession of the equinoxes a little further back amongst the stars every year, creating the complete cycle in 26,000 years. Hindu astrology, on the other hand, uses a zodiac starting from a fixed place among the stars. From what Olcott says of Nagaratnaswami's studying "the relationship of cosmic cycles with fixed points in stellar zodiac", he must have been watching the changing relations between the two, and expecting, with the regression of the first degree of Aries of the Turning into the last degree of Aquarius of the Fixed, to see the One who was to come, whose tutor, then pupil, Wood was to be.

It is impossible to me to believe that this great sage uttered the nonsense attributed to him about Krishnamurti's turning into a Deva.

Again, what age was Nagaratnaswami? The portrait of him Blavatsky made for Olcott, while they were in New York together in the 1870s, shows him as she remembered seeing him in India, which throws the date back to the late 1850s, and it shows a blind man no longer young; by the time Wood met him, in 1909-10, he must at the very least have been in his late nineties if he had not passed his century. When Wood returned to India after an absence of a few years and went out to Tiruvallar again and picked his way to the cottage, he was told the old man had died. Wood does not give -perhaps was not supplied with - the date, but I think it would have been before the arrival of Anrias in the mid 1920s.



## References

1. *The Initiate in the Dark Cycle*, by his Pupil [Cyril Scott] (London, Routledge, 1932) p.25
2. *Ibid.*, p.69
3. *Ibid.*, p.71
4. *Ibid.*, p.66
5. *A Defence of Poetry*, Percy Bysshe Shelley, written 1822 (London, Oilier, 1840); *Shelley, Selected Poetry, Prose and Letters*, (London, Nonesuch, 1951) p. 1050; *Shelley, A Biography*, Jean Overton Fuller, (London, Cape, 1968) p.273
6. *The Bible*, Romans: xii, 5
7. *Cyril Scott and a Hidden School, or Towards the Peeling of an Onion*, Jean Overton Fuller (Fullerton, California, Theosophical History, 1998) p.2
8. Scott, *ibid.*, p.135
9. *Ibid.*, p.136
10. *Ibid.*, p.97
11. *Ibid.*, pp.138-9
12. *Ibid.*, p.140
13. *Through the Eyes of the Masters*, David Anrias (London, Routledge, 1932) pp. 17-8
14. *Ibid.*, p.27
15. *Ibid.*, p.66
16. *Ibid.*, p.16
17. Scott, *ibid.*, p.89
18. *Old Diary Leaves*, Henry Steele Olcott (New York, Putnam, 1895) facing p.368
19. *Ibid.*, p.245
20. *Ibid.*, p.247
21. *Ibid.*, p.248
22. *Collected Writings, I*, H. P. Blavatsky, The Diaries of H.P. Blavatsky, passim.
23. *The Masters and the Path*, C. W. Leadbeater (Adyar, TPH, 1925) p.11
24. *Is This Theosophy . . .?*, Ernest Wood (London, Rider, 1936) p.168
25. *Ibid.*, p. 166. The mistake referred to by Narayan occurs in *Initiations Human and Solar*, Alice A. Bailey (New York, Lucis, 1922) pp.52-3, 57
26. Wood, *ibid.*, p.172
27. *Ibid.*, p.167