

# *Blavatsky defends Blavatsky*



## Madame Blavatsky defends her resignation from the Theosophical Society.

*Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (MADAME BLAVATSKY AND THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY) VI, pp. 281-84.

[The original manuscript of this letter, in H.P. Blavatsky's handwriting, is preserved in the Archives of The Theosophical Society, Adyar. Though addressed to *Light*, London, the Letter was never published in that Journal, as appears from a careful analysis of the issues for 1884–1885. Madame Blavatsky must have postponed its publication, after she withdrew her resignation from Office “at the urgent request and solicitation of Society friends,” as she pointed out in her final letter of resignation dated at Adyar, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 1885.<sup>1</sup> The present Letter was published for the first time in *The Theosophist*, August 1931. The title of it is H.P. Blavatsky's own. — *Boris de Zirkoff*.]



To the Editor of *Light*.

Sir,

Will you kindly permit me to notify my friends and foes through your columns, that yesterday, September 27<sup>th</sup>, I FORMALLY RESIGNED OFFICE in the Theosophical Society?

No one could regret more than I do, to give this pain to my devoted colleagues and friends. But I do it from a deep sense of duty to the Society, before whose interests all private consideration must give way.

For some time past — to be exact, since the very day when I overstepped the *legal* boundaries and gave out the secret of my whole life, namely what I knew about Occultism and its Custodians — I seem to have awakened against Theosophy all the fiends of the nether world, now domiciled on our earth. Persecution, suspicion — opposition, from simple cavilling at words, to the expression of the most malignant hatred — are dogging our steps wherever we direct them.

Had I to face them alone, *i.e.*, in my personality and private capacity I might have bowed my head in full humility, from a feeling that this was only my *Karma*: I have thrown the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven in their crudest and (owing to my personal inability) undigested form to be trodden upon, and *have* to bear my penalty. [282] But it is not I alone who am the sufferer. In my proud desire to benefit my fellowmen, and my vain endeavours to do what I sincerely thought (and still think) was good, I have brought unwittingly suspicion, almost opprobrium upon the Society it-

---

<sup>1</sup> See *The Theosophist*, Vol. VI, No 8, Supplement to May, 1885, p. 195.

self. Thus, a sort of indignity has been put upon hundreds of most respectable, most pure-minded men and women, whose sole mistake was not to have separated sufficiently, the abstract principle from the concrete personalities; a mistake which led, in a way, to hero-worship. It is since my arrival in Europe that I have begun to realize that so long as my name is attached to the Theosophical Society, the latter can never prosper, can never pursue its studies and execute its mission in the right way. If I would save the healthy body, I must lop away from it the limb that is pronounced by my charitable judges incurably diseased. Between *être* and *paraître*,<sup>1</sup> the world ever chooses the latter expedient; I cannot. Therefore, I am surely doomed to be misrepresented as long as I live. What right have I to drag our Society into and under such false lights?

Though I have not yet the means of knowing what is in the supposed “letters” of mine (telegraphed about to *The Times* by its Calcutta correspondent) as published by a missionary *Christian* magazine since this journal has not yet reached Europe — I know, nevertheless, that no such correspondence between myself and the wicked treacherous woman just expelled from the Society, ever took place. Such alleged letters of mine are surely impudent forgeries. The theory of the supposed “muslin” Mahatmas is the creation of a man and wife whom Col. Olcott and I saved in 1879 from starvation in the streets of Bombay; who have since found a ready home with us, and brotherly affection for five long years; and who, as Mr. St. George Lane Fox (just returned from Adyar where he lived for eight months) can tell you — have repaid us with the blackest ingratitude and the most villainous treachery, for which misdeeds and many others they were expelled from the Society by the Board of Control, in May last. The “muslin” Mahatmas and the “letters” are their revenge — a soap-bubble for the [283] wise, a heavy sledge-hammer with which the prejudiced and the unfair will vainly try to knock out the last breath from the Theosophical Movement. It is now found, moreover, that it was they, who had tried, during the whole five years they lived with us, to make me suspected as a “Russian Spy” and the Theosophical Society as a “dangerous *political* Movement.”

Nevertheless, and notwithstanding the apparent absurdity of this new charge, the scandal created is sure to be very great. It will take months to prove the alleged correspondence a forgery, and the publication itself a libel gotten up during our absence, by those meek men of God — the missionaries; it will require but one day to connect our names and the Society in your columns with a new and ridiculous scandal. Therefore, since the Society is now firmly established and since it suffers only through its connection with myself — the *chief*, if not the *only* target for the poisonous shots of our many enemies I have come to my present resolution.

Henceforth I cease to hold the official position of Corresponding Secretary in our Society, and I am even willing that it should be forgotten, if possible, that I was ever one of its two active founders. I break — for a long time, at any rate — every connection with the Headquarters, with the Parent Society, as a body, and with its two hundred

---

<sup>1</sup> [The paradox of *being* as opposed to *appearing to be*; in other words, the changeless real versus the ever-changing unreal. Cf. “. . . the mass of mankind accept what seems as what is; nay, are often touched more nearly by appearances than by realities.” Niccolò Machiavelli, *Discourses on the First Decade of Titus Livius*, Bk. I, Ch. 25. Translated from the Italian by Ninian Hill Thomson in 1883. — ED. PHIL.]

Branches. *I shall not return to Adyar, before I have vindicated the Society of every villainous aspersion upon its character*, and had the purity of its motives better recognized. To begin, I have placed my official resignation in the hands of the President-Founder for submission to the General Council of December, at Adyar. In order, however, that the kind neighbours should have no ground for inventing a new calumny, I say here beforehand, that I shall not leave Europe until this new infamous *imbroglio* — the joint production of missionary hatred and the revenge of two expelled members — is proved to be false, as it shall be by Col. Olcott who returns home by the first steamer. The Society, if it derives no further benefits, will certainly suffer no additional troubles from me. [284]

Thus, from this day, Mr. Editor, you may open your columns unsparingly to any kind and variety of abuse against the personality known as H.P. Blavatsky. I have retired into private life, and will mind it very little. It was the honour of the Society that I had in view, whenever I was moved to answer misrepresentations of its Corresponding Secretary. I am now prepared to receive personal vilification with a calm worthy of that of Mr. Bright or Gladstone. I only hope that it may be remembered, that whatever I appear, or may be in reality, my mistakes and shortcomings are *mine* and have nothing to do with the Theosophical Society.

Very soon, I hope, I will retire to a locality where no one is likely to meet me and no ordinary mail can reach me. After a time, when it is shown that my absence notwithstanding, the occasional manifestations of power by the Mahatmas, and their communication, whether personal or by correspondence with some of the elect members, are going on as before; that phenomena, in short, are taking place in the same way as they always have; and that nothing is virtually changed by my withdrawal; then only will our opponents perceive, that whatever the real nature of our Mahatmas, whether made of flesh and bones, or of “bladders and muslin” — they are certainly not the creation of your very obedient servant,

H.P. BLAVATSKY

ELBERFELD,  
September 28<sup>th</sup>, 1884



## Madame Blavatsky on her greatest admiration for the Christianity of Christ, and her greatest contempt for “Church” Christianity.

First published in the *Light*, London, Vol. VIII (416), December 22<sup>nd</sup>, 1888, p. 634. Republished in *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (THE SECRET DOCTRINE) X pp. 243-45.

To the Editor of *Light*.

Sir,

Permit me for the first time after many years of silence, and probably for the last time, to say a few words in answer to the direct attack upon me (in your issue of October 15<sup>th</sup>) by “Leo.” He premises by speaking of my “violence and personal animus against Christianity.” I premise by replying that his statement is absolutely the reverse of truth, and that only one who reads my writings very superficially could get such a wrong idea. I have no animus. On the contrary, I have the greatest admiration for the Christianity of Christ, identified with Jesus of Nazareth and embodied in the Sermon on the Mount. On the other hand, in perfect agreement with “Leo,” I have the greatest contempt for “Church” Christianity, or “Churchianity,” so-called by Mr. Laurence Oliphant — that which “Leo” so aptly describes in his criticism as a “combination of feeble ignorance and bigotry.”

At this Christianity, as my critic confesses,

. . . it is no wonder that the shafts of the enemy [read Theosophists, or, perhaps, “Madame Blavatsky”] are levelled.

And if so, why should my “violence and personal animus” — if any — be taken to task by one who is at one with me in this? He adds, it is true, “Very different is the grand and magnificent Christianity which is to come,” and proceeds as though it were this *future* Christianity I was sinning against in *The Secret Doctrine* as in private life. Now, notwithstanding “Leo’s” suspicion that I “evidently” consider myself “superior to Éliphas Lévi,” even my outrageous vanity in that direction could have hardly suggested to me any “violence or personal animus” against the grand and magnificent Christianity *which is to come*. For how can I hate that which exists nowhere so far — outside the womb of futurity? No more than the “foolish virgins” can even “Leo” “know the day nor the hour when the bridegroom [of that future [244] Christianity] cometh.” For which Christianity then, am I taken to task? Is it for “Christianity as at present,” or the one now gestating in the brain of “Leo”? Evidently my critic, who accuses me of having neglected “the management of currents,” taught by Éliphas Lévi, has neglected it as much, if not more. He sought to direct a current of sarcasm against me, and got himself caught in the finest current of paradoxical illogicalness, such as even the great Abbé Louis Constant could well envy him.

Nor is his selection of “Theosophical perversion of religious ideas” any happier. He quotes a query in *The Secret Doctrine*:

. . . what have other nations to do with that particular *national* Deity?,<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [*The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 576]

*i.e.*, *Yahoveh* or *Jehovah*, and shows me making the latter identical with chaos

“The Sun and Moon, good and evil, God and demon.”

But, as elsewhere<sup>1</sup> I remark in an entirely different combination of symbolism, that

. . . the Sun is the giver of life to the whole planetary system; the Moon is the giver of life to our globe,

“Leo” promptly proceeds to make of these two remarks (separated, by-the-bye, by almost 200 pages, and relating to entirely different subjects) a major and a minor proposition, and draws therefrom the following syllogistic *conclusion*:

<Therefore the God of the Jews and Christians is both Sun and Moon and Giver of Life.>

*Ergo*, Madame Blavatsky is guilty of a gross contradiction.

**Why should Jehovah be called “the God of the Christians,” since he is not once named in the New Testament, and since no Theosophist could speak with more implied contempt of that tribal god and his commandments than Jesus himself?**<sup>2</sup>

Now, the “therefore” is a conclusion that a Frenchman would call *tirée par les cheveux*.<sup>3</sup> Why should it be *Jehovah* of the Jews and Christians, “therefore,” any more than *Ahura Mazda* of the Parsis, *Osiris* of the Egyptians, or *Bel* of the Chaldees? And why should *Jehovah* be called “the God of the *Christians*,” since he is not once named in the New Testament, and since no Theosophist could speak with more implied contempt of [245] that tribal god and his commandments than *Jesus* himself? Let “Leo” read *Matthew* v, and see whether almost every verse in it does not demolish the Ten Commandments given by that angry and jealous Sinaitic Deity through *Moses*. “Therefore,” I would strongly advise “Leo” before he finds fault with others and exposes their supposed “contradictions” — “with unprejudiced mind and taking notes thereof” — to study the Bible himself, and above all, to learn to read it understandingly.

I feel very thankful, however, for his kind advice to the public to read my work. This is very unselfish; the more so as upon following it, comparing it with his criticism, and “taking notes,” no man with a teaspoonful of unprejudiced brains in his head can fail to see that there are more illogical contradictions in the half column occupied by “Leo’s” denunciatory letter, than in the 1,500 pages of *The Secret Doctrine*. But then people *do* like to see themselves in print, and to give other people pokes in the ribs from behind the sure screen of a pseudonym!

H.P. BLAVATSKY



---

<sup>1</sup> [*The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 386]

<sup>2</sup> [Consult “The Origin of Good and Evil” and “The Original Sin is a Jewish Invention,” in our Black versus White Magic Series. — ED. PHIL.]

<sup>3</sup> [far-fetched]

## Suggested reading for students.



### From our Theosophy and Theosophists Series.

- A DEBT OF GRATITUDE TO LORD LYTTON
- A LAY CHELA ON OCCULT STUDY
- A LAY CHELA ON THE SECRET DOCTRINE
- A THEOSOPHICAL LOVE FEAST IN FRANCE
- ALETHEIA IS OUR GOD AND DOGMA
- ANCIENT ETHICAL WORSHIPS
- ARCHAIC THEOSOPHY IS PRE-BUDDHIST WISDOM-RELIGION
- BLAVATSKY DEFENDS THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY
- BLAVATSKY ON ANNA KINGSFORD
- BLAVATSKY ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SOUL AND SPIRIT
- BLAVATSKY ON THE ORIGIN AND SOURCE OF THE SECRET DOCTRINE
- BLAVATSKY ON THE THEOSOPHY OF DR. N.I. PIROGOV
- BLAVATSKY REFUTES ARGUMENTS AGAINST THEOSOPHY
- BLAVATSKY REFUTES THE ASSERTIONS OF A FRENCH THEOSOPHIST
- BLAVATSKY'S OPEN LETTER TO FELLOW THEOSOPHISTS
- BUCK ON THE NATURE AND AIM OF THEOSOPHY
- COLD METAPHYSICS VERSUS DIVINE WISDOM
- CONDUCT AND DUTIES OF A TRUE THEOSOPHIST
- CORY'S ANCIENT FRAGMENTS (1832)
- COSMOPOLITANISM IS FAR HOLIER AND NOBLER THAN GRASPING GREEDINESS CLOAKED IN PATRIOTISM
- DE ZIRKOFF ON CHARLES JOHNSTON
- DE ZIRKOFF ON EDWARD DOUGLAS FAWCETT
- DE ZIRKOFF ON FRANZ HARTMANN
- DE ZIRKOFF ON GERALD MASSEY
- DE ZIRKOFF ON HP BLAVATSKY COLLECTED WRITINGS

**THEOSOPHY AND THEOSOPHISTS SERIES**  
**SUGGESTED READING FOR STUDENTS**

- DE ZIRKOFF ON SUBBA ROW
- DE ZIRKOFF ON THE COUNTESS OF CAITHNESS
- DE ZIRKOFF ON THE DREAM THAT NEVER DIES
- DE ZIRKOFF ON THE SECRET DOCTRINE
- DE ZIRKOFF ON THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES
- DE ZIRKOFF ON THE THIRD VOLUME OF THE SECRET DOCTRINE
- DE ZIRKOFF ON THREE EMINENT THEOSOPHISTS
- DE ZIRKOFF ON WILHELM HÜBBE-SCHLEIDEN
- DE ZIRKOFF RECALLS HIS FORMATIVE YEARS IN RUSSIA
- EASTERN LIGHT SHINES ON WESTERN MINDS
- EASTERN OCCULTISM IS THE PARENT STREAM OF INNER WISDOM
- EASTERN THEOSOPHY IS NEITHER A CREED, NOR A RELIGIOUS BODY
- ESSENTIAL THEOSOPHICAL DOCTRINES
- HARTMANN ON HOW TO ENTER THE PATH TO INFINITE LIFE
- HARTMANN ON THE HARMONICAL SOCIETY
- HOW THEOSOPHY REKINDLED TRUE BROTHERHOOD IN INDIA
- HUMANITY SEEMS TO PROGRESS BY INVENTING ONE DISCOVERY AFTER THE OTHER
- IMPORT AND POTENCY OF NUMBERS AS SYMBOLS
- IN THE EARLY DAYS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT
- ISIS UNVEILED IS THE MAJESTY OF TRUTH UNVEILED
- JUDGE AND DE ZIRKOFF ON GEORGE MEAD
- JUDGE ON THE HEART DOCTRINE
- JUDGE ON THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT
- JUDGE ON THE TRUE THEOSOPHIST'S PATH
- JUDGE ON THEOSOPHICAL STUDY AND WORK
- KEYS TO THE MYSTERY LANGUAGE
- LET THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY PERISH, THAN FORSAKE THE CAUSE OF TRUTH
- MYSTERY IS NOT UNREVEALED KNOWLEDGE
- OCCULT TRUTH IS NATURE WITHOUT THE ILLUSORY VEIL OF THE SENSES
- OUR GOD IS HUMANITY AND OUR CULT THE LOVE OF OUR FELLOW-MAN
- OUR ONLY DELIVERER AND SAVIOUR
- PLEDGED STUDENTS' PRESCRIBED GUIDE FOR CONDUCT
- PREREQUISITES TO MEMBERSHIP OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY



**THEOSOPHY AND THEOSOPHISTS SERIES**  
**SUGGESTED READING FOR STUDENTS**

- SPURNED THE SUBSTANCE AND CLUTCHED THE SHADOW
- STUDENTS HAVE A CHOICE OF TWO PATHS
- SUBBA ROW DEFENDS ESOTERIC BUDDHISM
- SUBBA ROW'S ESOTERIC WRITINGS (1895)
- THAT WHICH IS FALSE CAN ONLY BE KNOWN BY TRUTH
- THE AIMS AND MISSION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY FULFILLED
- THE CHALDEAN ORACLES OF ZOROASTER
- THE CROWN JEWELS OF THEOSOPHY (PHOTO ALBUM)
- THE POWER OF THE TRINITY OF KOSMOS MANIFESTS THROUGH THE FOUR PRINCIPLES OF MAN
- THE REVIVAL OF EASTERN OCCULT PHILOSOPHY
- THE SUN OF TRUTH FEARS NO LIGHT AND NEEDS NO LIES
- THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IS NOT A NURSERY FOR BUDDING ADEPTS
- THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL ARCANE TERMS
- THEOSOPHIA - FOUNTAIN, PERSPECTIVES, PRACTICE (DRAWING)
- THEOSOPHIA: INNER WISDOM
- THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, THE GREAT MORAL BUT SILENT FORCE
- THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY - ESOTERIC SECTION (LETTERHEAD)
- THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY - MISSION AND FUTURE
- THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY - MONOGRAM 1 (LOGOTYPE)
- THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY - MONOGRAM 2 (LOGOTYPE)
- THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY - OBJECTS AND EARLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS
- THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY - SEAL 1 (LOGOTYPE)
- THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY - SEAL 2 (LOGOTYPE)
- THEOSOPHICAL SYMBOLS (TRUE TYPE FONT)
- THEOSOPHIST IS WHO THEOSOPHY DOES
- THEOSOPHISTS DEFINED ATTITUDINALLY, ETHICALLY, PHILOSOPHICALLY (DRAWING)
- THEOSOPHY AND THEOSOPHISTS
- THEOSOPHY BRINGS THE WISDOM OF LOVE BEFORE THE EYE OF THE SOUL
- THEOSOPHY IS DEEPER MONISM THAN SECULARISM, AND MORE PHILOSOPHICAL
- THEOSOPHY IS RELIGION ITSELF AND SUBLIME CODE OF ETHICS
- THEOSOPHY IS THE SCIENCE OF TRUTH AND THE RELIGION OF JUSTICE
- TRIBUTES TO WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE
- TRUE THEOSOPHISTS ARE ALWAYS UNDER THE MASTER'S EYE

**THEOSOPHY AND THEOSOPHISTS SERIES**  
**SUGGESTED READING FOR STUDENTS**

- TRUTH IS ALWAYS MIXED WITH ERROR AND HINDERED BY TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE
- TWO JOURNALS DEVOTED TO THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN
- VERNAL BLOOMS BY WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE
- VISTAS OF VIRTUE AND TRUTH
- WADIA'S RESIGNATION FROM THE TS
- WHAT SORT OF MAN THE REAL PHILOSOPHER SHOULD BE?
- WHEN PURE LOVE IS PERVERTED, HUMANITY QUIVERS
- WHO CAN MEND THE BROKEN SOCIETY?
- WHO CAN READ THE RIDDLE OF THE SERPENT?
- WHO SHOULD BE INVITED TO THEOSOPHICAL MEETINGS?
- WHY A BRAHMIN ABANDONED HIS CASTE
- WHY PAGAN SYMBOLISM IS INDESTRUCTIBLE?
- WILDER ON THE WISDOM RELIGION OF ZOROASTER

