

# **Unraveling the Myths about Gregory Rasputin: Revolutionary Lies, Academic Fraud and the Provisional Government's “Emergency Commission of Inquiry”**

Matthew Raphael Johnson  
Johnstown, PA

I discovered some interesting facts. No serious research on Rasputin was done in the Soviet times. There is not a single article (to say nothing of books) where Rasputin's life is described consistently, historically, on the basis of critical analysis of primary sources. All existing books and articles about Rasputin simply repeat in various combinations the same historic legends and anecdotes (with the revolutionary accusations), most of which are made up or fabricated just as false memoirs by Vyrubova or shorthand reports of proceedings against «enemies of the people» from the 1930's. In fact they created a myth about Rasputin with the only purpose being to blacken and discredit Russia, the spirituality of its people which, as we will see later, Rasputin represented to a certain extent. And «this incredible rage coming from the pages of the yellow press targeted against Rasputin completely gave away those devilish firemen which were capable of getting what they wanted only by enormous and all-around heat» – Oleg Platonov, 1994

Few things in Russian history are as mysterious as the relations between the last Royal family and Gregory Rasputin. Most historians will claim the following, usually just repeating the majority opinion: first, that the Tsarevich was sick with hemophilia, and Rasputin had an ability to heal him. Second, that he was no monk, but a charlatan. Third, that Rasputin was a devious man playing on the Tsar's piety to worm his way into the family's life. Fourth, that Rasputin had some influence over policy, often tremendous and unwarranted. This is one of the things that led to the fall of the crown. And finally, that Rasputin had little control over his libido, making him lecherous and possibly a rapist. He was killed, or so it was thought, for the good of the state.

There seems to be no reason to deny this set of propositions. After all, the police who were sent to spy the fallen monk said that he was a drunk and a womanizer. Yet, since most things about Russia are distorted and misunderstood in the west, why should this one be any different? The fact is that it is not. This paper makes no claim that Rasputin was a saint. It merely states that the propositions above are, to one extent or another, false.

Under Alexander Kerensky, the Provisional Government convened the “Emergency Investigation Committee for Misuses of Former Ministers and other Chief Executives” (EIC). One would think that this would be a treasure-trove for historians. It is not. A good reason exists to explain this fact. The point was to uncover crimes and corruption in the old imperial bureaucracy. There is a good reason why this almost never gets mentioned in Russian history texts: because they admitted there was none. Little corruption and no abuse of power was uncovered by the revolutionaries. Having every incentive to justify their recent bloodletting, the commission discovered nothing. It was swept under the rug. In 2016, it is still there.

Rasputin too was exonerated from all charges of corruption, drunkenness or serial-fornication. No records have ever been found of his being wealthy or even having a bank account. There is not a shred of evidence that he was ever the member of the Khlysty sect or any other

bizarre group. The EIC, consisting of members who spread these rumors a few years earlier, said Rasputin was not pro-German and had no influence over foreign policy. Further, tsar Nicholas II himself ordered an investigation into Rasputin's character lest his family be taken in my charlatan. Again, no evidence of wrongdoing was ever found.

The EIC stated,

19 July 1917:

This testimonial delivered to Mikhail Mihailovich Leibikov certifies that not a single indication of Gregory Rasputin's political activity was disclosed by the High Commission of Inquiry. The inquiry into the influence of Rasputin on the Imperial Family was intensive but it was definitely established that that influence had its source only in the profound religious sentiment of their Majesties. The only favor Rasputin accepted was the rental of his lodging, paid by the personal Chancellor of his Majesty. He also accepted presents made by the hands of the Imperial Family, such as shirts, waist-bands, etc. That Rasputin had no connections with any foreign authorities. That all pamphlets and newspaper articles on the subject of Rasputin influence and other rumors and gossip were fabricated by the powerful enemies of the emperor. This statement is given under the signature and seal of the Attorney General of the High Commission.  
V.M. Rudnev (signature)

The fact is that the Provisional Government, set up after the formal abdication of the Tsar in 1917, had full access to all the private and public papers of the Tsar, the Duma and all government ministries both private and public. Never has such an exhaustive commission into the form, behavior, structure and functioning of the royal government ever been attempted, and certainly, can never be again, given the full access to all records the Commission had (much of which was destroyed by the Bolsheviks for obvious reasons). They found, not only no moral problems with Rasputin, but also that the Imperial government maintained the highest standards in personal dignity while holding office. And all this from the sworn enemies of the Imperial government.

In his 1922 work on the matter, AF Romanov (no relation to the royal family), stated that: "The Extraordinary Commission of Inquiry investigator Rudnev made a written statement on the results of the Commission's work which could not find literally anything to compromise Nicholas II and the Empress." This is extraordinary.

In the text of the EIC itself, the conclusion reads:

It turns out that the supreme power in the last months of the old regime itself gradually delegated parts of their sovereign rights in the hands of ministers or senior officials. . . All of us, comrades, lived under the old regime, and we all knew what was being done. We all think something terrible is happening in the police department. You know, in all fairness, it should be, not as it is in the depraved imagination of the Russian people, but what was really there. . .

In front of me a document which is the Magna Carta of the police department as to its lawlessness. This document is called the "Instruction on the organization and conduct of internal supervision in the gendarme and investigative offices." Entire generations, who gave themselves to the police had a hand in the creation of this manual. All of them gradually perfect this system.

This, given to a revolutionary audience, means that they could find nothing in the police department worthy of legal prosecution. This suggests that the new government was interested in the truth of the matter rather than revolutionary slogans. It also suggests that the new state did not trust the ramblings of the media, utterly distasteful and slanderous as it was. It is an admission, loaded with all manner of revolutionary jargon, that they were wrong. The Commission is kept out of history textbooks in the west for a reason: the judicial inquiry of the revolutionary government showed that there was little if any corruption in the Russian system. And this with so much incentive to discover it! This takes a few moments to sink in.

Rudnev continues further,

We began our committee's work, perhaps you will join in this respect to us and say that we were right, at this point of view we consider as a whole, to grasp a general picture of the past months and years of the fallen regime. This is from a certain point of view: we conducted extensive investigative work; the other part of our commission is engaged in the [actionability] of these crimes, namely, to gather the evidence objectively so as to detail the offenses committed by officials as to whether they come under criminal law. Those crimes they have committed are to be punished. If you pay attention only to the concluding lines of future indictments, you will be disappointed. You might say that it will merely be the usual abuse of power and the overexertion of state authority. That conclusion would be false, my comrades!

Bringing this up here is to say that the “facts” of the corruption of Rasputin, Ministers, bureaucrats, the court or policy was non-existent. This means the entire history of the era has to be rewritten. None of this, however, should be surprising to the prescient reader. Tsar Nicholas was personally impeccable, and his personal stamp is felt all over the governing structure. The government in Petrograd was small, especially when compared to Europe, and its duties were well delineated. The bureaucracy was highly professional and ranked according to military ascendancy. In other royal states, serving in this capacity was a sacred trust before God. At a time when that was taken very seriously, the foibles of the Petrograd state pale in comparison to the mass slaughters of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to come.

One element that did penetrate the noble classes was Masonry. This doctrine was largely political and bound the elite together in a liberal order against monarchy.<sup>1</sup> The payoff was brotherhood and camaraderie, but ultimately, it was absolute power. The Decembrists were overwhelmingly members of the Lodge, and the Craft was at the root of all pre-Bolshevik elite revolutionary action.

Oleg Platonov writes:

---

1 The doctrine of Masonic orders whether Anglo-American or Continental is not the subject of this essay. It is significant to it, however. Manley Hall's *Secret Teachings of the Ages* and JSM Ward's *Freemasonry: Its Aims and Ideals*, are essential texts in understanding the ideological goals of the Craft. In addition, the famed *Morals and Dogma* by Theodore Pike, the “Bible” of Anglo-American Masonry, as well as Coil's *Masonic Encyclopedia* are also critical. In *Secret Teachings*, we read: I hereby promise the Great Spirit Lucifer, Prince of Demons, that each year I will bring unto him a human soul to do with as it may please him, and in return Lucifer promises to bestow upon me the treasures of the earth and fulfill my every desire for the length of my natural life” (104). There is no question as to the religious doctrine of the Craft, especially in the French-style lodges in Russia that were even more radical.

Earlier Freemasons planned the assassination of Nicholas II. Freemason Duke Bebutov who hosted such meetings in his home wrote in his memoirs that he gave Azev 12,000 rubles to assassinate the Tsar. Later they adopted the plan to discredit the Tsar's family by creating a fabricated, evil and mysterious image of Rasputin. Their plan was heinous but effective. The Mason Guchkov began Rasputin's persecution in the State Duma and was constantly promoting it. Masons such as Kerensky, Lvov, Nekrasov, and Hessen were Guchkov's active supporters. They were not alone. At least a half of the most influential deputies of the State Duma were members of the Lodge. In the Tsar's chambers, constant intrigues against Rasputin were led by Dukes Nikolay Mikhailovich and Aleksandr Mikhailovich who were also Freemasons. Deputy Minister of the Interior, Governor General Dzhunkovsky, another member, had been fabricating police reports against Rasputin for many years (Platonov, 1996).

The Lodge in Russia is admitted by mainline historians to have been particularly powerful.<sup>2</sup> Derivign from the radical Grand Orient lodges of France, it was purely Jacobin at its most moderate. Platonov cites the number of public Masons<sup>3</sup> in charge of the Russian state:

Masons were all over the Russian court. They included the Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich, and Alexander, Dmitri Pavlovich and General Mosolov, Chief Minister's Office at the royal court. Among the king's ministers and their deputies we see at least eight members of Masonic lodge: Polivanov (War), Naumov (Agriculture), Cutler and Bark (Finance), Dzhunkovsky (Interior) and Fedorov (Trade and Industry). In the Council of State were several Masons: Guchkov, Kovalevsky, Moeller-Zakomelsky, Gurko and Polivanov. Treason entered in the Defense Ministry, under the Mason Polivanov. The Masonic lodges including the head of the Russian General Staff Alekseev, representatives of top generals such as Generals Ruza, Gurko, Krymov, Kuzmin-Karavaev, Teplov, Admiral Verderevsky and lower officers such as Samarin, Golovin, and Colonel Manikovskiy.

Royal diplomats who were masons included Gulkevichi von Meck (Sweden), Stakhovich (Spain), Poklevsky-Kozell (Romania), Loris-Melikov (Sweden, Norway), Kudashev (China), Shtcherbatsky (Latin America), Zabello (Italy) and Islavin (Montenegro). At the head of the city administration of Moscow stood the Masons mayor NI Guchkov (who was AI Guchkov's brother), Chelnnokov and Aster. The media contained major masonic owners in Russia, Russian Morning, Stock Exchange News, The Russian Gazette, and The Voice of Moscow (Platonov, ch 10).

Clearly, the Tsar did not rule absolutely. This brief listing of public masons suggests that a secret cabal, one dedicated to the Jacobin ideals of 1789, was operating in Petrograd while the

---

2 Nicholas BI (1990) Russian Freemasons and the Revolution. Ed: Yuri Felshtinsky. Moscow: Terra. This is just one example. He argues that the assault on Rasputin was an essential pillar of the Masonic Lodge's drive to delegitimize the emperor. Another is Solovyov's (1994) Russian Masons from the Romanovs to Berezovsky. Yauza (both in Russian).

3 That is, these were Masons whose membership was well known. There certainly were many secret ones.

crown was still in power. This alters how historians need to see policy at the time. It has not even affected their views.

The dismissive claim uttered by the corrupted academic class over this states that because the Tsar was so “oppressive,” the Lodge was the only real way to build civil society. That most Russia-specialists pulling down six-figures in American universities have not even a cursory understanding of masonry with this level of penetration is inexcusable.

While their claims are laughable, it forces the Regime's writers to see the Lodge as an important part of Russian life. After all, Peter I and Peter III had been members, as were Lord Biron and his gang of criminals. The dark 18<sup>th</sup> century in Russia is littered with the Craft. Masonry had penetrated the nobility and is the main reason that this increasingly irrelevant group had abandoned the Tsar and Orthodoxy for Jacobinism. As the noble class abandoned their mortgaged estates and moved into the cities, they took up bourgeois careers. They believed that they were unjustly cut out of power, and thus, the Jacobin idea became important to them. The result is that the Craft grew in size.

Mentioning Masonry is essential in this paper because the Lodges, with no exception, sought to overthrow the monarchy in Russia. Part of their operation was to attack the royal family by using Rasputin. Nicholas remained popular, so attacking him directly was never a good idea. Therefore, they attacked them indirectly. Many of the stories, therefore, on Rasputin come from the Craft and their powerful presence in Russian life and media. Rasputin was a victim of revolutionary politics from without, and anti-monarchist palace intrigue from within.

Up until recently, revisionist material in English on Rasputin was very scarce. He is universally seen as a force of evil, and has taken almost an archetypal presence in the western mind. Recently, Liberty and Life publishing in California released a small book on the life of Rasputin from one who actually knew the man. Dr. Elizabeth Judas was the wife of Alexander Ivanovich, an officer in the Tsar's secret service. Her uncle was a major figure in the imperial government. For years, this manuscript, called today *Neither Devil nor Saint*, has lain rather undisturbed, out of print for decades and completely ignored by mainstream Russia scholarship.

Through a series of very interesting events, events that themselves tell much of local politics in the early part of the 20th century, the author, as a young child, met the acquaintance of Rasputin while living in Siberia, where she had many relatives. She knew Rasputin long before the Tsar did. It was the author's uncle, Dr. Lebikov, who first suggested to the royal family that this charismatic wanderer from Siberia be brought to the palace to pray for the ailing Tsarevich, Alexei. Rasputin was not a priest, nor a monk, nor did he ever have a desire to be ordained or tonsured. Now, the tsarevich suffered from acute pains in his stomach, but this was never diagnosed as hemophilia, nor is there any evidence of this serious disease in his medical records, or even within the correspondence between Nicholas and Alexandra.<sup>4</sup>

The distracted royal couple had no difficulty in permitting this Siberian religious man entrance into the palace.<sup>5</sup> Though his appearance, with long hair and beard, wearing traditional Russian peasant dress, did cause a stir among the nobility at court, many of which were incensed to find such a commoner at the palace. Keep in mind that Russian dress and appearance was

---

4 This correspondence was, interestingly enough, conducted in English.

5 Rasputin probably arrived in St Petersburg in the Fall of 1904. He went to the St. Alexander monastery there to stay. He met with the Archimandrite Hermogen. Given that this was a powerful institution, he met the famed theologian Bishop Theophan of Poltava who was quite taken with his knowledge. This friendship led to his meeting the Countess Sophia Ignatieva who in turn, introduced him to Milica of Montenegro and her sister Anastasia. From here, he met the Tsar in November of 1905.

forbidden in the public square by Peter I, though that Enlightenment-era prejudice had long subsided. So foreign was he to Petrograd that the very appearance of Russian dress filled the court nobles with anger. Tsar Nicholas II sought to temper this substantially. The nobility remained followers of Peter while Nicholas looked to his father for inspiration (both Peter's father Alexei, for whom the Tsarevich was named, and his own).

One great flaw in Nicholas's reign was his inability to control the powerful and obnoxious nobility (including other members of the extended Romanov clan). To be fair, this was no easy task. Not only did Nicholas have certain familial responsibilities towards them, they also were possessed of political power in their own right, as well as access to substantial fortunes. Nicholas illustrious father, Alexander III, succeeded in controlling this element, which is in part explanatory as to why terror activity and revolutionary politics substantially subsided during his reign.

Of course, Alexander was very different from his son, being much larger and more intimidating, Alexander personally often used physical coercion to control the more restless members of the clan. Nicholas was not of this temperament, being more refined than his father, but he eventually paid for his lack of a hard line in this matter. Nicholas wanted a court (and society at large) that relied less on violence and more on the traditions of Old Russia. This is manifest in his disarmament papers distributed to the old allies of the Holy Alliance.

Furthermore, Nicholas was a Slavophile: this means, in a nutshell, that Nicholas believed that Russia's strength was in her peasant tradition, her agriculture, the commune and the church, all of which Nicholas was attached to not merely as a political figure, but also as a Russian man. The nobility, by and large, had long abandoned these. To Nicholas, Rasputin represented the best in the Russian peasant: hardy, simple, pious. Rasputin made a powerful impression on the royal couple. This also meant that the schism between the nobles and the Tsar, a very significant rupture in Russian history, was growing by the moment.

Rasputin was religiously opposed to the use of hypnosis or any sort of "mesmerism" in religious life; he made this clear to Dr. Judas on many occasions. There is no evidence that he was a part of any sect that used these techniques, nor is there any proof he was even aware of their techniques apart from reputation. Rasputin was able to calm Alexei during his times of physical pain, and it was in this that his services were important. Rasputin did not cure Alexei of anything, but through prayer, was able to soothe the nerves of the young heir.

He never took any credit for his services, saying only that God is responsible for the alleviation of Alexei's pain. Nor did Rasputin seek any reward for his services, and was very quick to leave the palace when he was no longer needed. In fact, it is worth nothing that Rasputin routinely left the company of the royal family with intentions to go back to Siberia. It was only through the pleading of the royal couple that he returned. This is rather curious behavior from someone who was "power mad." In fact, twice, Rasputin packed up to leave for his native land, but was enticed back by Alexandra who clearly needed Rasputin to soothe the Tsarevich.

Consulting eyewitnesses, there is no evidence that Rasputin had any political agenda whatsoever. There is substantial reason to doubt he was even a monarchist, though he respected the reigning royal family. The author claims that Rasputin told her that praying for the tsar was wrong, and only the poor and needy should be prayed for. However odd this statement might be, it hardly reflects any belief in royalism.

However, he was close to the royal family, but this should not be exaggerated. He was far from a perennial presence, but it did not take long for Rasputin to make enemies. The first sin he committed was to foil an assassination attempt on the heir to the throne. Apparently, several members of the palace nobility were ordering one of Alexei's nurses to rub a certain powder on

his rectum. The nurse was told that this was a medication brought back from the Middle East to treat Alexei's condition. Rasputin, suspicious, asked that it be analyzed, only to discover that it was poison. As soon as this concoction was no longer applied, the tsarevich's illness disappeared (Judas, 102-103). There is no question, in Rasputin's mind after this, that there was a cabal in the palace against the young heir. Rasputin's days were numbered, and he knew it. But it was this incident that sealed the bond of trust between the royal family and Rasputin.

It didn't help matters when a certain Prince Felix Yusapov approached Rasputin, asking him to intercede with the royal family for the oldest Romanov daughter's hand. Rasputin, after being offered a bribe, refused. Eventually the story began to circulate, and Prince Yusapov moved to England to avoid further embarrassment. From there, Yusapov began to circulate stories about Rasputin at the English press. Among his accusations was that Rasputin was a Jew, that he had an out of control libido, and that he was an alcoholic. From this time on (about 1909), the stories about Rasputin began to circulate with fervor. Always looking for something, anything, to discredit a rapidly growing Russia, the British press put this garbage on the front page.

Returning to the EIC, it reads concerning Rasputin:

This testimonial delivered to Mikhail M. Lebikov certifies that not a single indication of Rasputin's political activity was disclosed by the [EIC]. The inquiry was intensive, but it was definitely established that his influence was only in the profound religious sentiments of their majesties. The only favor Rasputin accepted was the rental of his house, paid by the personal chancellor of his majesty. He also accepted presents made by the hands of the imperial family such a shirts, waist-bands, etc. that Rasputin had no connection with any foreign authorities [is established]. **That all pamphlets and newspaper articles on the subject of Rasputin's influence and other rumors and gossip were fabricated by powerful enemies of the Emperor.** This statement is given under the signature and seal of the Attorney General if the High Commission (Quoted from Judas, 189, emphasis mine)

This paragraph alone means that the history of early 20<sup>th</sup> century Russia needs to be rewritten. That "newspaper articles" were fabricated is a potent admission by such a body, since it means that this was a normal way for important political issues to be described by the press. What else was fabricated by powerful forces?

It is normally told that Rasputin was killed after nearly every conceivable form of killing had failed: from poison to bullets to drowning to beatings. Rasputin was murdered by a group known as the "Mad Gang," a group of extremely high ranking but also very amoral nobles and politicians who sought the eventual overthrow of Nicholas (and the monarchy in general) and their own installation in power. Among whom was Duma president Rodzianko, Vladimir Purishkevich, and Prince Yusipov.

Apparently, according to later police reports, Rasputin was aware of the reason the liberal Prince Yusipov wanted him at his house, though the cover story was to pray for his ailing wife. In several confessions from Yusipov, he said that he first wanted to poison Rasputin, but he refused to eat the cakes especially prepared for him, nor the wine; all of which was poisoned. Eventually, he simply shot Rasputin, and eventually dumped his body into the river Neva, where, according to the autopsy, he died of drowning. It was a rather quick affair, bereft of the drawn out will to live so popular among cinematographers.

Much of the upper nobility in St. Petersburg was frankly being converted to liberalism as the 20<sup>th</sup> century got started. Many of them resented the traditionalism of the Emperor (though a traditionalism strongly tinged with practical good sense), and certainly, the presence of an “uneducated hick” at court. It might be mentioned that Rasputin was not uneducated, though he certainly had strong peasant roots. He appeared only when Alexis needed him and very rarely at other times. He was not a perennial sight there.

Many of the nobility through their weight behind the liberal reformers, and, slowly but surely, the upper reaches of the nobility were turning against Nicholas. The Emperor was surrounded by turncoats and traitors, each viewing himself as the future president of a republican Russia, or even as the next Emperor. It reached a point where, except for a few trusted intimates, Nicholas was unsure who he could trust. Ultimately, it was Rasputin and Alexandra.

Significantly, the author reports many of the spiritual teachings of Rasputin. He never sought disciple, but he certainly attracted them, and one of his most ardent was the author. Now, here is where things get sticky. Though there is no direct evidence that Rasputin was ever a member of one of the small sects that dotted the Russian landscape, some of his teachings are eccentric in the context of Russian Orthodoxy, a view the royal family was certain he espoused.

In short, this book is a well done revisionist understanding of Rasputin from one of his ardent supporters and disciples. There is every reason to believe her most important points about the man, and his enemies, largely because they derive solely from eyewitnesses and police reports. For this reason alone, it is an extremely important book. It will not be taken seriously by scholars in “Russia studies,” for it proves one of the major points made by monarchists, then and now: that the nobility in St. Petersburg was anti-royalist and viewed “parliamentary democracy” as merely a means to gain power under the ubiquitous slogan of “human rights.” Dr. Judas clearly, and though first hand accounts solely, bears this age-old contention out. The peasants were right after all: the tsar was good, his bureaucrats and nobles, bad. This refrain is to be found in peasant folk songs and dances from the 15th century onward, and Dr. Judas shows they were not too far off.

The police were not of one mind on him. For example, officer N Prilina stated that Rasputin was always sober (January 4 1910). There is a theory that Rasputin was hired to heal the schism with the Old Believers. The murder of Rasputin was to be the first stage in a revolutionary coup. Rasputin was a means to “desacrilize” the monarchy without attacking it directly. His Eminence, Archbishop Ambrose (Schurov) in 2002 at the Royal Orthodox Conference held in Ivanovo on May 18, said: “Rasputin suffered many attacks from the enemies of Russia. The press created a hatred of the crown so as to cast a shadow on the royal family (quoted from Platonov, 1996).

Three saintly elders at the time, Jerome (Verendyakin), Kirill (Pavlov) and Nicholas (Guryanov) all revered Rasputin for his righteous behavior. However, the first attack on Rasputin, printed in 1910, came from the Supreme Council of the Russian Freemasonry through its organs Slovo and the Russian Word. Masons VA Maklakov, IV Gessen, M. Vinaver, twin brothers princes Dolgorukys were its owners and backers. BI Nicholas' book Russian Freemasons and the Revolution strongly implicate the Supreme Council of Russian Freemasonry as a major player in the fight against the crown using Rasputin (Platonov, 2006).

MV Rodzianko, the chair of the Duma, admitted that it was the Masonic congress in Brussels that led him to begin attacking Rasputin (Rodzianko, 1990). This newly published version of his memoirs affirm the role of the lodges. It should be noted that the Russian Baptist JS Prokhanov stated that with Rasputin gone, the “Reformation of Russia” can proceed (Multatuli, 2011).

The English wanted to see the tsar overthrown, as Russia was quickly becoming the most important threat to global British dominance. The BBC aired a documentary in 2007 called *Killing Rasputin*<sup>6</sup> suggesting that a member of the MI6 killed him. According to the press service of the BBC, a retired Scotland Yard inspector Richard Cullen and historian Andrew Cook conducted a new study of the death of Rasputin. They found that Rasputin was most likely killed by an agent of the British Secret Intelligence Bureau (then known as the Secret Intelligence Service MI6) Oswald Rayner, who was then working at the imperial court in St. Petersburg. Masonic Provisional Government not only immediately after his accession to power destroyed the tomb and remains of Rasputin, but also created a special commission of inquiry, to witness the sabotage activities of Rasputin's Russia.

Andrew Cook said that Cullen studied the official medical documents about the death of Rasputin, post-mortem photographs of his body and the crime scene. Attention Britons caught a bullet hole in the center of the forehead, which is clearly seen in post-mortem photographs of Rasputin. The exact scope of this became fatal for the 51-year-old shot Rasputin leaves no doubt that he was made a professional marksman and also a short distance. Certain, being an opponent of the war, England desperately needed Rasputin out of the way and his reputation destroyed.

Although Rasputin is constantly accused of debauchery – wrote A. Vyubova – it seems strange that when I started my role on commission of inquiry, there was not a single woman in St. Petersburg, or in Russia, who would make accusations against him. . . A photograph was found that appeared that he had finished lunch or dinner. There was a table with food residues, unfinished glasses which then depicted Rasputin and some priest with some laughing women. Behind them there was a band that gave the impression of revelry. On closer study, this picture shows that are two male figures were etched: one between Rasputin and standing beside him as a nurse, and another between the priest and standing next to him a lady. Later it turned out that the picture was taken in the hospital after breakfast. . . (Abbot Seraphim Orthodox Tsar-Martyr. Spiritual Mission. Beijing. 1920).

Another investigator of the Extraordinary Commission of Inquiry VM Rudnev exposed yet another myth about the alleged wealth of the man. It turned out that after his death there was not a penny in savings. He was poor. His friends stated to the Commission that Rasputin was not a heavy drinker. In fact, the only time anyone observed him drinking was during any travel, and the drink was some sort of sweet wine. He fully supported Nicholas' decision to ban alcohol during the war. In 1910, the police tail in Siberia observed him in his own village totally sober all the time.

The Special Investigation Committee also peered into his alleged mistresses and orgies. Vladimir Rudnev headed this part of the Commission, and his final report notes that no reliable witnesses can be produced that show any of this. In fact, the main “mistress,” Anna Vyubova, was specially examined and was found to still be virginal.

Rasputin's contemporaries said that the Empress and Rasputin made controlled Russia together at the expense of Nicholas and “the people.” Many who actually knew Rasputin said that he had no interest in politics and did not seek power. Vladimir Rudnev, again, working for the Commission above, interviewed many witnesses and could not find any clear reference to

---

6 The video can be accessed here: (<http://video.yandex.ru/users/rublev-museum/view/65/>)

any sort of “control” over political life or the court.

Bishop Alexis of Tobolsk, formerly the Exarch of Georgia, thoroughly studied the investigative file of Gregory from this same Provisional Government inquiry. He went to Tyumen in order to interview others who knew Rasputin. The bishop came back with no evidence that Rasputin was a sectarian and, in addition, established that he was a firmly grounded Orthodox monk.

In addition to his personal impressions according to this case, Alexis interviewed the clergy and council of Intercession Church in Tyumen. He was informed that there was little sectarian activity in the region and the property owned by Rasputin's family was never known to be anything other than Orthodox. As a form of expiation for the slander of Rasputin, the bishop then donated 500 rubles for the construction of the temple in the village, a new gold alter cross 84% solid gold, four silver gilded lamps and a large golden table to house the icon of Christ.

This sort of evidence throws a very different light over the Rasputin issue. The English saw the Russians as their greatest threat, especially after the expansion of the Baku oilfields. Rasputin was a thin end of a wedge forged by the old nobility who demanded power at the expense of tradition, the crown, the people and the church they had long abandoned. Attacks on Rasputin would delegitimize the monarchy, which would bring an oligarchy to power easily tempted by the massive wealth of the Bank of England.

Rasputin had little effect on policy, was not particularly close to the royal family (except where the Tsarevich was concerned), was not a drunk, a womanizer nor a sectarian. These are carefully stage-managed slogans of a global ruling class just beginning to exercise their power. “Backward” regimes like Russia needed to “get with the times” and go into debt with London. That, after all, was the “rational” way to finance growth. Russia had found another way, and this was intolerable. Rasputin was one prong in a well-financed strategic attack on Tsarist Russia that was poised to rule an entire continent.

## Bibliography

Varfolomeyev, V (2012) The Results of the Emergency Provisional Commission on the Investigation of the Government. Social Sciences, Politics and law, 2(22), UDC (342, 518 9,in Russian)

Romanov, AF (1922) Nicholas II and his Government According to the Extraordinary Commission of Inquiry in Two Volumes. Russian Annals, Paris, 1922, in Russian

Archbishop Ambrose Schurov (2002) Masons Slandered Rasputin. Imperial News, in Russian  
<http://www.imperiyanews.ru/details/6151488f-aebd-4ecd-a4c1-66cbe7de1dff>

Voronina, Daria (2013) Seven Fables about Gregory Rasputin. RG, in Russian  
<https://rg.ru/2013/12/16/rasputin-site.html>

Judas, Elizabeth (1951) Rasputin: Neither Devil nor Saint. Wetzel Publishing

Platonov, OA (1996) The Truth about Grigori Rasputin. Saint Petersburg, in Russian

Multatuli, Peter (2011) Why the Dark World Turned On Rasputin. Orthodox Combat (Interview in Russian)  
<http://pravoslav-voin.info/pravvoiny/88-pochemu-temnyj-mir-opolchilsya-na-rasputina.html>

Rodzianko, MV (1990) Collapse of the Empire. Interbook

Memoirs of Contemporaries about Grigory Rasputin. Compiled by the Editors of the Journal Third Rome, 2016, in Russian  
<http://3rm.info/publications/7944-vospominaniya-sovremennikov-o-grigorii-rasputine.html>

Evsin, I. (2016) Grigory Rasputin and the Main Arguments about His “Perversion.” Journal of the Russian Folk, in Russian