

Explanatory Statement

The United Lodge of Theosophists is an integral part of the Theosophical Movement, which has the whole of Nature for its object, and which began far back in the night of time. Wherever thought has struggled to be free, wherever spiritual ideas, as opposed to forms and dogmatism, have been promulgated, there the great Movement is to be discerned. The Theosophical Movement is moral, ethical, spiritual, universal, invisible save in effect, and continuous.

While the existence of Masters of Wisdom has never been made a dogma in Theosophy, yet, the larger meaning of the Theosophical Movement will not be grasped without serious consideration of the teaching that Masters exist as facts in nature, and not merely as ideals. The United Lodge of Theosophists recognizes in these great beings the Founders of the Theosophical Movement, and seeks to promote unity of aim and purpose and of teaching among all who call themselves Theosophists, in order to realize as quickly as possible unity of thought, will, and feeling — the first step in the formation of a nucleus of universal brotherhood which the Masters exemplify.

It should be clearly recognized that there is a wide difference between the Theosophical Movement and any theosophical society or organization. Theosophy has existed eternally throughout cycles upon cycles of the past, and will ever exist throughout the infinitude of the future, because Theosophy is synonymous with EVERLASTING TRUTH — established Truth, recorded in various ages, in various climes, throughout an untold series of incessant observations. On the other hand, a society formed for theosophical work is a visible organization, an effect, a machine for conserving energy and putting it to use; it is not, nor can it be, universal, nor is it continuous. Organized theosophical bodies are made by men for their better cooperation, but, being mere outer shells, they must change from time to time as human defects come out, and as the great underlying spiritual Movement compels such alterations.

The real unity and prevalence — the real internationalism — of the Theosophical Movement are, therefore, not to be looked for in any form of organization, but are to be found in the similarity of aim, of aspiration, of purpose, of teaching, and of ethics, among those in the world who are working for it. All who love Brotherhood are parts of that great whole denominated The Theosophical Movement, which, though aided by working organizations, is above them all

[The following explanatory statement drawn up by Robert Crosbie for the information of all theosophists, was made public concurrently with the foundation of The United Lodge of Theosophists and the adoption of its DECLARATION by himself and the seven original Associates, on February 18, 1909.]

The United Lodge of Theosophists is an integral part of the Theosophical Movement begun in New York in 1875. It is — as the name implies — an Association of Theosophists irrespective of organization, who are bound together by the tie of common aim, purpose and teaching, in the cause of Theosophy.

Theosophy, being the origin, basis and genius of every Theosophical organization, forms in itself a common ground of interest and effort, above and beyond all differences of opinion as to persons or methods; and being the philosophy of Unity, it calls for the essential union of those who profess and promulgate it.

This Union does not mean a sameness of organization or method, but a friendly recognition, mutual assistance and encouragement among all engaged in the furtherance of Theosophy.

The Teacher, H. P. Blavatsky, declared that "Want of Union is the first condition of failure," and in her last message to the American Convention in 1891, said: "Never has it been more necessary for the members of the Theosophical Society to lay to heart the parable of the bundle of sticks, than it is at the present time; divided, they will inevitably be broken, one by one; united, there is no force on earth able to destroy our Brotherhood. I have marked with pain ... a tendency among you to allow your very devotion to the cause of Theosophy to lead you into disunion ... No opportunity will be lost of sowing dissension, of taking advantage of mistaken and false moves, of instilling doubt, of augmenting difficulties, of breathing suspicions, so that by any and every means the unity of the Society may be broken and the ranks of our Fellows thinned and thrown into disarray."

There are a number of Theosophical organizations in existence today, all of them drawing their inspiration from Theosophy, existing only because of Theosophy, yet remaining disunited. The nature of each organization is such, that unity cannot be had on the basis of any one of them; hence a common basis should be taken if the success originally purposed is to be attained.

The need of such a basis with a broader view of the Movement is the cause for the present Association — the United Lodge of Theosophists — composed of Theosophists of different organizations, as well as those belonging to none. This Lodge, having no constitution, by-laws, officers or leader, affords in its Declaration a common basis of Unity for all who see the great need of it, and seeks their co-operation.

Holding to its motto: "There is no Religion higher than Truth," it seeks for the truth in all things, and beginning with the history of the Theosophical Movement, sets forth herein some facts with their inevitable deductions, for general information and consideration.

There is no question anywhere as to who brought the message of Theosophy to the Western World, nor is there any reason to believe that the Messenger, H. P. Blavatsky, failed to deliver all that was to be given out until the year 1975 — the time stated by her for the advent of the next Messenger.

While she lived there was one Society. After her departure, dissensions arose, resulting in several separate organizations. The basic cause of these divisions is to be found in differences of opinion as to "successorship," even where other causes were in evidence. No such question should ever have arisen, for it is abundantly clear that H. P. Blavatsky could no more pass on to another her knowledge and attainments, than could Shakespeare, Milton or Beethoven pass on theirs.

Those who were attracted by the philosophy she presented, or who were taught by her, were followers or students, of more or less proficiency in the understanding and assimilation of Theosophy.

Once the idea of “successorship” is removed from consideration, a better perspective is obtainable of the Movement, the philosophy, and the principal persons — past and present — engaged in its promulgation.

We have the declarations of her Masters that she was the sole instrument possible for the work to be done, that They sent her to do it, and that They approved in general all that she did. That work not only includes the philosophy she gave, but her work with the relation to others in the Movement; and where a relation is particularly defined — as in the case of William Q. Judge — wisdom dictates that full consideration be given to what she says.

H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge were co-Founders of the Theosophical Society in 1875. They were colleagues from the first and ever remained such. When H. P. Blavatsky left America — never to return — she left behind her William Q. Judge to establish and carry on the work of the Theosophical Movement in America. How well that work was done is a matter of history.

H. P. Blavatsky departed from the body in 1891; William Q. Judge some five years later. He never claimed to be her successor; on the contrary, when asked the question, he said: She is *sui generis* — she can have no successor;” the fact being that both he and she were contemporaneous in the work, he retaining his body for some five years longer in order to complete the work he had to do.

The work of these two cannot be separated if the Movement is to be understood. The evidence of the greatness and fitness of William Q. Judge, as a Teacher, is to be found in his writings — a large and valuable part of which has become obscured through the organizational dissensions before spoken of. These writings should be sought for, and studied, in connection with those of H. P. Blavatsky. That study will lead to the conviction that both were great Teachers — each with a particular mission — that each was *sui generis*, that their work was complementary, and that neither of them had, nor could have, any successor.