



teozofija v sloveniji



Alexis Dolgorukii

WAS THEOSOPHY SUBORNED?

Republished from the website www-parascience.org

alexis dolgorukii © 1998

Prispevki k raziskovanju zgodovine Teozofskega gibanja - v izvirniku

What exactly happened to theosophy? Nothing really, it is **NOT** theosophy itself, which as I believe I have adequately demonstrated in my previous essay, is a process and an intellectual attitude, which has been suborned or changed in any way.

It is what the various Theosophical Societies were, have been, and are becoming, that is the question. It is **NOT** theosophy itself which has been suborned, it is the organizations which claim to present the process to humanity, that seem to have been suborned. I believe I have exhaustively discussed what is wrong with The Theosophical societies in their present incarnations in the essay "WHAT IS THEOSOPHY?". So then, having dealt with what is wrong with The Institution, I need to discuss how it went wrong and why.

But the far more important question I have come to see needs to be asked is this:

WERE THE VARIOUS THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETIES EVER AS THEY SEEMED? WHERE THEIR CLAIMS MERELY "COVER" FOR ANOTHER SET OF GOALS AND AGENDAS ALTOGETHER.

Nowhere is this question more urgently to be asked than in connection with the original and quite frankly the **ONLY VALID** Theosophical Society. The other so-called theosophical societies were simply the results of relatively inane ego-based personality disputes which took place after the death of H.P.B., or simply "Cults of Personality" which formed around certain charismatic theosophists such as Rudolf Steiner and Katherine Tingley.

What we have to learn is this: How, in fact, did the promise of an organization, which *claimed* to have been formed to propagate a process so extremely valuable to human evolution, come to naught but a sad series of "might have beens"? How could the highly touted "original programme" of this Society, which, had it ever been real, could have been so very good, turn so very sour? Why did The Theosophical society which was, at its inception, claimed to be so very positive, turn into a force that is actually negative and would be very much more so if it weren't so totally ineffectual.

Needless to say, when any movement such as theosophy goes so completely astray, it is **ALWAYS** the leadership of the movement that is the cause. It does not matter at all what kind of intellectual gym-

nastics the movement produces to deny that its leadership is entirely responsible for its having gone astray. It also doesn't matter at all what kind of intellectual contortions the leadership goes through to attempt to deny that they have gone astray! Both of these phenomena are common in the various Theosophical Institutions, but to no avail whatsoever. It is clear to anyone not in the leadership much of these organizations that the theosophical movement went astray in 1878 and worse yet, it has never even attempted to find its way back to its original program.

Now, it is absolutely clear to me that the basic source of "what went wrong" is **YELENA PETROVNA BLAVATSKAYA**. She, of course is not entirely to blame for what went so very wrong with the theosophical movement, others bear a great deal of blame for their onerous activities. But she was the founder, and the motivation force behind the original program and as such, she, and she alone, had the absolute responsibility to prevent that program from going astray. Rightly or wrongly, for good or for ill, in the firmament of theosophy H.P.B. was **THE** heavenly body, Henry Steele Olcott and William Quan Judge and the other "founding members" were simply her satellites. She led, and they followed to the best of their abilities. This is amply proven by Henry Olcott's ex-post facto "introduction" to "Isis Unveiled." That level of awestruck fatuousness makes it crystal clear that, at least in the beginning, Henry Steele Olcott followed mindlessly where Yelena Blavatskaya led.

So then, the basic question we have facing us is this: What "happened" to Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya? When, how, and why did she lose her way? For, if the "original program" was a valid thing, she certainly did "lose her way" and that which she proclaimed loudly that she most feared for theosophy has come about. The problem is that pre-1878 she seemed to be one person, and after that date she seemed to become, little by little, another person altogether. Or did she really? Or did she "go astray"? Going astray implies inadvertency and/or misunderstanding. I do not think what happened was inadvertent in any way. I have come to the certain belief that The Theosophical Society, from its inception, had absolutely nothing really to do with the propagation of theosophy. ***It's goals and agenda were almost entirely radically political and ultra-radically anti-religious, and in those goals it succeeded perfectly well.***

To understand the real agenda of The Theosophical Society, requires an understanding of its orchestrator who was H.P.B.

The **ACTUAL** political, theological, and social goals of The Theosophical Society, were, I believe, truly admirable in and of themselves, and I'll discuss them fully in the course of this essay, but unfortunately a great many sincere, well-meaning, but gullible people have been "taken in" by the "cover-story," and by the relatively harmful fantasies spun by H.P.B.'s successors and have therefore participated in a belief system which was not beneficial. It was not beneficial because it was entirely false. There are other reasons it was harmful too, but they shall appear as this essay continues.

I wrote a short essay on "The Heritage of Yelena Blavatskaya." I think it worth repeating here in an expanded format, as we must understand her completely in order to be able to see and comprehend what her actual agenda was. She never swerved from this agenda, and she was incredibly successful in attaining its goals. ***But this is clear; "theosophy" was an excuse for, and a cover story for, The Theosophical society, whose goals had NOTHING to do with an intellectual and philosophical process for enlightenment.***

There have been an enormous number of books written about Helena Petrovna Blavatsky and what she said, and what she did, or was alleged to have done. These books are either slavishly hagiographic or mindlessly demonographic (my friend K. Paul Johnson calls them “**PATHOGRAPHIC**” because they deal with pathology rather than reality, and I believe it’s a good description). But Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya was neither “Saint” nor “Demon.”

Though I do believe that in time she will be clearly seen to have been a benefactor of the human race, one who made the world a better place for everyone to live in. She was a fascinating and brilliant woman. There have been many books written about the books she wrote. Of course, there have also been an inordinate number of books written about her, which discuss her childhood based upon the alleged memories of her Aunt and Sister. Most of this was entirely revisionistic, and a good deal of that revisionism was by the authors of the reports rather than intrinsic to the reminiscences they allege to report.

The single most important fact one must assimilate before discussing the life and works of H.P.B. is this: *The “Masters” or “Mahatmas” of which she so fulsomely and endlessly talked, were entirely a fiction. They bore no resemblance or connection with any living person. They were simply a “cover-story” and distraction to keep people from realizing who she was, what she was, and with whom she worked.*

To attempt to identify any of them with any person then alive is to get trapped in exactly the diversion that H.P.B. intended. She was an agent and full colleague of the Illuminati but, the Illuminati bear no resemblance at all to her “magical-mystical Masters-of The Wisdom.” As I have said many times, and in many places, there is no such thing as magic, even when you spell it “magick.” H.P.B.’s so-called “Masters” were great practitioners of what I call “shooting lightning out of their asses,” real Illuminati do no such thing, ever. But a real Illuminatus, like for example; Sir Francis Bacon, changes the world for the better far more than some fictional Mage who precipitates letters into railway cars.

But in all of the books I have read, almost nothing has been said about the ancestral heritage that was hers through her Grandmother Princess Yelena Pavlovna Dolgorukii. And that lack is a terrible flaw. I am not making that statement because it is a heritage I share, but because you simply cannot understand Yelena unless you know what she was that enabled her to do what she did. *It is important to know that Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya is a hero to me, despite the fact that I have a perception of her and her work that is not in any way orthodox.*

It is my belief that one can’t really understand many things about HPB as a person unless one understands the heritage that was hers by birth.

In Sylvia Cranston’s altogether too hagiographic and inaccurate Book; “HPB”, the author displays some confusion (quite understandably) when she reports that HPB and her Aunt checked into a hotel in Germany and registered as “Countesses,” when Cranston claimed that there is no appearance that HPB had ever otherwise used the title.

In her book, “MADAME BLAVATSKY, PRIESTESS OF THE OCCULT,” Gertrude Marvin Williams, (on page 21) says “Helena Blavatsky was no Countess,” which is a lie!

Now Cranston wasn’t lying, she was speaking from her perception of Blavatsky’s actual social status, though that, in itself is not a true perception. For the fact remains that, regarding the use of the title

“Countess,” she certainly used the title, and had long done so. But she did not do so since the inception of her involvement with the Theosophical Society. In 1878 she became (for reasons connected with her actual goals and agendas) an American Citizen, and both in her eyes and by law that precluded any further use of the title.

Cranston’s book deals with an almost entirely fictionalized view of Blavatskaya’s childhood, and a propagandized view of her life after the founding of the Theosophical society. In other words, Cranston’s book (and most Officially sanctioned Biographies of HPB) deals with what are largely her sister Vera’s fantasies of HPB’s early life, and with the last 16 years of her life. It leaves out almost the entire 26 years between her departure from Yerevan at the age of 18, and the founding of The Theosophical Society in the year 1875. (1849-1875) and the truth of the matter is that no one has knowledge of, or can prove any of her activities during that period as they were very carefully occulted by H.P.B. herself. An “occultation” she worked at for the rest of her life, through the simple process of making one contradictory statement after another about her life, this of course, enabled many people who considered themselves to be her friends, as well as, and this is far worse, those who **KNEW** themselves to be her enemies (and they were well organized and their number was legion, and they still are), to make up their own histories about her.

Now getting back to Cranston’s confusion regarding HPB’s use of her title, that “confusion” not only implies to me that there is much about Russian Aristocracy that is not known to Sylvia Cranston, but that it is equally “terra incognita” to most Westerners. But this is something of which I have been long aware in contexts other than theosophical.

Almost every educated person in the Western world knows about the Feudal Society of Europe that gave rise to Aristocracy. In the West there are “nobility,” and there is “Royalty,” the two things are not the same.

Now, if you are in the possession of a P.H.D. in Medieval History, or even just an amateur “history buff” with a special interest in the feudal world, what follows is going to be simplistic and superficial in the extreme. But it will be far more than the average person knows. I have discovered, as a person who has a title, that such things are utterly meaningless to most people. In fact, in our contemporary societies, they are totally meaningless, except in as how they reveal the heredity of the titled individual. This is useful because it is very rare that an individual not of aristocratic heritage can trace their descent back any distance at all. While I, on the other hand, can trace my ancestors back to prior to the Common Era. The only thing most people know about nobility and feudalism (those, that is, who know anything at all) is what they’ve read in Sir Walter Scott and/or the books of some other novelists (Mercedes Lackey and Marion Zimmer Bradley for instance).

I am going to discuss subject of “nobility,” in this part of this essay, as it pertains to the English Feudal system, every country in Western Europe had much the same system but the names of the titles were based on the individual language.

For instance, a “Knight” in England, was a “Chevalier” in France, a “Cavaliere” in Italy, a “Caballero” in Spain, and a “Ritter” (which I think came originally from “Rieter” which means “rider”), in Germany. All these names had to do with the fact that they fought battles as mounted horsemen. That was only a late development however, and originally it meant simply the owner of a horse or horses.

Before the stirrup was brought into Europe from Central Asia, the equestrian classes simply rode to the battle site and then fought on foot.

It probably would not be too farfetched to say that the difference between aristocracy and commonality, at the lowest levels, had to do with the possession or non-possession of a horse. There is a complete discussion of the institution of aristocracy in my work-in-progress “**THE KELTIC KNOT**”.

But appended to that feudal system were a graded series of titular “ranks.” This hierarchy ascended not from Knights, which were the lowest form of titular aristocracy, and whose descendants are now called “Country Gentry,” but from “Baronets” whose title was the same as a Knight, but in which case the title was hereditary. This line of progression ran up all the way to Dukes, which was the highest title available to non-sovereign rulers, and took two forms. Dukes who were landed magnates of immense possessions and the highest form of non-royal nobility, and to “Royal Dukes” who were the younger sons of Kings. The title comes from the Roman Rank “Dux Bellorum” and the Germanic title “Kriegs Graf.” Both of which originally meant “War Leader,” and in fact, that’s what Dukes originally were. Even higher were the various levels of “sovereign rulers” themselves, those who were absolute rulers of their territories and owed fealty to no one, or only to Imperial Rulers. These were, in order of seniority: Grand Dukes, Princes, and Kings. These are all feudal nobility, or more accurately military nobility, *the only valid nobility*. What the French call “Noblesse de L’Epee” or Nobility of the Sword.

The primary problem with aristocracy, both in our time and ever since the Renaissance, is that it has outlived its social context. Originally the nobility provided a vital service to the people over whom they ruled, they provided security from outside attack, and order within the community. They also provided (ideally) food in times of scarcity. But over time, the situation reversed itself and the commons simply served the aristocracy, and that’s when aristocracy became doomed.

There’s another kind of “nobility” and that is “Court Nobility” what the French, with their usual aptness with phrases, call “Noblesse de La Robe” or Nobility of the Robe, and these were titles that were given for service to the sovereigns (service to the Nation was viewed in those days as service to the Sovereign), and this class of “nobility” did not in any way partake of the ancient compact between the rulers and those they ruled. By the Renaissance, the “Nobility of the Robe” or those with “Court titles” who were actually only bureaucrats, began to outnumber the “Nobility of the Sword” and that too doomed both classes. It was the willing consent of those ruled that made the nobility of the sword valid for the time it lived up to its obligations under that social contract.

But in Eastern Europe, which, due to Tartar and Mongol incursions, had a different developmental history than the West; there was an aristocracy too, and it was equally powerful. In Eastern or Slavic Europe, Nobility was primarily based upon land ownership and wealth associated with the land. And so, for the longest time, there were no such things as “Counts” or “Marquesses” or “Barons” in Eastern Europe, by which, remember, I mean to say Slavic Europe.

Hungary was another kettle of fish altogether and had the same system as the West (actually, along with the other states which came under Turkish Dominion, it alternated between Western Feudalism and Turkish Feudalism).

Now, HPB's heritage was, on her Father's side, pure German, and therefore part of the European Feudal Aristocracy, but on her Mother's side it was a different story altogether.

HPB's Father's family, whose name was Hahn-Hahn-von Rottenstern-Hahn were Counts in the hodgepodge of politically irrelevant German states that existed prior to 1870. The many hyphens tell the story of why they relocated into Russia. *They were impoverished.*

In England, and really England alone in Europe, Titles, except that of the sovereign, were bound to property and the property was "entailed," which meant that it could only be passed from its holder to the closest MALE heir. Daughters could be willed valuables, but they inherited neither lands nor titles.

In regard to "titles" in the English system, only the oldest son inherited the family title. During his Father's lifetime, the heir held what is called a "Courtesy Title" which, while it indicated rank and position, did not carry the "Peer of the Realm" status. For instance, a "courtesy title" didn't bring membership in the House of Lords. It usually worked out that a Duke's heir carried the courtesy title of Marquess, a Marquess's heir carried the title of "Earl" or "Viscount" and so on. The other sons were called Lord John Smith (or whatever his personal name and family name were). This was to differentiate them from titular "Lords" who would be called John, Lord Smith. The sons of younger sons had no titles at all and were distinguished by the honorific "The Right Honorable." The best example of this I can present is: The Right Honorable Winston Spencer Churchill, whose Father was Lord Randolph Churchill, and whose Grand-father was His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.

This kind of control over inheritance was also true, but not invariably so, in France. But in France it wasn't as bound about with legalities as it was in England.

Now in the rest of Western Europe especially in Germany, if your papa was a Count so were you. The Land wasn't entailed, and so when the land owner died, the property was split between the heirs and so eventually one is confronted with a lot of really poor nobility. One of my German ancestors at the time of the Crusades (which was an exercise which he carefully avoided) made himself both very rich and very important by marrying the heiresses of defunct Crusaders. With the young ladies, he obtained their lands and titles. By the time he was through, he had so many titles that the family was eventually made Princes when he started out as a Count.

Another ancestor of mine, Princess Sophie of Anhalt-Zerbst (who became The Empress Catherine the Great of Russia) had no experience of wealth and "the world's goods" as a child, because the Anhalt Principality had been split into far too many postage-stamp Principalities. Princess Sophie was so poor, that part of the marriage agreement stipulated that her entire wardrobe had to be supplied by her future Mother-in Law the Empress Elisabeth.

Because of this poverty many German Aristocrats emigrated to Russia, where their services as Military Officers and administrators were in high demand. This was true of the von Hahn family, but according to German Law and Custom, Peter von Hahn, HPB's father had every right to use the title "Graf" which is the German equivalent of Count.

But now let's go on to Russia where there were no such titles. At least there weren't prior to Peter the Great and his successors who were more European oriented than their predecessors. In Russia there were Serfs (who were not slaves in the sense that Blacks in America were; in America slaves were simply property, or more correctly, chattels, and could be sold individually just as a horse or dog

could be sold. Serfs, on the other hand were simply bound to the land and as such, if the land was sold they went with it, but they themselves were not property in the sense that slaves were in America, and still are in parts of the Arab world); above the Serfs were the peasants (Muzhiks); above them were a tiny mercantile class, most of whom were foreigners (most frequently German), and the Landowners of whom the more powerful were called Boyars. It is important to remember that many of the Boyars lived exactly like wealthy peasants, which in fact, is what they were.

The only people who really carried a title in Russia, which was the “Land of the Rus,” were originally the rulers of the tribe called The Rus. Most of the inhabitants of what we call Russia, were not of the Rus Tribe. The Rus tribe were actually Nordics from Gothland (an Island off the coast of Sweden), who conquered Russia, they claim at the request of the indigenous populace, in the 9th century.

The tribal chief of the Rus was a man named Rurik, his sons were the “Rurikovitchii,” and they were, or rather became, the only actual title holders in Russia. Their title was KNYAZZ, which is usually translated as “Prince” but which really means “Appanage Prince” which is a sovereign and territorial title. All of Rurik’s sons were Knazzin.

The Dolgorukii family is directly descended from Rurik’s third son Oleg Ruriksson. He was a most interesting if barbaric person. He was what the Byzantines called a “Varangian,” which was their equivalency to Viking. He went to Constantinople to offer his services as a mercenary (or so the legend goes), and was treated very rudely. He nailed his shield to the gates of the city saying “I will return” and he did, and burned most of the place down. (I personally don’t really know if this is apocryphal or not, I tend to suspect that it is.) Oleg Ruriksson’s sons became “Appanage Princes” of Kiev, Nijni Novograd, Moscow, Pereslavl, Rostov-Suzdal, Vladimir, and other places. For a while, the sons of Ruriksson’s sons, also carved out appanages for themselves, usually at one another’s expense. The family was famed for its incestuous murderousness. Brother killed brother with almost Turkish frequency. In fact, the family was always notorious for the volatility of its personalities. This helps one to understand the immense volatility of Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya. I am known to be more than a little volatile myself.

It was from the “Boyar class” that titles of equivalency to the European title system evolved. This occurred during Peter the Great’s “opening to the West” and had a lot to do with his reforms of the Russian Court System. Peter wanted his young nobles educated in the West (there was really no secular education available in Russia at that period) and this was a kind of “bribe,” or incentive to encourage them to do so. There were some very fine, and ancient Universities in Poland, but that was not sufficiently Western and modern for Peter, he wanted his young nobles educated in France, England, Germany and Italy. Peter himself was entirely an auto-didact (self-taught).

The use of Western titles expanded even further during the reign of Catherine, during which time many Russian aristocrats began to travel to Europe on business and pleasure trips. This was, after all, the period during which the Hermitage Art Collection was amassed. From the time of Peter the Great onwards “titles” were bestowed for exceptional services to the Crown. Under Catherine, some of the exceptional services were exceptional indeed. And even then, the most common titles (called “Court Titles” and equivalent almost to English “Courtesy Titles” or to Papal Titles in Italy) were Count and Prince. There were no lands or power connected with these “court titles” except that conferred by

wealth and ability. What it did confer was some degree of prestige in the Russian Court, and also, and this was far more important, a title to use when confronting Western Europeans.

HPB's grandfather, the Privy Counselor (in Russia also a title, and a very important one) Andrei Fadeev, was of the Boyar class and perfectly entitled to style himself "Count," or, as he was a Privy Councillor as well as a Boyar, perhaps even Prince. Which may be why he was enabled to marry as illustriously as he did.

Marrying a Princess of the Dolgorukii family, is marrying into royalty and most common born don't get to do that. As far as I can tell HPB's first (and only legitimate) Husband, General Nicephor Blavatsky; was also of the Boyar class and therefore fully entitled to style himself "Count," ergo HPB was legitimately Countess Blavatskaya.

And so for the many centuries prior to the time of Peter the Great and his successors, Russia's validly titled aristocracy were all Royalty and only royalty.

The first Czar, was actually only a "primus inter pares" or "first among equals" (and those "equals" were all his First Cousins, Uncles, and Brothers. At least at first, he wasn't called Czar at all. He was Grand Prince (Knyazz) of Moscow. The power accreted sequentially from the Grand Dukes of Kiev, to those of Vladimir, and then Vladimir and Moscow. The first man actually to be crowned Czar (Which is Russian for Caesar) was Ivan IV (later known as Ivan the terrible) and he was a contemporary of Henry the VIII and he is mainly known to the Russian people for casting off the Tartar yoke. Other famous members of the Dolgorukii or Rurikovitch line besides Ivan, were Saint Vladimir of Kiev, who was the Prince, who converted Russia to Christianity, and Alexander Nevsky (Alexander of the Neva) the great victor over the Swedes and the Teutonic Knights on the frozen Neva River, and Dimitri Donskoi (Dimitri of the Don) who won a great victory over the Tartars on the River Don, but not the final victory. That was Ivan the Terrible's. There is also Yurii Dolgorukii who built the city of Pereslavl, and then the City of Moscow.

This was HPB's heritage by way of her Grand-mother. She was a descendent of a long line, not simply of nobility, but of Royalty and later of Imperial Princes and Czars. It's important to remember that HPB was the near cousin of the Czars who ruled during her lifetime. This explains certain courtesies afforded her during her travels by various Russian diplomats. It also makes it clear she was never a "Russian Agent." These "courtesies" have always been a prime source of ammunition to H.P.B.'s detractors. It also explains how her works were published contrary to usual Russian practice. By that I mean to say they were not subject to severe censorship. They were of course reviewed by the censors, but because of who she was, the censors "wore kid gloves," as it were.

The peculiar truth here is that Richard Hodgson wasn't entirely wrong in his estimation. The Theosophical Society and its principal founder were an imposture. The whole thing was a front for other activities. As to Yelena, Hodgson believed her to be a Russian Agent, there he was totally wrong. She was an "agent," but she wasn't a Russian Agent, though the propagation of suspicion that she was such was also a part of her "cover story." In point of fact, there is some indication she was an agent of more than one political entity. One could ask how it was that she and Henry Steele Olcott went to India carrying American Diplomatic Passports. I have no idea what one would have to do to find an answer to that question. But all things, considered her activities certainly served America's geo-political goals.

It seems to me that much of HPB's nature is far better clarified by this knowledge of her background. She was so frequently described as "imperious" and "autocratic," but how not? I am more often than not described in similar language.

Now let's spend some time looking at the life Yelena Blavatskaya led in the years from 1849, when she left Erivan and her husband's control, to 1875 when she founded the theosophical movement.

Most of the books written about her either avoid her childhood, if they are by her detractors, or make a great fuss over it, if they are like Sylvia Cranston and trying to make something extra-special about Yelena from the very beginning of her life.

Let's face it, very few children are all that interesting from an historians point of view. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart was interesting as a child precisely because he was NEVER really a child. Peter the Great was interesting as a child precisely because he was so extremely precocious. On the other hand, completely, Frederick the Great was of interest when he was a child, only because his father was a monster and abused him horribly. That is interesting because despite the abuse, Frederick grew up to become a truly great man, one of vast talents and abilities.

People like Sylvia Cranston, Mary K. Neff, Howard Murphet, Countess Wachtmeister, and Henry Olcott, for the most part, utilize H.P.B.'s sister Vera as their primary source for her childhood. But, from the family's point-of-view Vera was, and is, the absolutely worst, and surely the most unreliable, source for reminiscences of H.P.B.'s childhood. It is absolutely clear to me that Vera both envied and, as is unfortunately not at all uncommon between sisters, hated H.P.B. every day of her life. That hatred and envy is also clearly a thing which H.P.B., who needed both affection and unconditional approval far more than most people, decided to pretend didn't exist. But it did, and the entire family know of it.

So, let's take a different look at Yelena as a child. It is, I think, important to uncover the reality of Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya's so-called "Lost Years" and what these amount to are the entirety of her life prior to her founding of the theosophical movement in New York City in 1875. Her life divides into three segments: 1831 - 1849 (18 years), 1849 - 1875 (26 years), 1875 - 1891 (16 years), it's the middle segment that is called "The Veiled Years" and it's that period which interests us.

According to books written about her by orthodox theosophists, they make poor Yelena out to have been a veritable monster of a child. One who was almost constantly surrounded by paranormal phenomena like spirit-rapping and furniture movements etc. But none of that is true at all, it is all Theosophical Revisionism designed to emphasize the idea that she was always surrounded by "signs and wonders." She wasn't, she was a bright, happy, cheerful and very intelligent little girl. She was the apple of her Mother's eye, as well as that of her Grandmother, Grandfather, and Father. She wasn't particularly beautiful in a family that was for centuries, famous for their good looks. But she made up for it in charm, talent, and intelligence. Her sister Vera who was a beauty, had none of those virtues, but was, as a child, a rather spiteful little "tattle tale." And with the absolutely irrepressible and enthusiastic Yelena around, there was always quite a bit to "tattle" about. But it never did poor Vera any good, everybody loved Yelena and admired Yelena, and made a "fuss" over her and that was the cause of the lifelong envy and hatred Vera had for her sister.

Actually, it was more accurately described as "the most important cause" of Vera's life-long envy and hatred. Another cause was the fact that Vera was an extremely conservative and religious person who

literally regarded her sister as “an agent of the Devil” because of her lifestyle and her extremely radical political activities. Vera was a totally Victorian “Lady.” HPB was a cross-dressing Lesbian deeply involved in anti-monarchical activities.

In the course of my research on another topic altogether, I ran into some curious information. Immanent Yelena’s life that does not at all match the usual Theosophical Biography of H.P.B. I call it “curious” because I cannot rationally understand the motivations which might lay behind this disinformation. This disinformation has to do with her Mother’s death, her Mother’s life, and the lives of her Grand-mother and Great-Grandfather.

In the Century Cyclopedia, which was published in 1892, there is a two-book section called “The Encyclopedia of Names” which is very useful to the researcher. It is essentially a compilation of famous people taken out of previously published American and European references. 1892 was a year after Yelena Blavatskaya’s death. There are two very interesting entries. In the cyclopedia they give no connection between them, but they were closely connected indeed. The two entries are:

BLAVATSKY; Madame. (Helena Petrovna Hahn-Hahn)

Born: Ekaterinoslav 1831; Died: London 8 May 1891.

Russian Theosophist and traveler in the East. One of the chief founders of “The Theosophical Society” in 1875. She wrote “Isis Unveiled” (1876); “The Secret Doctrine” (1888); “Key to Theosophy” (1889): etc.

And that’s it, a very short, and clearly minor entry. One year after her death she was revealed to be of minor interest only. Clearly, other than the fact that she seemed to be considered of relatively minor importance, there’s nothing new and surprising in it. It’s this next entry that’s interesting.

HAHN; Madame: (Helena Andrejevna Fadejeff) [those are the Russian spellings]

Born: 1814; Died: **SAINT PETERSBURG**, June 24th 1842.

Russian Novelist, wife of an officer of artillery. Among her novels are: “Jelaleddin”, “Utballa”, “THEOPHANIA”, and “Abbiaggio”, her best work. She wrote originally under the pseudonym “Zeneida R___WA”. (Most Theosophical Histories spell it “Zenaida”).

Now, what is so strange and peculiar about this? Well, there are a number of things. In the first place in Mme. Von Hahn’s entry it says nothing about her being “the Mother of Mme Blavatsky.” Which would imply (at least) that even one year after Blavatsky’s death, being her Mother was not considered relevant or important. Which again tells us something of her relative importance at that time. What it tells us is entirely contrary to Institutional Theosophical Myth. The next, and more important peculiarity is the fact that in this contemporary account, Helena von Hahn died on June 24th 1842 in **SAINT PETERSBURG**. Now this is odd, as in all of the Theosophical accounts she is said to have died in **ODESSA**. Why this discrepancy, and what could it mean? Because such a discrepancy is so seemingly petty this gets pretty Byzantine, and I will discuss it as part of my general response to these two entries. Lastly there is the list of Mme. von Hahn’s most well-known books, **NONE OF WHICH ARE EVER MENTIONED IN THEOSOPHICAL SOURCES** (other than by Geoffrey Barborcka in his book “H.P.B., TIBET AND TULKU”, wherein he gives a very complete listing of her works without any other comment), and I think I know why.

As a Dolgorukii, and fully aware of the significance of the name, I have always been truly amazed that the propaganda put out by the various Theosophical societies never mentioned the fact that Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya was a close relation of the Czar.

One would assume that it would be seen as a useful adjunct to claiming legitimacy for her.

That social status also completely answers the charges placed against her by various enemies. (i.e. that she was a Russian Spy). But the Theosophical Leadership, both then and now, avoid the reality of Yelena's extremely distinguished social status like the plague.

They also very carefully avoided some really important facts about her. Facts one would think they would trumpet to the skies. For instance, her Cousin, (my great-Grandfather), was Governor General of Moscow. Her Great-Grandfather Prince Pavel Dolgorukii, who was the younger brother of my own Great-great Grandfather the Ambassador and Diplomat, Prince Alexander Dolgorukii, was an extremely famous Occultist and Esotericist and a very important figure in both the Masonic Orders and the Knights Templar of the Strict Observance. He, and his brother, were also very close colleagues of Prince Edward Rakoczy (a.k.a. The Count de St. Germaine). This was equally true of their contemporaries Prince Nicholas Youssouppoff, and Prince Alexander Galitsyn (Whose Grandson, also Prince Alexander Galitsyn, was a very close friend of Yelena's). They were four of Russia's highest ranking, most distinguished, richest, and powerful men. Prince Nicholas Youssouppoff in fact, was the direct descendant of Mohammed (through his ancestor Youssouf, Krim Kha Kahn).

You'd think the T.S. would want this to be known, and widely known at that, as it lends legitimacy to their foundress. But they have always kept this secret. They have also always "glossed over" the fact that H.P.B.'s Maternal Grandmother Yelena Pavlovna Dolgorukha-Fedejeva was an extremely famous woman in her own right. She was one of the extremely few woman scientists of her period who were recognized and admired in Europe. She was also an occultist-esotericist as was her husband Privy Counselor Andrej Fedejev, who served the Imperial Government in many really important posts. The level of his importance has always been obscured by "Official Theosophical Histories."

Now what was it about certain of Yelena Andrejevna von Hahn's novels that the T.S. didn't want known to their members. ***Their subject matter that's what!*** Mme. Von Hahn's creative output was extremely metaphysical and esoteric. Look at the titles given in her Cyclopedia entry ... "Jelaleddin". Why is that significant? Because it is the cognomen of one of the most important Sufi mystics that ever lived, and H.P.B., and certainly her Great-Grandfather were definitely strongly connected with the Sufi order. Do you really think a book which is entitled "**THEOPHANIA**" is merely a matter of coincidence or accident?

Well, I don't think so.

So, what do I think was the purpose of this dissimulation? And remember, I said it was Byzantine, I have a Byzantine mind, but I come by it quite naturally, The Dolgorukii are descended from the Comnenoi and the Paleologoi both of which families produced a succession not only of the Emperors of Byzantium, but of those of Trebizond as well.

This of course is equally true of Yelena Blavatskaya. And let me tell you, **SHE** had the "Byzantine Mind" to end all Byzantine Minds! By "Byzantine Mind," in the case of Yelena Blavatskaya, I mean to say a mind that was labyrinthine in its complexities. A mind in which there were layers upon layers

of motivations and meanings, a mind which produced material in which what is said only sometimes actually means exactly what is said and not something entirely different. That is not at all true in my own case, for while I too have a very complex mind, I always say exactly what I mean.

Now then, the question is what were the people associated with the Theosophical Societies trying to do. I think that their entire motivation was to destroy any kind of perception that Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya's work and writing was the result of study, hard work, and parental indoctrination, and throw all that she was and did into the laps of "The Masters" who, as Theosophy depicts them are utterly fictional. In other worlds, in order to concentrate on the miraculous and fictional, they completely obfuscated the truth about Blavatskaya's life and background. It is also perfectly obvious that prior to her death in 1891, she, herself, at least acquiesced in the scam, if not fully participated in its planning.

That is in all likelihood, why most of the stories which we read in the official Theosophical Biographies, and also most of the stories we read in those biographical works by her enemies, are based upon the only data the T.S. made available which was her sister Vera's spiteful fantasies, coupled with the incredibly malicious fantasies of her cousin Vasilevod Solovyoff. The sad thing is that in the process the true Yelena Blavatskaya gets completely lost.

Countess Yelena Petrovna Hahn-Hahn von Rottenstern-Hahn's childhood was both a happy time for her and a very exciting and interesting one. In the first place they were not only very rich, but very important and powerful, and that made absolutely certain that no matter where they were, they lived in great comfort and style. For comparison and example, my own Grandfather owned Palaces in Saint Petersburg and Moscow, another one in the suburb of Saint Petersburg called Tsarskoie-Selo. There were Palaces in Yalta and Odessa in the Crimea, there was the Primary Estate near Kiev, and palaces or palatial mansions in Warsaw, Prague, Vienna, Rome, and Paris, as well as a hunting lodge in the Polish country side, and another in Finland, And a very large Yacht indeed. This is how the Russian 19th Century high nobility lived.

This, of course had absolutely nothing at all to do with Peter von Hahn's military salary. In that period of time most Military Officers (especially in Russia) were members of the aristocracy, and so their lifestyles had absolutely nothing to do with their military pay. Of course, the fact that her Mother Yelena Andrejevna was probably the most important and popular female novelist in the Russian Empire added to the luster of their lives.

Now, as regards Yelena Andrejevna's novels: She did not write the typical sentimental Victorian "Lady Novels," rather her novels could be compared with Marie Corelli's or Lord Bulwer-Lytton's, they were exciting and exotic but they were, in a sense, revelatory because they dealt with subjects which were more properly included in her inheritance from her Mother and her Maternal Grandfather and Grand Uncle. And that was metaphysics and the occult. Yelena Andrejevna had absorbed metaphysical esotericism with her Mother's milk, so too did Yelena Petrovna.

Now it appears to me that this is something the Theosophical Establishment wanted to hide. They were unhappy and uneasy about the fact that Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya had a long and distinguished inheritance and was simply the most recent member of a family that had long been deeply connected with what I call "The Humanist Collective" or "The Association of Adepts." The Theo-

sophical Establishment, with the very active collaboration of HPB herself, had transmogrified this collective into a totally fictional and fantastical thing: that thing was "The Masters of the Wisdom".

The Humanist Collective or The Association of Adepts is a very real and potent thing, albeit highly secretive. Actually, they are not so much "secretive" as they are discreet and subtle. "The Masters of the Wisdom" is an entirely fictional portrayal of the adeptii and is both entirely misleading, and because of the nature of the fiction, terribly harmful. It is so very harmful because it creates a vast edifice of false expectations and because it enables the unethical to indulge in some truly opportunistic charades.

But then what exactly is "The Humanist Collective"? It is simply an on-going group of people connected lightly by motivations and goals and by genetic inheritance. Their only goal is to make the world a far better, more peaceful, more benign place in which humanity can evolve. The method for this provision is to slowly and gradually create a world society in which the keynote is illimitable liberty. For centuries the adeptii have slowly but surely weaned humanity away from the totally ferocious anarchy in which it began its history, through ever less and less and less oppressive societies. The ultimate goal is a world society in which no oppression of any kind exists.

Historically, the most publically renowned (unfortunately so) adept was Eduard von Rokoczy, Prince of Siebenbergen (Transylvania) who was known primarily by his pseudonym: "The Comte de St. Germaine". Yelena Blavatskaya's Great-Grandfather Pavel, and his Brother Alexander and, as I mentioned above, their two close friends, colleagues and Cousins, were colleagues of Eduard Rokoczy's and fellow members of the Association of Adepts. I tend to think of them as "The Six Princes". The difference between them was that Rokoczy was the "Chairman" of the Association of Adepts. Otherwise, they were equal. The Chairman's position is simply that of "Primus inter Pares" or first among equals. The Association of Adepts is not based upon hierarchical principles, in fact, it is unalterably opposed to such principles.

Now, I suppose you have noticed that all five of these men; Rokoczy, the two Dolgorukii, Galitsyn, and Youssoupoff, were Princes, they were all the descendants of sovereign rulers, three of them, the two Dolgorukii and Galitsyn, were Rurikovitchii, and one, Youssoupoff, was the descendant of the Kha Khan of the Crimea, Yousouff ibn Ali, the direct descendant of Islam's founder Mohammed. In view of that overwhelmingly powerful set of antecedents, I suppose you are wondering why would I claim that these scions of power and privilege, all of whom clearly represent what can only be called "The Oppressor Class," were men who were absolutely totally dedicated to, and devoted, to the ultimate creation of an ever less oppressive society. They were dedicated to creating a planetary society in which all sentient beings had illimitable liberty, illimitable opportunity, and most of all infinite possibilities.

Well, I have a question for you. Who else? Who was in a better position to do so? ***It really does take power to fight power.*** Several Dolgorukii Princes and relatives were executed as a result of their participation in the Revolution of 1905, and their predecessors had suffered the same fate under Catherine the Great. Yelena Petrovna von Hahn came by her role of "Freedom Fighter" and Iconoclast very naturally indeed. It's a real shame that the Bolsheviks, in their rush to power, saw fit to murder every member of the Dolgorukii family they could get their hands on. For the Dolgorukii, more than any other Russians, had set the stage for the successful revolution.

When one really investigates the life and works of Prince Eduard Rokoczy one becomes clearly aware that he was the Father of the Age of Revolution that followed the "Age of Enlightenment." There is not one of the many revolutions in the period from 1776 to 1917 that was not entirely inspired by the work of the so-called "Comte de St. Germain and/or his immediate associates and successors.

When one researches history carefully it becomes very clear indeed that all through the History of this planet, especially in the Common era, and particularly from the Renaissance to the present time, the Association of Adepts, sometimes called the Illuminati, in the pursuit and service of illimitable liberty, have been responsible for all major social changes leading to the increase of human freedom and happiness.

Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya devoted her entire life to that cause.

What has HPB left to us? Well, the years after 1875 are supposed to be an "open book" but they aren't really that open. As usual with her, they are a labyrinthian collection of misleading documentation, misleading clues, absolute truth, and equally absolute falsehood. The years between 1849, when she left Yerevan (with her husband's blessing and support) and 1875 are an almost complete mystery, at least as far as "Official Theosophical History" is concerned. To HPB's enemies, and they were not so much personal enemies as enemies of the cause she served, this hiatus was all to the good. They hastened to fill it with a history of their own making, all of it pure falsehood.

The thing that most constantly amazes me, and has always amazed her, is the "story line" they chose to develop, it was one in which they never bother to think about verisimilitude. The scandalous history the enemies of HPB created was one which not only wasn't true, but one which, with just a moments reflection, everyone could see wasn't true at all. These enemies, and Gertrude Marvin Williams may only have been their dupe, explain that for most of the 26 years involved, HPB was in Paris (and other major European Centers) earning her keep as a demi-mondaine, or high society Courtesan, all of which means to say an upper-class whore. And that's where they made a terrible error.

One of the most fascinating things about Yelena Blavatskaya is the fact that she drew to herself some of the most important and influential men of her period. The leaders in the intellectual and artistic communities and many others as well, were all her devoted admirers. I'm not going to include a list of these people because that list is already well known and is included in far too many other books, both those who unreservedly approve of HPB and those who unreservedly disapprove of her. So, her enemies either drew a false conclusion (which I do NOT believe to be the case) or willfully distorted the facts which is what I am sure happened. First, they always insist upon her status as a "Penniless Russian Adventuress." Which of course we know is totally not the case at all. Because they really like to think of her as a "penniless adventuress," they claim that the only way a "woman alone" could have supported herself, was by "selling her charms." They entirely neglect the amply proven facts that she was a far better than ordinary concert level pianist, and an extremely talented artist, and, in fact, could have earned a large income at either or both of those arts.

But basically, the whole story is untrue. She wasn't "penniless," for the simple fact that funds were available, to her order, at every Russian Embassy and Consulate in the world. I know this because my Grand Father and his Brothers (all of whom, with the single exception of my Grandfather, and in his case they tried but failed, were murdered by the Bolsheviks) made sure there were.

Because these people who were opposed to her and her work viewed her in such a negative social light, they felt impelled to claim that she could never meet such a large number of famous men on her own, any other way than through the fringes of Parisian Society, i.e. "The Demi-Mondaine." They claimed that she had drawn all these famous and intelligent men to her by way of sexual seduction and they have stuck with that story ever since.

But Yelena just didn't "fit the bill"! In the first place, Yelena Blavatskaya spent the 26 years between 1849 and 1875 primarily dressed as, and passing as, a male. She was a Lesbian, and an extremely masculine one at that. Now I am the first to admit that many prostitutes and even some Courtesans are Lesbians, there are many good reasons for this to be so. None of which are relevant to our discussion. But Yelena was what is called a "butch" Lesbian, she was extremely masculine, when dressed as a male, it was almost impossible to detect that she was not a male. That makes it unlikely that she used "seduction" as a weapon against Heterosexual Males. Secondly, Yelena was not a physically attractive woman. She had a fantastic personality, was multi-talented, and was a brilliant conversationalist. But nevertheless, she was, while not "ugly" certainly not at all sexually attractive. Lastly, and this is the most important factor of all; Yelena was deformed. Her genitals were shaped in such a fashion that heterosexual congress would have been not simply painful for her, but impossible.

So, I think it safe to say: So much for the "Demi-Mondaine" hypothesis.

But what was Yelena doing during those 26 years?

Perhaps we ought to start with a discussion of her marriage to Nicephor, General Count Blavatsky. Why did an 18 year old Countess marry a man very much her senior? It is true though, that poor General Blavatsky was not nearly as old as Theosophical myth makes him. As I understand it, he was about 40, or twenty-two years older than Yelena. Well, that's neither impossible or unusual, my own Father was 35 years older than my Mother and theirs was a complete "love match." But in the case of Yelena and Nicephor, it was a different but far from unusual story.

Now, it had long been obvious to her family that Yelena was a Lesbian (that's another reason her sister, who was a religious bigot, hated her). Well, prior to our own times, in the highest social circles, in cases like this, marriages were carefully arranged to avoid scandal. It was equally valuable to Blavatsky who had been using his extensive military and diplomatic career as an excuse for the fact that he wasn't married. But now he had been appointed as Voivode of Yerevan (Erevan) which means to say Governor of Armenia. And for this appointment he needed to be a married man. BUT, his wife didn't need to be at his side, and so it was convenient for all concerned.

Shortly after Count and Countess Blavatsky arrived in Yerevan, the Countess (HPB) left.

She was accompanied by a small troupe of Cossack bodyguards to assure her arrival at her destination. And that was??? Certainly NOT Tibet!

Now, the only sources we have for her activities during these lost years are her own so-called reminiscences and Colonel Olcott's long after the fact memoirs of what she may have told him, or, and this is also quite likely, what he wanted her to have told him. The other source cited regularly as "proof" of her activities during this period, is her correspondence with Prince Dondukoff-Korsakoff. But many researchers, K. Paul Johnson among them, consider this "correspondence" to be more spurious than not, an ex post facto production designed to further muddy the waters of her life. ***It is my own***

belief that the reason so many of her subterfuges were so clumsy is that she wanted them to be discovered. The more of an impostor she was seen to be, the more obscure her actual work.

There are two distinct sets of falsehoods that very effectively obscure the life and actions of Yelena Blavatskaya, and which help to occult her real work. The first is her own total fabrication of “false trails,” “red herrings,” and blinds, many of which were really humorous “pranks.” One of the most blatant of these “Red Herrings” is the Secret Doctrine, a book so intrinsically nonsensical, that I cannot but believe it was her greatest “prank.” It too, appears to be carefully designed to draw attention away from her actual work. It is hard for intelligent and educated people to take the writer of such blatant balderdash seriously. She didn’t want to be taken seriously.

It is important to remember too, that while she has been accused of imposture, no one has ever accused her of doing this for personal gain or profit. They accuse Yelena of all kinds of things, but no one, has ever bothered to explain her motivations. The implication then, would seem to be that she did her impostures as an amusement.

Now, the second set of falsehoods were based on her Sister Vera’s desperate need to preserve the family’s respectability and hide her own long-term envy and truly deep hatred of her Sister. The problem with Vera is that despite her background and undeniable social level, she was totally possessed by Middle-Class attitudes, and worst of all they were Victorian Middle Class attitudes.

Now there was a third set of falsehoods to add to this tissue of fabrication and those were the dissimulations of her Aunt Nadezhda Fedejeva, who was truly a friend to Yelena, and a strongly believing Theosophist and who, whenever she could, backed up Yelena’s “stories.”

Now in addition, Yelena Petrovna very consciously used both of these relatives to increase the “smoke screen” about her.

But the real fact of the matter is this: Almost, but not quite, everything we think we might know about the life of Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya is untrue! There is just enough truth to lend verisimilitude to the whole story and totally mislead both her hagiographers and her pathographers.

People tend to worry far too much about Yelena Petrovna’s “inner” and “occult” life, and not nearly enough about her real life. In his two excellent books, K. Paul Johnson is constantly and desperately attempting to identify the originals of Yelena Petrovna’s “Masters,” in the course of which he correctly identifies many Illuminati. But none of them were the “models” for her “Himalayan Masters,” it is an absolute waste of time to search for the real originals of totally fictional characters. Her various associates and colleagues were one thing, and the “Masters” were another thing, and that “thing” was a complete fiction designed to hide her and the other Illuminati and their socio-political activities.

Yelena Petrovna’s identification of “adepts” is in perfect accord with the fantasies and fictions of popular occultism. By directing people’s attention in the direction of the totally fictional and fantastical “shoot lightning out their asses” adepts, she very easily misdirected those people’s attention from the real thing. By placing “The Masters” in Tibet (which in those days was the “Forbidden Kingdom” and therefore completely “terra incognita”) she rendered their actual reality inviolate because it was impossible to either prove or disprove their existence.

Now it is very important to remember that her family had long been connected to the “Esoteric Underground” as it were, and as such were intimately connected with certain elements in the Sufi Orders.

Now it is also well known that Prince Alexander Galitsyn (the younger) was among other things a Sufi. It is known, and even admitted in Theosophical Circles, that Alexander Galitsyn was instrumental in her “marriage” and in her subsequent departure from Yerevan. It is known that he had her tested for the levels of her psychic abilities, and that it was he who gave her the contacts she had in Egypt. But based on what I have been told, I am under the impression that rather than Tibet, her “place of instruction” was in Shiraz in Persia. In Shiraz, she gave herself over into the hands of the Sufis, The Association of Adepts has long been associated with certain branches of the Sufi Order, and Prince Galitsyn had made arrangements for her further teaching and guidance in Shiraz which was and always had been a prime center of advanced Sufi Teaching.

Now, what exactly was “advanced Sufi Teaching”? Did it involve “flying carpets” or “levitation” or “shooting lightning out of their asses”? In other words, “Magick”? Not at all, in Shiraz at the school founded by Sadr al-Din Shirazi (Mulla Sadra) in the 17th Century, which was the final resting place of what had been Plato’s Academy, was taught the purest form of theosophy or philalethianism. The theosophical movement, as it was in its “original programme,” a programme that had been long established well **BEFORE THE COMMON ERA** in Greece, and places other than Greece, was protected and preserved here. In addition, Yelena became an active part of the “Humanist Collective” and began her activities to aid in the liberation of mankind from oppression. The Yelena Blavatskaya who left Shiraz was an entirely different person than the Countess Blavatskaya who arrived there.

How so?

Well, if one understands that metaphysical philosophy IS philalethianism IS theosophy, one can understand what happened to Yelena Petrovna better. She left Russia as an enthusiastic student, well prepared by her Mother, Grand Mother, and Great Grandfather, and her friend and teacher Alexander Galitsyn, as a student of theoretical metaphysics. Her family had also taught her the basics of how to control her psychic abilities. But when she left Shiraz, metaphysics were no longer even slightly theoretical, they were pragmatically experiential. She was also an expert on the utilization of her paranormal abilities. It was on her departure from Shiraz that she became an active and very useful agent of the Humanist collective.

“A useful agent of the Humanist Collective” ... now what exactly do I mean to say by that? I will be the first to admit that it sounds like a line out of Ian Fleming or Tom Clancy, and in a way it could be. And it’s not altogether a bad analogy.

I don’t know if it’s popular knowledge or not, but the infamous John Birch Society has always considered Yelena Blavatskaya to be “an agent of a worldwide conspiracy” that they call “the insiders,” and whom they see as the modern manifestation of Adam Weisshaupt’s “Illuminati.” Now as Adam Weisshaupt was clearly an adept and a member of “The Humanist Collective” and therefore his group “The Illuminati” were a function of the Association of Adepts, and Yelena’s activities were certainly consonant with those of Adam Weisshaupt, in that sense then, the Bircher’s aren’t entirely wrong. It’s surely interesting, even paranoids are occasionally right. They have apparently traced the Humanist Collective by the effects of its actions, what they haven’t done is comprehend its nature. Because they don’t understand it, and because the activities and nature of the association are mysterious to the Birch Society, they jumped to extremely false conclusions and assume that the Humanist Collective

is evil, which it most decidedly is not. But it can only be perceived to be “evil” from the viewpoint of mindless reactionaries. And that is what the John Birch society is, mindlessly reactionary.

The Association of Adepts, or The Humanist Collective, whichever you prefer and they are identical, is the prime force for radical change on the planet. Some of its members have been behind every major political revolution since the mid of 18th Century. Members of the Association have been the prime movers of all social change throughout the history of mankind on this planet. Yelena Petrovna Blavatskaya and many of her family were no exceptions to this rule. She, however, served primarily as first an activist, and then, after the battle of Mentana, in which she was severely wounded, as a social and philosophical iconoclast.

Being an iconoclast is not a comfortable position to be in, but absolutely nothing changes society quite as reliably as a truly spectacular iconoclast. When images (and concepts are, in a way, images) are broken that people have accepted without thinking for centuries, they are forced to find new concepts, and that is revolutionary.

Now, without wandering too far into hither to fore uncharted territory, let's look at Yelena's life after her possible stay in Shiraz. The reality of her life after leaving her “Husband” at Yerevan is very important so that a person can see clearly the degree to which that life has been fictionalized by Yelena herself, and by the fantastical embroidering of Institutional Theosophists. To the degree that it has lied about Yelena, and to the degree that she lied about herself, we can judge the degree to which The Theosophical Society is more a fiction than a reality.

Now, I have no question at all that Yelena dissembled regarding her life prior to the foundation of Theosophy. I also have no doubt at all that her life after the foundation of the Theosophical Society is also to a very great degree a work of fiction on the part of her Theosophical Biographers. These folks got especially creative after she died.

Now, it is clearly admitted by most biographers of Yelena that the period from 1849 to 1875 is a relative mystery. They are called by some “The Veiled Years.” Most of what we do hear about these years of peregrinate is totally false. The chances that she ever went even near Tibet before 1878 when she took up residence in India, are so tiny that they aren't worth considering.

There is a possibility that her work took her to the United States at some time, but it never really took her to South America. She certainly spent time in both Europe and the Middle East. But we can infer what she was doing by what we do know of her colleagues during this period. These are people she met in Shiraz or because of Shiraz. We are pretty sure that Prince Alexander Galitsyn the younger had contacts in Egypt and elsewhere in the middle East to whom he directed her. The people I am talking about are people it is undeniable she knew. It was absolutely clear that she was closely associated with people like Eliphas Levi (Alphonse Louis Constant), Charles Sotheran (Who was a really important Socialist, in the revolutionist sense) Albert Rawlings, Lydia Pashkov, and Emir Jamal al Din Afghani. It is important to remember that some of her other alleged contacts were totally fictional.

Once it is seen what her over-all purpose and agenda was, it is more easy to comprehend the reason for her lying. Now we do know what she accomplished after 1878. Now by this I definitely do NOT mean what she claimed she was trying to do, that was all “smoke and mirrors,” but what she actually accomplished, and that was a really tremendous accomplishment. In addition, as we know a more than just a bit about her associates prior to 1875 it is not too difficult to project exactly what she was

engaged in. I have to say that in the course of obtaining terribly worthwhile results many people, who sincerely believed in the “Cover Story” that was the Theosophical Society were very badly hurt. I, for one, do not hold that “the end justifies the means” and so I am less than totally approving of her actions.

What did Yelena and the Humanist Collective achieve in the years after 1878? They were almost completely responsible for inspiring the people of India to remember their greatness and free themselves from The British Raj. When England began to lose India, the British Empire began to dissolve. It took many years, but World War II finished the process. The Institutional theosophical Society was simply a front, it was the foundation of The Congress Party and the inspiring of Mohandas Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, and Mohammed Ali Jinnah towards the goal of Indian Nationalism that was what was important. It was also the primary agenda of Yelena Blavatskaya.

Now, let us look at what she was involved in doing before 1875. We can see many things as precursors of her later activity. We know some of the people with whom she was connects, and some of the causes. She was, besides being a Sufi, a Carbonaro, and a member of the Free Masons in that aspect of Free Masonry which always was and always will be political activists.

We know she was closely associated with Giuseppe Garibaldi, Giuseppe Mazzini, and most importantly, for he was the actual leader of the movement, The Count Di Cavour. Now, let us see who the “enemies” of the Carbonaro were. They were the enemies of Human Liberty. The Papacy, The British Empire, The Austro-Hungarian Empire, The Ottoman Empire, The Russian Empire and all autocratic societies elsewhere. But the primary targets were the Papacy, the British Empire, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire for they were the strongest. The Russian Empire was oppressive, but as is always true with Russia, the oppression was tempered by extreme inefficiency and extreme corruption and Vodka. The inefficiency and corruption were even more true with the Ottoman Empire which had reached a level of corruption probably never seen before of since on this planet.

Now we do know that Yelena had a long-term association with a man named Agardi Metrovitch. I say “association” and not “relationship” because it was only as a colleague that Yelena ever dealt with males. Her “relationships” were entirely with women. Now, Agardi Metrovitch was a Romanian who was a primary player in the Hungarian Revolt against Austria. Yelena Blavatskaya always claimed he was the “natural son” of someone she called “The Duke of Lucea.” K. Paul Johnson makes a logic leap here and assumes it to be a misprint for the “Duke of Lucca” (in Italy). But that’s impossible as Lucca was a Principality and not a Duchy, it, along with Genoa, was an appanage of the Bonaparte Family.

There may have been a Duchy of Lucea in Romania, for their appanages were not familiar to most people, but I rather think this too was one of her “red Herrings.” In any case, while the Hungarians lost their cause, they did make some gains as a result of their ill-fated Revolution, and their revolution weakened the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy so that the Italians succeeded in their Revolution. She and Metrovitch spent a great deal of time in Egypt, probably working towards both the weakening of the Ottoman Empire and the prevention of England’s seizure of Egypt. But in a way, they may have not been trying to prevent England from seizing Egypt. That seizure helped destroy the Ottoman Empire, and the added burden on England’s resources that the maintenance of Egypt and the Suez Canal meant, and the subsequent diversion of important British Military Forces to Egypt, was a factor in the eventual dissolution of the British Empire.

We also know her association with Garibaldi and company went so far that she was present as an Officer of Horse Dragoons in the Battle of Mentana, at which the “other side” were the Papal Armies. Her work with the Carbonari in that cause eventually divested the Vatican from its temporal power.

It is apparent that even without getting more involved than that, we can see the Institutional Society was, no matter what its spurious claims to a religious character, was simply a front for Libertarian Political action and Anti-Clerical Action. Yelena Blavatskaya and her associates were, all of them, totally anti-Christian.

I think that in the context of what is after all, an essay and not a book, I have amply demonstrated the proof of my statement that Theosophy was **NOT** suborned, it was exactly what it was intended from the first to be. A pseudo-religion opposed to all religion and to oppressive forms of Government. What a terrible shame that it turned from a Pseudo-religion into an actual religious cult based entirely on synthetic and fictional premises.